PRIVATE LIBRARY

OF

HERBERT F. BRIGGS

Gift of
Herbert F. Briggs
In Memory of

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL,

THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL

LITERATURE.

PREPARED BY

THE REV. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D.,

AND

JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.

VOL. V.—K, L, Mc.

Property of
CBPac
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.
1891.

Ref.
BR
95
M352
1890
V. 5

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873, by
HARPER & BROTHERS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

LIST OF WOOD-CUTS IN VOL. V.

The Kaaba at Mecca.....Page 1
Figures on Rocks at Kanah..... 11
Ancient Egyptian Key..... 59
Interior of Khan at Aleppo..... 69
Mouth of the Kishon..... 111
English Merlin..... 113
Red Kite..... 113
Figure of Kneph..... 125
Ancient Etruscan Knife..... 126
Ancient Egyptian Knives..... 126
Various Ancient Knives..... 126
Egyptian Flint Knives..... 127
Egyptian Slaughtering-knives.... 127
Ancient Assyrian Knives..... 127
Border of Assyrian Slab..... 135
Krishna trampling on the Serpent. 164
Serpent biting Krishna's Heel..... 165
Roman *Labarum*..... 177
Monogram of Christ..... 177
Attack of Lachish by Assyrians... 181
Assyrian Ground-plan of Lachish. 181
Jewish Captives from Lachish.... 182
Ancient Egyptian Ladder..... 190
Ancient Assyrian Ladders..... 191
Figure of the *Dalai Lama*..... 202
Agnus Dei..... 206
Ancient Egyptian Cylindrical Lamp 220
Bronze Lamp and Stand..... 221
Various Ancient Egyptian Lamps. 221
Ancient Assyrian Lamps..... 221
Classical Hand-lamps..... 221
Classical Hanging Lamps..... 221
Oriental Wedding Lantern..... 222
Oriental Hanging Lamps..... 222
Enlarged View of the *Kandil*..... 222
Egyptian Knives and Lancets..... 225
Lancet-window..... 225
Ancient Roman Lantern..... 235
Modern Oriental Lantern..... 235
Ancient Egyptian Lantern..... 235
Ordinary Eastern Lantern..... 235
Architectural Lantern of St. Helen's 235
Copper Coin of Laodicea..... 237
The Hoopoe..... 246
The Pewit.....Page 246
Lattice Window at Cairo..... 268
Lattice-work at Cairo..... 269
Lavatory at Selby..... 280
The Laver, after Thenius..... 281
The Laver, according to Paine.... 282
Costume of a Lazarist..... 300
Ancient Egyptians working in Leather..... 308
View of Lebanon... 310
A suppliant Native of Lebanon... 314
Felling Trees on Lebanon..... 314
Lectern at Ramsay Church..... 317
The Leek..... 324
Trigonella Fœnum-Græcum..... 324
Ancient Legionary Soldiers..... 329
Ancient Egyptians cooking Lentiles 347
The Lentile..... 348
Syrian Panther..... 370
Levitical City, Diagram I, *a*..... 394
Levitical City, Diagram I, *b*..... 394
Levitical City, Diagram II..... 394
Levitical City, Diagram III..... 394
Levitical City, Diagram IV..... 394
Levitical City, Diagram V..... 395
Levitical City, Diagram VI, *a*..... 395
Levitical City, Diagram VI, *b*..... 395
Egyptian Gnat magnified..... 422
Aquilaria Agallochum..... 428
The Water-lily..... 432
White Lily..... 433
Scarlet Martagon..... 434
African Lion..... 446
Claw in Lion's Tail..... 446
Persian Lion..... 447
Lion at Arban..... 447
Lion let out of a Cage..... 447
Egyptian Hunting with a Lion.... 448
A Lion devouring a Man..... 448
Ancient Egyptian Palanquin..... 455
Modern Persian Palanquin..... 455
Syrian Double Palanquin..... 455
Camel bearing the *Hodaj*.....Page 455
Chamæleo Vulgaris..... 469
Lacerta Stellio..... 470
Ancient Roman Bread..... 472
Ancient Egyptian Bread..... 472
Modern Egyptian wooden Lock... 477
Œdipoda Migratoria..... 484
Acridium Lineola..... 485
Acridium Peregrinum..... 485
Locust flying..... 485
Dried Locusts..... 486
Locust-eating Bird..... 486
"Lot's Wife"..... 521
Coin of Lycia..... 584
Lych-gate at Blackford Church.... 584
Persepolitan Emblem of Macedon. 617
Coins of Macedonia..... 618
Mosque at Hebron..... 621
Ancient Egyptian Cuirass..... 659
Jews' Mallow..... 684
Sea-purslane..... 684
Vicinity of Abraham's Cemetery.. 687
Map of Manasseh—East..... 690
Map of Manasseh—West..... 691
Atropa Mandragora Officinarum... 700
Tamarix Gallica..... 712
Alhagi Maurorum..... 712
Modern Egyptian Mantle..... 718
Specimen of Odessa MS..... 722
Specimens of Greek MSS..... 728
Maronite Sheik and Wife..... 769
Table of Prohibited Marriages.... 779
Mohammedan Bridal Procession.. 797
Figure of Mars..... 812
Mary Queen of Scots..... 849
Rock of Massada..... 856
Mask Corbel 858
Masonry at Hebron..... 858
Pistacia Lentiscus..... 871
Mater Dolorosa..... 872
Ancient Egyptian Hoes..... 902
Ancient Throw-sticks..... 903
Coin of Maximin I..... 916
Coin of Maximin II..... 917

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

K.

Kaab, a celebrated Arabian poet, author of one of the seven poems which were suspended in the temple of Mecca, was originally a strenuous opponent of Mohammed, whose doctrines and person he satirized. He, however, recanted by writing a poem in honor of the prophet. As a reward, the prophet gave him his green mantle, which one of the descendants of Kaab sold for ten thousand pieces of silver. He died in 662.

Kaaba (Arabic *Al-Kaabah*, "Square House," or, more properly, now *Beit-Allah*, "House of God") is the name of an oblong stone building inclosed in the great mosque at Mecca. From time immemorial tradition makes Mecca to have been a place of pilgrimage from all parts of Arabia "within a circuit of a thousand miles, interrupted only by the sea. The Kaaba, the Black Stone, and other concomitants of worship at Mecca have a similar antiquity" (Muir, *Mahomet*, i, 211). There are intimations of the Kaaba to be found in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. It certainly existed before the Christian æra (Sir W. Jones, *Works*, x, 356; M. C. de Percival, i, 74; ii, 532). See MECCA.

Origin and History.—Mr. Muir (ii, 34) thinks the Kaaba to be of Yemen origin, and to have been connected with the systems of idolatry prevalent in the southern portion of the Arabian peninsula. The Mussulmans say that Adam first worshipped on this spot, after his expulsion from Paradise, in a tent sent down from heaven for this purpose. Seth substituted for the tent a structure of clay and stone, which was, however, destroyed by the Deluge, but afterwards rebuilt by Abraham and Ishmael. But this tradition may have arisen in connection with a traditional Jewish inscription found on a stone in the Kaaba about forty years before Mohammed, and which would suggest the possibility that some remote Abrahamic tribe acquainted with Syriac may have been at an early period associated with aboriginal Arabs in the erection of the Kaaba. Some have supposed it to have been devoted to the worship of Saturn (Zohal). Certain it is that it has been the holy emblem at different periods of four different faiths. Sabæan, Hindu, Gueber, and Moslem have all held it in veneration (Burton, iii, 160). According to the Koran, it is "the ancient house," the first house built and appointed for God's worship (Sale's *Koran*, p. 276), and the guardianship of it was by express revelation given to Othman (Sale, p. 167).

It was originally without a roof, and, having suffered material damage by a flood, was considered to be in danger of falling. The treasures it contained were considered insecure, and some of them were alleged to have been stolen. In A.D. 605 Mohammed rebuilt the edifice, but in A.D. 1626 it was again destroyed by a great torrent, and in A.D. 1627 was rebuilt substantially after its present form.

Structure.—It stands now on a base about two feet in height, which is a sharp inclined plane; and, as the roof is flat, the building becomes an irregular cube, the sides of which vary from forty to fifty feet in height, and eighteen by fourteen paces in extent. It is inclosed by a wall some two hundred and fifty paces on two sides, and two hundred paces on the others.

The Kaaba has but one door, which is raised some four or five feet from the ground, and is reached by a ladder. It is allowed to be entered only two or three times a year, though it is reputed to be susceptible of a money influence, and to be opened clandestinely much more frequently. The door is wholly coated with silver, and has gilt ornaments. Wax candles are burned before it nightly, together with perfuming-pans containing musk, aloes, etc., and other odorous substances.

The Kaaba at Mecca.

Black Stone.—The most important feature of the Kaaba is the "Black Stone," which is inserted in the north-

east corner of the building, at the height of four or five feet from the ground. It is in shape an irregular oval, about seven inches in diameter. There are various opinions as to the nature of this stone. Burckhardt supposes it to be a "lava" stone. Others suggest that it is an aerolite. Muir calls it "a fragment of volcanic salts sprinkled with colored crystals, and varied red feldspath upon a dark black ground like a coal, one protuberance being reddish." Burckhardt thinks it looks as if it had been broken into several pieces and cemented. He says, however, that it is difficult to determine the quality of it, because it is so worn by the millions of kisses and touches of the pilgrims. Muir says it is worn "until it is uneven, and has a muscular appearance." It is bordered all round with a large plate of silver about a foot broad. The part or angle exposed is semicircular. So much of the merit of the Kaaba depends on this stone that at the time of the rebuilding of the edifice by Mohammed a great contest arose between the families of the Koreish for the honor of placing it in the new structure. Mohammed settled this dispute by placing it on his own mantle, and causing a chief of each tribe to lift it, and then put it himself in its position in the Kaaba. See KOREISH. Pilgrims, on arrival at Mecca, proceeding to the Kaaba and making the circuit of it, start at the corner where the black stone is inserted.

Fabulous stories abound relative to the black stone, such as that it was originally white, but became black because of the silent and unseen tears which it wept on account of the sins of men. This, however, only affected its exterior. Others attribute its change of color to the innumerable touches and kisses of the pilgrims. It is one of the precious stones of Paradise, which came to earth with Adam, and was miraculously preserved during the flood, and brought back to Mecca by the angel Gabriel, and given to Abraham to build originally in the Kaaba. It was taken at one time by the Karmathians (q. v.), who refused to release it for five thousand pieces of gold, but they finally restored it.

Veiling.—There is a custom, very remote in its origin, of covering the outside of the Kaaba with a veil, which has at various times been made of Yemen cloth, of Egyptian linen, of red brocade, and of black silk. To supply it became at one time a sign of royalty, and it was accordingly furnished by the caliph of Egypt, and later by the Turkish sultan. There seems to be some conflict of authorities about some things pertaining to the custom of veiling. About one third from the top of the veil is a band about two feet in width, embroidered with texts from the Koran in gilt letters (see Muir, ii, 32; Burton, iii, 295, 300).

Admission.—Since the ninth year of the Hegira an order has obtained that none but Islamites shall be admitted to the Kaaba. Formerly the General Assembly of Ocadh convened at Mecca. In it poets contested for a whole month for prizes, and those poems to which prizes were from time to time awarded were by public order written in letters of gold on Egyptian silk, and hung up in the Kaaba (Sale, p. 20).

Other Features.—In the south-east corner of the Kaaba is a smaller stone, less venerated than the above, being touched only, and not kissed, by those walking round the Kaaba. On the north side of the Kaaba is a slight hollow, large enough to admit three persons, where it is specially meritorious to pray, it being the place where Abraham and Ishmael kneaded chalk and mud for the original structure. From the west side of the Kaaba a water-spout carries rain from the roof and pours it on the reputed grave of Ishmael, and pilgrims are not unfrequently seen "fighting to catch it." This water-spout is said to be of pure gold, and is four feet in length and about six inches in width. It is declared to have been taken to the Kaaba A.H. 981. The pavement round the Kaaba is a mosaic of many colored stones, and was laid in A.H. 826. There is on one side of the Kaaba a semicircular wall, which is scarcely less sacred than the Kaaba itself. The walk round the Kaaba is outside this wall, but the closer to it the better. This wall is entitled *El Hattim*, and is of solid stone, five feet in height and four feet in thickness. It is incased in white marble, and inscribed with prayers. The Kaaba has a double roof, supported by pillars of aloe-wood, and it is said that no bird ever rests upon it. The whole building is surrounded by an inclosure of columns, outside which there are found three oratories, or places of devotion for different sects; also the edifice containing the well Zem-Zem, the cupola of Abbas, and the Treasury. All these are further inclosed by a splendid colonnade, surmounted by cupolas, steeples, spires, crescents, all gilded and adorned with lamps, which shed a brilliant lustre at night. These surroundings, between which and the Kaaba run seven paved causeways, were first devised by Omar for the better preservation of the Kaaba itself. According to Burckhardt, the same holy Kaaba is the scene of such indecencies as cannot with propriety be particularized; indecencies which are practiced not only with impunity, but publicly and without a blush. See MOHAMMEDANISM.

Since the second year of the Hegira the Kaaba has been for the Mussulman world the *Keblah*, or place towards which all Moslems turn in prayer. See KEBLAH.

See *Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Mecca*, by Richard F. Burton, vol. iii (Lond. 1855); Sale's *Koran;* Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, vol. ii and iii (London, 1858); Sprenger, *Life of Mahomet*, ii, 7; Ley, *De templi Meccani origine* (Berlin, 1840, 4to). (J. T. G.)

Kaath. See PELICAN.

Kabbala. See CABALA.

Kabiler is the name of a nephew of Brahma, and one of India's greatest saints. His father was Kartamen, the ancestor of the Brahmin race. It is in the person of this Hindu that Vishnu took the form of man some twenty-four different times. See Vollmer, *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, p. 987.

Kab'zëel (Heb. *Kabtseël'*, קַבְצְאֵל, *gathering of God*, i. e. perhaps *confluence* of waters; Sept. Καβσεήλ in Joshua, elsewhere Καβασάηλ v. r. Καβεσεήλ, etc.), a town on the extreme south of Judah, near Idumæa, and therefore probably included within the territory of Simeon (Josh. xv, 21); the native place of Benaiah (son of Jehoiada), one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 20; 1 Chron. xi, 22). It was inhabited after the captivity under the similar name of JEKABZEEL (Neh. xi, 25). Its locality can only be conjectured as being near the edge of the Ghor, south of the Dead Sea (see Masius, *Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.). The name and vicinity are probably still represented by the wady *El-Kuseib*, a small winter torrent running into the Dead Sea from the south (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 497). Here the boundaries of Palestine, Edom, and Moab would converge, as is implied in the above Scripture references, and the region is still the resort of wild animals (Lynch, *Jordan*, p. 319; De Saulcy, *Dead Sea*, i, 298), and characterized by a deep fall of snow in winter (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 402), as is stated in the account of Benaiah's adventure with the lion.

Ka'dès (Κάδης), a town of Palestine, apparently in the south (Judith i, 9); probably the same as KADESH-BARNEA (q. v.).

Ka'desh (Heb. *Kadesh'*, קָדֵשׁ, *holy*, perhaps as being the site of some ancient oracle [compare the early equivalent name "fount of judgment"], Gen. xiv, 7; xvi, 14; xx, 1; Numb. xiii, 26; xx, 1, 14, 16, 22; xxvii, 14; xxxiii, 36, 37; Deut. i, 46; xxxii, 51; Judg. xi, 16, 17; Psa. xxix, 8; Ezek. xlvii, 19; xlviii, 28; Sept. Κάδης, but in Ezek. xlvii, 19, Καδής v. r. Καδήμ) or, more fully, KA'DESH-BAR'NEA (Hebrew *Kadesh'-Barne'ä*, קָדֵשׁ בַּרְנֵעַ, the latter portion of the name being regarded by Simonis, *Lex.* s. v., as compounded of בַּר, *open country*, and נָעַע, *wandering;* Numb. xxxii, 8; xxiv, 4;

Deut. i, 2, 19; ii, 14; ix, 23; Josh. x, 41; xiv, 6, 7; xv, 3; Sept. Κάδης [τοῦ] Βαρνή), a site on the south-eastern border of the Promised Land, towards Edom, of much interest as being the point at which the Israelites twice encamped (their nineteenth and thirty-seventh stations) with the intention of entering Palestine, and from which they were twice sent back; the first time in pursuance of their sentence to wander forty years in the wilderness, and the second time from the refusal of the king of Edom to permit a passage through his territories. It is probable that the term "Kadesh," though applied to signify a "city," yet had also a wider application to a region, in which Kadesh-meribah certainly, and Kadesh-barnea probably, indicate a precise spot. Thus Kadesh appears as a limit eastward of the same tract which was limited westward by Shur (Gen. xx, 1). Shur is possibly the same as Sihor, "which is before Egypt" (xxv, 18; Josh. xiii, 3; Jer. ii, 18), and was the first portion of the wilderness on which the people emerged from the passage of the Red Sea. See SHUR. "Between Kadesh and Bered" is another indication of the site of Kadesh as an eastern limit (Gen. xvi, 14), for the point so fixed is "the fountain on the way to Shur" (v, 7), and the range of limits is narrowed by selecting the western one not so far to the west, while the eastern one, Kadesh, is unchanged. Again, we have Kadesh as the point to which the foray of Chedorlaomer "returned"—a word which does not imply that they had previously visited it, but that it lay in the direction, as viewed from Mount Seir and Paran, mentioned next before it, which was that of the point from which Chedorlaomer had come, viz. the north. Chedorlaomer, it seems, coming down by the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, smote the Zuzims (Ammon, Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 20), and the Emims (Moab, Deut. ii, 11), and the Horites in Mount Seir, to the south of that sea, unto "El-Paran that is by the wilderness." He drove these Horites over the Arabah into the Et-Tîh region. Then "returned," i. e. went northward to Kadesh and Hazezon Tamar, or Engedi (comp. Gen. xiv, 7; 2 Chron. xx, 2). It was from Kadesh that the spies entered Palestine by ascending the mountains; and the murmuring Israelites, afterwards attempting to do the same, were driven back by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and afterwards apparently by the king of Arad, as far as Hormah, then called Zephath (Numb. xiii, 17; xiv, 40–45; xxi, 1–3; Deut. i, 41–44; compare Judg. i, 7). There was also at Kadesh a fountain (EN-MISHPAT) mentioned long before the exode of the Israelites (Gen. xiv, 7); and the miraculous supply of water took place only on the second visit, which implies that at the first there was no lack of this necessary article. In memory of the murmurs of the Israelites, this fountain afterwards bore the name of "the Waters of MERIBAH" (Deut. xxxii, 51). The adjacent desert was called the "Wilderness of Kadesh" (Psa. xxix, 8). On the second visit to this place Miriam died there, and Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom, informing him that they were in Kadesh, a city in the uttermost part of his border, and asking leave to pass through his country, so as to continue their course round Moab, and approach Palestine from the east. This Edom refused, and the Israelites accordingly marched to Mount Hor, where Aaron died; and then along the Arabah (desert of Zin) to the Red Sea (Numb. xx, 14–29). The name of Kadesh again occurs in describing the southern quarter of Judah, the line defining which is drawn "from the shore of the Salt Sea, from the bay that looked southward; and it went out to the south side of Akrabbim, and passed along to Zin, and ascended up on the south side to Kadesh-barnea" (Josh. xv, 1–3; compare Numb. xxxiv, 3, 4). In Gen. xiv, 7 Kadesh is connected with Tamar, or Hazezon Tamar, just as we find these two in the comparatively late book of Ezekiel, as designed to mark the southern border of Judah, drawn through them and terminating seaward at the "river to," or "towards the great sea" (Ezek. xlvii, 19; xlviii, 28). There is one objection to this view. The Kadesh from which the spies were sent was in *the wilderness of Paran* (Numb. xiii, 26); Kadesh-barnea was in the wilderness of Zin (xx, 1). This is easily removed. Paran was the general name for the whole desert west of the Arabah, extending from Palestine to Sinai (Gen. xxi, 21; Numb. x, 12; xii, 16; 1 Sam. xxv, 1). It even seems to have included the Arabah, reaching to the very base of Mount Seir (Gen. xiv, 6). Zin was a specific name for that part of the Arabah which bordered on Edom and Palestine (Numb. xiii, 21; xxxiv, 3, 4; Josh. xv, 1–3). If Kadesh was situated on the western side of the Arabah, then it might be reckoned either to Paran or to Zin; or, if we agree with Keil, Delitzsch, and others (Keil *on Josh.* x), that Paran was the general name for the whole, and Zin the specific name of a portion, the objection is removed at once.—Kitto; Smith. Compare KEDESH, 1.

To meet these various indications, two places by the name of Kadesh were formerly supposed to exist; but the editor of the *Pictorial Bible* has shown (note on Numb. xx, 1) that a single Kadesh would answer all the conditions, if placed on the western border of the Arabah, opposite Mt. Hor. Accordingly, Dr. Robinson locates it at *Ain el-Webeh*, which he argues coincides with all the circumstances mentioned (*Researches*, ii, 538). But this is somewhat too distant from the pass es-Sufa, which is probably the Zephath where the Israelites encountered the Canaanites, and on this account Raumer has with greater plausibility fixed Kadesh at *Ain es-Husb* (*Der Zug der Israeliten*, Leipz. 1843, p. 9 sq.). See EXODE. Mr. Rowlands, who travelled through this region in 1842, thinks he discovered Kadesh (as well as numerous other ancient localities in this vicinity) at a place which he calls *Ain Kudes* (Williams's *Holy City*, 2d edit., i, 467). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* argues at length in favor of this position at *Ain Gades*, but all his reasoning partakes of the character of special pleading, and rests upon inconclusive grounds. His only real argument is that Kadesh appears to have lain between wady Feiran (Paran) and Engedi (Hazezon-tamar), on Chedorlaomer's route (Gen. xiv, 7); but that route is given so vaguely that we can lay no particular stress upon it. The other arguments even tell the other way; especially do the passages adduced go to show that Kadesh was at the extreme east from Shur (Gen. xx, 1) and el-Arish (Numb. xxxiv, 5; Josh. xv, 5), and the same was the case with Zin (Numb. xiii, 21; xxxiii, 36). This position also is avowedly not only inconsistent with the location of Huzeroth at Ain Hudheirah, but even requires us to enlarge the borders of Edom far to the west (Numb. xx, 16), and actually to remove Mt. Hor from its well-defined traditionary situation (Deut. i, 2). Capt. Palmer has more lately visited the site thus assumed for Kadesh, and particularly describes it (*Quart. Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," Jan. 1871, p. 20 sq.) as "consisting of three springs, or rather shallow pools, one of them overflowing in the rainy season;" but his advocacy for the identity adds no additional argument. In fact, the agreement in the name is the only plea of any force. This is counterbalanced by the scriptural notices of the position of the place. See Dr. Robinson, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1849, p. 377 sq.; also Palmer, *Desert of Exodus*, p. 286; comp. Kitto's *Scripture Lands*, p. 78 82; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xiv, 1077–1089. Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 23) endeavors, from Rabbinical authority, to locate Kadesh at a place named by him wady *Bierin*, about forty-five miles south of Gaza; but his whole theory is imaginary, besides indicating a position too far west for this Kadesh, and requiring another for En-Mishpat (p. 214), which is stated by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Κάδης, Βαρνή, *Cades*) to have been in the vicinity of Mt. Hor. From this last statement Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 95) unwarrantably infers that Kadesh was identical with Petra.

Kadi (Arabic) is among the Mohammedans the title of an assistant judge of civil law, and, like the judge himself (molla), is classed among the higher clergy, be-

cause all civil law of the Mussulman is based on the Koran. See KORAN.

Kadkod. See AGATE.

Kad'miël (Heb. *Kadmiel'*, קַדְמִיאֵל, *before God*, i. e. his servant; Sept. Καδμιήλ), one of the Levites who returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity (Neh. xii, 8), and assisted in the various reforms of that period, being always named in connection with Jeshua (Ezra iii, 9; Neh. vii, 43; comp. Ezra iii, 9); sometimes only as a descendant in common of Hodaviah (Ezra ii, 40; Neh. vii, 43; comp. Ezra iii, 9), but once as a son (Neh. xii, 24). The length of time over which these notices seem to extend (B.C. 536–410) leads to the suspicion that they relate to two individuals (perhaps a brother and also a son of the Levite Jeshua), one of whom may have been concerned in the earlier events, and the other in the later.

Kad'monite (Heb. *Kadmoni'*, קַדְמֹנִי, *eastern*, as in Ezek. x, 19, etc., or *former*, as in Ezek. xxxviii, 17, etc.; only once of a nation, collect. in the sing., Gen. xv, 19; Sept. Κεδμωναῖοι, Vulg. *Cedmonæi*, A. V. "Kadmonites"), the name of a Canaanitish tribe, who appear to have dwelt in the north-east part of Palestine, under Mount Hermon, at the time that Abraham sojourned in the land, and are mentioned in a more than ordinarily full list of the aborigines of Canaan (Gen. xv, 19). As the name is derived from קֶדֶם, *kedem*, "east," it is supposed by Dr. Wells and others to denote a people situated to the east of the Jordan, or, rather, that it was a term applied collectively, like "Orientals," to all the people living in the countries beyond that river. At least it may be a term of contrast with the more western Zidonians. As the term likewise signifies *ancient*, it may designate the older or aboriginal races of that region in general, who were recognized as the earliest in origin. Both these explanations may be correct, as the Kadmonites are not elsewhere mentioned as a distinct nation; and the subsequent discontinuance of the term, in the assigned acceptation, may easily be accounted for by the nations beyond the river having afterwards become more distinctly known, so as to be mentioned by their several distinctive names. See HIVITE. The reader may see much ingenious trifling respecting this name in Bochart (*Canaan*, i, 19); the substance of which is that Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, in Bœotia, was originally a Kadmonite, and that the name of his wife, Hermione, was derived from Mount Hermon. By others the name Kadmonites has been extended as equivalent to "the children of the East" (בְּנֵי קֶדֶם), i. e. those living beyond the Euphrates (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* i, 300) [see BENE-KEDEM], and Reland (*Palæstina*, p. 94) has sought to identify them with the Nabathæans of Arabia; but these were Ishmaelites. It was probably applied collectively to various tribes, like the Saracens of the Middle Ages or the Bedouins of modern times (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv, 138). According to Dr. Thomson, the name is still preserved among the Nusariyeh north of Tripoli, who have a tradition that their ancestors were expelled from Palestine by Joshua, and who seem in physiognomy and manners to belong to the most ancient inhabitants of the country (*Land and Book*, i, 242). See CANAANITE.

Kadroma is the name of a Thibetian Jewish divinity. Strangely enough, the Darwinian theory seems to have been entertained at a date considerably anterior to our century, for this goddess the Thibetians claim to have belonged to the ape race, and, after marriage to an ape, to have become the mother of the entire population of Thibet. See Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 990.

Kaffres (from the Arabic *Kafir*, infidel, i. e. non-Mohammedan), a people in south-eastern Africa, who received this name from the Moorish navigators of the Indian Ocean. When the Dutch colonists came in contact with the most southern tribe of the Kaffres, the Koosas, or Amakosa, the Moorish name was given to them exclusively, and in this restricted sense it is commonly used by the Dutch and English colonists. It is, however, well ascertained that not only the tribes now commonly called Kaffres, but the Tambookies, Mambookies, Zulus, Damaras, the inhabitants of Delagoa Bay, Mozambique, and the numerous Bechuana tribes who occupy the interior of the continent to an extent as yet unexplored, are but subdivisions of one great family, allied in language, customs, and mode of life. The Kaffre languages (in the wider sense of the word) are divided (by Fr. Müller) into an Eastern, Middle, and Western group. The former comprises, 1. the Kaffre languages (in the narrower sense of the word), embracing, besides the Kaffre proper, also the Zulu dialect; 2. the Zambesi languages, embracing the languages of the Barotse, Bayeye, and Mashona; 3. the languages of Zanzibar, embracing the languages of the Kisuahili, Kinika, Kikamba, and the Kihian. The Middle group contains, 1. the Sechuana languages (Sesuto, Serolong, and Shlapi); 2. the Tekeza languages, embracing the languages of the Mancolosi, Matonga, and Maloenga. The Western group contains, 1. the Bunda, Herero, and Londa languages; 2. the languages of Congo, Mpongwe, Dikele, Isuba, and Fernando Po. The Kaffre languages are sonorous, flexible, and definite. The southern tribes have adopted the peculiar smacking sounds of the Hottentots, which frequently change the meaning of words. The government of the Kaffre tribes is feudal—an aristocracy of chiefs, acknowledging the supremacy of the sovereign, but, except on extraordinary occasions, acting independently of him. The general chief is the sovereign of the nation, and in a council of chiefs is very powerful, and is looked upon by all the nobles and people with unbounded respect. The kraals (hamlets) generally consist of a dozen low, conical huts, the diameter of which is no more than about ten feet, into which one has to creep through a low opening, closed during the night by trees. In the middle of the hut is a room for the cattle. Wars generally arise out of the stealing of cattle. In personal appearance the Kaffres are a remarkably fine race of men. They are of dark brown color, have a beautiful and vigorous constitution, dark woolly hair; a lofty front, and bent nose like the Europeans, projecting cheek-bones like the Hottentots, thick lips like the negroes. Their beard is thin. The women are handsome and modest; their clothing consists of cloaks of skin, while the men are almost naked. They have no national religion; there are some traces of a belief in a supreme being and in subordinate spirits, but no kind of religious worship and no priests. They are very superstitious, and pay a high tribute to sorcerers. "They have no idea," says Philip (*South Africa*, i, 118), "of any man's dying except from hunger, violence, or witchcraft." Like many other savage tribes, they practice the worship of their ancestry, "They sacrifice and pray to their deceased relatives, although it would be asserting too much to say absolutely that they believe in the existence and the immortality of the soul. In fact, their belief seems to go no further than this, that the ghosts of the dead haunt for a certain time their previous dwelling-places, and either assist or plague the living. No special powers are attributed to them, and it would be a misnomer to call them deities" (comp. Lubbock, *Primitive Condition of Man*, N. Y. 1871, 8vo, ch. iv sq.). They practice circumcision, but only as a custom, not as a religious rite. Polygamy is allowed, and as the heavy work is chiefly performed by the women, it has proved a great obstacle to the introduction of Christianity.

The various tribes of the Kaffre family are estimated by Rev. J. J. Freeman, secretary of the London Missionary Society, at 2,000,000, spread from the eastern frontier of Cape Colony beyond Delagoa Bay, and then across the whole continent, without break, to the Atlantic in latitude 20°. A part of the territory of the Kaffres, from which, in particular, constant raids were made into English territory, was annexed to the British do-

minions under the name of Queen Adelaide province. It was subsequently restored to the chiefs of the Kaffres; in 1847 it again became an English province, under the name of British Kaffraria, and King William's Town, on the Buffalo River, was made the capital and the military head-quarters. The capital has a population of 5169, the sea-port, East London, of 2134. The population of the towns consists chiefly of English and German settlers, while the country people are Kaffres. In 1857 the province numbered 3942 kraals, and had a population of 104,721, but a terrible famine, which was caused by a false prophet of the name of Umhlakasa, reduced it in 1858 to 1291 kraals, and a population of 52,186. In 1880 the province embraced about 3006 sq. miles, and a population of 122,159. The British influence more and more extends over Kaffraria proper, which is situated between British Kaffraria and Natal, and embraces about 1800 sq. miles and 543,000 inhabitants. North Natal and the Transvaal republic extends the land of other Kaffre tribes, the territory of which is estimated at 62,930 square miles, with a population of about 440,000. Cape Colony, according to the census of 1875, had a Kaffre population of 166,979.

As the Dutch government of Cape Colony was hostile to all Christian missions, the missions among the Kaffres did not begin until the government had passed under British rule. The Moravians, who then for the first time found the necessary protection for their re-established missions among the Hottentots [see HOTTENTOTS], extended in 1818 their labors also to the Kaffres, in particular to the tribes of the Fongus and Tambakis, whence in 1862 a station was established among the last named tribe of Independent Kaffraria. The missionary Von der Kemp, who in 1798 was sent out by the London Missionary Society, laid the foundation of the missions of this society among the Kaffres. The Wesleyan missionaries have (since 1820) numerous stations in all parts of the Kaffre territory. Their missionaries have for a long time been almost the only ones who ventured to penetrate into the uncultivated districts of the free Kaffres. The Free Church and the United Presbyterians of Scotland have a number of stations in British Kaffraria, and have begun to extend their labors to (independent) Kaffraria, among the natives whom the British government has induced to settle there. The Berlin missions have also, since 1834, established a number of stations in British Kaffraria. The Anglican Church, which has bishops at Capetown (1847), Grahamstown (1853), and in the Orange Free State (1863), has stations both in British and in Free Kaffraria, and is eagerly intent upon extending its work. The Dutch Reformed Church had done nothing for the Kaffres until the establishment of a special missionary board in 1863 (Synodale Zendings Comissië in Zuyd Africa), which displays a great zeal in the establishment of missions among the pagan population. More recently the German Baptists have sent out missionaries to British Kaffraria. The Roman Catholic Church has also a few stations in British Kaffraria. See Grundemann, *Missionsatlas* (2d number, Gotha, 1867); Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions;* Moffat's *Southern Africa* (Lond. 1842); T. B. Freeman's *Tour in South Africa* (Lond. 1857); Lichtenstein, *Travels in South Africa;* Burchell, *Travels in Southern Africa.* (A. J. S.)

Kagbossum is the name of a crow which the Hindus assert embodies the soul of one of their celebrated sages; some of them say even of Brahma himself. See Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 991.

Kahanbarha, the Persian name for the period in which the world was created, and which in their cosmogony, as in that of the Christian dispensation, covers six days; but, like some of our theorists, they say that each day of creation corresponds in length to a period of one month. See ZOROASTRIANISM.

Kahler, JOHANNES, a Lutheran theologian of some note, was born at Wolmar, Hesse Cassel, Jan. 20, 1649, and was educated at the University of Giessen. He began his lectures at that university in 1673 on the Cartesian philosophy, and became one of its ablest exponents. In 1677 he was called as extraordinary professor of metaphysics to Rinteln, and shortly after was promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. In 1683 he became also professor of theology. He died May 17, 1729. Kahler was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and enjoyed the confidence and good will of his colleagues to such a degree that he was chosen rector at six different elections. His writings, consisting mainly of dissertations on theology and philosophy, were collected and printed in 2 vols. 12mo. See *Allgem. Hist. Lex.* vol. iii, s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon,* vol. ii, s. v., gives a complete list of Kahler's productions.

Kaisersberg. See GEILER.

Kaiserswerth. See FLIEDNER.

Kajomorts, the Persian name for the first man, who they say was a direct descendant of a bull (Abudad), and was both man and wife at the same time. So sacred was his person that even angels worshipped him. Ahriman, however, was bent upon his destruction, and for thirty years he persecuted Kajomorts, until successful in slaying him. But the seed of Kajomorts fructified the earth, the sun purified it, and after forty years a plant sprang up, which became a mighty tree, bearing, instead of fruit, ten human pairs, one of which, Meshia and Meshiane, became the ancestors of the human race (see Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 992). See ORMUZD; ZOROASTRIANISM.

Kakusandu is the name of the third Buddha who preceded Gotama (q. v.), and, according to Major Forbes's (*Journ. Asiatic Society,* June, 1836) calculation of Hindu chronology, must have lived on the earth B.C. 3101 (see Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism,* p. 87, 96, *et al.*). See BUDDHA.

Kalasutra, the Hindu name for a place in hell to which the trespassers of Hindu tradition are consigned, particularly those who, after offering a sacrifice for their ancestors, dare to remove from the altar any portion of the offering which the flames might have left unconsumed. See Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 993.

Kalderon (more accurately CALDERON), the most celebrated poet of Spain, born of a noble family at Madrid Jan. 1, 1601, was educated at the University of Salamanca, but at length went into the army, and fought in Milan and Flanders, until in 1651 he entered the priesthood. Already, as a soldier, he had devoted much time to the cultivation of his poetical talents; now, as a priest, he devoted most of his time to it, and it is for his influence on the religious poetry of Spain, for his relation to the history of Roman Catholic poetry, that we make room for a short sketch of this religious (Roman Catholic) Shakespeare. Shortly after his admission to the priesthood he took a chaplaincy at Toledo, but the king, with whom Kalderon was in special favor, soon gained the poet for his court by assigning Kalderon a lucrative position in the royal chapel. He died about 1681, perhaps somewhat later. He wrote no less than five hundred dramas, many of which have a religious tendency, and display most accurately the religious and moral character of his time and people. Those of his productions which have been preserved are divided into three different groups. The first contains his comedies of familiar life; the second, the heroic; and the third embraces his religious pieces, or "Sacramental Acts" (*Autos Sacramentales*), and these only concern us here. They are compositions which bear a strong resemblance to the miracle-plays of the Middle Ages, and are, like them, deformed by fantastic extravagances of religious opinion and feeling. Some of them, however, are beautifully poetical. One of the most characteristic, held also by some critics to be the best, is "The Devotion of the Cross," a strange farrago of the wildest supernatural inventions, and the most impractically-motived exhibitions of human conduct, but breathing a po-

etic spirit which is wonderfully impressive. One of its main incidents is the legend of one dead man shriving another, which had been used by another poet. Another successful effort of his is "The steadfast Prince." Both of these have frequently been translated into English and other languages. See, however, Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature* (new edition, 1871, with Index). One of the ablest Roman Catholic critics, professor Frederick Schlegel, thus speaks of Kalderon's position as a Christian poet: "The Christianity of this poet, however, does not consist so much in the external circumstances which he has selected, as in his peculiar feeling, and the method of treating his subject, which is most common with him. Even where his materials furnish him with no opportunity of drawing the perfect development of a new life out of death and suffering, yet everything is conceived in the spirit of this Christian love and purification, everything seen in its light, and clothed in the splendor of its heavenly coloring. In every situation and circumstance, Kalderon is, of all dramatic poets, the most Christian, and for that very reason the most romantic" (*History of Literature*, p. 280, 281). See also Eichendorff, *Geistliche Schauspiele von Don Pedro Kalderon de la Barca;* Schmidt, *Schauspiele Calderons* (Eberfeld, 1857); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 218 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kaldi, Georg, a celebrated Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Tyrnau (Hungary) in 1570. After filling various positions in the Jesuitical order, preaching at Vienna, and teaching theology at Olmutz, he became at last rector of the college at Presburg, and remained there until his death in 1634. He was the first Roman Catholic to furnish his co-religionists a Hungarian translation of the Bible. It was published at Vienna in 1626, folio (the Protestant translation, by Visoli, was made in 1589). A portion of Kaldi's sermons were published at Presburg in 1631.

Kalendar. See Calendar.

Kālî (or Kalee) is the name of one of the many forms of *Doorgā*, so popularly and variously worshipped in Hindustan.

Names and History.—Doorgā is the female principle in the production of the world who appears throughout the Hindu Shastras as *Prakriti* or *Bhagwati*. She is said to have had a thousand names, and to have appeared in a vast number of forms in different periods: thus, as *Sati*, she first became the wife of Siva, but renounced her life on hearing her father reproach her husband. She again appeared as "the mountain-born goddess" under the name of *Parwati*, and again married Siva. After giving birth to her sons Ganesh and Katik, she became renowned for her achievements in war against the giant enemies of the gods.

This goddess assumed the name of Kali on the occasion of a battle with a thousand-headed giant demigod whom she slew. In her excessive delight over her victory, she danced till she shook the foundation of the earth, and the gods were compelled to induce her husband Siva to influence her to stop, which, however, he found no means of doing till he resorted to the expedient of throwing himself among the bodies of the slain. Kali, observing herself dancing on the body of her husband, was shocked, and, protruding her tongue in her surprise, stood still. In this attitude she is represented in the images of her now made, and sold, and worshipped throughout Bengal.

Images.—In allusion to the above contest with the giant, Kali is often represented as "a ten-armed goddess." Her image in this aspect is that of a yellow woman with ten arms, richly dressed and ornamented, standing erect, resting her left foot on the back of a prostrate buffalo, and her right on that of a couchant lion, holding in her hands a spear, an axe, a discus, a trident, a club, an arrow, and a shield.

Her most common image, however, is that of a black or very dark blue-colored woman with four arms; the upper left arm holding a cimeter, the lower left a human head by the hair. The other right arm is held up to indicate either that she is bestowing a blessing or the restoration of nature from the devastation which she has caused, and to which her lower right hand is pointing. All her hands are bloody. In this form she is standing on the body of her husband, who is a white man, stretched at full length upon his back. Around her waist, as a covering, she wears a string of bloody human hands. She wears an immense necklace, reaching below her knees, which is composed of human skulls. In some images a pair of dead human bodies hang by the hair from her ears. Her tongue, as above set forth, protrudes from her mouth upon her chin.

She appears, moreover, under other forms: sitting on a dead body, with two giants' heads in her arms; as a black female sitting on a throne, etc.

Character.—Kali, in Hindu mythology, is nothing more nor less than a *female Satan*. She is a very sanguinary goddess; her eyebrows are bloody, and blood falls in a stream down her breast. Her eyes are red, like those of a drunkard.

Sacrifices.—Mr. Ward makes a summary from one of the Puranas to the effect that a tiger's blood offered to her in sacrifice will please her for a hundred years; that of a lion, a reindeer, or a man, a thousand years; and that of three men for ten hundred thousand years. In the event of a human person being offered in sacrifice, it must be performed in a cemetery, or at a temple, or in a mountain. Only a person of good appearance should be offered. The victim should be adorned with chaplets and besmeared with sandal-wood, after various ablutions. The deformed, timid, leprous, or crippled must not be offered; nor must a priest, nor a childless brother. The victim must be prepared the day before the offering, his neck being besmeared with blood from the axe with which he is to be sacrificed. Besides this, however, persons may draw blood from their own bodies, or cut off their flesh, to be presented to this goddess as a burnt-offering, or burn the body by the flame of a lamp.

Worshippers.—Many Hindus adopt the ten-armed Doorgā as their guardian deity, and she is considered as the image of the divine energy. Her worship in Lower Bengal is so popular that on the occasion of a great annual festival all business is suspended, and even the European courts, custom-house, and other public offices are closed.

The professional robbers and murderers so long known and dreaded throughout India, and notorious elsewhere as *Thugs*, are the special devotees of the four-armed Kali. In the hope of greater success in their work, they consecrate to her their instruments of death, and their victims are held to be immolated in her honor. These men will join travellers, and accompany them for days, gaining their confidence if possible, under some disguise, until, watching their opportunity, they can administer drugs, or choke them with a small cord, and then rob them of all they possess. Formerly, it is supposed, the goddess rendered them much more assistance than of late, by putting out of the way the corpses of those slain; but, in consequence of one of their number looking behind him after a murder, she ceased to render them so certainly this assistance, as this was a violation of the express condition on which she kept secret all traces of their deeds. The accounts of the occasion of their losing her assistance in this particular are conflicting, and scarcely worthy of reproduction. Persons wishing to trace the matter may refer to *Illustrations of the History and Practices of the Thugs* (Lond. 1837). See Thugs.

Ceremonies.—Distinct from the great festival alluded to above in honor of Doorgā as the "ten-armed goddess" is a famous and popular festival held in her service under the special form of Kali. It is observed with much the same form as the other. Annual sacrifices of sweetmeats, sugar, garments, rice, plantains, and pease are of-

fered in great abundance. The first day ends with singing, dancing, and feasting, and with the lower classes in great debauchery and shameless licentiousness, the *arak*, an intoxicating liquor, being consecrated to the idol goddess. On the second morning images of all sizes representative of the goddess are made, and, after consecration by the Brahmans, are carried through the streets in procession to the Hooghly River, and there, carried out in boats, are thrown into it, and with this act terminate these wild and terrible orgies. Immense sums are expended by many of these devotees during these festivals. Mr. Ward estimates as much as £9000 sterling to have been expended annually at the single shrine in Calcutta, and narrates cases of individual offerings, at one time, of £10,000, comprising rich beds, silver plate, and food for the entertainment of a thousand persons.

Temples.—There are many buildings devoted to her worship. The greatest and most popular of these is that of Kali-Ghat, about three miles to the south of Calcutta. There are fifty other edifices in various parts of India devoted to Doorgā under her variety of forms and names. All these are said to have originated in an incident connected with her history previous to her having assumed the shape of Parwati, when Vishnu severed her body into fifty-one separate pieces, which were strewn over the earth, and conferred a peculiar sanctity on the places where they happened to fall. All of these became sites of temples, in which an image of some one of her thousand forms was set up. The whole of the country to the south of Calcutta, including the spot known as Kali-Ghat, was thus rendered sacred, the toes of the right foot being deposited at the latter place. The temple at Kali-Ghat consists of one room, with a large pavement around it. The image of Kali is in this temple (Ward, ii, 157).

There is, perhaps, no fabled impersonation in all the Hindu mythology exerting a greater or more gloomy influence over millions of men than Doorgā under the title of Kali.

Literature.—*Journ. of the Asiatic Society's Researches*, vol. v.; Coleman, *Mythology of the Hindoos;* Moor, *Hindoo Pantheon;* Ward, *Hindoo Mythology;* account of temple at Kali-Ghat in the *Calcutta Christian Observer*, Sept. 1833; Col. Sleeman, *Journey through Oudh.* (J. T. G.)

Kali. See PARCHED CORN.

Kalighi is the name of one (the tenth) impersonation of the Hindu god Vishnu. See KRISHNA.

Kaliph (more generally CALIPH), originally a deputy or lieutenant, but afterwards applied chiefly to the successors of Mohammed. As a representative of the prophet and Islam, the caliph exercised a power which was primarily spiritual, and in theory, therefore, he claimed the obedience of all Mohammedans. In practice the claim was soon disregarded, and the Fatimite caliphs of Africa and the sovereigns of the Ommiad dynasty of Spain each professed to be the only legitimate representatives of Mohammed, in opposition to the Abasside caliphs of Bagdad. The latter caliphat reached its highest splendor under Haroun al-Raschid, in the 9th century; but his division of the empire among his sons showed how completely the caliph had lost sight of the spiritual theory of his office. For the last two hundred years the appellation of caliph has been swallowed up in shah, sultan, emir, and other titles peculiar to the East. See Brande and Cox, *Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art*, i, 350.

Kalir, ELEASAR HA-, one of the oldest Jewish poets of Italy, generally regarded as the founder of the synagogual poetry of the non-Sephardite Jews in Europe, flourished about the beginning of the 8th century. Of his personal history nothing further is known. He wrote some one hundred and fifty different sacred poems, many of which were inserted in the liturgies of the Babylonian, Italian, German, and French Jews. He was a disciple of Jannai, and was greatly admired by his contemporaries. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 181 sq.; Sachs, *Religiöse Poesie d. Juden in Spanien*, p. 180 sq.; Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, p. 128 sq. See also LITURGY, JEWISH; MACHSOR; SYNAGOGUAL POETRY.

Kaliyuga, or the KALI AGE, is the fourth or last age of the *Maha*, or great age [see YUGA], and bears some resemblance to the Iron Age of classical mythology. The Hindus, recognising, like all religionists of antiquity, that man by sin has fallen from his high estate, have divided the world's existence into four periods, which are marked by successive physical and moral decrements of created beings. They hold that the present period is the last one, that it consists of 432,000 solar sidereal years, and that the Kali Age began B.C. 3102. "In the Krita (or first) age," Manu says, "the (genius of) Truth and Right (in the form of a bull) stands firm on his four feet, nor does any advantage accrue to men from iniquity. But in the following ages, by reason of unjust gains, he is deprived successively of one foot; and even just emoluments, through the prevalence of theft, falsehood, and fraud, are gradually diminished by one foot (i. e. by a fourth part)." The estimate in which Kaliyuga, our present age, is held by the modern Hindus may be gathered from one of their most celebrated Purânas, the Padma-Purâna. In the last chapter of one of the books (Kriyâyogasâra) of this Purâna, the following account, which we take from Chambers, *Cyclopœdia* (s. v. Kaliyuga), is given of it: "In the Kaliyuga (the genius of) Right will have but one foot; every one will delight in evil. The four castes will be devoted to wickedness, and deprived of the nourishment which is fit for them. The Brahmans will neglect the Vedas, hanker after presents, be lustful and cruel. They will despise the Scriptures, gamble, steal, and desire intercourse with widows. . . . For the sake of a livelihood, some Brahmans will become arrant rogues. . . . The Sûdras will endeavor to lead the life of the Brahmans, and, out of friendship, people will bear false witness . . . they will injure the wives of others, and their speech will be that of falsehood. Greedy of the wealth of others, they will entertain a guest according to the behest of the Scriptures, but afterwards kill him out of covetousness; they are indeed worthy of hell. The twice-born (i. e. the first three castes) will live upon debts, sell the produce of cows, and even their daughters. In this Yuga men will be under the sway of women, and women will be excessively fickle. . . . In the Kaliyuga the earth will bear but little corn; the clouds will shed but little rain, and that, too, out of season. The cows will feed on ordure, and give little milk, and the milk will yield no butter; there is no doubt of that. . . . Trees, even, will wither in twelve years, and the age of mankind will not exceed sixteen years; people, moreover, will become gray-haired in their youth; women will bear children in their fifth or sixth year, and men will become troubled with a great number of children. In the Kaliyuga the foreigners will become kings, bent upon evil; and those living in foreign countries will be all of one caste, and out of lust take to themselves many wives. In the first twilight of the Kaliyuga people will disregard Vishnu, and in the middle of it no one will even mention his name." There is a remarkable identity of the Hindu belief with that of the Hebrew as to redemption from this sinful state by a Messiah. See Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 303 sq., 329 sq.; Weber, *Indische Studien*, ii, 411; Wilson, *Asiatic Researches*, x, 27 sq.; Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 111 sq.

Kallah. See TALMUD.

Kal'laï (Heb. *Kallay'*, קַלַּי, *runner;* Sept. Κολλαΐ), a chief priest, son of Sallai, contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (Neh. xii, 20). B.C. post 536.

Kalmucks (Tatar *Khalimik*, i. e. apostates), also called *Ölök* or *Eleutes*, a Mongolian tribe of nomads,

a portion of whom live under Chinese rule, while the greater number, during the last two centuries, have settled in or belong to Russia. They are similar to the Mongols proper, but inferior to them in point of civilization. They are divided into nobles, people (serfs), and priests; the last have, in particular, a very great influence among the Buddhistic Kalmucks. They are divided into tribes (Uluss), at the head of which are Tchaidas; and the tribes are subdivided into Aimaks (of from 150 to 300 families each), at the head of which are the Saisans. They call themselves *Derben Eret* (Dörbön-Oirat), i. e. the four allies, because, from time immemorial, they have been divided into four chief tribes: 1. The Dsongars, after whom Dsongaria is called, formerly the most powerful of the tribes, but subsequently subdued by the Chinese, and now extant only in small number. 2. The Koshotes (i. e. warriors), under princes from the family of Jenghis Khan, numbering from 50,000 to 60,000; they voluntarily placed themselves under the sceptre of Russia, and are loyal subjects; their favorite drink is the kumiss (fermented horse milk). 3. The Derbets, living, in the 16th and 17th centuries, on the Volga and Ural, now on the Don and the Ili. 4. The Torgots (Törga-Uten), or Kalmucks of the Volga, have, for the most part, left Russian territory; only the tribe Zoochor, under the prince Dundukor, a grand-uncle of the powerful khan Ayuka, remained. Dundukor himself was baptized, and, by order of Alexander I, the title passed over to his son-in-law Norkasov. Some of the Kalmucks live scattered in the government of Simbirsk (15,000 souls, all in connection with the Greek Church), others east of the Ural, on the Jhet River (professing Islamism), and in several commercial towns of Russia, altogether about 120,000 souls, of whom 73 per cent. live in the government of Astrachan. The majority of the Kalmucks are still Buddhists. They were all originally adherents of that form of Buddhism known as *Lamaism*, which the Mongols in general received from Thibet. In Dsongaria they have two celebrated temples; the one is situated on the Tekes, the other on the Ili. In the latter resides the Tchamba Lama in the winter, and with him a number of priests, who here teach reading and writing. They are joined by pious pilgrims and numerous Chinese merchants, who set up their shops around the temple. The chiefs of the Chinese Kalmucks used to receive from the mandarin the insignia of their rank, but of late the virtual independence of Dsongaria has severed the former relation of the Kalmucks to the Chinese government; and, after the occupation of Kultsha by the Russians in May, 1871, the Chinese Kalmucks generally declared their submission to the Russian government. The language of the Kalmucks is a branch of the Mongolian language; grammars of the language have been published by Bobrovnikov (Kasan, 1849) and Zwieck (Donaueschingen, 1857). The literature consists almost exclusively of translations of Buddhistic writings from India. A collection of legends (Siddhi-Kür), with German translation, was published by Jülg (Leipzig, 1866). (A. J. S.)

Kalonymus BEN-KALONYMUS, a Jewish writer of some note, was born in Italy in 1287, but lived for some time in Southern France, and was there picked up by king Robert of Naples. He returned with the latter to his native land, and filled some important offices in his service. Kalonymus was an accomplished scholar, translated into Hebrew medical, astronomical, and philosophical works of the Arabians, wrote a number of satirical treatises on the low moral state of his contemporaries, and labored in this and other ways to ameliorate the miserable condition of his countrymen. He died about 1337. The best of his later works is אבן בחן, or *The Stone of Weeping* (Naples, 1489; translated into Jewish German, Frkft. 1746). He also edited with great ability a part of the Arabian Encyclopædia of the Sciences (known as "Treatises of the Honest Brethren") for the use of the Italian Jews. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 305 sq.; Zunz, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, ii, 313; iv, 200 sq.; Flügel, *Zeitschrift der deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* 1859. (J. H. W.)

Kalottinocracy is a new word sometimes used instead of *hierarchy*. The word is derived from the French *calotte* (cap, such as the Roman Catholic clergy wear), and the Greek κρατεῖν (to govern).

Kalpa designates in Hindu chronology the Brahminical period of one day and night, and corresponds to a period of 4,320,000,000 solar sidereal years, or years of mortals, measuring the duration of the world, and, according to many, including even the interval of its annihilation. The *Bhavishya-Purâna* admits of an infinity of kalpas; other Purânas enumerate thirty. A great kalpa comprises not a day, but a life of Brahmâ. In Vedic literature, kalpa is a Vedânga (q. v.). See Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 1 sq., 7 sq. See KALPA-SÛTRA.

Kalpa-Sûtra is, in Vedic literature, the name of those Sanscrit works which treat of the ceremonials usual at a *Vedic* sacrifice. See VEDA. In Jaina literature it is the name of the most sacred religious work of the *Jainas* (q. v.). It chiefly relates the legendary history of Mahavîra, the last of their twenty-four deified saints, or Tîrthankaras, but contains also an account of four other saints of the same class. The author of the work was Bhadra Bâhu, and it was composed, Stevenson assumes, in the year A.D. 411. It is held in high respect by the Jainas, who, out of the eight days which, in the middle of the rains, they devote to the reading of their most sacred writings, allot no less than five to the Kalpa-Sûtra. See Stevenson, *The Kalpa-Sûtra and Nava Tatva* (London, 1848).

Kalteisen, HEINRICH, a celebrated Dominican of the 15th century, was born near Coblentz, and educated at Vienna and Cologne. In the latter city he was afterwards professor of theology, preaching at the same time. Later he removed to Mentz, and became general inquisitor of Germany. He was present at the Council of Basle, and took quite a prominent part in the deliberations against the Hussites. He was one of the four doctors on the Roman Catholic side who disputed with the Bohemians. See HUSSITES; BASLE, COUNCIL OF. In 1443 pope Eugenius IV made him Magister sacri Palatii, and in 1452 pope Nicholas V created him archbishop of Drontheim. He died in 1465. Kalteisen's literary abilities are generally spoken of as moderate. He wrote much, but little has been published. See Basnage-Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* iv, 628 sq.; Quetif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.* ii, 828; Schröchk, *Kirchengesch.* xxxiv, 707; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 15.

Kama, the Hindu *deva* or deity of Love, one of the most pleasing creations of Hindu fiction, is, in the Sanscrit poetry of later periods, the favorite theme of descriptions and allusions. The genealogy of this deity is quite obscure; according to some Purânas, he was originally a son of Brahmâ; according to others, a son of Dharma (the genius of Virtue), by Sraddha (the genius of Faith), herself a daughter of Daksha, who was one of the mind-born sons of Brahmâ. The god Siva, being on one occasion greatly incensed at Kama, reduced him to ashes; but ultimately, moved by the affliction of Rati (Voluptuousness), the wife of Kama, he promised her that her husband should be reborn as a son of Krishna, and he was accordingly born under the name of *Pradyumna*, who was the god of Love. "But when the infant was six days old it was stolen from the lying-in chamber by the terrible dæmon Sambara; for the latter foreknew that Pradyumna, if he lived, would be his destroyer. The boy was thrown into the ocean, and swallowed by a large fish. Yet he did not die, for that fish was caught by fishermen, and delivered to Mayavatî, the mistress of Sambara's household; and, when it was cut open, the child was taken from it. While Mayavatî wondered who this could be, the divine sage Narada satisfied her curiosity, and counselled

her to rear tenderly this offspring of Krishna. She acted as he advised her; and when Pradyumna grew up, and learned his own history, he slew the dæmon Sambara. Mayavati, however, was later apprized by Krishna that she was not the wife of Sambara, as she had fancied herself to be, but that of Pradyumna—in fact, another form of Rati, who was the wife of Kama in his former existence. In the representations of Kama we find him holding in one hand a bow made of sugar-cane, and strung with bees, in the other an arrow tipped with the blossom of a flower which is supposed to conquer one of the senses. His standard is, agreeably to the legend above mentioned, a fabulous fish, called Makara; and he rides on a parrot or sparrow—the symbol of voluptuousness. His epithets are numerous, but easily accounted for from the circumstances named, and from the effects of love on the mind and senses. Thus he is called *Makaradhwaja*, 'the one who has Makara in his banner;' *Mada*, 'the maddener,' etc. His wife, as before stated, is *Rati;* she is also called *Kamakala*, 'a portion of Kama,' or *Priti*, 'affection.' His daughter is *Trisha*, 'thirst or desire;' and his son is *Aniruddha*, 'the irresistible.'" See Müller, *Chips*, vol. ii, ch. i, especially p. 127–135; Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörtenbuch*, p. 1008.

Kama. See TALMUD.

Kamawachara, the Buddhist name of one of the three divisions of the *Sakwala* (q. v.), and refers to the worlds in which there is form, with sensual enjoyment. The Buddhist affirms that there are innumerable worlds, but only three kinds of them, viz. (1) worlds in which there is no perceptible form; (2) worlds in which there is form, but no sensual enjoyment; (3) and lastly, the *Kamawachara* explained above. See Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 3 sq.

Kamenker. See MEÏR, MOSE.

Kami (or *Happy Spirits*) is the name given in Japanese mythology to certain spirits or divinities who founded the first terrestrial dynasty. All primitive mythologies are coupled with and made to rise out of cosmogony. Unfortunately, however, the cosmogony of the Japanese is not only of the wildest sort, but so mixed with that of the Chinese that it is very difficult to speak with any certainty of this ancient religion. From primæval chaos, say the Japanese, there sprung a self-created, supreme God, who fixed his abode in the highest heaven, and could not have his tranquillity disturbed by any cares. Next there arose two plastic, creative gods, who framed the universe out of chaos. The universe was then governed for myriads of years by seven gods in succession. They are called the Celestial Gods. The last of them was the only one that had a wife, and to him the earth we inhabit owes its existence. In what may be called the Genesis of the Japanese Bible the creation of the world is thus narrated:

"In the beginning there was neither heaven nor earth. The elements of all things formed a liquid and troubled mass, similar to the contents of an undeveloped egg, in which the white and the yellow are still mingled together. Out of the infinite space which this chaos filled a god arose, called the divine Supreme Being, whose throne is in the centre of heaven. Then came the celestial reason, exalted above the creation; finally, the terrestrial reason, who is the sublime spirit. Each one of these three primitive gods had his own existence, but they were not yet revealed beyond their spiritual natures. Then, by degrees, the work of separation went on in chaos. The finest atoms, moving in different directions, formed the heavens. The grosser atoms, attaching themselves to each other, and adhering, produced the earth. The former, moving rapidly, constructed the vault of the firmament which arches above our heads; the latter, being slowly drawn together in a solid body, did not form the earth until at a much later period. When the earthly matter still floated as a fish that comes to the surface of the waters, or as the image of the moon that trembles on a limpid lake, there appeared between the heavens and the earth something similar to a piece of reed, endowed with movement, and capable of transformation. It was changed into three gods, which are: the August one, reigning perpetually over the empire; he who reigns by virtue of water; and he who reigns by virtue of fire. All three were of the male sex, because they owed their origin to the action of the divine reason alone. After the first three males there came three pairs of gods and goddesses, reigning over the elements of wood, metal, and earth. This second dynasty contained as many goddesses as gods, because the terrestrial united equally with the celestial reason in producing them. The first of the seven gods commenced the creation of the earth, and all together personify the elements of the creation. The æra of the celestial gods, commencing with the first and terminating with the last male and female pair, who were called Izanaghi and Izanami, continued for millions on millions of years."

But the world, and, most important of all, the empire of Japan, was not yet created. The account given, therefore, is very circumstantial. One day, when the god and goddess were sitting together on the arch of the sky, they happened to talk of the possible existence of an inferior world. "There should be somewhere," said Izanaghi at length to his wife, "a habitable earth. Let us seek it under the waters that are seething beneath us." He plunged his spear into the water, and, as he withdrew it, some turbid drops trickled from the diamond point of his javelin, congealed, and formed a great island, upon which the pair descended, determined to make it the beginning of a grand archipelago. From out the waters Izanaghi raised the island of Awadzi, then the mountainous Oho-yamato, rich in fruits and with fine harbors; then the others in succession, until the empire of the eight great islands was completed. The smaller islands were then made, six in number; and the islets scattered here and there formed themselves afterwards from the mixture of the sea-foam and the deposits of the rivers. Eight millions of gods (genii) were then called into existence, and ten thousand kinds of things, out of which came everything that can be found in the earth. Upon the completion of this work, Izanaghi and his wife made the earth their habitation, and became the progenitors of the five dynasties of terrestrial deities, who in turn governed the earth during two million and odd years. The last of these, having married a terrestrial wife, left a mortal son upon earth named Linmou-tenwou, the ancestor and progenitor of the races of men, the first of the mikados. See MIKADO. Born upon earth, Linmou-tenwou was of course mortal. His parents, especially the tender Izanami, trembled at the thought that she must one day close the eyes of her children, and yet continue to enjoy immortality herself. They therefore conferred upon their terrestrial offspring the gift of immortality, the power of mediation between the gods and man—made them immortal kamis, happy spirits, worthy of divine honors. This is the point where the Japanese commence their history, and hence their doctrine, that the spirits of human beings survive the body, and, according to the actions of the individual in life, receive reward or punishment. When a man's life has been distinguished for piety, for patriotism, or for good works, the Japanese deify him, after death, as a kami, and thus the number of these demigods has become indefinite. Some of these spirits preside specially over the elements and powers of nature.

The worship of these demigods or Kami is called *Kami-no-mitsi*, or "the way of the Kami." It possesses some features which are found in the religious observances of no other race. There are chapels dedicated to the several Kamis in all parts of the empire, but they are most numerous and celebrated in the southern islands. "These chapels are called *mias*. They are always built in the most picturesque localities, and especially where there is a grove of high trees. Sometimes a splendid avenue of pines or cedars conducts to the sacred place, which is always approached through one or more detached portals, called *toris*, like the pylæ of the Egyptian temples. The chapel is usually set upon a hill, natural or artificial, buttressed with Cyclopean walls, and with a massive stone stairway leading to the top. At the foot of the stairs there is a small building containing a tank of water for ablutions. The chapel itself is usually small, and very simple in its plan,

much resembling the native dwelling-house. Three sides are closed, and one is open to sun and air. The woodwork is kept scrupulously clean, and the floor is covered with the finest matting. The altar, which stands alone in the centre, is ornamented with a plain disk of metal, but no statues or symbolical figures are to be seen, and very rarely emblems of any kind. Nevertheless, there are sometimes stationed at the head of the staircase, outside of the chapel, sitting figures resembling dogs and unicorns, which are said to represent the elements of water and fire. The interior is generally hung with strips or ribbons of colored paper, the exact significance of which is not yet clearly understood. The chapels are also ornamented by their pious votaries with colored lanterns, vases of perfume, and of flowers or evergreen branches, which are renewed as fast as they wither. At the foot of the altar there is a heavy chest with a metal grating, through which fall the pieces of money contributed: it is hardly necessary to say that the priest carries a key to the box. These mias were originally commemorative chapels, erected in honor of Japanese heroes, like that of Tell by the lake of the Four Forest Cantons. The prince of the province which had given birth to the hero, or where his deeds had been performed, took upon himself the charge of keeping the chapel in repair; there was no priest to officiate at the altar of the kami; no privileged caste interposed between the adorer and the object of his worship. The act of adoration, in fact, performed before the mirror (representing that bequeathed by the goddess Izanami to her children), passed beyond the guardian spirit of the chapel, and reached the supreme god above him. The chapel, therefore, was open to all; the worship was voluntary, and offered as the individual might choose, no ceremonial being prescribed. With the introduction of Buddhism, however, an important change took place. The new faith was sufficiently incorporated with the old to transfer the chapels to the special charge of the priests [called *Kami-nusi*, or 'ministers of the spirits'], and to introduce, in place of the voluntary, formless worship of the people, a system of processions, litanies, offerings, and even of miracle-working images. Indeed, almost the only difference between this system and the worship of the saints in Catholic countries lies in the circumstance that the priests who officiate only put on their surplices for the occasion, and become secular again when they leave the chapel" (Bayard Taylor's *Japan*, p. 255 sq., in the excellent collection of Scribner's *Library of Wonders, Travels*, etc., N. Y., 1872, 12mo). Compare Humbert, *Sojourn in Japan*, transl. in *Ladies' Repository*, March, 1870, p. 184 sq.; Macfarlane, *Japan* (London, 1852, 8vo), p. 204 sq.; Siebold, *Nippon*, i, 3 sq.; ii, 51; Kämpfer, *Japan*, in Pinkerton, vii, 672 sq.; Tylor, *Primitive Culture* (London, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Kammon. See Cummin.

Kampanton, Isaac ben-Jacob, a Jewish rabbi of some note, was born in Castile in 1360. Of his personal history but little is known. He was gaon of Castile, and is particularly noted for his contributions to Talmudical literature, and his influence, through his pupils, on Jewish literature of the 15th century in the Spanish peninsula. He died at Penjafiel in 1463. One of his most important works is דרכי התלמוד (*Ways of the Talmud*, first published at Mantua in 1596), an introduction to the study of the Talmud (really a methodology). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 152; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 87; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 140. (J. H. W.)

Kamsin. See Simoom.

Kamtchatka, a peninsula in the extreme northeast of Asia, occupied by the Russians from 1696 to 1706, extends between the seas of Kamtchatka and Ochotzk, from latitude 51° to 61° N., and contains 20,800 square miles, and about 4500 inhabitants, one third of whom are Russians. The former principal place, Nishnei Kamtschatk, on the mouth of the Kamtchatka River, has hardly 200 inhabitants. Petropaulovsk, the present capital, is the seat of a Russo-American trading company, and has a population of about 1000. Until 1856 Kamtchatka was a separate district; at present it constitutes the district Petropaulovsk, of the coast district of Eastern Siberia. The Kamtchadales inhabit, besides Kamtchatka, also a part of the Kurile Islands. They belong to the Mongolian race, are small, have thick heads, and flat, broad faces, and small eyes, which are frequently inflamed by the snow. Though baptized, the Kamtchadales are still addicted to Shamanism (q. v.), and, in particular, practice sorcery. They are fond of hunting and fishing, good-natured, and hospitable. (A. J. S.)

Kana (Heb. ספר הקנה), the name of one of the later cabalistic works treating of the religious rites of the Jews, has attained considerable notoriety on account of its decided opposition not only to all the Jewish ritual, to Talmudical interpretation, and to the Talmud itself, but for its fierce attacks even against Biblical Judaism. Its authorship is undecided, but of late most Jewish critics lean to the opinion that Kana and another cabalistic work entitled *Pelia* (פלאה, published at Kores in 1784, and often), an interpretation of the first book of the Law (Genesis), were written by one and the same person, and belong to a Spanish Jewish heretic of the 15th century or thereabout. Dr. Jellinek (*Bet-Ha-Midrash*, iii; Einl. p. xxxviii sq.) thinks both the production of an Italian or Greek Jew. See, for further details, Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 230 sq., 458 sq. See also Cabala. (J. H. W.)

Ka'nah (Heb. *Kanah'*, קָנָה, *reedy*; Sept. Κανά v. r. Καναθάν), the name of two places in Palestine.

1. A stream (נַחַל, *torrent* or wady, q. d. "the brook of reeds," as in the marg.) that formed the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh, from the Mediterranean eastward to the vicinity of Tappuah (Josh. xvi, 8); lying properly within the territory of Manasseh, although the towns on its southern bank were assigned to the tribe of Ephraim (Josh. xvii, 9; see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc. prior.). See Tribe. Schwarz says it is to be still found in the equivalent Arabic name *Wady al-Kazah* (valley of reeds), that rises in a spring of the same name, Ain *al-Kazah*, one mile west of Shechem, and, after flowing westerly, acquiring a considerable breadth, and irrigating fields on its way, finally falls into the Mediterranean south of Cæsarea (*Palestine*, p. 51). Other travellers, however, do not speak of such a stream unless it be the *Nahr el-Kezib* (river of reeds) spoken of in the *Life of Saladin* (p. 191, 193) as existing between Cæsarea and Arroplo (Arsuf), and supposed to be represented by the Nahr-Arsuf (otherwise el-Kassah) which enters the Mediterranean due west of Sebustieh (Samaria). Dr. Robinson, in his last visit to Palestine, discovered a *Wady Kanah*, south-west of Shechem, which he describes as originating in a spring of the same name in the plain el-Mukhna (south of Nablus), and running between deep and rugged banks westerly to the plain bordering the Mediterranean, near Hableh, where it is wide and cultivated, and bears a different name (*Researches*, new edit., iii, 135); from which it appears that it joins the Nahr el-Aujeh, as laid down on his map. This, however, is too southern a position for the stream in question; for it would wholly cut off Ephraim from the sea-coast, and confine its territory within very narrow limits (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 259). In the absence of more specific information respecting this region, we may conclude that the name "Brook of Reeds" is a designation of the sedgy streams that constitute the *Nahr Falaik* (comp. the *Arundinetis*, between Cæsarea and Apollonia, spoken of by Schultens, *Vita Saladini*, p. 191, 193), perhaps including its middle branch, called Wady Mussin or Sileh (on Van de Velde's *Map*). Dr. Thomson (*ut sup.*) thinks it is the present *Abu Zabura*; but this, again, seems rather too far north.

2. A town in the northern part of Asher, not very

far from its eastern border, mentioned in connection with Hammon and Zidon (Josh. xix, 22). Dr. Robinson identifies it with *Kana*, a large village on the brow of a valley not far south-east of the site of Tyre (*Researches*, iii, 384). So also Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 192), Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 327), and Porter (*Handbook for Palestine*, p. 325, 442). About a mile north of the place is a very ancient site, strewn with ruins, some of them of colossal proportions; and in the side of a ravine not very far distant are some singular figures of men, women, and children cut on the face of a cliff (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 298). Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 58) regards them as Phœnician. See INSCRIPTIONS.

Ancient Figures on Rocks at Kanah.

Kandekumaraio, another name for the Hindu deity known as KARTIKEYA (q. v.).

Kaneh. See REED.

Kanne, JOHANN ARNOLD, a German mystic, was born at Detmold in 1773, and educated at the gymnasium of his native city. While but a youth he attempted the restoration of the exceedingly marred text of Varro, *De Lingua Latina*. He studied theology at the University of Göttingen, where the rational exegesis of Eichhorn nearly stifled all his religious belief. From Göttingen he went to Leipsic, thence as a teacher to Halle, and finally to Berlin. In 1805 he wrote at Würtemberg a work on the mythology of the Greeks (Weimar, 1805). His study of this subject led him to read the Old Testament, and ultimately resulted in the publication of *Die erste Urkunde der Geschichte*, with a Preface by Jean Paul (1808, 2 vols. 8vo). During the war with the French he joined the Prussian army, but was captured by the French, from whom he soon escaped, and then entered the Austrian army. But, prostrated by disease, he was several times confined in the hospital at Linz, when, through the efforts of Jean Paul and president Jacobi, he was dismissed from the service. On Jacobi's recommendation, in 1809 he was called to the chair of history in the College of Science at Nuremberg. His sufferings in the army seemed to have accelerated his previous religious decline, and his works published after his appointment at Nuremberg give evidence of his leaning towards extreme rationalism. He wrote in this period *Pantheon der ältesten Naturphilosophie oder die Religion der Völker* (1811):—*System der Indischen Mythe oder Kronus und die Geschichte des Gottmenschen* (1813). He was, however, soon afterwards induced to renounce his antichristian views laid down in these books. He made an attempt to derive all languages from one primitive language in his *πάγγλωσσον*, but his request to king Alexander to aid his philological undertaking received no hearing. In Nuremberg his moral and spiritual condition was for a long time a turmoil of conflicting emotions, but the reading of religious writings and elevated conversation with distinguished Christians brought about a spiritual regeneration. In 1818 he was called to the chair of Oriental literature in the University of Erlangen. Here he withdrew from all society, and lived in seclusion from the world, wholly absorbed in contemplative mysticism. Doubtless his papers would have afforded a clear view of the state of his soul, but, according to his friends, towards the close of his life he destroyed all documents relating to this subject. He died Dec. 17, 1824. His other religious works are: *Sammlung wahrer und erwecklicher Geschichten aus dem Reiche Christi und für dasselbe* (1815–17, 2 vols.; 1822, 3 vols.):—*Leben, und aus dem Leben merkwürdiger und erweckter Christen* (1816–17, 2 vols.):—*Fortsetzung* (1824):—*Romane aus der Christenwelt aller Zeiten* (1817):—*Christus im A. T.*, or *Untersuchungen über die Vorbilder und messianischen Stellen* (1818, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Biblische Untersuchungen oder Auslegungen mit und ohne Polemik* (1819–20, 2 vols. 8vo). He edited also the following: *Auserlesene christliche Lieder* (Erlang. 1818):—*Weissagungen u. Verheissungen der Kirche Christi auf die letzten Zeiten der Heiden.*—*Katholische Real-Encyklop.* v, 1036.

Kanon is one of the names by which the official list or register of the Church is known. It is also frequently spoken of as *κατάλογος ἱερατικός*, *list of the priesthood*, and hence spiritual persons were denominated *κανονικοί*, *canonici*, and *οἱ τοῦ κανόνος*, *men of the canon*, because their names were entered in the list. The word *κανών* had also other significations. The assent of the catechumens to a summary of the leading articles of the Christian faith was required, and this creed was variously designated; sometimes *κανών*, *the rule*, sometimes *πίστις*, *the faith*, and *symbolum*, a badge or token (see Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, s. v.). See CANON.

Kanouse, PETER, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Boonton, N. J., August 20, 1784, of German descent; was educated for the ministry under Drs. Armstrong and Richards, and was licensed and ordained in 1822. He successively preached at Suckasunna, N. J.; Newark, N. J.; Wantage, N. J.; Newark, N. J.; Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; again at Wantage, N. J., and then as a home missionary in Dane Co., Wisconsin. He died May 30, 1864. "He was an able and impressive preacher of the Gospel. . . . bearing the 'fruits of the Spirit,' and instrumental in the conversion of many souls."—Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 216.

Kansa, in Hindu mythology, is the name of a king of the race of Bhoja—considered also a dæmon (Kâlanemi) in human shape, and notorious for his enmity towards the god Krishna [see VISHNU], by whom he was ultimately slain.

Kant, IMMANUEL, designated by De Maistre "the philosopher of nebulous memory," acquired enduring renown as the author of the *Critical Philosophy*, as the father of the recent German or transcendental speculation, and as the most acute and profound metaphysician of the closing 18th century. The importance of his philosophical career is evinced by his furnishing the link of connection between the schools of Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and those of Hegel, Schelling, and Comte. He closes one great and brilliant era of metaphysical inquiry; he commences another with singular fulness of knowledge, breadth of comprehension, perspicacity of discernment, and logical subtlety and precision. He exposed inveterate errors of procedure; he improved, sharpened, and refined the methods of investigation; he surveyed and plotted out the boundaries of metaphysical research; and he rendered more distinct and precise the nature of the inquiry, the subject with which it is concerned, and the instruments at our command for its investigation. These are inestimable services, the benefits of which are experienced even in the midst of the errors that have sprung from the system by which they were rendered.

Life.—Kant was born at Königsberg April 22, 1724, and spent his whole life there or in its immediate neighborhood, never having journeyed more than forty miles from his native place. He ended his tranquil life in the city of his birth, February 12, 1804. He was of Scotch origin. His father, John George Cant, removed from Tilsit, where his immigrant grandfather first settled, to Königsberg, and followed the saddler's trade with little worldly success. His pinched fortunes were ennobled by stern and unostentatious integrity. All accounts commemorate the high character, intelligence, and austere piety of Anna Regina Reuter, the philosopher's mother—virtues affectionately attested by her illustrious son, who ascribes all that was best in himself to her example and instructions, and to the purifying influences of his childhood's home. He lost his mother when he was eleven years of age, his father in his twenty-second year (1746). They lived long enough to transmit to him the memory of their virtuous example—'twas all they had to bequeath. After receiving the first rudiments of education at the charitable schools of the city, he was sent to the Frederick College in 1734, at the expense of his uncle, a substantial shoemaker. Here he remained for seven years under the care of Dr. Schultz, an eminent adherent of Wolf, at the time when the Wolfian philosophy was a subject of acrimonious controversy. He devoted himself chiefly to the classics and mathematics, the essential foundation of all thorough instruction, and had Ruhnken for his fellow-student. From the *Collegium Fredericianum* he passed in 1740 to the University of Königsberg, and entered upon a course of theology; but his ill success in preaching discouraged him, and he attached himself to the mathematical and physical sciences, in the former of which his first distinction was gained. During the latter period of his university career he supported himself by teaching in the humblest grades, in consequence of the increasing penury of his father, whose death in 1746 compelled him to withdraw from the university, and to seek a living from his own exertions alone. For the nine following years he was employed as a private teacher in or near Königsberg, and finally in the noble family of Kayserling, by whom his merits were appreciated, and in whose society he acquired that polish of manner which distinguished him through life. He changed his family name of Cant to the more Germanic appellative Kant, but he did not thus divest himself of the Scotch characteristics of mind and morals. In the second year of his engagement in private tuition he published his first work, *Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte* (*Thoughts on the true Measure of Living Forces*, 1747), which was esteemed a valuable contribution to the famous controversy on the subject. In 1754 he discussed the question proposed for a prize by the Berlin Academy, *Whether the Earth had undergone any change consequent upon its revolution upon its Axis.* This essay facilitated his acquisition of the master's degree in the next year. At this time he returned to the university as *privat-docent*, and maintained an uninterrupted connection with it thenceforth till the closing years of his life. He inaugurated his lectures by the composition of two theses: the first, *De Igni;* the second, *Dissertatio de Principiis Primis Cognitionis Humanæ*, which was the first manifestation of the direction of his mind to metaphysical inquiry, and also showed that he had fixed on the central point of all philosophy. While employed in private teaching he had diligently prosecuted his encyclopædical studies, and had acquired the English language by his own exertions, in order to master the speculations of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Another kindred treatise belongs to this year—*Principiorum Primorum Cognitionis Metaphysicæ Nova Dilucidatio*, as also his *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels* (*Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens*). The last work was issued anonymously, with a dedication to Frederick the Great. It is remarkable for its bold views, and for announcing the probable resolution of the nebulæ into stars, and the probable discovery of new planets—scientific predictions fulfilled in much later years by Herschel and Leverrier. This production occasioned a correspondence with Lambert (1761), the singularly profound president of the Berlin Academy, who espoused similar opinions. For fifteen years (1755–1770) Kant lectured to private classes in the university. His courses treated "pæne de omni scibili," but were marked by a special addition to the physical sciences, and, after 1757, to physical geography, a novel branch of knowledge which he continued to expound annually till the close of his academical career. A life so retired as Kant's, and so exclusively occupied with study and the duties of instruction, scarcely offers any events for biography beyond the development of opinions, the publication of the treatises in which such opinions are set forth, and the academic distinctions attained. The chronicler finds little to report more exciting than Dr. Primrose's migrations "from the blue chamber to the brown," and hence is compelled to mark the critical *moments* of his career by the notice of the principal works as they appeared. Such indications, however, have a value of their own, as they reveal the growth of speculations which have moulded the intelligence of the world, and mark the times and modes in which the revolutions of thought have been effected. In 1762 appeared Kant's criticism of the Aristotelian logic, in a treatise entitled *Die falsche Spitzfindigkeit der vier syllogistischen Figuren* (*False Subtlety of the Syllogistic Figures*). The censors of Aristotle have usually misapprehended both his doctrines and his aims, and have imagined to be erroneous dogmas which the Stagyrite had meditated more profoundly, and had treated with a juster regard to practical convenience than themselves. In the course of the next year, 1763, Kant gave to the public his *Der einzig mögliche Beweissgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseyns Gottes* (*Ontological Demonstration of the Being of God*), in which he repudiated alike the deductions *à priori* of Anselm, Des Cartes, and Clarke, and the inductions *à posteriori* of the natural theologians, and regarded the conception of the possibility of God as attesting the reality of his existence. This treatise still bears the impress of the dominant Wolfian philosophy, which he had imbibed from his early teacher Schultz. In this year he contended for the prize offered by the Berlin Academy, his treatise on the *Principles of Natural Theology and Morals* (*Untersuchung über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und Moral*) receiving the second honors, while the first were adjudged to Moses Mendelssohn. Three years more elapsed before he received his first public appointment as underkeeper of the Royal Library, with the scant salary of fifty dollars. In this year he exposed the pretensions of Swedenborgianism, being always ready to assail new-fangled delusions, whether stimulated by enthusiasm or by imposture. At length, when approaching the end of his forty-seventh year, he was promoted to the chair of logic and metaphysics in his own university, with a stipend of three hundred dollars. He had suffered two previous disappointments. He had failed to obtain the professorship extraordinary of logic in 1756, and the ordinary professorship in 1758, and had declined the professorship of poetry in 1764, from distrust of his aptitudes and acquirements. He had refused invitations from Erlangen and Jena, from reluctance to abandon his people and his native home.

Custom demanded an inaugural dissertation from the professor elect. Kant's subject was *De Mundi Sensibilis atque Intelligibilis Forma et Principiis.* This essay contained the first distinct anticipations of his characteristic system, though his philosophy did not receive form or coherent development for many ensuing years. The remainder of his life was, however, consecrated to its definite constitution and exposition. It early began to assume shape, for in 1772 he smoothed the way for a fuller discussion by his *Scheme of Transcendental Philosophy.* No desire of change, no temptation of worldly ad-

vancement and honor could seduce him from his calm lucubrations. He refused to go to Halle, though a double salary was offered him. After eleven years of patient meditation he produced in 1781 his *Critique of the Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*), which proclaimed a new philosophy, and ushered in a new cycle of speculation —*novus ordo sæclorum metaphysicorum*. The work was modified in a second edition in 1787, to obviate the imputation of idealism and idealistic infidelity objected to it as to the previous system of Wolf. It long seemed as if this remarkable production—a revolution itself, and the parent of revolutions—would never reach a second edition. For six years it lay so unheeded on the publisher's shelves that he contemplated disposing of it as waste paper, when a sudden demand relieved his anxieties, and rendered a republication expedient. This timely interest in the book was scarcely due to Kant's *Prolegomena to Metaphysics* (*Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, 1783), but may be attributed to striking notices of the doctrine in prominent German magazines. In 1785 the practical side of his system was exposed in his *Metaphysics of Ethics* (*Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*), and in the following year its extension to physical speculation was attempted in his *Metaphysics of Natural Science* (*Metaphysische Aufangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft*). In 1788 the positive aspect of his philosophy was presented in the *Critique of the Practical Reason* (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*), which treats of the principles and objects of the moral law, and constructs ethics on the formula, Act so that your principle of action may serve as a universal law. The foundation is narrow, and has the cold rigidity of Stoical pretension, but it was a stern and strict rule in the conception of its propounder, and was borrowed from his own line of conduct, and from the austere virtues of his parental home, as much as from the dictates of his reason. The defects of this canon will be indicated hereafter. The outline of the new philosophy was completed in 1790 by the *Critique of the Practical Judgment* (*Kritik der Urtheilskraft*), which is in some respects the most satisfactory work of the series. It is designed to unite the practical with the theoretical reason, the freedom of the will with the law of existence, by regarding the whole order of creation as a system of means effectually adapted to the attainment of beneficent aims. It is thus a tractate of teleology or of final causes. It is principally occupied with the theory of the beautiful and the sublime, and is in great measure a development of the *Observations on the Beautiful and the Sublime* (*Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen*, 1764), and the *Metaphysics of Ethics* (1785).

Kant's metaphysics had thus been exhibited by himself in all its principal applications. It had attracted general notice; it had gathered around it numerous and enthusiastic disciples; it had secured for its author profound respect and earnest admiration. Distinguished men flocked to his lectures; princes and sovereigns commissioned learned scholars to hear his teachings and to report his doctrines. His life was surrounded with ease, and his days were crowned with honor. His salary had been increased, and had given what was wealth to one of his simple tastes and frugal habits. He had been twice appointed rector of the university. His industrious and meditative career had passed its grand climacteric, and was stretching serenely to its close. Just when the aims of life appeared to have been won, Kant was plunged into the only serious troubles which disturbed his tranquil existence. He became involved in a grave religious controversy by some articles in a Berlin magazine, afterwards reproduced in a volume under the title of *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason* (*Die Religion inner halb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 1793). There was a ferment in the religious circles of Germany at this time, and Kant's philosophy had early excited alarms which appeared now to be justified. A doctrine which rejected the accepted arguments for the being of God, the validity of revelation, the immortality of the soul, and the creation of the world, offended too many convictions, unsettled too many inveterate habits of thought, and substituted too shadowy and too abstract speculations for accredited precepts and dogmas, not to produce discontent and censure. Nor were the alarms entertained unreasonable, as was shown by the subsequent developments of the transcendental philosophy. The agitation excited by Kant's theological innovations was partially allayed by a royal mandate directing him to observe silence on religious topics. The king's interference is supposed to have been induced by Kant's sympathies with the French Revolution, despite of the Reign of Terror. On the death of the king in 1797 he resumed his expositions, considering his engagement as a personal one with that monarch. But before this time he had narrowed the sphere of his activity. In 1794 he withdrew from general society; in 1795 he discontinued all his instructions except in logic and metaphysics, and he closed his academic labors altogether two years afterwards. In 1798 he composed his *Strife of the Faculties* (*Der Streit der Facultäten*), reviving the religious dispute in which he had been entangled; and he bade farewell to the public in his *Pragmatical View of Anthropology* (*Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*). The last work from his own pen was a protest against Fichte's doctrine, which gave to the new philosophy the subjective or idealistic cast, against which his own efforts had always been strenuously directed. In this paper were manifested his own failing powers, and his incapacity to appreciate other systems than his own —a natural consequence of his habitual disregard of the history of speculation. His pupils published several other works from his notes and papers during the last years of his life. That life was not long extended after his retirement. His constitution gradually broke up; his health, so remarkably maintained, began to decline; appetite, teeth, strength, sight, voice, memory, all failed, and his pure, laborious, and honorable existence was terminated by an apoplectic attack, Feb. 12, 1804, when he had nearly completed his eightieth year. His death produced profound emotion throughout Germany. The whole city of Königsberg put on mourning; multitudes flocked to his funeral, and his remains were escorted to the grave by a solemn procession. A characteristic medal was struck to commemorate his fame. It bore an emblem and a motto appropriate to his doctrine, "Altius volantem cœrcuit." He was worthy of such honor. He left to his countrymen the example of a career rich in wholesome fruits — simple, sincere, upright, laborious; devoted singly to the promotion of truth, and to the removal of error in the highest and most perilous regions of speculation, illustrated by seventy years of unbroken industry, and by half a century faithfully given to the instruction of successive generations of the young in various branches of learning, from the humblest rudiments of knowledge to the most recondite metaphysical research. Humble, modest, and true, his life was a nobler crown to his memory than all the honors that men could bestow.

In person, Kant was small and delicately built. His blue eyes expressed benevolence, but his features were rugged, and seamed with the lines of habitual thought. Lavater mistook his portrait for that of a noted highwayman. His manners were kindly and courteous. He was very genial in company, full of mirth and innocent wit, and scrupulously abstinent of learned or metaphysical discourse. As a lecturer he was easy and attractive, displaying nothing of the repulsive aridity and elaborate awkwardness of his philosophical treatises. He was a reverential observer of all truth, and rigid in the practice of all justice. The like precise propriety regulated all his habits. He was plain in his tastes, abstemious in eating and drinking, chary of indulgences, frugal in his expenditures, methodical in every arrangement. "Early to bed and early to rise" was the rule of his life. His hour for rising was four in summer and five in winter; for bed, ten in summer and nine in win-

ter. By this regularity and moderation he reached fulness of years with health, cheerfulness, and perfect serenity. He seems to have been deficient in poetic sensibility and poetic imagination. To this defect may be ascribed several imperfections in the exposition of his philosophy, and his total want of religious sentiment. Shortly before his death he declared that he had no determinate notion of a future state, but was inclined to believe in metempsychosis. This was the flaw in his mental and moral constitution which produced many flaws in his speculation.

Like his illustrious contemporary Hume, whom he survived nearly thirty years, Kant was never married. He gave no "hostages to fortune," but illustrated Bacon's *dictum*, that "the best works, and of greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from unmarried or childless men." Of the works constituting Kant's bequest to posterity, the most noted and important are those that expound the "Critical Philosophy," and of this philosophy a brief notice remains to be given.

Philosophy.—Kant's scheme of speculation is so comprehensive, so extensive, so intricate, so systematic, so full of divisions and subdivisions, that it is impossible to attempt any complete summary of it within the limits allowed by this article. Not the fullest, but the most compact mode of exposition is required. Hence the notice of the numerous treatises not directly employed in the construction of the "Critical Philosophy" has been introduced into the biographical sketch. Hence, too, the reader who desires a formal outline of the system must be referred to some of the numerous synoptical views presented in German, French, English, and Latin. All that can be aimed at here will be to give a cursory account of the distinctive peculiarities of Kant's scheme. To do this, it may suffice to explain his relation to previous philosophy, to point out his characteristic method, and to note the chief developments and applications of that method.

To show the exact relation of Kant to antecedent and contemporary modes of speculation would require a detailed account of the fortunes of philosophy from Bacon, and Gassendi, and Des Cartes. This is more than has been attempted by Rosenkranz. It must suffice to state that in the middle of the 18th century the Wolfian development and systematization of the philosophy of Leibnitz was predominant in Germany; the scepticism of Hume perplexed and alarmed Britain; and the materialism of D'Alembert, Diderot, and Condillac was fashionable in France. The philosophy of Leibnitz was an effort to escape the pantheistic tendencies of Cartesianism as evolved in the idealism of Spinoza and the theosophism of Malebranche. Hume's philosophy was the sceptical evolution of the sensationalism of Locke, generated by the collision between the *mechanicism* of Hartley and the Pyrrhonism of Berkeley. The infidel doctrine of the school of the French Encyclopædia was the superficial deduction of the French intellectual anarchists from the partial appreciation of the tenets of Locke, whose own principles were vague and incoherent. The problem presented for solution was to find some ground of conciliation between all these divergent opinions, to detect and expose the fallacies on which they rested, to avoid the mischiefs caused or portended by them, and to discover a trustworthy and intelligible basis for human knowledge. The situation was in many respects analogous to that which characterized the Hellenic world at the time of Socrates. Kant undertook the investigation of this arduous and urgent problem, and, like Socrates, he proceeded by the critical investigation of the nature of knowledge and of the intellectual faculties of man. By this procedure he was gradually led to the determination of the conditions of the problem, and to the discovery of a solution partially true, and which appeared to himself complete and irrefragable. In metaphysics the method is the philosophy, and Kant's method gave to his system the appropriate name of the Critical Philosophy.

It must be remembered that Kant's early guide was Schultz, an earnest partisan of Wolf; that Kant proceeds from the Wolfian, that is, from the methodical Leibnitzian School; that he slowly emerges from the Wolfian circle, and that Wolfian characteristics may be traced throughout the whole construction of his scheme.

The response made by Leibnitz to the thesis of Locke —"Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu"—a dogma by no means Aristotle's, and only virtually Locke's —furnishes the key-note to the whole philosophy of Kant. "Nisi intellectus ipse," replied Leibnitz; thus distinguishing the faculty of thought from the impressions it receives, and offering a refutation at once of both the sceptical and the materialistic followers of Locke. The same just discernment may be found in Aristotle, though it has been little noticed (*Analyt. Post.* ii, xix). What was required was the discovery of some principle of intelligence, some interpretation of the process of human thought, which would withdraw the mind of man from the arbitrary government of a Providential compulsion, a blind necessity, or a mechanical regulation by material constitution or by external chance. Kant sought this principle in the constitution and limitations of the human mind. He analyzed the products and the processes of thought. He found that in every perception, in every judgment, in every generalization, the mind communicated something of its own to what was presented as the object of knowledge; that in every apprehension, what was apprehended was moulded and determined by the intelligence which apprehended it. To use the language of the school, the form of knowledge was necessarily imposed by the constitution of the cognizant mind. This seems to have been the doctrine of Aristotle (*τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι τόπον εἰδῶν*, *De Anim.* iii, iv), and was deduced from his teachings by his scholiast, Asclepius.

It was slowly that Kant reached this conclusion, which became very prolific in his hands. He tells us that it was due to the examination of Hume's denial of any *nexus* between cause and effect, which of course reduced the universe to a disconnected dream, and rendered all knowledge the mere aggregate of impressions fortuitously succeeding each other. He found that the same difficulty which had been exposed by Hume in regard to cause and effect existed in the case of all synthetic judgments *à priori*, or those which unite two unconnected conceptions in one proposition. Truth was thus deprived of all validity, and experience became fallacy. How could a firm foundation be attained? Was experience as hollow, and spectral, and delusive as it had been represented by Hume? Three questions presented themselves for solution, each corresponding to a distinct branch of metaphysical inquiry: "What can I know?" "What ought I to do?" "What may I hope for?" The answer to the first question, which was the investigation of the nature of knowledge and of the nature of the mind, was given in the *Critique of the Pure Reason.* The answer to the second, which embraced the theory of duty, was propounded in the *Critique of the Practical Reason.* The answer to the third, which contemplated the *summum bonum* under a peculiar aspect, was presented in the *Critique of the Judgment*—a very ambiguous designation. This distinction of subjects and division of treatises sprung from the distribution of the matter of philosophy then prevalent in Germany. The distribution had itself descended from Aristotle (*θεωρητικὴ γὰρ καὶ πρακτικὴ καὶ ποιητικὴ λέγεται* scil. *ἐπιστήμη.*—*Top.* vi, 6; comp. *Metaph.* v, 1; xi, 7; xii, 9).

(1) *The Critique of the Pure Reason* contains the essence of Kant's philosophy. It exhibits his method, illustrates his procedure, and presents his fundamental conclusions. The conception of the Pure Reason is in great measure his own, though both the name and what is denoted by the name are found in previous systems (Plotinus, *Ennead.* v, 3, 3; Leibnitz, *Theod.* § 1; *Nouv. Ess.* ii, iv, § 3). The pure reason is reason in its essential constitution—*ἐν δυνάμει*, not *ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ*—the think-

ing faculty in its adaptation to thought—empty of the matter of thought, and distinct from its experiences. It is the mill without the grain which is to be ground by it. In analyzing the principle of thought, Kant detects an active as well as a passive factor. In every act of thought there is the reception of the impression from the object of thought, and the subjective reaction thereby excited, which reaction communicates the rational form to the *conclusum*, and differentiates *τὸ νούμενον*, the subject of thought, from *τὸ φαινόμενον*, the object of thought.

Kant distinguishes the agencies which supply the materials of knowledge into three—sense, understanding, reason. The distribution of the faculties of the mind is always hazardous, and often beguiling. The mind is one and complete. In the perceptions of sensation, the elements derived from the mind, and not from the impression, are space and time. Such elements are called *transcendental* because they transcend, precede, and formulate the experience. They are consequently the forms or conditions of sensations. They are not supplied by the sensation, but they are added to it by the mind in the act of perception. There are indications of this doctrine in Plotinus (*Ennead.* ii, 7, 9), Leibnitz (*Nouv. Ess.* liv. ii, chap. v), and in other writers. It is intimated, indeed, by Aristotle, and is a natural deduction from the Ideas of Plato. It is singularly corroborated by recent expositions of the physiology of nervous action. In Kant's theory the phenomena of the external world are all subject to the conception of space, the phenomena of the mind to the conception of time. The sensationalist is thus refuted, as space and time are not obtained from sensation. The dogmatic idealist is refuted, as the matter of knowledge must be supplied by external impressions.

The understanding co-ordinates the perceptions of sense, and forms them into judgments by giving to them unity and interdependence. The transcendental elements supplied in this action of the understanding are arranged by Kant in twelve categories. The name of categories is taken from the Organon of Aristotle, but Kant's categories are entirely diverse from Aristotle's. Kant observed that metaphysical science pursued a delusive round, without making progress or securing stability, while logic had received full, complete, and definite form from its great founder. He ascribed this difference of fortune to the fact that logic was simply the exposition of the procedure of the mind in reasoning, and he concluded that equal validity would be conferred on metaphysics, if it were reduced to an accurate representation of the procedure of the mind in the acquisition and employment of the materials of knowledge. Hence he invented a forced analogy between the two branches of speculation, and rendered his theory intricate, arbitrary, and obscure by compelling it to assume a form fantastically corresponding with logical distinctions. In this spirit he devised his twelve categories, and arranged them according to the forms of propositions, in the manner exhibited in the following table:

	Logical.	Transcendental.
I. Quantity	Universal.	Unity.
	Particular.	Plurality.
	Singular.	Totality.
II. Quality	Affirmative.	Reality.
	Negative.	Negation.
	Indeterminate.	Limitation.
III. Relation	Categorical.	Substance.
	Hypothetical.	Cause.
	Disjunctive.	Reciprocity.
IV. Modality	Problematical.	Possibility.
	Assertory.	Existence.
	Apodeictic.	Necessity.

All judgments are framed by the mind under the influence of these categories, four of them—one from each class—being inevitably applied in every instance. As, however, things are thus seen, not as they are, but as the intellectual predispositions make them appear to be—knowledge is purely relative to the human mind—objective truth is not attainable, and all our experiences or knowledge have only a subjective validity. The mind cannot think except so far as it has been provoked by objective stimulation, therefore there is a real objective existence of things. It thinks under the control of the categories of the understanding, therefore knowledge is subjective in form, is moulded by the recipient mind, and cannot be known to correspond to the reality of things. The image is reflected from the mirror, but the object represented may be magnified or diminished, or strangely distorted by the character of the mirror, without being altered in itself. The image is all that constitutes knowledge; there is, accordingly, no assurance of agreement between the image and the object. Thus all knowledge is conditional only—conditioned by the forms of the understanding, which mould it into the form in which it is received. Some principle was required to give coherence, unity, confidence to the relative knowledge obtained through such mental experiences. This was supposed to be given by the consciousness of personality which bounded, adunated, and harmonized all the qualified judgments that could be entertained. It seems a misapprehension on the part of Kant, and at variance with his system, to claim any necessary truth for judgments formed in this manner. There can be nothing more than a relative or contingent necessity—an impossibility of thinking otherwise than the constitution of the mind necessitates.

In the highest region of the mind—the reason or the faculty of ideas—there is also subjection of the matter of knowledge to transcendental forms. But the functions of the reason pass beyond the limits of experience, and are only regulative. In this branch of the subject, which is designed to explain the combination of the judgments of the understanding into ratiocinative conclusions, Kant introduces three *pure ideas*, which are deemed to be analogous to the three forms of the syllogism—categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive. These ideas are, 1. Absolute unity, or simple being, the soul, which gives origin to *Rational Psychology;* 2. Absolute totality, the aggregate of phenomena in space and time, the world, which is the basis of *Cosmology;* and, 3. Absolute reality, supreme existence, the First Cause, which is the subject of *Theology*. From this point the later German schools diverge by ascribing a real and not simply a subjective validity to the forms of the absolute. With Kant they are merely postulates of reason, having no assured objective existence. Rational psychology only exhibits the phenomena of mental consciousness without guaranteeing anything in regard to the essential nature of the mind or to the immortality of the soul. Rational cosmology is equally unable to attain to any positive knowledge in regard to the creation. It lands us finally in four pairs of transcendental ideas, each pair producing twin contradictions. These are Kant's celebrated *antinomies:* 1. In quantity, it may be proved that the world is both limited and unlimited; 2. In quality, that its elements are ultimately simple and infinitely divisible; 3. In relation, that it is caused by free action, and by an infinite series of mechanical causes; 4. In modality, that it has an independent cause, and that it is composed of interdependent members. Whichever of these alternatives be asserted, it cannot be exclusively maintained, for it results in hopeless paralogisms. Both must be in some sense true, yet both cannot be simultaneously entertained, because they are contradictory. Hence no certainty, no complete comprehensive knowledge can be attained. Metaphysics is simply inquisitive, speculative, critical, showing the limitations of the human mind, and the impossibility of knowing the reality of things, but at the same time furnishing glimpses of a reality which the mind can not compass—of existence and truth beyond the range of finite comprehension. It is the confession, if not the demonstration of the intellectual weakness of man. The same negative result is reached in rational theology. The ontological argument for the being of God—that of Anselm and Des Cartes, derived from the notion of per-

fect and independent existence—the cosmological argument of Clarke, which proceeds from the conception of contingent to that of necessary being—and the physico-teleological argument of the natural theologians, which infers a supreme intelligent Designer from the evidences of design in the creation, are all equally inconclusive. "Thus the soul, the world, and God are left by Kant's speculative philosophy as problems not only unsolved, but demonstrably unsolvable." To furnish a positive support for convictions on this subject indispensable for human guidance, and to give an authoritative rule for action, Kant constructed his ethical systems.

(2) *Critique of the Practical Reason.*—Neither the name nor the conception of the practical reason was a novelty; both occur in Aristotle (*De Anim.* iii, 10; *ὁ μὲν γὰρ θεωρητικὸς νοῦς οὐδὲν νοεῖ πρακτόν*, ibid. c. ix). They are found in Aquinas (*Summ. Theol.* ii, 1, 90, and especially 91, 3), in Roger Bacon (*Opus Majus*, p. 35, 44), and in most philosophers, mediæval and modern, who have accepted the Aristotelian doctrine. Whatever systems have recognised a moral sense, whatever theories have admitted a sustaining and guiding illumination of the conscience, whatever schemes acknowledge the inworking spirit, and whatever expositions of the mysteries of man assume an abiding faith as the foundation of moral action, entertain substantially the same fundamental doctrine as Kant's, though it is differently expanded and applied by them. The characteristic feature of Kant's ethical system is what he terms the "*Categorical Imperative*." Speculative philosophy affords neither absolute truth nor certain guidance. Practical philosophy rests upon the enlightened conscience—enlightened by its own indwelling light. The "categorical imperative" is a rule of action—a moral law deriving its authority from itself—intuitively received—determining action by the idea—governing by the rational form, not by the matter—thus advancing to the realm of the absolute, the unconditional, the *noumenal*, and passing from the shadows of speculation to the realities of action and duty. The formula of this "categorical imperative" is, Act so that your action may be applied as a universal rule. It is obvious that a precept so vague and so abstract may represent an essential characteristic or property of right conduct, but cannot be accepted as its principle. It is indefinite, and it wants the authority of sovereign command. It would require the omniscient comprehension of all contemporaneous relations, and all possible consequences for the regulation of every act, and at best would result in transcendental utilitarianism. It is too abstruse to be promptly and habitually applied to all the occurrences of life, and by all grades of men. It is limited to finite intelligences, and is sufficiently elastic to allow each one's ignorance or obtuse conscience to be alleged as the individual rule of right. It might easily be stretched so as to sanction the Donatist thesis, "Quicquid libet, licet." On such a scheme, to employ the expression of Lyly's Euphues, "it is the disposition of the mind that altereth the nature of the thing." Our morals would be shifting and casuistical. The wish would continually be the father to the thought; and all enthusiasm, all fanaticism, all monomania might be presented as the canon of order. The conception of duty is the touchstone and stumbling-block of philosophy, and against it is shattered every scheme which does not rest upon the acceptance of revelation, and the acknowledgment of God, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being." There is no other mode of passing the chasm which separates the negative results of speculative inquiry from the positive requirements of practical action. Speculative philosophy discusses the boundaries of the mind; practical philosophy is concerned with actions which are infinite in their consequences, and whose effects "wander through eternity."

(3) *The Critique of the Judgment* (*Urtheilskraft*—Faculty of Judgment).—This is the third of the systematic treatises devoted to the construction of the critical philosophy. The designation is infelicitous and ambiguous. The *Imagination* would be more appropriate, but would scarcely be applicable without some violence to the whole scope of the inquiry proposed. The department corresponds to the *ἐπιστήμη ποιητική*, or constructive science of the peripatetic distribution of knowledge, and connects the domain of the pure with that of the practical reason. The imagination is the faculty of conciliation—of *re-creation*—uniting in emotional delight the obligations of action with the highest discoveries of speculation. In Kant's critique of the judgment are included the doctrine of the beautiful and the sublime, or æsthetics, and the doctrine of final causes, or teleology. His theory of beauty accords in substance with that of Plato, or rather that of Plotinus, but from his own singular defect of imagination, and consequent limitation of view, it is denied the completeness, splendor, and fulness of far-reaching suggestion which illustrate that magnificent exposition of the grandest and most recondite subject of metaphysical speculation. In beauty, Kant contemplates only the latent beneficent design, the harmony of means and ends, without dwelling upon the more significant conception of the primordial plan, the archetypal perfection, from which the whole creation has declined, but towards which man's ideal ever strives to return. The terms in which the doctrine is expounded are often confused and indistinct, but the essential principle of beauty, which is not in things, but in the mind, is the intuitive perception of the concord between the ideal perfection suggested and the order of the universe observed. The principle of the sublime is the intuition of the discrepance between the finite powers of man and the infinite towards which he aspires, producing pain from the sense of limitation, but exaltation from yearning towards the limitless, beyond sense and conception, which is felt to be his natural home, his ultimate destination. In the discussion of teleology proper Kant endeavors to restore some efficacy to that reasoning from final causes which in earlier treatises he had repudiated. This part of the subject is inadequately unfolded, but it presents many vast and suggestive views, and in some sort prepares the way for the last of Kant's treatises which can be specially noticed here.

(4) *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason.*—This is Kant's theology, and is the most unsatisfactory of all his efforts. It was an attempt to reconstruct the foundations of religious belief, which had been sapped and in great measure overthrown by his critical investigations. It was the work of his old age, and at all periods of his life he seems to have been at least as deficient in religious sentiment as in emotional imagination, which is closely allied to it. The work provoked much opposition at the time of its appearance, and caused the only serious annoyance of his life. It scandalized many religious minds, it was dangerously consonant with the revolutionary infidelity of France, and it presented the point of departure for the German rationalism of the 19th century. It treats the revelations of Scripture in regard to the fall of man, to his redemption, and to his restoration as a moral allegory, the data for which are supplied by the consciousness of depravity, and of dereliction from the strict principles of duty. It is Strauss in the germ. It is utterly inconsistent with any scheme of religion, and serves to show Kant's profound sense of the insufficiency of his own doctrine for the solution of the highest enigmas of humanity. The *ποῦ στῶ*—the solid *locus standi* was wanting to his elaborate system. The philosophy was wholly critical in its procedure, and negative in its results. It weakened or undermined those intuitive convictions—inexplicable, but irrefragable—which enable man "to walk by faith, and not by sight."

This notice is too brief to allow the exhibition of the incongruities or fallacies of the transcendental system, or the suggestion of rectifications, as it has been too brief for any detailed account of the several parts of his complex and elaborate scheme. That scheme is a wonder-

ful monument of patient industry, acute discernment, perspicacious analysis, and of bold and honest thought. It was soon felt to be unsatisfactory, and it engendered new swarms of speculative heresies; but its influences must be sought in Rosenkranz's history of Kant's doctrine, and in other treatises on the history of German speculation.

Literature.—The bibliography of Kant's philosophy would make the catalogue of an extensive library, and would include nearly everything in the highest branches of metaphysics which has appeared since the publication of the Critique of Pure Reason. In all the general histories of modern speculation, much space is of course conceded to this subject. The following treatises may be examined with advantage. Kant, *Werke*, of course. The best editions are that of Hartenstein (Leipzig, 1838-9, 10 vols.), and that of Rozenkranz and Schubert (Leipzig, 1840-42, 11 vols.), including a full biography of the philosopher by Schubert, and an elaborate appreciation of the relations and influences of the philosophy by Rosenkranz. It gives also a chronological catalogue of Kant's multifarious writings. Recent translations into English are those of his *Critik of Pure Reason*, by Hayward (Lond. 1848, 8vo), and by Meiklejohn (Lond. 1856, 8vo); of his *Metaphysics of Ethics*, by Semple (Lond. 1856, 8vo); of his *Theory of Religion*, by the same (Lond. 1858, 8vo). There are biographies by Borowsky (1804: this was revised by Kant); by Wasiansky, his private secretary, giving an account of his last years (1804); by Jachmann (1804); by Hasse (1804); and the ablest by Kunotischen of Jena (1860). For the appreciation of the doctrine the following works may be consulted: Nitzsch, *General and Introductory View* (Lond. 1796); Schmidt-Phiseldek, *Expositio Philosoph. Crit.* (Hafn. 1796); Mellin, *Encyclop. Dict. of the Kantian Philosophy* (1797, 6 vols.); Willich, *Elements of the Critical Philosophy* (London, 1798); Villers, *Philosophie de Kant* (Metz, 1801); Degerando, *Hist. Comp. de Philosophie* (Paris, 1804); Wirgman, *Principles of the Kantesian Philosophy* (London, 1824—a recomposition of an able article contributed to the *Encyclopædia Londinensis* in 1812); Cousin, *Leçons sur la Philosophie de Kant* (Paris, 1842; translated by A. G. Henderson, Lond. 1871, 8vo); Murdoch, *Sketches of Modern Philosophy* (1842); Barchou de Penhoën, *Hist. de la Phil. Allemande depuis Leibnitz jusqu'à Hegel* (Paris, 1837, 2 vols.); Erdmann, *Gesch. der neueren Philosophie;* Michelet, *Geschichte des letzten Systems;* Willm, *Histoire de la Philosophie Allemande* (Paris, 1847, 4 vols.); Morell, *Philosophy of the 19th Century* (1848); Chalybæus, *Histor. Entwickelung d. spekulativen Philosophie von Kant bis Hegel* (4th edit. Leipz. 1848); E. Remhold, *Gesch. d. Philos.* (4th ed. Jena, 1854), vol. iii; Lewes, *History Philos.* (3d ed. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* (N. York, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), lect. iv, sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought.* Very instructive notices of Kant and his philosophy are contained in the *North British Review*, vol. x, the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and in Appleton's *American Cyclopædia.* The criticisms of Dugald Stewart in the *Supplement to the Encyclop. Britannica* are wholly unsatisfactory. (G. F. H.)

Kantoplatonism, the French term for a new mode of philosophizing which inclines to *Idealism* (q. v.). The Kantoplatonists are considered an offspring of the Platonic and Kantian schools of philosophy. The representative of Kantoplatonism is Cousin (q. v.).

Kanute. See Denmark.

Kaphar. See Kephar.

Kapharnaites. See Lord's Supper; Transubstantiation.

Kapila, the reputed author of the *Sânkhya* (q. v.), one of the philosophical systems of the Hindus. As to the origin of Kapila, Hindu tradition is rather vague. Among his followers he is by some described as a son of Brahma, and by others, especially his later followers, as an incarnation of Vishnu. He is also recounted to have been born as the son of Devahûti, and, again, is identified with one of the agnis or fires. Finally, it is said that there existed, in fact, two Kapilas—the first an embodiment of Vishnu; the other, the igneous principle in human disguise. The probability is that Kapila was simply, like the great majority of his educated countrymen, a Brahman. Spence Hardy (*Manual of Buddhism*, p. 132) quotes a legend by which it may be shown that the Hindus regarded Buddha as a later existence of our Kapila, and that therefore Buddhism is the Sankhya philosophy modified; but professor Max Müller rejects this theory, and says that he has looked in vain for any similarities between the system of Kapila, as known to us in the Sankhya-sûtras, and the Abhidharma, or the metaphysics of the Buddhists. He adds, however, that if any similarity of the two systems could be established, such proofs would be very valuable. "They would probably enable us to decide whether Buddha borrowed from Kapila, or Kapila from Buddha, and thus determine the real chronology of the philosophical literature of India, as either prior or subsequent to the Buddhist æra." See Professor J. E. Hall, *Bibliotheca Indica, Sânkhyapr.* p. 14 sq.; Ballantyne, *Lecture on the Sankhya Philosophy* [Mirzapore, 1850]; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 208 sq.; Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 223 sq. See also Sânkhya.

Kapitorists, a sect of the Russian Church. See Russian Church.

Karaites (Heb. קראים, *Karaim*, i. e. Readers) is the name of one of the oldest and most remarkable sects of the Jewish synagogue, whose distinguishing tenet is strict adherence to the letter of the written law (i. e. sacred writings of the O. T.), and utter disregard of the authority of the oral law or *tradition* (q. v.).

Origin.—Up to our own day it has been impossible to determine the age in which the Karaites originated; certain it is that they existed before the 8th century, to which their origin was formerly assigned. The Karaites themselves claim to be the remains of the ten tribes led captive by Shalmaneser. The Rabbins (e. g. Aben-Ezra, Maimonides, etc.) unjustly assert that this sect is identical with the Sadducees (comp. Rule, *Karaites*, p. viii), and that they were originated by Ahnan (about A.D. 640), because the latter was ignored in the election of a new *Resh-Gelutha* (q. v.); but the investigations of our day lead us to believe that the Karaites must have originated immediately after the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity, although they did not organize into a distinct sect until after the collection of oral tradition, and that for this, and no other reason, we find no mention of them as such in the New-Test. writings, nor in those of Josephus and Philo. Upon the completion of the Talmud it is well known that a great agitation prevailed in the Jewish community, especially in the western synagogues, and particularly at Constantinople, where, on the ides of February, A.D. 529, Justinian was obliged to interfere, and actually prohibited the reading of the Mishna in the synagogue. In the conversion of the Khazars (q. v.) to Judaism, the Karaites, as we learn from the Sepher Chozri [see Judah Ha-Levi], already appear as a distinct sect. From inscriptions collected and examined by Abraham Firkovitch, the celebrated Russian Jew, within the last twenty years, there are indications that in the Crimea at least Karaites may have flourished as early as the first half of the 4th century (compare Rule, p. 83; N. Y. *Nation*, June 7, 1866). The external unity, however, of the Jewish Church was not broken apparently until the time of Ahnan ben-David. It is true, even in the days of Christ, the internal peace of the Jewish fold was much disturbed; synagogues differed greatly from each other, but ostensibly these differences were provoked only by ignorance of the Hebrew, and the introduction of Greek and other foreign idioms, on doctrines and discipline there seemed to reign universal harmony. Not so after

the publication of the Talmud. There were many who inclined to pay strict deference only to the inspired writings of the O. T.; and when, in the middle of the 8th century, a Luther in the form of Ahnan ben-David arose in the Jewish midst and declared his opposition to the Rabbinites, a party was formed in his favor at Jerusalem itself, which soon extended throughout Palestine, and even far away through all the East, as well as towards the West. The personal history of this great Jewish reformer is rather obscured by the fables of Arabs, and the calumnies of some Rabbinites; and it remains to be settled whether, as the Karaites assert, he was born at Beth-tsur, near Jerusalem (and of the lineage of king David), or in Beth-tsur (Bazra) on the Tigris, and consequently imbibed his reformatory notions from the Arabian or Persian dissenters from Mohammedanism known as *Mutazilites* (q. v.). Certain it is, however, that at the time of the election of a new *Resh-Gelutha* Ahnan must have enjoyed some distinction, or he could never have presented claims for the office of "leader in Israel." In the year 761 we find him at Jerusalem in a synagogue of his own, expounding the new doctrine, and, after kindling great enthusiasm among a host of disciples who had quickly gathered about him, sending forth from this centre of Judaism "letters of admonition, instruction, and encouragement to distant congregations, with zealous preachers who proclaimed everywhere the supreme authority of the Law, and the worthlessness of all that, in the Talmud or any other writings, was contrary to the law of Moses" (comp. Pinsker, *Likute Kadmonioth*, or *Zur Geschichte u. Liter. des Karäismus*, Append. p. 33 and 90). Ahnan died in 765, yet within that astonishingly brief period the Karaites had spread over Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Barbary, Spain, Syria, Tartary, Byzantium, Fez, Morocco, and even to the ranges of the Atlas, and by all the Karaites in these distant lands his death was mourned as the loss of a second Moses. Under Rabbi Salomon ben-Jerukhim (born in 885) they prospered greatly in the 9th century, and even up to the 14th they seem to have increased, but thereafter their condition becomes obscure, and light first again breaks upon the Karaites' history with the opening of the present century (see below).

The reason why so little is yet known about the Karaites is that their writings are not generally accessible. Towards the close of the 17th century Protestant theologians interested themselves in their behalf, and in 1690 Peringer (then professor of Hebrew at the university at Upsala) was sent to Poland by the king of Sweden to make inquiries into their history. In 1698 Jacob Trigland (professor at Leyden) went thither for the same purpose, and the results of his investigations, which remain of great value to this day, were published in the *Thesaurus of Sacred Oriental Antiquities*. Trigland says that he had learned enough to speak of them with assurance. He asserts that, soon after the prophets had ceased, the Jews became divided on the subject of works and supererogation, some maintaining their necessity from tradition, whilst others, keeping close to the written law, set them aside, and that thus Karaism commenced. He adds that, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, on the re-establishment of the observance of the law there were several practices found proper for that end, and these, being once introduced, were looked upon as essential, and as appointed by Moses. This was the origin of Pharisaism, while a contrary party, who continued to adhere to the letter, founded Karaism. Wolfius, the great Hebrew bibliographer, depending on the *Memoirs* of Mardachai ben-Nissan, a learned Karaite (published by Wolf under the title of *Notitia Karæorum*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1714, 4to), refers their origin to a massacre among the Jewish doctors under Alexander Jannæus, their king, about a hundred years before Christ, because Simon, son of Shetach, and the queen's brother, making his escape into Egypt, there forged his pretended traditions, and, on his return to Jerusalem, published his visions, interpolating the law after his own fancy, and supporting his novelties from the notices which God, he said, had communicated by the mouth of Moses, whose depositary he was. He gained many followers, and was opposed by others, who maintained that all which God had revealed to Moses was written. Hence the Jews became divided into two sects, the Karaites and Traditionists. Among the first, Juda, son of Tabbai, distinguished himself; among the latter, Hillel (q. v.). In later history he agrees with what has been said above. It remains only to be stated that Wolfius reckons not only the Sadducees, but also the Scribes, in the number of Karaites. But such a classification is wholly inconsistent with our present knowledge of the Sadducees and the Scribes. Karaism cannot be regarded as in any sense a product of Sadduceeism; the two are the opposites both in principle and tendency, or, as Rule has it, "Sadduceeism and Karaism are just as contrary the one to the other as unbelief and faith."

Doctrines and Usages.—Although the Karaites are decidedly opposed to assigning any authority to tradition, they by no means reject altogether the use of the Talmud, etc. Quite to the contrary, they gladly accept any light that they can get in their investigation of the O.-T. Scriptures, but it is only as exegetical aids that they are ready to accept Jewish traditionary writings. Selden, who is very express on this point, observes, in his *Uxor Hebraica*, that besides the mere text, they have also certain interpretations which they call hereditary, and which they consider proper traditions. Their theology seems to differ only from that of the Rabbinites in being purer and free from superstition, as they give no credit to the explications of the Cabalists, chimerical allegories, nor to any constitutions of the Talmud. In short, they accept only what is conformable to Scripture, and may be drawn from it by just and necessary consequences. The Karaites, in distinction from the Rabbinites, have their own Confession of Faith, which consists of ten articles. They are (as translated by Rule, p. 128) as follows:

1. That all this bodily (or material) existence, that is to say, the spheres and all that is in them, is created.
2. That they have a Creator, and the Creator has his own soul (or spirit).
3. That he has no similitude, and he is one, separate from all.
4. That he sent Moses, our master (upon whom be peace!).
5. That he sent with Moses, our master, his law, which is perfect;
6. For the instruction of the faithful, the language of our law, and the interpretation, that is to say, the reading (or text), and the division (or vowel pointing).
7. That the blessed God sent forth the other prophets.
8. That God (blessed be his name!) will raise the sons of men to life in the day of judgment.
9. That the blessed God giveth to man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.
10. That the blessed God has not reprobated the men of the captivity, but they are under the chastisements of God, and it is every day right that they should obtain his salvation by the hands of Messiah, the Son of David.

A comparison of this confession with the thirteen articles of the Rabbinites [see JUDAISM] makes it evident that the Karaitic confession was framed later than that of the Rabbinites, with intent to put in bold relief the peculiar doctrines of Karaism. Prayer, fasting, and pilgrimages to Hebron (evidently inspired by the Mohammedan pilgrimage to Mecca) are points of religious practice to which they pay particular attention. They are eminently moralists (revering greatly Leviticus xix and xx), very conscientious in their dealings with their fellow-men, temperate and simple in food and dress, although far from being ascetics. In distinction from the Rabbinites, they make the heads of their phylacteries round instead of square, and their prohibition of marriage among persons of affinity extends to degrees almost of infinity. Instead of facing their synagogues towards the east, as do the Rabbinites, they face them north and south, arguing that Shalmaneser brought them northward, so that in praying they must turn to the south in order to face Jerusalem.

Number and Present Condition.—The number of the present adherents to Karaism has been variously estimated; nothing, however, can be definitely or even approximately given until more shall be known of the Jews of Asia. They are strongest, according to modern accounts, in the Crimea, where there are over 4000 of them; but, with Rule (p. 112), we believe that there are many Jews, ostensibly adherents of the Rabbinites, who are truly believers in Karaism; certainly the Reformed schools of Judaism are nothing else than *Rationalistic Karaites.*

Under the Russian and Austrian governments the Karaites enjoy greater privileges than the Rabbinites; in many respects they are on an equality with the adherents to the state religion of these respective countries. Fortunately for the Rabbinites, however, it is not any want of morality in them, but the excesses of the *Chasidim* (q. v.) who belong to their number, that has deprived them of the favors which are so freely bestowed on the Karaites. Strangely enough, the Karaites contend that the Messiah will issue from their tribe, and that their princes were once the sovereigns of Egypt.

Literature.—The Karaites have, ever since the days of Ahnan, produced writers of great excellence and distinction. Unfortunately, we have thus far succeeded in wresting from oblivion, comparatively speaking, only a few works, but these evince that Karaism has not failed to be active in urging its adherents to literary activity. They have produced an extensive special Hebrew literature of their own, chiefly consisting of works on theology, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, etc. The greatest number of these are deposited in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. So long as they lived principally under Mohammedan rule they wrote in *Arabic*, but when they unfolded a literary activity in the Crimea and among the Tartars they originated a language peculiar to themselves—a mixture of Tartar and Turkish. Some of their principal later authors are little known to us, e. g. Joseph b.-Noah, Jeshua, Jehudah Hadassi, Aron b.-Joseph, Aron b.-Eliah, the celebrated opponent of Moses Maimonides; Eliah Beshitzi, Kaleb, Moses Beshizi, Mardochai b.-Nissan, Salomo b.-Abram Traki, Simcha b.-Isaac b.-Moses, etc.

See Fürst, *Gesch. d. Karäerthums* (Leipz. 1869, 5 vols. 8vo); Beer, *Gesch. d. jüdisch. Sekten*, vol. i (Leipz. 1822, 8vo); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ii, 497 sq., and later volumes; and the compendium of Rule, *History of the Karaite Jews* (Lond. 1870, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Kare'äh (Heb. *Kare'äch*, קָרֵחַ, *bald;* Sept. Κάρης v. r. Καριέ or Καρεέ; in 2 Kings xxv, 23, Καριέ v. r. Καρήϑ, Auth. Vers. "Careah"), the father of Johanan and Jonathan, who attached themselves for a time to the loyal party under Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (Jer. xl, 8, 13, 15, 16; xli, 11, 13, 14, 16; xlii, 1, 8; xliii, 2, 4, 5). B.C. ante 588.

Karēna (also *Carena, Quarena, Carentana*) is the name of an ecclesiastical fast formerly observed in the Roman Catholic Church, forty days in length, and was generally imposed by bishops or monastic authorities for various venial sins. The Karenist was confined to bread and water, and deprived of all other temporal conveniences and enjoyments, as well as all association with the world. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 689.

Karens, the name of a people of India, occupying various portions of Burmah between 28° and 10° N. latitude, and 99° and 93° E. longitude. The name *Karen* is of Burmese origin, and designates a class of the Mongolian family of tribes who call themselves *Pgah Kenzaũ*, a term meaning *man.* They first became known to Europeans in A.D. 1824–7. They appear to be identical with the *Kakhyens*, which Kincaid thinks to be only another name for Karen. He says that all these tribes, through the whole extent of the Shan country, and farther north, are called Kakhyens. They are found from the Martaban Gulf inward as far as the Burman population has ever extended. They are numerous about Rangoon and Ava, and are known to extend at least two hundred and fifty miles east of Ava. These tribes are supposed to number about five millions.

Origin.—There is much doubt as to their origin. There are amongst them many distinct traditions which would point to a Thibetan source. Mason (in his *Tennasserim*) says that they regard themselves as wanderers from the north, and as having crossed "a river of running sand," by which name he says Fa Hian, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India about the 5th century, constantly speaks of the great desert to the north of Burmah, and between China and Thibet. Bruce says that they are of Turanian stock, and allied with the Tamulians of India and the inhabitants of Thibet (p. 145, 147). A portion of northern Burmah and Yunnan has been suggested as the probable original seat of the Karen race. Many authorities consider them as the aborigines of much of Burmah. Amongst the reasons assigned for this view are the following: (1) They received from the Burmese their name of *Karen*, which means *first* or aboriginal. (2) Their habits are much more primitive than those of the Burmese, and they dislike their subjugation to the latter. (3) They have traditions distinctly fixing their early location on the eastern side of a body of water which they call *Kaw* or *Kho*, which is so ancient a term that they have lost the meaning of it altogether, but the tradition itself shows that this was the Bay of Bengal. (4) The Moans or Talaings, a people who are older residents than the Burmese in Farther India, say the Karens were in the country when they first entered it, and were known as Beloos or wild men by their forefathers (*Journ. American Oriental Society*, vol. iv).

Description.—The Karens of the north are more advanced in the arts and in the habits of civilization than those of the southern district. They reckon themselves not by villages nor by cities, but by families, having a patriarchal form of society, single families, occupants of one house, often numbering from three to four hundred members. Their houses are immense structures, made of posts, with joists at a height of seven or eight feet from the ground, the sides being lined with mats, the roof being of palm-leaves, and the partitions of bamboo matting.

It is the southern section of these tribes, however, which is best known, especially those designated as *Sgau* and *Pgho* Karens. The latter are called by the Burmese *Talaing Karens*, and are a vigorous people, robust, full-chested, with large limbs, square cheek-bones, thick and flattened nose, but not specially prominent lips. The Sgau, or pure Karens, are smaller, with a complexion lighter than others surrounding them, and with a general languor about their movements. Mr. Judson in 1833 wrote of them as "a meek, peaceful race, simple and credulous, with many of the softer virtues and few flagrant vices, greatly addicted to drunkenness, extremely filthy, indolent in their habits, their morals in other respects being superior to many more civilized races, though he was told that they were as untamable as the wild cow of the mountains" (Wayland, *Judson*, i, 542 sq.).

Religious Traditions.—They have amongst them a great number of religious traditions which bear a marked analogy to Biblical history. The tradition respecting the creation specifies that man was created from the earth, and woman from one of man's ribs. The Creator said, "I lose these, my son and daughter. I will bestow my life upon them," and he then breathed a particle of his life into their nostrils, "and they came to life and were men." God made food and drink; rice, fire, and water; cattle, elephants, and birds. Traditions concerning man's primitive state and first transgression, very similar to the Bible narrative, are also preserved amongst them. *Nauk'plau*, who answers to the serpent of Genesis, is variously impersonated as sometimes male and sometimes female: man is located in a garden, with sev-

en different kinds of fruits of which he should eat, with one exception. Nauk'plau meets him and tells him the character of all the fruits, and assures him that the forbidden one is the most delicious of all. He prevails on the woman first to taste this fruit. She gives it to her husband, etc. On the morrow Ywah (on this name, see below, under *Religious Views*) comes, etc. The very detail of the narrative is preserved to a marvellous degree.

Other traditions point to a flood, in which the waters "rose and rose till they reached to heaven." Others refer to an early separation of the human family. "Men had at first one father and mother; but, because they did not love each other, they separated, after which they did not know each other's language, and became enemies and fought." Still another says that when they were scattered, a younger brother, or the "White Westerner," came, begging the Karens to return to the place where they left God; which tradition is said to have had much to do with the early success of the missionaries amongst these people, as the Karens applied these traditions to them.

Religious Views.—They have remarkably clear views of God, whom they believe to be "immutable, eternal; that he was from the beginning of the world. The life of God is endless; generations cannot measure his existence. God is complete and good, and through endless generations will never die. God is omnipotent, but we have not believed him. God created man anciently. He has a knowledge of all things to the present time. He created spirit and life." This God is known as Ywah, "which approaches the word Jehovah as nearly as possible in the Karen language." He was not, however, worshipped when the missionaries first went to the Karens. A great power for evil (Satan) since the fall has rendered relief to man by introducing charms against sickness, death, and other misfortunes, and this personage, though without image, is widely worshipped. Thus originated their dæmon worship. They appear to believe in the immortality of the soul, though it is doubtful if this obtains universally amongst them. Mr. Cross doubts if they have any proper idea of the resurrection of the dead. Transmigration is not accepted amongst them, and many think the soul "flies off in the air." They are thus distinguished from the Buddhists, though long resident with them in Burmah.

Spirit Worship.—Besides the Ywah and the dæmons above alluded to, they believe in many other spiritual beings known as *Kelah*, or, speaking more definitely, every object has a kelah, whether men, trees, or plants, and even inanimate objects, such as axes and knives. The grain growing has its kelah, and when it does not flourish it is because the kelah is leaving it, and it must be called back by invocation. The human kelah is not the soul, nor is the responsibility of human actions lodged in it, nor any moral character attached to it. All this is attributed to the Thah. The kelah is the author of dreams; it is that nature which pertains to life, the sentient soul, the animal spirits. It can leave the body at will. When it is absent disease ensues; when yet longer away, death results. Kelah seems to signify *life*, or existence in the abstract, or of the individual. It is more apt to forsake feeble persons and children. The kelah of one person may accompany that of another in going away, hence children are kept away from a corpse, and the house where a person dies is abandoned. Great efforts are made to induce a departed kelah to return. Tempting food is placed on the public wayside or in the forest, and various ceremonies and rituals are gone through, which sometimes are thought to be successful in securing the return of the kelah. One might almost wonder that its return should be considered desirable when we are further told that the kelah has seven separate existences in one, which endeavor to superinduce madness, recklessness, shamelessness, drinking propensities, anger, cruelty, violence, murder, and are constantly bent on evil. But along with the kelah we learn of *Tso*, which means *power*, and seems to be a personification of *reason*. If the tso becomes heedless or weak, or is unfortunately circumstanced, then the kelah can do mischief, but otherwise it is powerless for evil.

There are other spiritual beings, such as *Kephoo*, a species of vampire, which is the stomach of a wizard, and in the form of the head and entrails of a human being goes out at night to seek food. It destroys human kelahs. *Therets* are spirits of those who have died by violence, as by tigers or other wild beasts, by famine, or sword, or starvation. These can neither go to the upper region (Mūkhah), nor to that of the Plu, where men are punished, but must remain on earth, causing mortal sickness. Offerings and supplications are made to them. *Tahmus* or *Tah-kas* are spectres of those who have been dreadfully wicked in this life. They appear as apparitions only, in form of horses, elephants, dogs, crocodiles, serpents, vultures, ducks, or colossal men. *Sekhahs* are spirits of persons left unburied, and of infants or aged persons who have become infirm because the tso has left them. *Plupho* are inhabitants of the infernal region, and are spirits of all who go naturally to their proper place, and renew their earthly employments, building houses, cutting rice, etc. The location is undeclared, but is above the earth, or below it, or beyond the horizon. It is presided over by king Cootay or Theedo. At his call the kelahs must go, and men die. Under his dominion they serve, as in an intermediate state, a probation, and if good go to heaven, if bad to hell or Lerah, which has two gradations of punishment, one being more severe than the other. *Tah-nahs* or *Nahs* are the spirits of two sorts of fiends which take the form of any animals they please, and prey upon men. The Lord of men created them as a punishment in consequence of a disobedience on the part of men to one of his commands. They have a king who was the great tempter of man in the garden. *Mūkhahs* are the ancestors of the Karens who inhabit the upper region, and are the creators of the present generation. Sometimes they work imperfectly, and, as a consequence, ill-favored and imperfect persons are found. They preside over births and marriages, mingling together the blood of two persons. They are worshipped with offerings. The *Keleepho* create the winds; the *Tah Yoornū* cause eclipses; the *Cooda* and *Lauphoo* preside over the wet and dry seasons.

Priesthood.—There are amongst the Karens a class of people who serve as prophets, and assume conditions of mind and body much like those affected by the "medicine-men" amongst North American Indians. What with writhing of the body, rolling on the ground, foaming at the mouth, etc., they are presumed to attain a state of clairvoyance favorable to the prediction of coming events. The prophecies uttered by these which are retained in tradition mostly pertain to the deliverance of the Karens from the oppression of the Burmese. These prophets are of two classes. The *wees* compose ballads and other poetry, and have great power in calling back departed kelahs. The other class are known as *bookhos*, and are rather priests than prophets, taking the lead in the religious ceremonies of the people, instructing them in their religious obligations, and are a more respectable class, being heads of communities, though not hereditary chiefs.

Missions.—Missionary work was commenced amongst these tribes about 1828, by Messrs. Boardman and Judson, who were succeeded by Messrs. Wade, Mason, and Kincaid. Twenty-five years after that the Karen apostle Ko-thau-Bu, a native convert, met with wonderful success amongst these people. Associated prominently with this great movement was Rev. Mr. Vinton, who "in six years planted forty churches, opened forty-two houses of worship and thirty-two school-houses, and saw between eight and nine thousand Karens raised to the level of Christian worshippers. In 1852 alone he received five hundred Karens into the Church. In 1868 the Baptist Mission report showed that they had amongst this

people sixty-six native ordained pastors and evangelists; three hundred and forty-six native preachers unordained; three hundred and sixty native churches; nineteen thousand two hundred and thirty-one church-members, and nearly sixty thousand natives" of all ages known as Christians. A writer in the *Madras Observer* (India) stated that, in Oct. 1868, a gentleman, not in sympathy with the Baptists, but a great traveller, performing his journeys on foot through Burmah while amongst these Karen districts, said that on one occasion "he found himself for seventeen successive nights, at the end of his days' journeys through the forest, in a native Christian village.

Literature.—*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. iv; Wayland, *Life of Judson;* Brace, *Races of the Old World;* Whitney, *Language and the Study of Language;* Latham, *Elements of Comparative Philology;* Anderson, *Foreign Missions* (N. Y. 1869); Mullen, *Ten Years of Missionary Work in India;* Mrs. Mason, *Civilizing Mountain Men, or Sketches of Mission Work among the Karens* (1862); Mrs. Wylie, *Gospel in Burmah.* For a full history of the mission work amongst the Karens, see Mason, *Gospel in Burmah; Report of American Baptist Mission Union for* 1868. A comparative vocabulary of the Sgau and Pwo dialects of the Karen language, by the Rev. Dr. Nathan Brown, Baptist missionary, now of New York City, may be found in the *Jour. of the American Oriental Society*, vol. iv. See also the article BURMAH (II. *Missions*). (J. T. G.)

Karè-Patrepandaron, the name of a class of Hindu ascetics, beggars of the Brahminic order, who have vowed eternal silence. Wholly naked, with only a sacred string, generally a snake's skin, over their shoulders, they make their home under large shade-trees. When they enter a house they manifest their presence by the clapping of their hands, and generally share with the inmates the best of their dainties, for a Brahmin considers himself highly honored by such a visit.—Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 1020.

Karg, GEORG (the "*Parsimonious*"), a German theologian, was born at Heroldingen in 1512. In 1538 he was ordained for the ministry by Melancthon, and became pastor first at Oettingen, later at Schwabach; and finally, in 1553, settled at Anspach, and became general superintendent of the churches of the duchy of Baireuth. He died in 1576. Karg acquired great notoriety during the difficulties concerning the *Formula Concordiæ* by maintaining that it was only by passive obedience that Christ made atonement for us: for active obedience (*obedientia activa*) he was bound to give as man; the law binds us either to obedience or to punishment, but not to both together. Christ, while suffering the punishment for us, rendered obedience on his own account. What he has paid remains no longer for us to pay (i. e. the punishment); obedience, however, we are bound to render, as he rendered his, in order to be a pure and perfect offering unto God. See IMPUTATION. He defended these opinions in 1563, but, as they provoked a great controversy, he finally retracted them in 1570. The same opinions were afterwards maintained by John Piscator, professor at Herborn, and by John Camero of Saumur. See Walch, *Streitigkeiten innerh. d. luth. Kirche*, xiv, 360; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformation*, v, 358; Döllinger, *D. Reformation*, iii, 564; Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, ii, 16, 17; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 379.

Karigites, or SEPARATISTS, is the name of a Mohammedan sect who oppose all government, both ecclesiastical and spiritual. They hold that the person who is to preside in spiritual affairs should be a man of supernatural birth and altogether of a spiritual character. See MOHAMMEDANS; comp. KARMATHIANS.

Karim. See CAREM.

Kar'kaä, or, rather, KAR'KA (Hebrew *Karka'*, קַרְקַע, a *floor*, as in Numb. v, 17, etc.; with art. and ה directive in pause, הַקַּרְקַעָה, *hak-Karka'ä*; Sept. Ἀκκαρκά v. r. τὴν κατὰ δυσμὰς Κάδης; Vulg. *Carcaa* v. r. *Cariatha*), a place situated at a bend in the southern boundary of Judah (i. e. Simeon or Palestine), between Adar and Azmon (Josh. xv, 3); probably about midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, perhaps near the well marked as Bir Abu-Atreibé on Zimmermann's map. See TRIBE.

Karkaphensian Version. See SYRIAC VERSIONS.

Karkom. See SAFFRON.

Kar'kor (Heb. *Karkor'*, קַרְקֹר, *foundation;* Sept. Καρκάρ v. r. Καρκά, Vulg. *requiescebant*), a place beyond Jordan whither the Midianitish princes Zeba and Zalmunna had retired with their remaining army after the first rout by Gideon, who pursued and routed them again in its vicinity (Judg. viii, 10). From the context it appears to have been situated not far beyond Succoth and Penuel, towards the south, in a naturally secure spot east of Nobah and Jogbehah; indications that point to a locality among the southern openings of Jebel Zurka, north-east of Rabbath Ammon. Schwarz supposes (*Palest.* p. 223) that *el-Kerah* is meant, a place a few miles south-east of Draa or Edrei, in the Hauran; but this is too far distant north-easterly. Eusebius's comparison of the castle (φρούριον) *Carcaria* (Καρκαρία, *Onomast.*), one day's journey distant from Petra, is equally foreign; and this may be the modern Kerak of Moab. See KENATH.

Karl-Borromæus Union, a Roman Catholic association in Rhenish Prussia, formed for the purpose of effecting in Roman Catholic society the same results for which the Gustavus Adolphus Society of the Protestant Church was founded. Perhaps, in a measure, it was intended to oppose any inroads of the Protestant association among the Roman Catholics. It originated in 1844, and makes it its special object to circulate at large the literary productions of Roman Catholics. The society publishes a monthly journal, and occasionally works of a religious character written in popular form. See *Katholische Real-Encyklopädie*, xi, 835.

Karlowitz, CHRISTOPH VON. See MAURICE OF SAXONY.

Karlstadt, Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein. See CARLSTADT.

Karlstadt, Johannes. See DRACONITES.

Karmathians (so called from Abu Said Al-Jenabi, surnamed *Al-Karmatha*) is the name of a Mohammedan sect which originated in the 9th century, under the caliphate of Al-Motammed. Strictly speaking, the Karmathians were Shiites (q. v.; see also ISMAÏL), for Karmatha, their founder, was one of the missionaries in the province of Kufa, appointed by one of the apostles (Hussein Ahwagi) of Ahmed, the successor of Abdallah Ibn-Maimun, who flourished about the middle of the 2d century, and who first gave character to the Ismailite schism. It was he likewise who projected and prepared the way for a union of the Arabic conquerors, and the many races that had been subjected since Mohammed's death, and the enthronement of what later was called "Pure Reason" as the sole deity for worship. With an extraordinary knowledge of the human heart and human weakness, he found a way to attract the high and the low. To the believer he offered devotion; liberty, if not license, to the "free in spirit;" philosophy to the "strong-minded;" mystical hopes to the fanatics; miracles to the masses. To the Jews he offered a Messiah, to the Christians a Paraclete, to the Moslems a Mahdi, and to the Persian and Syrian "pagans" a philosophical theology. The results of his exertions, so practical in tendency, were truly wonderful, and at one time it seemed as if Mohammedanism was doomed. He was soon persecuted by the authorities, and, driven from place to place, he finally died in Selamia, in Syria, leaving the work he had so successfully begun to his son

Ahmed. This Ahmed, profiting by the experience of his father, carried on the work of conversion somewhat secretly; at least he did not dare to assume publicly the claims of an imam, as his father had done. He sent missionaries, however, to different parts of the country to gain adherents for this extreme Rationalistic movement, and one of the converts made was our Karmatha, who gave new life to this undertaking. He quickly gathered about him a large number of converts, and, successful in securing their confidence, he soon made them the blind instruments of his will. He advocated, according to some authorities, absolute communism, not only of property, but even of wives, and founded one particular colony, consisting of chosen converts, around his own house at Kufa. (See below, *Religious Belief*.)

From this place, called the "House of Refuge," thereafter the whole religious movement of the Karmathians was conducted. Missionaries were created and sent to different parts of the earth to convert the nations, and gather them into the fold of Karmathianism. Among these converts was one Abu Saïd, whose success in Southern Persia, and afterwards at Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf, deserves special notice here. The inhabitants of this country, formerly a province of Persia, adhering partly to the Jewish, partly to the Persian faith, had been subjected by Mohammed, but had been allowed to retain their own creed. After the prophet's death they had at once shaken off the unwelcome yoke, which, however, had again been put upon them by Omar. In the interior of this country lived certain Arabs, highly disaffected against Islam, the innumerable precepts of which they intensely disliked, and among these Abu Saïd made the most marvellous strides in his conversions, until he finally gained the confidence of the Bahreinites generally, and in less than two years he brought over a great part of the people of Bahrein. To suppress this proselytism, an army of 10,000 men was dispatched in 282 (Hegira) against him and his followers, but the Karmathians were victorious, and Abu Saïd now became undisputed possessor of the whole country, destroyed the old capital Hajar, and made Lahsa (his own residence) the capital of the country. In other parts of the Saracenic possessions the Karmathians also warred for a time successfully against the caliphate of Bagdad, and threatened its very existence, until, in a battle fought in the 294th year of the Hegira, the caliph's general, Wasif, won a decisive victory, and greatly crippled the military strength of the Karmathians. Both Karmatha (of whose personal history after this time we lack all information) and Abu Saïd became—by what means is matter of great obscurity—faithless to their own creed; but they continued to have followers, and when Abu Saïd was killed, together with some of his principal officers, in the bath in his own castle at Lahsa, in 301 of the Hegira, by one of his eunuchs, his son, Abu Tahir, became his successor, and the struggle was continued. In 311 he seized the town of Basra. In the next year he pillaged the caravan which went to Mecca, and ransacked Kufa. In 315 he once more appeared in Kufa and in Irak, and gained so decided a victory over the caliph's troops that Bagdad began to tremble before him. In 317 (A.D. 930) the great and decisive blow against the caliphate, or, rather, against Mohammedanism itself, was struck. "When the great caravan of pilgrims for the annual pilgrimage had arrived at Mecca, the news suddenly spread that Abu Tahir, the terror of Islam, had appeared at the head of an army in the holy city itself. All attempts to buy him off failed, and a massacre of the most fearful description ensued. With barbarous irony, he asked the victims what had become of the sacred protection of the place. Every one, they had always been told, was safe and inviolable at Mecca. Why was he allowed thus easily to kill them—the race of donkeys? According to some, for six days; to others, for eleven or seventeen, the massacre lasted. The numbers killed within the precincts of the temple itself are variously given. The holy places were desecrated, almost irredeemably. But, not satisfied with this, Abu Tahir laid hands on the supreme palladium, the black stone itself. Yet he was apparently mistaken in his calculations. So far from turning the hearts of the faithful from a worship which God did not seem to have defended, the remaining Moslems clung all the more fervently to it. God's decree had certainly permitted all these indignities to be put upon his house, but it was not for them to murmur. The stone gone, they covered the place where it had lain with their kisses." Whenever Abu Tahir did not prevent them by force, the caravans went on their usual annual pilgrimage, and Abu Tahir was finally persuaded to conclude a treaty permitting the pilgrimage on payment of five denars for every camel, and seven for every horse. But the black stone, notwithstanding all the efforts on the part of the court of Bagdad, he never returned. (See below.) Abu Tahir himself was a man of great daring, and so infatuated were his men with the personal bravery and divine calling of their leader that they blindly obeyed any demands he made upon them.

Abu Tahir died in 332 of the Hegira, master of Arabia, Syria, and Irak. It was not until seven years later (A.D. 950), under the reign of two of his brothers who had succeeded him, that the "black stone" was returned to Mecca for an enormous ransom, and fixed there, in the seventh pillar of the mosque called *Rahmat* (God's mercy). But with the death of Abu Tahir the star of the Karmathians began to wane. Little is heard of them of any import till 375, when they were defeated before Kufa—an event which seems to have put an end to their dominion in Irak and Syria. In 378 they were further defeated in battle by Asfar, and their chief killed. They retreated to Lahsa, where they fortified themselves; whereupon Asfar marched to Elkatif, took it, and carried away all the baggage, slaves, and animals of the Karmathians of that town, and retired to Basra. This seems to have finally ruined the already weak band of that once formidable power, and nothing further is heard of them in history, although they retained Lahsa down to 430, and even later. To our own day there still exists, according to Palgrave, some disaffected remnants of them at Hasa (the modern name of their ancient centre and stronghold), and other tracts of the peninsula; and their antagonism against Mohammedanism, which they have utterly abrogated among themselves, so far from being abated, bids fair to break out anew into open rebellion at the first opportunity. Indeed, some of the most trustworthy writers on Eastern history assert that the modern Druses owe the origin of their religious belief to the Karmathians (comp. Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, 210).

The *religious belief* of the Karmathians, so far as it has been preserved to us, seems in the beginning—before Ismailism became a mixture of "naturalism" and "materialism" of whilom Sabaism, and of Indian incarnations and transmigrations of later days—to have only been a kind of "reformed" Islam. Their master Karmatha, this sect maintained, had evinced himself to be a true prophet, and had brought a new law into the world. By this many of the Mohammedan tenets were altered, many ancient ceremonies and forms of prayer were changed, and an entirely new kind of fast introduced. Wine was permitted, as well as a few other things which the Koran prohibited, while many of the precepts found in that book were made mere allegories. Prayer was but the symbol of obedience to their imam, and fasting the symbol of silence, or, rather, of concealment of the religious doctrine from the stranger. They also believed fornication to be the sin of infidelity, and the guilt thereof to be incurred by those who revealed the mysteries of their religion, or failed to pay a blind obedience to their chief, or to contribute the fifth part of their property as an offering to the imam (compare Sale, *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*).

For further details, see Weil, *Geschichte d. Chalifen;*

idem, *Geschichte der islamitischen Völker* (Stuttg. 1866, 8vo), p. 197 sq.; De Goeje, *Mémoire sur les Carmathes*, etc.; Silvestre de Sacy, *Religion des Druses;* Sale, *Koran;* Taylor, *Hist. Mohammedanism*, p. 223 sq.; Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, 164 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclopœdia*, x, 586 sq. See SHIITES.

Karn, AARON JAKOB, a Lutheran minister, was born in Loudon Co., Virginia, August, 1820. In his youth he dedicated himself to the service of the Lord, and, with a view to enter the Christian ministry, became a student in the institution at Gettysburg in the autumn of 1837, and was graduated from Pennsylvania College in 1842, and from the theological seminary in 1844. After his license to preach he accepted a call to the Lutheran Church at Pine Grove, Pa.; thence he removed to Canton, Ohio. In 1848 he took charge of the English Lutheran Church in Savannah, Georgia. Here he labored, enjoying the confidence of his people and the respect of the whole community, till his physical strength gave way, and advancing disease compelled him to suspend the exercise of his office. His congregation suggested a trip to foreign lands. They provided the expenses for the journey, and supplies for the pulpit during his absence. He travelled through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland, but his impaired health derived no advantage from the tour, and he returned to his native country only to close his life surrounded by the tender sympathies of loved ones at home. He died at Chicago, Ill., Dec. 19, 1860. Karn was an able preacher and an excellent man. His ministry was fruitful in good results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever in Savannah in 1854 and 1858, he continued at his post, exhausting his time and his strength in ministering to the suffering and the dying, not only of his own congregation, but to others who were not in connection with any Church, amid scenes the most distressing and heart-rending, in his offices of kindness to the sick and in the burial of the dead. It is supposed his physical constitution sustained an injury from the influences of the epidemic from which he never recovered. (M. L. S.)

Karnaïm. See ASHTAROTH-KARNAIM.

Karnkowski, STANISLAUS, a celebrated Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Bland in 1526. Of his early life nothing is known to us. In 1563 he was made bishop of Wladislaw, and became coadjutor to the archbishop of Gnesen in 1577, and in 1581 sole occupant of the archbishopric and primate of Poland. In the civil history of Poland Karnkowski played no unimportant part. King Stephen (Betori) was crowned by him (May 1, 1576), and on the death of the king Karnkowski himself assumed the reins of government until a royal successor was found in the person of the Swedish crown-prince Sigismund, whom he also crowned. It is generally supposed that Karnkowski belonged to the Jesuitical order. In Kalisch he built a college for the Jesuits: he also founded two schools for the theological training of Roman Catholics. Under his protection the celebrated Jesuit Jacob Wujek translated the Bible into Polish, a work which to this day remains the only authentic edition in the Polish (Roman Catholic) Church. Karnkowski died May 26, 1603. He published *Constitutiones synodales dioceses cum catechesi:—Sermones ad parochos:—De ecclesiæ utraque;* etc. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 632.

Karo, JOSEPH BEN-EPHRAIM, a Jewish Rabbi, one of the most celebrated characters in Rabbinic literature, was born in Spain in 1488, of a family of note. Amid the great persecutions which the Spanish Jews suffered in the early part of the 16th century, the Karo family were exiled, and settled finally at Nicopolis, in European Turkey. His early Talmudical education Joseph received under the instruction of his own father, and the youth quickly evinced, in the ready acquisition of Talmudic lore, a particular liking for tradition. The Mishna text, it is said, he had learned by heart, and before he had reached the age of twenty-five he was accepted as a Talmudical authority. From Nicopolis Joseph removed successively to Adrianople and Salonica. While a resident of these places (about 1522–35) he became acquainted with the great cabalistic fanatic Salomo Molebo of Portugal, and he was finally induced to remove to Safet (q. v.), in Palestine, the great cabalistic centre in the East in the 16th century. In Safet he studied much with the Rabbinical authorities of Palestine, and during the controversy on the Jewish gaonate [see JACOB BERAB] Joseph Karo was one of the four disciples whom Jacob Berab ordained when forced by Levi ben-Chabib to quit the country. See ORDINATION, JEWISH. Previously infatuated with the Cabalists' Messianic notions, and now (Jacob Berab died January, 1541, shortly after quitting Palestine) one of the four Rabbis ordained by the only authority competent to perform the sacred rite, he became satisfied that he was divinely chosen for some important mission, perhaps even the Messiahship itself. (He believed, says Grätz [see below], that he would die and be again raised up to become the leader of his nation.) Ever since 1522 he had been engaged in writing an extensive religious and ritual codex, entitled בֵּית יוֹסֵף (*Beth Yoseph*, first published at Sablonets, 1553, 4 vols. folio), a revision, correction, and enlargement of a like work by Jacob ben-Asher; he now hastened the completion of this gigantic undertaking in the hope that its publication would lead his people to assign him at once the place to which he believed himself divinely called. He completed the work in 1542, but it gained for him only the recognition of being one of the ablest rabbis of Safet. Unremittingly he continued his labors, determined to bring about the result which he believed to be his mission—the union of Israel—and with it hasten the days of the Messiah. In the 16th century the Talmud was extensively studied among the Jews. Every important congregation sustained not only a rabbi, but a college. Thus many lucrative positions were open to men inclined to study, and there resulted a general interest in the study of the Talmud. But many students imply many interpreters, and thus it came that, after a time, each congregation, and sometimes even each member of a college, had their own interpretation of the Talmudical precepts, and Jewish orthodoxy was at a loss how to judge rightly. Joseph, comprehending the danger of a general division and a loose interpretation, determined to meet the case by a compilation of rabbinical law and usage, i. e. by the publication of the interpretations which the Talmud had received at the hands of the most distinguished teachers in Israel. At first he simply subjected his former work to a general supervision, which he completed after twelve years of hard labor. Finding, however, that this did not quite accomplish the desired result, he set about writing a new work, and after nine years of intense application presented his people with a compendium of rabbinical law and usage, entitled שֻׁלְחָן עָרוּךְ (*Shulchan Aruk*, first published at Venice, 1565), which to this day remains a rabbinical authority. His name now became celebrated in all lands where Jews made their abode, and at Safet itself (which really meant all Palestine) he was cheerfully accorded the place of first authority, as a worthy successor of Jacob Berab. See, however, the article MOSES DE TRANI. He died in 1575. One result Karo's labors had at least effected—the harmony of all Israelites in expounding the law through the Talmud—the establishment of Rabbinic Judaism—after all, a very different religion from that revealed through Moses at Mount Sinai, foretold by the prophets, and taught by Moses Maimonides. For a long time the Shulchan Aruk was the text-book in all the Jewish schools, the accepted interpretation among all that people, and many are the editions that have been published of it, legions the scholars who have commented upon it. Karo's other work of note which deserves mention here is *Cheseph Mishne*, a commentary on Maimonides's *Jad Hachazaka*, which

has frequently been published with the latter work. See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, ix, 319 sq.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur*, p. 230 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 129; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 172 sq. (J. H. W.)

Karpas. See Green; Cotton.

Kar'tah (Heb. *Kartah'*, קַרְתָּה, *city;* Sept. Καρθάν v. r. Κάδης), a town in the tribe of Zebulon, assigned, with its suburbs, as one of the places of residence for the Levites of the family of Merari (Josh. xxi, 34). It is there mentioned between Jokneam and Dimnah, the fourth city named being Nahalal; but the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi, 77) gives but two cities, and these different, namely, Rimmon and Tabor, the first of these being probably a preferable reading for Dimnah, and the latter a collective for two others, Jokneam being in the same connection (ver. 68) separately attributed to the Kohathites along with other places on Mt. Ephraim, near which it lay. Kartah is doubtless identical with the Kattath elsewhere spoken of in the same association (Josh. xix, 15). Van de Velde suggests (*Memoir*, p. 327) that it is "possibly the same with *el-Harte*, a village with traces of antiquity on the banks of the Kishon," not very far from its junction with wady Melek; the ruins being on the tell *Harteyeh*, on the opposite side of the river (*Narrative*, i, 289).

Kar'tan (Heb. *Kartan'*, קַרְתָּן, *double city*, an old dual from קַרְתָּה; Sept. Καρθάν v. r. Θεμμών and Νοεμμών), a town of Naphtali, assigned to the Gershonite Levites, and appointed to be one of the cities of refuge (Josh. xxi, 32). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi, 76) it is called by the equivalent name of Kirjathaim. The associated names suggest the probability of some locality near the north-western shore of the Sea of Tiberias, perhaps the ruined village marked as *el-Katanah* on Van de Velde's map, on wady Furam, about midway between Lake Tiberias and the Huleh.

Kartikeya is the name of the Hindu Mars, or god of war, who is represented by the Purânic legends as having sprung from Siva after a most miraculous fashion. The germ of Kartikeya having fallen into the Ganges, it was on the banks of this river, in a meadow of Sara grass, that the offspring of Siva arose; and as it happened that he was seen by six nymphs, the Krittikâs (or Pleiades), the child assumed six faces, to receive nurture from each. Grown up, he fulfilled his mission in killing Târaka, the dæmon-king, whose power, acquired by penances and austerities, threatened the very existence of the gods. He accomplished, besides, other heroic deeds in his battles with the giants, and became the commander-in-chief of the divine armies. Having been brought up by the Krittikâs, he is called *Kârtikeya*, or *Shânmâtura*, the son of six mothers; and, from the circumstances adverted to, he bears also the names of *Gângeya*, the son of the Ganges; *Sarabhû*, reared in Sara grass; *Shanmukha*, the god with the six faces, etc. One of his common appellations is *Kumâra*, youthful, since he is generally represented as a fine youth; and, as he is riding on a peacock, he receives sometimes the epithet of *Sikhivâhana*, or "the god whose vehicle is the peacock."

Kasimir, St., prince of Poland, noted in the annals of the Roman Catholic Church for his great piety and asceticism, born in October, 1458, took no unimportant part in the efforts of the royal house of Poland to secure the throne of Hungary. Quite inconsistently with his saintly profession, he marched at the head of a large army towards the borders of Hungary in 1471. On his return, after the declaration of pope Sixtus IV in favor of the deposed king of Hungary, Kasimir practised even greater austerity than before, and died March 4, 1483, at Wilna, in Lithuania. Kasimir was canonized in 1522 by pope Leo X, and he is looked upon as the patron saint of Poland. See Poland.

Kaspi. See Ibn-Caspi.

Katan. See Hakkatan.

Katerkamp, Johann Theodor Hermann, an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ochtrup, near Münster, Germany, Jan. 17, 1764; studied theology at Münster, and subsequently (1809) became professor of Church History in his alma mater. He had been ordained priest in 1787, and in 1823 he was appointed canon, and in 1831 dean of the cathedral at Münster. He died July 8, 1834. Katerkamp's principal work is his *Kirchengesch.* (of which the introduction was published in 1819; and five volumes, bringing the work down to the second Crusade, from 1823–34, 8vo). He also wrote *Ueber d. christl. Leben u. d. Geist d. gottesdienstl. Versammlungen* (Münster, 1830, 8vo): — *Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. Leben d. Fürstin Galiczin* (ibid. 1828; 2d ed. 1838). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 459; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 637.

Katharinus, Ambrosius. See Catharinus.

Kathenotheism (καθ' ἑνὸς θεός, *each one a god*) is a term devised by Prof. Max Müller (*Rig Veda*, i, 164, 460) to designate the doctrine of divine unity in diversity as unfolded in the sacred writings of the Hindus. He rejects the term *polytheism* on the ground that the Hindus, in their worship, ever ascribe to one god the attributes of all the others. Thus in one hymn, ascribed to Manu, the poet says, "Among you, O gods, there is none that is small, none that is young; you are all great in deed." . . . "And what more could human language achieve," asks the professor, "in trying to express the idea of a divine and supreme power? . . . This is surely not what is commonly understood by polytheism. Yet it would be equally wrong to call it monotheism. If we must have a name for it, I should call it *Kathenotheism*" (*Chips*, i, 28). See also Tyler, *Primitive Culture* (Lond. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 321. (J. H. W.)

Kathismăta (καθίσματα, *sittings*) is a name which, in the early Church, according to Suicer, was applied to certain parts of holy Scripture, because, during the reading of them, the people *sat*. Other portions of Scripture were entitled στάσεις (*standings*), because, during the reading of them, the people *stood*. It was usual in the early Church for all worshippers to stand during the reading of the gospels and the singing of the psalms.

Katona, Emeric, of Abaujvar, a Hungarian Protestant controversialist, was born at Uifalon in 1572. He became rector of the college of Szepsi in 1593, but resigned in 1595 to study theology at Wittenberg and Heidelberg for two years and a half, and then returned to his country. He became successively rector of Patak (in 1599), preacher at the court of George Ragoczi, prince of Transylvania, pastor of Szepsi, Goenczin, and Karextur, and died Oct. 22, 1610. He wrote *De Libero Arbitrio, contra theses Andreæ Saroſi; Antipapismus; Tractatus de Patrum, conciliorum et traditionum Auctoritate circa fidei dogmata, cultus idem moresque vivendi* (Francfort, 1611, 8vo, with a Life of the author by Pareus). See Czvittinger, *Specimen Hungariæ Literatæ*, p. 199; Horanyi, *Nova Memoria Hungarorum*, ii, 304.

Katon Moëd. See Talmud.

Kat'tath (Heb. *Kattath'*, קַטָּת, *small*, for קְטֹנֶת; Sept. Καττάθ v. r. Καταβάθ), one of the cities of Zebulon, mentioned first in a list of towns apparently along the southern border from Mount Tabor westerly (Josh. xix, 15); and (notwithstanding the slight difference in radicals) probably the same with the Kartah (q. v.) of Josh. xxi, 34; perhaps also with Kitron (Judg. i, 30). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 172), by a tortuous derivation through the Talmud, seeks to identify it with *Cana* of Galilee.

Kâtyâyana is a name of great distinction in the history of the literature of India, especially the ritual and grammatical literature of the Brahmanical Hindus, which has been greatly enriched by a writer or writers

of that name. Katyayana is also the name of several of the chief disciples of the Buddha Sâkyamuni.

Kautz, JACOB, an eminent German theologian, prominent in the Anabaptist movement of the 16th century, was born at Bockenheim, Hesse Cassel, about 1500. He was a preacher at Worms when, in 1527, he identified himself with the Denk-Hetzer movement in forming a strong opposition against infant baptism. Previously to this time, Kautz had estranged himself from the Lutheran reformers by his anti-Trinitarian heresies; now he openly broke with them, and warmly welcomed the Strasburg preachers. See ANABAPTISTS. He published seven theses in defence of his peculiar views (comp. Arnold, *Ketzerhistorie*, i, 63), and for the day of Pentecost invited the Lutheran ministers to public disputation. Although yet a young man, he had already obtained great celebrity as a public speaker, and no doubt took this course in order to increase the number of his followers. But the theses of Kautz were so decidedly opposed to Lutheran christology and dogmas that the authorities interfered, incarcerated him, and finally obliged him to quit Worms. Wandering about from place to place, we find him in July at Augsburg, later at Rothenburg, and in 1528 finally at Strasburg. Here he succeeded for a time in preaching his heretical doctrines, but in 1529, so great had his fanatical excesses become, that the city authorities felt obliged to interfere, and he was arrested and compelled to leave the city. After losing sight of him for a time, we find him in 1532 again knocking at the gates of the city of Strasburg, and vainly seeking admission. From this time all traces of him are lost, and neither the time nor the place of his death is known. Kautz was quite intimate with Capito, the eminent coadjutor of the Reformers Œcolampadius and Bucer, and at one time it was even asserted by the Anabaptists that he had succeeded in winning him to their side. Capito, however, does not deserve this reproach. On the contrary, he did all in his power to restrain Kautz in his fanaticism. See Trechsel, *Antitrinitarier*, i, 13 sq.; Keim, in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* i, 2, 271 sq.; *Stud. und Krit.* 1841, p. 1080 sq. See also DENK; HETZER. (J. H. W.)

Kay, JAMES, a Unitarian minister, was born at Heap Fold, in Lancashire, England, June 21, 1777, and was reared in the Church of England. At the age of seventeen, however, he became a dissenter, and at once prepared for the ministry. In 1799 he was settled over a Calvinistic congregation in Kendal, Westmoreland, but he resigned this charge in 1810, and, with about one third of his congregation, joined the Unitarians, and two years later became pastor of a Unitarian church at Hindley, Lancashire. In 1821 he emigrated to this country, but never again took active work. He died Sept. 22, 1847, at Trout Run, Pa. "He fell asleep with the accents of a devout faith on his lips, and, we doubt not, with the trustful spirit of a disciple in his heart."—*Christian Examiner*, 1848, p. 157.

Kaye, John (1), D.D., an English divine, was born at Hammersmith, London, in 1783, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge (graduated in 1804 with high honor and distinction). In 1814 he was elected master of his college, and afterwards filled the office of vice-chancellor. In 1816 he was chosen regius professor of divinity, and in 1820 became bishop of Bristol; was translated to Lincoln in 1827, and died in 1853. Besides his professional labors, Kaye did a great deal of literary work. Many of his writings are of special value. Characterized as they are by clearness and precision, by accuracy and fairness, combined with the necessary flexibility, no thinking mind can fail to be enriched by them. His principal writings are: *The Ecclesiastical History of the 2d and 3d Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian* (Camb. 2d ed. 1826, 8vo; 3d ed. 1845):—*Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr* (Lond. 2d ed. 1836, 8vo; 3d ed. 1853):—*A Charge delivered at the primary Visitation in* 1828 (Camb. 1828, 8vo):—*A Charge to the Clergy, delivered at the triennial Visitation in* 1843 (London, 1843, 8vo). He also published some anonymous *Remarks on Dr. Wiseman's Lectures*, and a *Reply to the Travels of an Irish Gentleman* (a Roman Catholic polemical work). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.; *London Gentleman's Magazine*, 1853 (April, May, and August). (J. L. S.)

Kaye, John (2). See CAJUS.

Kayits. See FRUIT.

Kazin. See ITTAH-KAZIN.

Keach, BENJAMIN, an eminent English Baptist divine, was born at Stokehaman, Buckinghamshire, Feb. 29, 1640. He does not appear to have followed any regular course of study; his parents were poor, and could not aid him in a collegiate education. He paid particular attention to the Scriptures. In 1658 he became a preacher, and in 1668 was chosen pastor of a congregation in Southwark, of which he had for three years previously been a member. After the Restoration he suffered in common with all nonconformists, and fled from the country, where the persecutions were unbearable, to the metropolis. Here he became pastor of a small society, which met in a private house in Tooley Street. Successful as a minister, he soon moved his fast-increasing flock (which numbered at one time over 1000) to a large new church in Horsley Down, Southwark. He died July 18, 1704. Keach belonged to the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, and was considered a man of great piety and learning. His principal works are, *Tropologia, or Key to open Scripture Metaphors* (Lond. 1682; best edition 1779, fol.—very scarce; and reprinted in 1856, 8vo):—*The Marrow of true Justification, or Justification without Works* (Lond. 1692, 4to):—*The Axe laid to the Root, or one more Blow at the Foundation of Infant Baptism and Church-membership* (London, 1693, 4to):—*Light broke forth in Wales* (Lond. 1696, 8vo; an answer to Mr. James Owen's book, entitled *Children's Baptism from Heaven*):—*The Display of glorious Grace, in* 14 *Sermons* [on Isa. liv, 10] (Lond. 1698, 8vo):—*Gospel Mysteries Unveiled, or an Exposition of all the Parables*, etc. (Lond. 1701, fol.; 1856, royal 8vo. "Mingled with unquestioned reverence for the divine Word, and much good material of which the judicious student may avail himself with advantage, there is a large amount of fanciful exposition and of unwise spiritualizing" [Kitto]):—*A Golden Mine opened, or the glory of God's rich Grace displayed in the Mediator*, etc. (Lond. 1694, 4to):—*The French Impostor detected, or Zach. Housel tryed by the Word of God*, etc. (Lond. 1703, 12mo):—*Believer's Baptism*, wherein the chief arguments for infant baptism are collected and combated (London, 1705, 8vo):—*Travels of True Godliness*, and *Travels of Ungodliness*, after the manner of Bunyan's (often reprinted); also with Notes and Memoirs of the author, by the Rev. Howard Malcolm (N. Y. 1831, 18mo):—*Exposition of the Parables* (Lond. 1704, fol.). Keach also figured in his day as a hymnologist, but his sacred songs were rather mediocre. See Stoughton, *Eccles. History of Engl.* ii, 465 sq.; Crosby, *Hist. of the Baptists;* Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenting Churches;* Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and American Authors*, s. v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Keating, GEOFFREY, an Irish divine and historian, flourished in the early part of the 17th century (died about 1625, or somewhat later). He is noted as the author of a general history of Ireland, in which the ecclesiastical history of that country is treated in detail. It was translated into English by Dermot O'Connor (London, 1728, fol.; Westm. 1726, fol.; 1738, fol.; Dubl. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo; 1811, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v.

Keblah is a term by which the Mohammedans designate the direction towards which they are commanded to turn their faces in their devotions. "At first," says Sale (*Koran*, p. 17), "Mohammed and his followers observed no particular rite in turning their faces towards any certain place or quarter of the world when

they prayed, it being declared to be perfectly indifferent. Afterwards, when the prophet fled to Medina, he directed them to turn towards the temple of Jerusalem [probably to ingratiate himself with the Jews], which continued to be their Keblah for six or seven months; but, either finding the Jews too intractable, or despairing of otherwise gaining the pagan Arabs, who could not forget their respect to the temple of Mecca, he ordered that prayers for the future should be towards the last. This change was made in the second year of the Hegira, and occasioned many to fall from him, taking offence at his inconstancy." See KAABA.

Keble, JOHN, "the sweetest and most Christian poet of modern days," was born in Fairford, in Gloucestershire, April 25, 1792. His father was fellow of Corpus Christi College, and for fifty years vicar of Coln, St. Aldwins, and lived until his ninetieth year. His mother was the daughter of a clergyman. Thus on both sides he came of a pastoral stock; and it is worthy of note that his only surviving brother, Thomas, like himself became a clergyman (rector of Bisley), that that brother's son also took orders, and that Mr. Keble himself, like his father, married a clergyman's daughter. Young Keble was prepared for college by his father, and entered the University of Oxford, and there greatly distinguished himself by a remarkable display of talent and application. When only eighteen, full four years below the customary age for graduating, John Keble won the highest intellectual rank the university can bestow, that of a "double-first classman," his name appearing in the first class of classics as well as in the first class of mathematics. This distinction had never been achieved up to that time except in the case of Robert Peel. April 20, 1811, wanting a few days of the completion of his nineteenth year, he was elected probationer fellow of Oriel, and took his place at the high table, and in the senior common room of that celebrated college. Whately entered it with him, and these two were the *duumviri* to whom all paid an almost obsequious deference. In 1812 he won the prizes for both the bachelors' essays —the English on Translation from Dead Languages, the Latin a comparison of Xenophon and Julius Cæsar as Military Chroniclers. In the annals of Corpus twice only has such a triumph been won, one instance that of young Keble, and the other no less a man than Henry Hart Milman, the late celebrated dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. At the unprecedented age of twenty-two—indeed, some months short of it—he was appointed by the University of Oxford one of its public examiners. Thus did Keble attain a success which we believe has never been equalled for its precocious ability. In 1815 he was ordained deacon, the following year priest, and soon after left the university, and never again permanently resided there. He became his father's curate, and lived with him in that capacity nearly twenty years. He turned aside from the numerous paths of ambition which were open to him, and gave himself to parochial work as the employment of his life. In 1835 Keble's father died. He was now offered and accepted the vicarage of Hursley, and married. His parish was obscure, thirty miles from Oxford. There was not, it is said, a single cultivated family in his charge, so that his labors were altogether among the humbler and poorer classes, but under his indefatigable ministrations it became one of the model parishes of England. It is, however, as the poet of the "Christian Year" and the "Lyra Innocentium" that Keble will be most widely and permanently known. The former was published in 1827. It is probable that most of the poem was written at Fairford. Its success was certainly most remarkable. More than one hundred editions have been sold. Of course Keble might have realized a fortune from the sale of this extraordinary book; but in this, as in everything else, he showed his disinterestedness. When, in 1835, Keble came to Hursley, he found a church not at all to his mind. It is described as a plain and anything but beautiful building of flint and rubble. He at once determined to have a new one built, and, in order to carry out his project, he employed the profits of the many editions of *The Christian Year;* and when the building was finished, his friends, in token of their regard for him, filled all the windows with stained glass. On Friday, the 6th of April, 1866, he was buried in the church-yard of Hursley, where he had officiated as minister for nearly thirty years. It was on the day before Good Friday, viz. on the 29th of March, that he died. On the eve of a great Christian observance, he, the singer of Christian observances, passed away to his rest. The character of Keble's poetry may be surmised from his life and opinions; it is gentle, sweet, devotional, and highly cultivated; it translates religious sentiment out of the ancient and exclusively Hebrew dialect into the language of modern feeling. A deep tone of home affection runs through all his poems. The highest culture of which man is capable, and the most refined thought in him, had not weakened, but only made natural affection more pure and intense. Never, perhaps, except in the case of George Herbert, has a character of such rare and saintly beauty concurred with a poetic gift and power of poetic expression of the highest order. John Keble is noted also as the leader of the original band of Oxford scholars and divines who began the so-called "Puseyite" movement in the English Church. He contributed to the famous *Tracts for the Times* (1834–1836), and it is to Keble's influence over Newman that the latter ascribes his conversion to Romanism, dating it from July 14, 1833, when Keble preached his sermon on *National Apostasy.* He was also one of the editors of the *Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* (begun in 1838). His works are, *On Translation from the Dead Languages* (an Oxford Prize Essay, 1812; Oxf. 1812):—*The Christian Year:* thoughts in verse for the Sundays and holy-days throughout the year (1827, 2 vols.; 36th ed. 1852, 8vo): —*The Child's Christian Year* (4th edit. 1841, 18mo):—*Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture;* a Sermon (on 2 Tim. i, 14; 4th ed., with a Postscript and Catena Patrum [No. 3 of the *Tracts of the Times*], 1839, 18mo; originally published [in 1837] as No. 78 of the [Oxford] *Tracts for the Times*):—*The Psalter, or Psalms of David, in English Verse* (1839, sm. 8vo; 3d edit. 1840, 18mo):—*Selections from Richard Hooker* (1839, 18mo; 2d edit. 1848, 18mo):—an edition of *Hooker's Works*:—*Prælectiones Academicæ Oxonii Habitæ* (1832–41, 2 vols. 8vo; 1844–1846, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Lyra Innocentium:* Thoughts on Verse, on Children, their Ways and their Privileges (1846, sm. 8vo, Anon.):—*Sermons Academical and Occasional* (1847, 8vo; 2d edit. 1848, 8vo):—*A very few plain Thoughts on the proposed Addition of Dissenters to the University of Oxford* (written from his position as High-Church polemic, 1854). See Coleridge, *Memoirs of the Rev. J. Keble* (1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Shairp, *Memoir* (in *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.; *Church Review*, Oct. 1866, art. i; *Amer. Ch. Review*, April, 1870, art. i. (E. de P.)

Keckermann, BARTHOLOMÆUS, a reformed German theologian, was born at Dantzic in 1571, and educated at Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Heidelberg. In the last place he became professor of the Hebrew language about 1592. In 1602 he accepted the rectorate of the gymnasium at Dantzic, where he died August 25, 1609. Keckermann wrote many theological and philosophical works, the most important of which are *Systema Theologiæ* (Berlin, 1615, 4to), and *Rhetorica Ecclesiasticæ* (Hanau, 1600, 1613, 8vo). These are circulated very extensively, and prove him to have been a writer of great originality and ability. He argued in behalf of a separation of philosophy and theology, to prevent any further mischief to Christianity such as scholasticism had caused, and in his *Systema Ethices* (ibid. 1610, 8vo) he pleads for the separation of ethics, as a philosophical science, from theology; the latter, he argues, must confine itself to the inner religious life, the former to the "*bonum civile*" (*Opp.* ii, 233 sq.). In view of these, his own teachings, it is unjust to classify this writer, as some

have done, among the originators of Protestant scholasticism. Of value, also, are Keckermann's speculations on the Trinity (comp. Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, iii, 308 sq.). His works have been published entire (*Opera Omnia*) at Geneva in 1614. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 463.

Ke'dar (Heb. *Kedar'*, קֵדָר, *dark*-skinned; Sept. Κηδάρ), the second son of Ishmael, and founder of the tribe that bore his name (Gen. xxv, 13). B.C. post 2061. The name is used in Scripture as that of the Bedouins generally, whose characteristic traits are ascribed to them (Cant. i, 5; Isa. xxi, 16; xlii, 11; lx, 7; Jer. ii, 10; xlix, 28; Ezek. xxvii, 21); more fully, "sons of Kedar" (בְּנֵי קֵדָר, Isa. xxi, 17); in Psa. cxx, 5, Kedar and Mesech are put for barbarous tribes. Rabbinical writers expressly identify them with the Arabians (Pseudojon. on Gen. xxv, and the Targum on Psa. cxx; comp. the Jewish expression "tongue of Kedar" for the Arabic language), and the Arabs acknowledge the paternity (Pococke, *Spec.* 46). The *Kedarenes* (as they were called in later times) do not appear to have lived in the immediate neighborhood of Judæa (Jer. ii, 10; comp. Psa. cxx, 5). Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Μαδιάν) places them in the Saracenic desert, on the east of the Red Sea, which identifies them with the *Cedrei* of Pliny (v, 12) as neighbors of the Nabathæans (comp. Isa. xl, 7). Stephen of Byzantium reckons them (Κεδρανῖται) as inhabitants of Arabia Felix; but Theodoret (on Psa. cix) assigns them a locality near Babylon (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 86 sq.). Ptolemy calls them *Darræ* (*Geog.* vi, 7), evidently a corruption of the ancient Hebrew; and Forster supposes that it is the same people Arrian refers to as the *Kanraitæ*, which he thinks should be read *Kadraitæ* (*Géogr. of Arabia*, i, 247). A very ancient Arab tradition states that Kedar settled in the Hejaz, the country round Mecca and Medina, and that his descendants have ever since ruled there (Abulfedæ *Hist. Anteislamica*, ed. Fleischer, p. 192). From Kedar sprung the distinguished tribe of Koreish, to which Mohammed belonged (Caussin, *Essai*, i, 175 sq.). Of the history of the head of the tribe little is known, but his posterity are described as being rich in flocks of sheep and goats, in which they traded with the Syrians (Ezek. xxvii, 21; Jer. xlix, 49), as dwelling in tents of black hair (Cant. i, 5), though some of them occupied cities and villages (ערים and חצרים; Isa. xlii, 11) in the midst of the wilderness of Arabia, apparently in a mountainous and rocky district, and as being skilful in the use of the bow (Isa. xxi, 17): particulars which eminently agree with all descriptions of the manners and mode of life of the nomade Arabs bordering Palestine on the east, from the Red Sea to Asia Minor (Wellsted, *Travels in Arabia*, ii, 231 sq.; Wallin, in the *Journ. of R. Geog. Soc.* vols. xx and xxiv). See Arabia.

Ked'emah (Heb. *Ked'mah*, קַדְמָה, *eastward*; Sept. Κεδμά, but in Chron. v. r. Κεδάμ), the last named of the sons of Ishmael, and probably head of an Arab tribe called by the same title (Gen. xxv, 15; 1 Chron. i, 31). B.C. post 2061.

Ked'emoth (Heb. *Kedemoth'*, קְדֵמוֹת, *beginnings*; Sept. Κεδμώθ, Κεδημώθ, but in Chron. Καδμώθ v. r. Καμηδώθ), a city in the tribe of Reuben, assigned, with its suburbs ("villages"), to the Levites of the family of Merari (Josh. xiii, 18; xxi, 37; 1 Chron. vi, 79; in all which passages it is mentioned between Jahazah and Mephaath), with a desert (מִדְבַּר, open pasture-grounds) of the same name adjacent, whence Moses despatched the messengers requesting of Sihon a peaceable passage through his dominions, which the Israelites were now entering, having crossed the river Arnon (Deut. ii, 26). These indications fix its locality not far northeast of Dibon-gad, possibly at the ruined village *ed-Duleitat* (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 170), east of Medeba (Van de Velde, *Map*).

Ke'desh (Heb. *id.*, קֶדֶשׁ, *sanctuary*; Sept. Κέδες, but Κάδες in Josh. xxi, 32; Κάδης in Judg. iv, 6, v. r. 9; Κεδεέ v. r. in 1 Chron. vi, 72), the name of three towns in Palestine.

1. A city in the extreme southern part of the territory originally assigned to Judah (Josh. xv, 23, where it is mentioned between Adadah and Hazor), and doubtless included in the portion afterwards set off to Simeon (Josh. xix, 1–9). As the associated places seem to indicate a position towards the Dead Sea, we may conjecture that it was the same as Kadesh-barnea (the names being the same in Heb.), which lay there, and is not mentioned in either of the foregoing lists, although it certainly was included within the district indicated.

2. A Levitical city of the tribe of Issachar (1 Chron. vi, 72), otherwise called Kishion (Josh. xix, 20; "Kishon," xxi, 28).

3. A "fenced city" of Naphtali (Josh. xix, 37, where it is mentioned between Hazor and Edrei), hence also called Kedesh-naphtali (i. e. Kadesh of Naphtali, Judg. iv, 6); appointed as one of the cities of refuge (Josh. xix, 7, where it is located on Mt. Naphtali), being a Levitical city assigned to the Gershonites (Josh. xxi, 32; 1 Chron. vi, 76). It was one of the original Canaanitish royal cities, whose chieftains were slain by Joshua (Josh. xii, 22), and was reckoned as a Galilæan town (Josh. xix, 7; xxi, 32; 1 Chron. vi, 76). It was the residence of Barak (Judg. iv, 6), and there he and Deborah assembled the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali before the conflict (ver. 9, 10). Near it was the tree of Zaananim, where was pitched the tent of the Kenites Heber and Jael, in which Sisera met his death (ver. 11). It was probably, as its name implies, a "holy place" of great antiquity, which would explain its selection as one of the cities of refuge, and its being chosen by the prophetess as the spot at which to meet the warriors of the tribes before the commencement of the struggle "for Jehovah among the mighty." It was one of the places depopulated by Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings xv, 29). Josephus calls it *Kedesa* (ἡ Κέδεσα, *Ant.* v, 1, 18, and 24) or *Cydisa* (*Ant.* ix, 11, 1), and places it under the name of *Cedasa* (Κεδάσα), on the border between Galilee and Tyre (*Ant.* xiii, 5, 6), to the latter of which it adhered in the final struggle (*War*, ii, 18, 1). It was here that Jonathan the Maccabee gained the victory over the princes of Demetrius (Κάδης, 1 Macc. xi, 63, 73). It is probably the same with the *Cydis* (Κύδις ἡ Νεφθαλί) mentioned as the birthplace of Tobit (i, 1). Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Κεδές) mentions it by the name of *Cydossos* (Κυδοσσός, Jerome *Cidissus*), as lying in the neighborhood of Paneas, about 20 Roman miles from Tyre. It is also probably the same with the strongly-fortified place in this district called *Cydyssi* by Josephus (Κυδυσσοί, *War*, iv, 2, 3). Kedesh was situated near the "plain" of Zaanaim, on the route taken by Barak (who was a native of the place) in the pursuit of Sisera, and hence must have been beyond Mt. Tabor, in the direction from the Kishon (Judg. iv, 6, 9, 10, 11). The indications correspond very well to the position of the modern village of *Kedes*, discovered by Dr. Robinson on the hills west of the lake el-Huleh (*Researches*, iii, 355; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 11), and fully described by Rev. E. Smith (*Bibl. Sac.* 1849, p. 374, 375) as being a small place romantically situated on a hill in a rich and beautiful plain, abundantly supplied with water, and containing extensive ruins apparently of Roman origin (see also Robinson's *Researches*, new edit., iii, 366-369; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 417). From the 12th century (Benj. of Tudela, in Bohn's *Early Travels*, p. 89) it has been reputed to possess the graves of Deborah, Barak, Ahinoam, Jael, and Heber (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 183; comp. p. 91). Porter, in 1858, saw close by the site the black tents of nomads pitched under the terebinths (*Handbook for Palest.* p. 443), like those of Heber the Kenite (Judg. iv, 11).

"In the Greek (Κυδίως) and Syriac (*Kedesh de Naphtali*) texts of Tob. i, 2—though not in the Vulgate or A.

V.—Kedesh is introduced as the birthplace of Tobias. The text is exceedingly corrupt, but some little support is lent to this reading by the Vulgate, which, although omitting Kedesh, mentions Safed—*post viam quæ ducit ad Occidentem, in sinistro habens civitatem Saphet.*

"The name Kedesh exists much farther north than the possessions of Naphtali would appear to have extended, attached to a lake of considerable size on the Orontes, a few miles south of Hums, the ancient Emessa (Thomson, in Ritter, *Damascus*, p. 1002 sq.). The lake was well known under that name to the Arabic geographers (see, besides the authorities quoted by Robinson [iii, 594, new ed.], Abulfeda in Schultens's *Index Geogr.*, 'Fluvius Orontes,' and 'Kudsum'), and they connect it in part with Alexander the Great. But this and the origin of the name are alike uncertain. At the lower end of the lake is an island which, as already remarked, is possibly the site of Ketesh, the capture of which by Sethos I is preserved in the records of that Egyptian king" (Smith).

Kedron. See KIDRON.

Keel (*τρόπις*, as being that which *turns* the vessel), the longitudinal projection on the bottom of a ship (Wisd. v, 10).

Keeler, SYLVANUS, was the earliest native Methodist itinerant in Canada. He first appears in the Minutes of 1795 on the Bay of Quinte Circuit. "He proved," says the Canadian chronicler of the Church, "a good and faithful minister of Christ." He labored about twelve years in the itinerant work, and then retired into the local ranks, compelled by the growing necessities of his family to resort to other means of support. He did not, however, abandon his Sabbath labors, but continued to preach all his days. After his family grew up and were able to provide for themselves, he extended his efforts to greater distances from home, carrying the Gospel into the distant settlements of immigrants beyond the Rideau. He died in the faith. Keeler had no advantages of early education; he had, however, endowments, natural and of divine bestowment. His person was commanding, and his voice clear, melodious, and strong. His spirit and manners were the most bland and engaging, and his zeal and fervor knew no bounds and suffered no abatement.—Stevens, *Hist. M. E. Church*, iii, 192; iv, 274. (J. L. S.)

Keeling, ISAAC, an English Wesleyan minister of note, was born in the latter half of the last century, and entered the ministry in 1811, but it was not until after many years of hard labor that he rose to any prominence. In 1845 he was elected president of the Conference; shortly after his health began to fail, and he was obliged to take a supernumerary relation. He died in 1869. "Mr. Keeling was sagacious, discriminating, cautious, profound, and intensely original. His sermons were models of pure diction, exact thought, luminous arrangement, careful definition, and varied instructiveness. He was a man of retiring habits and cold exterior, but he had a warm heart, and a keen relish of the pleasures of friendship."

Keene, EDMUND, D.D., an English prelate, and a native of Lynn, Norfolk, was born in 1713. He became master of Peter House in 1748, bishop of Chester in 1752, and was thence transferred to Ely in 1770. He died in 1781. He published five *Occasional Sermons* (1748, 1753, 1755, 1757, 1767).

Keeper, in its widest sense, corresponds to the Heb. שׁוֹמֵר, *shomer'*, Gr. *τηρῶν*; in a special sense to נוֹטֵר or נוֹצֵר, a *watchman*, as often rendered; רוֹעֶה, is a *shepherd;* while שַׂר, *φύλαξ*, is a *guard* over prisoners. These words are of frequent occurrence, besides others in certain peculiar senses or combinations, the meaning being clear from the connection.

Kehel'athah, or, rather, KEHE'LAH (Heb. *Kehelah'*, קְהֵלָה, *assembly*, only with ה paragogic, קְהֵלָתָה, *Kehela'thah;* Septuag. Μακελλάθ, Vulg. *Ceelatha*), the twenty-third station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rissah and Mt. Shapher (Numb. xxxiii, 22, 23); perhaps at the mouth of wady el-Hasana, west of Jebel Achmer. See EXODE.

Keil, KARL AUGUST GOTTLIEB, an eminent German theologian, was born at Grossenhain, near Dresden, Saxony, April 23, 1754, and was educated at Leipzig University. Three years after graduation he obtained a privilege as tutor at his *alma mater*, and at once opened a course of lectures on exegesis and hermeneutics. In 1785 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy, in 1788 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1793 was finally promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. He died at Leipzig April 22, 1818. His works are *Systematisches Verzeichniss derjenigen theologischen Schriften d. Kenntniss allgemein nöthig und nützlich ist* (Stendel, 1783, 1792, 8vo):—*De exemplo Christi recte imitando Dissert.* (Lpz. 1792, 4to):—*De Doctoribus veteris Ecclesiæ culpa corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologiæ liberandis* (Lpzg. 1793, 1816, 4to), consisting of twenty-two dissertations, which were to be followed by others. They were afterwards printed in his *Opuscula Acad.*, of which they form the second part. It is a very valuable work:—*Ueber d. historische Erklärungsart d. heiligen Schrift u. deren Nothwendigkeit* (Lpz. 1798, 8vo; Latin by Hempel):—*Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik d. N. T. nach Grundsätzen d. grammatisch-historischen Interpretation* (Leipzig, 1810, 8vo; Latin translation by C. A. G. Emmerling, Lpz. 1811, 8vo), a very useful and important contribution to the department of hermeneutics, which he made his specialty, and in which he has justly become very celebrated. After his death his occasional writings were collected by J. D. Goldhorn, and published under the title of *Opuscula academica ad N. T. interpretationem grammatico-historicam et theologiæ Christianæ origines pertinentia* (Lpzg. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo). Besides treatises on topics of hermeneutical interest, this volume contains several exegetical essays, and an elaborate dissertation, *De Platonicæ philosophiæ ad theolog. Christ. apud vet. eccles. scriptores ratione.* "Keil," says Prof. W. L. Alexander (in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.), "is a perspicuous writer, and his works, though cold and formal, are full of good sense and solid learning." In connection with H. G. Tzschirner, Keil also published a theological journal under the title *Analecten f. d. Studium d. exegetischen u. systematischen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1812–18, 4 vols. 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xx, 503; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 504.

Kei'lah (Heb. *Keïlah'*, קְעִילָה [in 1 Sam. xxiii, 5, קְעִלָה], prob. *citadel;* Septuag. Κεϊλά or Κειλᾶ, v. r. in Chron. and Neh. Κειλά), a city in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 44), bordering on the southern portion of the highlands (see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.). It appears to have been founded by Naham the Garmite, brother of Hodiah, one of the wives of Mered (1 Chron. iv, 19). "The Philistines had fallen upon the town at the beginning of the harvest (Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 13, 1), plundered the corn from its threshing-floor, and driven off the cattle (1 Sam. xxiii, 1). The prey was recovered by David (ver. 2–5), who remained in the city till the completion of the ingathering. It was then a fortified place, with walls, gates, and bars (1 Sam. xxiii, 7, and Josephus). During this time the massacre of Nob was perpetrated, and Keilah became the repository of the sacred ephod, which Abiathar the priest, the sole survivor, had carried off with him (ver. 6). But it was not destined long to enjoy the presence of these brave and hallowed inmates, nor indeed was it worthy of such good fortune, for the inhabitants soon plotted David's betrayal to Saul, then on his road to besiege the place. Of this intention David was warned by divine intimation. He therefore left (1 Sam. xxiii, 7–13). It will be observed that the word *Baali* is used by David to denote the inhabitants of Keilah in this passage (ver. 11, 12; A. V. 'men'), possibly pointing to the existence of

Canaanites in the place" (Smith). See Baal. Keilah was so considerable a city in the time of Nehemiah as to have two præfects, who are mentioned as assisting in the reconstruction of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 17, 18), and existed in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, who place it eight (the former, s. v. Κηλά, less correctly, seventeen) Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, on the road to Hebron (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 488, 698). Josephus calls it *Cilla* (Κίλλα, *Ant.* vi, 13, 1). The prophet Habakkuk is said to have been buried here (Sozomen, *Hist.* vii, 29; Nicephorus, *Hist.* xii, 48); but see Hukkok. The above notices all point to a locality at a fork of wady el-Faranj, a little N. of Idhna (Jedna), "where on a projection of the right-hand mountain stands a ruined tower" (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 427), which Van de Velde learned at Hebron was still called *Kilah* (*Memoir*, p. 328). This is confirmed by Tobler (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 150 sq.), although he remarks (p. 467) that Van de Velde, on the first edition of his *Map*, had placed it too far south (S.E. of Idhna). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* (s. v.) argues in favor of the locality of *Khuweilifeh* [see Rimmon], but this is utterly out of the required region, being in the Simeonitish portion of the tribe. See Judah.

Keir, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Bucklyvie, Stirlingshire, Scotland, Feb. 2, 1770, educated at the University of Glasgow, studied theology under Rev. A. Bruce, professor of theology in the General Associate Synod, and was licensed at Glasgow in 1807. In 1808 he was appointed missionary to Nova Scotia, B. P., whither he immediately proceeded. In the spring of 1809 he preached at Halifax and Merigomiah, and later took charge of the societies at Princetown and St. Peter's, Prince Edward Island, and in June, 1810, was ordained and installed as pastor, which position he held for nearly fifty years. In addition to his pastoral duties he filled the position of professor of theology in the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, to which he was appointed in 1843. He died Sept. 22, 1858. "Mr. Keir, as a lecturer, left upon the minds of the students a deep impression of the duties and responsibilities of the sacred office."—Wilson's *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1859-60, p. 234.

Keith, George, the noted leader of a faction of the Quakers, was born of Presbyterian parentage, in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1638. He was a man of superior intellect, who had enjoyed the advantages of a splendid training, not only in the schools of the national Church of Scotland, but also at the University of Aberdeen. In the year 1664 he came as a minister from the south of Scotland to his friends in Aberdeen, and, adopting the views of the Quakers, was involved in confiscations and imprisonment, together with others of that persecuted people. He wrote and published several treatises in vindication and explanation of the principles of that respectable body of Christians, and in 1675 was engaged with the celebrated Robert Barclay in a dispute with the students of the University of Aberdeen in defence of the Quaker doctrines. He also, about this time, with William Penn, George Whiting, and Stephen Crisp, engaged in a discussion with the Baptists in London. About the year 1682 he removed to England, and took charge of a school at Edmonton, established by the Society of Friends. He was soon persecuted, however, for preaching and teaching without a license, and, refusing to take the oath, was committed to jail. In 1684 he removed to London, but was imprisoned five months in Newgate for nonconformity. After his liberation he emigrated to New Jersey, and was there appointed surveyor general, and employed in determining the boundary-line between East and West Jersey. In 1689 he removed to Philadelphia, where he took charge of a Friends' school, with a liberal salary, but resigned his position at the end of the school year, and travelled in New England, visiting meetings and holding disputations with the religious professors. He is noted for his defence at this time of the Quaker tenets against Increase and Cotton Mather. On his return to Philadelphia he became involved in a controversy with his own denomination, on various points of discipline and doctrine. He charged them with doing away, by allegory, with the narrative of the real sufferings of Christ, and consequently the doctrine of a real atonement. He also suspected them of being infected with the spirit of Deism. Penn, being at this time in London, addressed a letter to Turner, a justice in Philadelphia, in which he defends "honest Geo. Keith and his Platonic studies," but afterwards, becoming acquainted with the merits of the dispute, decided against Keith. Keith returned to London, where he soon came in collision with Penn himself. Penn having spoken from the text, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," his exposition being strictly orthodox on their principles, namely, that "the blood is the life, and the life is the light within them," Keith took up the subject, and showed that "sin was cleansed by the blood of the true Christ actually shed on Calvary." Penn is reported to have started from his seat, and, as he himself afterwards stated in the annual meeting, being "so transported by the power of God that he was carried out of himself, and did not know whether he was sitting, or standing, or on his knees," he thundered forth this anathema: "I pronounce thee an apostate, over the head of thee." The great body followed Penn, and Keith was condemned by an edict of the annual meeting. He was not slow, however, in his own defence, but denounced the society as Deists, and entered into an able and labored argument to prove it (see Keith's *Deism of William Penn*, and Mosheim, vol. v, cent. xvii, ch. iv, sect. ii, part ii), and formed a society of his own, known as *Christian Quakers*, *Baptist Quakers*, or *Keithians* (q. v.). Still dissatisfied, he finally entered the Church of England, and became a regular priest. In the years 1702, 1703, 1704, he performed an important and successful mission on the American continent, under the care of the *Episcopal Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts*. He was especially successful in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Seven hundred Quakers were through his instrumentality converted from Quakerism and baptized (see Humphry's *History of the Quakers*, Lond. A.D. 1730; *Christian Observer*, April, 1816). Returning to England, in 1706 he was appointed rector of Edburton, in Sussex, and there died about 1715. Bishop Burnet, who was educated with Keith at the University of Aberdeen, in his *History of his Own Times* (1700, ii, 144), says that Keith "was esteemed the most learned man that ever was in that sect; he was well versed both in the Oriental tongues, in philosophy and mathematics." Keith wrote a great many theological tracts, principally directed against the Quakers, for a list of which see Watts, *Bibl. Brit.* The most important of all is *The Standard of the Quakers examined* (Lond. 1702, 8vo), which is a refutation of Barclay's *Apology*. See Janney, *History of the Friends* (Philad. 1867, 4 vols. 12mo), iii, 71 sq. (E. de P.)

Keith, Isaac Stockton, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Newton, Pa., Jan. 20, 1755, graduated at Princeton College in 1775, entered the ministry in 1778, and was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Alexandria in 1780. In 1788 he went to Charleston, S. C., as colleague pastor of the Congregational church, in which position he labored until his death, Dec. 14, 1813. A memoir of his life and a few sermons were published in a volume in 1816.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 166.

Keith, Reuel, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal minister in America, was born at Pittsford, Vt., in 1792, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1814. After teaching for some time, he became an assistant at St. John's, Georgetown, D. C., and, in 1820, professor of humanity and history in Williamsburgh, Va. A theological seminary having been established soon after in Alexandria, he became professor of pulpit eloquence and pastoral theology there, and in 1827 was made D.D. by

his alma mater. For upwards of twenty years he continued to discharge his duties, when his mind became unstrung in regard to his salvation, and the cloud was removed by death Sept. 3, 1842. He published a *Translation* (from the German) *of Hengstenberg's Christology of the Old Testament* (Alexandria, D. C., 1836, 3 vols. 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals*, v, 625.

Keith, Robert, primus bishop in the Scotch Episcopal Church, was born at Uras, Kincardineshire, in 1681. He studied at the University of Aberdeen, and in 1713 became pastor of a congregation in Edinburgh. In 1727 he was ordained bishop of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles, and in 1733 became bishop of Fife. He died in 1757. His principal works are, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland from the beginning of the Reformation to the Retreat of Queen Mary into England, anno* 1568 (Edinb. 1734, fol.):—*Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops down to the Year* 1688, etc. (Edinb. 1755, 4to; new ed. 1824, 8vo). — Chambers and Thomson's *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, iii, 305; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 397.

Keith, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Easton, Mass., Sept. 15, 1776, entered the itinerancy in 1798, withdrew from the connection in 1801, but returned in 1803, and in 1806 re-entered the itinerancy. In 1809 he was stationed in New York, where he died, Sept. 7, 1810. He was a man of fine abilities, of comprehensive mind, and logical power. His piety was deep and sincere, and his preaching talents often eloquent and always useful.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 193.

Keithians, a party which separated from the Quakers in Pennsylvania in the year 1691. They were headed by the famous George Keith (q. v.), from whom they derived their name. Those who persisted in their separation, after their leader deserted them, practiced baptism, and received the Lord's Supper. This party were also called *Quaker Baptists*, because they retained the language, dress, and manner of the Quakers.

Kelah. See KARENS (*Spirit Worship*).

Kelai'ah (Heb. *Kelayah'*, קְלָיָה, perh. *despised* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Κωλία v. r. Κωλαά), one of the Levites who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity, otherwise called KELITA (Ezra x, 23).

Keleb. See DOG.

Keleusma (κέλευσμα, *call*). See CALL.

Keli. See TALMUD.

Kel'ita [some *Keli'ta*] (Hebrew *Kelita'*, קְלִיטָא, *dwarf;* Sept. Κωλίτας, Καλλίτας, Κυλιτάν), one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7), and joined the sacred covenant (Neh. x, 10); he was also one of those who had divorced their heathen wives (Ezra x, 23, where it is stated that his name was likewise KELAIAH). B.C. 459–410.

Kell, JOHN, a Reformed Presbyterian minister, a native of South Carolina, was educated in the University of Glasgow, Scotland, and, with a view to enter the ministry, he pursued a theological course of study under the direction of the late Rev. John McMiller, then professor of theology in the Reformed Church of Scotland. On his return to this country he was ordained and installed pastor at Beech Woods, Ohio, which he left a few years later, to become pastor at Princeton, Indiana, a charge held by him for more than 20 years. He died Nov. 6, 1842. "Mr. Kell was ardent in temperament, and by constitution and habit generous. He was never neutral in the cause which he believed to be right, and, while zealous, he was liberal. Strict in regard to himself, towards others he was indulgent."—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 387.

Keller, Benjamin, D.D., a prominent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Lancaster, Pa., March 4, 1794. Under the faithful ministry of Rev. Dr. H. E. Muhlenberg, he made a public profession of religion, and from that time felt an earnest desire to devote himself to the work of preaching the Gospel. His classical course he pursued under the direction of Rev. Dr. D. F. Schæffer, of Frederick, Md.; his theological studies with his pastor, Dr. Muhlenberg. In 1814, before he had reached his 21st year, he was commissioned by the Synod of Pennsylvania to preach. His first charge was Carlisle, Pa. He subsequently labored in Germantown, Pa., Gettysburg, and Philadelphia, and in each charge he was pre-eminent as a pastor. For a season he was most successfully engaged as general agent of the Parent Education Society, and at a later period his services were secured by the Synod of Pennsylvania in its efforts to endow a German professorship in the institution at Gettysburg. By his untiring devotion to the work, his perseverance and tact, the object was readily attained. For some years he was also engaged in the work of the Lutheran Publication Society, in a general agency and superintendence of its interests. He died July 2, 1864, after a service of fifty years in the Gospel ministry. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Emanuel, a Lutheran minister, was born at Harrisburg, Pa., Sept. 30, 1801. Blessed with pious and faithful parents, his thoughts and desires were early turned to the Christian ministry. His classical studies were pursued at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and the study of divinity under the instruction of his pastor, Rev. Dr. Geo. Lochman. In 1826 he was inducted into the sacred office. He labored in the ministry successively at Manchester, Md., and Mechanicsburg, Pa.; at the latter place he died, April 11, 1837. In his death the Church mourned for one of her most useful and devoted ministers. Through his direct and personal instrumentality a large number of individuals were introduced into the ministry. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Ezra, D.D., an eminent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Middletown Valley, Md., June 12, 1812. Influenced by an unquenchable desire to preach the Gospel, the most formidable obstacles could not deter him from his purpose. While at Pennsylvania College (he graduated in 1835) he began the study of theology, and then entered the seminary at Gettysburg. After his licensure to preach he devoted himself for a season to the arduous work of an itinerant missionary for the Western States. In this work he was very successful, especially as he preached in German as well as English. Subsequently he was engaged in the pastoral work, first at Taneytown, Md., and then at Hagerstown. His ministry at both places was very efficient. In 1844 he accepted the presidency of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, a literary and theological school called into existence to meet the wants of the Lutheran Church in the West, a position for which he was regarded as admirably fitted. At the time of his death few men in the Church gave greater promise of extensive and permanent influence. Ezra Keller died Dec. 29, 1848. He received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College in 1845. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, the son of Benjamin Keller, was born in Carlisle, Pa., April 19, 1819; he graduated at Pennsylvania College in 1838, and studied theology at the seminary in Gettysburg. For a brief season he engaged in the work of teaching at Waynesborough, Pa., but was licensed to preach in 1842; and having received a unanimous call to Trinity Church, Reading, Pa., he immediately entered upon the duties assigned him as an assistant to Rev. Dr. Miller. On the death of Dr. Miller in 1850, St. James's Church was organized, of which he became pastor. This congregation, with others in the vicinity, he continued to serve with a fidelity and a diligence that never faltered, till his death, March 18, 1864. (M. L. S.)

Keller (CELLARIUS), **Jacob**, a German Jesuit, was born at Säckingen, in Swabia, in 1568, and entered the Jesuitical order when only twenty years old. He gained an unenviable notoriety by his controversies with

Protestants; most prominent among them is his public dispute with Jacob Heilbrunner. The Jesuits claim that Keller silenced the Protestant, but evangelical writers all deny the truth of this assertion. Be this as it may, Keller himself became a great favorite in his order, and was honored with a professorship of theology at Regensburg, and later with the rectorate at Munich. He was in great favor also with the duke of Bavaria. Klose (in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 508) accuses Keller of having contributed, both by pen and by word of mouth, towards the feeling of hatred which divided Protestants and Romanists just before the Thirty Years' War. Keller died Feb. 23, 1631.

Kellerman, GEORG, a celebrated Roman Catholic, was born Oct. 11, 1776, near Münster (Germany), and was educated at the University of Münster and in the Roman Catholic seminary of that place. He was ordained priest Aug. 2, 1801, but did not hold any priestly office until 1811, filling up to this time the position of private tutor in the family of the celebrated count of Stolberg, and to Kellerman, no doubt, is due the strong Roman Catholic tendencies of the Stolberg family. In 1826 Kellerman assumed, besides his priestly duties, those of the professorship of New-Testament exegesis in the Roman Catholic theological school at Münster, which in 1836 he exchanged for those of pastoral theology. December 13, 1846 he was elected bishop of Münster, but he died shortly after, March 29, 1847. He published *Predigten* (Münster, 1830, 3 vols. 8vo; 1831, and 1833): —*Gesch. d. A. und N. Test.* (an abridgment of the large work of Overberg, and extensively used as a text-book in Roman Catholic schools); and edited several works of others.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 641.

Kelley, CHAS. H., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Logan Co., Ky., 1821; emigrated to Indiana in 1829; was converted in 1836; entered the Indiana Asbury University in 1845, but his health soon failed, and he left; entered the Indiana Conference in 1846; was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1849, and appointed to St. Joseph station; in 1850 was stationed at St. Louis; in 1851 at Independence; and in 1852 at Lagrange Mission. While on this work he was arrested, on Feb. 13, 1853, by a band of ruffians, on a pretended suspicion of his identity with Chas. F. Kelley, who had recently escaped from the state-prison at Fort Madison. Thither he was forced on a stormy winter night, and though the state officers instantly set him at liberty, the outrages and exposure of the eighteen hours he was in the hands of the mob threw his feeble system into sickness, and he died shortly after, Sept. 17, 1853. He was a good man, an able and faithful preacher, and much lamented by his brethren.—*Minutes of Conf.* v, 481. (G. L. T.)

Kells (originally *Kenlis*) is the name of an ancient Irish town in which a very important synod was held A.D. 1152. It was convoked by Papyrio (Paparo?), cardinal priest, and the pope's (Eugenius III) legate, for the formal reception of the Irish Church into the see of Rome. The Church of Ireland, which had been founded A.D. 432, remained until the close of the 9th century, and even later, almost entirely isolated from the rest of Christendom. Through these long years, bishop Usher says (iv, 325), "All the affairs of the bishops and Church of Ireland were done at home . . . the people and the kings made their bishops." All this while the Irish Church, in her isolation and poverty, grew from infancy to maturity, following the plain scriptural teachings of her unlettered founder, without perhaps knowing anything of the refinements and innovations which were arising on the Continent. The irruption of the Danes in A.D. 787 had brought the Irish, and with them the Church, into more general communication with continental Europe; and when, towards the close of the 9th century, many of the colonists in Ireland embraced Christianity, their clergy applied to the English, whom they claimed as their kindred, for ordination, and in A.D. 1085, Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, ordained for them Donatus as the bishop of Dublin. On his consecration Donatus made the following declaration: "I, Donatus, bishop of the see of Dublin, in Ireland, do promise canonical obedience to you, O Lanfranc, archbishop of the holy Church of Canterbury, and to your successors" (*Illust. Men of Ireland*, i, 235). This was the first promise of fealty on the part of any church in Ireland, and it was made by a foreigner (no native had ever made such a pledge), and gave rise to two Church organizations, the old one founded by St. Patrick, and the new Dano-Irish Church started by this action of the archbishop of Canterbury. The Synod of Kells was called to bring about a union of the two branches, or, at least, to establish on a permanent basis the claims of Romanism. We cannot tell who composed this celebrated synod at Kells, for from this time forward all the records were in the keeping of the new organization; those of the old were either accidentally or intentionally lost. It is not, however, very probable that the old Irish government of nearly seven hundred years' standing would at once dissolve itself and merge into the new one, whose purposes they had so long resisted. Besides, nearly twenty years afterwards, in A.D. 1170, we find the old Synod of Armagh still in existence, deploring and protesting against the slaughterings and devastations of the English under Henry II, whom the popes had then sent over to Ireland to bring their Church "to canonical conformity." Papyrio clearly recognised it as his task to establish a hierarchy where none had ever existed before, and for this purpose he attempted to suppress most of the former Irish bishops, and to create four great archiepiscopal sees—those of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam—by instituting a system of tithes, claiming Peter's pence, and requiring conformity in all Church matters "to the one catholic and Roman office." He brought also with him the palliums or investitures from the pope for the four newly-created archiepiscopal sees; the reception of these was regarded as so many pledges of fealty and obedience to the popes of Rome. The public presentation and reception of these badges had long been an object of great solicitude on the part both of Rome and of several of the prominent bishops in England and Ireland; for, in their estimation, until this was done, there seemed to have been something wanting in regard to a full and complete union. All of these measures, as we have seen, were, however, inaugurated and carried forward by the Dano-Irish and a small Romanizing party in Ireland. The native clergy, with few exceptions, would have actively opposed them had they not looked upon the Danes as mere colonists. To their sorrow, the Irish learned, when too late, that the Roman hierarchy had been successfully established in Ireland by the action of the Synod of Kells. See Mant, *History of the Irish Church*, p. 6. See IRELAND. (D. D.)

Kelly, John, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born at Rocky Creek, Chester District, S. C., in 1772, and was educated abroad (at Glasgow College, Scotland), as was the custom and necessity in his day. His theological studies he pursued under the direction of the Rev. Dr. McMillan, of Stirling, Scotland. He returned to South Carolina in 1808, and in June, 1809, was licensed to preach. Two years later he was ordained and appointed missionary in the Western States and Territories, and settled finally at Beech Woods, Butler Co., Ohio. He was released from active service in 1837, but continued preaching up to the time of his death, Nov. 6, 1842. "His life was one of most untiring activity, and under his faithful ministry many a spot in the wilderness was seen to bud and blossom as the rose." —Sprague, *Annals*, ix (Ref. Presb.), p. 63.

Kelly, Thomas, was born in Queens County, Ireland, about 1769, and was the son of Judge Kelly, of Kellyville. He graduated at the Dublin University with the highest honors, with a view of studying law. He entered at the Temple, London, and while there en-

joyed the friendship of his celebrated countryman, Edmund Burke, but before the completion of his legal studies, his mind having been strongly exercised on the subject of religion, he entered upon a course of theological reading, and in 1793 was ordained a clergyman of the Established Church. Kelly became one of the most popular preachers in Dublin, and crowds flocked to his church Sunday after Sunday to listen to his fervent appeals; incurring, however, the displeasure of his superiors in the Church, he was induced at length to leave the Establishment, though he never dissented from its doctrines. He continued to labor in Dublin for more than sixty years, and it was a common remark concerning him that he never seemed to waste an hour. He was possessed of abundant means, a rare thing among clergymen, and devoted a large portion of it to the building of churches. He was a man of varied learning, versed in the Oriental languages, and an excellent Biblical critic. He was also skilled in music, and composed a volume of airs for his hymns which were remarkable for their simplicity and sweetness. In October, 1854, while preaching to his own congregation, he was seized with a slight stroke of paralysis, which gradually lessened his strength, till he died May 14, 1855. Mr. Kelly was the author of *Andrew Dunn*, a controversial work against Romanism, and of a pamphlet entitled *Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness*, but as a writer he is best known as the author of *Hymns on various Passages of Scripture* (the last edition, published in Dublin, 1853, contains seven hundred and sixty-five hymns).

Kelpies, in Scotch mythology a name for departed spirits, who are said to return to this world in the shape of river-horses. They correspond to the Nök of Norwegian mythology. See Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*, ii, 22.

Kelsey, James, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Tyringham, Mass., Oct. 18, 1782, was converted in 1796, entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1806, and labored with great success. He died in 1840 (?). James Kelsey was a good man, and through a long service was intent on the work of saving the souls of men. —*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 146.

Kelso, George W., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Louisa County, Va., in 1815, and emigrated while young to Tennessee. He was educated at the Nashville University, joined the Tennessee Conference in 1835, was transferred to the Virginia Conference in 1842, and died Aug. 10, 1843. Kelso was a faithful and very successful minister, not brilliant, but sound and equable, and very trustworthy in all things.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 460.

Kemp, James, D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Aberdeenshire, Scotland, in 1764, of Presbyterian parentage; graduated at Aberdeen University (Marischal College) in 1786, and the year following came to this country. At first he engaged in teaching, but, finally deciding to join the Episcopal Church, he prepared for the ministry; was ordained by bishop White Dec. 26, 1789, and the year following became rector of Great Choptank parish, Maryland, where he remained for more than twenty years. In 1802 he received from Columbia College the degree of D.D. Two years later he was elected suffragan bishop with bishop Claggett, of Maryland, with the understanding that he was to succeed the latter in case he was the survivor. He was consecrated for this position at New Brunswick, New Jersey, Sept. 1, 1814. The jurisdiction of bishop Kemp was exercised especially over the parishes on the Eastern Shore; in 1816, however, on bishop Claggett's decease, the whole diocese came under his charge, and by his prudence and moderation he commended himself to both clergy and laity. In 1816 he accepted the provostship of the University of Maryland, and held it until the time of his death, Oct. 28, 1827. (J. H. W.)

Kemp, Thomas William, a minister of much promise in the Lutheran Church, was born in Frederick Co., Md., Dec. 2, 1833. Under the influence of faithful Christian nurture his religious principles were successfully developed, and the foundation of his character laid. His childhood and youth were characterized by an exemption from everything vicious, by unusual sprightliness, and an eager desire for study. For four years he was a pupil of St. Mary's (Catholic) College, Baltimore. He subsequently entered Pennsylvania College, and graduated in 1853. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of Drs. Morris, Seiss, and Webster, at the time pastors in Baltimore, and completed them at the seminary in Gettysburg. He was licensed to preach in 1855. For a brief period he was associated with Dr. Stork in the pastoral work in Philadelphia. He subsequently took charge of a Mission Church in Chicago, Illinois, but the climate proving unfavorable to his health, he was obliged to retire from the field. He visited foreign lands, but returned from his pilgrimage to die amid the scenes of his childhood and the embrace of loved ones at home. He passed peacefully away Sept. 15, 1861. (M. L. S.)

Kemp, van der, John Theodore, a Dutch missionary, was born at Rotterdam in 1748, and studied Oriental languages and theology at the University of Leyden, but after graduation he entered the army in a regiment of dragoons, in which he soon attained the grade of lieutenant. He left the army, however, and turned to the study of medicine at Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced practicing at Dort; but, in the end, he turned again to theology. The loss of his wife and daughter, who were drowned together, so affected him that he devoted himself exclusively to the service of his divine Master. About this time he wrote a work on St. Paul's theodicy (published in 1798), and later he went as a missionary to the Hottentots. Arriving at the Cape of Good Hope, he obtained leave from a Kaffre king to settle in his states, but was subsequently driven away by the jealousy of the Dutch settlers. Retained at the Cape by governor Janssens until 1806, he was then permitted by the English governor Baird to settle at Bethelsdorp. The official report of his mission, which he drew up in 1809, does not show him to have been particularly successful in his attempts to civilize the natives. He died at the Cape Dec. 7, 1811. See Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 539. (J. N. P.)

Kempe, Stephan, one of the leaders in the German Reformation of the 16th century, the founder of Protestantism in the city of Hamburg, his native place, was born towards the close of the 15th century. He was educated at Rostock, and became a Franciscan monk in 1523; but, while on business for his order at Hamburg, he became acquainted with the reformer Joachim Slüter, and soon was himself one of the most enthusiastic preachers of the new religion. To Kempe belongs the glory, indeed, of the evangelization of Hamburg. One of his ablest assistants in the glorious work was Ziegenhagen (q. v.). In 1528 they had so far gained the upper hand that the Roman Catholics were obliged to leave the city altogether in their hands. In Lüneburg, also, Kempe aided the good cause of the Lutherans; in fact, wherever, in the immediate neighborhood of the Hanse cities, his assistance was needed to further the reformatory movement, it had not to be asked for twice. He died at Hamburg October 23, 1540. He wrote a narrative of the Reformation in Hamburg which was published by Mayer in *Das Evangelische Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1693, 12mo).

Kemper, Jackson, D.D., LL.D., first missionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, was born at Pleasant Valley, in Dutchess County, New York, Dec. 24, 1789. When about twelve years of age he was sent to the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire, Conn., and remained there two years; after that he was put under the charge of Rev. Dr. Barry, a graduate of

Trinity College, Dublin, at that time one of the most distinguished classical teachers in the country; entered Columbia College in 1805, and graduated in 1809. He began the study of theology under the care of bishop Moore and the clergy of Trinity parish, there being no theological seminaries in those days. As soon as he had reached the canonical age of twenty-one years, he was ordained deacon at the hands of bishop White, in St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, on the second Sunday in Lent, 1811. He was immediately called to the assistantship under bishop White, and held this position till June of 1831, when he accepted the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Conn. In 1835 he was elected the first missionary bishop of the American Church. His jurisdiction comprised "the North-west." Out of it have been formed the dioceses of Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. Early in the winter of this year bishop Kemper reached St. Louis, where he took up his residence until he removed to Wisconsin in 1844. Meanwhile (about 1838) he had been elected to the bishopric of Maryland, but this honor he declined, preferring the more burdensome but not less honorable position of missionary bishop. In 1847, Wisconsin having been organized into a diocese, the Primary Convention elected bishop Kemper diocesan. This was also declined; but in 1854, being again unanimously elected, he accepted, only upon condition that his acceptance should allow him to remain missionary bishop still. At the General Convention of 1859 he resigned his office as missionary bishop, and from that time until his death, May 24, 1870, his labors were confined to the diocese of Wisconsin. He was active in the establishment of a theological seminary within the bounds of his diocese, and when, in 1843, it was founded at Nashotah, Wisconsin, the bishop took up his residence on a farm adjoining.

Kempis, John à, a German monk, brother of Thomas à Kempis (q. v.), was born at Kempen, near Cologne, in 1365. About 1380 he came to Deventer, and was admitted by Gerard Groot among the Brethren of the Common Life. He became successively one of the first members of the Canons Regular of Windesheim in 1386; prior of the Convent of Mariabrunn, near Arnheim, in 1392; and of the new Convent of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwoll, in 1399. Here he remained nine years, during which he caused the buildings, etc., of the convent to be finished. He subsequently directed four other establishments of his order, and died at Bethany, near Arnheim, Nov. 4, 1432. It was John à Kempis who drew up the rules of the chapter of Windesheim, the central establishment of his order. Gerson pronounced his eulogy in the Council of Constance. See Buschius, *Chronicon Windesemense;* Rosweide, *Vita Joh. à Kempis (Appendix ad Thomæ à Kempis Chronicon Montis S. Agnetis)*; Mooren, *Nachrichten über Thom. à Kempis*, p. 134.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 542. (J. N. P.)

Kempis, Thomas à (so called from his native place, *Kempen*, a village in the diocese of Cologne; his family name was *Hämerken* [Latinized *Malleolus*, Little Hammer]), one of the most celebrated mystics and forerunners of the Reformation of the 16th century, was born about 1380. Thomas's parents were poor, and could ill afford the aspiring youth any superior advantages of education, but, trained by a pious mother, he had early inclined to the priesthood, and, aware of the advantages afforded young persons by the monastic brotherhood known as the *Brethren of the Common Life* (q. v.), he quitted his parental roof at the age of thirteen to seek further educational advantages than he had enjoyed at his home, under the instruction of the celebrated John Bœhme, then at the head of a school at Deventer, superintended by the "Brethren of the Common Life." While here at school he was brought to the notice of Florentius, one of the principal disciples of Gerhard Groot, and the superintendent of the brotherhood, whose protection Thomas was enjoying. Florentius, not slow to discover in Thomas abilities of a high order, embraced every opportunity to draw the pious youth closer to his side, and in 1396 finally offered him a home at his own house, the head-quarters of the brethren, to study and watch more closely the character and inclinations of the youthful stranger. Surrounded by pious comrades, among whom we meet Arnold of Schoonhoven (q. v.), with whom he shared a little chamber and bed, Thomas was soon inclined to a life of asceticism. "Examples," says Thomas à Kempis himself, "are more instructive than words" (*Vall. lilior.* xxiv, 1, p. 95). Possessed of a boding mind, and animated by a piety so fervent as to presume always the best of others, such was the effect produced upon him by the brethren's whole manner of life, that the seven years he spent in the zealous exercise of piety and the prosecution of his studies at the school and brother-house of Deventer were to him seven years spent in an actual paradise. About 1400 he petitioned father Florentius for a recommendation to admit him into the convent of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwoll, of which his brother John à Kempis (q. v.) was then prior, and with a hearty welcome he entered this monastery as a novice among the regular canons. "Strangely as the mind of Thomas was bent upon his vocation, and although both nature and previous education had perfectly adapted him for it, he did not plunge into it without consideration. Deliberate even in his youthful zeal, he spent five years of novitiate, assumed the monastic dress in the sixth, and did not until the year following take the vow, which he then, however, kept with inviolable fidelity" (Ullmann, *ut infra*, ii, 124). It was not until about 1413 that he was ordained to the priesthood. Before this ordination he had buried himself, like all worthy disciples of the brotherhood, in the copying of MSS. and in the performance of religious exercises. Now that he was a priest, his chief occupation became the delivery of religious discourses and the duties of the confessional. He continued, however, copying religious MSS. Thomas à Kempis, indeed, applied himself with vigor to this labor, to which he brought a quick eye and a skilful hand. He copied out the whole Bible, a missal, and a multitude of other works, which the monastery of St. Agnes preserved; but, in performing this office, he also practiced the advice of one of the ancients, who, in writing out books, did not only seek by the labor of his hands to gain food for his body, but also to refresh his soul with heavenly nourishment. He was humble, meek, ready to give consolation; fervent in his exhortations and prayers, spiritual, contemplative, and his efforts in this direction finally resulted in the composition of an original treatise, which to this hour remains one of the most perfect compositions in religious literature, by many considered the most beautiful uninspired production — the *Imitation of Christ* (see below). In 1425 Thomas was appointed subprior, an office which intrusted to his care the spiritual progress of the brethren and the instruction of novices. A difficulty having occurred between the pope on the one side, and the chapter and nobility of Utrecht on the other, about the election of Rudolph of Diephold as archbishop, the diocese was put under interdict, and the canons left Mount St. Agnes in 1429 to retire to Lunekerke, in Friesland, but returned in 1432, when Thomas became procurator of the convent. But, as the duties of this office appeared to abstract him too much from meditation and his more profitable labors as an author, he was, about 1449, reponed in the subpriorate, and continued in this office until his death, July 26, 1471. "From the nature of the case, we have little to say of Thomas's cloisteral life. Without any considerable disturbance, it flowed on like a limpid brook, reflecting on its calm surface the unclouded heavens. Quiet industry, lonely contemplation, and secret prayer filled up the day, and every day was like another." Among his contemporaries Thomas was eminently distinguished for sanctity and ascetic learning.

Works.—The reputation of à Kempis, however, rests not upon his ascetic character, but rather on the productions of his pen—his sermons, ascetical treatises, pious biographies, letters, and hymns—and from these only one need be selected to claim for him the mastery as a religious writer—his *De Imitatione Christi*—"standing, as no one doubts, and as even its effects have demonstrated it to do, in point of excellence far above all the rest, the purest and most finished production of Thomas;" a work which, next to the sacred Scriptures only, has had the largest number of readers of which sacred literature, ancient or modern, can furnish an example. In its pages, says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, vi, 482), "are gathered and concentred all that is elevating, passionate, profoundly pious in all the older mystics. No book, after the holy Scripture, has been so often reprinted; none translated into so many languages, ancient and modern," extending even to Greek and Hebrew, or so often retranslated. Sixty distinct versions are enumerated in French alone, and a single collection, formed at Cologne within the present century, comprised, although confessedly incomplete, no fewer than 500 distinct editions. Indeed, it may be somewhat of a surprise to some to learn that this book has had an important influence on the mind of John Wesley and on the origin of Methodism. Wesley published a translation of it, entitled *The Christian's Pattern*. It was one of the earliest volumes issued by the Methodist Book Concern, and is still on their catalogue. "It should be," says one of the most distinguished American Methodists, "in the hands of every Methodist."

Strange, indeed, it seems that the authorship of a work so popular and so widely noted, and of comparatively recent origin, should ever have been a subject of doubt and long controversy. Shortly after the decease of Thomas à Kempis a violent dispute arose between the Canons Regular of St. Augustine and the Benedictines, the former claiming *De Imitatione Christi* as the work of Thomas à Kempis, the latter asserting it to have been the production of the celebrated John Gerson (q. v.), chancellor of the University of Paris, who died in 1429. These two persons were generally cited as its authors until the beginning of the 17th century, when the Spanish Jesuit Manriquez discovered a MS. which credited it to John Gersen, or Gesen, abbé of Verceil in the early part of the 13th century. Since that time (1604) three competitors have divided the voices of the learned—not alone individuals, but public bodies, universities, religious orders, the Congregation of the Index, the Parliament of Paris, and even the French Academy; and the assertors of these respective claims have carried into the controversy no trifling amount of polemical acrimony. So much has been written on the theme, especially by French and Netherland antiquaries, that its pamphlets and books would make up quite a little library. Among the French writers the tendency of opinion has been to give the merit of this celebrated production to John Gerson. "Kempis," argued Messieurs Barbier and Leroy, "was an excellent copyist; his copy of the Bible—the labor of fifteen years—was thought a masterpiece of calligraphic art; and so he was merely employed in transcribing the work of Gerson," basing their inference mainly on the name and date of an ancient MS. of the *De Imitatione* preserved in the library at Valenciennes. German writers, on the other hand, have always been decidedly in favor of assigning the work to Thomas à Kempis, and since the discovery by bishop Malon of a MS. in the library at Brussels, bearing the name of Thomas à Kempis as author, the Belgians have joined the Germans. The proofs in favor of Thomas à Kempis are thus stated by M. Ernest Gregoire (in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 545 sq.).

A. *The direct Testimony of his Contemporaries.*—1. John Buschius, canon regular of the monastery of Windesheim (1420–79), positively declares in his *Chronicle* of that convent that Thomas wrote the *Imitation*. As he knew him intimately, and had often occasion to see him, his testimony is important. They were of the same congregation, and Buschius was in the principal convent, where was held the general chapter, in which Thomas, as subprior, took part. Moreover, he resided there for fifty-one years, only one league and a half from Mount St. Agnes, where Thomas lived at the same time. It was said by some that the passage referring to Thomas was afterwards added in the chronicle; but a well-authenticated deed, drawn up in 1760, testifies that the MS. of the chronicle written by Buschius's own hand contains the passage written in the same hand, with the same ink, and in full, without erasure, insertion, or parenthesis. The same has been proved concerning a MS. copy of the *Chronicle of Windesheim*, written in 1477, and another written in 1478, which was sold at Cologne in 1823. 2. Hermann of Ryd, who wrote in 1454 a description of the convents belonging to the Canons Regular of Windesheim, states as positively as Buschius that Thomas, with whom he was personally acquainted, wrote the *Imitation*. 3. Gaspard Pforzheim, at the end of his German translation of the first three books of the *Imitation*, written in 1448, declares that it was the work of Kempis. 4. The author of an anonymous biography of Kempis, written before the year 1488, counts the *Imitation* among the works of Thomas. His testimony is the more valuable, as he had expressly gone to Mount St. Agnes to learn all the particulars concerning Kempis from those who had lived with him. 5. Albert of Hardenberg, a disciple of the celebrated Wessel, who was himself a disciple of Thomas, wrote the following decisive passages: "The reputation of the excellent brother Thomas à Kempis attracted many people to him. About that time he was writing the book of the *Imitation of Christ*, commencing *Qui sequitur me*. Wessel used to say that this book first rendered him zealously pious, and decided him to become better acquainted, and even familiar, with master Thomas, so that he actually embraced monastic life in the same convent of St. Agnes;" again: "The monks of Mount St. Agnes have shown me several writings of the very pious Thomas à Kempis, of whom they have preserved, among others, the truly estimable work of the *Imitation of Jesus Christ*, to which Wessel owed his taste for theology. The reading of this work had decided him, while yet quite young, to go to Zwoll to study belles-lettres, and to enjoy the friendship of the pious Thomas à Kempis, who was then canon of St. Agnes. Wessel had the highest regard for him, and preferred dwelling there rather than anywhere else." 6. John Mauburne, a canon regular, who was a novice of Mount St. Agnes under Renier, which latter had lived there six years with Thomas à Kempis, quotes, in his *Rosetum spiritualium exercitiorum*, printed in 1491, three passages of the *Imitation*, naming Kempis as its author. In his *Catalogue des hommes illustres de la congrégation de Windesem* (Windesheim) he names three books of the *Imitation*, separately, as the work of Thomas.

These various testimonies are all derived from learned and trustworthy men, all of whom, with the exception of one, were personally acquainted with Thomas à Kempis, or with persons who lived with him. They are, moreover, given with a simplicity which shows that they did not consider the question as one at all likely to give rise to controversy. They appear so conclusive that it is hardly necessary to mention other writers of the 15th century who testified to the same effect. Trithemius (*De Script. Eccles.* c. 707) informs us that in his day Kempis was universally considered as the author of the *Imitation;* and though after 1441 some MSS. and subsequently some editions bore the name of John Gerson, every time the question as to the authorship arose in the 15th century it was decided in favor of Kempis. Thus Peter Schott, canon regular of Strasburg, in the preface to his edition of the works of John Gerson in 1488, says: "Some treatises are attributed to John Gerson, though well known to have been written by other par-

ties; such, for instance, is the work *De Contemptu Mundi*, which is proved to have been written by a canon regular called Thomas à Kempis." The publisher of the French translation of the *Imitation* (Paris, 1493) expressly states that Thomas à Kempis was the author. The publisher of the Nuremberg edition, 1494, does the same. Finally, Francis of Tholen, successor of Thomas as subprior of Mount St. Agnes, gives the MS. copies of the *Imitation* in Thomas's own handwriting as a proof against Gerson.

B. *Indirect Proofs from the various MSS. and Editions.*—The oldest MS. of the *Imitation* we now possess is that known as Kirchheim's (in the Bourgogne Library, Brussels, as No. 15,137); it contains only the first three books. At the bottom of the first page is a note saying, "Be it remarked that this treatise is the work of a pious and learned man, master Thomas of Mount St. Agnes, and canon regular of Utrecht, called Thomas à Kempis. It was copied from the author's autograph in the diocese of Utrecht in the year 1425, in the central house of the province." Another MS. of the same period was discovered in 1852 [by bishop Müller, of Münster], in the gymnasium of Gadesdonk, near Goch: it contains the first four books of the *Imitation:* the first he copied in 1425, and the last in 1427. It does not give the name of the author, but a very significant fact is that it belonged originally to the Canons Regular of Bethlehem, near Dottingheim, in the neighborhood of Mount St. Agnes. Among the other MSS. we notice, in the first place, that belonging to the Jesuits of Anvers, which played an important part in the controversy respecting the authorship. It is now in the Bourgogne Library, Brussels, as No. 5855–5861. It is all in Thomas's own handwriting, and, besides the first four books of the *Imitation*, it contains some other treatises of Kempis. It closes with these words: "Finitus et completus Anno Domini 1441 per manus fratris Thomæ Kempensis in Monte S. Agnetis prope Zwollas." Some have considered this as a proof that he only copied it, for he used the same formula concerning the copies of the missal and Bible which he wrote in 1417 and 1438; but it has been ascertained that he used it also in all copies of his own original works. The Bourgogne Library, Brussels, preserves as No. 4585–4587 a MS. of Thomas à Kempis containing a collection of his essays, and which ends as follows: "Anno 1446 finitus et scriptus per manus fratris Thomæ Campensis," without otherwise naming Thomas as the author. This formula, therefore, proves nothing either for or against the claims of Kempis. But it is worthy of notice that the authorship of the ascetic treatises contained in the Anvers MS. after the four books of the *Imitation* has always been unanimously ascribed to Kempis, and he would certainly not have put at the head of them the work of another which he had merely copied, or he would be open to the charge of deception. There are other MSS., dated 1441, 1442, 1445, 1447, and 1451, as also seven between 1463 and 1488, which name Kempis as the author of the *Imitation*. Among the many MSS. of the 15th century which bear no precise date, but testify to this authorship, we shall mention only that of Dalhem, copied by a priest who said a mass for Kempis two months after the latter's death, and that of the canons of St. Martin of Louvain, which they received in 1570 from the last remaining members of the congregation of Mount St. Agnes. It is in Kempis's own handwriting, and contains the first draft of the fourth book of the *Imitation*—the first he prepared in composing the work. Among the many editions of the *Imitation* published in the 15th century, twenty-three at least consider Kempis as the author; and among these we find the oldest of all, published by Zainer (Augsb. 1468–1472).

C. *Proofs drawn from the Doctrines held and the Expressions used in the Imitation.*—The principles advanced in the *Imitation* are in perfect accordance with those held by the founders of the congregation of the *Brethren of the Common Life*, Gerhard Groot, Florentius Radewins, and John van Heusden. It may even be considered only as a commentary or exposition of their doctrines. In judging it thus, criticism, however, does not detract from the value of this masterpiece of the second half of the fourteenth century. Buschius said of its author, "Verus his novissimis temporibus hujus nostræ terræ apostolus, primus hujus nostræ reformationis et totius modernæ devotionis origo." The word *devotio* came to be used to designate the kind of piety Groot sought to develop among his disciples, and the latter took the name of *devoti*. Now, in the *Imitation* we find some ten passages where the expression *devotus* is used to designate a particular class of persons who applied themselves zealously and ceaselessly to the practice of religious exercises, and to which the author himself belonged. Some eleven other passages, and a whole chapter even, show, moreover, that the book was written for a religious community of which the author was also a member, a fact quite incompatible with the opinion which considers Gerson as the author. We can quote here only three of the most conclusive passages: "Sæpe sentimus, ut meliores et puriores in initio conversionis nos fuisse inveniamus, quam post multos annos professionis" (lib. i, ch. 11). "O quantus fervor omnium religiosorum in principiis suæ sanctæ institutionis! . . . O temporis et negligentiæ status nostri, quod tam cito declinamus a pristino fervore" (lib. i, ch. 18). "Suscepi, suscepi de manu tua crucem; portabo et portabo eam usque ad mortem, sicut imposuisti mihi. Vere vita boni monachi crux est; sed dux paradisi. Eia fratres, pergamus simul; Jesus erit nobiscum. Propter Jesum suscepimus hanc crucem: propter Jesum perseveremus in cruce" (lib. iii, ch. 56). Another and strong proof in favor of Kempis is the fact that the principles advanced in those of his treatises the authorship of which has not been contested are precisely the same as are advocated in the *Imitation*. More than twenty chapters in these various treatises have almost the identical headings of some of the *Imitation*. Some have accounted for this on the ground of his familiarity with *De Imitatione* by copying; but this theory falls to the ground when we consider that in all his other treatises, more than forty in number, he nowhere refers to or quotes the *Imitation*, which he would not have failed to do if it were the production of some other writer. Next to the general resemblance of these productions with regard to their tenor and tone, we must notice their similarity of style. The *Imitation* consists wholly of a series of separate maxims, pious reflections, advice, axioms, without any special connection of the several parts. A number of MS. copies bore the title *Liber sententiarum de Imitatione Christi*, or *Admonitiones ad spiritualia trahentes*. But this is exactly Thomas à Kempis's style. The writer's own description of his manner of writing is evidently that of the author of the *Imitation:* "Vario etiam sermonum genere, nunc loquens, nunc disputans, nunc orans, nunc colloquens, nunc in propria persona, nunc in peregrina, placido stylo textum præsentem circum flexi" (Prolog. *Soliloqui Animæ*). Some object to Kempis on the ground that he was a mere copyist, who spent his life peaceably in a convent, and could not have known so intimately and accurately the yearnings, the sublime outbursts of the human heart which fill every page of the *Imitation*. We must remark, however, that the Canons Regular were not mere copyists, as the word is understood in our time, but rather intelligent publishers of the works they copied, and often men of great learning. They compared and corrected the works which came out of their hands by the aid of the best authorities, and, according to Thomas, their principal occupations were *orare, meditare, studere, scribere*. Thomas, as we have seen, was especially intrusted with the instruction of the novices, and, it seems, preached on all special occasions, drawing large crowds by his eloquence. He who seriously studies his own heart, moreover, does not need to go abroad in the world to become thorough-

ly acquainted with human nature, with its varied struggles, emotions, and yearnings. "I have," says Kempis himself, "everywhere sought rest, and found it only in solitude and among books" (*De Imitat. Christi*, i, 22, 6; 23, 1 sq.; iii, 54, 1–8). "The *Imitation*," says a writer in the *Revue Chrétienne* (Feb. 1861), "is a great and good book. One breathes in it the most perfect love of God. The author, whoever he may be, has sounded the depths of this abyss of love, and the abyss attracts instead of frightening him. In this faith resting on God one feels a passionate casting aside of the things of this world, and a fervent yearning for the realities of a future life."

Another great reason for assigning the work directly to German ground, and therefore also to Kempis, are the many Germanisms occurring in the *Imitation*. We shall mention only five, but these are sufficient to show that the writer was thoroughly conversant with German idioms: *Cadere super*, in the sense of caring for a thing; *jacere in*, for to depend on; *gravitas*, for difficulty; *leviter*, for easily; and, finally, *scire exterius*, for to know by heart. This last is a literal translation of the German idiom (unintelligible in any other), and should have been *memoriter scire*. Some have, on the other hand, pointed to several Gallicisms in the *Imitation*, but the University of Paris was at that time the centre of theological knowledge, and it is no wonder if some French idioms became current expressions in the schools, while this could not be the case with German. See GERSON.

The other works of Thomas à Kempis, which are all of an ascetic character with the exception of two, have been collected in several editions, none of which, however, is quite complete. Among the most important editions are those of Ketelaer, published at Utrecht a few years after Kempis's death; of Paris (1493, 1520, 1521, 1523, 1549), Nuremberg (1494), Venice (1535, 1568, 1576), Antwerp (1574). That published at the same place in 1600 by the Jesuit Sommalius is considered the best, though it is not complete; it was reprinted at Antwerp (in 1607 and 1615), at Douay (1635), Cologne (1660, 1728, 1754), etc. A German translation of Kempis's complete works was published by Silbert (Vienna, 1834, 4 vols. 8vo). One of the latest editions was prepared by Krans, *Opera Omnia* (Treves, 1868, 16mo), but the most remarkable modern edition is a Heptaglot, printed at Sulzbach (1837), containing, besides the original, later versions in Italian, Spanish, French, German, English, and Greek. As for the *De Imitatione*, it has continued in print to the present time in nearly all the languages of the civilized world.

Doctrines.—Supposing, then, that Thomas à Kempis, of whose life and principal work we have just treated, actually flourished in the 14th century, it remains to be seen in how far his doctrinal views entitle him to prominence in the Christian Church, and to a place among the forerunners of the great Reformation. "It is true that with him (Kempis), in common with all eminent men, a few governing thoughts constitute the kernel of his intellectual being . . . but then . . . what we find in him is practical wisdom . . . sustained by a determinate general tendency of life and spirit." It must be confessed, also, that Thomas's whole theory of Christian life and faith, in so far as we see it developed in his writings, cannot be properly called original, for "he draws continually from the great traditionary stream." "But," says Ullmann (ii, 132), "even though the material be not to any great extent original, it yet acquires through the individuality of Thomas, compacting it into a beautiful unity, a new soul, something peculiarly lovely, amiable, and fresh, a tone of truth, a cheerfulness, and gentle warmth of heart, by virtue of which it produces quite a peculiar effect."

For a decided inclination to asceticism we always look in characters of the age to which Thomas à Kempis belonged; we do not, therefore, make room here for a delineation of this part of his character, but will treat hastily only his peculiar views *on fellowship with God*. "Where," asks he, "can man find that which is truly good, and which enduringly satisfies? Not in the multitude of things which distract, but in the *One* which collects and unites. For the one does not proceed out of the many, but the many out of the one. That one is the one thing needful, the chief good, and nothing better and higher either exists or can even be conceived. . . . Compared with him the creature is nothing, and only becomes anything when in fellowship with him. Whatever is not God is nothing, and should be counted as nothing" (*De Imit. Christi*, iii, 32, 1). Here we find Thomas agreeing in words with Eckart of the Brethren of the Free Spirit. Both say God is all and man nothing. But with what difference of meaning! Eckart understands the proposition metaphysically; Thomas understands it morally. "According to Eckart, man only requires to bear in mind his true and eternal nature in order to be himself God; according to Thomas, God, as himself the most perfect person, in the exercise of free grace, and from fulness of the blessings that reside in him, is pleased to impart personality to men in order that, although, morally considered, they are themselves nothing, they may through him, and in voluntary fellowship with him, attain to true existence and eternal life. To enter into fellowship with God, the chief good and fountain of blessedness, and *to become one with him*, is the basis of all true contentment. But how can two such parties, God and man, the Creator and the creature, be brought together? God is in heaven and man on earth; God is perfect, and man sensual, vain, and sinful. There must, therefore, be mediation—some way in which God *comes* to man, and man to God, and both unite. This union of man with God depends upon a twofold condition, one negative and the other positive. The negative is that man shall wholly renounce what can give him no true peace. He must forsake the world, which offers to him such hardship and distress, and whose very pleasures turn into pains; he must detach himself from the creatures, for nothing defiles and entangles the heart so much as impure love of them; and only when a man has advanced so far as no longer to seek consolation from any creature does he enjoy God, and find consolation in him; he must, in fine, deny himself, and wholly renounce—be dead to—selfishness and self-love, for whoever loves himself will find, wherever he seeks, only his own little, mean, sinful self, without being able to find God. This last is the hardest of all tasks, and can only be attained by deep and earnest self-acquaintance. But whosoever strictly exercises self-examination will infallibly come to recognise himself in his meanness, littleness, and nonentity, and will be led to the most perfect humility, entire contrition, and ardent longing after God. For only when man has become little and nothing in his own eyes can God become great to him; only when he has emptied himself of all created things can God replenish him with his grace. . . . Having condensed his whole doctrine into the short rule, '*Part with all, and then find all*,' he immediately subjoins, 'Lord, this is not the work of a day, nor a game for children. These few words include all perfection.' Here, accordingly, an efficacy must intervene which is superior to human strength. This efficacy is divine love imparting itself to man, and becoming the mediatrix between God and him, between heaven and earth. Love brings together the holy God who dwells in heaven and the sinful creature upon earth, uniting that which is most humble with that which is most exalted. It is the truth that makes man free, but the highest truth is love. Divine love, imparting and manifesting itself to man, is grace. God sheds forth his love into the heart of man, who thereby acquires liberty, peace, and ability for all good things; and, made partaker of this love, man reckons as worthless all that is less than God, loving God only, and loving himself no more, or, if at all, only for God's sake. . . . 'He who has true and perfect love does not seek himself in anything, but only desires that God may be glorified. He cares not to have joy in himself, but refers all to God, from whom, as their source,

all blessings flow, and in whom, as their final end, all saints find a blissful repose'" (Ullmann, ii, 140 sq.).

Naturally enough, Thomas à Kempis shares the notion of his day—of almost the whole mediæval period—in reckoning monachism the highest stage of the Christian life, and the monk the perfect Christian. But this is due, first of all, to the high ideal which Thomas had of monachism, and of which he was himself no mean example. Asceticism, therefore, characterizes all he writes. Indeed, even a taint of the Pelagianism of the mediæval theology fastens also upon him, and is especially manifest in those of his writings which are devoted to the delineation and recommendation of the monastic life, where the notion of *merit* plays a not unimportant part, and the centre of Thomas's whole religious system constitutes, not justification by faith, but *reconciliation by love*. It is even true that "Thomas was a strict Catholic, and directly impugned nothing which had received the sanction of the Church," and that "he practiced with great zeal the whole divine worship as it then obtained, and which, as such, appeared to him just what it ought to be. He insists with particular urgency upon what is so characteristically Romish, prayers for the dead offered through the medium of the mass, especially the adoration of the saints, among whom he chiefly worships the patron saints of his own monastery, and, most of all, the service of Mary, to whom he ascribes so important a share in the divine government of the world as to say of her, 'How could a world which is so full of sin endure unless Mary, with the saints in heaven, were daily praying for it?' (*De Discip. Claustr.* cap. xiv; comp. *Sermon. ad Novit.* iii, 4, p. 84; and see also Trithemius, *De Script. eccl.* c. 707, p. 164; *Specul. Exemplar. Dist.* x, § 7). He no less acknowledges the existing hierarchy and ecclesiastical constitution in their whole extent, together with the priesthood in its function of mediating between God and man;" but, if he does not attack, *neither does he defend* or establish any, while, in many respects, he may be said, by his negative position, to have not only actually destroyed the influence of the Church, but really to have paved the way for reform. However true it be that "Thomas is not *intentionally* a reformer . . . he nevertheless is a reformer, for he desired the selfsame objects as Luther;" for the former, like the latter, everywhere insists upon the Christian principles of spirituality and freedom which formed the very basis of the Lutheran Reformation. In the 12th century mysticism was the defender of the Church, but not so the practical mysticism of the 15th century, as exhibited by the Brethren of the Common Life, and especially by Thomas. By this time the tables had turned completely. The position once occupied by scholasticism was now assumed, in a measure, by mysticism, and it became, though perhaps only covertly and unintentionally, the opponent of the Church; it founded or gave life to the institutions which sent forth the most influential precursors—the very leaders of the great German reform—and in many other respects "directly or indirectly exercised a positive influence upon the Reformation." For did not the Brethren of the Common Life labor in many new ways to prepare the way for the great reforms of the 16th century? Who but they afforded religious instruction to the people in their mother tongue, and sought their improvement by every means—educated the young, and circulated the Bible? "And, inasmuch as à Kempis also belongs to that side, inasmuch as he is manifestly antischolastical, gives prominence to the religious and moral import of the dogma, and applies it almost exclusively to the use of the mystical and ascetical life, we must, from a regard for his edifying character, ascribe to him a real, although an indirect influence on the dissolution of the creed" (Ullmann, ii, 158).

See Brewer, *Thomæ à Kempis Biographia*; Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii, 114 sq.; Bähring, *Thomas à Kempis nach seinem äusseren u. inneren Leben dargestellt* (Berlin, 1854, 8vo); Mooren, *Nachrichten ü. Thomas à Kempis* (Crefeld, 1855, 12mo); Rosweyde, *Vindiciæ Kempenses;* J. Fronteau, *Kempis Vindicatus;* Heser, *Dioptra Kempensis;* Th. Carré, *Thomæ à Kempis a seipso restitutus;* Eus. Amort, *Plena Informatio de statu controversiæ quæ de auctore libelli de Imitatione Christi agitatur*, etc.; Delprat, *Verhandeling over het Broederschap van G. Groot* (Leyden, 1856); Scholz, *Dissertatio qua Thomæ à Kempis sententia de re Christiana exponitur*, etc. (Groning. 1839); Malou, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le véritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jésus Christ* (Louvain, 1849)—the most recent and best account of the details of the discussion on the authorship of the *Imitation;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie;* Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxiv, 302; Erhard, *Gesch. des Wiederaufblühens*, i, 263; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 4, p. 347; Hodgson (William), *Reformers before the Reformation* (Philada. 1867, 12mo), chap. x; Kühn, in the *Rev. Chrét.* Aug. 1857; *Contemp. Rev.* Sept. 1866; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1856, p. 642; *Am. Presb. Review*, Jan. 1863, p. 164; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* x, 1. (J. H. W.)

Kemu'ël [some *Kem'uël'*] (Heb. *Kemuël'*, קְמוּאֵל, perhaps *helper of God*, otherwise *assembly of God;* Sept. Καμουήλ), the name of three men.

1. The third son of Abraham's brother Nahor, and father of six sons (Gen. xxii, 21), all unknown except the last, Bethuel, who was the father of Laban and Rebekah (Gen. xxiv, 15). B.C. cir. 2090. As the name of Aram, the first-born, is also the Hebrew name of Syria, some commentators have most strangely conceived that the Syrians were descended from him; but Syria was already peopled ere he was born, Laban (Gen. xxviii, 5) and Jacob (Deut. xxvi, 5) being both called "Syrians," although neither of them was descended from Kemuel's son Aram. The misconception originated with the Septuagint, which in this case renders אֲבִי אֲרָם, "father of Aram," by *πατέρα Σύρων*, "father of the Syrians." See ARAM.

2. Son of Shiphtan and phylarch of Ephraim, appointed commissioner on behalf of that tribe to partition the land of Canaan (Numb. xxxiv, 24). B.C. 1618.

3. A Levite, father of Hashabiah, which latter was one of the royal officers under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 17). B.C. 1014.

Ken, THOMAS, D.D., bishop of Bath and Wells, a distinguished nonjuror divine, was born at Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire, in July, 1637. He was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford. About 1666 he entered the Church, and became chaplain to bishop Morley, who in 1669 secured for him a prebend in Westminster. In 1674 he visited Rome, and on his return in 1679 was made D.D. About the same time he was appointed to the household of the princess of Orange; but the strictness of his moral and religious principles having displeased prince William, he soon left Holland, and accompanied lord Dartmouth in his expedition against the pirates of Tangier. On the recommendation of the latter, he was, on their return in 1684, appointed chaplain to Charles II, and knew how to maintain the dignity of his office unspotted in the midst of that monarch's licentious court. It is said that once, as the king was on a visit to Winchester, Ken refused to receive the favorite, Eleonora Gwynn, into his house; the king, however, praised highly the dignity of the prelate's character instead of resenting this refusal, and only remarked, "Mistress Gwynn will find other lodgings." In the very same year (1684) Ken was promoted to the bishopric of Bath and Wells. During the reign of James II, when the Church of England seemed threatened with inroads from the papacy, bishop Ken stood forth one of the most zealous guardians of the national Church, stoutly opposing any attempts to introduce popery into Great Britain. He did not, indeed, take an active part in the famous popish controversy which agitated the reign of king James II so briskly, but he was far from being unmindful of the

danger, and while others worked by their pen, he as actively labored in the pulpit, and boldly took every occasion to refute the errors of Romanism; nor did he hesitate, when the danger of the hour seemed to require it, to set before the royal court its injurious and unmanly politics in ecclesiastical affairs. Some have asserted that bishop Ken was at one time won over to the papal side, either at this time or later in life, but against this assertion speaks his decided stand in 1688, when he protested energetically against the Edict of Tolerance, and his refusal, when the Declaration of Indulgence was strictly commanded to be read, by virtue of a dispensing power claimed by the king, to comply with the demand of his king. Bishop Ken was one of the seven bishops who signed a petition to the king protesting against the act, and who were imprisoned in the Tower for their insubordination. After the Revolution, however, he proved his steadfastness to his royal master by his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William of Orange, and thereby lost his bishopric. Even his political adversaries, however, could not but respect such conduct, and queen Mary, whose chaplain he had been, provided for him by pension. He retired to Longleate, in Wiltshire, and there died, March 19, 1711. Ken was an eminently pious man, and possessed great learning and talents. While in the bishopric he published an *Exposition of the Church Catechism* (Lond. 1686, 8vo), and *Prayers for the Use of Bath and Wells* (Lond. 1686, 12mo, and often). Later he composed a *Manual of Prayers* (Lond. 1712, 12mo):—*Exposition of the Creed* (Lond. 1852, 12mo), etc. He also wrote much poetry, which remains popular to this day. His works were first published at London in 1721, in 4 vols. 8vo; also *Prose Works* (London, 1838, 8vo). See W. L. Bowles, *Life of Thomas Ken* (Lond. 1830–31, 2 vols. 8vo); *Life of Thomas Ken, by a Layman* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Hawkins, *Life of Ken* (1713); Duyckinck, *Life of Bishop Thomas Ken* (N. Y. 1859); Burnet, *Own Times; Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxxiv; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of the Engl. Church of the Restoration* (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 87, 97, 141 sq., 278, 469; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1713; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s. v.; Strickland (Agnes), *Lives of the Seven Bishops* (Lond. 1866, 12mo), p. 234 sq. (J. H. W.)

Ke'nan (1 Chron. i, 2). See CAINAN.

Ke'nath (Heb. *Kenath'*, קְנָת, *possession;* Sept. Κανάθ), a city of Gilead, captured, with its environs, from the Canaanites by Nobah (apparently an associate or relative of Jair), and afterwards called by his name (Numb. xxxiii, 42; compare Judg. viii, 11); although in the parallel passage (1 Chron. ii, 23) the capture seems not to be distinguished from the exploits of Jair himself, a circumstance that may aid to explain the apparent discrepancy in the number of villages ascribed to the latter. See JAIR. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) call it *Kanatha* (Καναθά), and reckon it as a part of Arabia (Trachonitis). It is probably the *Canatha* (Κάναθα) mentioned by Ptolemy (v, 15, and 23) as a city of the Decapolis (v, 16), and also by Josephus (*War*, i, 19, 2) as being situated in Cœle-Syria. In the time of the latter it was inhabited by Arabians, who defeated the troops led against them by Herod the Great. In the Peutinger Tables it is placed on the road leading from Damascus to Bostra, twenty miles from the latter (Reland, *Pal.* p. 421). It became the seat of a bishopric in the 5th century (*id.* p. 682). All these notices indicate some locality in the Hauran (Auranitis) (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 681), where Burckhardt found, two miles northeast of Suweidah, the ruins of a place called *Kunawat* (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 83–6), doubtless the same mentioned by Rev. E. Smith (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 157) in the Jebel Hauran (see also Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 223). This situation, it is true, is rather distant north-easterly for Kenath, which lay not far beyond Jogbehah (Judg. viii, 11), and within the territory of Manasseh (Numb. xxxiii, 39–42), but the boundaries of the tribe in this direction seem to have been quite indefinite. See MANASSEH, EAST. The suggestion that *Kenawât* was Kenath seems, however, to have been first made by Gesenius in his notes to Burckhardt (A.D. 1823, p. 505). Another Kenawat is marked on Van de Velde's map about ten miles farther to the west. The former place was visited by Porter (*Damascus*, ii, 87–115), who describes it as "beautifully situated in the midst of oak forests, on the western declivities of the mountains of Bashan, twenty miles north of Bozrah. The ruins, which cover a space a mile long and half a mile wide, are among the finest and most interesting east of the Jordan. They consist of temples, palaces, theatres, towers, and a hippodrome of the Roman age; one or two churches of early Christian times, and a great number of massive private houses, with stone roofs and stone doors, which were probably built by the ancient Rephaim. The city walls are in some places nearly perfect. In front of one of the most beautiful of the temples is a colossal head of Ashteroth, a deity which seems to have been worshipped here before the time of Abraham, as one of the chief cities of Bashan was then called Ashteroth-Karnaim (Gen. xiv, 5). Kunawât is now occupied by a few families of Druses, who find a home in the old houses" (*Handbook for Palest.* p. 512 sq.; comp. Ritter, *Pal. and Syr.* ii, 931–939; Buckingham, *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, p. 240).

Ke'naz (Heb. *Kenaz'*, קְנַז, *hunter;* Sept. Κενέζ, but in 1 Chron. i, 36 v. r. Κεζέζ), the name of three or four men.

1. The last named of the sons of Eliphaz, Esau's firstborn; he became the chieftain of one of the petty Edomitish tribes of Arabia Petræa (Gen. xxxvi, 11, 15; 1 Chron. i, 36). B.C. post 1905. "The descendants of Esau did not settle within the limits of Edom. The Ituræans migrated northward to the borders of Damascus; Amalek settled in the desert between Egypt and Palestine; Teman went westward into Arabia. We are justified, therefore, in inferring that Kenaz also may have led his family and followers to a distance from Mount Seir. Forster maintains (*Geography of Arabia*, ii, 43) that the tribe of Kenaz, or Al-Kenaz with the Arabic article prefixed, are identical with the *Lækeni* or *Læeni* of Ptolemy, a tribe dwelling near the shores of the Persian Gulf (*Geog.* vi, 7), and these he would further identify with the Ænezes (properly *Anezeh*), the largest and most powerful tribe of Bedawîn in Arabia. It is possible that the Hebrew *Koph* may have been changed into the Arabic *Ain;* in other respects the names are identical. The Ænezes cover the desert from the Euphrates to Syria, and from Aleppo on the north to the mountains of Nejd on the south. It is said that they can bring into the field 10,000 horsemen and 90,000 camel-riders, and they are lords of a district some 40,000 square miles in area (Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*, 1 sq.; Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palest.* p. 536 sq.)" (Kitto). See KENIZZITE.

2. Successor of Pinon, and predecessor of Teman among the later Edomitish emirs ("dukes"), who appear to have been contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen. xxxvi, 42; 1 Chron. i, 53). B.C. considerably ante 1658. See ESAU.

3. The younger brother of Caleb and father of Othniel (afterwards judge), who married Caleb's daughter (Josh. xv, 17; Judg. i, 13); he had also another son, Seraiah (1 Chron. iv, 13). B.C. post 1698. On account of this double relationship Caleb is sometimes called a KENEZITE (Numb. xxxiii, 12; Josh. xiv, 6, 14), whence some have maintained that he was the son rather than brother of Kenaz.

4. Son of Elah, and grandson of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 15, where the margin understands "even Kenaz," קְנַז, as a proper name, *Uknaz*). B.C. post 1618.

Kendal, Samuel, a Congregational minister, was born at Sherburne, Mass., July 11, 1753, of humble parentage. Young Kendal labored hard to secure for himself the advantages of a thorough education, with a view to entering the ministry. When about ready to go to college the Revolution broke out, and he entered the army. He finally went to Cambridge University when 25 years old, and graduated in 1782; studied theology under the shadow of the same institution, and settled over the Congregational Church at Weston, Mass., as an ordained pastor, Nov. 5, 1783. In 1806 Yale College conferred the degree of D.D. on Mr. Kendal. He died Feb. 15, 1814. He published many of his *Sermons* (from 1793–1813). Dr. Kendal "stood high among the clergy of his day, and was . . . an acceptable preacher." Of his religious opinions, Dr. James Kendal says (in Sprague, *Annals*, viii, 180), "he was classed with those who are denominated 'liberal,' and was probably an Arian, though I think he was little disposed either to converse or to preach on controversial subjects."

Kendall, George (1), D.D., an English Calvinistic divine, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was prebend of Exeter and rector of Blisland, Cornwall, at the Restoration, when, on account of nonconformity, he was ejected. He died in 1663. He is noted as the author of an able treatise on the Calvinistic faith, entitled *Vindication of the Doctrine of Predestination* (Lond. 1653, fol.). Another noted work is his reply to John Goodwin, *Defence of the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints* (1654, fol.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Amer. and Engl. Authors*, ii, s. v.

Kendall, George (2), a Methodist minister, was born about the year 1815, was converted at the age of 16, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1845 he joined the Southern Church. He was licensed to preach about 1858, and upon the reorganization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Georgia after the war, he was among the first to return to the Northern Church. He was ordained deacon by bishop Clark at Murfreesborough, Tenn., and continued to labor as a missionary among his people until the organization of this Conference, when he was received on trial and appointed to Clayton Circuit. In 1868 he was appointed to Clark Chapel, Atlanta, and in 1869 and 1870 to White Water Circuit. He died there April 12, 1871. His dying words, "The gates are open and I must go," give assurance that he passed away as one of the fathers, after a useful and happy life, to the rest that remaineth to the people of God.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1871, p. 278.

Kendall, John, a prominent Quaker, was born in Colchester, England, in 1726; entered the ministry when 21 years old, and in 1750 accompanied Daniel Stanton on a religious visit through the northern parts of England. He was active in the work for over sixty years, and encouraged many "to the exercise both of civil and religious duties." He died Jan. 27, 1815.—Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, iv, 44 sq.

Kendrick, Bennett, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was a native of Mecklenburg Co., Va.; entered the itinerancy in 1789; was stationed at Wilmington in 1802; at Charleston in 1803–4; at Columbia in 1805; presiding elder on Camden District in 1807, and died April 5 of that year. The date of his birth is not given, but he died young. He was a man of much gravity, piety, and intelligence, and was a studious and skilful preacher of the Word. His ministry was very useful, and his early death was a loss to his Conference and the Church.—*Min. of Conferences*, i, 156. (G. L. T.)

Kendrick, Clark, a Baptist minister, was born in Hanover, N. H., Oct. 6, 1775. After teaching school for a time, he finally turned his attention to preaching, and became pastor of the Baptist Church at Poultney, Vt., where he was ordained, May 20, 1802. He had in 1810 been appointed a delegate to the Vermont Association, of which he remained a member all his life. He also made several missionary tours, aside from his regular pastoral duties. Mr. Kendrick had early interested himself in the subject of foreign missions, and when, in 1813, the Baptist General Convention for the Promotion of Missions was established, he immediately advocated an auxiliary in his own state, and it was formed. He was elected first vice-president, and in 1817 became its corresponding secretary, which office he held until his death. In 1819 he received the honorary degree of M.A. from the Middlebury College. He was chiefly instrumental in forming the Baptist Education Society of the State of Vermont, of which he was chosen president, and afterwards appointed agent. In this connection he co-operated with the Baptists of Central and Western New York for the benefit of Madison University, Hamilton. He died Feb. 29, 1824. Mr. Kendrick published a pamphlet entitled *Plain Dealing with the Pedo-Baptists*, etc., and some occasional *Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 379.

Kendrick, Nathaniel, D.D., a Baptist minister of note, was born in Hanover, N. H., April 22, 1777. His early education was limited, and he was at first engaged in agricultural pursuits. Having joined the Baptist Church in 1798, he felt called to preach, and, after studying with that view, was licensed in the spring of 1803. He supplied for about a year the Baptist society in Bellingham, Mass.; was ordained pastor of the church at Lansingburgh, N. Y., in Aug., 1805; and from thence removed in 1810 to Middlebury, Vt. In 1817 he became pastor of the churches of Eaton, N. Y., and in 1822 he was elected professor of theology and moral philosophy in Madison University, N. Y., with which institution he remained connected until his death, Sept. 11, 1848. In 1823 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1825 one of the overseers of Hamilton College. Dr. Kendrick published two or three occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 482; Appleton, *American Cyclopædia*, x, 185.

Ken'ezite (Numb. xxxii, 12; Josh. xiv, 6, 14). See Kenizzite.

Ken'ite [some *Ke'nite*] (קֵינִי, *Keyni'*, prob. from קִין, to *work* in iron, Gen. xv, 19; Numb. xxiv, 21; Judg. i, 16; iv, 11, 17; v, 24; 1 Sam. xv, 6; xxx, 29; written also קֵנִי, *Keni'*, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10; and plural, קֵינִים, *Kinim'*, 1 Chron. ii, 55; Sept. Κεναῖοι, Gen. xv, 19; Κεναῖος, Numb. xxiv, 21; Judg. iv, 11, 17; Κιναῖοι, 1 Chron. ii, 55; Κιναῖος, Judg. i, 16; v, 24; 1 Sam. xv, 6; Κενί v. r. Κενεζί, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10; xxx, 29; Vulg. *Cinæi*, Gen. xv, 19; 1 Chron. ii, 55; *Cinæus*, Numb. xxiv, 21; Judg. i, 16; iv, 11, 17; v, 24; 1 Sam. xv, 6; *Ceni*, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10; xxx, 29; Auth. Vers. "Kenites," Gen. xv, 19; Numb. xxiv, 21; Judg. iv, 11; 1 Sam. xv, 6; xxvii, 10; xxx, 29; 1 Chron. ii, 55; "Kenite," Judg. i, 16; iv, 17; v, 24; sometimes written קַיִן, *Ka'yin*, Numb. xxiv, 22, Septuag. *νοσσιὰ πανουργίας*, Vulg. *Cin*, Auth. Vers. "Kenite; Judg. iv, 11, last clause, Sept. Κενᾶ, Vulg. *Cinæi*, Auth. Vers. "Kenites"), a collective name for a tribe of people who originally inhabited the rocky and desert region lying between Southern Palestine and the mountains of Sinai adjoining—and even partly intermingling with—the Amalekites (Numb. xxiv, 21; 1 Sam. xv, 6). In the time of Abraham they possessed a part of that country which the Lord promised to him (Gen. xv, 19), and which extended from Egypt to the Euphrates (verse 18). At the Exodus the Kenites pastured their flocks round Sinai and Horeb. Jethro, Moses's father-in-law, was a Kenite (Judg. i, 16); and it was when Moses kept his flocks on the heights of Horeb that the Lord appeared to him in the burning bush (Exod. iii, 1, 2). Now Jethro is said to have been "priest of *Midian*" (ver. 1), and a "Midianite" (Numb. x, 29); hence we conclude that the Midianites and Kenites were identical. It seems, however, that there were two distinct tribes of Midianites, one descended from Abraham's son by Keturah (Gen. xxv, 2), and the other an older Arabian tribe. See Midianite. If this

be so, then the Kenites were the older tribe. They were nomads, and roamed over the country on the northern border of the Sinai peninsula, and along the eastern shores of the Gulf of Akabah. This region agrees well with the prophetic description of Balaam: "And he looked on the Kenites, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest (קֵן, *ken*, alluding to their name) in a rock" (Numb. xxiv, 21). The wild and rocky mountains along the west side of the valley of Arabah, and on both shores of the Gulf of Akabah, were the home of the Kenites. The connection of Moses with the Kenites, and the friendship shown by that tribe to the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness, had an important influence upon their after history. Moses invited Jethro to accompany him to Palestine; he declined (Numb. x, 29–32), but a portion of the tribe afterwards joined the Israelites, and had assigned to them a region on the southern border of Judah, such as fitted a nomad people (Judg. i, 16). There they had the Israelites on the one side, and the Amalekites on the other, occupying a position similar to that of the Tartar tribes in Persia at the present day. One family of them, separating themselves from their brethren in the south, migrated away to Northern Palestine, and pitched their tents beneath the oak-trees on the upland grassy plains of Kedesh-Naphtali (Judg. iv, 11, where we should translate: "And Heber the Kenite had severed himself from Kain of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, and pitched," etc.). It was here that Jael, the wife of Heber, their chief, slew Sisera, who had sought refuge in her tent (verse 17–21). It would appear from the narrative that while the Kenites preserved their old friendly intercourse with the Israelites, they were also at peace with the enemies of Israel —with the Canaanites in the north and the Amalekites in the south. When Saul marched against the Amalekites, he warned the Kenites to separate themselves from them, for, he said, "Ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt" (1 Sam. xv, 6). The Kenites still retained their possessions in the south of Judah during the time of David, who made a similar exemption in their case in his feigned attack (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; compare xxx, 20), but we hear no more of them in Scripture history. If it be necessary to look for a literal "fulfilment" of the sentence of Balaam (Numb. xxiv, 22), we shall best find it in the accounts of the latter days of Jerusalem under Jehoiakim, when the Kenite Rechabites were so far "wasted" by the invading army of Assyria as to be driven to take refuge within the walls of the city, a step to which we may be sure nothing short of actual extremity could have forced these Children of the Desert. Whether "Asshur carried them away captive" with the other inhabitants we are not told, but it is at least probable.

Josephus gives the name Κενεσίδες (*Ant.* v, 5, 4); but in his notice of Saul's expedition (vi, 7, 3) he has τὸ τῶν Σικιμιτῶν ἔθνος—the form in which he elsewhere gives that of the Shechemites. In the Targums, instead of Kenites we find *Shalmai* (שלמאי), and the Talmudists generally represent them as an Arabian tribe (Lightfoot, *Opera*, ii, 429; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 140). The same name is introduced in the Samarit. Vers. before "the Kenite" in Gen. xv, 19 only. Procopius describes the Kenites as holding the country about Petra and Cades (Kadesh), and bordering on the Amalekites (ad Gen. xv; see Reland, p. 81). The name has long since disappeared, but probably the old Kenites are represented by some of the nomad tribes that still pasture their flocks on the southern frontier of Palestine. The name of *Ba-Kain* (abbreviated from *Bene el-Kain*) is mentioned by Ewald (*Geschichte*, i, 337, note) as borne in comparatively modern days by one of the tribes of the desert; but little or no inference can be drawn from such similarity in names.

The most remarkable development of this people, exemplifying most completely their characteristics—their Bedouin hatred of the restraints of civilization, their fierce determination, their attachment to Israel, together with a peculiar semi-monastic austerity not observable in their earlier proceedings—is to be found in the sect of the Rechabites, instituted by Rechab, or Jonadab his son, who come prominently forward on more than one occasion in the later history. See RECHABITE. The founder of this sub-family appears to have been a certain Hammath (Auth. Vers. "Hemath"), and a singular testimony is furnished to the connection which existed between this tribe of Midianitish wanderers and the nation of Israel, by the fact that their name and descent are actually included in the genealogies of the great house of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 55). It appears that, whatever was the general condition of the Midianites, the tribe of the Kenites possessed a knowledge of the true God in the time of Jethro [see HOBAB]; and that those families which settled in Palestine did not afterwards lose that knowledge, but increased it, is clear from the passages which have been cited. See Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 192 sq.; Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 218; Ewald, *Gesch. der V. Israel*, i, 337; ii, 31; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv, 135–138; also the monographs of A. Murray, *Comm. de Kinæis* (Hamb. 1718); A. G. Kerzig, *Bibl.-hist. Abhandl. v. d. Kenitern* (Chemnitz, 1798). See MIDIANITE.

Ken'izzite (Heb. קְנִזִּי, *Kenizzi'*, patronymic from KENAZ), the appellation of two races or families.

1. (Sept. Κενεζαῖοι, Vulg. *Cenezæi*, Auth. Vers. "Kenizzites.") Dr. Wells suggests that they were the descendants of Kenaz (*Geogr.* i, 169). Mr. Forster adopts this view (*Geography of Arabia*, ii, 43), but it is clearly at variance with the scope of the Mosaic narrative. The words of the covenant made with Abraham were: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates, the Kenites, and the *Kenizzites*," etc., plainly implying that these tribes then occupied the land, whereas Kenaz, the grandson of Esau, was not born for a century and a half after the Kenizzites were thus noticed. Forster's idea that the promise to Abraham was proleptical cannot be entertained. Nothing further is known of their origin, which was probably kindred with that of the other tribes enumerated in the same connection. As the name signifies *hunter*, it may possibly be a general designation of some nomade tribe. The sacred writer gives no information as to what part of the country they inhabited, but, as they are not mentioned among the tribes of Canaan who were actually dispossessed by the Israelites (Exod. iii, 8; Josh. iii, 10; Judg. iii, 5), we may infer that the Kenizzites dwelt beyond the borders of those tribes. The whole country from Egypt to the Euphrates was promised to Abraham (Gen. xv, 18); the country divided by lot among the twelve tribes extended only from Dan to Beersheba, and consequently by far the larger portion of the "land of promise" did not then become "the land of possession," and, indeed, never was occupied by the Israelites, though the conquests of David probably extended over it. Bochart supposes that the Kenizzites had become extinct between the times of Abraham and Joshua. It is more probable that they inhabited some part of the Arabian desert on the confines of Syria to which the expeditions of Joshua did not reach (see Bochart, *Opera*, i, 307). This is the view of the Talmudists, as may be seen in the quotation from their writings given by Lightfoot (*Opera*, ii, 429).

2. (Sept. Κενεζαῖος, but διακεχωρισμένος in Numb.; Vulg. *Cenezæus*, Auth. Vers. "Kenezite.") An epithet applied to Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (Numb. xxxii, 12; Josh. xiv, 6, 14); probably designating his twofold relationship with KENAZ, 2 (see further in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xv, 138). "Ewald maintains that Caleb really belonged to the tribe of the Kenizzites, and was an adopted Israelite (*Isr. Gesch.* i, 298). Prof. Stanley (*Lectures*

on Jewish Church, i, 260) holds the same view, and regards Caleb as of *Idumæan* origin, and descended from Kenaz, Esau's grandson. But a careful study of sacred history proves that the Edomites and Israelites had many names in common; and the patronymic Kenizzite is derived from an ancestor called *Kenaz*, whose name is mentioned in Judg. i, 13, and who was perhaps Caleb's grandfather." See CALEB.

Kennaday, JOHN, D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York Nov. 3, 1800. In early life he was a printer, devoting even then, however, his leisure, as far as practicable, to literary pursuits. He was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Heman Bangs, in the John Street Methodist Episcopal Church; was licensed to exhort the year following; joined the New York Conference in 1823; was stationed on Kingston Circuit in 1823; 1825, Bloomingburgh Circuit; 1826, transferred to Philadelphia Conference, and appointed that and the following year at Patterson, N. J.; 1828–29, Newark, N. J.; 1830-31, Wilmington, Del.; 1832, Morristown, N. J.; in 1833, retransferred to New York Conference, and stationed in Brooklyn; 1835–36, preacher in charge of New York East Circuit, embracing all the churches east of Broadway; 1837–38, Newburgh, N. Y.; 1839, retransferred to Philadelphia Conference, and that and the following year stationed at Union Church, Philadelphia; 1841–42, Trinity Church, Philadelphia; 1843–44, second time to Wilmington, Del.; at the close of his pastoral term the Church was divided peacefully, and a new Church organized, called St. Paul's, and for the two following years Dr. Kennaday was its pastor; 1847–48, again pastor of Union Church, Philadelphia; 1849, Nazareth Church, in that city; 1850, transferred to New York East Conference, and that and the following year was pastor of Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1852–53, returned to Washington Street Church; 1854–55, First Church, New Haven, Conn.; 1856–57, second time to Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1858–59, third time to Washington Street Church, Brooklyn; 1860–61, reappointed to First Church, New Haven, Conn.; 1862, Hartford, Conn.; and in 1863 he was appointed presiding elder of Long Island District, which office he was administering at the time of his decease. The noticeable fact of this record is the number of times Dr. Kennaday was returned as pastor to churches that he had previously served. Of the forty years of his ministerial life, twenty-two years, or more than half, were spent in five churches. No fact better attests his long-continued popularity and his power of winning the affections of the people. "As a Christian pastor," says bishop Janes, "Dr. Kennaday was eminent in his gifts, in his attainments, and in his devotion to his sacred calling, and in the seals God gave to his ministry. In the pulpit he was clear; in the statement of his subject, abundant and most felicitous in his illustrations, and pathetic and impressive in his applications. His oratory was of a high order. . . . Out of the pulpit, the ease and elegance of his manners, the vivacity and sprightliness of his conversational powers, the tenderness of his sympathy, and the kindness of his conduct towards the afflicted and needy . . . made him a greatly beloved pastor." He died Nov. 13, 1863. —*Conference Minutes*, 1864, p. 89. (J. H. W.)

Kennedy, B. J., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bolton, Vt., Aug. 16, 1808; was converted in 1842; served the Church faithfully as a local preacher until 1860, when he joined the Erie Annual Conference, and filled with great success the pulpits at Bainbridge, Mayfield, Bedford, Twinsburgh, and Hudson successively. He died at Hudson, Ohio, Nov. 30, 1869. The chief elements of Kennedy's power with the people were purity of life, cheerfulness, broad Christian sympathies for fallen humanity, and strong convictions of the saving efficacy of Jesus and his Gospel. He sustained a high position among the brethren of his Conference.—*Christian Advocate* (N. Y.), 1870.

Kennedy, James, a Scotch prelate, grandson, by his mother, of Robert III of Scotland, was born in 1405 (?). After studying at home, he was sent to the Continent to finish his education, entered the Church, and as early as in 1437 became bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1440 exchanged for the more important see of St. Andrew. He next made a journey to Florence, to lay before pope Eugenius IV the plan of the reforms he intended introducing in the administration of his diocese. On his return (1444) he was made lord chancellor, and as such took an active part in the affairs of Scotland. Pained at witnessing the discords which marked the first years of the reign of James II, he again applied to the pope for advice; but the latter's intervention, which he thought would restore peace, did not have this result. During the minority of James III he sat in the council of the regency, and, according to Buchanan, used his influence there for the public good. He died at St. Andrew, May 10, 1466. Kennedy founded and endowed the college of San Salvador, which afterwards became the University of St. Andrew. He is reputed to have written a work entitled *Monita Politica*, and also a history of his times, both of which are probably lost. See Mackenzie, *Lives;* Crawford, *Lives of Statesmen;* Buchanan, *History of Scotland;* Chambers, *Illustrious Scotsmen;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 560. (J. N. P.)

Kennedy, John, an English divine, who flourished about the middle of the 18th century (he died about 1770), rector of Bradley, Derbyshire, is noted for his works on Scripture chronology, of which the following are best known: *Complete System of Astronomical Chronology unfolding the Scriptures* (London, 1762, 4to): this work Kennedy dedicated to the king, and the dedication was composed by Dr. Samuel Johnson:—*Explanation and Proof of ditto* (1774, 8vo), addressed to James Ferguson.—Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Kennedy, Samuel, M.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland in 1720, and educated in the University of Edinburgh. On coming to America he was received by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and licensed by them in 1750. The following year he was ordained, and installed over the congregations of Basking Ridge, New Jersey, where he was principal of a classical school which acquired considerable celebrity. In 1760 he rendered his name conspicuous in behalf of an Episcopal clergyman by his connection with the ludicrous proclamation, "*Eighteen Presb. Minis. for a groat.*" He was not only a minister and a teacher, but a physician, and practiced medicine with no small reputation in his own congregation. He died August 31, 1787.—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 175.

Kennedy, William Megee, an early Methodist minister, was born in 1783, in that part of North Carolina which was ceded to Tennessee in 1790. He lived some years in South Carolina, and afterwards settled in Bullock County, Ga. In 1803 he was brought into the Church under the ministry of Hope Hull; joined the South Carolina Conference in 1805, and filled its most important appointments for more than thirty years, half of the time as presiding elder. In 1839 he was struck with apoplexy, and was consequently returned as superannuate, but he still continued to labor until his death in 1840. He was lamented as one of the noblest men of Southern Methodism. Kennedy had a peculiarly well-balanced mind. His counsel was prudent and sagacious; he formed his opinions deliberately, and such was his discretion that, in the various responsible relations he sustained to the Church, it is questionable whether a single instance of rashness could be justly charged upon him. His piety unaffected, his intercourse with the people affectionate, his preaching faithful, earnest, and successful, he was a very popular preacher. He was successively at Charleston (in 1809, 1810, 1820, 1821, 1834, and 1835), Camden (1818), Wilmington, N. C. (1819), Augusta, Ga. (1826–27), Columbia, S. C. (1828–

29, 1836–37). See Summers, *Sketches*, p. 131; Stevens, *History of the M. E. Church*, iv, 205. (J. L. S.)

Kennedy, William Sloane, a Presbyterian minister (N. S.), was born in Muncy, Pa., June 3, 1822; graduated at Western Reserve College in 1846; was licensed by the Cleveland Presbytery in 1848, and soon after installed pastor of the Congregational Church in Bucksville, Ohio. Here he labored earnestly for four years. In 1852 he accepted a call to Sandusky, Ohio, where he ministered with great success until his removal to Cincinnati in 1859. His work there seemed to promise well, his congregations increased, and his influence was strong; but in the spring of 1860 his health began to fail, and for fourteen months he struggled against disease, preaching even the Sabbath before his death. He died July 30, 1861. He was a thorough scholar, a profound theologian, and an instructive and impressive preacher. He wrote *Messianic Prophecies:*—a *History of the Plan of Union:*—*Life of Christ;* and *Sacred Analogies.*—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862.

Kennerly, Philip, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Augusta Co., Va., Oct. 18, 1769; converted in 1786; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1804; and in 1806, on account of ulcerated throat, located and settled in Logan Co., Ky. In June, 1821, he re-entered the itinerancy in the Kentucky Conference, but died on the 5th of the ensuing October. "But his work was done, his temporalities well adjusted, his slaves emancipated, and his sun went down without a cloud." During his long location his labors were "very extensive and useful." "He was a good preacher, full of faith and of the spirit of Christ."—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 399.

Kennet, Basil, an English divine of note, younger brother of the following, was born Oct. 21, 1674, at Postling, in Kent; entered Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1690; took the master's degree in 1696, and the year following entered the ministry. In 1706 he was, by the interest of his brother, appointed chaplain to the English factory at Leghorn, where he no sooner arrived than he met with great opposition from the papists, and was in danger of the Inquisition. This establishment of a Church of England chaplain was a new thing; and the Italians were so jealous of the Northern heresy that, to give as little offence as possible, he performed the duties of his office with the utmost privacy and caution. But, notwithstanding this, great offence was taken at it, and complaints were immediately sent to Florence and Rome, when both the pope and the court of Inquisition declared their resolution to expel heresy and the public teacher of it from the confines of the holy see, and secret orders were given to apprehend and hurry him away to Pisa, and thence to some other religious prison, to bury him alive, or otherwise dispose of him in the severest manner. Upon notice of this design, Dr. Newton, the English envoy at Florence, interposed his offices at that court, where he could obtain no other answer but that "he might send for the English preacher, and keep him in his own family as his domestic chaplain; otherwise, if he presumed to continue at Leghorn, he must take the consequences of it, for, in those matters of religion, the court of Inquisition was superior to all civil powers." When the earl of Sunderland, then secretary of state, was informed of this state of affairs, he sent a menacing letter by her majesty's command, and the chaplain was permitted to continue to officiate in safety (*Life of Bishop Kennet*, p. 53 sq.). In 1713 Kennet's failing health obliged him to quit Leghorn, and he returned to Oxford, to be elected only the year following president of his college. He died, however, shortly after, either towards the close of 1714 or the opening of 1715. He wrote in the theological department an *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed:*—*Paraphrase on the Psalms*, in verse (1706, 8vo); and published shortly before his death a volume of *Sermons on several Occasions* (Lond. 1715, 8vo). He also furnished English translations of, 1. Puffendorf's *Law of Nature and Nations:*—2. Placette's *Christian Casuist:*—3. Godeau's *Pastoral Instructions:*—4. Pascal's *Thoughts on Religion*, to which he prefixed an account of the manner in which those thoughts were delivered by the author:—5. Balzac's *Aristippus*, with an account of his life and writings:—6. *The Marriage of Thames and Isis*, from a Latin poem of Mr. Camden. Dr. Basil Kennet is said to have been a very amiable man, of exemplary integrity, generosity, and modesty. See Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; *Gen. Dictionary;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 433. (J. H. W.)

Kennet, White, D.D., an eminent English prelate and writer, was born at Dover Aug. 10, 1660. He studied at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and while there attracted attention by publishing in 1680 a pamphlet against the Whig party, entitled *Letter from a Student at Oxford to a Friend in the Country, in Vindication of his Majesty, the Church of England, and the University.* Through the influence of sir William Glynne he was appointed vicar of Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, in 1684, and obtained a prebend in the church of Peterborough, but returned to Oxford, where he became vice-principal of Edmund Hall, the college to which Hearne belonged. He was decidedly opposed to the concessions in 1688, and was of the number in the Oxford diocese who refused to read the declaration for liberty of conscience. He subsequently (1700) resigned Ambrosden, and settled in London as minister of St. Botolph's, Aldgate, where he became a very popular preacher. He was made successively archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1701, and in 1707 dean of Peterborough, and finally, in 1718, bishop of Peterborough. He died Dec. 19, 1728. Bishop Kennet was a man, as his biographer says, "of incredible diligence and application, not only in his youth, but to the very last, the whole disposal of himself being to perpetual industry and service, his chiefest recreation being variety of employment." His published works are, according to his biographer's statement, fifty-seven in number, including several single sermons and small tracts; but perhaps not a less striking proof of the indefatigable industry ascribed to him is to be seen in his manuscript collections, mostly in his own hand, now in the Lansdowne department of the British Museum Library of Manuscripts, where from No. 935 to 1042 are all his, and most of them containing matter not incorporated in any of his printed works. The principal among the latter are: *Parochial Antiquities attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester*, etc. (Oxford, 1695, 4to; 1818, 4to):—*Ecclesiast. Synods*, etc., *of the Church of England vindicated from the Misrepresentations*, etc. (Lond. 1701, 8vo):—*An occasional Letter on the Subject of English Convocations* (Lond. 1701, 8vo), and a number of occasional letters and sermons:—*Monitions and Advices delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Peterborough*, etc. (London, 1720, 4to):—*On Lay Impropriations* (see below):—*Complete History of England* (Lond. 1719, 3 vols. fol.), etc. Bishop Kennet, in 1713, had made a large collection of books, maps, etc., with intent to write *A full History of the Propagation of Christianity in the English American Colonies*, but, for some reason unknown to us, the plan was never executed. It is to be regretted that the bishop failed to carry out the project; to judge from vol. iii of the History of England which he prepared, the contribution would have been valuable to American Church history. In 1850, S. F. Wood and Ed. Baddeley published from bishop Kennet's MSS. his *Lay Impropriations* (Lond. 12mo). See William Newton, *Life of the Right Rev. Dr. White Kennet* (London, 1730, 8vo); Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 563; *English Cyclopædia;* Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Kenney, Pardon T., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Bedford, Mass., Sept. 5, 1810. He embraced religion at the tender age of seven, but gradually became indifferent to its personal enjoyment until his nineteenth year, when he was restored to the di-

vine favor. He was licensed to preach in 1830; entered Wilbraham Academy, and in 1832 Middletown University. In 1833 he joined the New England Conference, was appointed to Thompson Circuit; 1834, Hebron; 1835, East Windsor; 1836, Mystic; 1837, North Norwich; 1838–39, Chicopee Falls; 1840–41, Willimantic; 1842, located; 1844, readmitted and sent to Manchester; 1845–46, Mystic Bridge; 1847, Westerly Mission; 1848, Falmouth; 1849, East Harwich; 1850–51, Provincetown Centre; 1852–55, Sandwich District; 1856–57, North Manchester; 1858–59, Stafford Springs; 1860–61, Allen Street, New Bedford; 1862–65, Sandwich District; 1866–68, New London District. In 1869 he removed to Nebraska City, Neb., and started a school, with the prospect of its becoming a Conference Seminary, but died shortly after, Nov. 11, 1869. As a preacher, he was eminently practical, lucid, fervent, and spiritual, and his labors were attended with success. As a presiding elder, his executive ability gave general satisfaction.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1871, p. 72.

Kennicott, Benjamin, D.D., one of the most eminent Biblical scholars, was born of humble parents at Totness, in Devonshire, England, Apr. 4, 1718. At quite a youthful age he succeeded his father as master of a charity school in his native place, and here continued until 1744, when, having previously given proof of possessing superior talents, he was, through the kindness of several gentlemen in the neighborhood who interested themselves in his behalf, and opened a subscription to defray his educational expenses, enabled to go to the University of Oxford. He entered at Wadham College, and applied himself to the study of divinity and Hebrew with great diligence, and while yet an undergraduate published *Two Dissertations:* 1. *On the Tree of Life in Paradise, with some Observations on the Fall of Man;* 2. *On the Oblations of Cain and Abel* (Oxf. 8vo), which came to a second edition in 1747, and procured him, free of expense, the distinguished honor of a bachelor's degree, even before the statute time. Shortly afterwards he was elected fellow of Exeter College, and in 1750 took his degree of M.A. By the publication of several sermons at this time he acquired additional fame, but his great name is due to his elaborate researches for the improvement of the text of the Hebrew Bible, for which he laid the foundation in 1753. It was in this year that he inaugurated his great undertaking by giving to the public the first volume of his dissertations, entitled *The State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the O. T. considered* (Oxford, 1753–1759, 2 vols. 8vo). In this work he evinces the necessity of the undertaking upon which he had set his heart by refuting the popular notion of the "absolute integrity" of the Hebrew text. In the first volume he institutes a comparison of 1 Chron. xi with 2 Sam. v and xxiii, followed by observations on seventy Hebrew MSS., and maintains that numerous mistakes and interpolations disfigure the sacred Scriptures of the O. T.; in the second volume he vindicates the Samaritan Pentateuch, proves the corruption of the printed copies of the Chaldee paraphrase (the accordance of which with the text of the O. T. was boasted of as evincing the purity of the latter), gives an account of the Hebrew MSS. supposed at his day to have been extant, and closes with the proposition to institute a collation of existing Hebrew MSS. for the purpose of securing a correct edition of the O.-T. Scriptures in the original; extending a very hearty invitation for assistance to the Jews also. This undertaking, as we might naturally expect, met with much opposition both in England and on the Continent. It was feared by many that such a collation might overturn the received reading of various important passages, and introduce uncertainty into the whole system of Biblical interpretation. The plan was, however, warmly patronized by the majority of the English clergy; and when, in 1760, he issued his proposals for collecting all the Hebrew MSS. prior to the invention of the art of printing that could be found in Great Britain or in foreign countries, the utility of the proposed collation was very generally admitted, and a subscription to defray the expense of it, amounting to nearly ten thousand pounds, was quickly made. Various persons were employed, both at home and abroad; among foreign literati the principal was professor Bruns, of the University of Helmstadt, who not only collated Hebrew MSS. in Germany, but went for that purpose into Switzerland and Italy. In consequence of these efforts, more than *six hundred* Hebrew MSS., and *sixteen* MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch, were discovered in different libraries in England and on the Continent, many of which were wholly collated, and others consulted in important passages. To this collation of MSS. was also added a collation of the most noted printed editions of the Bible, including those edited by the Rabbins, whose annotations, as well as the Talmud itself, were frequently consulted by the learned Kennicott. The collation continued from 1760 to 1769, during which period an account of the progress making was annually published. At length, after sixteen years of unmitigated industry, appeared the first, and four years later the second volume of Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible—*Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis Lectionibus* (Oxonii, 1776, 1780, 2 vols. fol.). Though the number of various readings was found to be very great, yet they were neither so numerous nor by any means so important as those that are contained in Griesbach's edition of the New Testament. But this is easily accounted for from the revision of the Hebrew text by the Masorites in the 7th and 8th centuries, and from the scrupulous fidelity with which the Jews have transcribed the same text from that time. "The text of Kennicott's edition," says Marsh (*Divinity Lectures*, pt. ii), "was printed from that of Van der Hooght, with which the Hebrew manuscripts, by Kennicott's direction, were all collated. But as variations in the points were disregarded in the collation, the points were not added in the text. The various readings, as in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, were printed at the bottom of the page, with references to the corresponding readings of the text. In the Pentateuch the variations of the Samaritan text were printed in a column parallel to the Hebrew; and the variations observable in the Samaritan manuscripts, which differ from each other as well as the Hebrew, are likewise noted, with references to the Samaritan *printed* text. To this collation of manuscripts was added a collation of the most distinguished editions of the Hebrew Bible, in the same manner as Wetstein has noticed the variations observable in the principal editions of the Greek Testament. Nor did Kennicott confine his collation to manuscripts and editions. He further considered that as the quotations from the Greek Testament in the works of ecclesiastical writers afford another source of various readings, so the quotations from the Hebrew Bible in the works of Jewish writers are likewise subjects of critical inquiry." To the second volume Kennicott added a *Dissertatio Generalis*, in which an account is given of the manuscripts and other authorities collated for the work, and also a history of the Hebrew text from the time of the Babylonian captivity. This dissertation, which the best Biblical scholars regard as able and valuable, was reprinted at Brunswick, Germany, in 1783, under the superintendence of professor Bruns. The faults attaching to this great work of Dr. Kennicott are thus summarized by Dr. Davidson (*Biblical Crit.* 2d edit., p. 154 sq.): "He (i. e. Kennicott) neglected the *Masorah* (q. v.) as if it were wholly worthless. In specifying his sources, he is not always consistent or uniform in his method. Some MSS. are only partially examined. Neither was he very accurate in extracting various readings from his copies. Where several letters are wanting in MSS. there is no remark indicating whether the defect should be remedied, and how. The MSS. corrected by a different hand are rejected without reason. Old synagogue MSS. are neglected, though they would have contributed to the value of the various readings.

Van der Hooght's text is not accurately given, since the marginal *keris*, the vowel points, and the accents, have been left out. The Samaritan text should have been given in Samaritan letters, that readers might see the origin of many of the various readings. The edition wants extracts from ancient versions, which is a serious defect. His principles or rules for judging Hebrew MSS., and determining the age, quality, or value, are defective. In applying his copious materials he often errs. He proceeds too much on the assumption that the Masoretic text is corrupt where it differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch and ancient versions, and therefore sets about reforming it where it is authentic and genuine. Yet," Dr. Davidson continues, "there can be no doubt that Kennicott was a most laborious editor. To him belongs the great merit of bringing together a large mass of critical materials. The task of furnishing such an apparatus, drawn from so many sources, scattered through the libraries of many lands, was almost Herculean, and the learned author is entitled to all the praise for its accomplishment." An important Supplement to Kennicott's Hebrew Bible was published by De Rossi, under the title of *Variæ Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (Parma, 1784–88, 4 vols. 4to, with an Appendix in 1798). The works of Kennicott and De Rossi are, however, too bulky and expensive for general use. An edition of the Hebrew Bible, containing the most important of the various readings in Kennicott's and De Rossi's volumes, was published by Döderlein and Meissner, Leipz. 1793; but the text is incorrectly printed, and the paper is exceedingly bad. A far more correct and elegant edition of the Hebrew Bible, which also contains the most important of Kennicott's and De Rossi's various readings, is that of Jahn (Vienna, 1806, 4 vols. 8vo). Dr. Kennicott, during the progress of this work, resided at Oxford, where he was librarian of the Radcliffe Library after 1767, and canon of Christ Church. He died there Sept. 18, 1783. Kennicott's other works are, *The Duty of Thanksgiving for Peace*, etc. (Lond. 1749, 8vo):—*A Word to the Hutchinsonians*, etc. (London, 1756, 8vo):—*Christian Fortitude: a Sermon on Rom. viii*, 35, 37 (Oxford, 1757, 8vo):—*Answer to a Letter from the Rev. T. Rutherford, D.D., F.R.S.* (London, 1762, 8vo):—*A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's Church, May* 19, 1765 (Oxf. 1765, 8vo):—*Observations on* 1 *Sam. vi*, 19 (Oxford, 1768, 8vo):—*Ten Annual Accounts of the Collation of Hebrew MSS. of the O. Test.*, 1760–1769 (Oxf. 1770, 8vo):—*Critici Sacri*, or *Short Introd. to Hebrew Criticism* (Lond. 1774, 8vo):—*Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, etc. (Oxonii, 1776–80, 2 vols. fol.):—*Dissertatio generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, etc. (Oxonii, 1780, fol.):—*Epistola ad celeberrimum professorem Joannem Davidem Michaelis, de censurâ primi tomi Bibliorum Hebraicorum nuper editi, in Bibliotheca ejus Orientali*, parte xi (Oxonii, 1777, 8vo):—*Editionis Veteris Testamenti Hebraici cum variis lectionibus brevis defensio, contra Ephemeridum Goettingensium criminationes* (Oxon. 1782, 8vo):—*The Sabbath, a Sermon* (Oxf. 1781, 8vo):—*Remarks on select Passages in the O. T., to which are added eight Sermons* (Oxford, 1787, 8vo), of which more than one hundred pages are occupied with a translation of thirty-two psalms and critical notes on the entire book. "It is worthy of the author's reputation." See Dr. Paulus, *Memorabilia*, No. i, p. 191–198; *Gentl. Magazine*, 1768; *North Amer. Review*, x, 8 sq.; Walch, *Neueste Religionsgesch.* i, 319–410; v, 401–536; Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. T.* vol. ii; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliograph.* ii, 1721; *English Cyclopædia;* Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopædia*, vol. ii, s. v.

Kennon, Robert Lewis, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Granville County, N. C., in 1789, was converted in 1801, entered the South Carolina Conference in 1809, and in 1813 was ordained elder, and located on account of ill health; then studied medicine and practiced for several years, preaching as his health permitted. In 1819 he removed from Georgia to Tuscaloosa, Ala., and continued his profession until 1824, when he re-entered the ministry in the Mississippi Conference, and was four years presiding elder on the Black Warrior District. In 1829–30 he was stationed at Tuscaloosa, in 1831–2 on Tuscaloosa District, in 1834 on the Choctaw Mission, in 1835–6 in Mobile, and in 1837 in Tuscaloosa. He died during the session of the Conference at Columbus, Miss., Jan. 9, 1838. Mr. Kennon was one of the most able and influential ministers of his time in the Southern States. His home culture in childhood was excellent, and he had a very good academical education. While studying medicine he further pursued his literary studies at the South Carolina College. Kennon numbered among his friends the foremost men of the county in all professions, and was the father and model of the Conference. He died honored and beloved by a wide circle of brethren and citizens.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 573; *Sketches of eminent Itinerant Ministers* (Nashville, 1858), p. 113. (G. L. T.)

Kenōsis (κένωσις), a Greek term signifying the act of *emptying* or self-divestiture, employed by modern German divines to express the voluntary humiliation of Christ in his incarnate state. It is borrowed from the expression of Paul, "But *made himself of no reputation* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, emptied himself)," etc. (Phil. ii, 7). The same self-abasement is indicated in other passages of Scripture; e. g. the Son laid aside the glory which he had with the Father before the world was (John xvii, 5), and became poor (2 Cor. viii, 9). This term touches the essential difficulty in the doctrine of the incarnation. That difficulty seems to consist in the supposition that the Logos *in his absolute infinitude* of being and attributes united himself in one personality with an individual created man. On the other hand, it has been alleged as an objection to the *kenosis* theory that "to assume any self-limitation on the part of God is inconsistent with the unchangeableness of the divine Being." But God's immutability is that perfection by virtue of which his will and nature remain in constant harmony. Every change must, as a matter of course, be rejected that would bring God's will or nature in conflict with each other. But any act on the part of God, affecting his existence internally or externally, that is in harmony with the divine will and being, is consistent with the divine immutability. To deny such acts on the part of God is to deny the *living God himself*. A God without a motion internally or externally would be, according to the Scriptures, a nullity, a dead God, an idol. "The very idea," says Ebrard, "of God as the living one implies the possibility of a self-limitation or change of self, of course of such a change by which God continues as God, and out of which he has at all times the power of asserting his infinitude. In the divine Being this is possible through the Trinity. As the triune God, there is in his being the possibility for him to distinguish himself from himself also in time, i. e. to receive within himself the difference between existence within time and out of time." That the Son of God can become a man without thereby destroying his true divinity even the fathers of the Church taught. Tertullian says: "God can change himself into everything and yet remain (in substance) what he is." Hilary says: "The form of God and the form of a servant can indeed not unqualifiedly become a unity; they rather exclude one another as such. But how does their union become a possibility? Answer: Only by giving up the one, the other can be assumed. But he that has emptied himself, and taken upon himself the form of a servant, is therefore not a different person. *To give up a form does not imply the destruction of its substance.* Exactly in order to prevent this destruction the act of self-emptying goes only far enough to constitute the form of a servant." Ebrard makes the fitting comparison: "If a crown prince, in order to set others free, should go for the time being into voluntary servitude, he would be, to all intents and purposes, a servant, and, as he has not forfeited his claims to the crown, also a prince, so that he could with propriety be called both

servant and a prince: in the same manner Jesus was the true and eternal God, and at the same time a true and real man; and it can be said with propriety of him, the Son of God is man, and the man Jesus Christ is God." To this is added by the author of *Die biblische Glaubenslehre* (published by the "Calwer Verein"): "The same is the case with man, who, notwithstanding the various changes of his circumstances here, and the great changes which he shall undergo in the resurrection, is still the same person. We meet even in God with a change of conditions. He rested before and after he had created the world; does not this imply a self-limitation on the part of God? And what self-limitations does not God impose upon himself with regard to human liberty! The omnipresence of God is no infinite diffusion, but has its definite starting-point; and if God is not as near to the wicked as he is to the pious, this is likewise an act of self-limitation on God's part over against the ungodly. Again, the personality of God, what else is it than a self-comprehension of the infinite? Yet in all these self-limitations God remains God. Should, then, the Son not be able to remain in substance what he is, if, out of compassion for fallen humanity, he becomes a man, and, in order to become a man, lays aside his divine glory?"

This leads us, then, to the main question, *What have we to understand by the divine glory which the Son laid aside during his sojourn on earth?* To this question the Christologians who adopt the *kenosis* return different answers. We are met here again by the old difficulty to unite the divine and the human in one self-consciousness. The question is this, Whether the self-consciousness of the God-man is the divine self-consciousness of the eternal Son, or the self-consciousness of the assumed human nature? Gess (*Gesch. d. Dogmatik*) takes the latter view, and says that, in order to do justice to the true humanity of Jesus Christ, it is necessary to consistently carry out the self-emptying act of the Logos, so that the Son of God in the act of the incarnation laid aside the divine attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, together with his divine self-consciousness, and regained the latter gradually in the way of a really human development, in such a manner as not to affect the true and real divinity of Christ. Whether a temporary laying aside of the divine self-consciousness is consistent with the immutability of the divine Being we need not discuss here. The argumentation of Gess is very acute, and may appear to the metaphysician the most consistent and satisfactory analysis of the personal union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ; but exegetically it seems to us untenable, nor is it fit for the practical edification of the Christian people, and a theology that cannot be preached intelligibly from the pulpit is justly to be suspected. We conclude with Liebner and other Christologians that by the glory which the Son of God laid aside during his sojourn on earth we must not understand his divine self-consciousness, not the fulness of the Deity, as far as it can manifest itself in a human nature. On the contrary, it is said of this very glory, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. . . . And of his fulness we all have received grace for grace." This divine fulness the Son did not give up at his incarnation, but it followed him as his peculiar property from heaven, from out of the Father's bosom, to legitimate him as the Logos, as the only begotten of the Father, yet so that he turned it into a divine-human glory, acquired in a human manner. Only the form of God, the divine form of existence, consequently the transcendent divine majesty and sovereign power over all things, united with uninterrupted glory, he exchanged, at his incarnation and during the time of his sojourn on earth, for his human form of existence, for the form of the servant. Into this his antemundane glory, however, he re-entered (John xvii, 5) on his going home to his Father (John vi, 62), also in the capacity of the exalted Son of man (Phil. ii, 9). But in every stage of his divine-human development the Son's oneness of being and of will with the Father remained, and by this very fact he was in his human teaching and conduct the express image of the invisible God, the personal revealer of him who had sent him, the Son of God in the form of human existence. According to this view, the immanent relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost did not suffer any change by the laying aside of the divine form of existence on the part of the Son, nor during the time of his existence in human form. Only according to this view also have the words of the incarnate Son of God their full force: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; if not, believe me for the very works' sake. The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works" (John xiv, 10, 11). If it be objected that the really human development of Jesus is inconsistent with or excluded by the continuance of the eternal self-consciousness of the Logos in the incarnation, we answer that this inference does not necessarily follow. There is nothing self-contradictory in the assumption that the incarnate Logos had in his one Ego a consciousness of his twofold nature. Even if we cannot explain how the Logos was conscious of himself as the eternal Son of God, and yet had this self-consciousness only in a human form, yet *the consciousness of his twofold nature* was necessary for the *mediatorial office* of the incarnate Logos; he was to know himself according to his absolute divinity and his human development; and if we suppose that of his divine self-consciousness *only so much as was necessary for his mediatorial office* passed over into his human self-consciousness, this double self-consciousness is in perfect agreement with his purely human life and with his mediatorial office. As to the divine attributes or powers that are connected with the divine self-consciousness, there is nothing self-contradictory in the supposition that the divine Ego of the Logos acted in concert with the powers of human nature, with human self-consciousness, and human volition, if we *adopt the above-mentioned relative self-limitation of the divine knowledge and will as necessary for the mediatorial office.* But even if by this view of the personal oneness of the divine and the human in Christ the metaphysical difficulty should not be fully removed, we would prefer confessing the unfathomable depth of this mystery to any philosophical solution of the problem which we could not fully reconcile with the plain teachings of the Word of God.

One of the latest and most striking presentations of this self-abnegation on the part of our Lord is that found in Henry Ward Beecher's *Life of Jesus* (i, 50), which we here transcribe, omitting its monothelitism and anthropopathy: "The divine Spirit came into the world in the person of Jesus, not bearing the attributes of Deity in their full disclosure and power. He came into the world to subject his spirit to that whole discipline and experience through which every *man* must pass. He veiled his royalty; he folded back, as it were, within himself those ineffable powers which belonged to him as a free spirit in heaven. He went into captivity to himself, wrapping in weakness and forgetfulness his divine energies while he was a babe. 'Being found in fashion as a man,' he was subject to that gradual unfolding of his buried powers which belongs to infancy and childhood. 'And the child *grew* and *waxed* strong in spirit.' He was subject to the restrictions which hold and hinder common men. He was to come back to himself little by little. Who shall say that God cannot put himself into finite conditions? Though a free spirit God cannot grow, yet as fettered in the flesh he may. Breaking out at times with amazing power in single directions, yet at other times feeling the mist of humanity resting upon his brows, he declares, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father.' This is just the experience which we should expect in a being whose problem of life was, not the dis-

closure of the full power and glory of God's natural attributes, but the manifestation of the love of God, and of the extremities of self-renunciation to which the divine heart would submit, in the rearing up of his family of children from animalism and passion. The incessant looking for the signs of divine power and of infinite attributes in the earthly life of Jesus, whose mission it was to bring the divine Spirit within the conditions of feeble humanity, is as if one should search a dethroned king in exile for his crown and his sceptre. We are not to look for a glorified, an enthroned Jesus, but for God manifest *in the flesh;* and in this view the very limitations and seeming discrepancies in a divine life become congruous parts of the whole sublime problem."

Most theologians, however, will see in this progressive development of Jesus rather the growth of the *human* faculties as shone upon by the inward sun of divine life; and in the alternate lights and shades of the Redeemer's career, not so much the vicissitudes imposed upon the enshrined Deity by the earthly abode, as the mutual play of the divine and the human natures, now one and now the other specially manifesting itself. Indeed, the theory of a somewhat *double consciousness*, if we may so express it, or at least an occasional (and in early life a prolonged) withdrawal of the divine cognitions from the human intellect, and thus of the full divine energies from the human will, seems to be required in order to meet the varying aspects under which the compound life of Jesus presents itself in the Gospels. Certainly the union of the divine Spirit with a mere human body is a heathen theophany, not a Christian incarnation. Indeed, the "*flesh*" which the Saviour assumed, in its Scripture sense, has reference to *human nature* as such, its mental and spiritual faculties not less than its physical. The problem, therefore, still is to adjust the God to the man. This, of course, can only be done by conceiving of the infinite as assuming finite relations, and this, in short, is the meaning of *Kenosis.* See HUMILIATION.

This topic became a subject of controversy in the first part of the 17th century between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen; the former (Menzer and Feuerborn) contending that Christ during his state of earthly humiliation actually *divested himself* (κένωσις proper) of omnipotence, omniscience, etc.; while the latter (Luke Osiander, Theodore Thummius, and Melchior Nicolai) maintained that he still continued to possess these divine attributes, but merely concealed them (κρύψις) from men (see Thummius, *De ταπεινωσιγραφία sacra,* Tübing. 1623; Nicolai, *De κενώσει Christi,* ib. 1622). For details of the controversy, see Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* vii, 511 sq.; xiv, 786. On the doctrine itself, see Dorner, *Doct. of the Person of Christ,* I, ii, 29; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv, 670 sq.; comp. *Bib. Repos.* July, 1867, p. 413; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July, 1861, p. 551; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1861, p. 148; April, 1870, p. 291. The treatise of Bodemeyer, *Die Lehre von der Kenosis* (Götting. 1860), is of a very vague and general character. See CHRISTOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 281, 282.

Kenrick, FRANCIS PATRICK, D.D., an American Roman Catholic prelate of great note, was born in Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 3, 1797, received a classical education in his native city, and in 1815 was sent to Rome to study divinity and philosophy. There he spent two years at the House of the Lazarists, and four years in the College of the Propaganda. He was ordained in 1821, and immediately thereafter came to the United States to assume the charge of an ecclesiastical seminary just starting at Bardstown, Ky. He soon distinguished himself as a polemic writer by his *Letters of Omicron to Omega,* written in defence of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, in reply to attacks by Dr. Blackburn, president of Danville College, Ky., under the signature of "Omega." On June 6th, 1830, at Bardstown, he was consecrated bishop of Arath *in partibus infidelium,* and made coadjutor to the right reverend bishop Connell, of Philadelphia, whom he succeeded in 1842. During his episcopate there occurred the anti-Catholic riots, and by his firmness and promptness of effort his people were prevented from retaliatory acts. In 1851 bishop Kenrick was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore. In 1852, as "apostolic delegate," he presided over the first plenary council of the United States held at Baltimore, and in 1859 the pope conferred upon him and his successors the "primacy of honor," which gives them precedence over all Roman Catholic prelates in this country. He died at Baltimore July 8, 1863. Archbishop Kenrick was regarded as one of the most learned men and theologians of his creed in this country. He is equally distinguished as a controversialist and a Biblical critic. His style is vigorous and decided. In 1837 he published a series of letters *On the Primacy of the Holy See and the Authority of General Councils,* in reply to bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, subsequently enlarged and reprinted under the title of *The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated* (4th ed., Balt. 1855); also, *Vindication of the Catholic Church* (12mo, Baltimore, 1855), in reply to Dr. Hopkins's *End of Controversy Controverted.* The works, however, which constitute his chief claim to theological eminence are his Latin treatises on dogmatic theology, *Theologia Dogmatica* (4 vols. 8vo, Phil. 1839, 1840) and *Theologia Moralis* (3 vols. 8vo, Phil. 1841–3), which form a complete course of divinity, and are used as text-books in nearly all the Romish seminaries of the United States. An enlarged edition of these works has been published both in Belgium and in this country. This contains many valuable additions, among them a catalogue of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers, with an accurate description of their genuine works. At the time of his death he was engaged in revising the English translation of the Scriptures, of which the whole of the N. T. and nearly all of the O. T. have been published. "It is illustrated by copious notes, and will probably supersede the Douay version in general use." His other works of a sectarian and controversial character are *Catholic Doctrine on Justification Explained and Vindicated* (12mo, Phil. 1841):—*Treatise on Baptism* (12mo, New York, 1843). Kenrick was distinguished both for his sagacity and moderation in counsel, "and for his indefatigable efforts in extending the power and influence of his Church." While in Philadelphia "he founded the theological seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and introduced into his diocese the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, who devote themselves to the care of Magdalen asylums." "During the period of our civil war he was unswerving in his loyalty to the Union, and never failed to inculcate obedience to the laws" in the face of the opposition of many of his people.—Allibone's *Dict. of Authors,* s. v.; Appleton's *New Amer. Cyclop.* x, 136; *Annual for* 1863, p. 561.

Kent, Asa, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in West Brookfield, Mass., May 9, 1780. In 1801 he was licensed as an exhorter, and appointed to Weathersfield Circuit, Vermont; in 1802 he joined on trial the New York Conference, and was appointed to Whitingham Circuit. The following year he became a member of the old New England Conference, and during the thirty-six years succeeding filled appointments at Barnard, Vt.; Athens, Vt.; Lunenburg, Vt.; Ashburnham, Mass.; Salisbury, Mass.; Salem, N. H.; Lynn, Mass.; Bristol, R. I.; New London, Conn.; Nantucket, R. I.; Middleborough, Rochester, Mass.; Chestnut Street, Providence, R. I.; Elm Street, New Bedford, Mass.; Newport, R. I.; Charlestown, Andover, Mass.; and Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. During this period, ill health, brought on by the strain of indefatigable labors upon a naturally delicate constitution, compelled him several times to take supernumerary and superannuated relations. In 1814–17 he was presiding elder of the New London district. He was a delegate to the General Conference in New York in 1812, and also in Baltimore in 1816. From the date of his last appointment in 1839 to the day of his death, Sept. 1, 1860, he was always laboring when his health would permit. He wrote much for *Zion's Herald* and the

Christian Advocate and Journal. His productions were characterized by a clear, concise, unornamental style, freshness of thought, and deep spirituality. Not ostentatious in the expression of his religious convictions and experiences, he claimed personal knowledge of the doctrine of entire sanctification. "Uniformly cheerful, full of buoyant hopes in Christ, he always was remarkably sedate."—*Meth. Minutes for* 1861; *New York Christian Advocate.*

Kent, James, a distinguished English composer of Church music, was born at Winchester in 1700, and at an early age employed as chorister in the cathedral of that city. His talents secured him admittance to the Chapel Royal, London, where he enjoyed the tuition of the celebrated Dr. Croft. After completing his education, he was chosen organist of Finden, in Northamptonshire, and subsequently was appointed organist of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1737 he was elected to fill the same situation in the cathedral of his native place, which he accepted and held until 1774. He died in 1776. Mr. Kent greatly assisted Dr. Boyce in the preparation of his magnificent work, the collection of Cathedral Music, and his services are duly acknowledged by that learned editor. Mr. Kent published a volume of *Twelve Anthems* (London, 1773, 4to), among which are, *Hear my Prayer, When the Son of Man, My Song shall be of Mercy*, and others which are favorites with the congregations of English cathedrals. After his decease, a *Morning and Evening Service*, and *Eight Anthems*, composed by him for the Winchester choir, were collected and printed by Mr. Corfe, of Salisbury; but the probability is that the author never intended them for publication, as they are not equal to his other published productions. "Mr. Kent was remarkably mild in his disposition, amiable in his manners, exemplary in his conduct, and conscientiously diligent in the discharge of his duties. His performance on the organ was solemn and impressive, and he was by competent judges considered one of the best musicians of the age in which he lived" (*Harmonicon*). (J. H. W.)

Kentigern, St., a Scottish prelate who flourished toward the close of the 6th century, was actively engaged in the interests of the Christian Church among the natives of Scotland. He is said to have made many converts while bishop of Glasgow. Bishop Kentigern died about A.D. 600.

Kephar- (כְּפַר, *village*), a frequent prefix to the Heb. name of hamlets or small places in Palestine, as in that here following, and many others mentioned by Reland (*Palæst.* p. 684 sq.) and Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 118, 119, 160, 170, 177, 187, 188, 190, 200, 201, 204, 235). See CAPHAR-.

Kephar-Chananiah (כְּפַר חֲנַנְיָא, i. e. *village of Hananiah*), a place named in the Talmud, and now called *Kefr Anan*, 5 miles S.W. of Safed, containing the ruins of a synagogue (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 187; compare Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 78, note).

Kephir. See LION.

Kepler, JOHANN, the celebrated astronomer, deserves a place here not so much on account of his services to the science of astronomy as for the relation he sustained to, and the treatment he received from the Christian Church of the 16th century. He was born near the imperial city of Weil, in Würtemberg, Dec. 27, 1571, and in his childhood was weak and sickly. He was sent to school in 1577, but the straitened circumstances of his father caused great interruption to his education. He was soon taken from school, and employed in menial services at his father's tavern. In his twelfth year, however, he was again placed at the same school, but in the following year was seized with a violent illness, so that his life was for some time despaired of. In 1586 he was admitted to the monastic school of Maulbronn, where his expenses were paid by the duke of Würtemberg. The three years of Kepler's life following his admission to this school were marked by a return of several of the disorders which had well-nigh proved fatal to him in his childhood. To add to his misfortunes, his father left home in consequence of disagreements with his mother, and soon after died abroad. After the departure of his father his mother quarrelled with her relations, "having been treated," says Hantsch, Kepler's earliest biographer, (in his edition of *Epistolæ ad J. Keplerum*, etc. [Leipz. 1718]), "with a degree of barbarity by her husband and brother-in-law that was hardly exceeded even by her own perverseness." As a natural consequence, the family affairs were in the greatest confusion. Notwithstanding these complications, young Kepler took his degree of master at the University of Tübingen in August, 1591, holding the second place in the examination. While at the university he had paid particular attention to the study of theology, and no doubt intended to enter the ministry; but, annoyed by the strife which the controversy on the *Formula of Concord* occasioned, and opposed to the doctrine of ubiquity, at that time made an article in the confession of Würtemberg's state religion, he failed to secure a position as minister. He now turned to mathematical studies. His attention was first directed to astronomy by the offer of the astronomical lectureship at Gratz, the chief town of Styria. At that time he knew very little of the subject, but, having accepted the lectureship, he was forced to qualify himself for the position. While engaged in these investigations, he came by degrees to understand the superior mathematical convenience of the system of Copernicus to that of Ptolemy. His general views of astronomy, however, were somewhat mystical, as may be seen in his *Prodromus*. He supposed the sun, stars, and planets were typical of the Trinity, and that God distributed the planets in space in accordance with regular polyhedrons, etc.

In 1595 Kepler completed his *Mysterium Cosmographicum*, in which he details the many hypotheses he had successively formed, examined, and rejected concerning the number, distance, and periodic times of the planets, and endeavors to demonstrate the correctness of the Copernican system, which at that time was still discredited and rejected as un-Biblical by both Romanists and Protestants. To avoid persecution, Kepler took the precaution to secure the opinion of eminent theologians of both churches before publication, and for this purpose submitted the MS. to the faculty of Tübingen University. Of course they quickly condemned the sacrilegious effort and daring of the young astronomer (see below), but not so thought duke Louis of Würtemberg, who not only approved of the work, but furnished the means (in 1596) to defray the expense of printing it. It must be borne in mind that in the 16th century astronomical truth was equally unknown to the clergy and the laity, and that the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun were doctrines apparently inconsistent with holy Scripture. Besides, in those days the truths of religion were guarded by a sternness of discipline and a severity of punishment which have disappeared in more enlightened times. In order to form a correct judgment respecting the causes which led to the opposition to Kepler by the Church, and the subsequent trial and condemnation of Galileo (q. v.), we must turn to that period when they first submitted their opinions to the public. The philosophy of Aristotle was then prevalent throughout Europe. It was taught in all its universities by professors lay and clerical, and every attempt to refute their doctrines exposed its author to the opposition of the learning and scholarship of that day. One of the principal dogmas of the Aristotelian philosophy was the immutability of the heavens. The brilliant discoveries of Kepler and Galileo struck a blow at the ancient philosophy, and consequently exposed them to the hostility of the Peripatetic philosophers. Now when we reflect that the minds of all thinking men were then completely moulded by that philosophy, and that these, again, governed the reflections of those immediately beneath them, and from them the results

of Aristotelianism, mingling up, as they did, especially with the religious opinions of the day, thus reached the whole of the popular intellect, we will find it no matter of surprise that the zeal of these innovators met with the most determined opposition. "The Aristotelian professors, the temporizing Jesuits, the political churchmen, and that timid but respectful body who at all times dread innovation, whether it be in legislation or in science, entered into an alliance against the philosophical tyrants who threatened them with the penalties of knowledge." "He who is allowed to take the start of his species," says Sir David Brewster, "and to penetrate the veil which conceals from common minds the mysteries of nature, must not expect that the world will be patiently dragged at the chariot-wheels of his philosophy. Mind has its inertia as well as matter, and its progress to truth can only be insured by the gradual and patient removal of the difficulties which embarrass it." Those Protestants, therefore, who are so ready to censure the Church of Rome for its action with regard to these great men should remember that it was but carrying out the spirit of the age, and a measure which the spirit of the people demanded. Surely Protestantism has but little to boast of in this matter. More than half a century later we find that the great and good Sir Matthew Hale condemned to death two women for witchcraft on the ground, first, that Scripture had affirmed the reality of witchcraft; and, secondly, that the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against persons accused of the crime. Sir Thomas Browne, the celebrated author of the *Religio Medici*, was called as a witness at the trial, and swore "that he was clearly of opinion that the persons were bewitched." Not only so, but Henry More and Cudworth strongly expressed their belief in the reality of witchcraft; and, more than all, Joseph Glauride, probably the most celebrated theological thinker of his time, wrote a special defence of the superstition, without doubt the ablest book ever written on that subject. As late as 1692 nineteen persons were executed and one pressed to death in Massachusetts on the same plea for witchcraft. See SALEM. "To deny the possibility, nay, actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery," says Sir William Blackstone (*Commentary on the Laws of England*, bk. iv, ch. iv, sec. 6), "is at once flatly to contradict the revealed Word of God in various passages both of the Old and New Testaments." See WITCHCRAFT.

In 1597 Kepler married Barbara Müller von Mühleckh. She was already a widow for the second time, although two years younger than Kepler himself. In the year following his marriage, on account of the troubled state of the province, arising out of the two great religious parties into which the German empire was then divided, he was induced to withdraw into Hungary. The Jesuits, anxious to secure for the Romish Church the learning and renown of Kepler, earnestly worked in his behalf, and secured permission for his return to Gratz. Very independent in character, Kepler was not the man to eat the bread of his opponents, and upon his frank refusal to join the Romanists he was visited with still fiercer opposition. In 1600 he paid a visit to Tycho Brahé, and, by recommendation of the latter, was appointed assistant imperial mathematician by emperor Rudolph II. Upon the death of Tycho in 1601, Kepler succeeded him as principal mathematician to the emperor, and took up his residence at Prague. The special task intrusted to Kepler at this time was the reduction of Tycho's observations relative to the planet Mars, and to this circumstance is mainly owing his grand discovery of the law of elliptic orbits, and that of the equable description of æras. These continued studies, his searchings after harmony, led him at last to the discovery of the three remarkable truths called *Kepler's Laws*. (For an account of these, and the steps that led to their discovery, see the *English Cyclopædia*, s. v., where also will be found a list of Kepler's works.) In 1624 he went to Vienna, the emperor finding it impossible to make good his promises to assist Kepler, to secure the necessary means to aid him in the completion of the Rudolphine Tables; it was not, however, till 1627 that these tables—the first that were calculated on the supposition that the planets move in elliptic orbits—made their appearance; and it will be sufficient to say of them in this place, that, had Kepler done nothing in the course of his whole life but construct these, he would have well earned the title of a most useful and indefatigable calculator. He died at Ratisbon, Nov. 15, 1630, and his body was interred in St. Peter's churchyard of that city. "Ardent, restless, burning to distinguish himself by his discoveries, he attempted everything; and, having once obtained a glimpse, no labor was too hard for him in following or verifying it. All his attempts had not the same success, and, in fact, that was impossible. Those which have failed seem to us only fanciful; those which have been more fortunate appear sublime. When in search of that which really existed, he has sometimes found it; when he devoted himself to the pursuit of a chimera, he could not but fail; but even there he unfolded the same qualities, and that obstinate perseverance that must triumph over all difficulties but those which are insurmountable." See Breitschwerdt, *Johann Kepler's Leben u. Wirken* (Stuttg. 1831); Brewster, *Lives of the Martyrs of Science* (Lond. 1841); Bailly, *Histoire de l'astronomie moderne*, ii, 4 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexik.* s. v.; Brockhaus, *Conversat. Lex.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Menzel, *Gesch. der Deutschen*, v, 104 sq., 327 sq., 471; vi, 10 sq.

Kerach. See CRYSTAL.

Kéralay, DE, a French Roman Catholic missionary, who flourished in the early part of the 18th century, joined the Congregation of Foreign Missions, and in 1720 took charge of the mission at Mergui. In 1722 he was consecrated bishop of Rosalia, and became coadjutor to M. de Ciré, apostolic vicar of Siam, whom he succeeded in 1727. The court, which had at first appeared favorably inclined towards the Christians, soon began, at the instigation of the bonzes, to persecute them violently. The missionaries were forbidden publishing any books in the Siamese language, or teaching their doctrines to the people. Inscriptions insulting to the Christian faith were placed on the front or inside of the churches. Kéralay himself also was repeatedly summoned before the authorities, to answer for his infringements of their regulations, but he displayed throughout great firmness and patience. The death of the king and the civil war which followed gave the Christians some respite, but after a short time persecutions began anew, and it was during these that Kéralay died at Juthia, Nov. 27, 1737. See *Lettres édifiantes*; Henrion, *Hist. des Missions*; Pallegoix, *Description du royaume Thaï* (Paris, 1854, 12mo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 595. (J. N. P.)

Kerazin. See CHORAZIN.

Kerchief (only in the plur. מְסַפָּחוֹת, *mispachoth'*, so called from being *spread* out; Sept. ἐπιβόλαια v. r. περιβόλαια, Symmachus ὑπανχένια, Vulg. *cervicalia*), an article of apparel or ornament that occurs only in Ezek. xiii, 18, 21, where it is spoken of as something applied to the head by the idolatrous women of Israel, but the meaning of which it is difficult to discover. Some of the ancient versions (e. g. Symmachus, the Vulgate, etc.) understand *pillows* or cushions for the head, as in the parallel member (so Rosenmüller, Gesenius, etc.); others (e. g. the Sept., Syriac, etc.) think that *mantles* or coverings for the head are intended. Hitzig understands the *talith* or long cloth worn by Jewish worshippers. See FRINGE. The derivation of the Hebrew word, and the fact that the article might be torn (ver. 21), shows that it was long, loose, and flexible, like the shawl with which Oriental women envelop themselves (Ruth iii, 15; Isa. iii, 22); and the statement that they were adapted to be placed "upon the head of every stature" (עַל רֹאשׁ

כָּל־קוֹמָה, i. e. persons of whatever height), confirms this view. Kimchi says it was a rich upper garment. It was probably a long and elegant veil or head-dress, perhaps denoting by its shape or ornament the character of those who wore them. See VEIL. The false prophetesses alluded to practiced divinations, and pretended to deliver oracles which contradicted the divine prophecies. (See Hävernick, *Comment.* ad loc.). Schroeder (*De vest. mul. Hebr.* p. 266, 269) well interprets "veils such as those with which in the East women cover the entire head, especially the face" (comp. Ruth iii, 15; Isa. iii, 22). The Eastern women bind on their other ornaments with a rich embroidered handkerchief, which is described by some travellers as completing the head-dress, and falling without order upon the hair behind. See HEAD-DRESS. This, if of costly and splendid material, would be a not unapt decoration for the meretricious purpose in question. See also HANDKERCHIEF.

Kerckherdere, JOHN GERARD, a Dutch theologian and philologian, was born near Maestricht about 1678, and was educated at Louvain, where he afterwards became a professor. He died March 16, 1738. His theological works of note are, *Systema Apocalypticum* (Louvain, 1708, 12mo):—*Prodromus Danielicus, sive novi conatus historici critici in celeberrimas difficultates historiæ Vet. Test. monarchiarum Asiæ, etc., ac præcipue Daniel. prophet.* (Louv. 1711, 12mo):—*De Monarchia Romæ paganæ secundum concordium inter prophetas Danielem et Joannem; consequens historia a monarchiæ conditoribus usque ad urbis et imperii ruinam; accessit series historiæ Apocalypticæ* (Louv. 1727, 12mo):—*De Situ Paradisi terrestris* (Louv. 1731, 12mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxvii, 603.

Kerckhove, JOHN POLYANDER VAN DEN, a Dutch Protestant theologian, born at Metz March 26, 1568, was educated at Embden, where his father was pastor of the French Church, and afterwards went to study Hebrew and philosophy at Bremen, and theology at Heidelberg, under Du Jon and Crellius, and at Geneva under Theodore de Beza and Antony Lafaye. In 1591 he became pastor of the French Church at Leyden, and soon after at Dort. In 1611 he succeeded Arminius as professor of theology in the University of Leyden. He took part in the Synod of Dort, and was one of the theologians commissioned to draw up the canon of that synod; he was also member of a committee for revising the Bible. Kerckhove died Feb. 4, 1646. He wrote *Accord des passages de l'Ecriture qui semblent être contraires les uns aux autres* (Dort, 1599, 12mo):—*Theses logicæ atque ethicæ* (1602):—*Responsio ad interpolata A. Cocheletii, doctoris Sorbonnistæ* (1610); Cochelet answered in his *Cæmeterium Calvini*:—*Miscellaneæ Tractationes theologicæ, in quibus agitur de prædestinatione et Cœna Domini* (Leyden, 1629, 8vo):—*Prima Concertatio anti-sociniana* (Amsterd. 1640, 8vo):—*De essentiali Christi Existentia Concertatio, contra Johannem Crellium* (Leyden, 1643, 12mo); etc. He also published Thomas Cartwright's *Commentarii in Proverbia Salomonis,* and was one of the publishers of the *Synopsis purioris Theologiæ* (Leyden, 1625, 8vo). See Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica;* Boxhorn, *Theatrum Hollandiæ,* p. 361; Paquot, *Mémoires,* vol. v.; Joh. Fabricius, *Histor. Bibliothecarum,* iv, 92.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxvii, 604. (J. N. P.)

Ke'ren-hap'puch (Heb. *Ke'ren-hap-Puk',* קֶרֶן הַפּוּךְ, *horn of the* face-*paint,* i. e. cosmetic-box; Sept. Ἀμαλθίας [v. r. Ἀμαλθαίας, Ἀμαλθίας, Μαλθίας] κέρας, i. e. horn of plenty; Vulg. correctly *Cornu stibii,* i. e. of antimony), a name given to Job's third daughter (Job xlii, 14), after the Oriental ideas of elegance (see Kitto's *Daily Bib. Ill.* ad loc.). B.C. cir. 2220. See PAINT.

Keri and **Kethib** (קרי וכתיב, plural קריין וכתיבן), so frequently found in the margins and footnotes of the Hebrew Bibles, exhibit the most ancient various readings, and constitute the most important portion of the critico-exegetical apparatus bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times. On this subject we substantially adopt Ginsburg's article in Kitto's *Cyclopædia,* s. v. See MASORAH.

I. *Signification, Classification, and Mode of Indication of the Keri and Kethib.*—The word קְרֵי, *keri',* may be either the imperative or the participle passive of the Chaldee verb קְרָא, *to call out, to read,* and hence may signify "*Read,*" or "*It is read,*" i. e. the word in question is to be substituted for that in the text. כְּתִיב, *kethib',* is the participle passive of the Chaldee verb כְּתַב, *to write,* and signifies "*It is written,*" i. e. the word in question is in the text. Those who prefer taking the word קְרֵי as participle, do so on the ground that it is more consonant with its companion כְּתִיב, which is the participle passive. The two terms thus correspond substantially to the modern ones *margin* (Keri) and *text* (Kethib). We may add that the Rabbins also call the Keri מִקְרָא, *mikra',* *scripture,* and the Kethib מָסוֹרָה, *masorah', tradition;* but, according to our ideas, these terms should be reversed.

The different readings exhibited in the Keri and Kethib may be divided into three general classes: *a.* Words to be read differently from what they are written, arising from the omission, insertion, exchanging, or transposition of a single letter (כְּתִיב וְקְרֵי, קְרֵי וּכְתִיב); *b.* Words to be read, but that are not written in the text (קְרֵי וְלֹא כְתִיב); and, *c.* Words written in the text, but that are not to be read (כְּתִיב וְלֹא קְרֵי).

a. The first general class (*variations*) comprises the bulk of the various readings, and consists of—

1. Corrections of errors arising from mistaking homonyms, e. g. לֹא, the negative particle, for the similarly sounding לוֹ, the pronoun, of which we have fifteen instances (comp. Exod. xxi, 8; Lev. xi, 21; xxv, 30; 1 Sam. ii, 3; 2 Sam. xvi, 18; 2 Kings viii, 10; Ezra iv, 2; Job xiii, 15; xli, 4; Psa. c, 3; cxxxix, 16; Prov. xix, 7; xxvi, 2; Isa. ix, 2; lxiii, 9), and two instances in which the reverse is the case (1 Sam. ii, 16; xx, 2). Besides noticing them in their respective places, the Masorah also enumerates them all on Lev. xi, 15. The Talmud (*Sopherim,* vi) gives three additional ones, viz., 1 Chron. xi, 21; Job vi, 21; Isa. xlix, 5. עַל for אֶל, of which we have four instances (1 Sam. xx, 24; 1 Kings i, 33; Job vii, 1; Isa. lxv, 7; Ezek. ix, 5).

2. Errors arising from mistaking the letters which resemble each other, e. g. ב for כ (comp. Prov. xxi, 29); ד for ג (Ezek. xxv, 7); ד for ך (1 Sam. iv, 13); ר for ך, of which the Masorah on Prov. xix, 19, and Jer. xxi, 40, gives four instances (2 Sam. xiii, 37; 2 Kings xvi, 6; Jer. xxi, 40; Prov. xix, 19); ת for ח (Jer. xxviii, 1; xxxii, 1); ח for ם (2 Sam. xxiii, 13); ח for ת, of which the Masorah on Prov. xx, 21 gives four instances (2 Sam. xiii, 37; Prov. xx, 21; Cant. i, 17; Dan. ix, 24); ט for שׁ (1 Sam. xiv, 32); י for ו in innumerable instances; כ for ב in eleven cases (Josh. iv, 18; vi, 5, 15; 1 Sam. xi, 6, 9; 2 Sam. v, 24; 2 Kings iii, 24; Ezra viii, 14; Neh. iii, 20; Esth. iii, 4; Job xxi, 13; ם for ה (Isa. xxx, 32); צ for ע (2 Kings xx, 4); ר for ד twice (Jer. ii, 20; Ezra viii, 14); ת for ח (Eccles. xii, 6); ת for ה (2 Kings xxiv, 14; xxv, 17; Jer. lii, 21).

3. Errors arising from exchanging letters which belong to the same organs of speech, e. g. ב for מ, of which the Keri exhibits one instance (Josh. xxii, 7), and vice-versa, of which the Great Masorah, under letter ב, gives six instances (Josh. iii, 16; xxiv, 15; 2 Kings v, 12; xii, 10; xxiii, 33; Dan. xi, 18); ח for א (2 Kings xvii, 21); ע for א (1 Sam. xx, 24; 1 Kings i, 33; Job vii, 1; Isa. lxv, 7; Ezek. ix, 5); מ for פ (Isa. lxv, 4).

4. Errors arising from the transposition of letters,

which the Masorah designates מוקדם ומאוחר, and of which it gives sixty-two cases, as, for instance, the textual reading, or Kethib, is האהל, *the tent*, and the marginal reading, or Keri, transposing the letters ל and ה, has האלה, *these* (comp. Josh. vi, 13; xx, 8; xxi, 27; Judg. xvi, 26; 1 Sam. xiv, 27; xix, 18, 22, 23 [twice]; xxvii, 8; 2 Sam. iii, 25; xiv, 30; xvii, 16; xviii, 8; xx, 14; xxiv, 16; 1 Kings vii, 45; 2 Kings xi, 2; xiv, 6; 1 Chron. i, 46; iii, 24; xxvii, 29; 2 Chron. xvii, 8; xxix, 8; Ezra ii, 46; iv, 4; viii, 17; Neh. iv, 7; xii, 14; Esth. i, 5, 16; Job xxvi, 12; Psa. lxxiii, 2; cxxxix, 6; cxlv, 6; Prov. i, 27; xiii, 20; xix, 16; xxiii, 5, 26; xxxi, 27; Eccles. ix, 4; Isa. xxxvii, 30; Jer. ii, 25; viii, 6; ix, 7; xv, 4; xvii, 23; xxiv, 9; xxix, 18, 23; xxxii, 23; xlii, 20; l, 15; Ezek. xxxvi, 14; xl, 15; xlii, 16; xliii, 15, 16; Dan. iv, 9; v, 7, 16 [twice], 29).

5. Errors arising from the small letter י being dropped before the pronominal ו from plural nouns, and making them to be singular, of which there are a hundred and thirteen instances [it is very strange that the Masorah Magna only enumerates fifty-six of these instances] (Gen. xxxiii, 4; Exod. xxvii, 11; xxviii, 28; xxxii, 19; xxxix, 4, 33; Lev. ix, 22; xvi, 21; Numb. xii, 3; Deut. ii, 33; vii, 9; viii, 2; xxvii, 10; xxxiii, 9; Josh. iii, 4; viii, 11; xvi, 3; Ruth iii, 14; 1 Sam. ii, 9, 10 [twice]; iii, 18; viii, 3; x, 21; xxii, 13; xxiii, 5; xxvi, 7 [twice], 11, 16; xxix, 5 [twice]; xxx, 6; 2 Sam. i, 11; ii, 23; iii, 12; xii, 9, 20; xiii, 34; xvi, 8; xviii, 7, 18; xix, 19; xx, 8; xxiii, 9, 11; xxiv, 14, 22; 1 Kings v, 17; x, 5; xviii, 42; 2 Kings iv, 34; v, 9; xi, 18; Ezra iv, 7; Job ix, 13; xiv, 5; xv, 15; xx, 11; xxi, 20; xxiv, 1; xxvi, 14; xxxi, 20; xxxvii, 12; xxxviii, 41; xxxix, 26, 30; xl, 17; Psa. x, 5; xxiv, 6; lviii, 8; cvi, 45; cxlvii, 19; cxlviii, 2; Prov. vi, 13 [twice]; xxii, 24; xxvi, 24; Isa. lii, 5; lvi, 10; Jer. xv, 8; xvii, 10, 11; xxii, 4; xxxii, 4; lii, 33; Lam. iii, 22, 32, 39; Ezek. iii, 20; xvii, 21; xviii, 23, 24; xxxi, 5; xxxiii, 13, 16; xxxvii, 16 [twice], 19; xl, 6, 22 [twice], 26; xliii, 11 [thrice], 26; xliv, 5; xlvii, 11; Dan. xi, 10; Amos ix, 6; Obad. v, 11; Hab. iii, 14); as well as from the insertion of י before the pronominal ו and before the pronominal ך in singular nouns, and making them plural; the Keri exhibits seven instances of the former (1 Kings xvi, 26; Psa. cv, 18, 28; Prov. xvi, 27; xxi, 29; Eccles. iv, 17; Dan. ix, 12) and eight of the latter in the word דבו (Judg. xiii, 17; 1 Kings viii, 26; xxii, 13; Psa. cxix, 147, 161; Jer. xv, 16 [twice]; Ezra x, 12).

6. Errors of a grammatical nature, arising from dropping the article ה where it ought to be, of which the Keri exhibits fourteen instances (1 Sam. xiv, 32; 2 Sam. xxiii, 9; 1 Kings iv, 7; vii, 20; xv, 18; 2 Kings xi, 20; xv, 25; Isa. xxxii, 15; Jer. x, 13; xvii, 19; xl, 3; lii, 32; Lam. i, 18; Ezek. xviii, 20), or from the insertion of it where it ought not to be, of which there are ten instances (1 Sam. xxvi, 12; 1 Kings xxi, 8; 2 Kings vii, 12, 13; xv, 25; Eccles. vi, 10; x, 3, 20; Isa. xxix, 11; Jer. xxxviii, 11); or from the dropping of the ה after נער, or writing הוא instead of היא when used as feminine.

7. Errors arising from the wrong division of words, e. g. the first word having a letter which belongs to the second, exhibited by the Keri in three instances, and stated in the Masorah on 2 Sam. v, 2 (2 Sam. v, 2; Job xxxviii, 12; Lam. iv, 16), or the second word having a letter which belongs to the first, of which there are two instances (1 Sam. xxi, 12; Ezra iv, 12); or one word being divided into two separate words, of which the Masorah on 2 Chron. xxxiv mentions eight instances (Judg. xvi, 25; 1 Sam. ix, 1; xxiv, 8; 1 Kings xviii, 5; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 6; Isa. ix, 6; Lam. i, 6; iv, 3), or two separate words being written as one, exhibited by the Keri in fifteen instances (Gen. xxx, 11; Exod. iv, 2; Deut. xxxiii, 2; 1 Chron. ix, 4; xxvii, 12, Neh. ii, 23; Job xxxviii, 1; xl, 6; Psa. x, 10; lv, 16; cxxiii, 4; Isa. iii, 15; Jer. vi, 29; xviii, 3; Ezek. viii, 6).

8. Exegetical Keris or marginal readings which substitute euphemisms for the cacophonous terms used in the text, in accordance with the injunction of the ancient sages, that "all the verses wherein indecent expressions occur are to be replaced by decent words (e. g. ישגלנה by ישכבנה [of which the Keri exhibits four instances, viz. Deut. xxviii, 30; Isa. xiii, 16; Jer. iii, 2; Zech. xiv, 2]; עפולים by טחורים [of which the Keri exhibits six instances, viz. Deut. xxviii, 27; 1 Sam. v, 6, 9; vi, 4, 5, 17; omitting, however, 1 Sam. v, 12]; חריונים by דבריונים [of which the Keri exhibits one instance, viz. 2 Kings vi, 25]; חוריהם by צואתם [of which the Keri exhibits two instances, 2 Kings xviii, 27; Isa. xxxvi, 12]; מימי רגליהם by מימי שיניהם [of which the Keri exhibits two instances, 2 Kings xviii, 27; Isa. xxxvi, 12]; למחראות by למוצאות [of which there is one instance, 2 Kings x, 27, comp. *Megilla*, 25 b])."

The manner in which this general class of various readings is indicated is as follows: The variations specified under 1 and 2, not affecting the vowel points, are simply indicated by a small circle or asterisk placed over the word in the text (כתיב), which directs to the marginal reading (קרי), where the emendation is given, as, for instance, the Kethib in Exod. xxi, 8 is לֹא, in 1 Sam. xx, 24 לָיָּד, and in Prov. xxi, 29 יָכִין, and the marginal gloss remarks ק׳ אל, ק׳ לו, ק׳ יבין, the ק׳ being an abbreviation for קרי. In the variations specified under 3 and 4, where the different letters of the Kethib and the Keri require different vowel points, the abnormal textual reading, or the Kethib, has not only the small circle or asterisk, but also takes the vowel points which belong to the normal marginal reading, or the Keri, e. g. the appropriate pointing of the textual reading, or the Kethib, in 2 Kings xvii, 21, is וַיִּדֶּא, but it is pointed וַיַּדַּא, because these vowel signs belong to the marginal reading, or the Keri, וידח, which it is intended should accompany the vowel points in the text. The same is the case with the textual reading in 2 Sam. xiv, 30, which, according to the marginal reading, exhibits a transposition of letters, and which can hardly be pronounced with its textual points וְהַוִּצִּירִיהָ, because these vowel signs belong to the Keri, והצירוה. Finally, in the variations specified under 5, 6, 7, and 8, which involve an addition or diminution of letters, and which have therefore either more or fewer letters than are required by the vowel points of the Keri, a vowel sign is sometimes given without any letter at all, or two vowel signs have to be attached to one letter, and sometimes a letter has to be without any vowel sign; the variation itself being either indicated in the margin by the exhibition of the entire word which constitutes the different reading, or by the simple remark that such and such a letter is wanting or is redundant. For instance, in Lam. v, 7, which, according to the Masorah, exhibits two of the twelve instances where the ו conjunctive has been dropped from the beginning of words (comp. also 2 Kings iv, 7; Job ii, 7; Prov. xxiii, 24; xxvii, 24; Isa. lv, 13; Lam. ii, 2; iv, 16; v, 3, 5; Dan. ii, 43), the textual reading, or Kethib, is אֲנַחְנוּ אֵינֵם, and the marginal reading, or Keri, is ואנחנו ואינם, the vowel sign of the conjunction from the margin being inserted in the text under the little circle, which, consequently, has no letter at all; in Jer. xlii, 6, again, where the textual reading is אנו, and the marginal reading אנחנו, yet the Kethib, which has only three letters, takes the vowel signs of the Keri, which has five letters, and is pointed אֲנַנוּ, with two different vow-

el points attached to the one ו; whilst in 2 Kings vii, 15, where the reverse is the case, the marginal reading having fewer letters, and hence fewer vowels than the textual reading, which takes the vowel signs of the former, the Kethib is pointed בְּחַחְמָם, and the ח has no vowel sign at all. There is a peculiarity connected with the marginal indication of those words the variations of which consist in the diminution or addition of a single letter. When a letter is dropped from a word in the text, the whole word is given in the marginal reading with the letter in question, and the remark "*Read so;*" as, for instance, 1 Sam. xiv, 32; Prov. xxiii, 24, where the ח, according to the Masorah, is dropped from חשלל, and י from ייליד, as indicated by שָׁלָל and יוֹלֵד; the marginal glosses are ק' חשלל, ק' וילד; but when the reverse is the case, if a letter has crept into a word, the whole word is not given in the marginal gloss, but it is simply remarked that such and such a letter is redundant (יתיר), or is not to be read (לא קרי), as, for instance, in Eccles. x, 20; Neh. ix, 17, where the ח, according to the Masorah, has crept in before כנפים, and ו before חסד, the marginal gloss simply remarks יתיר ח', יתיר ו'. Upon this point, however, the greatest inconsistency is manifested in the Masoretic glosses; compare, for instance, the Kethib כיניד and רגליך in Eccles. iv, 8, 17, both of which, according to the Keri, have a redundant י, and are singular nouns, yet the Masoretic note upon the former is ק' כינו, exhibiting the whole word, whilst on the latter it simply remarks יתיר י'.

b. The second class (*insertions* directed), which comprises *entire words* that have been omitted from the text, exhibits ten such instances which occur in the Hebrew Bible, as follows: Judg. xx, 13; Ruth iii, 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii, 3; xvi, 23; xviii, 20; 2 Kings xix, 31, 37; Jer. xxxi, 38; l, 29. Besides being noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, these omissions are also given in the Masorah on Deut. i and Ruth iii, 16. They are also enumerated in the Talmud (Tract *Sopherim*, vi, 8, and in *Nedarim*, 37 b). In *Nedarim*, however, the passage which refers to this subject is as follows: "The insertion of words in the text (קריין ולא כתיבן) is exhibited in פרת [2 Sam. viii, 3]; איש [ibid. xvi, 23]; בארם [Jer. xxxi, 38]; לה [ibid. l, 29]; את [Ruth ii, 11]; אלי [ibid. iii, 5, 17];" thus omitting four instances, viz. Judg. xx, 13; 2 Sam. xviii, 20; 2 Kings xix, 31, 37, and adding one, viz., Ruth ii, 11, which is neither given by the Masorah nor in *Sopherim*.

This class of variations is indicated by a small circle or asterisk placed in the text with the vowel signs of the word which is wanting, referring to the margin, where the word in question is given. Thus, for instance, in Judg. xx, 13, where, according to the Keri, the word בְּנֵי is omitted, the Kethib is וְלֹא אָבוּ בְּנְיָמִן, upon which the marginal gloss remarks בני קרי ולא כתיב.

c. Of the third class (*omissions* suggested), exhibiting *entire words* which have crept into the text, there are eight instances, as follows: Ruth iii, 12; 2 Sam. xiii, 33; xv, 21; 2 Kings v, 18; Jer. xxxviii, 16; xxxix, 12; li, 3; Ezek. xlviii, 16. These variations are not only noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, but are also given in the Masorah on Ruth iii, 12. The passage in *Nedarim*, 27 b, which speaks of this class of variations, remarking, "Words which are found in the text, but are not read (כתיבן ולא קריין), are exhibited in נא [2 Kings v, 18]; ואת [Jer. xxxii, 11]; ידרך [ibid. li, 3]; חמש [Ezek. xlviii, 16]; אם [Ruth iii, 12]," omits 2 Sam. xiii, 33; xv, 21; and Jer. xxxviii, 16; xxxix, 12; and adds Jer. xxxii, 11, which does not exist in the Masorah; whilst *Sopherim*, vi, 9, which remarks אמנון כאשר במקום גואל ידרך חמש, referring to 2 Sam. xiii, 33; Jer. xxxix, 12; 2 Sam. xv, 21; Ruth iii, 12; Jer. li, 3; Ezek. xlviii, 16; omits 2 Kings v, 18, and Jer. xxxviii, 16.

This class of variations is not uniformly indicated in the different editions of the Bible. Generally the word in question has no vowel signs, but an asterisk or small circle is put over it, referring to the margin, where it is simply remarked כתיב ולא קרי, *written* [*in the text*], *but not* [*to be*] *read;* in one or two instances, however, the word itself is repeated in the margin, as in 2 Kings v, 18, where we have it נא כתיב ולא קרי, [*the word*] נא [*is*] *written* [*in the text*], *but* [*is*] *not* [*to be*] *read.*

II. *Number and Position of the Keri and Kethib.*—A great difference of opinion prevails about the number and position of these various readings. The Talmud, as we have shown above, and the early commentators, mention variations which do not exist in the Keris and Kethibs of the Masorah. This, however, is beyond the aim of the present article, which is to investigate the Keri and Kethib as exhibited in the Masorah and in the editions of the Hebrew Bible. From a careful perusal and collation of the Masorah, as printed in the Rabbinic Bibles, we find the following to be the number of the Keris and Kethibs in each book, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:

Genesis	24	Habakkuk	2
Exodus	12	Zephaniah	1
Leviticus	5	Haggai	1
Numbers	11	Zechariah	7
Deuteronomy	24	Malachi	1
Joshua	38	Psalms	74
Judges	22	Proverbs	70
1 Samuel	73	Job	54
2 Samuel	99	Song of Songs	5
1 Kings	49	Ruth	13
2 Kings	80	Lamentations	28
Isaiah	55	Ecclesiastes	11
Jeremiah	148	Esther	14
Ezekiel	143	Daniel	129
Hosea	6	Ezra	33
Joel	1	Nehemiah	28
Amos	3	1 Chronicles	41
Obadiah	1	2 Chronicles	39
Micah	4		
Nahum	4	Total...	1353

The disparity between Abrabanel's calculations about the number of Keris and Kethibs, leading him to the conclusion that the Pentateuch has 65, Jeremiah 81, and 1 and 2 Samuel 138 (*Introduction to Jeremiah*), and the numbers which we have stated as existing in these books, is easily accounted for when it is remembered that this erudite commentator died fifteen years before the laborious Jacob b.-Chajim collated and published the Masorahs on the Hebrew Scriptures, and therefore had no opportunity of consulting them carefully. But we find it far more difficult to account for the serious difference in the calculations of later writers and our results, as may be seen from the table on the following page.

For the collation of Bomberg's Bible, the Plantin Bible, and the Antwerp Bible, we are indebted to the tables exhibited in Cappellus's *Critica Sacra*, p. 70, and Walton's *Prolegomena* (ed. Cantabrigiæ, 1828, i, 473); and though we have been able by our arrangement to correct their blunder in representing Elias Levita as separating the Five Megilloth from the Hagiographa, and giving the number of Keris to be 329 exclusive of the Megilloth, yet we were obliged to describe the Megilloth apart from the Hagiographa, to which they belong according to the Jewish order of the Canon. Elias Levita's own words on the numbers are as follows: "I counted the Keris and Kethibs several times, and found that they were in all 848; of these, 65 are in the Pentateuch, 454 in the Prophets, and 329 in the Hagiographa. It is surprising that there should only be 65 in the Pentateuch, 22 of which refer to the single word נערה, which

		Bomberg's Sec. Edit. of Bible, 1524, 1525.	The Plantin Bible, 1566.	The Antwerp or Royal Bible, 1572.	Elias Levita.	Our Results.
Pentateuch.	Variations....	73	74	69		
	Interpolations	1	1	1		
	Deficiencies ..		2	1		
		74	77	71	65	76
Earlier Prophets.	Variations....	337	239	277		
	Interpolations	11	25	18		
	Deficiencies ..	2	5	5		
		350	269	300		361
Later Prophets.	Variations....	348	250	347		
	Interpolations	2	25	11		
	Deficiencies ..		1			
		350	276	358	454	377
Five Megilloth.	Variations....	51	43	48		
	Interpolations	11	14	8		
		62	57	56		71
Hagiographa.	Variations....	362	187	242		
	Interpolations	60	34	20		
	Deficiencies ..	1	1	1		
		423	222	263	329	468
Grand total.....		1259	901	1048	848	1353

N.B.—In this table, what are denoted by "Variations" are designated by the Masorites as קרי; "Interpolations," יתיר; "Deficiencies," חסיר.

is נער in the Kethib, and נערה in the Keri; that the book of Joshua, which in quantity is about a tenth part of the Pentateuch, should have 32; and that the books of Samuel, which are merely about a fourth the size of the Pentateuch, should contain 133" (*Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, ed. Sulzbach, 1771, p. 8 sq.). It will be seen from this extract that Elias Levita not only gives six Keris less in Joshua than we have given, but also differs from Abrabanel in the number of Keris to be found in the books of Samuel.

III. *Origin and Date of the Keri and Kethib.*—The Talmud traces the source of these variations to Moses himself, for we are distinctly told in *Nedarim*, 37 b, that "the pronunciation of certain words according to the scribes (מקרא סופרים), the emendations of the scribes (עטור סופרים), the not reading of words which are in the text (כתיב ולא קרי), and the reading of words which are not in the text (קרי ולא כתיב), etc., are a law of Moses from Sinai." Jacob b.-Chajim defends this view in his elaborate *Introduction* to the Rabbinic Bible. Elias Levita, who also expresses this Talmudic declaration, explains it as follows: "The Keri and Kethib of the Pentateuch only are a law of Moses from Mount Sinai, and the members of the Great Synagogue, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, Azariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Mordecai, and Zerubbabel, and other wise men from the craftsmen and artisans (מהחרש והנסגר) to the number of a hundred and twenty, wrote down the Keri and the Kethib according to the tradition which they possessed that our teacher Moses (peace be with him!) read words differently from what they were written in the text; this being one of those mysteries which they knew, for Moses transmitted this mystery to Joshua, Joshua to the elders, the elders to the prophets, etc., and these were put down in the margin as his readings, Ezra acting as a scribe. In the same manner they proceeded in the Prophets and Hagiographa with every word respecting which they had a tradition orally transmitted from the prophets and the sages that it was read differently from what it was in the text. But they required no tradition for the post-exilian books, as the authors themselves were present with them; hence, whenever they met with a word which did not seem to harmonize with the context and the sense, the author stated to them the reason why he used such anomalous expressions, and they wrote down the word in the margin as it should be read" (*Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, fol. 8 b, sq.). Mendelssohn, in his valuable introduction to his translation of the Pentateuch, and most of the ancient Jewish writers, propounded the same view. It is in accordance with this recondite sense ascribed to the origin of the Keri and Kethib that Rashi remarks on Gen. viii, 16, "The Keri is היצא, the Kethib הוצא, because he was first to tell them to go out; but if they should refuse to go, he was to make them go." Kimchi, however, is of the opposite opinion. So far from believing that these variations proceeded from the sacred writers themselves, who designed to convey thereby various mysteries, he maintains that the Keri and Kethib originated after the Babylonian captivity, when the sacred books were collected by the members of the Great Synagogue. These editors of the long-lost and mutilated inspired writings "found different readings in the volumes, and adopted those which the majority of copies had, because these, according to their opinion, exhibited the true readings. In some places they wrote down one word in the text without putting the vowel signs to it, or noted it in the margin without inserting it in the text, whilst in other places they inserted one reading in the margin and another in the text" (Introduction to his *Commentary on Joshua*). Ephodi (flourished 1391–1403), who maintains the same view, remarks that Ezra and his followers "made the Keri and Kethib on every passage in which they found some obliterations and confusion, as they were not sure what the precise reading was." Abrabanel, who will neither admit that the Keris and Kethibs proceeded from the sacred writers themselves, nor that they took their rise from the imperfect state of the codices, propounds a new theory. According to him, Ezra and his followers, who undertook the editing of the Scriptures, found the sacred books entire and perfect; but in perusing them these editors discovered that they contained irregular expressions, and loose and ungrammatical phrases, arising from the carelessness and ignorance of the inspired writers. "Ezra had therefore to explain these words in harmony with the connection, and this is the origin of the Keri which is found in the margin of the Bible, as this holy scribe feared to touch the words which were spoken or written by the Holy Ghost. These remarks he made on his own account to explain those anomalous letters and expressions, and he put them in the margin to indicate that the gloss is his own. Now, if you examine the numerous Keris and Kethibs in Jeremiah, and look into their connection, you will find them all to be of this nature, viz., that they are to be traced to Jeremiah's careless and blundering writing. . . . . From this you may learn that the books which have most Keris and Kethibs show that their authors did not know how to speak correctly or to write properly" (Introduction to his *Commentary on Jeremiah*). Though Abrabanel's hypothesis has more truth in it than the other theories, yet it is only by a combination of the three views that the origin of the Keri and Kethib can be traced and explained. For there can be no doubt that *some* of the variations, as the Talmud, Rashi, etc., declare, have been transmitted by tradition from time immemorial, and have their origin in some recondite meaning or mysteries attached to the passages in question; that some, again, as Kimchi, Ephodi, etc., rightly maintain, are due to the blunders and corruptions which have crept into the text in the course of time, and which the spiritual guides of the nation tried to rectify by a comparison of codices, as is also admitted by the Talmud (comp. *Jerusalem Megillah*, iv, 2; *Sopherim*, vi, 4); and that others, again, as Abrabanel remarks, are owing to the carelessness of style, ignorance of idioms and provincialisms, which the editors and successive interpreters of the Hebrew canon discovered in the different books, or, more properly speaking, which were at variance with the grammatical rules and exe-

getical laws developed in aftertime by the Masorites. Such, however, was their reverence for the ancient text, that these Masorites who made the new additions to it left the text itself untouched in the very places where they believed it necessary to follow another explanation or reading, but simply inserted the emendation in the margin. Hence the distinction between the ancient text *as it was written*, or Kethib (כתיב), and the more modern *emended reading*, or Keri (קרי); and hence, also, the fact that the Keri is not inserted in the synagogal scrolls, though it is followed in the public reading of the Scriptures.

IV. *Importance of the Keri and Kethib, especially as relating to the English Version of the Hebrew Scriptures.* —Some idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib may be gathered from the following analysis of the seventy-six variations which occur in the Pentateuch. Of the seventy-six Keris, twenty-one give נערה instead of נער (Gen. xxiv, 14, 16, 28, 55, 57; xxxiv, 3 [twice], 12; Deut. xxii, 15 [twice], 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 [twice], 27, 28, 29), which was evidently epicene in earlier periods (comp. Gesenius, *Gramm.* sec. 23, sec. 32, 6; Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sec. 175, *b*); fifteen have the plural termination יִ֫ם affixed to nouns instead of the singular וֹ in the text (Gen. xxxiii, 4; Exod. xxvii, 11; xxviii, 28; xxxii, 19; xxxix, 4, 33; Lev. ix, 22; xvi, 21; Numb. xii, 3; Deut. ii, 33; v, 10; vii, 9; viii, 2; xxvii, 10; xxxiii, 9), which some think is no real variation, since in earlier periods the termination ו was both singular and plural, just as בגדו stands for both בְּגָדָיו and בְּגָדָיו; seventeen give more current and uniform forms of words (Gen. viii, 17; x, 19; xiv, 8; xxiv, 33 with l, 26; xxv, 23 with xxxv, 11; xxvii, 3 with 5, 7; xxvii, 29 with the same word in the next clause; xxxvi, 6, 14 with ver. 18; xxxix, 20, 22; xliii, 28 with xxvii, 29; Exod. xvi, 2; xvi, 7 with Numb. xvi, 11; Numb. xiv, 36 with xv, 24; Numb. xxi, 32 with xxxii, 39; xxxii, 7 with xxx, 6; Deut. xxxii, 13 with Amos iv, 13); five substitute the termination third person singular, ו for ה (Gen. xlix, 11 [twice]; Exod. xxii, 26; xxxii, 17; Numb. x, 36), which is a less common pronominal suffix (comp. Gesenius, *Gramm.* sec. 91; Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sec. 247, *a*); two make two words of one (Gen. xxx, 11; Exod. iv, 2); two have שלוי instead of שלו (Exod. xvi, 13; Numb. xi, 32); three give plural verbs instead of singular (Lev. xxi, 5; Numb. xxxiv, 4; Deut. xxxi, 7), which are no doubt an improvement, since Numb. xxxiv, 4 is evidently a mistake, as may be seen from a comparison of this verse with verse 5; three substitute the relative pronoun לוֹ for the negative particle לא (Exod. xxi, 8; Lev. xi, 21; xxv, 30), which is very important; two substitute euphemisms for cacophonous expressions (Deut. xxviii, 27, 30); and two are purely traditional, viz., Numb. i, 16; xxvi, 9. The Pentateuch, however, can hardly be regarded as giving an adequate idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib, inasmuch as the Jews, regarding the law as more sacred than any other inspired book, guarded it against being corrupted with greater vigilance than the rest of the canon. Hence the comparatively few and unimportant Keris when contrasted with those occurring in the other volumes. Still, the Pentateuch contains a few specimens of almost all the different Keris.

As to the question how far our English versions have been influenced by the Keri and Kethib, this will best be answered by a comparison of the translations with the more striking variations which occur in the Prophets and Hagiographa. In Josh. v, 1, the textual reading is "till *we* were passed over" (עברנו), the Keri has עברם, "until *they* passed over;" and though the Sept., Vulg., Chaldee, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Version, etc., adopt the Keri, the A. V., following Kimchi, adheres to the Kethib; whilst in Josh. vi, 7, where the textual reading is "and *they* said (ויאמרו) unto the people," and the marginal emendation is "and *he* said" (ויאמר), and where the Vulg., Chaldee, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible, and the Geneva Version again adopt the Keri, as in the former instance, the A. V. abandons the textual reading and espouses the emendation. In Josh. xv, 47, where the Keri is "*the bordering sea* (הים והגבול) and its territory," and the Kethib has "and *the great sea* (הים הגדל) and the territory," which is again followed by the ancient versions and the translations of the Reformers, the A. V., without taking any notice of the textual reading in the margin, as in Josh. viii, 16, adopts the emendation, whereas in Josh. xv, 53 the A. V. follows the textual reading (ינום) *Janum*, noticing, however, the emendation (ינוח) *Janus* in the margin. All the ten emendations of the second class, which propose the insertion of entire words into the text (קרי ולא כתיב), are adopted in the A. V. without the slightest indication by the usual italics that they are not in the text. Of the eight omissions of entire words in the third class (כתיב ולא קרי) nothing decisive can be said, inasmuch as six of them refer to simple particles, and they might either be recognised by the translators or not without its being discernible in the version. The only two instances, however, where there can be no mistake (Jer. xli, 3; Ezek. xlviii, 16), clearly show that the A. V. follows the marginal gloss, and accordingly rejects the words which are in the text. Had the limits of this article allowed it, we could have shown still more unquestionably that, though the A. V. generally adopts the marginal emendations, yet in many instances it proceeds most arbitrarily, and adheres to the textual reading; and that, with very few exceptions, it never indicates, by italics or in the margin, the difference between the textual and the marginal readings.

Inattention to the Keri and Kethib has given rise to the most fanciful and absurd expositions, of which the following may serve both as a specimen and a warning. In looking at the text of the Hebrew Bible, it will be seen that there is a final *Mem* (ם) in the middle of the word לִמרבה, Isa. ix, 6. We have already alluded to the fact that it exhibits one of the fifteen instances where the Kethib, or the textual reading, is one word, and the Keri, or the emended reading, proposes two words (see above, sec. 1). Accordingly, לִמרבה stands for לָהֶם רַבָּה = לָהֶם, i. e. "*to them the dominion shall be great*," corresponding to the common abbreviation בָּהֶם for בָּהֶם. The question is not whether לם may be considered as an abbreviation of להם, seeing there are no other examples of it; suffice it to say that Jewish scribes and critics of ancient times took it as such, just as they regarded אראלם (Isa. xxxiii, 7) as a contraction of לם = להם ארא (comp. the Syriac, Chaldee, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate, Elias Levita, etc.); and that the Sept. read it as *two words* (i. e. לה רבה). Subsequent scribes, however, found it either to be more in accordance with the primitive reading, or with their exegetical rules, as well as with the usage of the prophet himself (comp. Isa. xxxiii, 23), to read it as one word; but their extreme reverence for the text prevented them from making this alteration without indicating that some codices have two words. Hence, though they joined the two words together as one, they yet left the final *Mem* to exhibit the variation. An example of the reverse occurs in Neh. ii, 13, where המפרוצים has been divided into two words, המ פרוצים, and where the same anxiety faithfully to exhibit the ancient reading has made the editors of the Hebrew canon retain the medial *Mem* at the end of the word. It was to be expected that those Jews who regard both readings as

emanating from the Holy Spirit, and as designed to convey some recondite meaning, would find some mysteries in this final *Mem* in the middle of לסרבה. Hence we find in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 94) the following remark upon it: "Why is it that all the *Mems* in the middle of a word are open [i. e. מ] and this one is closed [i. e. ם]? The Holy One (blessed be he!) wanted to make Hezekiah the Messiah, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog; whereupon Justice pleaded before the presence of the Holy One (blessed be he!), Lord of the World, 'What! David the king of Israel, who sang so many hymns and praises before thee, wilt thou not make him the Messiah; but Hezekiah, for whom thou hast performed all those miracles, and who has not uttered one song before thee, wilt thou make him the Messiah?' Therefore has the *Mem* been closed." Aben-Ezra again tells us that the scribes (not he himself, as Gill erroneously states) see in it an allusion to the recession of the shadow on the dial in Hezekiah's time; whilst Kimchi will have it that it refers to the "stopping up of the breaches in the walls of Jerusalem, which are broken down during the captivity, and that this will take place in the days of salvation, when the kingdom which had been shut up till the coming of the Messiah will be opened." But that Christian expositors should excel these mystical interpretations is surpassing strange. What are we to say to Galatinus, who submits that this *Mem*, being the cipher of 600, intimates that six hundred years after this prophecy the birth of Christ was to take place? or to the opinion which he quotes, that the name מרים שרה, *Maria Domina*, or even the perpetual virginity of Mary is thereby indicated (lib. vii, c. xiii)? or to Calvin, who thinks that it denotes the close and secret way whereby the Messiah should come to reign and set up his kingdom? or to the opinion which he mentions that it indicates the exclusion of the Jews from the Messiah's kingdom for their unbelief? or to the conjecture of Gill, that "it may denote that the government of Christ, which would be for a time straitened, and kept in narrow bounds and limits, should hereafter be throughout the world, to the four corners of it, so as to be firm and stable, perfect and complete, which the figure of this letter, being shut and four-square, may be an emblem of?"

It should be added that there are some words which are always read differently (קרי) from what they are written in the text (כתיב), and which, from the frequency of their occurrence, have only the vowel signs of the proposed Keri, without the latter being exhibited in the marginal gloss. These are, *a*. The name יהוה, which has always the vowel signs of אֲדֹנָי, and is pronounced with these vowels, i. e. יְהוָֹה, except when it precedes this name itself, in which case it has the vowel signs of אֱלֹהִים, i. e. יְהוִֹה; *b*. The name Jerusalem, when, as in the earlier books of Scripture, it is written with a *Yod* before the *Mem*, has never its own points, i. e. יְרוּשָׁלַיִם or יָם, but has the vowel signs of יְרוּשָׁלֶם, and is read so; *c*. The word הוּא, which was epicene in earlier periods, is always pointed הִוא in the Pentateuch, when it is used as feminine, to make it conformable to the later feminine form הִיא; and, *c*. The name ישׁשכר is always furnished with the vowels belonging to the Keri, יִשָּׂכָר with one *Shin*.

It remains only for us to say under this head that the judicious critic will often find good reason for differing from the opinion that seems to be implied in these Masoretic notes, and will in such cases, of course, prefer the Kethib to the Keri. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

V. *Literature.*—One of the earliest attempts freely to discourse upon the origin and value of the Keri and Kethib is that of D. Kimchi, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on Joshua;* Abrabanel, too, has a lengthy disquisition on this subject, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on Jeremiah.* He was followed by the laborious Jacob ben-Chajim, who fully discusses the Keri and Kethib in his celebrated Introduction to the *Rabbinic Bible*, translated by Ginsburg in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for July, 1863; and by the erudite and bold Elias Levita, who gives a very lucid account of the Keri and Kethib in his *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, ed. Sulzbach, 1771, p. 8 a, sq.; 21 a, sq. Of Christian writers are to be mentioned the masterly treatises by Cappellus, *Critica Sacra*, lib. iii, cap. ix, sq.; Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, cap. xiii; Buxtorf the younger, *Anticritica* (Basileæ, 1653), cap. iv, p. 448–509; Hilleri *De Arcano Kethib et Keri* (Tüb. 1692); Walton, *Biblia Polyglotta, Proleg.* (Cantab. 1828), i, 412 sq.; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, ii, 507–533; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841), p. 219 sq.; Sticht, *De Keri et Kethibh* (Altona, 1760; and against him Dreschler, *Sententia Stichii*, etc. Lips. 1763); Trägard, *De* כתיב וקרי (Gryph. 1775); Wolffradt, *De Keri et Ch'thibh* (Rost. 1739). See VARIOUS READINGS.

Keri, Francis Borgia, a learned Hungarian Jesuit, born in the beginning of the 18th century, in the county of Zemplin, Hungary, entered the Jesuitical order when yet very young, and became an instructor of philosophy and mathematics at Tyrnau. He died at Buda in 1769. Keri distinguished himself greatly as a historian, especially by his *Imperatores Ottomani a capta Constantinopoli* (Tyrnau, 1749, 9 pts. folio). He wrote also *Imperatores Orientis compendio exhibiti, e compluribus Græcis præcipue scriptoribus, a Constantino Magno —ad Constantinum ultimum* (Tyrnau, 1744, folio). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 612; Horangi, *Nova Memoria Hungarorum*, ii, 332.

Keri, Janos, a noted Hungarian prelate, born in the first half of the 17th century; entered as a mere youth, in 1656, the order of St. Paul, became afterwards director of the establishment, and held successively the bishoprics of Sirmium, Csanad, and Waitzen. He died in 1685. Bishop Keri wrote *Ferocia Martis Tureici* (Pos. 1672, 8vo):—*Philosophia scholastica* (Presb. 1673, 3 vols. fol.), etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 612; Czwittinger, *Hungaria Literata*, p. 203.

Ke'rioth (Heb. *Keriyoth'*, קְרִיּוֹת, *cities;* Sept. in Jer. Καριώθ, in ver. 41 v. r. Ἀκκαριώθ and Ἀκκαριών, elsewhere πόλεις; Vulg. *Carioth;* Auth. Vers. "Kirioth" in Amos ii, 2), the name of two places.

1. A town in the south of Judah (hence probably included within Simeon), mentioned between Hadattah and Hezron (Josh. xv, 25). From the absence of the copulative after it, Reland (*Palæst.* p. 700, 708) suggested that the name ought to be joined with the succeeding, i. q. *cities of Hezron*, i. e. Hazor itself, as in several ancient versions (but see Keil, ad loc.); and Maurer (*Comment.* ad loc.) has defended this construction, which the enumeration in ver. 32 requires, i. e. Kerioth-Hezron = Hazor-Amam. See JUDAH, TRIBE OF. It seems to be the place alluded to in the name of Judas *Iscariot* (Ἰσκαριώτης, i. e. אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, *native of Kerioth*). Dr. Robinson conjectures (*Bibl. Researches*, ii, 472) that the site is to be found in the ruined foundations of a small village discovered by him on the slope of a ridge about ten miles south of Hebron, and still called by the equivalent Arabic name *el-Kuryetein* (comp. De Saulcy's *Dead Sea*, i, 431; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 82). With this agree the *plural* form of the word, the associated *epithets*, and the *frontier* position, suggesting that the place was a fortification of contiguous hamlets for nomades rather than an individual city. See CITY; HAZOR.

2. A strong city of the land of Moab, mentioned in connection with Beth-gamul and Bozrah (Jer. xlviii, 24), in the prophetic denunciations of its overthrow by the Babylonian invaders on their way to Palestine (Jer. xlviii, 41; Amos ii, 2). But for the mention of Kiri-

athaim in the same connection (from which, however, it is somewhat difficult to distinguish it), we should be inclined (see Ritter's *Erdk.* xv, 583) to locate it at *Kureyat* on Jebel Attarus, east of the Dead Sea. See KIRJATHUZOTH. Porter confidently identifies it with the present *Kureiyeh*, six miles east of Busrah, in the plain at the foot of the mountain range of Bashan, where are very extensive remains of former edifices (*Damascus*, ii, 191 sq.). But the associate names (in the first passage of Jer.) appear to indicate a locality south-west of Bozrah, and it is doubtful whether the Mishor (q. v.) of Moab extended so far as this. See BOZRAH. The Kerioth (*cities*) in question may therefore be "the ancient cities to the north of Amman and south-west of Busrah, still bearing the names of *Kiriath* and *Kiriatin*, where the edifices are of such gigantic proportions and primitive forms as to induce a strong conviction that they were the work of the early Emim" (Graham, in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1858, p. 240).

Kerithuth. See TALMUD.

Kerkaroth. See CAMEL.

Kerkassandi, in Hindu mythology, is the name of the first Buddha who appeared (when men were yet attaining to the desirable age of 40,000 years) to take upon himself the sins of the world, to redeem them, and to secure them the continued enjoyment of the high age mentioned.—Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s. v.

Kernel (only in the plur. חַרְצַנִּים, *chartsannim'*, so called from their *sharp* taste; Sept. στέμφυλαι, Vulg. *uva passa*) is understood by the Talmudists (so the A.V.) to mean the *grape-stones* (Mishna, *Nasir.* vi, 2) as opposed to the skin ("husk"), i. e. the entire substance of the grape from the centre to the surface (Numb. vi, 4). The ancient versions, however, refer it to the sour or *unripe grapes* themselves, and this signification is favored by the use of kindred words in the cognate languages. (See further in Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 527.) See GRAPE.

Kero, a monk of St. Gall, who lived in the 8th century, is considered as the old German commentator of the rule of the Benedictines His work appeared in the first volume of Schilter's *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonic.*, in the second volume of Goldast's *Scriptores rerum Aleman.*, and in the first volume of Hattemer's *Denkmale d. Mittelalters.* He is also considered as the author of the translation of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed into old High-German, and is said to have written the *Glossarium Keronis* (to be found also in Hattemer's *Denkmale*), and a number of hymns, etc. —Pierer, *Universal Lex.* viii, s. v.

Ke'ros (Heb. *Keyros'*, קֵרֹס, *curved*, Neh. vii, 47; Sept. Κειράς v. r. Κιράς; or קֵרֹס, *Keros'*, Ezra ii, 44; Sept. Κηραός v. r. Κορές, Κάδης; Vulg. *Ceros*), a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabitants) returned as Nethinim from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 44; Neh. vii, 47). B.C. ante 536.

Kerr, George (1), D.D., LL.D., a Presbyterian minister, particularly eminent as a Christian educator, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Dec. 18, 1814, and came to this country with his parents in 1823. Early attached to the Church, he decided to enter the ministry, for which he sought thorough preparation, first by a full classical course at Williams College, Mass., and later at the Union Theological Seminary of New York City. He was licensed and ordained in 1844, and began his ministerial labors as pastor of the Reformed (Protestant Dutch) Church in Conesville, Schoharie Co., N. Y. In 1846 he received an urgent call to the principalship of Franklin (N. Y.) Academy, an institution then hardly deserving a higher place than the district school. Kerr, accepting the position, soon made this academy one of the best in the state. For a short period he filled a chair in the New York State Agricultural College, and then became principal of Watertown Academy, N. Y., and in 1865 removed to Cooperstown, where he did active and valuable service for the large seminary then located there. In 1867 he decided to return to Franklin and to resume his position in that school, but, while preparing for the removal, died, March 27. "Dr. Kerr was a man of work; his characteristics were prominent and clearly defined; all through life he was intellectually on the alert; everywhere, on all worthy subjects, analytical, independent, discriminating. He was a thorough scholar, especially in Greek literature, and a marvel of enthusiasm and power as a teacher" (Wilson, *Presb. His. Almanac*, 1868, p. 215). He aimed not only to educate the mind, but had particular regard for the education of the *heart* of all his students. (J. H. W.)

Kerr, George (2), a Methodist minister, was born in Ireland in 1819. His parents, who emigrated to Canada in 1822, intended him for the mercantile profession; but, converted when seventeen years old, and shortly after impressed with the conviction that he was called to preach, he came over to the States, and settled at Winstead, Conn., was made a local preacher, and in 1844 joined the New York Conference. In 1866 he was superannuated, and made Hudson, N. Y., his residence. He died while on a visit to his friends in Ireland, Sept. 8, 1869. He was much esteemed, not only by members of his own Church, but by ministers and members of other evangelical churches of the city.—Smith, *Annals of Deceased Preachers of N. Y. and N. Y. E. Conf.* p. 119.

Kerr, Henry M., a Presbyterian minister, was born in York District, S. C., Dec. 30, 1782. In very early life his mother had consecrated him, as Hannah did her Samuel, to the Lord, and had often expressed her desire to him that he should be a minister of the Gospel of the blessed Jesus. His parents being in moderate circumstances, and he the oldest of eleven children, he was compelled to labor for their maintenance; hence his education was much neglected in his earlier years. He went first to an academy in Roman County, N. C.; then he repaired to Iredell County, and enjoyed the advantages of instruction under the celebrated James Hall, D.D. Here he completed a very extensive course of scientific study, and was readily received as a candidate for the ministry by Concord Presbytery in 1811. He pursued his theological course part of the term with the Rev. Dr. Kilpatrick, and part of it with James M'Kee, D.D. In 1814 he was licensed by Concord Presbytery. At that time he was residing in Salisbury, N. C. He remained there, teaching and preaching, until the spring of 1816, when he removed to Lincoln County, and he was ordained in November of that year pastor of Olney, Long Creek, and New Hope churches. In 1819 he removed to Rutherfordtown to take charge of the village academy. He preached at the same time in the old church of Little Britain, and, after three years, removed into the bounds of this church. Here he spent fourteen years, and his labors were again blessed in a remarkable degree. In 1833 he removed to Jonesboro', East Tennessee; but, not finding his ministerial associations pleasant, he travelled further west, and settled in Hardeman County, West Tennessee, in 1835. Here he performed much missionary labor in all the surrounding counties, and organized many churches. The infirmities of age made it necessary for him to abandon, in part, his evangelistic labors, and he devoted the last years of his life to Bethel and Aimwell churches, in M'Nairy County. In the fall of 1860 he settled near Watervalley, in the Presbytery of North Mississippi, where he finished his long and useful career January 28, 1865. Trained under the old system, he made no effort at rhetorical display. His discourses were pre-eminently scriptural. He used "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and it was sharp in the heart of the King's enemies. "His style was perspicuous and energetic, and he was often truly eloquent. The providence of God cast his lot chiefly in destitute portions of the land, and his labors were evangelistic. He organized more churches, it is believed, than any

other member of the Presbytery. For many years he was stated clerk of the Presbytery of Western Tennessee District, and his acquaintance with the form of government and discipline was so perfect that his word was taken as the solution of all doubts and difficulties."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 338.

Kerr, James, a Presbyterian minister, a native of Scotland, was born in 1805, and was educated in the University of Glasgow, where he took his A.B. in 1832. In his twenty-fifth year he emigrated to the United States, and shortly after entered the Western Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Baltimore April 27, 1836, and was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Winchester at Martinsburg, Va., April 22, 1837. He labored first as a missionary in Hampshire County, Va., for two years, and was successful in his ministry, planting the standard of the Cross in many portions of that hitherto forsaken country. He was next invited by the Church of Cadiz, Ohio; began his ministerial work in this congregation Dec. 2, 1838, and was regularly installed June, 1839. He died April 19, 1855. Kerr was the author of *Mode of Baptism*, and a small work on *Psalmody*. "He was a good presbyter, and made an excellent presiding officer of an ecclesiastical court, to which both the members of the Presbytery and Synod can testify. His decisions were uniformly correct, and his thorough acquaintance with the government and polity of our Church gave him a superior influence in all her judicial meetings upon which he was called to attend. He was remarkably conscientious in every sphere of life, whether as a citizen, a Christian, or a minister. So decided was he against reading sermons, or even taking the smallest abstract into the pulpit, that he invariably voted against the licensure and ordination of any young man that did commit this 'great mistake,' as he sometimes termed it. As a preacher he was clear and logical, plain and interesting, in his statements of the great truths of the Gospel. His pulpit productions thoroughly partook of his own character, and came forth as the result of close application and much study; and on no occasion would he agree to preach, if it could at all be avoided, without special preparation."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 160.

Kerr, John, a Baptist minister of Scottish descent, was born in Caswell County, N. C., Aug. 14, 1782, converted in 1800, baptized in 1801, and at once licensed to preach. "Determined to avail himself of every means in his power to render his ministry efficient and useful, the young evangelist travelled to South Carolina to see the excellent Marshall and listen to his preaching, and thence to Georgia to form the acquaintance of the distinguished and venerable Mercer. Returning from the South, he visited Virginia, and became personally known to the lamented Semple and other valuable ministers of the state. Wherever he went his preaching produced a thrilling effect. His youthful appearance, the ardor and gracefulness of his manner, and the beauty of his diction, attracted universal attention. There are not a few who still remember his visit to Eastern Virginia with lively emotion after the lapse of almost half a century." In 1811 he embarked on the stormy sea of politics, consenting to become a candidate for Congress, and he was twice elected thereto. He was a member of that body during the War of 1812, and served his country at that critical period with a fervent and enlightened patriotism. At the close of his Congressional career he returned to Halifax, and served the churches at Arbor and at Mary Creek. In March, 1825, he removed to the city of Richmond, and became the pastor of the First Baptist Church. Here his fine pulpit talents were brought into active and successful operation. Crowds hung with delight on his ministry. In less than a year more than five hundred members were added to the Church, two hundred and seventeen of whom were white. This successful work continued until dissension was sown among his parishioners by the preaching of Alexander Campbell, whose efforts finally drew from Kerr's church nearly half of its members (in 1831). By the close of 1832 he had grown weary of the contentions to which the division had given rise, and resigned his charge. He died Sept. 29, 1842. He was naturally of a frank, generous, and disinterested disposition. Incapable of artifice himself, he was not always guarded against it in others. His temperament, peculiarly ardent, sometimes perverted his judgment. His manners were uniformly bland, gentle, and conciliating. In social intercourse he was highly gifted, never failing to impart an interest and a charm to conversation. He was dignified without ostentation, and cheerful without levity. "As a Christian, he imbibed in a high degree the spirit of his Master. His piety was not the dwarfish and stunted growth of sectarianism—morose, censorious, and persecuting, but the product of enlarged and liberal views—cheerful, candid, and conciliatory. Though he was firm to his convictions as a Baptist, he was remarkably free from bigotry, and was a lover of good men of every communion. As a preacher he possessed commanding talents. A fine person, a sonorous voice, and a graceful manner at once prepossessed his hearers in his favor. His apprehension was quick, his perception clear, and his imagination remarkably vivid. He is ranked among the most popular preachers of his day in Virginia, and for more than thirty years he rarely if ever failed to be appointed at associations and other important meetings to preach on occasions of the greatest interest."—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 446 sq.

Kerr, Joseph, D.D., a prominent minister of the Associate Reformed Church, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, in 1778; educated at the University of Glasgow, and, with a view of entering the ministry, pursued theological studies under the direction of the Associate Presbytery of Derry. He came to this country in 1801, and was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Pennsylvania shortly after. His appointment lay over a vast area of country west of the Alleghanies, a work for which he seemed to have been endowed by nature. In 1804 he was called to Mifflin and St. Clair as regular pastor, and, accepting, was installed October 17. When the Presbytery decided to establish a theological school at Pittsburg, they looked to him for its head, and felt constrained to urge his removal to that place, and appointed him professor of theology, a post which he successfully filled until he died, Nov. 15, 1829. "The death of Dr. Kerr shed a gloom not only over the large circle of his friends and acquaintances, and the families of his pastoral charge, but over the entire Synod of the West, as it seemed at once to dash the brightening prospects of the infant theological seminary intrusted to his supervision. . . . With an athletic physical constitution, of more than ordinarily prepossessing appearance, he was endowed with intellectual powers of the first order, highly cultivated, and possessed of all the essential elements of a natural orator. With undoubted yet unostentatious piety, mild, kind, affable, affectionate, benevolent, liberal, and hospitable almost to a fault, he at once won the friendship and affections of his acquaintances, and the confidence of the congregations to whom he ministered, and, without assuming it, or even being apparently conscious of it, he occupied from the commencement of his ministry the position of a master spirit, which was accorded to him without envy and without opposition by his co-presbyters."—(Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 372 sq.

Kerr, Joseph R., son of the preceding, and also a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in St. Clair township, Alleghany Co., Pa., Jan. 18, 1807, and was educated at the Western University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated in 1826 with the highest honors of his class. In the fall of 1827 he entered the theological seminary at Pittsburg, founded then only a short time, over which his father presided,

and was licensed Sept. 2, 1829. Only two and a half months later his father died, and young Kerr was called to fill his place in the pastorate, and, accepting the proffered place, was ordained July 29, 1830. "Thus called by Providence to fill the pulpit of such a man as his father, he succeeded, from the very first, in giving entire satisfaction to his people, and soon became one of the most, if he was not altogether the most, popular of the preachers in the city, but it was at the expense of such exhausting toil as contributed slowly but surely to undermine a constitution at best but delicate. From being a student of divinity, and without any experience, he entered at once on the pastoral oversight of a large congregation, and all the duties connected with the office of the Christian ministry. In his preparation for the pulpit he was a close, unwearying student. He was ambitious of excellence in whatever he attempted connected with his office, and became a workman that needeth not to be ashamed" (Sprague, *Annals* [Associate Ref. Presb. Church], ix, 162. His health, however, failed him, and in 1832 he was obliged to take an assistant, Moses Kerr (q. v.), a younger brother. His health, notwithstanding this timely precaution, continued to fail, and he died June 14, 1843. Kerr published an address, *Responsibility of Literary Men* (1836), and a sermon on *Duelling* (1838). (J. H. W.)

Kerr, Moses, a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, third son of Dr. Joseph Kerr (q. v.), was born in St. Clair, Pa., June 30, 1811. Naturally of a serious and thoughtful cast of mind, and manifesting in very early life decided piety, his education was directed from the first with a view to qualifying him for the sacred ministry. Signs of failing health, however, induced him to devote himself to mercantile life, but it soon proved as unfavorable to his health as his application to study, and he engaged in farm-work. His health becoming restored, he entered the Western University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in 1828. In the fall of the same year he began the study of theology in the seminary then under the care of his father; was licensed to preach on the 28th of April, 1831, and shortly after was called as pastor to Alleghany. But when the Presbytery met to ordain and install him, he returned the call on account of a hemorrhage of the lungs. The Presbytery, however, proceeded with his ordination to the office of the ministry. This was on the 9th of October, 1832. Shortly after he sailed for Europe, and on his return, with every appearance of restored and established health, resumed preaching, and finally accepted a call by the large and influential congregation of Robinson's Run, in the vicinity of Pittsburg, September 2, 1834. But a little more than six months later he was again attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and demitted his pastoral charge. During a vacancy he discharged for a time the duties of professor of languages in the Western University of Pennsylvania; afterwards of Biblical literature and criticism in the theological seminary, Alleghany. But his tastes and talents were for the pulpit, and he again accepted a call as a preacher, this time from the Third Church, Pittsburg, 18th of October, 1837. With that congregation he closed his life on the 26th of January, 1840. Moses Kerr "was a student from the love of study, and a careful reader of the best writings not only in theology, but in literature generally. With a becoming appreciation of the demands of his profession, he aimed to store his mind not only with the matter of text-books of theology and the works of past ages, but the fresh discussions of living divines, and at the same time keep up with the general advance of literature and science in the world. As a preacher he had capabilities which, with ordinary health and an ordinary length of life, must have rendered him eminent in his profession."—Sprague, *Annals*, ix, 166.

Kersey, Jesse, a minister of the Society of Friends, was born at York, Pa., in 1768. In his early youth his heart was given to God. In his seventeenth year he experienced a call to the Gospel ministry, but still remained an apprentice to the trade of a potter about four years, and afterwards taught school. In 1804 he embarked for England on a Gospel mission. In 1805 he returned to America, and in 1814 went on a religious mission to the Southern States, afterwards returning to his home, and continuing to labor and preach. He died near Kennet, Pa., in 1845. As a minister, Mr. Kersey's affability of manners, his grave and dignified deportment, the soundness of his principles, the beauty and simplicity of his style of address, heightened in their effect by the depth of his devotional feelings, gave an interest and a charm which gained him many admirers. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, iv, 116. (J. L. S.)

Keryktik (from κηρύσσω, to *preach*), i. e. the *art of preaching*, is a modern name for *Homiletics*, first introduced by Stier (*Keryktik*, 1830, 1846). See HOMILETICS.

Keseph. See SILVER.

Kesitah (קְשִׂיטָה, A. V. "piece of money," "piece of silver"). The meaning and derivation of this word, which only occurs thrice in the O. T., has been a subject of much controversy. The places where it is found—Gen. xxxiii, 19, recording Jacob's purchase of a piece of ground at Shechem; Josh. xxiv, 32, a verbal repetition from Genesis; and Job xlii, 11, where the presents made to Job are specified, and it is joined with rings of gold—indicate either the name of a coin or of some article used in barter. The principal explanations of the word are:

1. That of the Sept. and all ancient versions, which render it "*a lamb*," either the animal itself or a coin bearing its impress (Hottinger, *Diss. de Numm. Orient.*), a view which has been revived in modern times by the Danish bishop Munter in a treatise published at Copenhagen, 1824, and more recently still by Mr. James Yates, *Proc. of Numism. Society*, 1837, 1838, p. 141. The entire want of any etymological ground for this interpretation has led Bochart (*Hierozoic.* i, l. 2, c. 3) to imagine that there had been a confusion in the text of the Sept. between ἑκατὸν μνῶν and ἑκατὸν ἀμνῶν, and that this error has passed into all the ancient versions, which may be supported by the singular fact that in Gen. xxxi, 7, 41, we find עֲשֶׂרֶת מֹנִים (A. V. "ten times," מנה, however, more usually standing for a particular weight) translated by the Sept. δέκα ἀμνῶν, which it is difficult to account for on any supposition save that of a mistake of the copyist for μνῶν. See SHEEP.

2. Others, adopting the rendering "lamb," have imagined a reference to a weight formed in the shape of that animal, such as we know to have been in use among the Egyptians and Assyrians, imitating bulls, antelopes, geese, etc. (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 10; Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 600-602; Lepsius, *Denkmale*, iii, plate 39, No. 3).

3. Faber, in the German edition of *Harmer's Obs.* ii, 15–19, quoted by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1241), connects it with the Syriac *kesta*, Heb. קֶסֶת, "a vessel," an etymology accepted by Grotefend (see below), and considers it to have been either a measure or a silver vessel used in barter (comp. Ælian, *V. H.* i, 22).

4. The most probable view, however, is that supported by Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Jahn, Kalisch, and the majority of the soundest interpreters, that it was, in Grotefend's words (*Numism. Chron.* ii, 248), "merely a silver weight of undetermined size, just as the most ancient shekel was nothing more than a piece of rough silver without any image or device." The lost root was perhaps akin to the Arabic *kasat*, "he divided equally." Bochart, however (*ut sup.*), is disposed to alter the punctuation of the *Shin*, and to connect the word with קְשֹׁט, "truth," adding "potuit ק id est *vera* dici moneta quæcunque habuit justum pondus, aut etiam moneta sincera et ἀκιβδηλος."

According to Rabbi Akiba, quoted by Bochart, a certain coin bore this name in comparatively modern times, so that he would render the word by דִּנְקִי, ἐάνακις.—

Kitto, s. v. See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc. Job. See MONEY.

Kesler, ANDREAS, a German theologian, born July 17, 1595, was educated at the University of Jena, and afterwards became adjunct professor in the philosophical faculty of Wittenberg. In 1623 he was called to fill a professorship in Coburg; in 1625 he became pastor and superintendent at Eisfeld; in 1633 director of the gymnasium at Schweinfurt, whence in 1635 he was recalled to Coburg to fill a high ecclesiastical position. He died May 15, 1643. His writings consist, besides sermons, of polemical works against the Roman Catholic Church, for a list of which see Hagelhan, *Leichenrede*. See also Henning Witte, *Memoriæ Theologorum* (Decas 5), p. 557 sq.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 518.

Kessler, Christian Rudolph, a German Reformed minister, born February 20, 1823, in the Canton of Graubuenden, Switzerland, was educated in the best schools of his native land, and afterwards spent some time at the University of Leipsic; came to America with his parents in 1841; studied theology at Mercersburg, Pa.; was licensed and ordained in the spring of 1843, and took charge of congregations in Pendleton County, Va. In 1844 he became associated with Dr. Bibighaus as assistant pastor in the Salem congregation, Philadelphia. His health failing, in 1848 he removed to Allentown, Pa., to establish a female seminary. In this enterprise he was remarkably successful. He died March 4, 1855, leaving the institution he had founded in a flourishing condition.

Kessler (AHENARIUS), **Johann Jacob**, was born at St. Gall in 1502, and studied theology at Basle. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg to hear Luther, and on his way fell in with him at Jena, yet without knowing him. In 1523 he returned to St. Gall, but his inclination to the reform doctrines would not conscientiously permit him to enter the priesthood, and he became a saddler. At the request of his compatriots, he finally, in 1524, began Sunday evening meetings for the study of Scripture, which, on account of the general interest, were in 1525 transferred to the Church of St. Lawrence. He was somewhat opposed at first by a few narrow-minded theologians, and at their request even discontinued his meetings for a time; but the public, determined to hear the preaching of Kessler, induced him finally to enter the ministry, and he became, in 1535, evangelical pastor of the Church of St. Lawrence, and dean of St. Gall in 1573. He died March 15, 1574. Kessler wrote *Sabbatha*, *St. Gallische Reformationschronik*. See J. J. Bernet, *J. Kessler* (St. Gall, 1826); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 518; Pierer, *Universal Lex.* s. v.

Kethem. See GOLD.

Kethib. See KERI.

Kethubim. See HAGIOGRAPHA.

Kethuboth. See TALMUD.

Ketsach. See FITCHES.

Ketsiyah. See CASSIA.

Kett, HENRY, B.D., a learned English divine, was born at Norwich in 1761; studied at Trinity College, Oxford, of which he became fellow, and afterwards obtained the living of Charlton, Gloucestershire. He was drowned, while bathing, in 1825. His principal works are: *History; the Interpreter of Prophecy* (London, 4th ed., with additional notes, 1801, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sermons preached*, 1790, *at the Lectures founded by the late Rev. John Brompton, M.A.* (London, 2d ed. 1792, 8vo):—*Elements of general Knowledge* (Lond. 8th edit. 1815, 2 vols. 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Kett(e)ler, WILHELM, bishop of Münster from 1553 to 1557, though a layman, was promoted to the prelatical dignity by special request of the duke of Cleve. He was one of the most enlightened minds of this period in the Roman Catholic Church, and himself inclining to the Reformation, in concert with the duke of Cleve, persuaded Cassander (q. v.) to use his influence and his pen to prevent further schism in the Church, and to bring back those who had left the Romanists. At Rome he was disliked for his mildness towards the Reformers, and finally quitted the bishopric.

Kettenbach, HEINRICH VON, an eminent German writer of the period of the Reformation, was probably of French extraction. Little is known of his life. He became a Franciscan, and in 1521 went to Ulm in the place of one of the brethren expelled by the general of the order for holding evangelical opinions. Kettenbach, however, soon followed the example of his predecessor: he preached against the papacy and the monks, and, having thus aroused the enmity of the Dominicans, was in turn obliged to leave Ulm the same year. He then went to Wittenberg, where he openly joined the Reformation, took part in all the movements in favor of emancipation from Rome, and was probably killed in the peasants' war. Kettenbach was a very popular preacher, and made many converts from Romanism, which he attacked in *Vergleichung des Allerheiligsten Herrn u. Vaters Papst gegen d. seltsamen u. fremden Gast in d. Christenheit, genannt Jesus*, etc. (Wittenb. 1523):—*Practica; Neue Apologie u. Verantwortung Martini Luthers wider d. Papisten Mordgeschrei* (1523). It is generally supposed that Kettenbach wrote largely, but that his works have been lost. His influence among the Reformers must have been great, or he would not have been among the persons cited by Eck to appear with Luther before the Reichstag at Augsburg. See Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v.; Veesenmeyer, *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Literatur u. Ref.* p. 79 sq.; Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Kettle (דּוּד, *dud*, so called from *boiling*), a large *pot* for cooking purposes (1 Sam. ii, 14; elsewhere rendered "pot," Psa. lxxxi, 6; Job xli, 20; "caldron," 2 Chron. xxxv, 13). The same term in the original also signifies "basket" (2 Kings x, 7; Jer. xxiv, 2; probably Psa. lxxxvi, 6). From the passage in 1 Sam. ii, 13, 14, it is evident that the kettle was employed for the purpose of preparing the peace-offerings, as it is said (verse 14), "All that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself." In the various processes of cookery represented on the monuments of Egypt, we frequently see large bronze pots placed over a fire in a similar manner. See FLESH-POT.

Kettlewell, JOHN, B.D., an eminent English divine (nonjuror), was born at Northallerton, Yorkshire, March 10, 1653; studied at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and in 1675 became fellow of Lincoln College. Still but a youth, he distinguished himself by the publication of his celebrated work, *Measures of Christian Obedience*. He was generally noticed, and in 1682 lord Digby presented young Kettlewell with the vicarage of Coleshill, Warwickshire, but he was deprived of it soon after the Revolution on account of his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William and Mary. He removed to London, and died there April 12, 1695. His principal works have been collected and published under the style, *Works printed from Copies revised and improved by the Author a little before his Death* (Lond. 1719, 2 vols. fol.):—*The Duty of Moral Rectitude* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, iv, 219).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1725; Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. iv (1856); Nelson, *Life of Kettlewell* (Lond. 1718).

Kettner, FRIEDRICH ERNST, a German theologian, was born at Leipzig Jan. 21, 1671, and educated at the university of that place. He was licensed in 1697, and became shortly after superintendent in Quedlinburg, and first court preacher. He died July 21, 1722. His writings are mainly confined to local Church History.—*Allgemeines Hist. Lex.* iii, 22.

Ketu'rah (Heb. *Keturah'*, קְטוּרָה, *girdled*, otherwise *incense;* Sept. Χεττούρα), "the second wife, or, as she is called in 1 Chron. i, 32, the concubine of Abra-

ham; by her he had six sons, whom he lived to see grow to man's estate, and whom he established 'in the east country,' that they might not interfere with Isaac (Gen. xxv, 1–6). B.C. cir. 1997 et post. As Abraham was 100 years old when Isaac was born, who was given to him by the special bounty of Providence when 'he was as good as dead' (Heb. xi, 12); as he was 140 years old when Sarah died; and as he himself died at the age of 175 years, it has seemed improbable that these six sons should have been born to Abraham by one woman after he was 140 years old, and that he should have seen them all grow up to adult age, and have sent them forth to form independent settlements in that last and feeble period of his life. It has therefore been suggested that, as Keturah is called Abraham's 'concubine' in Chronicles, and as she and Hagar are probably indicated as his 'concubines' in Gen. xxv, 6, Keturah had in fact been taken by Abraham as his secondary or concubine wife before the death of Sarah, although the historian relates the incident after that event, that his leading narrative might not be interrupted. According to the standard of morality then acknowledged, Abraham might quite as properly have taken Keturah before as after Sarah's death" (Kitto); although, it is true, this would hardly have been in keeping with his usual regard for Sarah's feelings, and would have been likely to introduce into the family another scene of discord such as he had seen with Hagar. In opposition to these and similar arguments, however, which are maintained by Prof. Bush (*Note* on Gen. xxv, 1), Dr. Turner justly urges (*Companion to Genesis*, p. 293 sq.) the evident order of the narrative, the occasion offered by the death of Sarah, which preceded Abraham's demise thirty-six years, and the emphatic manner in which Keturah is introduced as a full *wife*, with lawful heirs, although of less esteem than Sarah. As to the objection drawn from the impotence of Abraham in consequence of advanced age, it is readily removed by the implied renewal of his vigor at the promise of an heir by Sarah (compare Heb. xi, 11); and, if sound, it would prove too much, for it would require the birth of all the six sons by Keturah to be dated before that of Isaac. See Abraham.

On the Arabian affinities of Keturah, see the *Journal Asiatique*, Aug. 1838, p. 197 sq. "Her sons were 'Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah' (Gen. xxv, 2); besides the sons and grandsons of Jokshan, and the sons of Midian. They evidently crossed the desert to the Persian Gulf, and occupied the whole intermediate country, where traces of their names are frequent, while Midian extended south into the peninsula of Arabia Proper. In searching the works of Arab writers for any information respecting these tribes, we must be contented to find them named as Abrahamic, or even Ishmaelitish, for under the latter appellation almost all the former are confounded by their descendants. Keturah herself is by them mentioned very rarely and vaguely, and evidently only in quoting from a rabbinical writer. (In the *Kámús* the name is said to be that of the Turks, and that of a young girl [or slave] of Abraham; and, it is added, her descendants are the Turks!) M. Caussin de Perceval (*Essai*. i, 179) has endeavored to identify her with the name of a tribe of the Amalekites (the 1st Amalek) called *Katûra*, but his arguments are not of any weight. They rest on a weak etymology, and are contradicted by the statements of Arab authors, as well as by the fact that the early tribes of Arabia (of which is Katûra) have not, with the single exception of Amalek, been identified with any historical names; while the exception of Amalek is that of an apparently aboriginal people whose name is recorded in the Bible; and there are reasons for supposing that these early tribes were aboriginal" (Smith). See Arabia.

Keuchenius, Petrus, a learned Dutch theologian, was born at Bois-le-Duc August 22, 1654, and studied at Leyden and Utrecht. He was successively minister at Alem, Tiel, and Arnheim. He died March 27, 1689. He wrote *Annotata in omnes N. T. libros*, the second and only complete edition of which, superintended by Alberti, appeared at Leyden in 1755. "The author's aim in these annotations is to throw light on the N. Test. by determining the sense in which words and phrases were used at the time it was written, and among those with whom its writers were familiar. For this purpose he compares the language of the N. Test. with that of the Septuagint, and calls in aid from the Chaldee and Syriac versions. His notes are characterized by sound learning and great good sense. Alberti commends in strong terms his erudition, his candor, solidity, and impartiality."—Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia*, ii, 729.

Kewley, John, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest, was by birth an Englishman, and of Roman Catholic parentage. He was educated at St. Omar's, and was in early life a Jesuit. He afterwards renounced the doctrines and communion of the Church of Rome, joined "Lady Huntingdon's persuasion," preached somewhat among that body and the Methodists, and, coming to the United States, was admitted to holy orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church by bishop Claggett (about 1804); in 1809 became rector of an Episcopal Church in Middletown, Conn., and in 1813 of the parish of St. George's, New York, where he continued till he sailed for Europe in 1816. He afterwards became reconciled to the Church of Rome, and returned to his original ecclesiastical connection, in which he continued till his death. Kewley was a man of great meekness and gentleness, always untiring in the discharge of his holy functions, and fervent and effective in his preaching. He published a *Sermon* delivered at the opening of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland in 1806; also a sermon entitled *Messiah the Physician of Souls*, preached at Middletown and Cheshire in 1811. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v, 545. (J. L. S.)

Key is a common heraldic bearing in the insignia of sees and religious houses, particularly such as are under the patronage of St. Peter. Two keys in saltire are frequent, and keys are sometimes *interlaced* or linked together at the *bows*, i. e. rings. Keys *indorsed* are placed side by side, the wards away from each other.

Key (מַפְתֵּחַ, *maphte'ăch*, an *opener*, Judg. iii, 25; Isa. xxii, 22; "opening," 1 Chron. ix, 27; κλείς, from its use in *shutting*, Matt. xvi, 19; Luke xi, 52; Rev. i, 18; iii, 7; ix, 1; xx, 1), an instrument frequently mentioned in Scripture, as well in a literal as in a figurative sense. The keys of the ancients were very different from ours, because their doors and trunks were generally closed with bands or bolts, which the key served only to loosen or fasten. Chardin says that a lock in the East is like a little harrow, which enters half way into a wooden staple, and that the key is a wooden handle, with points at the end of it, which are pushed into the staple, and so raise this little harrow. See Lock. Indeed, early Oriental locks probably consisted merely of a wooden slide, drawn into its place by a string, and fastened there by teeth or catches; the key being a bit of wood, crooked like a sickle, which lifted up the slide and extracted it from its catches, after which it was drawn back by the string. But it is not difficult to open a lock of this kind even without a key, viz. with the finger dipped in paste or other adhesive substance. The passage Cant. v, 4, 5 is thus probably explained (Harmer, *Obs.* iii, 31; vol. i, 394, ed. Clarke; Rauwolff, ap. Ray, *Trav.* ii, 17). Ancient Egyptian keys are often found figured on the monuments. They were made of bronze or iron, and consisted of a straight shank, about five inches in length,



Iron Key. (From Ancient Thebes, in Egypt.)

with three or more projecting teeth; others had a nearer resemblance to the wards of modern keys, with a short

shank about an inch long; and some resembled a common ring, with the wards at its back. The earliest mention of a key is in Judg. iii, 23–25, where Ehud having gone "through the porch and shut the doors of the parlor upon him, and *locked* them," it is stated that Eglon's "servants took a *key* and opened them." Among the Assyrian monuments are extant traces of strong gates, consisting of a single leaf, which was fastened by a huge modern lock, like those still used in the East, of which the key is as much as a man can conveniently carry (Isa. xxii, 22), and also by a bar which moved into a square hole in the wall. See DOOR.

The term *key* is frequently used in Scripture as the symbol of *government*, *power*, and *authority*. Even in modern times, in transferring the government of a city, the keys of the gates are delivered as an emblem of authority. In some parts of the East, for a man to march along with a large key upon his shoulder at once proclaims him to be a person of consequence. The size and weight of these oftentimes require them to be thus carried (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 493). So of Christ it is said, "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Isa. xxii, 22; Rev. iii, 7). He also has the "keys of hell and of death" (Rev. i, 18; comp. ix, 1; xx, 1). Our Saviour said to Peter, as the representative of the apostles generally, upon whom collectively the same prerogative was on another occasion conferred, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi, 19; xviii, 18)—that is, the power of preaching the Gospel officially, of administering the sacraments as a steward of the mysteries of God, and as a faithful servant, whom the Lord hath set over his household. This general authority is shared in common by all ministers and officers in the Church. The grant doubtless likewise included the authority to establish rules and constitutional orders in the Church, to which Christ himself gave no special ecclesiastical form, but left it to be organized by the apostles after his own resurrection. This power, too, in a subordinate degree, is delegated to the Church of later times; for it is noteworthy that even the apostles have not definitely prescribed any specific form of Church polity, and this is therefore, in a great measure, left to the discretion of each body of Christians. Indeed, the settlement of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, as a basis of Church-membership and ecclesiastical discipline, appears to be the only explicit element of the authority conferred in these passages by Christ to his apostles—and this exclusively belonged to them, inasmuch as their office was not transmissible; so that the canon of Scripture, as well as the essential points of Church constitution, have been completed by them for all time. See SUCCESSION. As to Peter himself, it is a gratuitous assumption on the part of Romanists that the authority was conferred upon him personally above his fellow-disciples, since in the other passage the general "ye" is used in place of the individual "thou." It is true, however, that as Peter was here addressed as the foreman, so to speak, of the apostolical college, he was eventually honored as the instrument of the introduction of the first Gentile as well as Christian members into the Church (see Acts ii, x), a fact to which Peter himself alludes in a very unassuming way (Acts xv, 7). The association of this authority with the power of *absolution* is another unauthorized gloss of the Roman Catholic Church; for the passage in which this is conferred (John xx, 23, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained") stands in a very different connection, and is evidently to be interpreted of the exclusively apostolical right to pronounce upon the religious state of those to whom, by the imposition of hands, they imparted the peculiar miraculous gifts of the primitive age (see Acts viii, 14–17; xix, 6). In accordance with the above analogies, the "key of knowledge" is the means of attaining to true knowledge in respect to the kingdom of God (Luke xi, 25; comp. Matt. xxiii, 13; Luke xxiv, 32). It is said that authority to explain the law and the prophets was given among the Jews by the delivery of a key. See BIND. The Rabbins say that God has reserved to himself four keys—the key of rain, the key of the grave, the key of fruitfulness, and the key of barrenness. See KEYS, POWER OF THE.

Keyes, JOSIAH, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Canajoharie, N. Y., Dec. 3, 1799; converted at the age of twelve; entered the Genesee Conference in 1820; in 1831–34 was presiding elder on Black River District, and in 1835 on Cayuga District, where he died April 22, 1836. Mr. Keyes possessed a grasping intellect and great application. Without regular instruction, he acquired "a respectable knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and as a general scholar, a theologian, and a preacher, he stood eminent among the Methodist ministry of the day. He was a very useful man, a sincere Christian, and many souls were converted through his labors."—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 412; Geo. Peck, D.D., *Early Methodism* (N. Y. 1860, 12mo), p. 473. (G. L. T.)

Keys, JOHN, a Presbyterian minister of English descent, was born at Wilton, N. H., in 1778. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1803, and afterwards taught school for several years. He studied theology at Morristown, N. J., under James Richards, D.D.; was licensed in 1805, and in 1807 ordained by the New York Presbytery at Orangedale, N. J., and in 1808 installed pastor of the Church at Sand Lake, near Albany, N. Y. In 1814 he accepted a call from the Congregational Church of Wolcott, Conn.; in 1824 removed to Tallmadge, Ohio, as pastor of a Congregational Church, and afterwards preached successively at Dover, Newburg, Ohio; at Peoria, Ill.; at St. Louis, Mo.; and at Cedar Rapids and Elkader, Iowa. At last he returned to Dover, Ohio, where he died January 27, 1867. Mr. Keys was an industrious student. As a preacher he took the greatest delight in his work; as a Christian he had great faith in the power of special prayer. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 216. (J. L. S.)

Keys, POWER OF THE, a term which in a general sense denotes the extent of ecclesiastical power, or, in a narrower sense, the right to authorize or prohibit absolution; and it is upon the interpretation in the one sense or the other that the Protestant and Romish churches differ from each other. We base this article, in the main, upon that in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xiii, 579 sq.

I. *New-Testament Doctrine.*—The expression מַפְתֵּחַ בֵּית־דָּוִד, or "key of the house of David" (Isa. xxii, 22), denotes the power which was given to the king's officer over the royal household. In literal symbolism, κλεὶς Δαυὶδ (Rev. iii, 7) denotes the authority which Christ as King exercises over his realm with special regard to his right of admission or dismission. When Jesus (Matt. xvi, 19) solemnly intrusted to Peter, as a representative of the apostles, the keys of the heavenly kingdom, he invested him by that act simply with his apostolical station, which involves the founding of the Christian Church by the preaching of the forgiveness of sin (Luke xxiv, 47) and the establishment of the Gospel doctrine (Matt. xx, 19). In this sense the commission (John xx, 23) to the other eleven apostles must likewise be interpreted, for we have no reason to believe that the apostles ever exercised the authority, as Jesus did, of relieving the sinner of his guilt; and yet, even if proofs could be adduced to show that the apostles did exercise such authority, all evidence that such authority was transferred to the Church after the apostolic age is surely wanting. Besides, it is proper to make a distinction between the power of the keys claimed for Peter as an expression of apostolical authority, and the power "to bind and to loose" which Jesus (Matt. xvi, 19) also conferred not only upon his other apostles, but upon the whole Church (Matt. xviii, 18). Both expressions, to *bind* and

to *loose*, which in New-Testament usage do not require a personal, but an impersonal object, mean, according to Rabinnical language, to *permit* and to *forbid*, to *confirm* and to *revoke* (see Lightfoot, ad loc. Matt., and comp. the art. BIND); and in the N.-T. passages quoted they can refer only to the sphere of Christian social life. Against the opinion of the later Church, that Paul (1 Cor. v, 3–5) made use of the apostolic authority to forgive and to retain sins, Ritschl (*Alt-Kathol. Kirche*, 2d edit., p. 337 sq.) argues that in this passage only a disciplinary regulation is referred to; that Paul conceded to the Church the right of discipline, and only exercised authority when he supposed himself to act in harmony with the wish of the Church; and that, if the apostle (2 Cor. ii, 6–10) held a contrary doctrine, he would be subject to the charge of simulation. The apostolical writings, moreover, do not allude to any other agency in the Church for the remission of sins than that spoken of by Paul himself, 2 Cor. v, 18 sq., namely, reconciliation by Christ and the prayers of believers (1 John v, 16; James v, 16).

II. *Doctrine of the Patristic Period.*—The misconception of the meaning of the power to *bind* and to *loose* was early manifested in the Church. The Jewish-Christian *Clementine Homilies*, it is true, still evince a knowledge of the original signification of the words to *bind* and to *loose*, inasmuch as they still supply—in the N.-T. sense—simply an impersonal object; but, withal, they have so far enlarged upon the meaning of the expression as to find comprehended in the power to which it alludes all privileges of the episcopal office as a continuation of the apostolical office (iii, 72). Quite the opposite was held in the Gentile-Christian Church of the 2d century. It interpreted the power "to bind and to loose" as authority to retain and to forgive sin, and supplied the two verbs with personal objects; yet regarded—in the spirit of the apostolic Church—as the authorities vested with the power to *bind* and to *loose*, the society (Church), and not the bishop.

In so far as from a heathen-Christian stand-point the power of the "keys" was identified with the power "to bind and to loose," the former was held to express in one conception both the latter acts, viz. excommunication and readmittance to the Church; but as the keys of Peter were taken also to comprehend all rights of Church government, and especially of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, we need not wonder that among the Church fathers of the patristic period all these different views were somewhat mixed (comp. Tertullian, *De Pudic.* 21; Cyprian, *De unit. eccles.* cap. 4). It was in the period of scholasticism that a really strict distinction was aimed at, and yet to this day Roman Catholics have failed to recognise generally this discrimination.

The whole Church was at first regarded as bearers of the keys, i. e. of the power to *bind* and to *loose*, evidently because Christ works and has his abode there. (For this reason, also, the martyrs were accorded the position of "præcipua ecclesiæ membra," in whom Christ is active for his own glorification. Comp. Eusebius, v, 2, 5; Tertullian, *De Pudic.*; Idem, *Apolog.* 39).

The first decided change of view is found among the Montanists. Tertullian (in his *De Pudicitia*) limits the promise of Matt. xvi, 18 sq. simply to the person of Peter as the apostolical founder of the Church; the power to forgive sin he regards as the right of the Church in so far as she is identical with the Holy Ghost. The bearer of this right he holds to be the spiritual man (spiritualis homo), but that the latter, in the interests of the Church, abstains from exercising this prerogative. His opponent, the Roman bishop, however, interpreted it in favor of all the bishops (bishopric = numerus episcoporum, chap. xxi). This thought Cyprian enlarged upon with a free use of the Montanistic thesis, holding that the episcopate is the inheritor (heir) of the apostolic power, the seat and the organ of the Holy Ghost, and therefore possessed of power to *bind* or to *loose* of its own accord. Of course, from such a stand-point, Cyprian was forced to reject as presumption the claim of the martyrs to the power of the keys; he only conceded to them the right of intercession for the fallen. To prove the ideal unity of the Church, Cyprian advances the argument that the power of the keys was first intrusted by Christ to Peter, and only afterwards to the other apostles (*De unit. eccles.* cap. iv). In the writings of Optatus Milevitanus this thought takes the form that Christ intrusted the keys to Peter, and that Peter himself surrendered them to the other apostles. The power of the keys in this sense evidently denotes the episcopal power in all its extent, i. e. the ecclesiastical government. With Cyprian, to *bind* and to *loose* already means to retain or forgive sins forever, yet he only uses these expressions when speaking of the forgiveness of sins by baptism (e. g. *Epist.* 73, c. 7). Later, however, they are used in a narrower sense, and refer to great sins committed after baptism; in short, they denote the right of exercising penance-discipline, a power in principle conceded to the bishop, but which actually he was permitted to exercise only in union with all his clergy. Not all sins committed after baptism were subject to the power of the keys, only the greater ones, as Augustine has it, "committed against the Decalogue" (*Serm.* 351, i, "De pœnit." c. 4). This declaration, however, is to be taken with the exception of all inward sins, i. e. trespasses against the ninth and tenth commandments; moreover, in the older practice, only the different species of idolatry, murder, and unchastity were punished by ecclesiastical courts. It is incorrect to argue, as has been done on the part of Protestants, that only the public sins—those which caused trouble to the Church, were taken account of by the Church. As to the sins alluded to above, whether committed in secret or publicly, it was supposed that they did injury to the gifts of regeneration, and entangled the soul in the meshes of spiritual death; they were therefore called *peccata* (delicta or crimina) *mortalia*, also *capitalia*; the others were regarded as simply daily experiences of the remains of weakness cleaving to the believer, of which it seems almost impossible to be rid in this life. For the former only the power of the keys and the exercise of penance were regarded as in force; the latter, on the other hand, were supposed to be atoned for by the daily penance of a believing heart, by the fifth request in the Lord's Prayer, by oblation and the eucharist, etc. They were called *peccata venialia*.

Actually the power of the keys was exercised by the whole clerical body, under the presidency of the bishop. In formal inquisitorial proceedings, the fact of the commission of a mortal sin was determined either by the voluntary confession of the perpetrator or by indictment and hearing of witnesses, followed, in case of established guilt, by the declaration of excommunication; but the excommunicated retained the privilege of praying for admission to the exercise of penance in the Church. This last, in early days, was in all cases public, especially after the time of Augustine, at least in cases of public crime; but after the beginning of the 4th century it was regulated by steps corresponding to catechumenical grades. Upon the expiration of the term of penance, the length of which, in the early Church, was discretionary with the bishop, but in later times was determined by ecclesiastical laws, the excommunicated was again received into Church membership. This act, which was consummated by imposition of hands, prayer, and the kiss of peace by the bishop, with the assistance of the clergy before the altar (ante apsidem), in presence of the membership of the Church, was called *reconciliation*, or the bestowal of peace (pacem dare). Penitent souls, however, in danger of immediate death, could be reconciled even before the expiration of their period of penance, in presence of the bishop, by any presbyter, or, if such a one was not accessible, even by a deacon (Cyprian, *Epist.* xviii, 1; *Conc. Eliberit.* can. 32); a practice which we find even as late as the Middle Ages, and which clearly proves that in the early Church reconciliation was more an act of jurisdiction than of order.

In the earliest days of the Church, the exercise of its prerogative of the power "to loose," in reconciliation, coincided completely with *absolution*, except that to this term there was not given the meaning which it received in the Middle Ages. Above all, it must not be forgotten that the Church fathers did not place the atoning power in the reconciling activity of the Church, but in the activity of the penitent himself; from the Church the penitent received only instruction how to heal the wound he had created by sin: hence they frequently designated penance as the medicine, and the clerus imposing it as the physician; he (the penitent) was to repair himself from his crime by his good works, and merit the divine forgiveness. Thus must be understood Cyprian's frequent demand of "justa pœnitentia," which consists in the congruity of the guilt with the penance offered as reparation. That God alone absolved from sin was the accepted axiom of the early Church. Yet the Church hesitated not to consider itself one of the means of grace, competent to assist in the work of salvation, acting upon the theory laid down by Cyprian: "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus." So long as the mortally sinning one saw himself inwardly and outwardly separated from the Church, the absolute way to salvation, divine forgiveness, seemed to him inaccessible; there was no need of judgment by the courts, he was already judged. If the Church again admitted him to membership among the purified, he was not necessarily among the number of the saved, but he had at least the prospect of salvation; he now belonged to the number of those over whom the Lord on the final day would sit in judgment, from whom he would select his own. Upon this point Cyprian (*Ep.* lv, 15, 24) and Pacian (*Epist. ad Sympron.* in fine) are very clear. As the absolving judgment of the Church thus becomes rather uncertain, depending upon approval or rejection in the final judgment, there was need of further elucidation. Reconciliation was therefore joined with prayer by a petition that God would forgive the penitent his sins, accept as sufficient his repentance, which of course could only afford a limited satisfaction for the committed offence, and restore to him the lost spiritual gifts. For this reason the act was accompanied by the imposition of hands; compare Augustine, *De Baptism.* iii, c. 16, who says of this ceremony that it is "oratio super hominem," i. e. the symbolic pledge that the answer of prayer should benefit the penitent, and that with it was bestowed the gift of the Holy Ghost. In this sense Cyprian speaks of a "remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata"—for he knows only a forgiving activity of God; and with him all absolving action of the Church confines itself to the restitution of external communion, and the prayerful intercession of the Church, viz. of the priests, martyrs, and believers. However greatly Pacian and Ambrosius may differ in their defence against the Novatians on the right of the priest to absolve from sin, they never claimed for the priest more than the power of intercession—a privilege which they believed he held in common with the congregation.

It is in the Augustinian period that we first discover an endeavor to define the place of the priest in the exercise of the power of the keys. The older fathers, Cyprian and Ambrose, had limited the effect of mortal sins by holding that they inflicted a mortal wound upon the fallen—calling to mind the man who, on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among murderers; and so ecclesiastical penance was regarded simply as a remedy for the afflicted. In the Augustinian period, however, sin was held to be a death-inflicting agent, implying that the fallen was dead, and had to be restored to life. But, as the Church did not possess this power, a change of heart was supposed to precede the exercise of the power of the keys—in short, that a divine influence visited the heart before any human agency could be effectually applied. Augustine, in several passages of his writings (e. g. *Tract.* 22 *in Ev. Joh.*; *Tract.* 49, No. 24) finds the process exemplified in the resurrection of Lazarus: the sinner, like Lazarus, is dead, and, so to speak, rests spellbound in the grave; Mercy awakens him, and restores him to life by wounding him inwardly, and, amid great pain, brings him to a consciousness of his offences; upon Mercy's call he arises, like Lazarus, from the grave, and comes to light, bowed down by his guilt, and, with an acknowledgment to the bishop, seeks the means of salvation in the practice of penance; he is at last freed by the activity of the priests, as Lazarus was freed by the disciples. This picture we find, from this time forward, in most representations of the penance-process, down to the Middle Ages; and especially did the Victorinians form their conception of absolution upon it. If in this picture the act of loosing can only designate the united action of the Church on the fallen, viz. the imposition of penance, intercession, the removal of excommunication, and the admission to the means of grace, it would seem that in other places Augustine holds that the forgiveness of sin is to be mediated by the Church; yet even here he does not speak of the Church as a professed institution of mercy, but rather the community of saints, or of the predestined, by whom the Spirit of God performs its work. Thus he says (*Serm.* 99, cap. 9): "The Spirit forgives, not the Church; this Spirit is God. God dwells in his temple, i. e. in his saintly believers, in his Church, and he forgives sin *by this agency*, because it is the living temple." But even this forgiveness is considered only as the fruit of prayers pleasing to God, and therefore answered by him. While, therefore, Augustine traces forgiveness in reconciliation mainly to the prayerful intercession of the faithful, Leo the Great argues that the priests alone are specific intercessors for the fallen, and that without their intercession forgiveness cannot be secured ("ut indulgentia nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri"). He bases this exclusive intercession prerogative of the priests upon the fact that the Saviour, according to his promise (Matt. xxviii, 29), which Leo refers simply to the clerus, always assists the action of his priests, and that he makes them the channel of his spiritual gifts (*Ep.* 82, al. 108; ad Theod. cap. 2). It is thus that the Catholic notion of the clerical priesthood, which, independent of the laity, communicates God's mercy, and regards this mediatorship as essential, has taken definite shape; and what has been added in later times is simply a more complete or perfect development of the idea as it originated with Leo. But even he does not make the assertion that the priest, instead of being a mediator by prayer for forgiveness, has himself the authority, by virtue of his office, to absolve from sin.

We do not possess an absolution-formula of the first ages of the Church, but we have every reason to suppose, upon the premises stated, that it could only have been deprecative. Augustine even denounced the expression "I forgive thy sins," of the Donatists, as heretical (*Serm.* 99, c. 7–9). If, in our last allusion to the reconciliation of the sinner by means of prayerful intercession, the priest alone seemed to be entitled to be deprecator, we find a very different view was entertained by other Church fathers. In accordance with Lev. xiv, 2, Jerome says that the priests cannot make the leper clean, nor the reverse; they can simply distinguish between the clean and the unclean (*Comm. in Matt.* lib. iii). Not understanding, therefore, Matt. xvi, 19 to concede to the bishops and the elders any other power, it follows that he concedes to the ecclesiastical office simply the authority of distinction, i. e. the judicial power of pronouncing those as loosed who by the mercy of God had been inwardly loosed, and those as bound who have not yet been loosed by God's mercy—a judicial decision whose validity is essentially confined to the forum of the Church, and does not extend to the forum of God. Just so says Gregory the Great (*Hom.* 26, in Ev. No. 6), "It must be determined what guilt has preceded and what penitence has followed guilt in order that the shepherd may loose those whom the Lord in his mercy visits with a sense of repentance. Only when the judg-

ment of the inner judge is obeyed can the action of the officer to loose be a correct and real one." Adding, as he does, like Augustine, the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus, it is evident that Gregory did not consider the bishop's action in mortal sins as anything more than constituting a recognition of the inner condition of the sinner; those into whose heart God has breathed the spirit of life the ecclesiastical judge is to pronounce as loosed, those yet spiritually dead as bound.

As in the early Church great penitence was conceded only once, so reconciliation by the Church was not repeated a second time. In the writings of Sozomen (lib. vii, 16) we first find a witness for the principle of admitting also backsliders to penance and reconciliation. This change of practice was a necessary consequence of the enactment of penitential laws which extended the use of the term mortal sin also to such offences as had formerly been considered simply venial.

III. *Doctrine of the Middle Ages and the Roman Catholic Church.*—The ancient Church classified her members into three sections—the faithful, the catechumens, and the penitent. The power of the keys was exercised upon the last, and in a certain sense also upon the second class; these two only were in any need of reconciliation or absolution by the Church. There is not the slightest evidence or reason to believe that the faithful were obliged to make confession of sins to the priest, even before communion. On the other hand, we find, after the beginning of the Middle Ages, a tendency among the newly-converted Germanic nations to enlarge the practice of penance into a general institution in the Church, and to make the power of the keys, which concerned the penitent alone, a general court of appeal and of mercy for all the faithful. This was done first by subjecting also mental sins to the power of the keys, while in the earlier Church such a thing had never been dreamed of. The origin of this innovation has been demonstrated with full evidence by Wasserschleben (*Bussordnung d. abendländischen Kirche*, p. 108 sq.). Monachism was the exercise of penance for all life. In the monastery it was early considered an act of asceticism to disclose to the brethren the most secret manifestations of sin. In the old British and Irish Church education was directed especially to the order and interests of practical Church life; morals and discipline were generally regulated by monastic rule, which thus penetrated society at large, and more or less influenced all civil legislation. As early as the penance-canons of Vinniaus, who flourished towards the end of the 5th century, the order is given that mental sins, even though prevented from execution, should be atoned for by abstinence from meat and wine for the period of twelve months. The Anglo-Saxon *Pœnitentiale*, which bears the name of Theodore of Canterbury, prescribes for lusts of fornication twenty to forty days' abstinence. The rules of penance of the Irish monk Columban (died A. D. 615) imported these regulations to the Continent, and ordered that all sinful lusts of the mind should be atoned for by penance with bread and water from forty days to six months (compare Wasserschleben, *Bussordnung*, p. 108, 109, 185, 353). In the 5th century the semi-Pelagian John Cassian, of Marseilles, established eight principal or radical sins (vitia principalia), from which spring the actual sins, namely, intemperance, licentiousness, avariciousness, anger, sadness, bitterness, vanity, pride (*Coll. S. S. Patrum V*, "de octo principalibus vitiis"). In the instructions of Columban (*Biblioth. Patr. maxim.* xii, 23) they are mentioned under the name of "crimina capitalia," by which the early Church designated simply those actual mortal sins that were subject to public penitence, and under this name they were introduced into several Anglo-Saxon and Frankish penance-regulations. The Synod of Chalons, in the year 813, directs the priest, in canon 32, to pay special regard to the principal sins of the confessors, a commendation which Alcuin already made in his *De divinis officiis*, cap. 13. From these eight radical sins the seven death-sins of scholasticism were developed. In these regulations of penance we find also already penance redemptions, so important to the history of absolution, which originated simply by a transfer of the old Germanic composition system to ecclesiastical life.

The extension of the power to bind and to loose over all Christians was a necessary consequence of such influences as those just alluded to. In the instructions for penance of the abbot Othman, of St. Gall (died A.D. 761), we have the principle laid down that without confession there is no forgiveness of sin. In Columban's book of confession (can. 30), on the borders of the 6th and 7th centuries, it is ordered that before every communion there should be confession, especially of mental excitements. According to Regino of Prum (died 915) (*De discipl. eccles.* ii, 2), every person ought to confess at least once a year. The first provincial synod which makes confession a general obligation is that of Aenham, A.D. 1109 (canon 20, in two very varying recensions). Innocent III is really the originator of the general penance law [see PENANCE], and thus likewise of the regular periodical exercise of the power of the keys over all Christians. His regulation had no doubt the intention of staying, by ecclesiastical shackles on the conscience, a spreading heresy, as seems evinced by the similarity of canon 29 of the fourth Lateran synod with the twelfth canon of the celebrated Synod of Toulouse in 1229.

Notwithstanding the opposition which manifested itself in the Frankish realm against the penitential books and those of its rules not corresponding to the regulations of the older canons, its principles took effectual hold, and caused a decided revolution in the practice of penance and reconciliation. Even though, after the 4th century, by the side of the public penance, private penance for secret offences had been practiced, reconciliation had remained public; now a distinction was made between public and private penance; the latter was inflicted on voluntary confession, the former for offences publicly proved against the perpetrator; and for great crimes, such as murder, public penance was followed by public reconciliation, which was gradually called absolution. But as, moreover, the extension and enlargement of the practice of penance and confession greatly increased the confessional business, the imposition of public penance, and the grant of a corresponding reconciliation, remained the prerogative of the bishop, while private confession and private absolution fell to the presbyter, who, however, exercised the right to forgive sin merely as the bishop's delegate. In the early Church reconciliation was granted only upon the expiration of penance; the penance regulations of Gildas, however, permitted private reconciliation upon completion of half of the penitential period; the rules of Theodore of Canterbury granted it at the expiration of a year, or even after six months. Boniface ordered in his statutes that it should be granted immediately after confession (Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 1, § 19, note b). All these changes became prevalent in the Carlovingian Age.

Public reconciliation of the penitents was practiced in the Romish Church as early as the 5th century on Green-Thursday (*Epist. Innocentii I, ad Decentium*, c. 7); in the Milanese and Spanish on Char-Friday (*Morin.* lib. ix, cap. 29). After the penitents on Ash-Wednesday had received ashes upon their head, and had been solemnly expelled from the Church, they were, according to the *Pontificale Romanum*, again solemnly led, on Green-Thursday, to the cathedral, where they were relieved of their excommunication and blessed by the bishop after the mercy-seat had been implored and the person sprinkled with holy water and incense. Public reconciliation and public penance naturally, in the course of the Middle Ages, gradually gave place to private confession and private absolution. Since the Reformation it has become obsolete, and the formulas for the same find a resting-place in the Episcopal ritual (comp. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus*, i, 279–288).

Upon the theological importance of absolution, and the relation which the priest in the administering of it sustains to it, the same opposite opinions which we found in the patristic period were entertained in the first half of the Middle Ages. According to the view of which Jerome and Gregory the Great must be especially designated as representatives, the priest is judge *in foro ecclesiæ*, and may by his judgment simply determine and certify for the Church the manifestation of divine mercy in the penitent's heart. Thus, in the *Homilies* of Eligius of Noyon, which, in all probability, belong to the Carlovingian period, we read that the priests, who are in Christ's stead, must by their office, in a visible manner (externally or ecclesiastically), absolve those whom Christ, by an invisible (inwardly effected) absolution, declares worthy of his reconciliation (atonement). Thus says Haymo of Halberstadt (died 853), in a sermon (*Hom. in Octav. Pasch.*), after alluding to the practices of the O.-T. priests towards lepers: "Those whom he recognises by repentance and worthy improvement as inwardly loosed, the shepherd of souls may absolve by his declaration." According to this view, divine forgiveness not only precedes priestly absolution, but also confession; it is the portion of the sinner from the moment when he repents in his heart and turns to God. Absolution of the Church in this instance is simply the confirmation of what God has already done. A proof that this was the stand-point in the 12th century is furnished in Gratian's treatment of the Decretals (caus. xxxiii, qu. iii). He there proposes the question whether anybody can give satisfaction to God by simple repentance without confession (and consequently, also, without absolution). He first adduces the reasons and authorities that must compel an affirmative answer to this question, then those that would answer it in the negative; at the close he leaves it to the reader to decide for himself in favor of the one or the other, as both opinions have the favor and disapproval of wise and pious men. Peter the Lombard, Gratian's contemporary, says (*Sent.* lib. iv, dist. 17) that the sense of forgiveness is felt before the confession of the lips, indeed, from the moment when the holy desire fills the heart. The priest has therefore the power to bind and to loose only in the sense that he declares men bound or loosed, just as the disciples declared Lazarus free from his bonds only after Christ had restored him to life. The declaration of the priest has therefore simply the effect of releasing before the Church the person already loosed by God. According to cardinal Robert Pulleyn (died 1115), the death-sinner enjoys divine forgiveness as soon as he repents; absolution is a sacrament, i. e. the symbol of a sacred cause, for it externally represents forgiveness already secured in the heart by repentance, *not as if the priest actually forgave, but by the external symbol, for the sake of greater consolation, he makes the penitent doubly sure of forgiveness, although it has already become manifest* (*Sentent.* lib. vii, 1). If, at the same time, the anxiety still remaining in the heart is lessened or relieved, this is the effect of absolution, not depending so much upon the activity of the priest as upon God, from whom it springs. By the exercise of divine forgiveness the sinner is simply relieved of the ultimate consequences of his guilt, i. e. eternal damnation; yet earlier or more immediate punishment can only be prevented by his future efforts to atone for the act. Hence the priest imposes a certain measure of satisfaction, a compliance with which can alone free the transgressor from punishment corresponding to the greatness of his guilt; if the satisfaction is too moderate, the penitent must not fancy himself absolved before God; he will have to atone to the fulness of the measure either in this world or in purgatory. The direct bestowal of complete absolution before God we evidently do not find here conceded to be the prerogative of the Church; her judgment is competent only to free the sinner after compliance with her imposition of punishment; on divine punishments she has no judgment.

Nearest in view to Robert Pulleyn comes Peter of Poictiers, chancellor of the University of Paris (he died about 1204), who (in his five *Libri Sententiarum*) lays down the doctrine that forgiveness of sin precedes confession, and that it is secured by repentance. He earnestly contends that the priest cannot relieve the confessing one of his guilt or of eternal punishment; both he asserts to be the prerogative of God alone. The priest has simply the authority to indicate or to declare that God has forgiven the penitent his sin. God, however, relieves of eternal punishment only on condition of definite satisfactions, which the priest has to determine as to measure, and to impose according to the greatness of the crime; and on this account the priest must possess not simply the power to loose, but also the power of discretion (clavis discretionis), which is not granted to everybody. The penitent is therefore advised in all cases to go, if possible, beyond the measure of satisfaction imposed by the priest, lest in purgatory the offender may be obliged to make satisfaction for his neglect here. It is quite characteristic that this scholastic regards confession as a sacrament of the O. T., for the whole process of penance he bases upon the personal activity of the penitent (*Sent.* iii, cap. 13 and 16).

Alongside of this view, according to which the possessor of the power of the keys officiates essentially as judge *in foro ecclesiæ*, another is entertained, which finds its strongest exponent in Leo the Great, according to whom the priest is intercessor and mediator for the penitent before God. This particular view, in its successive developments, has exerted the greatest influence in expanding the priestly power of the keys. This position is assigned to the priest in all late penitential books. Its nature is clearly defined by Alcuin, who, from the analogy of Leviticus (v, 12), in which the sinner is advised to seek the priest with his sacrifice, draws the conclusion that Christian penitents also must bring their sacrifice of confession to God by way of the priest, in order that it may be pleasing to and secure the forgiveness of the Lord (*Ad fratr. in provinc. Gothorum*, ep. 96). For this very reason he calls (in his *De officiis divinis*) the priest "sequester ac medius inter Deum et peccatorem hominem ordinatus, pro peccatis intercessor." This sacerdotal intercession received a higher import in the 11th or 12th century by the *De vera et falsa pœnitentia*, a work attributed, though incorrectly, to Augustine. It develops the following doctrines: 1. That the priest in confession stands in God's stead—his forgiveness is God's forgiveness; for does not Christ say, "Whom ye hold to be loosed and bound, but on whom ye practice the work of justice or of mercy?" (cap. xxv). 2. Gregory the Great had already laid down the dogma that by penance (but not by absolution), sin, which in itself was irremissible, became remissible, i. e. became an expiable guilt by the personal activity of the penitent. This thought was modified in the work just alluded to, so that in confession, it is true, the sinner is not cleared before God, but the committed offence is changed from a mortal to a venial sin (cap. xxv). 3. Such sins no longer incur eternal, but simply temporal punishment, and may be atoned for, either in this world by works of confession, or after death in purgatory, where the pain to be endured for them shall far exceed any torments which the martyrs ever suffered in this life. This thought was taken up by the Victorinians, and from it was developed a complete system. Hugo of St. Victor regarded the priest as the visible medium which man, spellbound by his senses, needs in his approaches to God, and which God uses to pour upon the human heart his mercies; yea, in virtue of this position he does not hesitate to refer the passage in Exodus xxii, 28 to the priests, and to call them *gods* (comp. lib. ii, *De sacr.* pt. xiv, cap. 1). And why should he not? Had not pope John VIII, in the year 878 (*Epist.* 66), already assumed for himself the power, in virtue of his authority from Peter, to bind and to loose, to absolve from all sins, those who had fallen in battle for the Church? and had not bishop

Jordanus, of Limoges, in 1031, at the council held in that city, developed the principle that Christ had intrusted to his Church such a power, that she may loose after death those whom in life she had bound? (Mansi, xix, 539; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 1, § 35, note K). Hugo's principles quickly spread among his contemporaries. Cardinal Pulleyn says that confession made to the priest means virtually (quasi) confession to God; and Alexander III declares that what the priest learns in confession he does not learn as judge, but as God ("ut Deus," cap. 2, ap. Greg. *De offic. judicis ordin.* i, 31). Now if we behold in the priest an intermediate being between God and man, surrounded by a splendor before which the layman's eye is blinded, it is no more than reasonable to expect that his acts must gain in importance, and his position approach nearer and nearer to the office of God's representative. Hugo beholds the sinner bound by a twofold bondage—by an internal and external, by hardness and by incurred damnation; the former God loosens by contrition, the latter by the assistance of the priest, as the instrument by which he works. Here also the resurrection of Lazarus serves both as example and as proof (lib. ii, pt. xiv, cap. 8). His pupil, Richard of St. Victor, goes a step further in his tract *De potestate ligandi et solvendi*. Loosing from *guilt*, the effects of which are manifest in imprisonment (impotency) and servitude (sin service), God alone performs, either directly, or indirectly by men, who need not necessarily be priests; it is done even before confession, by contrition. The loosing from *eternal punishment* God performs by the priest, to whom, for this purpose, the power of the keys has been intrusted; he changes it (i. e. the punishment) into a transitory one, to be absolved either upon earth or in purgatory. The loosing from *transitory* punishment is effected by the priest himself by changing it into an exercise of penance, which is done by the imposition of a corresponding satisfaction.

If hitherto we find independently, side by side, two opinions, namely, that the administrator of the power of the keys either judges *in foro ecclesiæ* or as an interceding mediator, we need not wonder that the advance of doctrinal development soon effected a dialectical union of the two. Richard of St. Victor evidently aimed at such a fusion; the great scholastics of the 13th century accomplished it; and Thomas Aquinas is to be especially regarded as the author of the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent. Alexander of Hales, in his *Summa Theologiæ* (pt. iv, qu. 20, membr. iii, art. 2), opens with the sentence, "The power to bind and to loose really belongs only to God; the priest can simply co-operate." But wherein shall this co-operation consist? Never would the priest take the liberty to absolve any one did he not suppose him to be loosed by God. Alexander is the first writer who meets the alternative as to whether the priest is to be regarded as deprecator or as judge. He holds him to be both in one person; the former he is before God, the latter before the penitent. But the power to loose he can exercise only after God has loosed. He is to the sinner simply an interpreter of what God has already accomplished in him, or is doing in reply to priestly intercession. Alexander of Hales then proceeds to the question whether the priest *can remit eternal punishment*. He replies (membr. ii, art. 2), that as eternal punishment is infinite, and cannot be severed from the offence, the priest does not possess any power to remit it; only God, whose powers have no bounds, can do this. On the other hand, the power of the keys can extend to temporal (or finite) punishments, inasmuch as the priest is God's instituted arbitrator. He explains this in detail thus: God's mercy forgives so that it does not affect his justice. His justice would require a measure of punishment exceeding our powers of endurance; therefore he has instituted, in his mercy, the priest as arbitrator, and given him authority to *levy* the divine punishment, and also, in virtue of Christ's sufferings, to remit a portion of it, for which God's justice need not be exercised. To the question whether the keys have authority also over purgatory, he replies, only *per accidens*, inasmuch as the priest may change the purgatorial punishment into a temporal one, i. e. into an exercise of penance. Just so reason Bonaventura (lib. iv, dist. xviii, art. ii) and Albert the Great (*Comment.* lib. iv, dist. xviii, art. xiii), the former often in the very words of Alexander.

Upon this basis Thomas Aquinas completed the doctrine of the Romish Church on the power of the keys. As Thomas generally distinguishes in ecclesiastical "power" between *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis* (Suppl. part iii, *Summæ*, qu. 20, a. 1, resp.), so there exists also a twofold "key," namely, *clavis ordinis* and *clavis jurisdictionis* (qu. 19, art. 3). The keys of the Church themselves are the power to remove the obstacle interposed by sin, and thus make admission to heaven possible (qu. 17, art. 1). The *clavis ordinensis*, so called because the priest receives it at ordination, directly opens heaven to the person by the forgiveness of sins (sacramental absolution), while the *clavis jurisdictionis* only indirectly causes this result, namely, by the intercession of the Church through excommunication and absolution in the ecclesiastical forum. It is therefore not in a strict sense a *clavis cœli*, but simply *quædam dispositio ad ipsam* (qu. 19, art. 3). To the acts of *clavis jurisdictionis* belong furthermore also the grant of indulgence (qu. 25, art. 2, ad 1 m.). Only the *clavis ordinis* is of a sacramental nature (ibid.); hence also laymen and deacons may possess and exercise the *clavis jurisdictionis*, like the judges *in foro ecclesiæ*, for instance, the archdeacons (quest. 19, art. 3) and the papal legates (quest. 26, art. 2). On the other hand, the use of the sacramental *clavis ordinis* necessarily presupposes the possession of the *clavis jurisdictionis*, as the priest receives at ordination simply the authority to forgive sins, while for the exercise of it a definite circle of men (so to speak, the material or the object of the power of the keys), who are subjected to his jurisdiction ("plebs subdita per jurisdictionem," qu. 17, art. 2, ad 2 m.), is necessary. The *clavis ordinis* can therefore not be exercised until after the possession of the *clavis jurisdictionis* (qu. 20, art. 1 and 2); and, vice-versa, a bishop may, by the withdrawal of the *clavis jurisdictionis*, deprive a schismatic, heretic, excommunicated, suspended, or degraded person of his inferiors (subjects), as well as of the possibility of exercising the *clavis ordinis* (qu. 19, art. 6).

The sacramental power of the keys (*clavis ordinis*) comes into practice in priestly absolution, and it is particularly due to Thomas Aquinas that in the Romish doctrine this power of the keys has gained so much importance, that all parts of the sacrament of penance secure their unity in it. Thomas himself argues that God alone relieves of guilt and eternal punishment on condition of mere contrition; but this contrition can only assure the heart and afford evidence of forgiveness when followed by the fulness of love (as an attendant of *fides formata*), and furthermore must be accompanied with a desire for sacramental confession and absolution. To him who thus repents, guilt and eternal punishment are already remitted before confession, because in the concomitant desire, while repenting, to subject himself to the power of the keys, the latter at once exerts its influence (*in voto existit*, although not *in actu se exercet*). If such a person comes into the penance-chair, the grace showered upon him is greatly increased (augetur gratia) by the exercise (in actu) of the power of the keys. But if contrition does not sufficiently fill the sinner's heart (for want of love, as is frequently the case in the simple *attritio*), and therefore his disposition does not admit the actual exercise of the power of the keys, then the latter supplements his disposition by removing any still existing hinderance to the inpouring of sin-forgiving grace, provided he does not himself bar all access to his heart. In all these relations the priest has that place in the sacrament of penance which water holds in the sacrament of baptism; the former is *instrumentum animatum*, as the latter is *instrumentum inanimatum*. His power, whether simply *in voto* requested or *in actu*

exerted, makes way for the overflowing stream of mercy, and secures the necessary disposition for its reception (*ibid.* qu. 18, art. 1 and 2). The power of the keys is consequently the red thread which is threaded at contrition, drawn through penance, and becomes visible to the outward eye also in absolution. It gives the real form, the frame that secures to all acts of penance (which by it first become *partes sacramenti*, and receive a sacramental character) their inner connection, and supplies to all what is still needed for their completion (comp. qu. 10, art. 1). This is manifest in the effects of absolution by the power of the keys; for example (according to qu. 18, art. 2), temporal punishment is remitted (just the opinion of Richard of St. Victor). Yet this is not completely done as in baptism, but only so in part; the portion still remaining must be atoned for by the personal satisfactions of the penitent, by his prayer, by almsgiving, by fasting to the fulness of the measure meted out by the priest (qu. 18, art. 3). The imposition of satisfactions Thomas calls *binding*, i. e. obliging to atone for punishments still in reserve. The satisfactions have the twofold object of appeasing divine justice and of counteracting any tendency in the soul to sin. Punishment still in reserve (pœnæ satisfactoriæ) again can be remitted in virtue of the *clavis jurisdictionis* by means of indulgence (qu. 25, art. 1), which in the forum of God has the same value as in that of the Church; and this, according to the idea of substituting satisfaction on which it rests, may be of benefit even to souls in purgatory.

By this further development of the doctrine of the power of the keys the form of absolution also was necessarily considerably altered. Alexander of Hales says that in his day the *deprecative* formula preceded and was followed by the *indicative;* and this he justifies from his stand-point by the sentence, "Et deprecatio gratiam impetrat et absolutio gratiam supponit" (comp. pt. iv, qu. 21, membr. 1). The indicative form of absolution, however, must have been an innovation, for the unnamed opponent of Thomas alluded to in his opusculum xxiii (others xxii) actually asserts that to within thirty years the absolution formula used by all priests was *Absolutionem et remissionem tibi tribuat Deus.* Thomas defends with special emphasis the formula *Ego te absolvo*, etc., because it has in its favor the analogy of other sacraments, and because it precisely expresses the effect of the sacrament of penance, namely, the removal of sin, as an exercise of the power of the keys. He interprets its contents in the following words: "Ego impendo tibi sacramentum absolutionis." But he also advises that the indicative form be preceded by the deprecative, lest on the part of the penitent the sacramental effects may be prevented (comp. Daniel, *Cod. Liturg.* i, 297).

The doctrine of Thomas had in its essentials already been dogmatically defined by Eugenius IV in 1439 at the Council of Florence (Mansi, xxxi, 1057), and in its different rules more minutely at the Council of Trent, at its fourteenth session, Nov. 25, 1551. The Council of Trent, in its decree and the canons appended, had simply pronounced authoritatively the exclusive right of the priest to absolve, and it explained the spirit of the latter to be not merely an announcement of forgiveness, but a judicial and sacramental act. The Roman catechism enters far more into detail on this particular point: as the priest in all sacraments performs Christ's office, the penitent has to honor in him the person of Christ. Absolution announced by him does not simply mean, but actually procures forgiveness of sin (pt. ii, cap. v, qu. 17 and 11), for it causes the blood of Christ to flow unto us, and washes away sins committed after baptism (qu. 10). If, in contrition, confession, and satisfaction, the personal activity of the penitent (the *opus operans*) is pre-eminent, on the other hand, in absolution (by which, as the *forma sacramenti*, those acts of penance first really assume a sacramental character, and become *partes sacramenti*), he must become perfectly passive (for it operates altogether *ex opere operato*). From this stand-point the objection frequently raised on the Roman Catholic side against Protestant polemics seems in some sort reasonable, namely, that absolution is neither hypothetical nor absolute, and that it is a sacramental act to which this distinction cannot actually be applied; and it must be conceded on our part that, with the conditions understood to be concurrent, it furnishes such a degree of certainty that its effects cannot fail to be manifest in every one who does not intentionally frustrate it.

This, however, is only one side, in which the priest stands as intercessor between God and the penitent, no longer (as formerly regarded) as a deprecant simply, but as dispenser of mercies. The Roman Catholic conception of absolution furnishes for consideration still another side, according to which the priest is essentially *judge*, not simply *in foro ecclesiæ*, but also, at the same time, *in foro Dei*, i. e. judge in God's stead. As such, he investigates sin to determine a corresponding punishment, and examines the spiritual condition of the confidant in order to know whether to bind or to loose. He is therefore not simply executor of the *opus operatum*, but also judge of the *opus operans*. Now, as such, he gives a judgment, and this must be either hypothetical or absolute. If we look at the form of the sacramental practice, "Ego te absolvo," and compare with it the assurances of the Roman catechism that the voice of the absolving priest is to be looked upon as if he heard the words of Christ to the leper, "Thy sins be forgiven thee" (*l. c.* qu. 10), we cannot do otherwise than regard the priestly decision as absolute, both by its form and contents, as an infallible divine decision. But if, on the other hand, we consider that the priest—and this is conceded on the part of the Roman Catholics—may also be fallible; that the confessor is, after all, a very imperfect surrogate on account of his want of omnipotence; yea, that but very rarely he can attain to an accurate knowledge of the spiritual condition of the confidant, his judgment must necessarily become conditioned; the whole sacrament becomes equally hypothetical, as upon this rests its basis. Thus the Roman Catholic doctrine fluctuates between two opposite poles of assurance and contingency. This, indeed, is the necessary consequence of its development as we have followed it in history, in which two separate originally distinct views as to the position of the priest in absolution had been combined, without, however, really agreeing with each other.

IV. *Doctrine of the Reformation and Protestantism.*—A very new development was given to the doctrine of the power of the keys by the Reformers. Especially noteworthy is,

1. *Luther's Attitude.*—He retained private confession and private absolution, although he knew them to be innovations of the Middle Ages; he even never wholly abolished the sacramental character of absolution. Yet, notwithstanding this apparent adherence to Romish practices, it will be found that he changed, so to speak, regenerated the whole institution in a reformatory spirit. With Luther also the power of the keys is identical with the power to bind and to loose. The keys he regards as nothing else than the authority or office by which the Word is practiced and propagated. As the Word of God, from the nature of its contents, is both law and gospel, so the sermon has the twofold task of alarming the secure sinner by threats of the law, and of giving peace to the troubled conscience by the consolations of the Gospel, i. e. by the forgiveness of sins. The former is denoted by the *binding* key, the latter by the *loosing* key, which are both equally essential to keep Christians in the narrow path of spiritual life. Even the sermon Luther therefore considers as an act (the essential act) of the power of the keys, and the consolation afforded by it as a perfectly effectual absolution. From the latter, however, is to be particularly distinguished *common absolution*, accorded at the close of the sermon, to which Luther assigns the task of admonishing all hearers to obtain for themselves forgiveness of sin; also *private absolution*, to be received only at the

confessional, and which is nothing more nor less than a sermon confined to one auditor. The existence of these different modes of exercising the power of the keys he ascribes partly to God's riches, who did not wish to manifest any littleness in the matter, and partly to the wants of an abashed conscience and a timid heart, which greatly need this strength and stimulant against the devil. The value of private absolution he places in its quasi sacramental character, for, like the sacrament, it also affords a real advantage in confining the Word to a particular person, and thus more securely strikes home than in the sermon. It is true, for this reason, private absolution cannot be regarded as an absolute necessity to forgiveness of sin; but he views it as unquestionably beneficial and advisable (Steitz, *Privatbeichte u. Privatabsolution*, p. 7–14). As Luther, moreover, did not look upon the confessional as a judicial authority, but simply as a mercy-seat, so he looked upon absolution, which he recognised as the most important feature of confession, not as a judicial decision, but as the simple announcement of the Gospel: "Thy sins are forgiven thee"—the apportionment of the forgiveness of sin to a *particular* person, the confinement of its consolation to the most individual needs of a single heart. The power and effect do not depend, according to Luther, upon the priestly character or upon the priestly utterance of him who administers it, but upon the word of Christ, which is announced by it, and upon the command of Christ, which is executed by it. For this very reason, all distinction of human and divine activity disappears from it; neither is the sentence of the person absolving afterwards ratified by God, nor does the absolver announce upon earth the judgment of heaven; but in the forgiveness at absolution God's forgiveness is directly afforded. The only condition upon which the effect of absolution depends is that upon which rests the effect likewise of the Word of God, i. e. of the sermon, namely, faith; for by faith it is received. Repentance is efficacious only so far as it is the indispensable preparation for the reception, but in itself cannot insure forgiveness, as without faith it remains simply sin come to life and experienced in the heart, a Judas-pain of despair (Steitz, *ut supra*, § 6, 13. 15–18). Notwithstanding this irremissible necessity of faith, Luther is far from basing upon it the power of absolution; a weak faith may receive strength also; yea, even to the unbeliever it is truly offered, and affords him forgiveness on account of the indwelling of the Word of God, at least for the moment, but if repelled by unbelief it only adds to his responsibility before the judge. The result of absolution is consolation to the conscience and peace with God in forgiveness of sins and restitution in innocence of the baptismal pledge. Private absolution, Luther holds, must be administered to every individual who demands it; and on this account the power to loose in private absolution is not accompanied by the power to bind. Upon this rests the importance of the distinction between private absolution and private confession; for to confess does not mean anything else than inwardly to desire absolution for our sins and for our guilt: confession can therefore not be *offered* to any one, for God himself does not offer it; it must be an inward want. For this reason, again, no remuneration can be demanded of the person confessing. Luther makes no distinction between the absolution of the layman and that of the priest. It is also his opinion that man cannot too frequently enjoy absolution and the consolation of forgiveness, hence God, in the riches of his mercy, has so ordered it that this consolation may be experienced wherever the Church of the faithful exerts her influence. He holds, finally, that while it may be well to confess all one's different sins, it is most important to confess those that particularly oppress the heart.

The *key to bind*, for which Luther found no place in private confession, he assigned particularly to *jurisdiction;* it found its application, therefore, in the ban. Luther's opinions on this point may be summed up as follows: the ban can be exercised only in cases of public sin and reproach, and for notorious disinclination to repentance; it is the public declaration of the Church that the sinner has bound himself, i. e. has deprived himself of all association of love, and surrendered himself to the devil. It excludes simply from the public association with the Church and her sacraments, not from the inner membership of the Church, from which the sinner himself only can cut loose. It is merely a public punishment of the Church, and has no other object than to improve the sinner. For this reason he is simply excluded from the sacrament, not from the sermon, nor even from the intercession of the Church on his behalf. The loosing from the ban is the public declaration of the Church that the person hitherto under ban has been reconciled to and is again accepted by the Church. This loosing is to be granted to any one who seeks it in repentance and faith; and this absolution of the Church, in virtue of the power of the keys, is God's absolution. A ban unjustly imposed can do the person so punished no harm, and should be borne patiently; nor must it be forgotten that external membership in the Church may be coexistent with exclusion from inner membership.

2. *Melancthon* coincided generally with Luther on the doctrine of the power of the keys, but with this difference, that he regarded the keys as an essential attribute of the episcopal or ministerial office. Yet we find in ecclesiastical regulations made under his supervision, as early as 1543, some decided deviations from Luther's doctrines. It is there directed to admit no one to communion "unless he have previously received private absolution from his pastor or some other competent person" (Richter, *Kirchenordnung*, ii, 45). Furthermore, the right is conceded to the absolving minister, under certain conditions, to deny absolution to the confessing. The ban itself, however, in consequence of its abuse, was early taken from the hands of the clergy, and its imposition left to the Consistory. Absolution was bestowed in the church at Sunday vesper service by imposition of hands. The formulas of absolution are partly exhibitory; not unfrequently both stand side by side for selection.

Chemnitz is the first who disputes that absolution can be regarded as a sacrament in the same manner as baptism and communion, and assigns for his reason that it rests simply upon the Word of God, and has received no additional external sign. He also regards the exercise of absolution as a specific prerogative of the sacred office, although he still holds to the old Protestant principle that the keys were given to the Church herself. (See Schmidt, *Dogmatik*, § 53, note 5; Heppe, *Dogmatik*, iii, 250; Kliefoth [see below], p. 278.) Moreover, he argues that it must be left to the absolving clergyman to use his judgment and cognition in the refusal or grant of absolution.

Quite differently teach Quenstedt and Hollaz. They explicitly speak of the power to forgive sin as an official prerogative of the servants of the divine Word, and the latter even teaches, in a quite un-Protestant manner, that the servants (ministers) relatively and effectually convert, renew, and bless the sinner by the Word of God; so they also relatively and effectually forgive sin (Heppe, p. 252).

As a misconstruction of the original Protestant view on this doctrine, we must certainly regard Baier's position that absolution is a juridical act; and he, in consequence, distinguishes the *potestas ordinis* and the *potestas clavium* or *jurisdictionis*, and determines the former to be a *potestas publice docendi et sacramenta administrandi*, and the latter a *potestas remittendi et retinendi peccata* (comp. Schmidt, § 59, note 9).

3. *The Swiss reformers*, from the very commencement, interpreted the power of the keys to refer especially to the exercise of ecclesiastical government, and more particularly to Church discipline, and in this sense they have formulated in their confessions the rules pertaining to this subject. On the other hand, Calvin referred the power of the keys altogether to the preaching

of the Gospel and the exercise of Church discipline, disregarding the sacramental idea. He taught: 1. Absolution is twofold: one part serves faith, the other belongs to Church discipline. 2. Absolution is nothing else than the witness of the forgiveness of sin based upon the forms of the Gospel (*Instit.* lib. iii, cap. iv, § 23). 3. Absolution is conditional; its conditions are repentance and faith. 4. As to the existence of these conditions men must necessarily be uncertain, so that the certainty of binding and loosing does not depend upon the judicial decision of a human court. The servants of the divine Word can therefore absolve only conditionally (§ 18): in virtue, viz. of this Word they can promise forgiveness to all who believe on Christ, and threaten damnation to those who do not lay hold of Christ (§ 21). 5. In this exercise of their functions they can, for this reason, not fall into error, for they do not promise more than the Word of God commands them; while the sinner can secure for himself certain and complete absolution with perfect assurance whenever he will lay hold upon the mercy of Christ in accordance with the spirit of the Bible promise, "According to thy faith be it unto thee" (§ 22). 6. The other absolution, which forms a constituent of Church discipline, has nothing to do with secret sins; it extinguishes only any offence which may have been given to the Church (§ 23). In this also the Church follows the infallible rule of the divine Word: in virtue of this word she announces that all adulterers, thieves, murderers, misers, and the unjust shall have no part in the kingdom of God; and in this binding she cannot err. With this same Word she looses the repenting ones, to whom she brings consolation (§ 21). According to these principles, which, with utter disregard of the sacramental idea, designate absolution simply as a species of sermon, and with it reproduce the doctrine of German Protestantism in an improved form, Calvin could not cast aside private absolution; yet he declined to recognise in it a general institution of the Church, and made its administration dependent upon the individual need of those who should demand it. Its value to the end in view he speaks of very much in the strain of the Lutheran Church: "It happens sometimes that some one hears the promises given to all the faithful, and nevertheless remains in doubt whether to him also his sins are forgiven. When such a one uncovers his secret wound to his pastor, and hears that voice of the Gospel, 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee' (Matt. ix, 2), addressed to himself, his heart is quieted and freed from all fear. Nevertheless we must take care lest we should dream of a power of the keys not in accordance with the doctrine of the gospels" (§ 14). It is true, this does not look exactly like Lutheran private absolution, but it is certainly the only evangelical sense; and of this alone the Scriptures, the apostolic Church, and the following centuries down to the Middle Ages, know anything.

4. Private absolution, as a whole, could be a blessing only so long as that specific religious interest which the Reformation awakened in all circles remained fresh and full of life; with a lassitude of the latter, the former also, together with confession, its offspring, necessarily deteriorated to a dead ecclesiastical form, and, instead of encouraging faith, favored a false security. In several Lutheran churches its exercise was ignored, and finally resulted in a complete change of the manner of confession and absolution (Steitz, p. 159 sq.). The fresh and living spirit of the Reformation had fled, private confession and private absolution had sunk to a mere thoughtless form, Church ban had become a punishment, public reconciliation a public restitution; this ecclesiastical punishment was pronounced only by the consistories, and simply in cases of offences of the flesh.

5. Suddenly *Pietism* came forward with a loud protest, and demanded a decided reform in the exercise of the power of the keys. The forerunner in this direction was Theophilus Grossgebauer, professor at Rostock (*Wächterstimme aus dem verwüsteten Zion*, 1661), who regarded as essential for private sins only confession before God, but for public sins, to which alone he referred the power to bind and to loose, public confession and reconciliation in presence of the offended Church. Spener, although in favor of retaining private confession and private absolution, advocated a modified form, viz., announcement to the pastor, and, as its object, advice for and examination of the condition of the confidant's soul; and he insisted that the confessor, whose choice he left to personal confidence, should absolve only those truly repenting, but should impress the sinner with his guilt, and should turn over the doubtful ones to a college of elders for them to judge and to exercise the authority of the ban. With special emphasis he declared the power of the keys to be a right of the whole Church or of the brotherhood, which, by way of abuse, had fallen exclusively into the hands of the ecclesiastics. With far greater decision his adherents opposed the institution of private confession: the attacks of pastor Johann Kaspar Schade, of Berlin, on the confessional, which he called an institution of Satan, and his abolition of private absolution of his own accord, resulted first in an investigation of the merits of the question (Nov. 16, 1698), and finally in an electoral resolution (shortly afterwards followed by a like regulation on the part of other states), which ordered confession and absolution of all confidants in common, but, on the other hand, left private confession and private absolution to be determined by the needs of the individual. The war thus opened between Pietism and Lutheran orthodoxy led the latter to declare private confession and private absolution a divine institution, and thus only brought some credit to the old Lutheran institutions, while it greatly increased the fervor of their opponents.

6. In the sphere of dogmatics Schleiermacher was the first among German Protestant divines to reintroduce the idea of the power of the keys, but he confines its application, after special exclusion of the sermon, to the law-giving and judicial (administrative) power of the Church, which he regards as the essential outgrowth of the ecclesiastical office of Christ, and whose existence he ascribes to the association of the Church with the world (§ 144, 145). When we consider, however, how vague and contradictory are the confessional books of the evangelical churches on this point (we need invite only to a comparison of the passages collected by Schleiermacher in § 145), how things altogether distinct are there joined, and how difficult it is in an exegetical way to define the subject with any degree of certainty, it seems the most proper course to ignore the attempt altogether of introducing into dogmatics such figurative terms as "keys of the heavenly kingdom," to "bind and loose." What has thus far been written upon these phrases would have been much more in place in defining "forgiveness of sin" and "justification" when alluding in practical theology to preparation for communion (as has been done, with a good deal of tact, by Nitzsch in his *Prakt. Theol.* ii, 2, 428), and in ecclesiastical law under discipline without any cause for fear of complication.

As regards the idea of absolution so prominent in the exercise of the power of the keys, it has, during the last twenty years, again become (in Germany) matter of general investigation. The beginning was made by the court preacher, Dr. Ackermann (at the Church diet in Bremen in 1852), on private confession. Although he did not lay particular stress upon absolution, but simply justified confession on its own account and as a psychological need, it naturally led to a debate on absolution by the Church diet, followed by a lively discussion between the Lutheran and Reformed ministers. On the part of the Lutherans every possible effort was made to reinvest private absolution with its former rights, and to pave the way at least for its early reintroduction. They went so far as to vindicate it as a divine institution, argued for general absolution as a duty, and, well knowing its origin in the Middle Ages, appealed to it as an institution sanctified by tradition of the Church.

Even the assertion was not wanting that absolution, under all circumstances, possesses divine power, so as actually to free the sinner from his guilt, quite in contradiction to the new Lutheran doctrine. See LUTHERANISM, NEW.

V. *Doctrine of the Greek Church.*—The Greek Church entertains views on the doctrine of the power of the keys and on absolution very similar to those entertained by the Latin Church in the Middle Ages. The subject is treated in full in Covel, *Account of the Greek Church* (Cambridge, 1722, fol.), p. 229 sq.; Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. ii. See GREEK CHURCH.

VI. *Doctrine of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church.*—On the question of absolution, as involved in the so-called "power of the keys," there is a division of opinion similar to that noticed above in the Lutheran Church of Germany. This difference is but part of a wide divergency of views on the whole question of ministerial functions, and is generally denoted by the opposite terms the *High-Church* and the *Low-Church* party. See RITUALISM.

VII. *Literature.*—J. Morinus, *De disciplina in administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ* (Paris, 1651, Antwerp, 1682); Daillé, *De pœnis et satisfactionibus humanis* (Amst. 1649); *De sacramentali sive auriculari Latinorum confessione* (Gen. 1661); Hottinger, *Smegma exercitat. de pœnitentia antiquioris Romanæ ecclesiæ* (Tigurini, 1706); Wernsdorf, *De absolutione non mere declarativa* (Vitt. 1761); Abicht, *De confessione privata* (Gedan. 1728); Fix, *Gesch. d. Beichte* (Chemnitz, 1800); Dens, *Theologia*, tom. vi; *De Sacrament. Pœnit.* No. 14, tom. ii, No. 91, *De Primatu Petri;* Mohnike, *Das Sechste Hauptstück im Katechismus* (Strals. 1830); Barron, *On the Supremacy* (in *Works*, vii, 134 sq., Oxf. 1830); Chas. Elliott, *Delineation of Roman Catholicism* (3d ed., by Dr. Hannah, Lond. 1851), p. 195 sq., 613 sq.; Möhler, *Symbolism* (transl. by Robertson, 3d ed., N. Y. Cathol. Publ. House, 1870), p. 217 sq.; H. C. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* (Phila. 1869), p. 153, 223 sq.; Haag (Romish), *Histoire des Dogmes Chrétiens*, vol. ii, § 20; *London Review*, 1864 (July), p. 86 sq.; *Evang. Quart. Rev.* 1869 (April), p. 69, 269; (July) p. 69, 341; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, p. 156. Among the early monographs on the keys we may mention those of Wigand, *De clave ligante* (Francof. 1561); Schmid, *De clavibus ecclesiæ* (Argent. 1667); Botface, *De clavibus Petri* (Haf. 1707); Luther, *Von d. Schlüsseln* (ed. Wiesing, Frankft. and Lpz. 1795). Of late (chiefly German) treatises specially on the subject we may name Rothe, *Amt d. Schlüssel* (Görl. 1801); Brescius, *Amt d. Schlüssel* (Breslau, 1820); Steitz, *Das Bussacrament* (Frankft. 1854); idem, *Die Privatbeichte und Privatabsolution* (Frankft. 1854); Kliefoth, *Beichte und Absolution* (Schwer. 1856); Pfisterer, *Luther's Lehre von der Beichte* (Stuttg. 1857). See also ABSOLUTION; LAY REPRESENTATION; ROCK.

Keyser, LEONHARD, a Baptist martyr, originally a Roman Catholic priest, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He joined the Baptists in 1525, and immediately began preaching the Reformation doctrine, undismayed by all the tyranny exerted against the faithful by water, fire, and sword. In the second year of his ministry (1527) he was apprehended at Scherding, on the River Inn, and condemned to the flames. "The chief heads of accusation against him were, that faith alone justifies, without good works; that there are only two sacraments; that the Gospel was not preached by the papists in Germany; that confession is not God's command; that Christ is the only satisfaction for sin; that there is no purgatory; that Christ is the only Mediator; and that all days (alluding to feast or saints' days) are alike with God."—*Baptist Martyrs*, p. 60.

Kezi'a (Heb. *Ketsiah'*, קְצִיעָה, *cassia*, as in Psa. xlv, 9; Septuag. Κασσία v. r. Κασία), the name of Job's second daughter, born to him after the return of his prosperity (Job xlii, 14). B.C. cir. 2220.

Ke'ziz (Hebrew *Ketsits'*, קְצִיץ, *abrupt;* only with עֵמֶק, *e'mek, valley*, prefixed; Septuag. both Ἀμεκκασίς, Vulg. *Vallis Casis*), or rather *Emek-Keziz* (Vale of Keziz), a city of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Beth-hoglah and Beth-arabah (Josh. xviii, 21), and therefore probably situated in a steep ravine of the same name leading to the valley of the Jordan. See BETH-BASI. M. De Saulcy found a small valley by the name of *Kaaziz* about an hour and a half distant from Bethany, in the direction of Jericho (*Narrative*, ii, 17), which he conjectures (p. 26) was the ancient Valley of Keziz. So also Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 328) calls it *Wady el-Kaziz.*

Khadijah is the name of the *first* wife of the Islamite prophet. See MOHAMMED.

Khan is the more common Arabic name for the public establishments which, under the less imposing title of *menzil*, or the more stately one of *caravanserai* (q. v.), correspond to our Occidental ideas of an INN (q. v.). These afford lodging, but not usually food, for man and beast. They are generally found near towns, but sometimes in the open country on a frequented route. They are mentioned in the N. Test. (*πανδοχεῖον*, Luke x, 34) and Talmud (פונדק, Lightfoot, *Opp.* p. 799), and something of the kind seems to occur in the later books of the O. T. (גֵּרוּת, Jer. xli, 17; the *κατάλυμα* of Luke ii, 7 is, however, thought by some to have been of a more



Interior of Vizir Khan at Aleppo.

private character). The earlier Hebrews knew of no such provision for travellers (Gen. xlii, 27; Exod. iv, 24; 2 Kings xix, 23; the מָלוֹן being merely the stopping-place over night; the זוּנָה of Josh. ii, 1 indicating rather a brothel, and the נָוֶה of 1 Sam. xix, 18 the home of the prophet-scholars). Entertainment was generally furnished by individual hospitality (q. v.).

Khatchadûr, an Armenian theologian, flourished in the opening of the 17th century. He was bishop of Dehougha, and in 1630 was sent by the Armenian patriarch Michael III to Constantinople on an ecclesiastical mission, and later to Poland. He is particularly celebrated, however, as a poet.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 675.

Khatchid I, elected patriarch of Armenia in 972, is noted in the annals of the ecclesiastical history of Armenia for the interest he manifested toward literature and the fine arts, and for the establishment of a number of monasteries. He died at his residence in Arkina in 992. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 676.

Khatchid II was patriarch of Armenia in 1058, but was oppressed by the Byzantine emperor Constantine Ducas, who imprisoned him for some three years, and then banished him to Cappadocia. He died in 1064.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 676.

Khazars or **Khozars** is the name of a Finnish people, a rude but powerful nation, north of the Caucasus, related to the Bulgarians and Hungarians, which in the 8th century embraced Judaism. After the dissolution of the empire of the Huns they settled on the borders of Europe and Asia, and at one time possessed a realm near the mouth of the Wolga (by them called Itil or Atel), on the Caspian Sea (after them sometimes called Khazar Sea), where the Kalmucks (q. v.) now live. They gave much uneasiness to the Persians, especially during the reign of Khosru I (q. v.), and in the 7th century, after the downfall of the Sassanians, the Khazars went across the Caucasus, invaded Armenia, and conquered the Crimea, hence called at one time *Khozari* or *Cho(a)zari*. The Byzantine emperors trembled before the warlike skill of the Khazars, and paid large tributes to keep them at a respectful distance from Constantinople; the Bulgarians and other peoples were their vassals; the Russians (Kievians) appeased their desire for conquest by an annual tribute, and with the Arabs they were waging constant warfare. But by degrees, as they abandoned their nomadic habits, their warlike spirit decreased, and they largely fostered commercial intercourse with the outer world. They exchanged dried fish, the furs of the north, and slaves for the gold and silver and the luxuries of southern climates. Merchants of all religions—Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans—were freely admitted, and their superior intelligence over his more barbarous subjects induced one of their kings, Bulan, to forsake their coarse, idolatrous worship, greatly mixed with sensuousness and licentiousness, and to embrace (A.D. 740) the Jewish religion. "By one account," says Milman (*Jews*, iii, 138), "he was admonished by an angel; by another, he decided in this singular manner between the claims of Christianity, Moslemism, and Judaism. He examined the different teachers apart, and asked the Christians if Judaism were not better than Mohammedanism; the Mohammedan, whether it was not better than Christianity. Both replied in the affirmative; on which the monarch decided in favor of Judaism." According to one statement secretly, to another openly, he embraced the faith of Moses, and induced learned teachers of the law to settle in his dominions. Of course, at first, the change of religious belief was confined to the royal household, and the four thousand nobles of the land, who, with Bulan, embraced Judaism; but soon the new religion spread, and ere long the majority of the nation bowed in adoration to the one and ever-living God. Judaism actually became a necessary condition to the succession to the throne, but there was the most liberal toleration to all other forms of faith. See Obadiah. Rabbi Hasdai, a learned Jew, who was in the highest confidence with Abderrahman, the caliph of Cordova, first received intelligence of this sovereignty possessed by his brethren through the ambassadors of the Byzantine emperor. After considerable difficulty, Hasdai succeeded in establishing a correspondence with Joseph, the reigning king. The letter of Hasdai is extant, and an answer of the king, which does not possess equal claims to authenticity. The whole history has been wrought out into a religious romance, entitled Cosri [see Jehuda ha-Levi], which has involved the question in great obscurity. Basnage rejected the whole as a fiction of the Rabbins, anxious to prove that "the sceptre had not entirely departed from Israel." Jost inclines to the belief that "there is a groundwork of truth under the veil of poetic embellishment." The latest writers upon the subject admit without hesitation, and Jewish writers almost boast of the kingdom of Khazar. Comp. Frähn's *Commentary of Ibn-Foszlan "De Chazaris"* (in the *Mémoires de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de Petersbourg*, 1822, vol. viii); D'Hosson, *Peuples du Caucase;* Dufrémery, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1849, p. 470 sq.; Reinaud, *Abulfeda*, Introd. p. 299; Vivien de St. Martin, *Les Khazars* (in the *Mém. à l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres*, Paris, 1851). The Khazars became extinct as a nation in A. D. 945, when they were conquered by Swaitoslaw [duke of Kiev (q. v.)], and their name, otherwise almost forgotten, was preserved in the archives of the Muscovite. See Schweitzer, *Judrüssiche Völker;* Carmoly, *Itineraires de la Terre Sainte* (Brux. 1847), p. 1–104; Rapoport, *Kerem Chemed*, v, 197 sq.; Cassel, in Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopädie;* Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, v, 211 sq.; Rule, *Karaites*, p. 79 sq. See Kief. (J. H. W.)

Khedr, Al, is the name which figures in the *Koran* (chap. xviii, Sale's edition, p. 244) as that of a person whom the Mohammedans assert the Lord pointed out to Moses as superior in wisdom to any other living person, Moses included. The story the Mohammedans tell is thus given by Sale: "Moses once preaching to the people, they admired his knowledge and eloquence so much that they asked him whether he knew any man in the world who was wiser than himself, to which he answered in the negative; whereupon God, in a revelation, having reprehended him for his vanity (though some pretend that Moses asked God the question of his own accord), acquainted him that his servant Al Khedr was more knowing than he; and, at Moses's request, told him that he might find that person at a certain rock where the two seas met, directing him to take a fish with him in a basket, and that where he missed the fish that was the place. Accordingly Moses set out, with his servant Joshua, in search of Al Khedr." See Sale's *Koran*, p. 244.

Khlesl, Melchior, a German theologian, born at Vienna in 1553 of Protestant parents, was induced to enter the Roman Catholic Church, and joined the Jesuits. After studying five years under the Jesuits he took the first four orders, then continued his studies for two years at Ingolstadt, and was ordained priest in 1579. He became successively provost of the cathedral at Vienna, administrator of the bishopric of Neustadt in 1588, and bishop of Vienna in 1598. The loose conduct of the Roman Catholic clergy having greatly contributed to the rapid spreading of Protestant doctrines, Khlesl showed himself a zealous partisan of reform in this respect, while, on the other hand, he did his utmost to bring Protestants back into the fold of Romanism. Yet he was still more inclined to mingle in politics than in Church affairs. He attached himself to the grand duke Matthias, eldest brother of the emperor Rudolph II, whom the latter particularly disliked on account of a prediction, according to which this brother was to depose him. The emperor contemplated exiling Khlesl,

but the latter succeeded in organizing a conspiracy, and Matthias was made emperor in Rudolph's place. The Protestant princes had a part in this revolution, but Khlesl took good care that they should not derive any benefit from it to further their religion. Under emperor Matthias he became president of the privy council in 1611, and cardinal in 1616. Notwithstanding his opposition to Protestantism, which he rigorously persecuted in 1616–18, he remained at the head of the German party, and opposed the adoption of the grand duke Ferdinand as heir to the throne. Ferdinand revenged himself by arresting Khlesl at Vienna, July 20, 1618, and confining him first at the castle of Ambras, and then at the convent of Georgenberg, in Tyrol. In 1622 a requisition from the pope caused him to be transferred to Rome, where he was imprisoned for seven months in the castle of St. Angelo. After his liberation he returned to Vienna in 1627, and was restored to the possession of his property and his offices. He gave up politics to attend exclusively to the management of ecclesiastical affairs, and died Sept. 18, 1630. His fortune, amounting to over half a million, he left to the bishopric of Vienna; 100,000 florins to Neustadt and Vienna for a yearly mass for his soul; 100,000 florins to the convent of Himmelspforte, 20,000 to the Jesuits, and 46,000 to his relatives. Khlesl's motto was "Strong and mild:" strong in action, mild in manner; the latter was somewhat difficult for him to submit to, as he was naturally hasty. He had not received a classical education, but was well versed in the Bible, in patristics, and in homiletics. See Hammer-Purgstall, *Lebensbeschreibung des Cardinals Khlesl* (Vienna, 1847–51, 4 vols. 8vo); Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* vi, 225.

Khlestovshchicki. See Skoptzi.

Khlistie (*Lashers*), also called **Danielites**, is the name of a powerful Russian sect. They call themselves "people of God," "Tribe of Israel," "worshippers of the true God," or "Brothers and Sisters." They originated in the first year of the reign of the emperor Alexis (A.D. 1645). According to their tradition, there descended, in the days of Alexis, upon Mt. Gorodin, in the district of Wladimir, in great power, on a wagon of fire surrounded by a cloud, "God the Father," accompanied by the hosts of heaven. The latter returned again to the other world, but the Lord himself remained on the earth, and manifested himself in the flesh in the person of Daniel Philippon (or Philippitch). This they hold to have been the second manifestation of God the Father in the flesh, and as in his first manifestation Jerusalem was enlightened, so at this time Russia was blessed with special divine favor; and, corresponding to Jerusalem, they point out as their Zion, or, as they call it, "the higher region," the province Kostroma, in which Daniel Philippon was born. The historical facts in the case, as related by Dixon (*Free Russia*, p. 139), however, are, that Daniel was a peasant in the province of Kostroma, and, after serving for a time in the Russian army, ran away from his flag in battle, declared himself the Almighty, and wandered about the empire, teaching those who would listen to his voice his doctrine, inculcated in the following twelve commandments:

1. I am the God of whom the prophets spoke. I came for the second time into the world to redeem the souls of men. There is no God besides me.
2. There is no other doctrine, and no other is to be sought.
3. In what you are taught, therein also remain.
4. Keep the commandments of your God, and become fishers of men in general.
5. Drink no strong drinks, and do not fulfil the lust of the flesh.
6. Do not get married, and whosoever is married let him live with his wife as with his sister. This is the sense of the Old-Testament Scriptures. The unmarried should not marry, and those who are married should separate.
7. No abusive word (*diabol*) is to be used.
8. Not to attend wedding or baptism festivities, or drink at parties.
9. Not to steal; and if any one takes of another the smallest coin, it will have to melt on his head at the judgment day from the heat of punishment before he can be pardoned.
10. These commandments are to be kept secret, not to be revealed even to father or mother. The suffering from fire and the knout must be endured, because for it the kingdom of heaven and bliss on earth are obtained.
11. Friends are to visit friends, to give suppers of friendship, to exercise love, to keep these commands, and pray to God.
12. To believe in the Holy Spirit.

Their own tradition asserts that Daniel himself did not issue these commands, but that a son was born to him fifteen years before his appearance in this world, in the person of Ivan Timofejen, in the village Maksakon, of a woman one hundred years old. That this Ivan, when thirty-three years old, was summoned by Daniel to the village Staraja, and there received his godhead, and that thereupon father and son ascended into heaven, and, after a short tarry, from the same place descended Jesus the Christ, in the person of Ivan, who at once commenced to preach, assisted by twelve disciples, the doctrines embodied in the twelve commandments above cited, and entered into the state of holy matrimony with a young female, whom they call "the daughter of God." To add to the romance of the story, the persecutions to which these fanatical religionists were subject has given rise to an imitation of the resurrection narrative of the N.-T. Scriptures. After suffering persecution under various forms and of divers kinds, Ivan was partly burned and then crucified; but, after removal from the cross, and his burial on a Friday, he rose again, and on the Sunday after appeared in the midst of his followers. Again seized by the authorities, he was tried and crucified a second time, and his skin taken off; one of his female followers standing by then wrapped the body in a sheet, out of which a new skin formed itself, and after burial he again rose and commenced anew the preaching of his doctrines, and made many followers. Thereafter Ivan took up his residence at Moscow, and openly taught his new religion. The house which he occupied was called the "New Jerusalem." He died on the day of St. Tichon, after living some forty-five years at Moscow, and ascended to heaven in presence of his disciples, to join his father and the saints. Notwithstanding the frenzy of this fabulous narrative, the sect is numerous, and has among its members many of the nobles of the land.

Like the Skoptzi, the sect of the Khlistie also observe some of the practices of the regular Church, to ward off suspicion and to shield themselves from persecution. From their usages it is known that before they go to communion in the church they first partake of it according to their own form. They also have a separate form of baptism. They have pictures of their god Daniel Philippon, their Jesus Christ, their mother of God, saints, prophets, and teachers whom they adore. The orthodox church edifices they call "ant-nests," and their priests "idolaters and adulterers." Marriage is considered an impurity, and all entering this state are lost, yet they permit one of the nearest relatives of Daniel Philippon and Ivan Timofejen to enter this state to prevent the interruption of the lineage. The water from a well in the village Staraja, near Kostroma, is in the winter sent about in the shape of ice, and used by them to bake their communion bread. In the same village lived in 1847 a girl, Uliana Visilijewa by name, who was adored as the last of the lineage by many from all parts, among them nobles and merchants of Moscow, and though for this reason the government passed unnoticed her sacrilegious acts, she was at last arrested and sent to a monastery.

Their mode of worship is very much like that of the Skoptzi, except that after service they partake of an ordinary meal in common, which is prolonged till late in the evening, and often becomes the occasion of licentious sins. This sect is known in various localities by different names; in some parts they are called *Ljady* (useless), in others *Chorashy* (hypocrites), *Vertuni* (turners), *Kupidony* (Cupido, the god of love). Great num-

bers of these heretics have been sent into the Caucasus and Siberia, where many of them have been forced to enter the armies and the mines. See Dixon, *Free Russia*, chap. xxiv.

Kholbah (Arabic), a peculiar form of prayer used in Mohammedan countries at the commencement of public worship in the great mosques on Friday at noon. It was originally performed by the Prophet himself, and by his successors up to A.D. 936, since which time special ministers are appointed for the purpose. The Kholbah is chiefly "a confession of faith," and a general petition for the success of the Mohammedan religion. It is divided into two distinct parts, between which a considerable pause is observed, which the Mussulman regards as the most solemn and important part of his worship. The insertion of the sultan's name in this prayer has always been considered one of his chief prerogatives. See Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art*, ii, 282.

Khonds. There are throughout India manifest traces of a rude primitive stock of people who occupied the country anterior to the Aryo-Scythian races, and there are still great divisions of the people bearing national characteristics which distinguish them from the Hindus. The earliest knowledge we have of these people is through the great epic poems of the Hindus, the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*, which describe the wars of the Aryans, as the invading race, with the aboriginal inhabitants of these impenetrable forests. Successive wars of invaders, however, subdued, to a greater or less extent, some of these, and modified their views and usages; but these, in turn, affected the religion and manners of their conquerors.

Divisions.—Some of these races have attached themselves to Hindu society, and serve in a condition of degradation as *Chandals* or *Mlechas*, i. e. outcasts or pariahs. They often hold offices of trust and responsibility in village communities, but, according to Hindu law, they should live outside of villages, and own no property but dogs and asses. Their customs and institutions are, however, everywhere different from those of the Hindus.

There are others of these aboriginal tribes who have not mingled with Hinduism at all, or only very partially. Among these are the *Kols* of Bengal and Eastern Nagpoor, the Khonds of Central India, the Bheels of the Vindhya Mountains, the Khaudesh Malwah, etc., of Central India, and others in the south amid the forests of the Neilgherry Hills, in Guzerat, and other places (see *Edinb. Review*, April, 1864). These preserve their own habits, even where Hinduism most presses them. They have no castes, their widows are allowed to remarry, they have no objection to any kind of flesh, and otherwise differ greatly from the Aryan peoples.

The least raised above their primitive condition are the Khonds of Orissa, who "occupy a district about two hundred miles long by one hundred and seventy broad, in Rampur, in the district of Gunjam" (Brace, p. 142), a tract of land back from the coast of the Bay of Bengal, where it trends eastward to Calcutta and southward to Madras, and embracing the plateaux of the Vindhya and other mountains.

Name.—They term themselves *Knee, Kui, Koinga, Kwinga*, but are known to Europeans by their Hindu name of *Khond* or *Kond*. Their language is affiliated with the Uriya (Ooriya), but the dialects are many, and often "a Khond of one district has been found unable to hold communication with one of a neighboring tribe." The speech has "a peculiar pectoral enunciation." Ethnologically, all these tribes are Turanian or Mongolian.

Domestic Relations.—Marriage may only take place without the tribe, but never with strangers, the tribes intermarrying. Boys of ten or twelve years of age are married to girls of fifteen or sixteen, the arrangements being always made by the parents. The father of the bridegroom generally pays twenty or thirty "lives" of cattle to the bride's father. The marriage rite itself is very simple. The father of the bridegroom, with his family and friends, bears a quantity of rice and liquor in procession to the house of the parents of the girl. The priest takes it, and dashes the bowl down, and pours out a libation to the gods. The parents of the parties join hands, and declare the contract completed. An entertainment follows, with dancing and song. Late at night the married pair are carried out on the shoulders of their respective uncles, when, the burdens being suddenly exchanged, the boy's uncle disappears, and the company assembled divides into two parties, who go through a mock conflict; and thus the semblance of a forcible abduction, remains or indications of which are found so frequently in widely separated quarters, are preserved among the Khonds of Orissa (see M'Lennan's *Primitive Marriage*). The marriage contract is, however, loosely held. If childless, the wife may return to her father at any time, or, in any event, within six months of the marriage if the money given at her marriage be restored to her father. She cannot be forcibly retained, however, even if the money be not returned. If her withdrawal be voluntary she cannot contract another matrimonial alliance. A man may ally himself with another woman than his wife, with the wife's consent. Concubinage is not disgraceful, fathers of respectable families allowing their daughters to contract such marriages. An unmarried woman may become a mother without disgrace.

Births are celebrated on the seventh day by a feast given to the priests and villagers. The name is determined by a peculiar rite, in which grains of rice are dropped into a cup of water.

Death.—After the death of a private person his body is burned, without any ceremony other than a drinking feast. If, however, a chief die, "the heads of society" are assembled from every quarter by the beating of gongs and drums; the body is placed on the funeral pile; a bag of grain is laid on the ground, a staff being planted in it; and all the personal effects of the deceased, his clothes, arms, and eating and drinking vessels, being first placed by the flag, are afterwards distributed, when the pile is fired, and the company dance round the flagstaff.

Social Organization and Government.—The family is the unit of organization and the government patriarchal, all the members of the family living in subordination to the head, the eldest son succeeding to his authority. All property belongs to the father, the married sons having separate houses assigned them, except the youngest, who always remains with the father. This father, or patriarch, is called *Abbaya*.

A number of families constitute a village, which generally numbers forty or fifty houses, over whom there is a village abbaya or patriarch. A number of villages are organized into a district, superintended by a district abbaya, who, however, must be lineally descended from the head of the colony. A number of districts constitute a tribe, with a tribal abbaya, and a number of tribes constitute a federal group, with a federal abbaya or chief. This chieftainship is immemorially hereditary in particular families, but is elective as to persons. The head, however, is only the first among equals, and his rule is without external pomp, or castle, or fort. The chief receives no tribute, but he takes part in all important discussions, whether social or religious, and leads his people in war. His influence is very great. Originally and theoretically, the abbaya is the priest. This is not so now in all cases, yet he is religiously venerated. The family and the religious principles are thus combined. The theory of government, as above sketched, is not, however, often completely realized, there being every possible deviation from it, and the tribes being much intermingled. These tribes bear names resembling those adopted by the North American Indians, e. g. "Spotted Deer," "Bear," "Owl," etc.

Personal and Social Characteristics.—These people, like almost all known rude races, are "given to hospi-

tality." For the safety of a guest life and honor are pledged. He is "before a child." A murderer even may not be hurt in the house of his enemy; it is doubtful if he may be even *starved* in it. The Khond physiognomy is clearly Turanian. The color varies from that of light bamboo to a deep copper; the forehead is full, the cheek-bones high, the nose broad at the point, the lips full, but not thick, and the mouth large. The Khonds are of great bodily strength and symmetry, well informed on common subjects, of quick comprehension, and otherwise show considerable intellectual capability. Their mode of salutation is with the hand raised over the head. Their natural moral qualities are of mixed character. They are personally courageous and resolute. They have so great a love of personal liberty that it is affirmed they have been known to tear out their tongues by the roots that they might perish rather than endure confinement. They are not very intensely attached to their tribal institutions, but have great devotion to the persons of their patriarchal chiefs. They have, however, a great spirit of revenge, and are given to seasons of periodical intoxication. They drink a liquor made of the *Mow* flower, this tree being found near every hut and in the jungles. They are a "nation of drunkards," and will drink any intoxicating beverage, the stronger the better.

Laws.—They have no code by which they are governed, but follow custom and usage. The right of property is recognised. Murder is left to private revenge or retaliation. In case of matrimonial unfaithfulness, the seducer may be put to death if the husband choose, or he may accept the entire property of the criminal in lieu of his right to put him to death. Property stolen must be returned, or its equivalent given. There are seven judicial tests; common oaths are administered on the skin of a tiger or lizard. Ordeals of boiling water and oil are likewise resorted to.

Arts and Manufactures.—The Khonds manufacture axes, bows and arrows, a species of plough, and other implements; they distil liquor, extract oil, work in clay and metals, and dye their simple garments. Their houses are formed of strong boards, plastered inside.

Arms and Agriculture.—They use the sling, bow and arrows, and a broad battle-axe, and adorn themselves for battle as for a feast. They raise rice, oils, millet, pulse, fruits, tobacco, turmeric, mustard, etc. No money other than "cowries" (shells) was until recently known, all property being estimated in "lives," as of bullocks, buffaloes, goats, fowls, etc. Women share in the work of harvest and sowing.

Diseases and Remedies.—For external wounds they resort to a poultice of warm mud, made of the earth of the ant-hills. They also cauterize with a hot sickle over a wet cloth. For internal ailments they have no medicines. They consider all diseases to be supernatural, and the priest, being the physician, must discover the deity that is displeased. He divides rice into small heaps, which he dedicates to sundry gods; then he balances a sickle with a thread, puts a few grains upon each end of it, and calls upon the names of the gods, who answer by agitating the sickle, whereupon the grains are counted, and if the number of them be odd he is offended. The priest becomes "full of the god," shakes his head frantically, utters wild and incoherent sentences, etc. Deceased ancestors are invoked in the same way, when offerings of fowls, rice, and liquor are made, which subsequently become the priest's portion.

Magical and Superstitious Usages.—Spells, charms, incantations, etc., are substituted for medicines; wizards, witches, ghosts, sorcerers, augurs, astrologers, conjurors, and all like means are in constant use. Death is not a necessity, not the appointed lot of man; it is a special penalty of the gods, who destroy through war, or assume the shapes of wild beasts to destroy mankind. Magicians may take away life.

Mythology.—(I.) The catalogue of gods worshipped among the Khonds is extensive. (1.) At the head of the pantheon is the *Earth-Goddess*, who, with the sun, receives the principal worship. The Earth-Goddess is the superior power, and presides over the productive energies of nature. She is malevolent, and is invoked in war. She controls the seasons, and sends the periodical rains. To her human sacrifices were offered. There are, besides her, (2.) a God of Limits, who fixes boundaries, and whose altar is on the highways. (3.) The sun and moon; ceremonially worshipped. (4.) The God of Arms, to whom a grove is devoted. (5.) The God of Hunting, worshipped by parties who hunt in companies of thirty or forty, and surround their game. (6.) The God of Births, worshipped in case of barrenness. (7.) The God of Small-pox, who "sows" that disease as men do the earth with seeds. (8.) The Hill-god, without formal worship. (9.) The Forest-god, to whom birds, hogs, and sheep are offered. (10.) The God of Rain. (11.) Of Fountains. (12.) Of Rivers. (13.) Of Tanks; and (14.) the village gods, who are the guardians of localities, and of domestic and familiar worship.

(II.) Besides the above principal gods there are inferior local or partially acknowledged gods, worshipped under symbols of rude stone smeared with turmeric, etc. The great conservative principle is worshipped.

Priesthood.—The abbayas are the priests, but this office may be assumed by others. Priests eat only with priests; take part in marriages, elections, political councils, etc. They are of about the same level of culture as those of other tribes among Turanian races.

Religious Rites and Sacrifices.—Nothing was definitely known of the tribes of Gúmsur until the British army was brought into collision with them in 1836, subsequently to which the custom of human sacrifices was discovered to exist among them. The British government, after a long series of efforts, succeeded in abolishing it. Major Campbell says, "The Khonds generally propitiated their deity (the Earth-Goddess) with human offerings (p. 38, 39). This had been handed down through successive generations, and was regarded as a national duty. In Gúmsur it is offered under the effigy of a bird, in other localities as an elephant (p. 51). The victim, called *Meriah*, must be purchased, may be of any age, sex, or caste, adults being best, and the more costly the more acceptable. These are purchased from relations in time of famine or poverty, or are stolen from other regions by professed kidnappers of the Panoo caste (p. 52). In some cases Meriah women were allowed to live until they had borne children to Khond fathers, the children being reared for sacrifice. . . . The sacrifice, to be efficacious, must be public (p. 53). In Gúmsur it was offered annually. The priest officiates. For a month previous there is much feasting, dancing, intoxication, etc. One day before, the victim is stupefied with toddy, and bound, sitting, at the bottom of a post bearing an effigy. The crowd dance, and say, 'O god, we offer this sacrifice to you; give us good crops, seasons, and health.' To the victim they say, 'We bought you with a price, and did not seize you; now we sacrifice you according to our custom, and no sin rests with us' (p. 55). Various other ceremonies are performed, after which they return to the post near the village idol, always represented by three stones, a hog is sacrificed, the blood flows into a pit, the human victim, having been intoxicated, is thrown in and suffocated in the bloody mire. The priest cuts a piece of the flesh and buries it; others do likewise, carrying the flesh to their own villages. In some cases the flesh is cut while the victim is yet alive, and buried as a sacred and supernatural manure."

Cognate Tribes.—These and other aboriginal races have received so much attention from ethnographers, philologers, and other scientific men that further details are not needed here. The prominence given to these aboriginal races of late years might justify full articles on the kindred tribes, but, as they are of substantially of the same level, we have chosen to make a tolerably full sketch of the Khonds, as typical of the aboriginal

Turanian element in Hindustan. The following copious literature will enable persons to make a pretty exhaustive study of what is known concerning them.

Literature.—*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1864; *Calcutta Review*, vol. v, vi, x; *Calcutta Christian Observer*, April, July, 1837; *Transactions of Ethnological Society*, i, 15; vi, 24–27; also for 1865, p. 81; B. H. Hodgson, *Aborigines of the Eastern Frontier; Chepang and Busunda Tribes; Aborigines of Southern India* (Calcutta, 1849); *Aborigines of India* (Calcutta, 1847); M'Pherson's *Reports upon the Khonds of the Districts of Gunjam and Cubback* (Calcutta, 1842); *A personal Narrative of thirteen Years among the wild Tribes of Khondistan for the Suppression of human Sacrifices*, by Major Gen. John Campbell, C. B. (Lond. 1864)); *Sonthalia and the Sonthals*, by E. G. Man (Lond. 1868); Metz, *The Tribes of the Neilgherries;* Lewin, *Hill Tracts of Chittagong;* Harkness, *Aborigines of the Neilgherries* (London, 1832); *The People of India*, by J. F. Watson and J. W. Kaye, vol. i; *History of the Suppression of Infanticide*, etc., by John Wilson, D.D., F.R.S. (Bombay and London, 1855); Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, vol. i and ii (London, 1871); Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, etc. (Lond. 1871); Brace, *Races of the Old World* (New York, 1863); Latham, *Elements of Comparative Philology* (Lond. 1862); Anderson, *Foreign Missions* (New York, 1869); M'Lennan, *Primitive Marriage;* Hunter, *Rural Bengal.* (J. T. G.)

Khorsabad. See NINEVEH.

Khosru, or **Khusru I**, surnamed NUSHIRVAN (*the noble soul*), and known in Byzantine history as *Chosroes I*, the greatest monarch of the Sassanian dynasty, a son of Kobad, king of Persia, mounted the throne in A.D. 531. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his contests with Justinian (q. v.), and gave shelter to great numbers of those whom Justinian, the Byzantine emperor, persecuted for their religious opinions. He also waged war with Justin II (570), and Justinian, grand-nephew of the emperor of that name. Khosru, however, did not live to see the end of the contest, as he died in 579. His government, though very despotic, and occasionally oppressive, was yet marked by a firmness and energy rarely seen among the Orientals. It was during the reign of this prince that the fanatical followers of Mazdak, who had obtained numerous proselytes to the inviting doctrine of a communism of goods and women, were banished from the lands of the Sassanidæ. Persia, during his reign, stretched from the Red Sea to the Indus, and from the Arabian Sea far into Central Asia. "The virtues, and more particularly the justice of this monarch, form to the present day a favorite topic of Eastern panegyric, and the glories and happiness of his reign are frequently extolled by poets as the golden age of the Persian sovereignty. His reign forms an important epoch in the history of science and literature: he founded colleges and libraries in the principal towns of his dominions, and encouraged the translation of the most celebrated Greek and Sanscrit works into the Persian language. A physician at his court, of the name of Barzûyeh, is said to have brought into Persia a Pehlvi translation of those celebrated fables which are known under the name of Bidpai or Pilpay, and it was from this translation of the Indian tales that these fables found their way to nearly every other nation of Western Asia and Europe. The conquests of Khosru were great and numerous; his empire extended from the shores of the Red Sea to the Indus; and the monarchs of India, China, and Thibet are represented by Oriental historians as sending ambassadors to his court with valuable presents to solicit his friendship and alliance" (*English Cyclopædia*). See Ewald, *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, i, 185 sq.; Malcolm, *History of Persia* (see Index). See PERSIA.

Khosru II, grandson of the preceding, surnamed PURVIZ (the *Generous*), was raised to the throne in 590. In the first years of the 7th century he opened war upon the Romans, and for seventeen years inflicted upon the Byzantine Empire a series of disasters the like of which they had never before experienced. Syria was conquered in 611, Palestine in 614, Egypt and Asia Minor in 616, and the last bulwark of the capital, Chalcedon, fell soon after. "The Roman Empire was on the brink of ruin; the capture of Alexandria had deprived the inhabitants of Constantinople of their usual supply of corn, the northern barbarians ravaged the European provinces, while another powerful Persian army, already advanced as far as the Bosporus, was making preparations for the siege of the imperial city. Peace was earnestly solicited by Heraclius, who had succeeded Phocas in 610, but without success. Khosru, however, did not cross the Bosporus, and at length, in 621, he dictated the terms of an ignominious peace to the emperor. But Heraclius, who had hitherto made very few efforts for the defence of his dominions, rejected these terms, and in a series of brilliant campaigns (A.D. 622–627) recovered all the provinces he had lost, repeatedly defeated the Persian monarch, and advanced in his victorious career as far as the Tigris. Khosru was murdered in the spring of the following year, 628, by his son Siroes." See PERSIA.

Khozars. See KHAZARS.

Kibby, EPAPHRAS, a Methodist minister, was born in Somers, Connecticut, in 1777. In 1793 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church at New London, and immediately became active in religious duties, and in 1798 entered the ministry. Through his labors Methodism was introduced into Bath and Hallowell, Maine. Melville B. Cox, the first foreign missionary of the M. E. Church, was converted under his preaching in the latter place. He also formed the first Methodist society in New Bedford. He was a local preacher eleven years; returned superannuated in 1841, in which relation he continued till his death, Sept. 8, 1864. Kibby's habits of study were careful and close, as shown in his accurately-trained reasoning powers, as well as his elegant and forcible diction. He was passionately fond of choice literature and poetry, and was himself a poet of taste and considerable ability. His pulpit talents were of a superior order, his judgment cool and clear, his piety deep and uniform. See *Conf. Minutes*, 1865, p. 60; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, iv, 35, 72, 73, 481. (J. L. S.)

Kib'roth-hatta'ävah (Heb. *Kibroth'-hat-Taävah'*, קִבְרוֹת הַתַּאֲוָה, *graves of the longing;* Sept. Μνήματα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, Vulg. *Sepulchra concupiscentiæ*), the fifteenth station of the Israelites in the desert of Sinai, between Taberah and Hazeroth, so called from being the burial-place of the multitudes that died from gorging themselves with the preternatural supply of quail-flesh (Numb. xi, 34, 35; xxxiii, 16, 17; Deut. ix, 22; comp. Psa. lxxviii, 30, 31; 1 Cor. x, 6). From the omission of Taberah in the list at Numb. xxxiii, 16, and the absence of any statement of removal in Numb. xi, it has been by some inferred that Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah were but different names for the same place; but in Deut. ix, 22 they are clearly distinguished, although they apparently lay not far apart. Kibroth-hattaavah was probably situated in wady *Murrah*, not far N.E. from Sinai (Robinson, *Res.* i, 221 sq.), corresponding in position to the *Erweis el-Eberig*, where Palmer has found traces of an ancient encampment (*Desert of the Exodus*, p. 212 sq.). Schwarz's identification (*Palestine*, p. 213) with *Ain esh-Shehabeh*, in the interior of the desert (Robinson, i, 264), is far astray. See EXODE.

Kibza'ïm [many *Kib'zaïm*] (Hebrew *Kibtsa'yim*, קִבְצַיִם, *two heaps;* Sept. Καβσαίμ), a Levitical city of the tribe of Ephraim, assigned to the Kohathites, and appointed a city of refuge (Josh. xxi, 22, where it is mentioned in connection with Gezer and Beth-horon, as if lying on the edge of the mountains of Ephraim); otherwise called JOKMEAM (1 Chron. vi, 68), which, however, is elsewhere (Josh. xxi, 34) assigned to the Merarites in Zebulon, probably by a slight diversity arising

from its contiguity to the Kishon, which formed the boundary-line between those tribes (Josh. xix, 11).

Kid (properly גְּדִי, *gedi'*, so called from *cropping* the herbage; more fully, גְּדִי עִזִּים, "kid of the goats;" fem. גְּדִיָּה, *gediyah'*, a *she-kid*, Cant. i, 8; also בֶּן־עֵז, *son of a goat*, 2 Chron. xxxv, 7, orig.; sometimes for עֵז, a *goat*, itself, Numb. xv, 11; 1 Kings xx, 27; likewise שָׂעִיר, *saïr*, *hairy*, i. e. a goat, Gen. xxxv, 31; Lev. iv, 23; ix, 3; xvi, 5; xxiii, 19, etc.; fem. שְׂעִירָה, *seïrah*, Lev. iv, 28; v, 6; Greek ἔριφος, Luke xv, 29; "goat," Matt. xxv, 32, ver. 33 ἐριφίον, diminutive), the young of the goat, reckoned a great delicacy among the ancients; and it appears to have been served for food in preference to the lamb (Gen. xxvii, 9; xxxviii, 17; Judg. vi, 19; xiv, 6; 1 Sam. xvi, 20). It still continues to be a choice dish among the Arabs. By the Mosaic law, the Hebrews were forbidden to dress a kid in the milk of its dam; and this remarkable prohibition is repeated three several times (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21). This law has been variously understood. However, it is generally supposed that it was intended to guard the Hebrews against some idolatrous or superstitious practice of the neighboring heathen nations. The practice is quite common with modern Orientals (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 135). Kids were also among the sacrificial offerings (Exod. xii, 3, margin; Lev. iv, 23–26; Numb. vii, 16–87). See GOAT.

Kidd, BENJAMIN, a noted Quaker minister, was born in Yorkshire, England, about 1692; entered the ministry at the age of twenty-one, emigrated to this country about 1722, and labored here successfully for some time. He afterwards returned, however, to England, and settled at Banbury, Oxfordshire, "where his exemplary conduct gained him the esteem of all ranks and persuasions." He died March 21, 1751. Kidd served his generation in "turning many from darkness to light, and from the paths of disobedience to the wisdom of the just."—Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, iii, 287.

Kiddah. See CASSIA.

Kidder, RICHARD, D.D., an eminent English prelate and learned Orientalist, was born at Brighthelmstone, in Sussex. He studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, of which he was elected fellow in 1655. He afterwards became vicar of Stanground, Huntingdonshire, but was ejected in 1662 for nonconformity. He, however, conformed some time after, and became rector of Raine, Essex, in 1664, and successively rector of St. Martin's Outwick, London, in 1674; prebendary of Norwich in 1681; dean of Peterborough in 1689; and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1691. He died in 1703. He was considered one of the best divines of his time, and a clear and elegant writer. His principal works are *Demonstration of the Messias*, etc. (London, 1684, 1699, 1700, 3 vols.; another edit. 1726, fol., and often since):—*The Judgment of private Discretion in Matters of Religion defended*—a sermon on 1 Thess. v, 21 (Lond. 1687, 4to):—*A Sermon preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall, Nov.* 5, 1692 [on 2 Sam. xxiv, 14] (Lond. 1693, 4to):—*Sermon, Zech. vii*, 5, *of Fasting* (Lond. 1694, 4to):—*A Commentary on the Five Books of Moses*, etc. (London, 1694, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Bellarmine examined* (Gibson's Preservative, iv, 55):—*On Repentance* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, ii, 300).—Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliograph.* vol. ii, s. v.; Birch, *Life of Tillotson;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Kidderminster. See KYDERMINSTER.

Kiddushim. See TALMUD.

Kidney (only in plur. כְּלָיוֹת, *kelayoth'*, prob. from the idea of its being the seat of *longing*), the leaf-fat around which was specially to be a burnt-offering, significant of its being the richest and most central part of the victim (Exod. xxix, 13, 22; Lev. iii, 4, 10, 15; iv, 9; vii, 4; viii, 16, 25; ix, 10, 19; Isa. xxxiv, 3). Spoken also of the "*reins*" of a human being, i. e. the inmost soul, which the ancients supposed to be seated in the viscera (compare the Homeric φρήν, midriff, hence mind), both in a physical sense (Job xvi, 13; xix, 27; Psa. cxxxix, 13; Lam. iii, 13), and figuratively (Psa. vii, 9; xvi, 7; xxvi, 2; lxxiii, 21; Prov. xxiii, 16; Jer. xi, 20; xii, 2; xvii, 10; xx, 12). Sometimes applied to *kernels* of grain, from their kidney-like shape and richness (Deut. xxxii, 14).

Kid'ron (Heb. *Kidron'*, קִדְרוֹן, *turbid*, compare Job vi, 16; Sept. Κέδρων, N. T. Κεδρών, John xviii, 1, where some copies erroneously have Κεδρῶν, and the Auth. Version "Cedron;" Josephus Κεδρών, Gen. -ῶνος), the brook or winter torrent which flows through the valley of Jehoshaphat (as it is now called), on the east side of Jerusalem (see 1 Macc. xii, 37). "The brook Kidron" is the only name by which "the valley" itself is known in Scripture, for it is by no means certain that the name "Valley of Jehoshaphat" in Joel (iii, 12) was intended to apply to this valley. The word rendered "brook" (2 Sam. xv, 23; 1 Kings ii, 37; xv, 13; 2 Kings xxiii, 6, 12; 2 Chron. xv, 16; xxix, 16; xxx, 14; Jer. xxxi, 40; compare Neh. ii, 15; Amos vi, 14) is נַחַל, *náchal*, which may be taken as equivalent to the Arabic *wady*, meaning a stream *and* its bed or valley, or properly the valley of a stream, even when the stream is dry. The Septuagint and evangelist (in the above passages), as well as Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 1, 5; but φάραγξ in ix, 7, 3; *War*, v, 6, 1), designate it χείμαῤῥος, a storm brook, or winter torrent. But it would seem as if the name were formerly applied also to the ravines surrounding other portions of Jerusalem, the south or west, since Solomon's prohibition to Shimei to "pass over the torrent Kidron" (1 Kings ii, 37; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 1, 5) is said to have been broken by the latter when he went in the direction of Gath to seek his fugitive slaves (ver. 41, 42). Now a person going to Gath would certainly not go by the way of the Mount of Olives, or approach the eastern side of the city at all. The route—whether Gath were at Beit-Jibrîn or at Tell es-Safieh—would be by the Bethlehem gate, and then nearly due west. Perhaps the prohibition may have been a more general one than is implied in ver. 37 (comp. the king's reiteration of it in ver. 42), the Kidron being in that case specially mentioned because it was on the road to Bahurim, Shimei's home, and the scene of his crime. At any rate, beyond the passage in question, there is no evidence of the name Kidron having been applied to the southern or western ravines of the city.

The Kidron is mentioned several times in the Scripture history, being the memorable brook which David crossed barefoot and weeping when fleeing from Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 23, 30); and Jesus must often have crossed it on his way to the Mt. of Olives and Bethany (see John xviii, 1). According to the Talmud, the blood of the animals slaughtered in the Temple, and other refuse (probably the impurities from the city, *Nuzir*, lvii, 4), were carried through a sewer into the lower Kidron, and thence sold as manure to gardeners (*Joma*, lviii, 2). For early notices of the Kidron, see William of Tyre, viii, 2; Brocardus, p. 8; Reland, p. 294 sq. The distinguishing peculiarity of the Kidron—that in respect to which it is most frequently mentioned in the O. T.—is the impurity which appears to have been ascribed to it. Excepting the two casual notices already quoted, we first meet with it as the place in which king Asa demolished and burnt the obscene phallic idol (see ASHERAH) of his mother (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16). Next we find the wicked Athaliah hurried thither to execution (Joseph. *Ant.* ix, 7, 3; 2 Kings xi, 16). It then becomes the regular receptacle for the impurities and abominations of the idol-worship, when removed from the Temple and destroyed by the adherents of Jehovah (2 Chron. xxix, 16; xxx, 14; 2 Kings xxiii, 4, 6, 12). In the course of these narratives the statement of Josephus just quoted as to the death of Athaliah is supported by the fact that in the time of Josiah it was the common cemetery of the city (2 Kings xxiii, 6; comp. Jer.

xxvi, 23, "graves of the common people"), perhaps the "valley of dead bodies" mentioned by Jeremiah (xxxi, 40) in close connection with the "fields" of Kidron, and the restoration of which to sanctity was to be one of the miracles of future times (ibid.). It was doubtless the Kidron valley which was in the mind of the prophet Ezekiel when he described the vision of the holy and healing waters flowing from the Temple through the desert into the sea (xlvii, 8); and this very contrast with its customary uses serves to add emphasis to his prophecy (comp. Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 32; Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 288). How long the valley continued to be used for a burying-place it is very hard to ascertain. After the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 the bodies of the slain were buried outside the Golden Gateway (Mislin, ii, 487; Tobler, *Umgebungen*, p. 218); but what had been the practice in the interval the writer has not succeeded in tracing. To the date of the monuments at the foot of Olivet we have at present no clew; but, even if they are of pre-Christian times, there is no proof that they are tombs. From the date just mentioned, however, the burials appear to have been constant, and at present it is the favorite resting-place of Moslems and Jews, the former on the west, the latter on the east of the valley. The Moslems are mostly confined to the narrow level spot between the foot of the wall and the commencement of the precipitous slope, while the Jews have possession of the lower part of the slopes of Olivet, where their scanty tombstones are crowded so thick together as literally to cover the surface like a pavement.

The Kidron is a mountain ravine, in most places narrow, with precipitous banks of naked limestone; but here and there its banks have an easy slope, and along its bottom are strips of land capable of cultivation. It contains the bed of a streamlet, but during the whole summer, and most of the winter, it is perfectly dry; in fact, no water runs in it except when heavy rains are falling in the mountains round Jerusalem. The resident missionaries assured Dr. Robinson that they had not during several years seen a stream running through the valley (see *Bibl. Researches*, i, 396–402). On the broad summit of the mountain ridge of Judæa, a mile and a quarter north-west of Jerusalem, is a slight depression; this is the head of the Kidron. The sides of the depression, and the elevated ground around it, are whitened by the broad, jagged tops of limestone rocks, and almost every rock is excavated, partly as a quarry, and partly to form the façade of a tomb. The valley or depression runs for about half a mile towards the city; it is shallow and broad, dotted with corn-fields, and sprinkled with a few old olives. It then bends eastward, and in another half mile is crossed by the great northern road coming down from the hill Scopus. On the east side of the road, and south bank of the Kidron, are the celebrated Tombs of the Kings. The bed of the valley is here about half a mile due north of the city gate. It continues in the same course about a quarter of a mile farther, and then, turning south, opens into a wide basin containing cultivated fields and olives. Here it is crossed diagonally by the road from Jerusalem to Anathoth. As it advances southward, the right bank, forming the side of the hill Bezetha, becomes higher and steeper, with occasional precipices of rock, on which may be seen a few fragments of the ancient city wall; while on the left the base of Olivet projects, greatly narrowing the valley. Opposite St. Stephen's gate the depth is fully 100 feet, and the breadth not more than 400 feet. The olive-trees in the bottom are so thickly clustered as to form a shady grove; and their massive trunks and gnarled boughs give evidence of great age. This spot is shut out from the city, from the view of public roads, and from the notice and interruption of wayfarers. See GETHSEMANE. A zigzag path descends the steep bank from St. Stephen's gate, crosses the bed of the valley by an old bridge, and then branches. One branch leads direct over the top of Olivet. This path has a deep historical interest; it was by it that David went when he fled from Absalom: "The king passed over the brook Kidron, and all the people passed over, towards the way of the wilderness" (2 Sam. xv, 23). See OLIVET. Another branch runs round the southern shoulder of the hill to Bethany, and it has a deep sacred interest, for it is the road of Christ's triumphal entry (Matt. xxi, 1 sq.; Luke xix, 37). Below the bridge the Kidron becomes still narrower, and here traces of a torrent bed first begin to appear. Three hundred yards farther down, the hills on each side—Moriah on the right and Olivet on the left—rise precipitously from the torrent bed, which is spanned by a single arch. On the left bank is a singular group of tombs, comprising those of Absalom, Jehoshaphat, and St. James (now so called); while on the right, 150 feet overhead, towers the south-eastern angle of the Temple wall, most probably the "pinnacle" on which our Lord was placed (Matt. iv, 5). The ravine runs on, narrow and rocky, for 500 yards more; there, on its right bank, in a cave, is the fountain of the Virgin; and higher up on the left, perched on the side of naked cliffs, the ancient village of Siloam. A short distance farther down, the valley of the Tyropœon falls in from the right, descending in terraced slopes, fresh and green, from the waters of the Pool of Siloam. The Kidron here expands, affording a level tract for cultivation, and now covered with beds of cucumbers, melons, and other vegetables. Here of old was the "King's Garden" (Neh. iii, 15). The level tract extends down to the mouth of Hinnom, and is about 200 yards wide. A short distance below the junction of Hinnom and the Kidron is the fountain of En-Rogel, now called Bîr Ayûb, "the Well of Job," or "Joab." The length of the valley from its head to En-Rogel is $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles, and here the historic Kidron may be said to terminate. Every reference to the Kidron in the Bible is made to this section. David crossed it at a point opposite the city (1 Sam. xv, 23); it was the boundary beyond which Solomon forbade Shimei to go on pain of death (1 Kings ii, 37); it was here, probably, near the mouth of Hinnom, that Asa destroyed the idol which Maachah his mother set up (xv, 13); and it seems to have been at the same spot, "in the fields of Kidron," that king Josiah ordered the vessels of Baal to be burned (2 Kings xxiii, 4). It would seem, from 2 Kings xxiii, 6, that a portion of the Kidron, apparently near the mouth of Hinnom, was used as a burying-ground. The sides of the surrounding cliffs are filled with ancient rock tombs, and the greatest boon the dying Jew now asks is that his bones be laid in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The whole of the left bank of the Kidron, opposite the Temple area, far up the side of Olivet, is paved with the white tombstones of Jews. This singular longing is doubtless to be ascribed to the opinion which the Jews entertain that the Kidron is the *Valley of Jehoshaphat* mentioned by Joel (iii, 2). See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF. Below En-Rogel the Kidron has little of historical or sacred interest. It runs in a winding course east by south, through the Wilderness of Judæa, to the Dead Sea. For about a mile below En-Rogel the bottom of the valley is cultivated and thickly covered with olive-trees. Farther down a few fields of corn are met with at intervals, but these soon disappear, and the ravine assumes the bleak and desolate aspect of the surrounding hills. About seven miles from Jerusalem the features of the valley assume a much wilder and grander form. Hitherto the banks have been steep, with here and there a high precipice, and a jutting cliff, giving variety to the scene. Now they suddenly contract to precipices of naked rock nearly 300 feet in height, which look as if the mountain had been torn asunder by an earthquake. About a mile farther, on the side of this frightful chasm, stands the convent of St. Saba, one of the most remarkable buildings in Palestine, founded by the saint whose name it bears, in the year A.D. 439. The sides of the chasm both above and below the convent are filled with caves and grottoes, once the abode of monks and hermits, and from these doubt-

less this section of the valley has got its modern name, *Wady er-Raheb*, "Monk's Valley" (Wolcott, *Researches in Pal.*, in Biblical Cabinet, xliii, 38). Below Mar Saba the valley is called *Wady en-Nar*, "Valley of Fire"—a name descriptive of its aspect, for so bare and scorched is it that it seems as if it had participated in the doom of Sodom. It runs on, a deep, narrow, wild chasm, until it breaks through the lofty line of cliffs at Ras el-Feshkhah, on the shore of the Dead Sea. It will thus be seen that the head of the Kidron is just on the verge of the water-shed of the mountain-chain of Judah, about 2600 feet above the sea. Its length, as the crow flies, is only twenty miles, and yet in this short space it has a descent of no less than 3912 feet—the Dead Sea having a depression of 1312 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 179, 182).—Kitto; Smith. In 1848 the levelling party of the Dead Sea Expedition, under command of Lieut. Lynch, worked up the wady en-Nar, the bed of the Kidron, from the Dead Sea to Jerusalem. They encountered several precipices from ten to twelve feet high, down which cataracts plunge in winter. They found the ravine shut in on each side by high, barren cliffs of chalky limestone, and the dry torrent-bed interrupted by boulders, and covered with fragments of stone (*Narrative*, p. 384, 387). The place where it empties into the Jordan is a gorge 1200 feet deep, narrow at the bottom, with a bed filled with confused fragments of rock, much worn, but perfectly dry (*ib.*). For further notices, see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xv, 600; Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ut sup.

Kief or **Kiev**, the name of the chief town of the government of that name, on the west bank of the Dnieper, one of the oldest of the Russian towns, and formerly the capital (containing 60,000 inhabitants, with a university and a theological school), was in 864 taken from the Khazars by two Norman chiefs, companions of Ruric, and conquered from them by Oleg, Ruric's successor, who made it his capital. In 1240 (when it ceased to be the capital) it was nearly destroyed by Batû, khan of Kiptchak. Christianity was first proclaimed in Russia at Kief in 988. In the 14th century it was seized by Gedimin, grand duke of Lithuania, and annexed to Poland in 1569, but in 1686 was restored to Russia. Kief is the oldest Russian metropolitan's residence, the cradle of Russian Christianity. It is also noted on account of two Church (Greek) councils that have been held there. See Landon, *Manual of Church Councils*.

(*a*) The first of these convened about 1147, and is noted for the manner in which the bishops elected a metropolitan in the place of Michael II. With the exception of Niphont of Novogorod, they all agreed to take the election into their own hands, without allowing to the patriarch of Constantinople the exercise of his right either to nominate or confirm. Niphont strongly protested against the step, but without effect. The choice of the synod fell upon Clement, a monk of Smolensk. As a substitute for the patriarchal consecration, Onuphrius proposed that the hand of St. Clement of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson, should be placed upon his head. This election led to great disorder, and subsequently the patriarch Luke Chysoberges consecrated Constantine metropolitan, who condemned the acts of this synod, and suspended for a time all the clergy ordained by Clement.—Mouravieff's *Hist. Russ. Church* (by Blackmore), p. 35.

(*b*) Another council was convened here in 1622. Meletius, archbishop of Polotsk, at one time a most zealous defender of the orthodox Church in Russia, had been obliged to flee into Greece upon a groundless suspicion of having been concerned in the murder of Jehoshaphat, Uniate archbishop of Polotsk, and, urged by fear, had given himself up to the Uniate party, and written an apology in censure of the orthodox Church; in this council he was called to account, made to perform open penance, and to tear his book. Soon after he entirely apostatized; and, going to Rome, had the title of archbishop of Hieropolis conferred on him.—Mouravieff, p. 179.

In the neighborhood of Kief is the convent of Kievo-Petchersk, a celebrated Russian sanctuary, which annually attracts thousands of pilgrims from the most remote corners of the empire. In the days of king Wladimir, the river Bug, near this city, was considered sacred by many Russian sects, and in many respects Kief, in those days, resembled the city of Benares in India. The reader can best obtain a view of the worship of rivers in the East by turning to the article GANGES (comp. Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterbuch*, p. 1049).

Kiernander, JOHN ZACHARIAH, a Swedish Protestant missionary, was born at Axtadt, Ostrogothia (now the læn Lindköping), Dec. 1, 1710. He studied at the school of Lindköping, and afterwards at the universities of Upsal and Halle. Professor Franke recommended him to the English Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge, and he was sent to India in 1740. Here he labored zealously for sixty years, and acquired such reputation that the shah of Persia intrusted to him the Arabic translation of the Psalms and the N. T. In 1767 he established at Calcutta a church, which was opened in 1770, but, as he was obliged to bear the expense almost exclusively himself, he was reduced to poverty. Kiernander was successively connected with the Dutch Church at Chinsurah, Bengal, and when that town was taken by the English in 1795 he was made prisoner, but afterwards permitted to settle at Calcutta. He died in 1799. See Walch, *Neueste Religionsgesch.*; *Acta Historico-ecclesiastica*; *Asiatic Annual Register*; Rose, *New Biographical Dictionary*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 715. (J. N. P.)

Kiesling, JOHANN RUDOLPH, a German Protestant theologian, was born at Erfurt, Oct. 21, 1706; became first deacon of Wittemberg in 1738, extraordinary professor of philosophy at Leipzig in 1740, professor of Oriental languages in the same university in 1746, and, finally, professor of theology at Erlangen in 1762. He retained this latter position until his death, April 17, 1778. He wrote a large number of works, the most remarkable of which are, *Exercitationes in quibus J. Chr. Trombelli Dissertationes de cultu sanctorum modeste diluuntur* (Lpzg. 1742–1746, 3 pts. 4to):—*Historia de Usu Symbolorum* (Lpzg. 1753, 8vo):—*De Disciplina Clericorum, ex epistolis ecclesiast. conspicua, Liber* (Lpzg. and Nuremberg, 1760, 8vo):—*Program. antiquoris Ecclesiæ Christianæ hereticos contra immaculatam Mariæ Virginis conceptionem testes sistit* (Erlangen, 1775, 4to):—*Lehrgebäude d. Wiedertäufer* (Revel, 1776, 8vo). He also published during the years 1756–61 the theological journal entitled *Neue Beiträge von alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen*, established by J. E. Knapp in 1751 (Lpzg. 8vo). See Winer, *Handb. d. theologischen Literatur*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 716. (J. N. P.)

Kiffin, WILLIAM, a distinguished English Baptist minister, born in 1616, originally a merchant, by his wealth exerted great influence at the courts of king Charles II and James II, and thereby indirectly secured many favors to his brethren. By his means the false and scurrilous pamphlet entitled *Baxter Baptized in Blood* was examined and condemned; and by his intercession, also, twelve Baptists who had been condemned to death at Aylesbury received the king's pardon. In 1683, two of his grandsons, Benjamin and William Hewling, young gentlemen of great fortunes, accomplished education, and eminent piety, were concerned in the ill-timed and ill-fated expedition of the duke of Monmouth, which terminated in the destruction of almost all who had any hand in it, including the two Hewlings, though every effort was made by Kiffin to save their lives. Kiffin was pastor of the Baptist church, Devonshire Square, London, from 1639 to 1701. He died Sept. 29, 1701, at an advanced age, "leaving behind him a character of rare excellence, tried alike by the fire of prosperity and adversity in the most eventful times." He wrote in favor of strict communion in reply to John Bunyan, opposed Dr. Featley in the famous disputation at South-

wark, and was handled with severity by Edwards in his *Gangrœna*. He is regarded as the father of the "Particular Baptists." An estimate may be formed of the high position Kiffin must have occupied in his day if Macaulay (*History of England*, vol. ii) could say, "Great as was the authority of Bunyan with Baptists, that of William Kiffin was still greater. Kiffin was the first man among them in wealth and station." "His portrait," says Skeats (*Hist. English Free Churches*, p. 154), "does not bear out the once current impression concerning the Baptists of that age. With skull-cap and flowing ringlets, with mustache and 'imperial,' with broad lace collar and ample gown (see his portrait in Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, i, 403), he resembles a gentleman Cavalier rather than any popular ideal of a sour-visaged and discontented Anabaptist." See Crosby, *Hist. Engl. Baptists;* and Lives (Lond. 1659, 4to, and one by Joseph Gurney, 1833, 8vo; also his Autobiography, edited by Orme, Lond. 1823, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Kikayon. See Gourd.

Kilburn, David, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Gilsum, N. H., October 24, 1784, was converted when seventeen years old, licensed to preach in 1805, and, after three years' labor as a local preacher, was received into the New England Conference, and obtained his first appointment at Union, Me. His subsequent stations were Readfield, Me.; Stanstead, Canada; Danville, Barnard and White River, Needham, Boston, Portland, Me.; Wethersfield and Barre, Vt.; Providence, R. I.; Lowell, Lynn-Common, Bridgewater, North-west Bridgewater, Waltham, Barre, Ashburnham, South Royalston, Enfield, and Southampton. He travelled also the following districts as presiding elder: Portland District, Maine Conference; New Hampshire, Boston, Springfield, and Providence Districts, in the New England Conference. In 1851 he became superannuated, in 1852–53 effective, in 1854 supernumerary, in 1856 effective, in 1858 again supernumerary, and in 1859 he again became superannuated, in which relation he remained till the time of his death, July 13, 1865. Kilburn "was a man of great endurance, and constitutionally qualified for the immense labor he performed; of sound judgment, clear understanding, strong will; earnest and conscientious in the performance of duty. During his laborious ministry he sustained a high reputation and exerted a powerful influence. . . . His prudent foresight, his comprehensive views, his knowledge of men, his almost intuitive perception of character, his urbanity, his high moral and Christian virtues, entitled him to an honorable social and official position in the Church which he so faithfully served."—*Conf. Minutes*, 1866, p. 56.

Kilbye, Richard, an English theologian, was born at Ratcliffe in the second half of the 16th century, and was educated at Oxford University, with which he was identified throughout life; he was its rector in 1590, and held a professorship of the Hebrew language. He died Nov. 7, 1620. Richard Kilbye was one of the translators of king James's version of the Bible. He also published several *Sermons* (1613, etc.) and a *Commentary on Exodus*.

Another English divine of the same name flourished about the same time in Warwickshire. He died in 1617, and is the author of a work entitled *Burthen of a loadened Conscience* (1616, 8vo; often reprinted).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Dict.* xxvii, 720; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Kildare, an ancient church in central Ireland, founded A.D. 480, derived its name from the Irish *celle*, church, and *dair*, the oak, and was at first established by St. Bridget as a Christian school, and afterwards called a nunnery, for the purpose of teaching pagan women, married or single, the doctrines and duties of Christianity. Soon a town or city grew up around it, and in later times it formed an extensive diocese. In the early period of Ireland's history it is nothing remarkable to find woman assuming the position of public instructor; Druidism, the former religion of Ireland, assigned offices to females. In the early history of the Irish Church we have several intimations that Christian women were employed in its services. St. Patrick, in his *Confession*, sect. xviii, writes about a woman of noble birth, of the daughters of the minor king, and even handmaids in servitude, who were active in the cause of Christianity. The *Book of Armugh*, an accredited manuscript of the 7th century, in speaking of an earlier period, says expressly, "The early Irish Christians did not reject the fellowship and help of woman, for they were founded on the rock, and did not fear the blast of temptation." St. Bridget, the founder of this church and female seminary, tradition says, died about A.D. 515, at an advanced age, loved in life and lamented in death. In honor of her memory, through an extent of fourteen centuries, in different countries and in different languages, millions have been called by her name; more children, perhaps, than after any other Christian woman whose name is not in the inspired records. Her memory was cherished by the Picts and the British Scots, but in no place except Kildare was it more honored than in the Hebrides, where at a later and less pure age she became the patroness of their churches. Several lives of her have been written by foreigners and in different languages, but the best and the fullest is said to be that by St. Ultan, the materials for which he obtained from a manuscript in the monastery of Ratisbon, Germany. See Moore, *Hist. of Ireland;* Ware's *Irish Antiquities;* Todd, *Irish Church*, p. 28. (D. D.)

Kilham, Alexander, one of the most celebrated characters in the history of Methodism, the founder of the "New Connection of Wesleyan Methodists," frequently called simply "Kilhamites," and really the first man in the Methodist connection who advocated the representation of the lay element in the government of the Church, was born at Epworth, England, July 10, 1762. His parents were Methodists, and he enjoyed a training strictly in accordance with their own religious convictions. Vacillating in character and impetuous in temper in his youthful days, he struggled hard against all religious impressions, but was finally converted at the age of eighteen, and shortly after began preaching. Brackenbury, one of Wesley's right-hand men, met young Kilham one day at Epworth while himself on a preaching excursion, and engaged him at once as his travelling companion. In Brackenbury's missionary visit to the Channel Islands, Kilham proved himself an able assistant. In 1785, shortly after their return from the islands, Wesley received Kilham into the regular itinerant ministry. Like all other laborers of early Methodism, his ministrations frequently met with opposition, and an encounter with a mob was almost a daily experience. At Bolton his chapel was stoned; at Alford market-place he was attacked by a clergyman and a constable; at Spilsby he was assailed with dirt and eggs. In another place gunpowder was laid under the spot where he expected to preach, with a train extending some distance, but without effect, for he took his stand elsewhere and escaped the danger. It was amid such difficulties and trials that Kilham zealously labored for the cause of his Master. In 1791 the founder of Methodism expired. During the life of Wesley there had been no actual separation of the Wesleyans from the Established Church. He had been careful to avoid religious meetings during the hours for public worship in the Establishment. He had never allowed the celebration of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper by his own preachers; his people received these at the hands of the ministers of the Established Church. Frequently a voice dissenting from this course was heard from among the Wesleyan ministers. Kilham himself had dared, three years before the death of Wesley, to record the wish, "Let us have the liberty of Englishmen, and give the Lord's Supper to our societies." About the time of Wesley's death he wrote, "I

have had several warm contests with a friend because I would not have my child baptized in the usual way. The storm, however, soon blew over. I hope God will open the eyes of the Methodists to see their sin and folly in their inconsistent connection with the Church." The opposition against ecclesiastical subserviency to the laws of the Church of England became more determined after the decision of the Conference at Manchester, July 26, 1791, the first after Mr. Wesley's death, to "take the plan as Mr. Wesley had left it." "The controversy could not," says Stevens (*History of Methodism*, iii, 38), "but be resumed, and more definite results must be reached before the Church could be at rest. Partisans of the national Church regarded the pledge as binding the Methodists to the Establishment; the advocates of progress dissented, and, in the language of Pawson, declared, 'Not so; our old plan has been to follow the openings of Providence, and to alter or amend the plan as we saw it needful, in order to be more useful in the hand of God.' Hanby, whom Wesley had authorized to administer the sacraments, still claimed the right to do so wherever the societies wished him. Pawson wrote the same year that if the people were denied the sacraments they would leave the connection in many places. Taylor was determined to administer them in Liverpool; and Atmore wrote that, having 'solemnly promised upon his knees before God and his people that he would give all diligence not only to preach the word, but to administer the sacraments in the Church of God,' he would do so wherever required by the people. 'We were as much divided,' he later wrote, 'in our views and practice as before;' and numerous disputes occurred during the year respecting the administration of the sacraments and a total separation from the Church of England. Circular letters in great abundance were sent into different parts of the kingdom, and the minds of the people were much diverted from the pursuit of more sublime objects by others which tended but little to the profit of the soul.' The diversified opinions of the connection were, in fine, resolving themselves into three classes, and giving rise to as many parties, composed respectively of men who, from their attachment to the Establishment, wished no change, unless it might be a greater subordination to the national Church by the abandonment of the sacraments in those cases where Wesley had admitted them; of such as wished to maintain Wesley's plan intact, with official provisions which might be requisite to administer it; and such as desired revolutionary changes, with a more equal distribution of powers among laymen and preachers." Kilham belonged to the third party, and used all the means at his command to influence the leaders in that direction. At the next Conference, however, he was severely criticised for his assertion of the popular rights, and for the publication of a pamphlet on the *Progress of Liberty*, in which he urged a distribution of the power of government between the clerical and the lay elements. In the course of the controversy severe remarks had been thrown out by Kilham, which were construed by the preachers into defamations of the society, and at the London Conference of 1796 he was formally arraigned, and expelled from the connection. This summary process precipitated the division of sentiment, and resulted in the establishment of an independent body (now known as the *New Connection Methodists*) in 1797 at Ebenezer Chapel. See METHODISTS, NEW CONNECTION. A writer in the *Wesleyan Times* of May 12, 1862, furnishes documents which go to prove that Kilham's course, both in 1793–4, and even as late as 1796, had the approval of the most celebrated leaders of Methodism. At that time Dr. Adam Clarke, Pawson, Bromwell, and Cownley, all earnestly indorsed the movement. Kilham himself did not long survive the ecclesiastical censure of his brethren. He died July 20, 1798. It is but just to his memory to say that he is acknowledged by all to have been a man of fervent piety, and that he was animated by great zeal for the success of the Wesleyan cause. What he actually sought to accomplish was the entire separation of the Methodists from the Established Church, with a due representation of the lay element in the government of the new Church, to be formed at once. See, for a fuller discussion of this subject, besides the article NEW CONNECTION METHODISTS, and the authorities already quoted, Smith, *Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism* (new edition), ii, 36 sq.; Cooke, *Hist. of Kilham*. (J. H. W.)

Kilhamites. See KILHAM.

Kilian or **Kyllina**, a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and bishop of Würzburg in the 7th century, was a native of Ireland, and a member of that distinguished body of Irish missionaries among the Teutonic nations to whose labors in the 6th and 7th centuries Christianity and civilization were so largely indebted in the southern and south-eastern countries of Europe. He was of a noble family, and while yet young entered the monastic life in his native country. Having undertaken, in company with several of his fellow-monks, a pilgrimage to Rome, he was seized, on his journey (A.D. 665) through the still pagan province of Thuringia, with a desire to devote himself to its conversion, and with his fellow-pilgrims, the presbyter Colman and the deacon Donatus, he secured for the project at Rome, in 687, the sanction of pope Conon, by whom he was ordained bishop. On his return he succeeded in converting the duke Gosbert, with many of his subjects, and in opening the way for the complete conversion of Thuringia. Unfortunately, however, Kilian provoked the enmity of Geilana, who, although the widow of Gosbert's brother, had been married to Gosbert, by declaring the marriage invalid, and having induced Gosbert to separate from her, he was murdered at her instigation, during the absence of Gosbert in 789, together with both his fellow-missionaries, and the Bible, Church monuments, and ecclesiastical vestments consigned to the flames. After Gosbert's return Geilana denied the deed, but both she and the murderer fell a prey to insanity, and Gosbert himself fell by the hands of a murderer, his son Hedan II was deposed, and, indeed, his whole family became extinct. Such are the oldest legends concerning Kilian's fate. One of them, written in the 10th or 11th century, is to be found in Mabillon, *Act. Sanct.* (ii, 991); another, with some arbitrary variations, in Surius (iv, 131). Yet this legend appears somewhat doubtful, since no mention is otherwise made of any British missionaries before Boniface. Rhabanus Maurus (Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii, 2, p. 333) claims that Gosbert himself condemned Kilian in 847 on account of his preaching. As to the punishment said to have overtaken all the family of Gosbert, it is contradicted by history, for Hedan II was yet in peaceful possession of his dukedom in 716, remained in relation with the British missionaries, and gave St. Willebrord some land at Arnstadt and Mühlberg, near Gotha. The facts may be that Kilian belonged to the Anglo-Saxon Roman Church, and that his death was caused by his strict enforcement of the rules concerning matrimony. Before his appointment to Thuringia Kilian seems to have already distinguished himself in the ministry. Mosheim says, "He exercised his ministerial functions with great success among the Franks, and vast numbers of them embraced Christianity" (*Eccles. History*, i, 441). Hence he is sometimes denominated "the Apostle of Franconia." The Rev. Mr. De Vinne, a writer on the early Church history of Ireland, gives credence to the legend concerning Kilian's missionary efforts in Germany, and his sad fate, on the ground that "towards the close of the 7th century there appear to have been a great number of Irish ecclesiastics and scholars in Germany and other parts of Central Europe. Many of these, that they might be the more useful to the people, translated their names into Latin or German, and in all things not sinful identified themselves with the different nationalities among whom they labored. To this class belong Wiro, Rumbold, bishop of Mechlin, Florentius, bishop of Strasburg, Colman, Albinus, Clementus, and many others, of whom Mosheim said there were 'French and Irish who

refused a blind submission, and gave much trouble to Rome'" (comp. De Vinne, *Primit. Irish Ch.*). See Ign. Gropp, *Lebensbesch. d. heiligen Kiliani Bischoffens u. dessen Gesellen* (Würtzburg, 1738, 4to); J. Rion, *Leben u. Tod d. heil. Kilian* (Aschaffenburg, 1834); J. Ch. A. Seiters, *Bonifacius*, etc. (Mayence, 1845), p. 97 sq.; F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* (Göttingen, 1848), ii, 303; Todd, *Irish Church*, p. 70 sq. (J. H. W.)

Killigrew, HENRY, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1612, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated in 1628. He was made chaplain to James, duke of York, and prebend of Westminster, in 1642, and died about 1685. His *Sermons* were published (1666, 4to; 1685, 4to; 1689, 4to; and 1695, 4to: the last edition was by bishop Patrick, who highly eulogized the abilities of Killigrew as a pulpit orator).—Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Kilvert, FRANCIS, an English theologian and teacher, was born in Bath in 1793. His early education was under the instruction of Dr. Rowlandson, at Hungerford; afterwards he was at the Bath Grammar School, where, because of his superior acquirements, he was engaged as one of the assistant masters prior to his entering Oxford. He went to Worcester College in 1811, was ordained deacon in 1816, and priest in 1817. His first curacy was that of Claverton, near Bath. In 1837 he became possessor of Claverton Lodge, in which he continued to teach privately until his death, Sept. 19, 1863. Kilvert was a man of uncommon purity of life, and as an instructor of the youth his precepts and holy example were invaluable. He published a volume of *Sermons* (preached in St. Mary's Church, Bathwick, 1827):—*Selection from unpublished Papers of Bishop Warburton* (1841):—*Collection of original Latin Inscriptions;* and *Memoirs of Bishop Hurd* (1860). See Appleton, *American Annual Cyclopædia*, 1863, p. 571. (J. L. S.)

Kilwardeby, ROBERT, a noted English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 13th century. He was educated at the universities of Oxford and Paris. In 1272 he became archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1277 was made cardinal. He died in 1279. Cardinal Kilwardeby is said to have written as many as 39 different works, but none of these were ever printed. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 730.

Kimashon. See THORN.

Kimber, ISAAC, an English dissenting minister, born at Wantage, Berkshire, in 1692, was educated at Gresham College, London, and the Dissenters' Academy, and in 1724 became pastor at Namptwich, Cheshire, but resigned in 1727 on account of some difficulties with his congregation, and returned to London, where he published a periodical which lived some four years. He was also employed by booksellers in various literary undertakings, compiling a number of historical works, among which we remark the *Life of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1714, 8vo). He wrote also the Life of bishop Beveridge prefixed to the folio edition of that prelate's works, of which he was editor:—*Sermons*, etc., *to which is prefixed Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Author* (London, 1756, 8vo). He died in 1758. See Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary;* Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v. (J. N. P.)

Kimchi, David, BEN-JOSEPH (by the Jews frequently called *Redak*, from the initial letters ר"ד ק = ר' דוד קמחי), one of the most distinguished Jewish writers of the Middle Ages, the great exponent of Hebrew grammar and lexicography, was born at Narbonne, in the south of France, in 1160. Very little is known of his private life. He must certainly have enjoyed, even among his contemporaries, considerable influence, gained perhaps, in a measure, by his masterly defence of Moses Maimonides; for in 1232 we find him acting as the arbiter to settle the dispute then existing between the Spanish and French rabbis respecting the opinions advanced in the *More Nebokim* of Maimonides. He died about 1240. His works are: (1.) *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (פרוש על התורה), only Genesis has been published by A. Ginsburg (Pressburg, 1842), cap. i, 1–10 being supplied by Kirchheim from the writings of Kimchi, as the MS. was defective:—(2.) *Commentary on the earlier Prophets* (פרוש על נביאים ראשונים), i. e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, printed in the Rabbinical Bibles edited by Jacob ben-Chajim (Venice, 1525, 1548), Buxtorf (1619), and Frankfurter (1724–27):—(3.) *Commentary on the later Prophets* (פרוש על נביאים אחרונים), i. e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the minor prophets; also given in the Rabbinical Bibles:—(4.) *Commentary on the Psalms* (פרוש על תהלים), first printed in 1477, reprinted several times, and also given in the Rabbinical Bibles of Jacob ben-Chajim, but not in those edited by Buxtorf and Frankfurter:—(5.) *Commentary on Ruth* (פרוש על מגילת רות), published for the first time by Mercier (Paris, 1563):—(6.) *Commentary on Chronicles* (פרוש על דברי הימים), given in the Rabbinical Bibles:—(7.) *Commentary on Job* (פרוש על איוב), which has not yet been published:—(8.) The celebrated work called *Miklol* (מכלול), or *Perfection*, which consists of two parts—*a.* A Hebrew Grammar (חלק הדקדוק), usually bearing the name *Miklol*, edited, with notes, by Elias Levita (Ven. 1545), and by M. Hechim (Furth, 1793):—and (9.) *b.* A Hebrew Lexicon (חלק השנין), commonly called *The Book of Roots* (ספר השרשים), the best editions of which are by Elias Levita (Venice, 1546), and Biesenthal and Lebrecht (Berlin, 1847):—(10.) *Refutation of Christianity* (תשובות לנוצרים), in which he denies that Messianic predictions are embodied in the Psalms; printed together with Lippmann's celebrated *Nitsachon* (נצחון) (Amst. 1709, 1711; Königsberg, 1847):—and (11.) Another polemical work called יכוח, also printed with the *Nitsachon*. Kimchi, as he himself frankly says in his introduction to the *Miklol*, did not so much furnish new and startling criticism as an exhibit of the results of the manifold and extensive labors of his numerous predecessors. His lexicon is, to a great extent, a translation of Ibn-Ganach's *Book of Roots* [see IBN-GANACH], and he freely quotes the great Jewish-Arabic commentators, grammarians, and lexicographers, Saadia, Ibn-Korcish, Chajug, Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Gebirol, Ibn-Giath, Ibn-Balaam, Gikatilla, and many other celebrities. "But, though his claims are modest," says Ginsburg, in Kitto (*Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.), "yet his merits are great. He was the first who discovered the distinction between the long and the short vowels, whereby the understanding of the changing of vowels has been greatly facilitated. He moreover defended a simple, natural, and grammatical exegesis, at a time when most of his Jewish brethren were enamored of Hagadic, Cabalistical, and astrological interpretations. It is therefore not to be wondered at that he became so eminent among his brethren that they applied to him, by a play of words, the saying in the Mishna (*Aboth*, iii, 17), אם אין קמח אין תורה, *No Kimchi, no understanding of the Scriptures.*" Among Christian scholars also Kimchi enjoyed great celebrity, more especially, however, among the precursors of the Reformation and the Reformers themselves, "notwithstanding his hostility to Christianity, which is displayed throughout his commentaries, and which arose from the persecutions that the Jews had to endure at the hands of the Crusaders." Many passages obnoxious to adherents of the Christian faith were struck out by the Inquisition, and are omitted in later editions of Kimchi's Commentaries. Pococke collected all the passages which had been omitted from the Prophets in *Not. ad Portam Mosis*, in his theological works (ed. Lond. 1740), i, 241 sq. The first efforts of Christian scholars in compiling Heb.

lexicons, or glossaries, and grammars, were based on the labors of Kimchi, and the notes accompanying the Latin Bibles of Munster and Stephen are derived from him. Excerpts of his Commentary on Isaiah were translated into Latin by Munster, and a Latin version of the whole of it was published by Malanimeus (Florence, 1774). Leusden published Latin versions of Joel (Utrecht, 1656) and Jonah (Utrecht, 1657). De Muis published a Latin translation of Malachi (Paris, 1618). Vehe published a German translation of Amos (Col. 1581), and Dr. M'Caul translated the Commentary on Zechariah and the Preface to the Psalms into English (London, 1837). A Latin translation of the Commentary on the Psalms was made by Janvier (Constanz, 1544). His grammatical labors embraced in the *Miklol* was translated into Latin by Guidacier (Paris, 1540), and a Latin version of the *Roots* was published in 1535. See Steinschneider, *Catalogus Lib. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 868–875; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 183 sq., and his Introd. to *Hebrew Dictionary;* the masterly biography of Kimchi by Geiger in *Ozar Nechmad* (Vienna, 1857), p. 157 sq.; Dukes, *Die Familie Kimchi* (*Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1850); Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vi, 236 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Kimchi, Joseph, Ben-Isaac, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, father of the preceding (David), was born in Spain in the latter half of the 11th century, but was obliged to quit Spain during the terrible persecutions by the Mohammedans, and settled at Narbonne, France. Just as little is known of his personal history as of his son's. He was well versed in the science of the Hebrew language and Biblical exegesis, and by the introduction into Southern France of that thorough scholarship for which the Spanish Jews in his day are so celebrated, gave a new impetus to the study of the O.-Test. Scriptures in the original. As has been pithily said, he became the Aben-Ezra of Southern France. He died about 1180. He wrote a number of valuable contributions to exegetical theology, but it is as a theologian, especially as a polemic, that Joseph Kimchi excelled. His most important works are: סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית (*Book of the Covenant*), a treatise against Christianity, in the form of a dialogue between a Jew (Maamin or believer) and a Christian (Min or heretic), and which was published in the *Milchemeth ha-Shem* (Constantinople, 1710, 8vo):—סֵפֶר מִלְחֲמוֹת הַשֵּׁם, against a Jew named Peter Alphonse, who had become a Christian: this work was never published. He also wrote in Hebrew verse the maxims of Solomon ben-Gabirol (of this fragments appeared in the *Zion* [Francf. 1842, 8vo], ii, 97–100); some Hebrew hymns, which were inserted in the *Ajaleth ha-Shachar* (published by Mard. Jare [Mantua, 1612, 8vo]); a Hebrew translation of Bachia ben-Joseph's morals, printed in the works of the latter (Leipzig, 1846, 12mo); besides commentaries on most of the books of the O. T. The last are as follows: (1.) *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה (*The Book of the Law*); fragments are extant in MS., De Rossi 166, and in the quotations of his son D. Kimchi:—(2.) *Commentary on the earlier Prophets*, called סֵפֶר הַמִּקְנָה, *The Bill of Purchase*, in allusion to Jer. xxxii, 11:—(3.) *Commentary on the later Prophets*, called סֵפֶר הַגָּלוּי (*The unfolded Book*, in allusion to Jer. xxxii, 14). These works, too, have not as yet come to light, and we only know them through the numerous quotations from them dispersed through David Kimchi's Commentaries on the Prophets:—(4.) *Commentary on Job*, of which defective MSS. are preserved in the Bodleian Library and at Munich, 260:—(5.) *Commentary on Proverbs*, a perfect MS. of which exists in the Munich Library, No. 242:—(6.) *Hebrew Grammar*, called סֵפֶר זִכָּרוֹן (*The Book of Remembrance*), which is the first written by a Jew in a Christian country, and is quoted by D. Kimchi in the *Miklol*, קנא, *b*:—(7.) Another grammatical work, entitled סֵפֶר חִבּוּר הַלֶּקֶט, also quoted in the *Miklol*, קלו, *a*. "Both as a commentator and a grammarian," says Ginsburg (in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.), "Joseph Kimchi deserves the highest praise; and, though his works still remain unpublished, his contributions to Biblical literature produced a most beneficial influence, inasmuch as they prepared the way in Christian countries for a literal and sound exegesis. His son, David Kimchi, who constantly quotes him, both in his commentaries and under almost every root of his Hebrew Lexicon, has familiarized the Hebrew student with the grammatical and exegetical principles of this deservedly esteemed Hebraist." See, besides the works cited under David Kimchi, Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's *Radicum Liber* (Berlin, 1847), col. xxiv sq.; and Geiger's excellent treatise in *Ozar Nechmad* (Vienna, 1856), i, p. 97–119; Bartolocci, *Mag. Biblioth. Rabbin.* iii, 327; *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1850; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 186 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kimchi, Moses, ben-Joseph (also called *Remak*, from the initial letters רמ"ק = ר' משה קמחי), eldest son of the preceding (Joseph), flourished about 1160–1170. Though far inferior in ability to his father and brother, he has earned an honorable place as a commentator and grammarian. His works are: (1.) *Commentary on Proverbs* (or פֵּרוּשׁ סֵפֶר מִשְׁלֵי) (printed in the Rabbinic Bibles of Jacob ben-Chajim, Ven. 1526, 1548; Buxtorf, Basel, 1619; and Frankfurter, Amst. 1724–27). This work has been falsely ascribed to Aben-Ezra. Compare Reifmann, in *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1841, p. 750, 751; *Zion* (F. a. M. 1841), i, 76; Lippmann, in *Zion* (F. a. M. 1842), ii, 113–117, 129–133, 155–157, 171–174, 185–188:—(2.) *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah* (also printed in the Rabbinical Bibles, and erroneously attributed to Aben-Ezra):—(3.) A grammatical work, entitled מְהַלֵּךְ שְׁבִילֵי הַדַּעַת (or *Journey on the Paths of Knowledge*), which became a manual for both Jews and Christians beginning the study of Hebrew grammar. It was highly commended by Elias Levita, who annotated and edited it in 1508. It was afterwards published, with a Latin translation, by Seb. Munster (Basel, 1531), and since frequently, with diverse additions and modifications. "The chief merit of this little volume consists in the fact that M. Kimchi was the first to employ therein the word פקד as a paradigm of the regular verbs, instead of the less appropriate verb mediæ gutturalis פעל, which had been used by his predecessors, in imitation of Arabic grammarians:"—(4.) A grammatical treatise on the anomalous expressions, entitled סֵפֶר תַּחְבּוּשׁוֹת, quoted by D. Kimchi in the *Miklol*. See Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's *Radicum Liber* (Berlin, 1847), col. xxxviii sq.; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 187 sq; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr.* in *Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1858–1844; by the same author, *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (Leipzig, 1859), p. 74 sq.; Geiger's *Ozar Nechmad*, ii, 17 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, s. v.

Kimmosh, Kimosh. See Nettle.

Ki'nah (Heb. *Kinah'*, קִינָה, an *elegy*, as in Jer. ix, 9, etc.; Septuag. Κινά v. r. Ἰκάμ), a city in the extreme south of Judah (hence prob. included within the territory of Simeon), mentioned between Jagur and Dimonah (Josh. xv, 22). "Stanley (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 160) ingeniously connects Kinah with the Kenites (קֵינִי), who settled in this district (Judg. i, 16). But it should not be overlooked that the list in Josh. xv purports to record the towns as they were at the conquest, while the settlement of the Kenites probably (though not certainly) did not take place till after it. It is mentioned in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (s. v. Κινά, *Cina*), but not so as to imply that they had any actual knowledge of it. With the sole exception of Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 99), it appears to be unmentioned by any trav-

eller, and the 'town *Cinah*, situated near the wilderness of Zin,' with which he would identify it, is not to be found in his own or any other map" (Smith). The true position of Kinah can only be conjecturally located as not far from the Dead Sea, possibly in wady Fikreh.

Kinanah. See MARBAH.

Kindervater, CHRISTIAN VICTOR, a German preacher and philosopher of the Kantian school, was born at Neuenheiligen, Thuringia, in 1758, and was educated at the University of Leipzig. He became pastor at Pedelwitz, near Leipzig, in 1790; in 1804, general superintendent at Eisenach, and died May 9, 1806. His most important works are, *An homo qui animum neget esse immortalem, animo possit esse tranquillo* (Lips. 1785, 4to): —*Giebt es unerschütterliche Beruhigung in Leiden ohne den auf Moralität gegründeten Glauben an die Unsterblichkeit* (1797):—*Gespräche über das Wesen der Götter* (1787):—*Adumbratio quæstionis, an Pyrrhonis doctrina omnis tollatur virtus* (1789, 4to):—*Skeptische Dialogen über die Vortheile der Leiden, und Widerwärtigkeiten dieses Lebens* (1788, 8vo):—*Geschichte der Wirkungen der verschiednen Religionen auf die Sittlichkeit und Glückseligkeit des Menschengeschlechts in ältern und neuern Zeiten* (1793, 8vo):—*Geist des reinen Christenthums* (1795, 8vo):—*Darstellung der Leidensgesch. Jesu* (1797, 8vo):—*De indole atque forma regni Messiæ e mente Johannis Baptistæ Dissertatio* (1803, 4to).—Krug, *Encyklop. Lex.* vol. ii, s. v.; Döring, *Deutsche Kanzelredner d. 18ten und 19ten Jahrh.* p. 155 sq.

Kindred. I. The following are the Hebrew terms thus rendered in the English Bible:

1. מִשְׁפָּחָה, *mishpachah'*, usually rendered "family," answering to the Latin *gens*, except that it more distinctly includes the idea of original affinity or derivation from a common stock; it corresponds exactly with our word *clan*. It is used of the different tribes of the Canaanites (Gen. x, 18); of the subdivisions of the Hebrew people (Exod. vi, 14; Numb. i, 20, etc.); sometimes for one of the tribes (Josh. vii, 17; Judg. xiii, 2, etc.), and in the later books tropically for a people or nation (Jer. viii, 3; xxv, 9; Ezek. xx, 32; Micah ii, 3). It is translated *kindred* in the A. V. at Gen. xxiv, 41; Josh. vi, 23; Ruth ii, 3; Job xxxii, 2—in all of which it refers to relationship by *consanguinity*, more or less remote.

2. מוֹלֶדֶת, *mole'deth*, conveys primarily the idea of *birth, nativity;* hence a *person born, a child* (Gen. xxviii, 9; Lev. xviii, 9, 11), and *persons of the same family* or *lineage* (Gen. xii, 1; xxiv, 4; xxxi, 3; xliii, 7; Numb. x, 30; Esth. ii, 10; viii, 6—in all which passages it is translated *kindred* in the A. V.). In some of these instances, however, the kinship is only the remote one of common nationality arising out of common descent.

3. מוֹדַעַת, *moda'ath*, literally *knowledge*, is used to express blood-relationship in Ruth iii, 2; compare מוֹדָע (Ruth ii, 1; Prov. vii, 4).

4. גְּאֻלָּה, *geüllah'*, *redemption*, a word which properly designated such near relationship by blood as would confer the rights and obligations of a גֹּאֵל, or kinsman, avenger, and redeemer, on the party. See GOËL. As commonly used, however, it denotes either the thing redeemed (Ruth iv, 6), or the right of redeeming (Lev. xxv, 29, etc.), or the redemption price (Lev. xxv, 26, etc.). The only passage in which it is translated *kindred* in the A. V. is Ezek. xi, 15. Hengstenberg (*Christol.* iii, 9, E. T.) and Hävernick (*Comment.* ad loc.) contend that גאלה is to be taken here not in the sense of *relationship*, but in that of *suretyship* or *substitutionary action*, and they would translate the passage, "Thy brethren are the men of thy suretyship," or "redemption," i. e. the men whom it lies on them to redeem or act for. The Sept. seems to have read גּוֹלָתְךָ, for they give *αἰχμαλωσίας* here.

5. אָח, *ach*, which properly means *brother*, occurs only once with the rendering *kindred* in the A. V., in 1 Chron. xii, 29. It is frequently used elsewhere in a wide sense, and may be understood of nearly all collateral relationships whatever, by consanguinity, affinity, or simple association. From this comes אַחֲוָה, *brotherhood* (Zech. xi, 14).

Besides these terms, the Hebrews expressed consanguinity by such words and phrases as בָּשָׂר, *flesh* (Gen. xxxvii, 27; Isa. lviii, 7); עֶצֶם יִבְשָׂרִי, *my bone and my flesh* (Gen. xxix, 14; Judg. ix, 2; 2 Sam. v, 1, etc.); שְׁאֵר, *flesh* (Lev. xviii, 12, 13, etc.; Numb. xxvii, 41), with שַׁאֲרָה, coll. *kinswomen* (Lev. xviii, 17); and שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, *flesh of his flesh* (A. V. *near of kin*, Lev. xviii, 6; *nigh of kin*, xxv, 49).

II. In the New Test. we have the following Greek words thus rendered: *γένος*, the most general and frequent term, our *kin*, i. e. birth relationship, with its derivative *συγγένεια*, *co-relationship; πατριά* (Acts iii, 25), *descent* in a direct line ("lineage," Luke ii, 4; "family," Eph. iii, 15); and *φυλή* (Rev. v, 9; vii, 9; xi, 9; xiii, 7; xiv, 6), a *tribe* (as elsewhere rendered).

In addition to these Heb. and Greek words, various others of cognate derivation or similar signification are frequently rendered "kin," "kinship," etc.

III. The terms expressive of immediate relationship are FATHER, MOTHER, BROTHER, SISTER, SON, DAUGHTER; those expressing collateral consanguinity are UNCLE, AUNT, NEPHEW (niece does not occur in the A. V., but brother's or sister's daughter), COUSIN; those expressive of affinity are FATHER-IN-LAW, MOTHER-IN-LAW, SON-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, BROTHER-IN-LAW, SISTER-IN-LAW. See each of these in their place.

IV. The relations of kindred, expressed by few words, and imperfectly defined in the earliest ages, acquired in course of time greater significance and wider influence. The full list of relatives either by consanguinity, i. e. as arising from a common ancestor, or by affinity, i. e. as created by marriage, may be seen detailed in the *Corpus Juris Civ. Digest.* lib. xxxviii, tit. 10, *de Gradibus;* see also *Corp. Jur. Canon. Decr.* ii, c. xxxv, 9, 5. See AFFINITY.

The domestic and economical questions arising out of kindred may be classed under the three heads of MARRIAGE, INHERITANCE, and BLOOD-REVENGE, and the reader is referred to the articles on those subjects for information thereon. It is clear that the tendency of the Mosaic law was to increase the restrictions on marriage, by defining more precisely the relations created by it, as is shown by the cases of Abraham and Moses. For information on the general subject of kindred and its obligations, see Selden, *De Jure Naturali*, lib. v; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, ed. Smith, ii, 36; Knobel on Lev. xviii; Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* iii, 3, 4, 5, vol. ii, p. 301–304, ed. Mangey; Burckhardt, *Arab Tribes*, i, 150; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* ii, 50, § 106, 107. See KINSMAN.

Kine (פָּרָה, *parah,'* i. e. *fruitful*, a *heifer*, Gen. xxxii, 15; xli, 2–27; and so rendered in Numb. xix, 2–9; also a young *milch-cow*, 1 Sam. vi, 7–14; "cow," Job xxi, 10; Isa. xi, 7; a "heifer" just broken to the yoke, Hos. iv, 16; put as a symbol of a voluptuous female, Amos iv, 1: sometimes in the Auth. Vers. for אֶלֶף, *e'leph*, usually an *ox*, as rendered in Psa. viii, 8; Prov. xiv, 4; Isa. xxx, 24; but fem. in Deut. vii, 13; xxviii, 4, 18, 51; also for בָּקָר, *bakar'*, Deut. xxxii, 14; 2 Sam. xvii, 29; a *beeve* or one of a herd of cattle, elsewhere without distinction of sex, and rendered "ox," "bullock," "herd," etc.). See Cow.

King (Heb. and Chald. מֶלֶךְ, *me'lek, ruler; βασιλεύς*), the most general term for an absolute, independent, and life-long sovereign.

1. *Scriptural Applications of the Title.*—In the Bible the name does not always imply the same degree of power or importance, neither does it indicate the magnitude of the dominion or territory of the national ruler thus designated (Gen. xxxvi, 31). Many persons are

called "kings" in Scripture whom we should rather denominate *chiefs* or *leaders;* and many single towns, or towns with their adjacent villages, are said to have kings. Hence we need not be surprised at seeing that so small a country as Canaan contained *thirty-one kings* who were conquered (Josh. xii, 9, 24), besides many who no doubt escaped the arms of Joshua. Adonibezek himself, no very powerful king, mentions *seventy kings* whom he had subdued and mutilated (Judg. i, 7; 1 Kings iv, 21; xx, 1, 16). Even at the present day the heads of Arab tribes are often called "king," which in this case also means no more than *sheik* or *chief*. In like manner, in the New Test., owing to the peculiar political relations of the Jews, the title "king" has very different significations: (1.) The Roman *emperor* (1 Pet. ii, 13, 17); and so the "seven kings" (Rev. xvii, 10) are perhaps the first seven Cæsars (comp. Thilo, *Apocr.* 579). (2.) Herod Antipas (Matt. xiv, 9; Mark vi, 22), although only *tetrarch* (compare Luke iii, 19). (3.) So also the ten provincial representatives of the Roman government (Rev. xvii, 12), as being supreme within their respective jurisdictions. See GOVERNOR, etc.

"King," in symbolical language, signifies the possessor of supreme power, whether lodged in one or more persons (Prov. viii, 15, 16). It is applied in the Scriptures to God, as the sole proper sovereign and ruler of the universe (1 Tim. i, 17), and to Christ, the Son of God, the sole Head and Governor of his Church (1 Tim. vi, 15, 16; Matt. xxvii, 11; Luke xix, 38; John i, 49; xviii, 33, 34); also to men, as invested with regal authority by their fellows (Luke xxii, 25; 1 Tim. ii, 1, 2; 1 Pet. ii, 13–17); so also the people of God are called *kings* and *priests* (Psa. xlix, 14; Dan. vii, 22, 27; Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 29, 30; 1 Cor. vi, 2, 3; 2 Tim. ii, 12; Rev. i, 6; ii, 26, 27; iii, 21; v, 10; xxii, 5). In Job xviii, 14 it is applied to Death, who is there called the "king of terrors." In Job xli, 34, leviathan, or the crocodile, is thus designated: "he is a king over all the children of pride." (See Wemyss's *Symbol. Dict.*)

The application, however, of the term "king," with which we are here particularly concerned, is that of the name of the national ruler of the Hebrews during a period of about 500 years previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 588. It was borne first by the ruler of the Twelve Tribes united, and then by the rulers of Judah and Israel separately. See KINGS, BOOK OF.

2. *Origin of the Hebrew Monarchy.*—Regal authority was altogether alien to the institutions of Moses in their original and unadulterated form. Their fundamental idea was that Jehovah was the sole king of the nation (1 Sam. viii, 7); to use the emphatic words in Isa. xxxiii, 22, "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king." Although Moses ventured, with his half-civilized hordes, on the bold experiment of founding a society without a king, and in doing so evinced a rare patriotism and self-denial, for without doubt the man who rescued the Jews from bondage and conducted them to the land of Canaan might, had he chosen, have kept the dominion in his own hands, and transmitted a crown to his posterity, yet he well knew what were the elements with which he had to deal in framing institutions for the rescued Israelites. Slaves they had been, and the spirit of slavery was not yet wholly eradicated from their souls. They had witnessed in Egypt the more than ordinary pomp and splendor which environ a throne. Not improbably the prosperity and abundance which they had seen in Egypt, and in which they had been, in a measure, allowed to partake, might have been ascribed by them to the regal form of the Egyptian government. Moses may well, therefore, have apprehended a not very remote departure from the fundamental type of his institutions. Accordingly he makes a special provision for this contingency (Deut. xvii, 14), and labors, by anticipation, to guard against the abuses of royal power. Should a king be demanded by the people, then he was to be a native Israelite; he was not to be drawn away by the love of show, especially by a desire for that regal display in which horses have always borne so large a part, to send down to Egypt, still less to cause the people to return to that land; he was to avoid the corrupting influence of a large harem, so common among Eastern monarchs; he was to abstain from amassing silver and gold; he was to have a copy of the law made expressly for his own study—a study which he was never to intermit till the end of his days, so that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren, that he might not be turned aside from the living God, but, observing the divine statutes, and thus acknowledging himself to be no more than the vicegerent of heaven, he might enjoy happiness, and transmit his authority to his descendants.

The removal of Moses and Joshua by death soon left the people to the natural results of their own condition and character. Anarchy ensued. Noble minds, indeed, and stout hearts appeared in those who were termed judges; but the state of the country was not so satisfactory as to prevent an unenlightened people, having low and gross affections, from preferring the glare of a crown and the apparent protection of a sceptre to the invisible and, therefore, mostly unrecognised arm of Omnipotence. A king accordingly is requested (1 Sam. viii). The misconduct of Samuel's sons, who had been made judges, was the immediate cause of the demand being put forth. The request came with authority, for it emanated from all the elders of Israel, who, after holding a formal conference, proceeded to Samuel, in order to make him acquainted with their wish. Samuel was displeased; but, having sought in prayer to learn the divine will, he was instructed to yield to the demand; yet at the same time he was directed to "protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." Faithfully did the prophet depict the evils which a monarchy would inflict on the people. In vain; they said, "Nay, but we will have a king over us." Accordingly, Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, was, by divine direction, selected, and privately anointed by Samuel "to be captain over God's inheritance;" thus he was to hold only a delegated and subordinate authority (1 Sam. ix; x, 1–16). Under the guidance of Samuel, Saul was subsequently chosen by lot from among the assembled tribes; and though his personal appearance had no influence in the choice, yet, when he was plainly pointed out to be the individual designed for the sceptre, Samuel called attention to those personal qualities which in less civilized nations have a preponderating influence, and are never without effect, at least, in supporting the physical dignity of a reign (1 Sam. x, 17–27). (For a fuller discussion of this change in the Hebrew constitution, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations* under the portion of history in question.) See SAMUEL.

The special occasion of the substitution of a regal form of government for that of the judges seems to have been the siege of Jabesh-Gilead by Nahash, king of the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi, 1; xii, 12), and the refusal to allow the inhabitants of that city to capitulate except on humiliating and cruel conditions (1 Sam. xi, 2, 4–6). The conviction seems to have forced itself on the Israelites that they could not resist their formidable neighbor unless they placed themselves under the sway of a king, like surrounding nations. Concurrently with this conviction, disgust had been excited by the corrupt administration of justice under the sons of Samuel, and a radical change was desired by them in this respect also (1 Sam. viii, 3–5). Accordingly, the original idea of a Hebrew king was twofold: 1st, that he should lead the people to battle in time of war; and, 2dly, that he should execute judgment and justice to them in war and in peace (1 Sam. viii, 20). In both respects the desired end was attained. The righteous wrath and military capacity of Saul were immediately triumphant over the Ammonites; and though ultimately he was defeated and slain in battle with the Philistines, he put even them to flight on more than one occasion (1 Sam. xiv, 23;

xvii, 52), and generally waged successful war against the surrounding nations (1 Sam. xiv, 47). See SAUL. His successor, David, entered on a series of brilliant conquests over the Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, Edomites, and Ammonites; and the Israelites, no longer confined within the narrow bounds of Palestine, had an empire extending from the River Euphrates to Gaza, and from the entering in of Hamath to the river of Egypt (1 Kings iv, 21). In the meanwhile complaints ceased of the corruption of justice; and Solomon not only consolidated and maintained in peace the empire of his father David, but left an enduring reputation for his wisdom as a judge. Under this expression, however, we must regard him, not merely as pronouncing decisions, primarily or in the last resort, in civil and criminal cases, but likewise as holding public levees and transacting public business "at the gate," when he would receive petitions, hear complaints, and give summary decisions on various points, which in a modern European kingdom would come under the cognizance of numerous distinct public departments. See DAVID; SOLOMON.

3. *Functions and Prerogatives.*—Emanating as the royal power did from the demand of the people and the permission of a prophet, it was not likely to be unlimited in its extent or arbitrary in its exercise. The government of God, indeed, remained, being rather concealed and complicated than disowned, much less superseded. The king ruled not in his own right nor in virtue of the choice of the people, but by concession from on high, and partly as the servant and partly as the representative of the theocracy. How insecure, indeed, was the tenure of the kingly power how restricted it was in its authority, appears clear from the comparative facility with which the crown was transferred from Saul to David; and the part which the prophet Samuel took in effecting that transference points out the quarter where lay the power which limited, if it did not primarily, at least, control the royal authority. It must, however, be added that, if religion narrowed this authority, it also invested it with a sacredness which could emanate from no other source. Liable as the Israelitish kings were to interference on the part of priest and prophet, they were, by the same divine power, shielded from the unholy hands of the profane vulgar, and it was at once impiety and rebellion to do injury to "the Lord's anointed" (Psa. ii, 6, 7 sq.). Instances are not wanting to corroborate and extend these general observations. When Saul was in extremity before the Philistines (1 Sam. xxviii), he resorted to the usual methods of obtaining counsel: "Saul inquired of the Lord; the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the prophets." So David, when in need of advice in war (1 Sam. xxx, 7), resorted to Abiathar the priest, who, by means of the ephod, inquired of the Lord, and thereupon urged the king to take a certain course, which proved successful (see also 2 Sam. ii, 1). Sometimes, indeed, as appears from 1 Sam. xxviii, it was a prophet who acted the part of prime minister, or chief counsellor, to the king, and who, as bearing that sacred character, must have possessed very weighty influence in the royal divan (1 Kings xxii, 7 sq.). We must not, however, expect to find any definite and permanent distribution of power, any legal determination of the royal prerogatives as discriminated from the divine authority; circumstances, as they prompted certain deeds, restricted or enlarged the sphere of the monarch's action. Thus, in 1 Sam. xi, 4 sq., we find Saul, in an emergency, assuming, without consultation or deliberation, the power of demanding something like a levy *en masse*, and of proclaiming instant war. With the king lay the administration of justice in the last resort (2 Sam. xv, 2; 1 Kings iii, 16 sq.). He also possessed the power of life and death (2 Sam. xiv). To provide for and superintend the public worship was at once his duty and his highest honor (1 Kings viii; 2 Kings xii, 4; xviii, 4; xxiii, 1). One reason why the people requested a king was that they might have a recognised leader in war (1 Sam. viii, 20). The Mosaic law offered a powerful hindrance to royal despotism (1 Sam. x, 25). The people also, by means of their elders, formed an express compact, by which they stipulated for their rights (1 Kings xii, 4), and were from time to time appealed to, generally in cases of "great pith and moment" (1 Chron. xxix, 1; 2 Kings xi, 17; Josephus, *War*, ii, 1, 2). Nor did the people fail to interpose their will, where they thought it necessary, in opposition to that of the monarch (1 Sam. xiv, 45). The part which Nathan took against David shows how effective, as well as bold, was the check exerted by the prophets; indeed, most of the prophetic history is the history of the noblest opposition ever made to the vices alike of royalty, priesthood, and people. If needful, the prophet hesitated not to demand an audience with the king, nor was he dazzled or deterred by royal power and pomp (1 Kings xx, 22, 38; 2 Kings i, 15). As, however, the monarch held the sword, the instrument of death was sometimes made to prevail over every restraining influence (1 Sam. xxii, 17). See PROPHET.

To form a correct idea of a Hebrew king, we must abstract ourselves from the notions of modern Europe, and realize the position of Oriental sovereigns. It would be a mistake to regard the Hebrew government as a limited monarchy, in the English sense of the expression. It is stated in 1 Sam. x, 25, that Samuel "told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in the book and laid it before the Lord," and it is barely possible that this may refer to some statement respecting the boundaries of the kingly power. (The word מִשְׁפָּט, literally *judgment*, translated "manner" in the A. V., is translated in the Sept. δικαίωμα, i. e. statute or ordinance [comp. Ecclus. iv, 17; Bar. ii, 12; iv, 13]. But Josephus seems to have regarded the document as a prophetical statement, read before the king, of the calamities which were to arise from the kingly power, as a kind of protest recorded for succeeding ages [*Ant.* vi, 4, 6]). But no such document has come down to us; and if it ever existed, and contained restrictions of any moment on the kingly power, it was probably disregarded in practice. The following passage of sir John Malcolm respecting the shahs of Persia may, with some slight modifications, be regarded as fairly applicable to the Hebrew monarchy under David and Solomon: "The monarch of Persia has been pronounced to be one of the most absolute in the world. His word has ever been deemed a law; and he has probably never had any further restraint upon the free exercise of his vast authority than has arisen from *his regard for religion*, his respect for established usages, his desire for reputation, and his fear of exciting an opposition that might be dangerous to his power or to his life" (Malcolm's *Persia*, ii, 303; comp. Elphinstone's *India*, bk. viii, ch. 3). It must not, however, be supposed to have been either the understanding or the practice that the sovereign might seize at his discretion the private property of individuals. Ahab did not venture to seize the vineyard of Naboth till, through the testimony of false witnesses, Naboth had been convicted of blasphemy; and possibly his vineyard may have been seized as a confiscation, without flagrantly outraging public sentiment in those who did not know the truth (1 Kings xi, 6). But no monarchy perhaps ever existed in which it would not be regarded as an outrage that the monarch should from covetousness seize the private property of an innocent subject in no ways dangerous to the state. And generally, when sir John Malcolm proceeds as follows in reference to "one of the most absolute" monarchs in the world, it will be understood that the Hebrew king, whose power might be described in the same way, is not, on account of certain restraints which exist in the nature of things, to be regarded as "a limited monarch" in the European use of the words. "We may assume that the power of the king of Persia is by usage absolute over the property and lives of his conquered enemies, *his rebellious subjects, his own family, his ministers, over*

public officers civil and military, and all the numerous train of domestics, and that he may punish any person of these classes without examination or formal procedure of any kind; in all other cases that are capital, the forms prescribed by law and custom are observed; the monarch only commands, when the evidence has been examined and the law declared, that the sentence shall be put in execution or that the condemned culprit shall be pardoned" (ii, 306). In accordance with such usages, David ordered Uriah to be treacherously exposed to death in the forefront of the hottest battle (2 Sam. xi, 15); he caused Rechab and Baanah to be slain instantly, when they brought him the head of Ishbosheth (2 Sam. iv, 12); and he is represented as having on his death-bed recommended Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death (1 Kings ii, 5–9). In like manner, Solomon caused to be killed, without trial, not only his elder brother Adonijah and Joab, whose execution might be regarded as the exceptional acts of a dismal state-policy in the beginning of his reign, but likewise Shimei, after having been seated on the throne three years. And king Saul, in resentment at their connivance with David's escape, put to death 85 priests, and caused a massacre of the inhabitants of Nob, including women, children, and sucklings (1 Sam. xxii, 18, 19).

Besides being commander-in-chief of the army, supreme judge, and absolute master, as it were, of the lives of his subjects, the king exercised the power of imposing taxes on them, and of exacting from them personal service and labor. Both these points seem clear from the account given (1 Sam. viii, 11–17) of the evils which would arise from the kingly power, and are confirmed in various ways. Whatever mention may be made of consulting "old men," or "elders of Israel," we never read of their deciding such points as these. When Pul, the king of Assyria, imposed a tribute on the kingdom of Israel, "Menahem, the king," exacted the money of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver (2 Kings xv, 19). When Jehoiakim, king of Judah, gave his tribute of silver and gold to Pharaoh, *he* taxed the land to give the money; he exacted the silver and gold of the people, of every one according to his taxation (2 Kings xxiii, 35). The degree to which the exaction of personal labor might be carried on a special occasion is illustrated by king Solomon's requirements for building the Temple. He raised a levy of 30,000 men, and sent them to Lebanon by courses of 10,000 a month; and he had 70,000 that bare burdens, and 80,000 hewers in the mountains (1 Kings v, 13–15). Judged by the Oriental standard, there is nothing improbable in these numbers. In our own days, for the purpose of constructing the Mahmûdeyeh Canal in Egypt, Mehemet Ali, by orders given to the various sheiks of the provinces of Sakarah, Ghizeh, Mensûrah, Sharkieh, Menûf, Bahyreh, and some others, caused 300,000 men, women, and children to be assembled along the site of the intended canal (see Mrs. Poole's *Englishwoman in Egypt*, ii, 219). This was 120,000 more than the levy of Solomon.

In addition to these earthly powers, the king of Israel had a more awful claim to respect and obedience. He was the vicegerent of Jehovah (1 Sam. x, 1; xvi, 13), and, as it were, His son, if just and holy (2 Sam. vii, 14; Psa. lxxxix, 26, 27; ii, 6, 7). He had been set apart as a consecrated ruler. Upon his head had been poured the holy anointing oil, composed of olive-oil, myrrh, cinnamon, sweet calamus, and cassia, which had hitherto been reserved exclusively for the priests of Jehovah, especially the high-priest, or had been solely used to anoint the Tabernacle of the Congregation, the Ark of the Testimony, and the vessels of the Tabernacle (Exod. xxx, 23–33; xl, 9; Lev. xxi, 10; 1 Kings i, 39). He had become, in fact, emphatically "the Lord's anointed." At the coronation of sovereigns in modern Europe, holy oil has frequently been used as a symbol of divine right; but this has been mainly regarded as a mere form, and the use of it was undoubtedly introduced in imitation of the Hebrew custom. But, from the beginning to the end of the Hebrew monarchy, a living real significance was attached to consecration by this holy anointing oil. From well-known anecdotes related of David—and, perhaps, from words in his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 21)—it results that a certain sacredness invested the person of Saul, the *first* king, as the Lord's anointed; and that, on this account, it was deemed sacrilegious to kill him, even at his own request (1 Sam. xxiv, 6, 10; xxvi, 9, 16; 2 Sam. i, 14). After the destruction of the first Temple, in the Book of Lamentations over the calamities of the Hebrew people, it is by the name of "the Lord's Anointed" that Zedekiah, the *last* king of Judah, is bewailed (Lam. iv, 20). Again, more than 600 years after the capture of Zedekiah, the name of the Anointed, though never so used in the Old Testament—yet suggested, probably, by Psa. ii, 2; Dan. ix, 26—had become appropriated to the expected king, who was to restore the kingdom of David, and inaugurate a period when Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, and the Philistines would again be incorporated with the Hebrew monarchy, which would extend from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea and to the ends of the earth (Acts i, 6; John i, 41; iv, 25; Isa. xi, 12–14; Psa. lxxii, 8). Thus the identical Hebrew word which signifies anointed, through its Aramaic form adopted into Greek and Latin, is still preserved to us in the English word *Messiah*. (See Gesenius's *Thesaurus*, p. 825.) See § 4, below.

4. *Appointment and Inauguration.*—The law of succession to the throne is somewhat obscure, but it seems most probable that the king during his lifetime named his successor. This was certainly the case with David, who passed over his elder son Adonijah, the son of Haggith, in favor of Solomon, the son of Bathsheba (1 Kings i, 30; ii, 22); and with Rehoboam, of whom it is said that he loved Maachah, the daughter of Absalom, above all his wives and concubines, and that he made Abijah her son to be ruler among his brethren, to make him king (2 Chron. xi, 21, 22). The succession of the first-born has been inferred from a passage in 2 Chron. xxi, 3, 4, in which Jehoshaphat is said to have given the kingdom to Jehoram "because he was the first-born." But this very passage tends to show that Jehoshaphat had the *power* of naming his successor; and it is worthy of note that Jehoram, on his coming to the throne, put to death all his brothers, which he would scarcely, perhaps, have done if the succession of the first-born had been the law of the land. From the conciseness of the narratives in the books of Kings no inference either way can be drawn from the ordinary formula in which the death of the father and succession of his son is recorded (1 Kings xv, 8). At the same time, if no partiality for a favorite wife or son intervened, there would always be a natural bias of affection in favor of the eldest son. There appears to have been some prominence given to the mother of the king (2 Kings xxiv, 12, 15; 1 Kings ii, 19), and it is possible that the mother may have been regent during the minority of a son. Indeed, some such custom best explains the possibility of the audacious usurpation of Athaliah on the death of her son Ahaziah: a usurpation which lasted six years after the destruction of all the seed-royal except the young Jehoash (2 Kings xi, 1–3). The people, too, and even foreign powers, at a later period interrupted the regular transmission of royal authority (2 Kings xxi, 24; xxiii, 24, 30; xxiv, 17). See HEIR.

It is supposed both by Jahn (*Bib. Archæol.* § 222) and Bauer (in his *Heb. Alterthümer*, § 20) that a king was only *anointed* when a new family came to the throne, or when the right to the crown was disputed. It is usually on such occasions only that the anointing is specified, as in 1 Sam. x, 1; 2 Sam. ii, 4; 1 Kings i, 39; 2 Kings ix, 3; xi, 12; but this is not *invariably* the case (see 2 Kings xxiii, 30), and there does not appear sufficient reason to doubt that each individual king was anointed. There can be little doubt, likewise, that the

kings of Israel were anointed, though this is not specified by the writers of Kings and Chronicles, who would deem such anointing invalid. The ceremony of anointing, which was observed at least in the case of Saul, David, and Solomon (1 Sam. ix, 14; x, 1; xv, 1; xvi, 12; 2 Sam. ii, 4; v, 1; 1 Kings i, 34; xxxix, 5), and in which the prophet or high-priest who performed the rite acted as the representative of the theocracy and the expounder of the will of heaven, must have given to the spiritual power very considerable influence; and both this particular and the very nature of the observance direct the mind to Egypt, where the same custom prevailed, and where the power of the priestly caste was immense (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* v, 279). Indeed, the ceremony seems to have been essential to constitute a legitimate monarch (2 Kings xi, 12; xxiii, 30); and thus the authorities of the Jewish Church held in their hands, and had subject to their will, a most important power, which they could use either for their own purposes or the common good. In consequence of the general observance of this ceremony, the term "anointed," "the Lord's anointed" (1 Sam. ii, 10; xvi, 6; xxiv, 6; 2 Sam. xix, 21; Psa. ii, 2; Lam. iv, 20), came to be employed in rhetorical and poetical diction as equivalent in meaning to the designation "king." See ANOINTING.

We have seen in the case of Saul that personal and even external qualities had their influence in procuring ready obedience to a sovereign; and further evidence to the same effect may be found in Psa. xlv, 3; Ezek. xxviii, 12: such qualities would naturally excite the enthusiasm of the people, who appear to have manifested their approval by acclamations (1 Sam. x, 24; 1 Kings i, 25; 2 Kings ix, 13; xi, 13; 2 Chron. xxiii, 11; see also Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 9).

5. *Court and Revenues.*—The following is a list of some of the officers of the king: 1. The recorder or chronicler, who was perhaps analogous to the historiographer whom sir John Malcolm mentions as an officer of the Persian court, whose duty it is to write the annals of the king's reign (*Hist. of Persia*, c. 23). Certain it is that there is no regular series of minute dates in Hebrew history until we read of this recorder, or *remembrancer*, as the word *mazkir* is translated in a marginal note of the English version. It signifies one who keeps the memory of events alive, in accordance with a motive assigned by Herodotus for writing his history, viz. that the acts of men might not become extinct by time (Herod. i, 1; 2 Sam. viii, 16; 1 Kings iv, 3; 2 Kings xviii, 18; Isa. xxxvi, 3, 22). See RECORDER. 2. The scribe or secretary, whose duty would be to answer letters or petitions in the name of the king, to write dispatches, and to draw up edicts (2 Sam. viii, 17; xx, 25; 2 Kings xii, 10; xix, 2; xxii, 8). See SCRIBE. 3. The officer who was *over the house* (Isa. xxxii, 15; xxxvi, 3). His duties would be those of chief steward of the household, and would embrace all the internal economical arrangements of the palace, the superintendence of the king's servants, and the custody of his costly vessels of gold and silver. He seems to have worn a distinctive robe of office and girdle. It was against Shebna, who held this office, that Isaiah uttered his personal prophecy (xxii, 15–25), the only instance of the kind in his writings (see Gesen. *Jesa.* i, 694). See STEWARD. 4. The king's friend (1 Kings iv, 5), called likewise the king's companion. It is evident from the name that this officer must have stood in confidential relation to the king, but his duties are nowhere specified. 5. The keeper of the vestry or wardrobe (2 Kings x, 22). 6. The captain of the body-guard (2 Sam. xx, 23). The importance of this officer requires no comment. It was he who obeyed Solomon in putting to death Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei (1 Kings ii, 25, 34, 46). 7. Distinct officers over the king's treasures—his storehouses, laborers, vineyards, olive-trees, and sycamore-trees, herds, camels, and flocks (1 Chron. xxvii, 25–31). 8. The officer over all the host or army of Israel, the commander-in-chief of the army, who commanded it in person during the king's absence (2 Sam. xx, 23; 1 Chron. xxvii, 34; 2 Sam. xi, 1). As an instance of the formidable power which a general might acquire in this office, see the narrative in 2 Sam. iii, 30–37, when David deemed himself obliged to tolerate the murder of Abner by Joab and Abishai. 9. The royal counsellor (1 Chron. xxvii, 32; Isa. iii, 3; xix, 11, 13). Ahithophel is a specimen of how much such an officer might effect for evil or for good; but whether there existed under Hebrew kings any body corresponding, even distantly, to the English Privy Council in former times, does not appear (2 Sam. xvi, 20–23; xvii, 1–14).

The following is a statement of the sources of the royal income: 1. The royal demesnes, corn-fields, vineyards, and olive-gardens. Some at least of these seem to have been taken from private individuals, but whether as the punishment of rebellion, or on any other plausible pretext, is not specified (1 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Chron. xxvii, 26–28). 2. The produce of the royal flocks (1 Sam. xxi, 7; 2 Sam. xiii, 23; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10; 1 Chron. xxvii, 25). 3. A nominal tenth of the produce of corn-land and vineyards, and of sheep (1 Sam. viii, 15, 17). 4. A tribute from merchants who passed through the Hebrew territory (1 Kings x, 14). 5. Presents made by his subjects (1 Sam. x, 27; xvi, 20; 1 Kings x, 25; Psa. lxxii, 10). There is, perhaps, no greater distinction in the usages of Eastern and Western nations than in what relates to the giving and receiving of presents. When made regularly, they do, in fact, amount to a regular tax. Thus, in the passage last referred to in the book of Kings, it is stated that they brought to Solomon "every man his present, vessels of silver and vessels of gold, and garments, and armor, and spices, horses and mules, a rate year by year." 6. In the time of Solomon, the king had trading vessels of his own at sea, which, starting from Eziongeber, brought back once in three years gold and silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). It is probable that Solomon and some other kings may have derived some revenue from commercial ventures (1 Kings ix, 28). 7. The spoils of war taken from conquered nations and the tribute paid by them (2 Sam. viii, 2, 7, 8, 10; 1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Chron. xxvii, 5). 8. Lastly, an undefined power of exacting compulsory labor, to which reference has already been made (1 Sam. viii, 12, 13, 16). As far as this power was exercised it was equivalent to so much income. There is nothing in 1 Sam. x, 25, or in 2 Sam. v, 3, to justify the statement that the Hebrews defined in express terms, or in any terms, by a particular agreement or covenant for that purpose, what services should be rendered to the king, or what he could legally require. See SOLOMON.

6. *Usages.*—A ruler in whom so much authority, human and divine, was embodied, was naturally distinguished by outward honors and luxuries. He had a court of Oriental magnificence. When the power of the kingdom was at its height, he sat on a throne of ivory, covered with pure gold, at the feet of which were two figures of lions, with others on the steps approaching the throne. The king was dressed in royal robes (1 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 9); his insignia were a crown or diadem of pure gold, or perhaps radiant with precious stones (2 Sam. i, 10; xii, 30; 2 Kings xi, 12; Psa. xxi, 3), and a royal sceptre (Ezek. xix, 11; Isa. xiv, 5; Psa. xlv, 6; Amos i, 5, 8). Those who approached him did him obeisance, bowing down and touching the ground with their foreheads (1 Sam. xxiv, 8; 2 Sam. xix, 24); and this was done even by a king's wife, the mother of Solomon (1 Kings i, 16). His officers and subjects called themselves his servants or slaves, though they do not seem habitually to have given way to such extravagant salutations as in the Chaldæan and Persian courts (1 Sam. xvii, 32, 34, 36; xx, 8; 2 Sam. vi, 20; Dan. ii, 4). As in the East at present, a kiss was a sign of respect and homage (1 Sam. x, 1; perhaps Psa. ii, 12). He lived in a splendid palace, with porches and columns (1 Kings vii, 2–7). All his drinking-vessels were of gold (1 Kings x, 21).

At his accession, in addition to the anointing mentioned above, jubilant music formed a part of the popular rejoicings (1 Kings i, 40); thank-offerings were made (1 Kings i, 25); the new sovereign rode in solemn procession on the royal mule of his predecessor (1 Kings i, 38), and took possession of the royal harem—an act which seems to have been scarcely less essential than other observances which appear to us to wear a higher character (1 Kings ii, 13, 22; 2 Sam. xvi, 22). A numerous harem, indeed, was among the most highly estimated of the royal luxuries (2 Sam. v, 13; 1 Kings xi, 1; xx, 3). It was under the supervision and control of eunuchs, and passed from one monarch to another as a part of the crown property (2 Sam. xii, 8). The law (Deut. xvii, 17), foreseeing evils such as that by which Solomon, in his later years, was turned away from his fidelity to God, had strictly forbidden many wives; but Eastern passions and usages were too strong for a mere written prohibition, and a corrupted religion became a pander to royal lust, interpreting the divine command as sanctioning eighteen as the minimum of wives and concubines.

Deriving their power originally from the wishes of the people, and being one of the same race, the Hebrew kings were naturally less despotic than other Oriental sovereigns, mingled more with their subjects, and were by no means difficult of access (2 Sam. xix, 8; 1 Kings xx, 39; Jer. xxxviii, 7; 1 Kings iii, 16; 2 Kings vi, 26; viii, 3). After death the monarchs were interred in the royal cemetery in Jerusalem: "So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David" (1 Kings ii, 10; xi, 43; xiv, 31). But bad kings were excluded "from the sepulchres of the kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xxviii, 27).

See Schickard, *Jus Regium Hebræor.* (Tübing. 1621); Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* p. 52; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* i, 298; Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 575; Hess. *Gesch. d. K. Juda und Israels* (Zür. 1787); Houtuyn, *Monarchia Hebræorum* (Leyd. 1685); Newman, *Hebrew Monarchy* (Lond. 1847, 1853); Pastoret, *Legislation des Hebreux* (Paris, 1817); Salvador, *Hist. des Institutiones de Moise* (Paris, 1828); Hullmann, *Staatsverfassung der Israeliten* (Lpz. 1834); Maurice, *Kings and Prophets of the O. T.* (Lond. 1852, Bost. 1858); *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, April, 1851. See MONARCHY.

King is the name of the five canonical works of the followers of Confucius. See the art. CONFUCIUS in vol. ii, p. 470 sq., especially p. 472.

King, Alonzo, a Baptist minister, was born in Wilbraham, Mass., April 1, 1796. His early educational advantages were few; but in 1818 he went to prosecute his studies in the family of the Rev. Leland Howard, then pastor of the Baptist church in Windsor, Vt., where he was converted to Christ. He afterwards entered Waterville College, Maine, and graduated in 1825. He was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in North Yarmouth, Me., in 1826, subsequently of a small church in Northborough, Mass., and finally settled at Westborough, Mass., where he died in 1835. King was a man of great humility, self-consecration, and self-abandonment. His preaching was never bold or startling, but always quiet, tender, persuasive. He had a talent for lyric poetry, and many of his productions are abroad without his name. His style as a writer was pure, with a decided cast of the imaginative or poetic, which was always apparent in his sermons and his printed productions. He compiled the Memoir of the distinguished missionary, Rev. George D. Boardman. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vi, 747. (J. L. S.)

King, Barnabas, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Marlborough, Mass., June 2, 1780. While yet in his 14th year, his great proficiency in study attracted the attention of Dr. Catline, who afterwards bore all the expense of fitting him for Williams College, Mass., which he entered in 1802. In 1804 he graduated, and then for a year taught school and studied theology with Dr. Catline. In 1805 he was licensed by the Berkshire Congregational Association, Mass., and in 1805 was ordained by the Presbytery, and installed as pastor of the Rockaway Church, N. J., where he continued to preach till 1848; his congregation then called a colleague pastor, which relation continued until the death of Dr. King, April 10, 1862. King was a man of admirable character; his consistent piety no one questioned, and his sympathetic heart made him a model pastor. As a preacher, his style was very simple, but scriptural, and usually very earnest. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1863. (J. L. S.)

King, Charles, the noted president of Columbia College, was born in New York, March 16, 1789. In company with his father, Rufus King, he went to England, and, during his residence at the court of St. James as the representative of the American government, young Charles attended Harrow School, and later went to Paris to further prepare himself for admission to college. He, however, afterwards abandoned this intention and entered the mercantile profession. In 1823 he became co-editor of the *New York American*. In 1849 he was chosen president of Columbia College. He died at Frascati, near Rome, in Italy, Sept. 27, 1867. A list of his works, which are not of special interest to theological students, is given by Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s. v.; *New American Cyclopædia*, 1867, p. 425.

King, Edward, a noteworthy English antiquary and lawyer, was born in 1735 in Norfolk, and was a graduate of Cambridge University. He was elected F.R.S. in 1767 and F.S.A. in 1770. He died in 1807. King wrote a number of works connected with theology, politics, political economy, and antiquities. We have room here only to note his *Morsels of Criticisms, tending to Illustrate some few Passages in Holy Scripture upon philosophical Principles and an enlarged View of Things* (Lond. 1788, 4to, and since). The contents of this work are: On the word "Heaven" in the Lord's Prayer; Septuagint Translation of Genesis; John the Baptist being Elias; Future coming of Christ; Day of Judgment; Series of Events in Revelation; Daniel's Prophecy; Deaths of Ananias and Sapphira; Dissertations on Light; The Heavens; Stars; Fluid of Heat; Miracles; Jacob and Esau; Soul, Body, Spirit, etc. King's learning was profound and extensive, but he was so inclined to the speculative and hypothetical that he perpetually fell into difficulty by advancing statements which he was unqualified to establish. The want of discrimination between theory and fact, supposition and reality, together with the tenacity with which he clung to his premature conclusions when assailed, proved quite detrimental. In a work of his treating on the signs of the times, he was very desirous of tracing the history of the French Revolution to the records of sacred antiquity; he also ventured to assert the genuineness of the second book of Esdras in the Apocrypha. He was replied to by Gough and bishop Horsley. See Chalmers's *Biog. Dict.* vol. xix (Lond. 1815); Watkins's *Biog. Dict.* (Lond. 1820); Blake's *Biog. Dict.* (3d edit. Phila. 1840); Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and American Authors*, ii, s. v.

King, Henry, D.D., bishop of Chichester, and eldest son of John King (q. v.), was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, in Jan. 1591. He studied at Westminster School, from whence he was elected to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1608. Having entered the Church, he became chaplain to king James I, archdeacon of Colchester, residentiary of St. Paul's, and canon of Christ Church; dean of Rochester in 1638, and finally bishop of Chichester in 1641. Although he was generally considered a Puritan, and his nomination had been a measure to conciliate that party, he remained a faithful adherent of the king during the civil war, and at the Restoration was reinstalled in his bishopric. He died Oct. 1, 1669. He was considered a very successful preacher and a learned divine. His principal works are, *An Exposition*

upon the Lord's Prayer (London, 1634, 4to):—*A Sermon of Deliverance*, Psa. xci, 3 (Lond. 1626, 4to):—*Two Sermons upon the Act Sunday*, July 10, 1625 (Oxford, 1625, 4to):—*The Psalms of David turned into Metre* (1621, 12mo; new edition, with biographical notice, notes, etc., by Dr. John Hannah, 1843, 12mo); etc. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Ellis, *Specimens*, vol. iii; Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 739; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s. v. (J. N. P.)

King, James S., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Albany, N. Y., Aug. 20, 1832. He graduated from the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., and studied theology in the Princeton Seminary. He was licensed by the New York Presbytery, and in 1858 ordained and installed pastor of the Rockland Lake Church, New York, where he was quite successful and greatly beloved by his people. Failing health, however, compelled him to withdraw from the active duties of the pastorate. During the period of his necessitated rest he did some effective work. He died at Woodlawn, near Sing Sing, New York, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. King was an estimable minister, of good talents, and thoroughly consecrated to his work. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 126; Appleton, *Annual Cyclopædia*, 1865, p. 468.

King, John (1), D.D., bishop of London, an English theologian and a descendant of Robert King, first bishop of Oxford, was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, about 1559. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford. Having entered the Church, he became successively chaplain to queen Elizabeth, archdeacon of Nottingham in 1590, D.D. in 1601, dean of Christ Church in 1605, and, finally, bishop of London in 1611. He died in 1621. James I called him the *king* of preachers. He wrote *Lectures upon Jonas, delivered at Yorke*, 1594 (Lond. 1611, 4to), and some *Sermons*. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i; Dodd, *Church History*, vol. i; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 739; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*.

King, John (2), D.D., an English theologian, was born in Cornwall in 1652. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge, and became succesively rector of Chelsea and (in 1731) prebendary of the Cathedral of York. He died May 30, 1732. King wrote *Animadversions* (2d ed. 1702, 4to):—*The Case of John Atherton, Bishop of Waterford* (1716, 8vo); and a number of *Sermons*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 742.

King, John (3), a Methodist minister, of whose early history nothing is definitely known, was one of the first lay evangelists who founded Methodism in this country. He came from London to America in the latter part of 1769, and his enthusiastic sympathy with the pioneer Methodists led him to throw himself immediately into their ranks. The Church hesitated when he presented himself for license, but, persistent in his determination to preach, he made an appointment "in the Potter's Field," where he proclaimed his first message over the graves of the poor, and began a career of eminent usefulness. Afterwards he was licensed, and stationed in Wilmington, Del. Thence he went into Maryland, and was the first to introduce Methodism to the people of Baltimore. In this latter place he preached from tables in the public streets, and suffered much opposition from frequent mobs. King was afterwards received into the regular itinerancy. He was a member of the first Conference of 1773, and was appointed to New Jersey. He soon after entered Virginia; still later he was again in New Jersey. He located during the Revolution, but in 1801 reappeared in the itinerant ranks in Virginia, and finally located in 1803. King was a pious, zealous, and useful man. He died at an advanced age, in the vicinity of Raleigh, N. C. He was probably the only survivor, at the time of his decease, of all the preachers of ante-revolutionary date.—Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, i, 87. (J. L. S.)

King, John Glen, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., a distinguished English theologian and antiquarian, was born in Norfolk about 1731. He studied at Caius College, Cambridge, entered the Church, and in 1764 was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Petersburg. He afterwards became successively rector of Wormley, Hertfordshire (in 1783), and minister of the chapel in Broad Court, Drury Lane, London (in 1786). He died Nov. 3, 1787. King wrote *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, containing an Account of its Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline* (Lond. 1772, 4to):—*A Letter to the Bishop of Durham, containing some Observations on the Climate of Russia*, etc. (Lond. 1778, 4to); etc. See *Gent. Magazine*, lvii and lix; Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary*; Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, ii, 1031.

King, John L., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana Feb. 1, 1835; was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., and studied divinity in Lane Theological Seminary, Ohio; was licensed and ordained at Cincinnati in 1861, and then assumed the pastorate at Williamsport, Indiana; afterwards labored as a missionary among the sailors at Detroit, Michigan, and finally went to Idaho and Colorado Territories. He died near Denver, Nov. 10, 1866. Mr. King was a man of ripe scholarly attainments and fine abilities, earnestly devoted especially to the work of elementary religious teaching.—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867.

King, Peter, lord chancellor of England, was born at Exeter, Devonshire, in 1669; went to Holland, and studied at the university at Leyden, and upon his return to England studied law at Lincoln's Inn, and became member of Parliament in 1699. In 1708 he was appointed recorder of London, and knighted. At the accession of George I he was made lord chief justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and soon after promoted to the peerage as lord King, baron of Ockham. He was made lord chancellor in 1725, but does not seem to have been as successful in that position as was expected. He died in 1733. He was well versed in both ecclesiastical history and the law. His principal works are, *An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church*, etc. [Anon.] (Lond. 1712, 8vo): in this, his first publication, he advocated, with much ability and learning, the right of Protestant dissenters from episcopacy to be comprehended in the scheme of the national establishment. The work excited much attention, and provoked much discussion, especially when the second edition was issued (1713). Prominent among the opponents was the nonjuring Sclater, who wrote an Answer to it. King himself has been said to have afterwards altered his opinion on the subject:—*The History of the Apostles' Creed, with critical Observations on its several Articles* [Anon.] (London, 1702, 8vo)—a work displaying extraordinary learning and judgment, and highly commended by the ablest critics, among others by Mosheim. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxii and lxx; Chalmers, *General Biog. Dictionary*; Lord Campbell, *Lives of Lords Chancellors*; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

King, Richard, an English theologian, was born at Bristol in 1749; studied at the University of Oxford, and became successively rector of Steeple, Morden, and of Worthing. He died in 1810. King wrote *Letters from Abraham Plymley to his Brother Peter on the Catholic Question* (Lond. 1803, 8vo), which created some sensation:—*On the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (1805, 8vo):—*On the Alliance between Church and State* (1807, 8vo). His wife, Frances Elizabeth Bernard, wrote *Female Scripture Biography* (12th edit. London, 1840, 12mo):—*The Benefits of the Christian Temper*; etc. See *Gent. Magazine* (1810); Rose, *New Biographical Dictionary*, s. v.

King, Thomas Starr, a Unitarian minister, was born in New York Dec. 16, 1824. His father, Rev. T. F. King, was a Universalist clergyman of very decided ability, but died in the prime of life, and Thomas, at

the age of twelve years, while fitting to enter Harvard College, found himself the principal support of a large family. He managed, however, successfully to complete his studies, and in September, 1845, preached his first sermon in Woburn, Mass. The next year he was settled over his father's former charge in Charlestown, whence he was called in 1848 to the Hollis Street Unitarian Church, Boston, where he preached with great acceptance and a constantly increasing reputation till 1860, when he accepted the call of the Unitarian Church in San Francisco to become their pastor. He entered upon his new duties with a zeal and energy which won the hearts of the people, and ere long he was as thoroughly identified with California interests as if his whole life had been spent there. His congregation increased in numbers and power with great rapidity; but he was a preacher for the whole city and state, and crowds hung upon his eloquent utterances, and his bold, earnest words. At the outbreak of our late civil war, King, finding California in a hesitating position, flung himself into the breach, and by his eloquence and earnestness saved the state; and when the sanitary commission was organized, he first set in motion, and through the next three years pushed forward, the efforts in behalf of the sick and wounded soldiers. His labors in this cause, added to his pastoral duties, were too severe for his strength, and he died March 4, 1864, after a very brief illness. Mr. King published several discourses and addresses, etc.—Appleton, *New American Cyclopædia*, 1865, p. 468.

King, William, (1), archbishop of Dublin, a learned divine and metaphysician, was born at Antrim, province of Ulster, Ireland, May 1, 1650. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, entered the Church in 1674, and became chaplain to Parker, archbishop of Tuam. The latter being translated to the archbishopric of Dublin in 1679, King became chancellor of St. Patrick and St. Marburgh, Dublin. Ireland was then a prey to violent religious controversies, which served also as a cloak for political dissensions. King wrote several pamphlets against Peter Manby, dean of Londonderry, who had embraced Roman Catholicism. In 1688 he was made dean of St. Patrick. The Revolution breaking out soon after, and James II having taken refuge in Ireland, King was twice sent to the Tower of Dublin as a partisan of the insurgents. He defended his opinions in a work entitled *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government* (3d and best ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo), which gave rise to a controversy between him and Charles Leslie, a partisan of the fallen monarch. In 1691 King was made bishop of Derry, and applied himself with much zeal to the task of bringing back into the Church the dissenters of his diocese. He finally became archbishop of Dublin in 1702, was appointed one of the lords justices of Ireland in 1717, and again in 1721 and 1723, and died at Dublin May 8, 1729. He was through life held in high esteem as a man, as well as in his character of a prelate and writer on theology. His principal work in that line is the *De Origine Mali* (Dublin, 1702, 4to; Lond. 1702, 8vo). "The object of this work is to show how all the several kinds of evil with which the world abounds are consistent with the goodness of God, and may be accounted for without the supposition of an evil principle." It was attacked by Bayle and also by Leibnitz: by the former for the charges of Manichæism made against him, and by the latter because King had taken him to task for his optimism. King, however, during his life made no reply, but he left among his papers notes of answers to their arguments, and these were given to the world after his death by Dr. Edmund Law, bishop of Carlisle, together with a translation of the treatise itself (Camb. 1758, 8vo). In 1709 he published a sermon on *Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge consistent with the Freedom of Man's Will*, preached before the House of Peers. In this work he advanced a doctrine concerning the moral attributes of God as being different from the moral qualities of the same name in man. This valuable and most important work was often reprinted (Exeter, 1815, 8vo; London, 1821, 8vo; and in the *Tracts of Angl. Fathers*, ii, 225). He wrote also *A Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God* (Lond. 1697, sm. 8vo):—*An Admonition to the Dissenters* (London, 1706, sm. 8vo):—*An Account of King James II's Behavior to his Protestant Subjects of Ireland*, etc. (Lond. 1746, 8vo):—*A Vindication of the Rev. Dr. Henry Sacheverell*, etc. [Anon.] (Lond. 1710, 8vo); etc. See *Bibliographia Britannica*; Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*; *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1730; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, vi, 456; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; and especially Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* ii, 1032. (J. N. P.)

King, William, (2), a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born in Tyrone, Ireland. He emigrated to America in 1830, and became pastor of a church at Nelson, Canada West. After laboring there faithfully and earnestly for many years he removed to Carador, C. W., where he died, March 13, 1859.

Kingdom of God or **of Heaven** (*ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* or *τῶν οὐρανῶν*). In the New Testament the phrases "kingdom of God" (Matt. vi, 33; Mark i, 14, 15; Luke iv, 43; vi, 20; John iii, 3, 5), "kingdom of Christ" (Matt. xiii, 41; xx, 21; Rev. i, 9), "kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph. v, 5), "kingdom of David," i. e. as the ancestor and type of the Messiah (Mark xi, 10), "the kingdom" (Matt. viii, 12; xiii, 19; ix, 53), and "kingdom of heaven" (Matt. iii, 2; iv, 17; xiii, 41, 31, 33, 44, 47; 2 Tim. iv, 18), are all synonymous, and signify *the divine spiritual kingdom, the glorious reign of the Messiah*. The idea of this kingdom has its basis in the prophecies of the Old Testament, where the coming of the Messiah and his triumphs are foretold (Psa. ii, 6–12; ci, 1–7; Isa. ii, 1–4; Mic. iv, 1; Isa. xi, 1–10; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; xxxi, 31–34; xxxii, 37–44; xxxiii, 14–18; Ezek. xxxiv, 23–31; xxxvii, 24–28; Dan. ii, 44; vii, 14, 27; ix, 25, 27). In these passages the reign of the Messiah is figuratively described as a golden age, when the true religion, and with it the Jewish theocracy, should be re-established in more than pristine purity, and universal peace and happiness prevail. All this was doubtless to be understood in a spiritual sense; and so the devout Jews of our Saviour's time appear to have understood it, as Zacharias, Simeon, Anna, and Joseph (Luke i, 67–79; ii, 25–30; xxiii, 50–51). But the Jews at large gave to these prophecies a temporal meaning, and expected a Messiah who should come in the clouds of heaven, and, as king of the Jewish nation, restore the ancient religion and worship, reform the corrupt morals of the people, make expiation for their sins, free them from the yoke of foreign dominion, and at length reign over the whole earth in peace and glory (Matt. v, 19; viii, 12; xviii, 1; xx, 21; Luke xvii, 20; xix, 11; Acts i, 6). This Jewish temporal sense appears to have been also held by the apostles before the day of Pentecost.

It has been well observed by Knobel, in his work *On the Prophets*, that "Jesus did not acknowledge himself called upon to fulfil those theocratic announcements which had an earthly political character, in the sense in which they were uttered; for his plan was spiritual and universal, neither including worldly interests, nor contracted within national and political limits. He gave, accordingly, to all such announcements a higher and more general meaning, so as to realize them in accordance with such a scheme. Thus, 1. The prophets had announced that Jehovah would deliver his people from the political calamities into which, through the conquering might of their foes, they had been brought. This Jesus fulfilled, but in a higher sense. He beheld the Jewish and heathen world under the thraldom of error and of sin, in circumstances of moral calamity, and he regarded himself as sent to effect its deliverance. In this sense he announced himself as the Redeemer, who had come to save the world, to destroy the works of the devil, to annihilate the powers of evil, and to bring men from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light.

2. The prophets had predicted that Jehovah would again be united to his restored people, would dwell among them, and no more give up the theocratic relation. This also Jesus fulfilled in a higher sense. He found mankind in a state of estrangement from God, arising from their lying in sin, and he viewed it as his vocation to bring them back to God. He reconciled men to God —gave them access to God—united them to him as his dear children, and made his people one with God as he himself is one. 3. The prophets had declared that Jehovah would make his people, thus redeemed and reunited to him, supremely blessed in the enjoyment of all earthly pleasures. To communicate such blessings in the literal acceptance of the words was no part of the work of Jesus; on the contrary, he often tells his followers that they must lay their account with much suffering. The blessings which he offers are of a spiritual kind, consisting in internal and unending fellowship with God. This is the *life*, the *life eternal*. In the passages where he seems to speak of temporal blessings (e. g. Matt. viii, 11; xix, 27, etc.) he either speaks metaphorically or in reference to the ideas of those whom he addressed, and who were not quite emancipated from carnal hopes. 4. The prophets had predicted, in general, the re-establishment of their people into a mighty state, which should endure upon the earth in imperishable splendor as an outward community. This prospect Jesus realized again in a higher and a spiritual sense by establishing a religious invisible community, internally united by oneness of faith in God and of pure desire, which ever grows and reaches its perfection only in another life. The rise and progress of this man cannot observe, for its existence is in the invisible life of the spirit (Luke xvii, 20), yet the opposition of the wicked is an evidence of its approach (Matt. xii, 28). It has no political designs, for it 'is not of this world;' and there are found in it no such gradations of rank as in earthly political communities (Matt. xx, 25). What is external is not essential to it; its prime element is mind, pious, devoted to God, and pleasing God. Hence the kingdom of Jesus is composed of those who turn to God and his ambassadors, and in faith and life abide true to them. From this it is clear how sometimes this kingdom may be spoken of as present, and sometimes as future. Religious and moral truth works forever, and draws under its influence one after another, until at length it shall reign over all. In designating this community, Jesus made use of terms having a relation to the ancient theocracy; it is the *kingdom of God* or *of heaven*, though, at the same time, it is represented rather as the *family* than as the *state* of God. This appears from many other phrases. The head of the ancient community was called *Lord* and *King;* that of the new is called *Father;* the members of the former were *servants*, i. e. *subjects of Jehovah;* those of the latter are *sons of God;* the feeling of the former towards God is described as the *fear of Jehovah;* that of the latter is *believing confidence* or *love;* the chief duty of the former was *righteousness;* the first duty of the latter is *love*. All these expressions are adapted to the constitution of the sacred community, either as *a divine state* or as a *divine family*. It needs hardly to be mentioned that Jesus extended its fulfilment of these ancient prophecies in this spiritual sense to all men."

Referring to the Old-Testament idea, we may therefore regard the "kingdom of heaven," etc., in the New Testament, as designating, in its Christian sense, the *Christian dispensation*, or the community of those who receive Jesus as the Messiah, and who, united by his Spirit under him as their Head, rejoice in the truth, and live a holy life in love and in communion with him (Matt. iii, 2; iv, 17, 23; ix, 35; x, 7; Mark i, 14, 15; Luke x, 9, 11; xxiii, 51; Acts xxvii, 31). This spiritual kingdom has both an *internal* and *external* form. As internal and spiritual, it already exists and rules in the hearts of all Christians, and is therefore present (Rom. xiv, 17; Matt. vi, 33; Mark x, 15; Luke xvii, 21; xviii, 17; John iii, 3, 5; 1 Cor. iv, 20). It "suffereth violence," implying the eagerness with which the Gospel was received in the agitated state of men's minds (Matt. xi, 12; Luke xvi, 6). As external, it is either embodied in the visible Church of Christ, and in so far is present and progressive (Matt. vi, 10; xii, 28; xiii, 24, 31, 33, 41, 47; xvi, 19, 28; Mark iv, 30; xi, 10; Luke xiii, 18, 20; Acts xix, 8; Heb. xii, 28), or it is to be perfected in the coming of the Messiah to judgment and his subsequent spiritual reign in bliss and glory, in which view it is future (Matt. xiii, 43; xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 29, 30; 2 Pet. i, 11; Rev. xii, 10). In this latter view it denotes especially *the bliss of heaven, eternal life*, which is to be enjoyed in the Redeemer's kingdom (Matt. viii, 11; xxv, 34; Mark ix, 47; Luke xiii, 18, 29; Acts xiv, 22; 1 Cor. vi, 9, 20; xv, 50; Gal. v, 21; Eph. v, 5; 2 Thess. i, 5; 2 Tim. iv, 18; James ii, 5). But these different aspects are not always distinguished, the expression often embracing both the internal and external sense, and referring both to its commencement in this world and its completion in the world to come (Matt. v, 3, 10, 20; vii, 21; xi, 11; xiii, 11, 52; xviii, 3, 4; Col. i, 13; 1 Thess. ii, 12). In Luke i, 33, it is said of the kingdom of Christ "there shall be no end;" whereas in 1 Cor. xv, 24–26, it is said "he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father." The contradiction is only in appearance. The latter passage refers to the *mediatorial* dominion of Christ; and when the mediatorial work of the Saviour is accomplished, then, at the final judgment, he will resign forever his mediatorial office, while the reign of Christ as God supreme will never cease. "His throne," in the empire of the universe, "is forever and ever" (Heb. i, 8).

"There is reason to believe not only that the expression *kingdom of heaven*, as used in the New Test., was employed as synonymous with *kingdom of God*, as referred to in the Old Test., but that the former expression had become common among the Jews of our Lord's time for denoting the state of things expected to be brought in by the Messiah. The mere use of the expression as it first occurs in Matthew, uttered apparently by John Baptist, and our Lord himself, without a note of explanation, as if all perfectly understood what was meant by it, seems alone conclusive evidence of this. The Old-Testament constitution, and the writings belonging to it, had familiarized the Jews with the application of the terms *king* and *kingdom* to God, not merely with reference to his universal sovereignty, but also to his special connection with the people he had chosen for himself (1 Sam. xii, 12; Psa. ii, 6; v, 2; xx, 9; 1 Chron. xxix, 11; 2 Chron. xiii, 8, etc.). In Daniel, however, where pointed expression required to be given to the difference in this respect between what is of earth and what is of heaven, we find matters ordered on a certain occasion with a view to bring out the specific lesson that 'the heavens do rule' (iv, 26); and in the interpretation given to the vision, which had been granted to Nebuchadnezzar, it was said, with more special reference to New-Testament times, that 'in the days of those (earthly) kings the God of heaven (lit. of the heavens) should set up a kingdom that should never be destroyed' (ii, 44). In still another vision granted to Daniel himself, this divine kingdom was represented under the image of 'one like a Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him' (vii, 13, 14). It appears to have been in consequence of the phraseology thus introduced and sanctioned by Daniel that the expression 'kingdom of heaven' (מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם, *malkuth hashamâyim*) passed into common usage among the Jews, and was but another name with them for a state of fellowship with God and devotedness to his service. Many examples of this are given by Wetstein on Matt. iii, 2 from Jewish writings: thus, 'He who confesses God to be one, and repeats Deut. vi, 4, takes up the kingdom of heaven;' 'Jacob called his sons and commanded them

concerning the ways of God, and they took upon them the kingdom of heaven;' 'The sons of Achasius did not take upon them the yoke of the kingdom of heaven; they did not acknowledge the Lord, for they said, There is not a kingdom in heaven,' etc. The expression, indeed, does not seem to have been used specifically with reference to the Messiah's coming, or the state to be introduced by him (for the examples produced by Schöttgen [*De Messia*, ch. ii] are scarcely in point); but when the Lord himself was declared to be at hand to remodel everything, and visibly take the government, as it were, on his shoulder, it would be understood of itself that here the kingdom of heaven should be found concentrating itself, and that to join one's self to Messiah would be in the truest sense to take up the yoke of that kingdom. See KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST.

The scriptural and popular usages of the term "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," etc., serve as a clew to the otherwise rather abrupt proclamation of the Baptist and Jesus at the very beginning of their public ministrations. It is true that in the Old Testament the kingdom or reign of God usually signifies his infinite power, or, more properly, his sovereign authority over all creatures, kingdoms, and hearts. See KING. Thus Wisdom says (x, 10), God showed his kingdom to Jacob, i. e. he opened the kingdom of heaven to him in showing him the mysterious ladder by which the angels ascended and descended; and Ecclesiasticus (xlvii, 13) says, God gave to David the covenant assurance, or promise of the kingdom, for himself and his successors. Still the transition from this to the moral and religious sphere was so natural that it was silently and continually made, especially as Jehovah was perpetually represented as the supreme and sole legitimate sovereign of his people. Indeed, the theocracy was the central idea of the Jewish state [see JUDGE], and hence the first announcements of the Gospel sounded with thrilling effect upon the ears of the people, proverbially impatient of foreign rule, and yet, at the time, apparently bound in a hopeless vassalage to Rome. It was to the populace like a trumpet-call to a war for independence, or rather like one of the old pæans of deliverance sung by Miriam and Deborah. See THEOCRACY.

Copious lists of monographs on this subject may be seen in Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Himmel-Reich, Messias-Reich; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 37; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 72, 77. See MESSIAH.

Kingdom of Israel. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Kingdom of Judah. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Kingly Office OF CHRIST, one of the three great relations which Jesus sustains to his people, namely, as prophet, priest, and king, and to which he was solemnly inaugurated at his baptism by John. See ANOINTING. It is by virtue of this that he became head of the Church, which is the sphere of his realm. See KINGDOM OF GOD. This is that spiritual, evangelical, and eternal empire to which he himself referred when interrogated before Pontius Pilate, and in reference to which he said, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John xviii, 36, 37). His empire, indeed, extends to every creature, for "all authority is committed into his hands, both in heaven and on earth," and he is "head over all things to the Church;" but his kingdom primarily imports the Gospel Church, which is the subject of his laws, the seat of his government, and the object of his care, and, being surrounded with powerful opposers, he is represented as ruling in the midst of his enemies. This kingdom is not of a worldly origin or nature, nor has it this world for its end or object (Rom. xiv, 17; 1 Cor. iv, 20). It can neither be promoted nor defended by worldly power, influence, or carnal weapons, but by bearing witness unto the truth, or by the preaching of the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven (2 Cor. x, 4, 5). Its establishment among men is progressive, but it is destined at last to fill the whole earth (Dan. ii; Rev. xi, 15). Its real subjects are only those who are of the truth, and hear Christ's voice; for none can enter it but such as are born from above (John iii, 3–5; Matt. xviii, 3; xix, 14; Mark x, 15), nor can any be visible subjects of it but such as appear to be regenerated by a credible profession of faith and obedience (Luke xvi, 16; Matt. xx, 28–44). Its privileges and immunities are not of this world, but such as are spiritual and heavenly; they are all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ Jesus (Eph. i, 3). Over this glorious kingdom death has no power; it extends as well to the future as the present world; and though entered here by renewing grace (Col. i, 13), it is inherited in its perfection in the world of glory (Matt. xxv, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 50; 2 Pet. i, 11). Hypocrites and false brethren may indeed insinuate themselves into it here, but they will have no possible place in it hereafter (Matt. xiii, 41, 47–50; xxii, 11–14; Luke xiii, 28, 29; 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Rev. xxi, 27). Its rule is one of love (Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*, i, 103). See CHRIST, OFFICE OF.

Kings, FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF, the second of the series of Hebrew royal annals, the books of Samuel forming the introductory series, and the books of Chronicles being a parallel series. In the Hebrew Bible the first two series alone form part of "the Former Prophets," like Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. See BIBLE. In the Authorized English Version it is added to their titles: "commonly called the Third [and the Fourth] Book of the Kings." See SAMUEL, BOOKS OF.

I. *Number and Title.*—The two books of Kings formed anciently but one book in the Jewish Scriptures, as is affirmed by Origen (apud Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* vi, 25, Βασιλείων τρίτη, τετάρτη, ἐν ἑνὶ Ὀυαμμέλεχ Δαβίδ), Jerome (*Prolog. Gal.*), Josephus (*Cont. Apion.* i, 8), and others. The present division, following the Septuagint and Latin versions, has been common in the Hebrew Bibles since the Venetian editions of Bomberg.

The old Jewish name was borrowed, as usual, from the commencing words of the book (וַיַּחֲלֹק דָּוִד), Græcized as in the above quotation from Eusebius. The Septuagint and Vulgate now number them as the third and fourth books of Kings, reckoning the two books of Samuel the first and second. Their present title, מְלָכִים, Βασιλέων, *Regum*, in the opinion of Hävernick, has respect more to the formal than essential character of the composition (*Einleitung*, § 168); yet under such forms of government as those of Judah and Israel the royal person and name are intimately associated with all national acts and movements, legal decisions, warlike preparations, domestic legislation, and foreign policy. The reign of an Oriental prince is identified with the history of his nation during the period of his sovereignty. More especially in the theocratic constitution of the Jewish realm the character of the monarch was an important element of national history, and, of necessity, it had considerable influence on the fate and fortunes of the people.

II. *Independent Form.*—The question has been raised and minutely discussed whether the books of Kings (1 and 2) constitute an entire work of themselves, or whether they originally formed part of a larger historical work embracing the principal parts of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, out of which these several books, as we now have them, have been formed. Ewald regards the books of Judges (with Ruth), 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, as forming parts of one whole work, which he calls "The great book of the Kings." The grounds on which this supposition has been built are partly the following:

(1.) These books together contain one unbroken narrative, both in form and matter, each portion being connected with the preceding by the conjunctive ו, or the continuative (וַיְהִי). The book of Judges shows itself to be a separate work from Joshua by opening with a narration of events with which that book closes; the work then proceeds through the times of the Judges, and goes on to give, in Ruth, the family history and genealogy

of David, and in Samuel and Kings the events which transpired down to the captivity.

(2.) The recurrence in Judges of the phrases, "And in those days there was no king in Israel" (xvii, 6; xviii, 1; xxi, 25); "It came to pass in those days when there was no king" (xix, 1); and in Ruth (i, 1), "Now it came to pass in the days when the judges ruled," shows that this portion of the work was written in the times when there *were* kings in Israel. The writer therefore was in a position to pass under review the whole period of the times of the judges, and we find that he estimates the conduct of the people according to the degree of their conformity to the law of the Lord, after the manner of the writer of Kings (Judg. ii, 11–19; 2 Kings xvii, 7–23).

Again, in Judg. i, 21, it is said that the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem *unto this day;* and in 2 Sam. xxiv, 16, mention is made of Araunah the *Jebusite* as an inhabitant of Jerusalem, from which it is inferred that the writer intended these facts to explain each other. (But see Josh. xv, 63.) So there is a reference in Judg. xx, 27 to the removal of the ark of the covenant from Shiloh to Jerusalem; and the expression "in those days" points, as in xvii, 6, etc., to remote times. There is thought to be a reference in Judg. xviii, 30 to the captivity of Israel in the days of Hoshea, in which case that book must have been written subsequently to that time, as well as the books of Kings.

(3.) The books of Kings take up the narrative where 2 Samuel breaks off, and proceed in the same spirit and manner to continue the history, with the earlier parts of which the writer gives proof of being well acquainted (comp. 1 Kings ii, 11 with 2 Sam. v, 4, 5; so also 2 Kings xvii, 41 with Judg. ii, 11–19, etc.; 1 Sam. ii, 27 with Judg. xiii, 6; 2 Sam. xiv, 17–20, xix, 27, with Judg. xiii, 6; 1 Sam. ix, 21 with Judg. vi, 15, and xx; 1 Kings viii, 1 with 2 Sam. vi, 17, and v, 7, 9; 1 Sam. xvii, 12 with Ruth iv, 17; Ruth i, 1 with Judg. xvii, 7, 8, 9; xix, 1, 2 [Bethlehem-Judah]). Other links connecting the books of Kings with the preceding may be found in the comparison, suggested by De Wette, of 1 Kings ii, 26 with 1 Sam. ii, 35; 1 Kings ii, 3, 4; v, 17, 18; viii, 18, 19, 25, with 2 Sam. vii, 12–16; and 1 Kings iv, 1–6 with 2 Sam. viii, 15–18.

(4.) Similarity of diction has been observed throughout, indicating identity of authorship. The phrase "Spirit of Jehovah" occurs first in Judges, and frequently afterwards in Samuel and Kings (Judg. iii, 10; vi, 34, etc.; 1 Sam. x, 6, etc.; 1 Kings xxii, 24; 2 Kings ii, 16, etc.). So "Man of God," to designate a prophet, and "God do so to me and more also," are common to them; and "till they were ashamed" to Judges and Kings (Judg. iii, 25; 2 Kings ii, 17; viii, 11).

(5.) Generally the style of the narrative, ordinarily quiet and simple, but rising to great vigor and spirit when stirring deeds are described (as in Judg. iv, vii, xi, etc.; 1 Sam. iv, xvii, xxxi, etc.; 1 Kings viii, xviii, xix, etc.), and the introduction of poetry or poetic style in the midst of the narrative (as in Judg. v, 1 Sam. ii, 2 Sam. i, 17, etc., 1 Kings xxii, 17, etc.), constitute such strong features of resemblance as lead to the conclusion that these several books form but one work.

But these reasons are not conclusive. Many of the resemblances may be accounted for in other ways, while there are important and wide differences.

(1.) If the arguments were sufficient to join Judges, Samuel, and Kings together in one work, for the same reasons Joshua must be added (Josh. i, 1; xv, 63; xxiii and xxiv; Judg. i, 1).

(2.) The writer of Kings might be well acquainted with the previous history of his people, and even with the contents of Judges and Samuel, without being himself the author of those books.

(3.) Such similarity of diction as exists may be ascribed to the use by the writer of Kings of earlier documents, to which also the writer of Samuel had access.

(4.) There are good reasons for regarding the Kings as together forming an entire and independent work, such as the similarity of style and language, both vocabulary and grammar, which pervades the two books, but distinguishes them from others—the uniform system of quotation observed in them, but not in the books which precede them — the same careful attention to chronology—the recurrence of certain phrases and forms of speech peculiar to them. A great number of words occur in Kings, which are found in them only; such are chiefly names of materials and utensils, and architectural terms. Words, and unusual forms of words, occur, which are only found here and in writers of the same period, as Isaiah and Jeremiah, but not in Samuel or Judges. See § v, below.

III. *Contents, Character, and Design.*— The books of Kings contain the brief annals of a long period, from the accession of Solomon till the dissolution of the commonwealth. The first chapters describe the reign of Solomon over the united kingdom, and the revolt under Rehoboam. The history of the rival states is next narrated in parallel sections till the period of Israel's downfall on the invasion of Shalmanezer. Then the remaining years of the principality of Judah are recorded till the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar and the commencement of the Babylonian captivity. See Israel; Judah. For an adjustment of the years of the respective reigns in each line, see Chronology.

There are some peculiarities in this succinct history worthy of attention. It is summary, but very suggestive. It is not a biography of the sovereigns, nor a mere record of political occurrences, nor yet an ecclesiastical register. King, Church, and State are all comprised in their sacred relations. It is a theocratic history, a retrospective survey of the kingdom as existing under a theocratic government. The character of the sovereign is tested by his fidelity to the religious obligations of his office, and this decision in reference to his conduct is generally added to the notice of his accession. The new king's religious character is generally portrayed by its similarity or opposition to the way of David, of his father, or of Jeroboam, son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin." Ecclesiastical affairs are noticed with a similar purpose, and in contrast with past or prevalent apostasy, especially as manifested in the popular superstitions, whose shrines were on the "high places." Political or national incidents are introduced in general for the sake of illustrating the influence of religion on civic prosperity; of showing how the theocracy maintained a vigilant and vengeful guardianship over its rights and privileges—adherence to its principles securing peace and plenty, disobedience to them bringing along with it sudden and severe retribution. The books of Kings are a verification of the Mosaic warnings, and the author of them has kept this steadily in view. He has given a brief history of his people, arranged under the various political chiefs in such a manner as to show that the government was essentially theocratic; that its spirit, as developed in the Mosaic writings, was never extinct, however modified or inactive it might sometimes appear. Thus the books of Kings appear in a religious costume, quite different from the form they would have assumed either as a political or ecclesiastical narrative. In the one case legislative enactments, royal edicts, popular movements, would have occupied a prominent place; in the other, sacerdotal arrangements, Levitical service, music, and pageantry, would have filled the leading sections of the treatise. In either view the points adduced would have had a restricted reference to the palace or the temple, the sovereign or the pontiff, the court or the priesthood, the throne or the altar, the tribute or tithes, the nation on its farms, or the tribes in the courts of the sacred edifice. But the theocracy conjoined both the political and religious elements, and the inspired annalist unites them as essential to his design. The agency of divinity is constantly recognised, the hand of Jehovah is continually acknowledged. The chief organ of theocratic influence enjoys peculiar prominence. We

refer to the incessant agency of the prophets, their great power and peculiar modes of action as detailed by the composer of the books of Kings. They interfered with the succession, and their instrumentality was apparent in the schism. They roused the people, and they braved the sovereign. The balance of power was in their hands; the regal dignity seemed to be sometimes at their disposal. In times of emergency they dispensed with usual modes of procedure, and assumed an authority with which no subject in an ordinary state can safely be intrusted, executing the law with a summary promptness which rendered opposition impossible, or at least unavailing. They felt their divine commission, and that they were the custodians of the rights of Jehovah. At the same time they protected the interests of the nation, and, could we divest the term of its association with unprincipled turbulence and sedition, we would, like Winer (*Realwörterb.* s. v. Prophet), style them the demagogues of Israel. The divine prerogative was to them a vested right, guarded with a sacred jealousy from royal usurpation or popular invasion; and the interests of the people were as religiously protected against encroachments, too easily made under a form of government which had not the safeguard of popular representation or aristocratic privilege. The priesthood were in many instances, though there are some illustrious exceptions, merely the creatures of the crown, and therefore it became the prophetical office to assert its dignity and stand forth in the majestic insignia of an embassy from heaven. The truth of these sentiments, as to the method, design, and composition of the books of Kings, is confirmed by ample evidence.

(1.) Large space is occupied with the building of the Temple—the palace of the divine Protector—his throne in it being above the mercy-seat and between the cherubim (ch. v–viii). Care is taken to record the miraculous phenomenon of the descent of the Shekinah (viii, 10). The prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the house is full of theocratic views and aspirations.

(2.) Reference is often made to the Mosaic law, with its provisions, and allusions to the earlier history of the people frequently occur (1 Kings ii, 3; iii, 14; vi, 11, 12; viii, 58, etc.; 2 Kings x, 31; xiv, 6; xvii, 13, 15, 37; xviii, 4–6; xxi, 1–8). Allusions to the Mosaic code are found more frequently towards the end of the second book, when the kingdom was drawing near its termination, as if to account for its decay and approaching fate.

(3.) Phrases expressive of divine interference are frequently introduced (1 Kings xi, 31; xii, 15; xiii, 1, 2, 9; and xx, 13, etc.).

(4.) Prophetic interposition is a very prominent theme of record. It fills the vivid foreground of the historical picture. Nathan was occupied in the succession of Solomon (1 Kings i, 45); Ahijah was concerned in the revolt (xi, 29–40). Shemaiah disbanded the troops which Rehoboam had mustered (xii, 21). Ahijah predicted the ruin of Jeroboam, whose elevation he had promoted (xiv, 7). Jehu, the prophet, doomed the house of Baasha (xvi, 1). The reigns of Ahab and Ahaziah are marked by the bold, rapid, mysterious movements of Elijah. Under Ahab occurs the prediction of Micaiah (xxii, 8). The actions and oracles of Elisha form the marvellous topics of narration under several reigns. The agency of Isaiah is also recognised (2 Kings xix, 20; xx, 16). Besides, 1 Kings xiii presents another instance of prophetic operation; and in xx, 35, the oracle of an unknown prophet is also rehearsed. Huldah the prophetess was an important personage under the government of Josiah (2 Kings xxii, 14). Care is also taken to report the fulfilment of striking prophecies, in the usual phrase, "according to the word of the Lord" (1 Kings xii, 15; xv, 29; xvi, 12; 2 Kings xxiii, 15–18; ix, 36; xxiv, 2). So, too, the old Syriac version prefixes, "Here follows the book of the kings who flourished among the ancient people; and in this is also exhibited the history of the prophets who flourished during their times."

(5.) Theocratic influence is recognised both in the deposition and succession of kings (1 Kings xiii, 33; xv, 4, 5, 29, 30; 2 Kings xi, 17, etc.). Compare, on the whole of this view, Hävernick, *Einleit.* § 168; Jahn, *Introduct.* § 46; Gesenius, *Ueber Jes.* i, 934. It is thus apparent that the object of the author of the Books of Kings was to describe the history of the kingdoms, especially in connection with the theocratic element. This design accounts for what De Wette (*Einleit.* § 185) terms the mythical character of these books.

As to what has been termed the anti-Israelitish spirit of the work (Bertholdt, *Einleit.* p. 949), we do not perceive it. Truth required that the kingdom of Israel should be described in its real character. Idol-worship was connected with its foundation; moscholatry was a state provision; fidelity obliged the annalist to state that all its kings patronized the institutions of Bethel and Dan, while eight, at least, of the Jewish sovereigns adhered to the true religion, and that the majority of its kings perished in insurrection, while those of Judah in general were exempted from seditious tumults and assassination.

IV. *Relation of Kings to Chronicles.*—The more obvious differences between the books of Kings and of Chronicles are,

(1.) In respect of language, by which the former are shown to be of earlier date than the latter.

(2.) Of periods embraced in each work. The Chronicles are much more comprehensive than Kings, containing genealogical lists from Adam downwards, and a full account of the reign of David. The portions of the Chronicles synchronistic with Kings are 1 Chron. xxviii–2 Chron. xxxvi, 22.

(3.) In the Kings greater prominence is given to the prophetical office; in Chronicles, to the priestly or Levitical. In the books of the Kings we have the active influence of Nathan in regard to the succession to the throne; and the remarkable lives of Elijah and Elisha, of whom numerous and extraordinary miracles are related, of which scarcely the slightest mention is made in Chronicles, although in Kings about fourteen chapters are taken up with them. Besides these, other prophets are mentioned, and their acts and sayings are recorded; as, 1 Kings xiii, the prophet who came to Bethel from Judah in the reign of Jeroboam, and his predictions; and in 2 Kings xxiii, the fulfilment of them in the days of Josiah; 1 Kings xiii, the old prophet who lived at Bethel with his sons. Ahijah the prophet, also, in the days of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv; Jehu, the son of Hanani, 1 Kings xvi; Jonah, in the time of Jeroboam, 2 Kings xiv, 25; and Isaiah in relation to the sickness of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. Of these there is either no mention, or much slighter in Chronicles, where the priestly or Levitical element is more observable; as, for example, the full account, in 2 Chron. xxix–xxxi, of the purification of the Temple by Hezekiah; of the services and sacrifices then made, and of the names of the Levites who took part in it, and the restoration of the courses and orders of the priesthood, and the supplies for the daily, weekly, and yearly sacrifices; also, the circumstantial account of the Passover observed by command of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv, 1–19. In this way we may account not only for the omission of much that relates to the prophets, but also for the less remarkable prominence given to the history of Israel, and the greater to Judah and Jerusalem; and for the frequent omission of details respecting the idolatrous practices of some of the kings, as of Solomon, Rehoboam, and Ahaz; and the destruction of idolatry by Josiah, showing that the books of Chronicles were written in times in which the people less needed to be warned against idolatry; to which, after the captivity, they had ceased to be so prone as before.

For further information on the relation between Kings and Chronicles, see CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF.

V. *Peculiarities of Diction.*—1. The words noticed by De Wette (*Einl.* § 185) as indicating their modern date are the following: אַתִּי for אֵתָּ, 1 Kings xiv, 2. (But

this form is also found in Judg. xvii, 2; Jer. iv, 30; Ezek. xxxvi, 13, and not once in the later books.) אוֹתוֹ for אֹתוֹ, 2 Kings i, 15. (But this form of אֵת is found in Lev. xv, 18, 24; Josh. xiv, 12; 2 Sam. xxiv, 24; Isa. lix, 21; Jer. x, 5; xii, 1; xix, 10; xx, 11; xxiii, 9; xxxv, 2; Ezek. xiv, 4; xxvii, 26.) יְשֹׁם for יָשֹׂם, 1 Kings ix, 8. (But Jer. xix, 8; xlix, 17, are identical in phrase and orthography.) רָצִין for רְצִין, 2 Kings xi, 13. (But everywhere else in Kings, e. g. 2 Kings xi, 6, etc., רְצִין, which is also universal in Chronicles, an avowedly later book; and here, as in צְדָנִין, 1 Kings xi, 33, there is every appearance of the ן being a clerical error for the copulative וְ; see Thenius, *l. c.*) מְדִינוֹת, 1 Kings xx, 14. (But this word occurs in Lam. i, 1, and there is every appearance of its being a technical word in 1 Kings xx, 14, and therefore as old as the reign of Ahab.) כֹּר for חֹמֶר, 1 Kings iv, 22. (But כֹּר is used by Ezek. xlv, 14, and *homer* seems to have been then already obsolete.) חֹרִים, 1 Kings xxi, 8, 11. (Occurs in Isaiah and Jeremiah.) רַב, 2 Kings xxv, 8. (But as the term evidently came in with the Chaldees, as seen in Rab-shakeh, Rab-saris, Rab-mag, its application to the Chaldee general is no evidence of a time later than the person to whom the title is given.) שָׁלֵם, 1 Kings viii, 61, etc. (But there is not a particle of evidence that this expression belongs to late Hebrew. It is found, among other places, in Isa. xxxviii, 3, a passage against the authenticity of which there is also not a shadow of proof, except upon the presumption that prophetic intimations and supernatural interventions on the part of God are impossible.) חִשְׁכִּיל, 2 Kings xviii, 7. (On what grounds this word is adduced it is impossible to guess, since it occurs in this sense in Joshua, Isaiah, Samuel, and Jeremiah: see Gesenius.) בִּטָּחוֹן, 2 Kings xviii, 19. (Isa. xxxvi, 4; Eccles. ix, 4.) יְהוּדִית, 2 Kings xviii, 26. (But why should not a *Jew*, in Hezekiah's reign as well as in the time of Nehemiah, have called his mother-tongue "the *Jews'* language," in opposition to the *Aramæan?* There was nothing in the Babylonian captivity to give it the name if it had it not before, nor is there a single earlier instance—Isa. xix, 18 might have furnished one—of *any* name given to the language spoken by all the Israelites, and which, in later times, was called Hebrew: Ἑβραϊστί, Prolog. Ecclus.; Luke xxiii, 38; John v, 2, etc.) הִבֵּר אֶת מִשְׁפָּט, 2 Kings xxv, 6. (Frequent in Jer. iv, 12; xxxix, 5, etc.) Theod. Parker adds פֶּחָה (see, too, Thenius, *Einl.* § 6), 1 Kings x, 15; xx, 24; 2 Kings xviii, 24, on the presumption, probably, of its being of Persian derivation; but the etymology and origin of the word are quite uncertain, and it is repeatedly used in Jer. li, as well as Isa. xxxvi, 9. With better reason might בָּדָא have been adduced, 1 Kings xii, 33. The expression עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר, in 1 Kings iv, 24, is also a difficult one to form an impartial opinion about. It is doubtful, as De Wette admits, whether the phrase necessarily implies its being used by one to the east of the Euphrates, because the use varies in Numb. xxxii, 19; xxxv, 14; Josh. i, 14 sq.; v, 1; xii, 1, 7; xxii, 7; 1 Chron. xxvi, 30; Deut. i, 1, 5, etc. It is also conceivable that the phrase might be used as a mere geographical designation by those who belonged to one of "the provinces beyond the river" subject to Babylon; and, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Judæa had been such a province for at least 23 years, and probably longer. We may safely affirm, therefore, that, on the whole, the peculiarities of diction in these books do not indicate a time after the captivity, or towards the close of it, but, on the contrary, point pretty distinctly to the age of Jeremiah. It may be added that the marked and systematic differences between the language of Chronicles and that of Kings, taken with the fact that all attempts to prove the Chronicles, in the main, later than Ezra, have utterly failed, lead to the same conclusion. (See many examples in Movers, p. 200 sq.)

2. Other peculiar or rare expressions in these books are the proverbial ones: מַשְׁתִּין בְּקִיר, found only in them and in 1 Sam. xxv, 22, 34; "slept with his fathers," "him that dieth in the city the dogs shall eat," etc.; כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה אֱל, 1 Kings ii, 23, etc.; also קְרֵבָה, 1 Kings i, 41, 45; elsewhere only in poetry and in the composition of proper names, except Deut. ii, 36; זוּלַת, i, 9. Also the following isolated terms: בַּרְבָּרִים, "fowl," iv, 23; חֲצֵלַת מַס, "stalls," v, 6; 2 Chron. ix, 25; אֲרֻוֹת, v, 13; ix, 15, 21; מַסָּע, "a stone-quarry" (Gesenius), vi, 7; לְפָנַי, vi, 17; לְחֻתֵּן, 19; פְּקָעִים and פַּקֻּעוֹת, "wild cucumbers," vi, 18; vii, 24; 2 Kings iv, 39; מִקְוֶה, x, 28; the names of the months, אֲתָנִים, viii, 2; זִו, בּוּל, vi, 37, 38; בָּדָא, "to invent," xii, 33; Neh. vi, 8, in both cases joined with מֵעַב; מִפְלֶצֶת, "an idol," xv, 13; בְּצַר and חִבְּצִיר, followed by אַחֲרֵי, "to destroy," xiv, 10; xvi, 3; xxi, 21; דְּבָקִים, "*joints* of the armor," xxii, 34; שֵׁרֶג, "a pursuit," xviii, 27; גָּהַר, "to bend one's self," xviii, 42; 2 Kings iv, 34, 35; שָׁנַס, "to gird up," xviii, 46; אֲפֵר, "a head-band," xx, 38, 42; שָׁפַק, "to suffice," xx, 10; חָלַט, uncert. signif., xx, 33; עָשָׂה מְלוּכָה, "to reign," xxi, 7; צַלְחַת, "a dish," 2 Kings ii, 20; גָּלַם, "to fold up," ib. 8; נֹקֵד, "a herdsman," iii, 4; Amos i, 1; אֲסוּךְ, "an oil-cup," iv, 2; חָרַד אֶל, "to have a care for," 13; זָרַר, "to sneeze," 35; צְקָלוֹן, "a bag," 42; חֲרִיט, "a money-bag," v, 23; מַחֲנוֹת, "a camp" (?), vi, 8; כְּרָה, "a feast," 23; נָחֹתִים, "descending," 9; קַב, "a cab," 25; חֲרֵי יוֹנִים, "dove's dung," ib.; מַכְבֵּר, perhaps "a fly-net," viii, 15; גֶּרֶם (in sense of "self," as in Chald. and Samar.), ix, 13; צְבוּר, "a heap," x, 8; מֶלְתָּחָה, "a vestry," 22; מְחֵרָאָה, "a draught-house," 27; כְּרִי, "Cherethites," xi, 4, 19, and 2 Sam. xx, 23 (kethib); מַסָּח, "a keeping off," xi, 6; מַכָּר, "an acquaintance," xii, 6; the form יוֹר, from יָרָה, "to shoot," xiii, 17; בְּנֵי הַתַּעֲרֻבוֹת, "hostages," xiv, 14; 2 Chron. xxv, 24; בֵּית הַחַפְשִׁית, "sick-house," xv, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 21; קֹבֶל, "before," xv, 10; דַּמֶּשֶׂק, "Damascus," xvi, 10 (perhaps only a false reading); מִרְצֶפֶת, "a pavement," xvi, 17; מוּסַךְ or מִרְסָךְ, "a covered way," xvi, 18; חָפָא, in Piel "to do secretly," xvii, 9; אֲשֵׁירָה, with ה, 16, only besides Deut. vii, 5, Mic. v, 14; נָדָא, i. q. נָדַד, xvii, 21 (kethib); שֹׁמְרִנִים, "Samaritans," 29; נְחִשְׁתָּן, "Nehustan," xviii, 4; אֹמֶנָה, "a pillar," 16; עָשָׂה בְּרִכָּה, "to make peace," 31; Isa. xxxvi, 16; סָחִישׁ, "that which grows up the third year," xix, 29; Isa. xxxvii, 30; בֵּית נְכֹת, "treasure-house," xx, 13; Isa. xxxix, 2; מִשְׁנֶה, part of Jerusalem so called, xxi, 14; Zeph. i, 10; Neh. xi, 9; מַזָּלוֹת, "signs of the zodiac," xxiii, 5; פַּרְוָר, "a suburb," xxiii, 11; גִּבְרִים, "ploughmen," xxv, 12 (kethib); שְׁנָא for שְׁנָה, "to change," xxv, 9; אֵרְכוּ for אֵרְכוּ, 2 Kings vi, 13; אַבְרִלָּה, "meat," 1 Kings xix, 8; אַלְמִגִּים, "almug trees," 1 Kings x, 11, 12; נָהַר, "to stretch one's self," 1 Kings xviii, 42; 2 Kings iv, 34, 35; אֲפִי, a "turban" ("ashes"), 1 Kings xx, 38, 41; הַבְרוֹת, "floats," 1 Kings v, 9; יָצִיעַ, "chambers," 1 Kings vi, 5, 6, 10; מַעֲבֶה, "clay," 1 Kings vii, 46; נָשֶׁא, "debt," 2 Kings iv, 7; סַר, "heavy," 1 Kings xx, 43; xxi, 4, 5; כֹּתֶרֶת, "chapiter," only in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah; מְזַמְּרוֹת, "snuffers," only in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah; מָכוֹנָה, "base,"

only in Kings, Chronicles, Jeremiah, and Ezra. To these may be added the architectural terms in 1 Kings vi, vii, and the names of foreign idols in 2 Kings xvii. The general character of the language is most distinctly that of the time before the Babylonian captivity.

VI. *Variations in the Septuagint.*—These are very remarkable, and consist of *transpositions*, *omissions*, and some considerable *additions*, of all which Thenius gives some useful notices in his Introduction to the book of Kings.

1. The most important *transpositions* are the history of Shimei's death, 1 Kings ii, 36–46, which in the Sept. (Cod. Vat.) comes after iii, 1, and divers scraps from ch. iv, v, and ix, accompanied by one or two remarks of the translators. The sections 1 Kings iv, 20–25, 2–6, 26, 21, 1, are strung together and precede 1 Kings iii, 2–28, but many of them are repeated again in their proper places. The sections 1 Kings iii, 1, ix, 16, 17, are strung together, and placed between iv, 34 and v, 1. The section 1 Kings vii, 1–12, is placed after vii, 51. Section viii, 12, 13, is placed after 53. Section ix, 15–22, is placed after x, 22. Section xi, 43, xii, 1, 2, 3, is much transposed and confused in Sept. xi, 43, 44, xii, 1–3. Section xiv, 1–21, is placed in the midst of the long addition to Chron. xii mentioned below. Section xxii, 42–50, is placed after xvi, 28. Chap. xx and xxi are transposed. Section 2 Kings iii, 1–3, is placed after 2 Kings i, 18.

2. The *omissions* are few. Section 1 Kings vi, 11–14, is entirely omitted, and 37, 38 are only slightly alluded to at the opening of chap. iii. The erroneous clause 1 Kings xv, 6, is omitted; and so are the dates of Asa's reign in xvi, 8 and 15; and there are a few verbal omissions of no consequence.

3. The chief interest lies in the *additions*, of which the principal are the following. The supposed mention of a fountain as among Solomon's works in the Temple in the passage after 1 Kings ii, 35; of a paved causeway on Lebanon, iii, 46; of Solomon pointing to the sun at the dedication of the Temple, before he uttered the prayer, "The Lord said he would dwell in the thick darkness," etc., viii, 12, 13 (after 53, Sept.), with a reference to the *βίβλιον τῆς ᾠδῆς*, a passage on which Thenius relies as proving that the Alexandrian had access to original documents now lost; the information that "Joram his brother" perished with Tibni, xvi, 22; an additional date "in the twenty-fourth year of Jeroboam," xv, 8; numerous verbal additions, as xi, 29, xvii, 1, etc.; and, lastly, the long passage concerning Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, inserted between xii, 24 and 25. There are also many glosses of the translator, explanatory, or necessary in consequence of transpositions, as 1 Kings ii, 35, viii, 1, xi, 43, xvii, 20, xix, 2, etc. Of the above, from the recapitulatory character of the passage after 1 Kings ii, 35, containing in brief the sum of the things detailed in vii, 21–23, it seems far more probable that ΚΡΗΝΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΛΗΣ is only a corruption of ΚΡΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΙΛΑΜ, there mentioned. The obscure passage about Lebanon after iii, 46 seems no less certainly to represent what in the Heb. is ix, 18, 19, as appears by the triple concurrence of Tadmor, Lebanon, and *δυναστεύματα*, representing מְמִשַּׁלְתּוֹ. The strange mention of the sun seems to be introduced by the translator to give significance to Solomon's mention of the house which he had built for God, who had said he would dwell in *the thick darkness*; not therefore under the unveiled light of the sun; and the reference to "the book of song" can surely mean nothing else than to point out that the passage to which Solomon referred was Psa. xcvii, 2. Of the other additions, the mention of Tibni's brother Joram is the one which has most the semblance of an historical fact, or makes the existence of any other source of history probable. See, too, 1 Kings xx, 19; 2 Kings xv, 25.

There remains only the long passage about Jeroboam. That this account is only an apocryphal version, made up of the existing materials in the Hebrew Scriptures, after the manner of 1 Esdras, Bel and the Dragon, the apocryphal Esther, the Targums, etc., may be inferred on the following grounds. The framework of the story is given in the very words of the Hebrew narrative, and that very copiously, and the new matter is only worked in here and there. Demonstrably, therefore, the Hebrew account existed when the Greek one was framed, and was the original one. The principal new facts introduced, the marriage of Jeroboam to the sister of Shishak's wife, and his request to be permitted to return, is a manifest imitation of the story of Hadad. The misplacement of the story of Abijah's sickness, and the visit of Jeroboam's wife to Ahijah the Shilonite, makes the whole history out of keeping—the disguise of the queen, the rebuke of Jeroboam's idolatry (which is accordingly left out from Ahijah's prophecy, as is the mention at v, 2 of his having told Jeroboam he should be king), and the king's anxiety about the recovery of his son and heir. The embellishments of the story, Jeroboam's chariots, the amplification of Ahijah's address to Ano, the request asked of Pharaoh, the new garment *not washed in water*, are precisely such as an embellisher would add, as we may see by the apocryphal books above cited. Then the fusing down the three Hebrew names, תִּרְצָה, צְרוּעָה, and צְרֵדָה, into one, *Σαριρά*, thus giving the same name to the mother of Jeroboam, and to the city where she dwelt, shows how comparatively modern the story is, and how completely of Greek growth. A yet plainer indication is its confounding the Shemaiah of 1 Kings xii, 22 with Shemaiah the Nehelamite of Jer. xxix, 24, 31, and putting Ahijah's prophecy into his mouth; for, beyond all question, Ἐνλαμί (1 Kings xii) is only another form of *Αἰλαμιτης* (Jer. xxxvi, 24, Sept.). Then, again, the story is self-contradictory; for, if Jeroboam's child Abijam was not born till a year or so after Solomon's death, how could "any good thing toward the Lord God of Israel" have been found in him before Jeroboam became king? The one thing in the story that is more like truth than the Hebrew narrative is the age given to Rehoboam, sixteen years, which may have been preserved in the MS. which the writer of this romance had before him. The calling Jeroboam's mother *γυνὴ πόρνη* instead of *γυνὴ χήρα* was probably accidental.

On the whole, then, it appears that the great variations in the Sept. contribute little or nothing to the elucidation of the history contained in these books, nor much even to the text. The Hebrew text and arrangement is not in the least shaken in its main points, nor is there the slightest cloud cast on the accuracy of the history, or the truthfulness of the prophecies contained in it. But these variations illustrate a characteristic tendency of the Jewish mind to make interesting portions of the Scriptures the groundwork of separate religious tales, which they altered or added to according to their fancy, without any regard to history or chronology, and in which they exercised a peculiar kind of ingenuity in working up the Scripture materials, or in inventing circumstances calculated, as they thought, to make the main history more probable. The story of Zerubbabel's answer in 1 Esdras about truth, to prepare the way for his mission by Darius; of the discovery of the imposture of Bel's priests by Daniel, in Bel and the Dragon; of Mordecai's dream in the apocryphal Esther, and the paragraph in the Talmud inserted to connect 1 Kings xvi, 34 with xvii, 1 (Smith's *Sacr. Ann.* ii, 421), are instances of this. The reign of Solomon, and the remarkable rise of Jeroboam, were not unlikely to exercise this propensity of the Hellenistic Jews. It is to the existence of such works that the variations in the Sept. account of Solomon and Jeroboam may most probably be attributed.

VII. Another feature in the literary condition of our books must be noticed, viz., that the compiler, in arranging his materials, and adopting the very words of the documents used by him, has not always been careful to avoid the *appearance* of contradiction. Thus the mention of the staves of the ark remaining in their place

"unto this day" (1 Kings viii, 8) does not accord with the account of the destruction of the Temple (2 Kings xxv, 9). The mention of Elijah as the only prophet of the Lord left (1 Kings xviii, 22; xix, 10) has an appearance of disagreement with xx, 13, 28, 35, etc., though xviii, 4, xix, 18 supply, it is true, a ready answer. In 1 Kings xxi, 13 only Naboth is mentioned, while in 2 Kings ix, 26 his sons are added. The prediction in 1 Kings xix, 15–17 has no perfect fulfilment in the following chapters. 1 Kings xxii, 38 does not seem to be a fulfilment of xxi, 19. The declaration in 1 Kings ix, 22 does not seem in harmony with xi, 28. There are also some singular repetitions, as 1 Kings xiv, 21 compared with 31; 2 Kings ix, 29 with viii, 25; xiv, 15, 16, with xiii, 12, 13. But it is enough just to have pointed these out, as no real difficulty can be found in them.

VIII. As regards the *sources of information*, it may truly be said that in the books of Kings we have the narrative of contemporary writers throughout. It has already been observed [see CHRONICLES] that there was a regular series of state annals both for the kingdom of Judah and for that of Israel, which embraced the whole time comprehended in the books of Kings, or at least to the end of the reign of Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv, 5). These annals are constantly cited by name as "the Book of the Acts of Solomon" (1 Kings xi, 41); and, after Solomon, "the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah, *or* Israel" (e. g. 1 Kings xiv, 29; xv, 7; xvi, 5, 14, 20; 2 Kings x, 34; xxiv, 5, etc.); and it is manifest that the author of Kings had them both before him while he drew up his history, in which the reigns of the two kingdoms are harmonized, and these annals constantly appealed to. (Similar phraseology is used in Esther x, 2, vi, 1, to denote the official annals of the Persian empire. Public documents are spoken of in the same way in Neh. xii, 23). But, in addition to these national annals, there were also extant, at the time that the books of Kings were compiled, separate works of the several prophets who had lived in Judah and Israel, and which probably bore the same relation to the annals as the historical parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah bear to those portions of the annals preserved in the books of Kings, i. e. were, in some instances at least, fuller and more copious accounts of the current events, by the same hands which drew up the more concise narrative of the annals, though in others perhaps mere duplicates. Thus the acts of Uzziah, written by Isaiah, were very likely identical for substance with the history of his reign in the national chronicles; and part of the history of Hezekiah we know was identical in the chronicles and in the prophet. The chapter in Jeremiah relating to the destruction of the Temple (ch. lii) is identical with that in 2 Kings xxiv, xxv. In later times some have supposed that a chapter in the prophecies of Daniel was used for the national chronicles, and appears as Ezra i. (Comp. also 2 Kings xvi, 5 with Isa. vii, 1; 2 Kings xviii, 8 with Isa. xiv, 28–32). As an instance of verbal agreement, coupled with greater fulness in the prophetic account, see 2 Kings xx compared with Isa. xxxviii, in which latter alone is Hezekiah's *writing* given.

These other works, then, as far as the memory of them has been preserved to us, were as follows (see Keil's *Apolog. Vers.*). For the time of David, the book of Samuel the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of Gad the seer (2 Sam. xxi–xxiv with 1 Kings i, being probably extracted from Nathan's book), which seem to have been collected—at least that portion of them relating to David—into one work called "the Acts of David the king" (1 Chron. xxix, 29). For the time of Solomon, "the Book of the Acts of Solomon" (1 Kings xi, 41), consisting probably of parts of the "Book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer" (2 Chron. ix, 29). For the time of Rehoboam, "the words of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies" (2 Chron. xii, 15). For the time of Abijah, "the story (מִדְרָשׁ) of the prophet Iddo" (2 Chron. xiii, 22). For the time of Jehoshaphat, "the words of Jehu, the son of Hanani" (2 Chron. xx, 34). For the time of Uzziah, "the writings of Isaiah the prophet" (2 Chron. xxvi, 22). For the time of Hezekiah, "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz" (2 Chron. xxxii, 32). For the time of Manasseh, a book called "the sayings of the seers," as the A.V., following the Sept., Vulg., Kimchi, etc., rightly renders the passage, in accordance with ver. 18 (2 Chron. xxxiii, 19), though others, following the grammar too servilely, make *Chozai* a proper name, because of the absence of the article. For the time of Jeroboam II, a prophecy of "Jonah, the son of Amittai the prophet, of Gath-hepher," is cited (2 Kings xiv, 25); and it seems likely that there were books containing special histories of the acts of Elijah and Elisha, seeing that the times of these prophets are described with such copiousness. Of the latter Gehazi might well have been the author, to judge from 2 Kings viii, 4, 5, as Elisha himself might have been of the former. Possibly, too, the prophecies of Azariah, the son of Oded, in Asa's reign (2 Chron. xv, 1), and of Hanani (2 Chron. xvi, 7) (unless this latter is the same as Jehu, son of Hanani, as Oded is put for Azariah in xv, 8), and Micaiah, the son of Imlah, in Ahab's reign; and Eliezer, the son of Dodavah, in Jehoshaphat's; and Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, in Jehoash's; and Oded, in Pekah's; and Zechariah, in Uzziah's reign; of the prophetess Huldah, in Josiah's, and others, may have been preserved in writing, some or all of them. These works, or at least many of them, must have been extant at the time when the books of Kings were compiled, as they certainly were extant much later when the books of Chronicles were put together by Ezra. But whether the author used them all, or only those duplicate portions of them which were embodied in the national chronicles, it is impossible to say, seeing he quotes none of them by name except the acts of Solomon and the prophecy of Jonah. On the other hand, we cannot infer from his silence that these books were unused by him, seeing that neither does he quote by name the Vision of Isaiah as the chronicler does, though he must, from its recent date, have been familiar with it, and seeing that so many parts of his narrative have every appearance of being extracted from these books of the prophets, and contain narratives which it is not likely would have found a place in the chronicles of the kings. See 1 Kings xiv, 4, etc.; xvi, 1, etc., xi; 2 Kings xvii, etc.

With regard to the work so often cited in the Chronicles as "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" (1 Chron. ix, 1; 2 Chron. xvi, 11; xxvii, 7; xxviii, 26; xxxii, 32; xxxv, 27; xxxvi, 8), it has been thought by some that it was a separate collection containing the joint histories of the two kingdoms; by others, that it is our books of Kings which answer to this description; but by Eichhorn, that it is the same as the Chronicles of the kings of Judah so constantly cited in the books of Kings; and this last opinion seems to be the best founded. For in 2 Chron. xvi, 11, the same book is called "the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," which in the parallel passage, 1 Kings xv, 23, is called "the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah." So, again, 2 Chron. xxvii, 7, comp. with 2 Kings xv, 36; 2 Chron. xxviii, 26, comp. with 2 Kings xvi, 19; 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, comp. with 2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 27, with 2 Kings xxiii, 28; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 8, with 2 Kings xxiv, 5. Moreover, the book so quoted refers exclusively to the affairs of Judah; and even in the one passage where reference is made to it as "the Book of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xx, 34), it is for the reign of Jehoshaphat that it is cited. Obviously, therefore, it is the same work which is elsewhere described as the *Chronicles of Israel and Judah*, and of *Judah and Israel*. Nor is this an unreasonable title to give to these chronicles. Saul, David, Solomon, and in some sense Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 1, 5, 6), and all his successors, were kings of Israel as well as of Judah, and therefore it is very conceivable that in Ezra's time the chronicles of

Judah should have acquired the name of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Even with regard to a portion of Israel in the days of Rehoboam, the chronicler remarks, apparently as a matter of gratulation, that "Rehoboam reigned over them" (2 Chron. x, 17); he notices Abijah's authority in portions of the Israelitish territory (2 Chron. xiii, 18, 19; xv, 8, 9); he not unfrequently speaks of Israel, when the kingdom of Judah is the matter in hand (as 2 Chron. xii, 1; xxi, 4; xxiii, 2, etc.), and even calls Jehoshaphat "king of Israel" (2 Chron. xxi, 2), and distinguishes "Israel and Judah" from "Ephraim and Manasseh" (xxx, 1); he notices Hezekiah's authority from Dan to Beersheba (2 Chron. xxx, 5), and Josiah's destruction of idols throughout all the land of Israel (xxxiv. 6–9), and his Passover for all Israel (xxxv, 17, 18), and seems to parade the title "*king of Israel*" in connection with David and Solomon (xxxv, 3, 4), and the relation of the Levites to "all Israel" (ver. 3); and therefore it is only in accordance with the feeling displayed in such passages that the name, "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah," should be given to the chronicles of the Jewish kingdom. The use of this term in speaking of the "kings of Israel and Judah who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression" (1 Chron. ix, 1) would be conclusive if the construction of the sentence were certain. But though it is absurd to separate the words "and Judah" from Israel, as Bertheau does (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb.*), following the Masoretic punctuation, seeing that the "*Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah*" is cited in at least six other places in Chronicles, still it is possible that Israel and Judah might be the antecedent to the pronoun understood before הָגְלוּ. It seems, however, much more likely that the antecedent to אֲשֶׁר is "מַלְכֵי יש" ורה". On the whole, therefore, there is no evidence of the existence in the time of the chronicler of a history, since lost, of the two kingdoms, nor are the books of Kings the work so quoted by the chronicler, seeing he often refers to it for "the rest of the acts" of Kings, when he has already given all that is contained in our books of Kings. He refers, therefore, to the chronicles of Judah.

From the above authentic sources, then, was compiled the history in the books under consideration. Judging from the facts that we have in 2 Kings xvii, xix, xx, the history of Hezekiah in the very words of Isaiah, xxxvi–xxxix; that, as stated above, we have several passages from Jeremiah in duplicate in 2 Kings, and the whole of Jer. lii in 2 Kings xxiv, 18, etc., xxv; that so large a portion of the books of Kings is repeated in the books of Chronicles, though the writer of Chronicles had the original Chronicles also before him, as well as from the whole internal character of the narrative, and even some of the blemishes referred to under the second head—we may conclude with certainty that we have in the books of Kings, not only in the main the history faithfully preserved to us from the ancient chronicles, but most frequently whole passages transferred verbatim into them. Occasionally, no doubt, we have the compiler's own comments, or reflections thrown in, as at 2 Kings xxi, 10–16; xvii, 10–15; xiii, 23; xvii, 7–41, etc. We connect the insertion of the prophecy in 1 Kings xiii with the fact that the compiler himself was an eye-witness of the fulfilment of it, and can even see how the *words* ascribed to the old prophet are of the age of the compiler. We can perhaps see his hand in the frequent repetition, on the review of each reign, of the remark, "The high places were not taken away; the people still sacrificed and burnt incense on the high places" (1 Kings xxii, 43; 2 Kings xii, 3; xiv, 4; xv, 4, 35; comp. 1 Kings iii, 3), and in the repeated observation that such and such things, as the staves by which the ark was borne, the revolt of the ten tribes, the rebellion of Edom, etc., continue "unto this day," though it may be perhaps doubted in some cases whether these words were not in the old chronicle (2 Chron. v, 9). See 1 Kings viii, 8; ix, 13 21; x, 12; xii, 19; 2 Kings ii, 22; viii, 22; x, 27; xiii, 23; xiv, 7; xvi, 6; xvii, 23, 34, 41; xxiii, 25. It is remarkable, however, that in no instance does the use of this phrase lead us to suppose that it was penned after the destruction of the Temple: in several of the above instances the phrase necessarily supposes that the Temple and the kingdom of Judah were still standing. If the phrase, then, is the compiler's, it proves him to have written before the Babylonian captivity; if it was a part of the chronicle he was quoting, it shows how exactly he transferred its contents to his own pages.

IX. *Author and Date.*—The authorship and age of this historical treatise may admit of several suppositions. Whatever were the original sources, the books are evidently the composition of one writer. The style is generally uniform throughout (Dr. Davidson, in *Horne's Introd.*, new edit., ii, 666 sq.). The same forms of expression are used to denote the same thing, e. g. the male sex (1 Kings xiv, 10, etc.); the death of a king (1 Kings xi, 43, etc.); modes of allusion to the law (1 Kings xi, 13); fidelity to Jehovah (1 Kings viii, 63, etc.; see De Wette, *Einleit.* § 184, *a*; Hävernick, *Einleit.* § 171). Similar idioms are ever recurring, so as to produce a uniformity of style (Hävernick, *l. c.*). See § ii, above.

1. With regard to the time when the author lived and wrote there are the following arguments:

(1.) The style and diction indicate the later age of the Hebrew language, but not the latest. Attempts to prove a more modern date than the middle of the captivity have signally failed. Nearly all the words which De Wette and others have selected (see § v, above) are shown to have been in use, either by the prophets who flourished before the captivity and at its commencement, or by still earlier writers; but words and phrases abound which were in common use by the writers of the concluding period of the kingdom of Judah, who did not go into captivity, especially by Isaiah and Jeremiah. In this respect there is a manifest difference between Kings and Chronicles. Though neither work is free from Chaldaic forms, they are rare in Kings, but numerous in Chronicles. Their occurrence at all in Kings is sufficiently accounted for from the contiguity of Judah to Syria, and from the frequent intercourse with Assyria which commerce and war involved.

(2.) With the evidence which the language affords, the internal evidence of the contents agrees. The history is carried down to the captivity in detail; and, by way of supplement, to the reign of Evil-merodach, king of Babylon. The closing verse implies that the writer survived Jehoiachin, but gives no hint whatever of the termination of the captivity, which he surely would have done had he written after the return from Babylon. We may therefore safely conclude that the work was composed before the end of the captivity, but after the twenty-sixth year of its continuance.

2. Calmet ascribes the authorship to Ezra; but there are no decided indications of his authorship, and the names Zif and Bul (1 Kings vi, 1, 37, 38) were not in use after the captivity. The general opinion, however, that Jeremiah was the author is adopted by Grotius, Carpzov, and others, and is lately revindicated by Hävernick, as also by Graf (*De libror. Sam. et Regum compositione*, p. 61 sq.), but is opposed by Keil, Davidson, and others. In favor of it are the following strong arguments:

(1.) The work is attributed to Jeremiah by ancient tradition. There is a reference to Jeremiah as the author in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 15, 1), and with this notice the common opinion of the Jews agrees.

(2.) The style and language of Kings resemble those of the acknowledged writings of Jeremiah. In both works there is an unusual number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα; and also of words peculiar to each work, though used more than once. What is still more to the purpose, there are words and forms of words used in both works, but in them only; as, בַּקְבּוּק, a "cruse" (1 Kings xiv,

3, and Jer. xix, 1, 10); כַּרְמֵל, a "husbandman" (2 Kings xxv, 12; Jer. lii, 16; and כַּרְמִים, Jer. xxxix, 10); חָבָה, to "hide," used in Niphal only in Kings (1 Kings xxii, 25; 2 Kings vii, 12) and in Jeremiah (xlix, 10); עִוֵּר, to "blind," used in the sense of putting out the eyes only in 2 Kings xxv, 7, and Jer. xxxix, 7, and lii, 11, etc. See § v, above.

(3.) The habit of referring to the Pentateuch, pointed out as characteristic of the books of Kings, is equally so of Jeremiah; and this habit in both is thought to be accounted for on the ground of the discovered copy of the law in the days of Josiah, in which Jeremiah took great interest, traces of which are discoverable in Jer. xi, 3–5 (Deut. xxvii, 26); xxxii, 18–21 (Exod. xx, 6; vi, 6); xxxiv, 14 (Deut. xv, 12). The same general spirit of solemnity, the same modes of thought and illustration, and the same political principles, are thought to mark the two works.

(4.) Some portions of Kings and of Jeremiah are almost identical, particularly 2 Kings xxiv, 18–xxv, and Jer. lii. The two passages are so much alike, though differing in some respects, as to appear like two narrations of the same event by the same person, in each of which some points are related with more fulness than in the other, for some particular purpose. Parts of this narrative are also contained in nearly the same words in Jer. xxxix, 1–10; xl, 7–xli, 10.

(5.) The impression produced on the reader is that the writer of Kings was not taken away into captivity either in the days of Jehoiachin or of Zedekiah, as the writer of Chronicles appears to have been; and this circumstance agrees with the supposition that Jeremiah was the writer. We know that, after being carried away as far as Ramah with the captives from Jerusalem, he was set free, and permitted to return to his own land with Gedaliah. He was afterwards taken away to Tahpanhes, in Egypt, where we obtain the last certain view of him. Besides this, many other points of agreement, more or less striking, present themselves to the careful reader—the book of Jeremiah serving more than any other part of Scripture to illustrate and explain the contemporaneous portions of the Kings, and the events recorded in Kings serving as a key to many portions of the prophet. In this way a number of undesigned coincidences appear between the supposed and the acknowledged writings of Jeremiah, as the following:

2 Kings xxv, 1–3, comp. with		Jer. xxxviii, 1–9.
2 Kings xxv, 11, 12, 18–21,	"	Jer. xxxix, 10–14; xl, 1–5.
2 Kings xxiv, 13,	"	Jer. xxvii, 18–20; xxviii, 3–6.
2 Kings xxiv, 14,	"	Jer. xxiv, 1.
2 Kings xxi, xxii, xxiii,	"	Jer. vii, 15; xv, 4; xix, 3.

(6.) The absence of all mention of Jeremiah in the history, although he was so prominently active in the four or five last reigns, both in the court and among the people, is only explicable on the supposition that Jeremiah was himself the writer. Had it been the work of another, he must, as in Chronicles, have had very distinct mention.

(7.) The events singled out for mention in the concise narrative are precisely those of which Jeremiah had personal knowledge, and in which he took special interest. The famine in 2 Kings xxv, 3 was one which had nearly cost Jeremiah his life (Jer. xxxviii, 9). The capture of the city, the flight and capture of Zedekiah, the judgment and punishment of Zedekiah and his sons at Riblah, are related in 2 Kings xxv, 1–7, in almost the identical words which we read in Jer. xxxix, 1–7. So are the breaking down and burning of the Temple, the king's palace, and the houses of the great men, the deportation to Babylon of the fugitives and the surviving inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judæa. The intimate knowledge of what Nebuzar-adan did, both in respect to those selected for capital punishment and those carried away captive, and those poor whom he left in the land, displayed by the writer of 2 Kings xxv, 11, 12, 18–21, is fully explained by Jer. xxxix, 10–14, xl, 1–5, where we read that Jeremiah was actually one of the captives who followed Nebuzar-adan as far as Ramah, and was very kindly treated by him. The careful enumeration of the pillars and of the sacred vessels of the Temple which were plundered by the Chaldæans tallies exactly with the prediction of Jeremiah concerning them (xxvii, 19–22). The paragraph concerning the appointment of Gedaliah as governor of the remnant, and his murder by Ishmael, and the flight of the Jews into Egypt, is merely an abridged account of what Jeremiah tells us more fully (xl–xliii, 7), and are events in which personally he was deeply concerned. The writer in Kings has nothing more to tell us concerning the Jews or Chaldees in the land of Judah, which exactly agrees with the hypothesis that he is Jeremiah, who we know was carried down to Egypt with the fugitives. In fact, the date of the writing and the position of the writer seem as clearly marked by the termination of the narrative at v, 26, as in the case of the Acts of the Apostles. It may be added, though the argument is of less weight, that the annexation of this chapter to the writings of Jeremiah so as to form Jer. lii (with the additional clause contained in vs. 28–30) is an evidence of a very ancient, if not a contemporary belief, that Jeremiah was the author of it. Again, the special mention of Seraiah the high-priest, and Zephaniah the second priest, as slain by Nebuzar-adan (v, 18), together with three other priests, is very significant when taken in connection with Jer. xxi, 1, xxix, 25–29, passages which show that Zephaniah belonged to the faction which opposed the prophet, a faction which was headed by priests and false prophets (Jer. xxvi, 7, 8, 11, 16). Going back to the xxivth chapter, we find in verse 14 an enumeration of the captives taken with Jehoiachin identical with that in Jer. xxiv, 1; in verse 13 a reference to the vessels of the Temple precisely similar to that in Jer. xxvii, 18–20, xxviii, 3, 6, and in verse 3, 4, a reference to the idolatries and bloodshed of Manasseh very similar to those in Jer. ii, 34, xix, 4–8, etc., a reference which also connects chap. xxiv with xxi, 6, 13–16. In verse 2 the enumeration of the hostile nations, and the reference to the prophets of God, point directly to Jer. xxv, 9, 20, 21, and the reference to Pharaoh-necho in verse 7 points to verse 19, and to xlvi, 1–12. Brief as the narrative is, it brings out all the chief points in the political events of the time which we know were much in Jeremiah's mind; and yet, which is exceedingly remarkable, Jeremiah is never once named (as he is in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 12, 21), although the manner of the writer is frequently to connect the sufferings of Judah with their sins and their neglect of the Word of God (2 Kings xvii, 13 sq.; xxiv, 2, 3, etc.). This leads to another striking coincidence between that portion of the history which belongs to Jeremiah's times and the writings of Jeremiah himself. De Wette speaks of the superficial character of the history of Jeremiah's times as hostile to the theory of Jeremiah's authorship. Now, considering the nature of these annals, and their conciseness, this criticism seems very unfounded as regards the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. It must, however, be acknowledged that, as regards Jehoiakim's reign, and especially the latter part of it, and the way in which he came by his death, the narrative is much more meagre than one would have expected from a contemporary writer living on the spot. But exactly the same paucity of information is found in those otherwise copious notices of contemporary events with which Jeremiah's prophecies are interspersed. Let any one open, e. g. Townsend's *Arrangement* or Geneste's *Parallel Histories*, and he will see at a glance how remarkably little light Jeremiah's narrative or prophecies throw upon the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign. The cause of this silence may be difficult to assign, but, whatever it was, whether absence from Jerusalem, possibly on the mission described in Jer. xiii, or imprisonment, or any other impediment, it operated equally on Jeremiah and on the writer of 2 Kings xxiv. When it is borne in mind that the writer of 2 Kings was a contemporary

writer, and, if not Jeremiah, must have had independent means of information, this coincidence will have great weight.

It has been argued on the other side—

(1.) That the concluding portion of the book of Kings could hardly have been written by Jeremiah, unless we suppose him to have written it when he was between eighty and ninety years old. To this it may be replied that the last four verses, relative to Jehoiachin, are equally a supplement, whether added by the author or by some later hand. There is nothing impossible in the supposition of Jeremiah having survived till the thirty-seventh year of Jehoiachin's captivity, though he would have been between eighty and ninety. There is something touching in the idea of this gleam of joy having reached the prophet in his old age, and of his having added these few words to his long-finished history of his nation (see Hävernick, *Ueber Daniel*, p. 14).

(2.) That the resemblance of style and diction may be accounted for on the supposition of Jeremiah's familiarity with the ancient records to which the writer of Kings had access, while the similarity of 2 Kings xxiv, 1–18, etc., and Jer. xxxix, might arise from the writer of Kings using that portion of Jeremiah's work. The identity of Jer. lii with the same portion of Kings is probably owing to its being an altered extract from Kings, appended as a supplement to Jeremiah by some later hand. Neither of the suppositions, however, seriously militates against the general authorship of Jeremiah as to the book of Kings. See JEREMIAH.

X. *Place of these Books in the Canon, and References to them in the New Testament.*—Their canonical authority having never been disputed, it is needless to bring forward the testimonies to their authenticity which may be found in Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, etc., or in Bp. Cosin, or any other modern work on the Canon of Scripture. See CANON. They are reckoned, as has already been noticed, among the Prophets, in the threefold division of the Holy Scriptures; a position in accordance with the supposition that they were compiled by Jeremiah, and contain the narratives of the different prophets in succession. They are frequently cited by our Lord and by the apostles. Thus the allusions to Solomon's glory (Matt. vi, 29); to the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon to hear his wisdom (xii, 42); to the Temple (Acts vii, 47, 48); to the great drought in the days of Elijah, and the widow of Sarepta (Luke iv, 25, 26); to the cleansing of Naaman the Syrian (ver. 27); to the charge of Elisha to Gehazi (2 Kings iv, 29, comp. with Luke x, 4); to the dress of Elijah (Mark i, 6, comp. with 2 Kings i, 8); to the complaint of Elijah, and God's answer to him (Rom. xi, 3, 4); to the raising of the Shunammite's son from the dead (Heb. xi, 35); to the giving and withholding of the rain in answer to Elijah's prayer (James v, 17, 18; Rev. xi, 6); to Jezebel (Rev. ii, 20)—are all derived from the books of Kings, and, with the statement of Elijah's presence at the Transfiguration, are a striking testimony to their value for the purpose of religious teaching, and to their authenticity as a portion of the Word of God.

On the whole, then, in this portion of the history of the Israelitish people to which the name of the *Books of Kings* has been given, we have (if we except those errors in numbers which are either later additions to the original work, or accidental corruptions of the text) a most important and accurate account of that people during upwards of four hundred years of their national existence, delivered for the most part by contemporary writers, and guaranteed by the authority of one of the most eminent of the Jewish prophets. Considering the conciseness of the narrative and the simplicity of the style, the amount of knowledge which these books convey of the characters, conduct, and manners of kings and people during so long a period is truly wonderful. The insight they give us into the aspect of Judah and Jerusalem, both natural and artificial, into the religious, military, and civil institutions of the people, their arts and manufactures, the state of education and learning among them, their resources, commerce, exploits, alliances, the causes of their decadence, and, finally, of their ruin, is most clear, interesting, and instructive. In a few brief sentences we acquire more accurate knowledge of the affairs of Egypt, Tyre, Syria, Assyria, Babylon, and other neighboring nations, than had been preserved to us in all the other remains of antiquity up to the recent discoveries in hieroglyphical and cuneiform monuments. The synchronisms with these, if they create some difficulties, yet furnish the only real basis for dates of these contemporaneous powers; and if we are content to read accurate and truthful history, substantially with an exact though intricate net-work of chronology, then we shall assuredly find it will abundantly repay the most laborious study which we can bestow upon it.

But it is for their deep religious teaching, and for the insight which they give us into God's providential and moral government of the world, that these books are above all valuable. Books which describe the wisdom and the glory of Solomon, and yet record his fall; which make us acquainted with the painful ministry of Elijah, and his translation into heaven; and which tell us how the most magnificent temple ever built for God's glory, and of which he vouchsafed to take possession by a visible symbol of his presence, was consigned to the flames and to desolation for the sins of those who worshipped in it, read us such lessons concerning both God and man as are the best evidence of their divine origin, and make them the richest treasure to every Christian man.

XI. *Commentaries.*—The following are the exegetical helps specially on the two books of Kings, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in Syriac, in his *Opp.* iv, 439); Theodoret, *Quæstiones* (in Greek, in his *Opp.* i, edit. Halle, 1769); Procopius of Gaza, *Scholia* [including Chron.] (from Theodoret, edit. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to); Eucherius [falsely attributed to him], *Commentarii* (in the *Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* vi, 965 sq.); Rashi [i. e. Rab. Sol. Jarchi], *Commentarius* [Joshua–Kings] (trans. by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1714, 4to); Bañolas, פֵּרוּשׁ [Joshua–Kings] (with Kimchi's Commentary, Seira, 1494, folio; and in the Rabbinical Bibles); Alscheich, בְּרֵאשִׁית, etc. [Joshua–Kings] (Venice, 1601, fol., and later); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Weller, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1557, Norib. 1560, fol.); Borrhaus, *Commentarius* [Joshua–Kings] (Basil. 1557, folio); Sarcer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1559, 8vo); Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1666, 1581, Heidelb. 1599, fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* [Samuel–Chron.] (Lips. 1583, 1591, fol.); Serarius, *Commentaria* [Joshua–Chron.] (Mogunt. 1609, 1617, 2 vols. fol.); Leonhardt, *Hypomnemata* [Samuel–Chron.] (Erfurt, 1608, 1614, 8vo; Lips. 1610, 4to); De Mendoza, *Commentaria* [including Sam.] (Lugd. 1622–1631, 3 vols. fol.); Sanctius, *Commentarii* [Sam.–Chron.] (Antwerp, 1624, Lugd. 1625, fol.); Crommius, *Illustrationes* [Ruth–Chron.] (Lovan. 1631, 4to); De Vera, *Commentaria* [includ. Sam.] (Limæ, 1635, fol.); *Bonfrère, *Commentaria* [Sam.–Chron.] (Tornaci, 1643, 2 vols. fol.; also with his other commentaries, Lugd. 1737); Caussinus, *Dissertationes* [includ. Sam.] (Par. 1650, fol.; Colon. 1652, 4to); *Schmidt, *Adnotationes* (Argent. 1697, 4to); Calmet, *Commentaire* (Par. 1711, 4to); A Lapide, *Commentarius* [Joshua–Kings] (Antw. 1718, fol.); Brentano and Dereser, *Erklärung* (F. a. M. 1827, 8vo); Tanchur-Jerusalami, *Commentarius* [includ. Sam.] (from the Arabic, by Haarbrücker, Lips. 1844, 8vo); *Keil, *Commentar* (Moskau, 1846, 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1857, 8vo, different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary); *Thenius, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdbk.* Lpz. 1849, 8vo); Schlüsser, *Einleitung in die Bücher der Könige* (Halle, 1861, 8vo). For monographs on particular passages, see Danz, *Wörterbuch*, p. 555. See COMMENTARY.

King's Book is the name of a book published A.D. 1543, under the sanction of Henry VIII, entitled *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.*

The people called it the *King's Book* in contradistinction from the work which furnished the basis for the *King's Book*, and was called the *Bishops' Book*. This latter was an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, and the Ave Maria: to these, in the *King's Book*, was subjoined additional matter touching free will, good works, justification, predestination, and purgatory. A comparison, however, of the two shows that in the *King's Book* there is a falling away from the principles of the Reformation. See INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN.

King's Dale (עֵמֶק הַמֶּלֶךְ, *E'mek ham-Me'lek*, *Valley of the King;* Sept. *τὸ πεδιον τῶν βασιλέων, ἡ κοιλὰς τοῦ βασιλέως*), a place incidentally mentioned in two passages of Scripture only. When Abraham was returning with the spoil of Sodom, the king of Sodom went out to meet him "at the valley of Shaveh, *which is the king's dale*" (Gen. xiv, 17); and in the narrative of the death of Absalom the incidental remark is inserted by the historian, "Now Absalom in his lifetime had reared up for himself a pillar which is in *the king's dale*" (2 Sam. xviii, 18). The locality has usually been supposed to be in the Valley of Jehoshaphat or Kidron, and that the well-known monument, now called the tomb of Absalom, is the pillar raised by that prince (Benjamin of Tudela, in *Early Trav. in Pal.* p. 84; Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 303; Barclay, *City of the Great King*, p. 92). The style of the monument, which is of the later Roman age, militates against this theory, unless we suppose that this structure merely represents the older traditionary site. See ABSALOM'S TOMB. The names given to the valley, *Emek*, *Shaveh*, prove that a "plain" or "broad valley" was meant, and not a *ravine* like the Kidron; but this would tolerably well apply to its broader part at the junction with that of Hinnom. See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF. Others locate the king's dale at Beersheba, others at Lebanon (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 357), others near the Jordan (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 44). But if we identify Salem with Jerusalem, then doubtless the king's dale was close to that city; and it seems highly probable besides that Absalom should have raised his memorial pillar in the vicinity of the capital (Krafft, *Die Topographie Jerusalems*, p. 88). Still others regard the place as that elsewhere called the "Valley of Rephaim," and now usually designated as the *Plain of Rephaim*. This is on the direct route from the north to Hebron; a practicable road leads down from it through the wilderness to the shore of the Dead Sea; and it is so close to Jerusalem that Melchisedec, from the heights of Zion, could both see and hear the joyous meeting of the princes of Sodom with the victorious band of Abraham, and the reclaimed captives (comp. Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i, 218; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, i, 488; Kalisch, *On Gen.* xiv, 17). See REPHAIM, VALLEY OF. The epithet "*King's*," however, seems rather to favor a connection with the "king's garden" [see JERUSALEM], which lay near the Pool of Siloam (2 Kings xxv, 4). See SHAVEH.

King's Evil is the name in England of a disease which the people believed their kings had the power of curing by touch. So strong was the popular conviction that the ecclesiastical authorities devised a special form of religious service to be recited while the king was touching the diseased person. It is as follows:

"The first gospel was exactly the same with that on Ascension Day. At the touching of every infirm person, these words were repeated, 'They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' The second gospel began at the first of St. John, and ended at these words, 'full of grace and truth.' At putting the angel (or gold) about their necks, 'That light was the true light which lights every man that cometh into the world,' was repeated,

Lord have mercy upon us.
Christ have mercy upon us.
Lord have mercy upon us.
Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, etc.
Minister. O Lord, save thy servants.
Answer. Which put their trust in thee.
Minister. Send unto them help from above.
Answer. And evermore mightily defend them.
Minister. Help us, O God, our Saviour.
Answer. And for the glory of thy name's sake deliver us; be merciful unto us sinners, for thy name's sake.
Minister. O Lord, hear our prayer.
Answer. And let our cry come unto thee.

THE COLLECT.

Almighty God, the eternal health of all such as put their trust in thee, hear us, we beseech thee, on the behalf of these thy servants, for whom we call for thy merciful help; that they, receiving health, may give thanks unto thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The peace of God, etc."

"The evidence which has sometimes been offered for supposed miraculous cures of the king's evil is none at all for the *miracle*, but goes to prove that patients were touched, and *afterwards recovered*. Symptoms of many diseases abate spontaneously; and especially in the case of scrofula, a strong excitement of mind is supposed by medical men to exert often a reaction in the absorbents. The touch of a hanged man's hand has been held in at least equal repute for scrofula and wens, doubtless for a like reason. If Jesus had laid his hands on many sick persons, and *some* of them had recovered within a week, how different would have been the state of the case! (See Paley on *tentative* miracles and gradual cures.) As the reality of a cure by the touch of a royal hand cannot be believed without the utmost degree of superstition, it is probable that the service was used as a petition for the cure, and that the touching the part affected was a superstitious act, followed by a cure in those cases in which the action of the mind was favorable to such an effect. Thus the cure itself would be explicable from natural causes."

King's Garden. See GARDEN.

King's House. See PALACE.

King's Mother. See QUEEN.

King's Mowings. See MOWING.

King's Pool. See POOL.

King's Primer. See PRIMER.

King's Sepulchre. See TOMB.

Kingsbury, Cyrus, a noted American missionary to the Indians, was born about 1789. He commenced his missionary labors about 1816, and for more than fifty years faithfully, quietly, and meekly served his Master in making known to those committed to his care the unsearchable riches of Christ. Kingsbury died August, 1870. His influence among the savages was great, and few men in any service could be more missed. Among the missionaries of this age, no purer name, no lovelier character, has appeared than that which belongs to Cyrus Kingsbury.

Kingsbury, William, a Congregational minister, was born in London July 12, 1744, and educated first at Christ's Hospital, London, and for the ministry at the educational institution for Congregational ministers at Mile End, where he graduated in 1764. He was ordained in 1765, and became pastor of the Independent Church at Southampton, a position which he most successfully filled for forty-five years. In 1772, in addition to his pastoral duties, he established an academy for the education of young men. In 1787 he declined a position in Homerton College. In 1795 he was one of the prime movers in founding the London Missionary Society, and was the first to preside over its deliberations. He died at Caversham Feb. 18, 1818. He published in 1798 *An Apology for Village Preachers*, in answer to an attack made upon them. Mr. Kingsbury was "one of the brightest ornaments of the ministerial character that has graced the Church of God in modern times—a man of rare and exalted worth, possessed of vigor of intellect, sound critical knowledge, as well as depth of piety."—Morison, *Missionary Fathers.* (H. C. W.)

Kingsley, Calvin, D.D., LL.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of Presbyterian

parentage, at Amesville, Oneida County, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1812. His early advantages were rather moderate, but his thirst for knowledge made him superior to circumstances, and he secured whatever he could by night study and the careful improvement of the intervals in his working hours. He was converted at the age of eighteen, and avowed it at once as his purpose to enter the ministry. By teaching country schools he saved enough to partially defray the expenses of a collegiate education, and in 1836 entered Alleghany College, whence he was graduated with honor in the year 1841, having held already, in his sophomore year, the appointment of tutor of mathematics. Immediately after graduation he was elected professor of mathematics in the college, and discharged the duties of that position for several years, taking upon himself also the work of preaching; he had been licensed to preach in 1836. In the year 1843, when Alleghany College was deprived of its assistance from Pennsylvania by an enactment withdrawing all appropriation from the high schools of the state, Kingsley, then an ordained deacon in the Church, was appointed agent "for the peculiarly arduous and thankless task of raising funds for the endowment of his college." About this time, also, the future bishop first came prominently before the general public. He had early entertained strong antislavery predilections, and in 1843 was led to open a public discussion with the distinguished preachers Luther Lee (q. v.) and Elias Smith (q. v.), who had formed the "Wesleyan" organization through disaffection at the position assumed by the Methodist Episcopal Church on the subject of the institution of slavery. In these discussions Kingsley proved himself in every respect the equal, if not the superior, of his antagonists—"men by nature able, and by practice trained to the highest point of effectiveness by their zeal for truth, and laborious study of the whole ground of the controversy." From 1844 to 1845 he was also regular pastor in the city of Erie, where a deep religious influence accompanied his ministrations. While here he had a public discussion with a Universalist minister, and also prepared his lectures on Prof. Bush's work on the *Resurrection*, which were published afterwards under the title *Kingsley on the Resurrection* (1845, and often). Preferring work in the pulpit to that in the rostrum, he resigned his place at Alleghany College in 1846, but the trustees refused to accept the resignation, and, at the most earnest entreaty of many of his friends, he was induced to continue his college relations, even at a considerable pecuniary sacrifice. Besides, however, discharging the duties of his chair, he continued to labor faithfully as a preacher upon the adjacent circuits and stations. In 1852 he was elected a delegate from his Conference to the General Conference, and not only was he at the head of his own Conference delegation, but while in attendance, though a comparative stranger, received, in the election of bishops, some forty votes for this distinguished office. By the next General Conference (1856) he was elected editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, successor of the celebrated late Dr. Elliott. In this place he displayed much editorial ability, and his paper became a powerful influence in the West. In 1860 he was recognised by the General Conference as the leader of the antislavery movement, and was chosen chairman of the Slavery Committee, and managed the discussion on that subject with great taste. He was at that time re-elected editor of *The Advocate*, and at the breaking out of the war brought its whole support to the aid of the government. In 1864, the General Conference, then in session at Philadelphia, promoted him to the high distinction for which he had been a candidate in 1852, and he performed the duties of the position until the summer of 1869, when he took an episcopal tour around the world, but died on his way homeward at Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1870. "As a bishop, he met the highest expectation of the Church. In the chair his decisions were clear and exact. In making the appointments he manifested great sympathy for the preachers and devotion to the interests of the Church. His ministrations were able and successful, and during the six years of his episcopal labor he gave himself wholly to the work of his great office. As a man, he was simple and unaffected in his manners, genial and social in his spirit. His intellect was strong, keen, and logical. He used a ready pen, and his descriptions were clear, concise, and graphic. His sermons were rich in doctrinal truth, and by their clear conception and earnest delivery held the attention of large congregations. His executive power was of a superior order, and each successive year his talents were unfolding" (*Conference Minutes*, 1870, p. 294). The Rev. Dr. Robert Allyn, in his *Personal Recollections of Bishop Kingsley* (*Central Christian Advocate*, June 1, 1870), speaks of him as "a man genial, charitable, honest, earnest, shrewd and far-seeing, patient, careful, logical, and bold in defense and in attack. His square form, solid lips, and broad shoulders were an indication of the wrestler, and his keen, quick eye was that of a master of fence. While he was one of the most diligent of workers, he had just enough of the phlegmatic about his temperament to make him the pluckiest of fighters. He always looked at a *point*, and not at half of the horizon, as many do when they preach or write. His eagle eye would see the mark, no matter how far away, and his steady hand could point the spear to hit it exactly. In his sermonizing there was no attempt at profundity, or speculation, or rhetorical ornamentation, or even logical force; yet it had all these so far as they are of any account. It was emphatically as the rain that cometh down from heaven—falling because the clouds are too full to hold it longer, and never caring on what place it may descend, or what it shall refresh. His thoughts were always clear, and his words exact and often picturesque. He was entirely indifferent to the applause of those to whom he spoke, and was so natural—commonly not graceful in all his manner, that a careless observer would be sure to be deceived into thinking him of less weight than he really had. Every word he chose was a word to help convey his meaning, and he never added another for show; hence a few, who looked for sound rather than sense, might undervalue his preaching; but let a congregation hear him often, and become accustomed to the flash of his eye and the movement of his face as his thoughts came leaping from his heart, and as he attempted to clothe them in words, and they could not fail to be fascinated. He had a magnetic power to keep people awake and to instruct them, and to attach men to him which not many possess. Said he once, 'I cannot soar on the wings of fancy, I can only instruct and convince.'" "In a word," says Dr. Wiley, "his whole character was well rounded and symmetrical as his mind was rigorously logical, and his frame robust, compact, and well knit together. He filled with ability all places to which the Church called him, as pastor, educator, editor, and bishop." Bishop Kingsley left in MS. form a series of lectures he delivered while professor at Meadville, in defence of the Orthodox doctrine. It is to be hoped that they will soon be brought out in book form. They certainly would prove a great addition to our literature on those subjects. Since his decease his letters of travel have been published under the title of *Round the World* (Cincinnati, 1870, 2 vols. 12mo), prefaced by a memoir of the bishop. (J. H. W.)

Kingsley, James Luce, LL.D., an eminent and one of the most successful American educators, born in Scotland, Conn., Aug. 28, 1778, was a lineal descendant of John Kingsley, one of the seven men who in 1636 constituted the first Church in Dorchester, Mass. He entered Williams College at the age of seventeen, and at the end of the freshman year was transferred to Yale, where he graduated in 1799. After teaching in Windham and Wethersfield for two years Mr. Kingsley was appointed tutor in Yale College in 1801, and in 1805 was promoted to the professorship of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages and of ecclesiastical history, a position which he retained till his death in 1852. His studies

were chiefly in language and history, but he was well versed in mathematics, theology, metaphysics, political science, and general literature. The study of the classics had disciplined his judgment and refined his taste, so that his writings were clear, finished, and forcible to the highest degree. As a writer of English, Dr. Dwight called him the American Addison; in Latin, Prof. Thacher says that "Cicero was his model, and he was certainly a successful imitator of his style—surprisingly successful, when we consider how he was dependent on himself for instruction." Prof. Kingsley was at the same time remarkably modest and retiring, the usual accompaniments of true greatness. He very rarely made a public address, although so eminently qualified for the task; and the editions of classical authors which he published as text-books, together with the numerous articles which he contributed to quarterly and monthly periodicals, were commonly anonymous. His Latin compositions were numerous, but rarely published. The congratulatory address which he gave at the inauguration of president Day in 1817, and a similar address at the inauguration of president Woolsey in 1846, have not even been found among his papers. The memorandum of one of his associates attributes to him six such monumental tributes, viz. president Dwight, 1817; colonel David Humphreys, 1818; professor Alexander M. Fisher, 1822; professor M. R. Dutton, 1825; tutor Amos Pettingill, 1832; and Osgood Johnson, 1837. The most elaborate of his writings was the address delivered on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Haven in 1838. It remains a model of thorough investigation and judicious combination. The letters of Prof. Kingsley have been very much admired. With president Sparks, Edward Everett, Dr. Palfrey, Mr. Savage, and other literary gentlemen, he was in constant correspondence, but more particularly with Dr. J. E. Worcester. In the *American Quarterly Register* for April, 1835, and August, 1836, will be found his sketch of the *History of Yale College*, which was also printed as a separate pamphlet (46 pages 8vo). This is regarded as a chief authority in relation to the early history of this celebrated college. The productions of Prof. Kingsley found a large place in the leading American periodicals; he ranked especially prominent among the contributors to the *New Englander*, the *Christian Spectator*, the *Biblical Repository*, and the *North American Review*. For a complete list of his works, see Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* vol. ii, s. v. See also Thacher (Thomas A.), *Commemorative Discourse on Prof. Kingsley* (Oct., 1852).

Kingsley, Phineas, a Presbyterian minister, born in Rutland, Vt., March 12, 1788, educated in the classics by his uncle, a graduate of Harvard College, was licensed to preach about 1818, and ordained at Highgate, Vt., Oct. 12, 1819, where he remained twelve years. He was next settled for seven years at Underhill, Vt., and for the five years following at Sheldon, Vt. In 1847 he removed to Brooklyn, Ohio, and continued preaching to the day of his death, July 6, 1863. "He was highly esteemed by his ministerial brethren, not for showy talents, but for substantial worth and fidelity."—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867.

Kingsmill, Andrew, an English divine, born at Sidmonton, in Hampshire, in 1538, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and removed thence to a fellowship of All Souls in 1558. In the year 1563 there were only three preachers in the university, of whom Kingsmill was one; but after some time, when conformity was pressed, he withdrew from the kingdom and went to Geneva, but at the end of three years moved to Lausanne, where he died in the year 1570, in the prime of life, "leaving behind him," says Neale (*Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 116 sq.), "an excellent pattern of piety, devotion, and all manner of virtue." He was an admired preacher, and a scholar of superior attainments. His memory was most remarkable, for it is said that he could readily rehearse, in the Greek language, all St. Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and other portions of holy Scripture, *memoriter*. His works are: 1. *View of Man's Estate* (1574, 8vo):—2. *Godly Advice touching Marriage* (1580, 8vo):—3. *Treatise for such as are troubled in Mind or afflicted in Body*:—4. *godly Exhortation to bear patiently all Afflictions for the Gospel*:—5. *Conference between a learned Christian and an afflicted Conscience*. (E. de P.)

Kinkaid, Samuel Porterfield, a Presbyterian minister, was born May 24, 1827, in Donegal, Butler County, Pa.; was educated at Washington College, Pa., where he graduated with honor in 1857; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed in the spring of 1859, and during his senior year at the seminary preached at Academia and Rockland, Pa. There his labors were so abundantly successful that immediately upon his graduation he was ordained and installed over the united churches of Academia, Rockland, and Richland. In addition to his pastoral duties, he taught the academy at Freedom, Venango County, Pa. He died March 24, 1866. Kinkaid was marked for his great earnestness and diligence, as well as for his ardent piety and ability to present truth with directness and searching power.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867.

Kinkead, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in St. Louis County, Mo., July 6, 1807, licensed to preach in 1833, and ordained in 1840. His ministerial life was passed entirely in St. Francois and Washington counties, Mo. During the civil war he took every opportunity to favor the Union cause, and thus became obnoxious to the rebels, by whom he was taken from his bed and cruelly murdered on the night of Sept. 26, 1863. Destitute of thorough educational training, he yet excelled in quickness of perception, power of reasoning, and good judgment. Not sectarian in views of doctrine and Church government, he was always tenaciously firm in the support of truth, and watchful against sophistry.—*Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865. (H. C. W.)

Kinnersley, Ebenezer, a Baptist minister, and an eminent scientist, was born in Gloucester, England, in 1711. In 1714 he was brought to America. His early life was spent in Lower Dublin, near Philadelphia, where he pursued his studies under the supervision of his father. He was ordained for the ministry in 1743. In 1746 his attention was directed to scientific pursuits and discoveries. Afterwards he became associated with Dr. Franklin in some of his most splendid discoveries, and delivered scientific lectures in Philade'phia, New York, Boston, and Newport. In 1753 he was chosen chief master of the English school in connection with the academy at Philadelphia, and in 1755 was unanimously elected professor of the English language and of oratory in the college. Successful in this department, he was honored, in 1757, by the trustees with the degree of master of arts, and in 1768 was chosen a member of the American Philosophical Society, which was then composed of the most learned and scientific men in the city. In 1772 he resigned the professorship, and visited the island of Barbadoes on account of his failing health. He afterwards returned to America, and died July 4, 1778. Mr. Kinnersley was of dignified personal appearance, and eminent as a teacher of public speaking. He acquired his chief renown not in the ministry, but in his scientific pursuits and experiments.—See Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vi, 45. (J. L. S.)

Kinnim. See Lice; Talmud.

Kinsman. Of the four Hebrew words thus translated in the A. V., three, שְׁאֵר (Numb. xxvii, 11; "kinswoman," Lev. xviii, 12, 13; elsewhere "kin," etc.; and so שְׁאֵרָה, "kinswomen," Lev. xviii, 17), מוֹדָע (literally *acquaintance*, Ruth ii, 1), and קָרוֹב (Psa. xxxviii, 12 [11]; Job xix, 14, A. V. "kinsfolk," literally *near*, as often), indicate simple relationship. The remaining one, גֹּאֵל, along

with that, implies certain obligations arising out of that relationship. The term גֹּאֵל, *goël'*, is derived by the lexicographers from the verb גָּאַל, *to redeem*. That the two are closely connected is certain, but whether the meaning of the verb is derived from that of the noun, or the converse, may be made matter of question. The comparison of the cognate dialects leads to the conclusion that the primary idea lying at the basis of both is that of *coming to the help* or *rescue* of one, hence *giving protection, redeeming, avenging*. In this case the גֹּאֵל of the O. T. would, in fundamental concept, answer pretty nearly to the παράκλητος or *paraclete* of the N. T. The goël among the Hebrews was the nearest male blood relation alive. To him, as such, three rights specially belonged, and on him corresponding duties devolved towards his next of kin. See KINDRED.

1. When an Israelite through poverty sold his inheritance and was unable to redeem it, it devolved upon one of his kin to purchase it (Lev. xxv, 25–28; Ruth iii; iv). So also, when an Israelite had through proverty sold himself into slavery, it devolved upon the next of kin, as his goël, to ransom him in the jubilee year (Lev. xxv, 47 sq.). See JUBILEE, YEAR OF. In allusion to this, God is frequently represented as the goël of his people, both as he redeems them from temporal bondage (Exod. vi, 6; Isa. xliii, 1; xlviii, 20; Jer. l, 34, etc.) and from the bondage of sin and evil (Isa. xli, 14; xliv, 6, 22; xlix. 7; Psa. ciii, 4; Job xix. 25, etc.). In some of these passages there is an obvious Messianic reference, to which the fact that our redemption from sin has been effected by one who has become near of kin to us by assuming our nature gives special force (comp. Heb. ii, 14). See REDEEMER.

2. When an Israelite who had wronged any one sought to make restitution, but found that the party he had wronged was dead without leaving a son, it fell to the next of kin of the injured party, as his goël, to represent him and receive the reparation (Numb. v, 6 sq.). The law provided that in case of his having no one sufficiently near of kin to act for him in this way, the property restored should go to the priest, as representing Jehovah, the King of Israel—a provision which the Jews say indicates that the law has reference to strangers, as "no Israelite could be without a redeemer, for if any one of his tribe was left he would be his heir" (Maimon. in *Baba Kama*, ix, 11). See GOEL.

3. The most striking office of the goël was that of acting as the avenger of blood in case of the murder of his next of kin; hence the phrase גֹּאֵל הַדָּם, *the blood-avenger*. In the heart of man there seems to be a deep-rooted feeling that where human life has been destroyed by violence the offence can be expiated only by the life of the murderer; hence, in all nations where the rights of individuals are not administered by a general executive acting under the guidance of law, the rule obtains that where murder has been committed the right and duty of retaliation devolves on the kindred of the murdered person. Among the Shemitic tribes this took the form of a personal obligation resting on the nearest of kin — a custom which still prevails among the Arabs (Niebuhr, *Des. d'Arabie*, ch. 7). This deep-rooted feeling and established usage the Mosaic legislation sought to place under such regulations as would tend to prevent the excesses and disorders to which personal retaliation is apt to lead, without attempting to preclude the indulgence of it. (Mohammed also sought to bring the practice under restraint without forbidding it [see *Koran*, ii, 173–5; xvii, 33].) Certain cities of refuge were provided, to which the manslayer might endeavor to escape. If the goël overtook him before he reached any of these cities, he might put him to death; but if the fugitive succeeded in gaining the asylum, he was safe until at least an investigation had been instituted as to the circumstances of the murder. If on inquiry it was found that the party had been guilty of deliberate murder, the law delivered him up to the goël, to be put to death by him in any way he pleased; but if the murder was accidental, the manslayer was entitled to the protection of the asylum he had reached. See CITY OF REFUGE. He was safe, however, only within its precincts, for if the goël found him beyond these he was at liberty to kill him. Among some of the Oriental nations the right of blood-revenge might be satisfied by the payment of a sum of money, but this practice, which obviously gave to the rich an undue advantage over the poor in matters of this sort, the law of Moses absolutely prohibits (Numb. xxxv, 31). See BLOOD-REVENGE.

From the narrative in Ruth iii and iv it has been concluded that among the duties of the goël was that of marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, so as to raise up seed to the deceased, thus identifying the office of the goël with that of the levir, as provided for in Deut. xxv, 5–10. See MARRIAGE. But the levirate law expressly limits the obligation to a brother, and, according to the Jewish commentators, to a full brother by the father's side (Maimonides, quoted by Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 372), and in this relation neither Boaz nor the other kinsman stood to Elimelech or his sons. It is further evident that the question was one of right rather than one of duty, and that the kinsman who waived his right incurred no disgrace thereby, such as one who declined to fulfil the levirate law incurred. The nearest kinsman had the right to redeem the land, and the redemption of the land probably involved the marrying of the widow of the deceased owner, according to usage and custom; but the law did not enjoin this, nor did the goël who declined to avail himself of his right come under any penalty or ban. The case of the goël and that of the levir would thus be the converse of each other: the goël had a right to purchase the land, but in so doing came under an obligation from custom to marry the widow of the deceased owner; the levir was bound to marry the widow of his deceased brother, which involved, as a matter of course, the redemption of his property if he had sold it (see Selden, *De Success. in bon. defunct.* c. 15; Benary, *De Hebræorum Leviratu*, p. 19 sq.; Bertheau, *Exeget. Hdb. zum A. T.* pt. vi, p. 249; Michaelis, *On the Laws of Moses*, ii, 129 sq.) See LEVIRATE LAW.

Kipling, THOMAS, an English divine, born in Yorkshire about the middle of the 18th century, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as B.A. in 1768, and became D.D. in 1784. His first prominent position was that of deputy regius professor of divinity under bishop Watson, and later he was promoted to the deanery of Peterborough. In 1792 Kipling preached the Boyle Lectures, which were not published. In 1793 he brought out at the university press a very handsome edition of the famous "Codex Bezæ" of the N. T., with fac-simile types (*Codex Bezæ, Quadratis literis, Græco-Latinis*, 2 vols. folio), which was immediately assailed with a virulence amounting to personal hostility by the party which had espoused the cause of the once notorious Frend, who was banished the university for Unitarianism, and in whose case Kipling had come forward as promoter, or public prosecutor. Dr. Edwards, the leader of the party, charged him with ignorance and want of fidelity. But, though his prolegomena do not manifest much accurate scholarship, and he commits the serious error of printing the *corrections* instead of the original reading of the *text*, which he relegated to the notes at the end, Tregelles (*Introd. to Text. Crit. of N. Test.*) allows that he "appears to have used scrupulous exactitude in performing his task efficiently according to the plan which he had proposed to himself." Kipling also published *The Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistical* (1802, 8vo), written in answer to Overton's *True Churchman ascertained*. He died in 1822. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 766.

Kippah. See PALM.

Kippis, Andrew, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., an eminent English Unitarian divine, was born at Nottingham in 1725. He studied under Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, and in 1746 became minister of a congregation at Boston, Lincolnshire. In 1750 he removed to Dorking, and in 1753 became the pastor of a Presbyterian congregation of Unitarian tendency at Prince's Street, Westminster, with which society he continued connected till his death, which occurred in 1795. The duties arising out of this connection, however, did not preclude Dr. Kippis from seeking other means of public usefulness. In 1763 he became a tutor in an academy for the education of dissenting ministers in London, on a plan similar to that on which the academy at Northampton had been conducted. He was also one of the principal contributors to the *Monthly Review* and the *Gentleman's Magazine* at a time when these were considered the leading periodicals of England. There are several pamphlets of his on the claims of the dissenters, and on other topics of temporary interest; but the work with which his name is most honorably connected is the republication of the *Biographia Britannica*, with a large addition of new lives, and a more extended account of many persons whose lives are in the former edition of that work. The design was too vast to be accomplished by any one person, however well assisted. Five large folio volumes were printed of the work (1778), and yet it had proceeded no further than to the name of Fastolf. Part of a sixth volume, it is understood, was printed, but it has not been given to the world. Many of the new lives were written by Dr. Kippis himself, and particularly that of captain Cook, which was printed in a separate form also. Dr. Kippis's was a literary life of great industry. He was the editor of the collected edition of the works of Dr. Nathaniel Lardner (q. v.), with a life of that eminent theological scholar. He published also the ethical and theological lectures of his tutor, Dr. Doddridge, with a large collection of references to authors on the various topics to which they relate. His other works of interest are, *Sermon on Luke ii*, 25 (Lond. 1780, 8vo):—*Sermon on Psalm cxlix*, 15 (London, 1788, 8vo):—*A Vindication of Protestant Dissenting Ministers* (1773). See Rees, *Funeral Serm.*; *Gent. Mag.* vols. lxv, lxvi, lxxiv; Darling, *Encyclopædia Bibliog.* s. v.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Kippod. See Bittern.

Kippoz. See Owl.

Kir (Heb. *id.*, קִיר, a *wall* or *fortress*, as often; Sept. always as an appellative, τεῖχος, πόλις, βόθρος, etc., but v. r. Χαρράν, Κυρηνή, etc.), a people and country subject to the Assyrian empire, mentioned in connection with Elam (Isa. xxii, 6), to which the conquered Damascenes were transplanted (2 Kings xvi, 9; Amos i, 5), and whence the Aramæans in the east of Syria at some time or other migrated (Amos ix, 7). This is supposed by major Rennel to be the same country which still bears the name of *Kur*distan or *Koor*distan (*Geogr. of Herodot.* p. 391). There are, however, objections to this view which do not apply so strongly to the notion of Rosenmüller and others, that it was a tract on the river *Cyrus* (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vi, 10; Ptolemy, v, 12) (Κῦρος and Κόρρος, in Zend *Koro*), which rises in the mountains between the Euxine and Caspian Seas, and runs into the latter after being joined by the Araxes (Büsching, *Magaz.* x, 420; compare Michaelis, *Spicil.* ii, 121; *Suppl.* 2191; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 1210); still called *Kur* (Bonomi, *Niveveh*, p. 47, 71). *Gur*jistan, or Grusia (Grusiana), commonly called Georgia, seems also to have derived its name from this river *Kur*, which flows through it. Others compare *Curena* or *Curna* of Ptolemy (Κουρήνα or Κοῦρνα, vi, 2, 10, Chald. קִרְנֵי), a city in the south of Media, on the river Mardus (Bochart, *Phaleg*, iv, 32); Vitringa the city *Carine*, also in Media (Καρίνη, Ptolemy, vi, 2, 15), now called *Kerend* (Ritter, *Erdk.* ix, 391). Some region in Media is perhaps most suitable from the fact that Armenia, whose northern boundaries are washed by the river Cyrus, was probably not a part of Assyria at the time referred to (see Knobel, *Prophet.* ii, 108), Keil (*Comment. on Kings*, ad loc.) thinks the Medes must be meant, erroneously imagining that the inhabitants of Kir are spoken of in Isaiah as good bowmen. The Sept. (Vat. MS. at 2 Kings), the Vulg., and Chald. (at 2 Kings and Amos), and Symmachus (at Amos ix), render *Cyrene!*

For *Kir of Moab* (Isa. xv, 1), see Kir-Moab.

Kirâtârjunîya, one of the most celebrated poems of Sanscrit literature, the production of Bhâravi, depicts the conflict of Arjuna with the god Siva in his disguise of a kirâta, or mountaineer.

Kirchentag. See Church Diet.

Kircher, Athanasius, an eminent German Jesuit, and quite prominent as a philosopher, was born near Fulda, Germany, in 1601. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1618, and taught mathematics and metaphysics in the college at Würzburg. During the inroads of the Swedes he fled before the Protestant powers, and, after a short stay in France, went to Rome, and became a professor at the Propaganda. He died in 1680. His writings, which extend over the different departments of the natural sciences, philosophy, philology, history, and archæology, evince great talent, but are often fanciful in their theories. His principal works of interest to us are, *Œdipus Ægyptiacus*, etc. (Romæ, 1652, etc., 4 vols. fol.):—*Mundus subterraneus, in xii libros digestus*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1665, fol.):—*Arca Noë, in tres libros digesta*, etc. (Amst. 1675):—*Liber philologicus de sono artificioso, sive musica*, etc. (in Ugolino's *Thesaurus*, xxxii, 353):—*Liber diacriticus de Musurgia, antiquo-moderna* (Ugolino, xxxii, 417):—*China, monumentis, qua sacris, qua profanis, illustrata* (Amst. 1667, fol.):—*Turris Babel, sive Archontologia*, etc. (Amst. 1679, fol.); etc. See his *Autobiography and Letters* (Augsb. 1684); Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol. vi, s. v.; Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliog.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Kircher, Konrad, a learned German philologian of Augsburg, of the 16th century, was a Lutheran pastor first at Donauwerth and later at Jaxtdorf, and died about 1622. He wrote *Concordiæ veteris Testamenti Græcæ Ebræis vocibus respondentes* (Francf. 1607, 2 vols. 4to; greatly enlarged by Abrah. Trommius, Amst. 1718):—*De usu concordantiorum Græcorum in Theologia.* See Simon, *Hist. Crit. du Vieux Testament*, i, 3, ch. ii, *Allgem. Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 33.

Kirchhofer, Melchior, a celebrated Swiss ecclesiastical writer, was born Jan. 3, 1775, at Schaffhausen, and was educated at Marburg. In 1797 he returned to Switzerland, and was ordained for the holy ministry. His first important position he secured in 1808 at Stein, and this he filled up to his death, Feb. 13, 1853. He is quite celebrated for his able efforts in the department of Church History, which procured for him in 1840 the doctorate of theology from the University of Marburg. Among the especially valuable writings of Kirchhofer are his monographs on Hofmeister (1810), Oswald Myconius (1813), Werner Steiner (1818), Berthold Haller (1828), Wilhelm Farel (1831), and his continuation of Hottingers' *Ecclesiastical History of Switzerland.*—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 708.

Kirchmayr, Thomas, a German theologian, was born at Straubingen, Bavaria, in the early part of the 16th century; became pastor first at Stadtsulza, in Thuringia, and later (in 1541) at Kahla. He died at Wiesbach in 1563. Kirchmayr is noted as the author of a commentary on 1 John, in which he advocates the predestination theory in a somewhat peculiar manner. He teaches that the chosen ones never lose the influence of the holy Spirit, however great their transgression. He was criticised and obliged to quit the pulpit.—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 534.

Kirchmeier, Johann Christoph, a noted German theologian, was born at Orpherode, Hesse, Sept. 4,

1674, and was educated at the University of Marburg. He became in 1700 professor of philosophy at Herborn, in the year following regular professor of theology at the same high-school, and in 1702 removed in this capacity to Heidelberg. In 1723 he returned to Marburg, and was promoted to the highest honors that his alma mater could bestow. He died March 15, 1743. Kirchmeier was the honor and pride of the German Reformed Church in Marburg, and his memory is revered to this day. A list of his writings, which are mostly of a controversial nature and in pamphlet form, is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands d.* 18*ten und* 19*ten Jahrh.* ii, 94 sq.

Kirchmeier, Johann Siegmund, a German theologian of note, was born at Allendorf Jan. 4, 1674, and was educated at Marburg and Leyden. In 1703 he became pastor at Schwebda. In 1704 he accepted the professorship of logic and metaphysics at Marburg University, and at the same time became pastor of a Reformed church at Marburg. He died April 23, 1749. His writings, mainly dissertations, are enumerated by Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands d.* 18*en u.* 19*ten Jahrh.* ii, 99 sq.

Kirghis, or KIRGHIS-KAISAKI (*Cossacks of the Steppes*), is the name of a people spread over the immense territory bounded by the Volga, desert of Obshtchei (in 55° N. lat.), the Irtish, Chinese Turkestan, Ala-Tau Mountains, the Sir-Daria, and Aral, and Caspian Seas—a vast tract of land, not unfrequently designated as the "Eastern Steppe," and containing 850,000 English square miles; sterile, stony, and streamless, and covered with rank herbage five feet high. The Kirghis are of Turkish origin, and speak the Uzbek idiom of their race. They have from time immemorial been divided into three branches, called the *Great, Middle, and Little Hordes.* The first of these wanders in the south-west portion of the Eastern Steppe; the Middle Horde roams over the territory between the Ishim, Irtish, Lake Balkhash, and the territory of the Little Horde. The Little Horde (now more numerous than the other two together) ranges over the country bounded by the Ural, Tobol, Siberian Kirghis, and Turkestan. (A small offshoot of them has, since 1801, wandered between the Volga and the Ural river, and is under rule of the governor of Astrachan.) South of Lake Issikul is a wild mountain tribe called the *Diko-Kamennaja*, the only tribe which calls itself Kirghis. They are called by their neighbors *Kara* or Black Kirghis, and are of Mandshûr stock. Their collective numbers are estimated at upwards of 1½ millions of souls, more than half of whom belong to the Little Horde. This people is, with the exception above mentioned, nomadic, and is ruled by sultans or khans. They are restless and predatory, and have well earned for themselves the title of the "Slave-hunters of the Steppes," by seizing upon caravans, appropriating the goods, and selling their captives at the great slave-markets of Khiva, Bokhara, etc. Their wealth consists of cattle, sheep, horses, and camels. They are of the Moslem faith, in a somewhat corrupt form, and, like the followers of Mohammed, are the sworn enemies of the Mongols. "Fired by hereditary hate," says Dixon (*Russia*, p. 339 sq.), "these Kirghis bandits look upon every man of Mongolian birth and Buddhistic faith as lawful spoil. They follow him to his pastures, plunder his tent, drive off his herds, and sell him as a slave. But when this lawful prey escapes their hands they raid and rob on more friendly soil, and many of the captives whom they carry to Khiva and Bokhara come from the Persian valleys of Atrek and Meshid. Girls from these valleys fetch a higher price, and Persia has not strength enough to protect her children from their raids." Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of Russia to educate the Kirghis, there are among them at the present time only twelve schools, attended by about 370 children. See Chambers, *Cyclopœdia*, vol. v, s. v.; Brockhaus, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. viii, s. v. Kirgesen.

Kir-har'aseth (2 Kings iii, 25), **Kir-har'eseth** (Isa. xvi, 7), **Kir-ha'resh** (Isa. xvi, 11), **Kir-he'res** (Jer. xlviii, 31, 36). See KIR-MOAB.

Kiriatha'im (Jer. xlviii, 1, 23; Ezek. xxv, 9). See KIRJATHAIM.

Kiriathia'rius (Κιριαθιάριος v. r. Καριαθιρί, *Vulg. Crearpatros*), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. v, 19) for *Kirjath-arim* (Ezra ii, 25), or KIRJATH-JEARIM (Neh. vii, 29).

Kir'ioth (Amos ii, 2). See KERIOTH.

Kir'jath (Josh. xviii, 28). See KIRJATH-JEARIM; also the following names, of which this is the first part.

Kirjatha'im (Heb. *Kiryatha'yim*, קִרְיָתַיִם, *two cities*, i. e. double-town; Sept. Καριαθάϊμ, but Καριαθάμ in Numb.; ἡ πόλις in Gen.; v. r. Καριαθέμ or Καριαθέν in Jer. and Ezek.; πόλις παραθαλλασσία [apparently mistaking the directive termination יַם for יָם] in Ezek.; Auth. Vers. "Kiriathaim" in Jer. and Ezek.), the name of two places.

1. One of the most ancient towns in the country east of the Jordan (see Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* i, 308), as it was possessed by the gigantic Emim (Gen. xiv, 5), who were expelled by the Moabites (compare Deut. ii, 9, 10), and these, in their turn, were dispossessed by the Amorites, from whom it was taken by the Israelites. Kirjathaim was then assigned to Reuben (Numb. xxxii, 37; Josh. xiii, 19); but during the Assyrian exile the Moabites again took possession of this and other towns (Jer. xlviii, 1, 23; Ezek. xxv, 9). Burckhardt (*Travels*, p. 367) found ruins, called *El-Teim*, which he conjectures to have been Kiri*athaim*, the last syllable of the name being retained. This is somewhat doubtful, as the Christian village *Kariatha* or *Koreiatha* (Καριάθα, Καριάθα) of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) is placed ten miles west of Medeba, whereas El-Teim is but two miles (Seetzen places it at half an hour, *Reise*, i, 408). Michaelis (*Orient. u. exeg. Bibl.* iii, 120; *Suppl.* 2203 sq.) compares the modern city *Kirjathaim*, one day's journey from Palmyra (Wood, *Ruins of Palmyra*, p. 34); and Büsching (*Erdb.* xi, 568) adduces *Kariathaim* (in Pliny, vi, 32, *Carriata*), a place in the desert of Arabia; but both these identifications are inadmissible (Hamesveld, iii, 169). Ritter (*Erdkunde*, xv, 1185, 1186) supposes that the *Onomasticon* confounds two places of the same name, one being the ancient city corresponding to El-Teim, north of the wady Zurka, and the other the Christian town, represented by the modern *Kureyat*, south of the same wady; but we see no occasion for this, as the latter place, the name of which fully agrees, lies at the required distance (eleven miles, Seetzen, *Reise*, ii, 342) south-west of Medeba (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 300), upon the southern slope of Jebel Attarus (perhaps referred to by Eusebius in the expression annexed to his description, ἐπὶ τὸν Βάριν, *on the Baris*, using the term in the sense of a fortress on a *hill*-top rather than alluding to a position beyond the valley Zurka-Main, which Ritter, p. 578, fancifully conceives to be thus indicated from the abundance of mandrakes, βαάρας). See KERIOTH, 2.

2. A city of refuge in the tribe of Naphtali (1 Chron. vi, 76); elsewhere (Josh. xxi, 32) called KARTAN (q. v.).

Kirjath-ar'ba (Hebrew *Kiryath'-Arba'*, קִרְיַת אַרְבַּע, *city of Arba;* Sept. πόλις Ἀρβόκ, Gen. xxiii, 2; Judg. xiv, 15; xv, 13, 54; xx, 7; Καριαθαρβόκ, Josh. xxi, 11; Judg. i, 10; πόλις τοῦ πεδίου, Gen. xxxv, 27; once with the art. קִרְיַת הָאַרְבַּע, *Kiryath'-ha-Arba';* Septuag. Καριαθαρβό v. r. Καριαθαρβόκ, Neh. xi, 25; Auth. Vers. "city of Arba," in Gen. xxxv, 27; Josh. xv, 13; xxi, 11), the original name of HEBRON, in the mountains of Judah, so called from its founder, one of the Anakim, and inhabited under the same name after the exile. Hengstenberg, however, thinks that Hebron was the earlier name, and Kirjath-Arba only was imposed by the Canaanites (*Beitr.* iii, 187). Sir John Mandeville (cir. 1322) found it still "called by the Saracens *Karcarba*, and by the Jews *Arbotha*" (*Early Travels*, p. 161).

It is a Jewish gloss (first mentioned by Jerome) which interprets the latter part of the name (אַרְבַּע, *arba*, Heb. "four") as referring to the four great men buried there (the saints Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; so the Talmud, see Keil, ad loc.; or the giants Anak, Ahiman, Sheshai, and Tolmai, according to Bochart, *Canan*, i, 1).

Kir'jath-a'rim (Ezra ii, 25). See KIRJATH-JEARIM.

Kir'jath-ba'äl (Heb. *Kiryath'-Ba'äl*, קִרְיַת־בַּעַל, *city of Baal;* Sept. Καριαθβάαλ), another name (Josh. xv, 60; xviii, 14) for KIRJATH-JEARIM (q. v.). See also BAALAH.

Kir'jath-hu'zoth (Heb. *Kiryath'-Chutsoth'*, קִרְיַת חֻצוֹת, *city of streets;* Sept. πόλεις ἐπαύλεων), a city of Moab to which Balak took Balaam on his arrival to offer a preparatory sacrifice (Numb. xxii, 39). The Vulgate understands an extreme city of the territory of Moab, as that on the border of Arnon, where the king met his prophetic guest (verse 36); but the two appear to have been different. The city in question was probably the capital of the Moabitish king, usually called KIR-MOAB, and here distinguished from other places of a similar name (*Kirjath* meaning simply "city") by an epithet indicative of its extent; compare the presence of the court and "high places of Baal," as well as the conspicuous situation of the city (verse 41), corresponding to that of Kerak. Porter, however (Murray's *Handbook for Pal.* p. 299 sq.), inclines to identify the place with the *Keireyat* on Jebel Attarus, and so with KIRIATHAIM (q. v.).

Kir'jath-je'ärim (Heb. *Kiryath'-Yeärim'*, קִרְיַת יְעָרִים, *city of forests;* Sept. Καριαθιαρείμ, Josh. xviii, 14; Judg. xviii, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 50, 52; 2 Chron. i, 4; Neh. vii, 29; Jer. xxvi, 20; Κιριαθαρίμ, 1 Sam. vi, 21; vii, 1, 2; v. r. 1 Chron. ii, 50, 52; 2 Chron. i, 4; Neh. vii, 29; Jer. xxi, 20; πόλις Ἰαρείμ, Josh. xv, 9, 60; 1 Chron. xiii, 5 [v. r. Ἰαρίμ]; πόλεις Ἰαρείμ, Josh. ix, 17; Καριαθιαείρ v. r. πόλις Ἰαΐρ, 1 Chron. ii, 53; Καριαθβάαλ, Josh. xiii, 15; omits in 1 Chron. xiii, 6 [or, rather, paraphrases the words "Baalah, which is Kirjath-jearim," by πόλις Δαυίδ]; Josephus ἡ τῶν Καριαθιαριμιτῶν πόλις, *Ant.* vi, 2, 1; with the art. קִרְיַת הַיְּעָרִים, Jer. xxvi, 20), in the contracted form KIRJATH-ARIM (Heb. *Kiryath'-Arim'*, קִרְיַת עָרִים, Ezra ii, 25; Sept. Καριαθιαρείμ v. r. Καριαθιαρίμ), and simply KIRJATH (Heb. *Kiryath'*, קִרְיַת, Josh. xviii, 28; Sept. πόλις Ἰαριείμ), one of the towns of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 17). It belonged to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 60; Judg. xviii, 12), and lay on the border of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 15; 1 Chron. ii, 50), to which it was finally assigned (Josh. xviii, 28). It was to this place that the ark was brought from Beth-shemesh, after it had been removed from the land of the Philistines, and where it remained till removed to Jerusalem by David (1 Sam. vii; 1 Chron. xiii). This was one of the ancient sites which were again inhabited after the exile (Ezra ii, 25; Neh. vii, 29). It was also called KIRJATH-BAAL (Josh. xv, 60; xviii, 14), and BAALAH (Josh. xv, 9). It appears to have lain not far from Beeroth (Ezra ii, 25). "It is included in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 50, 52) as founded by or descended from Shobal, the son of Caleb ben-Hur, and as having in its turn sent out the colonies of the Ithrites, Puhites, Shumathites, and Mishraites, and those of Zorah and Eshtaol. 'Behind Kirjath-jearim' the band of Danites pitched their camp before their expedition to Mount Ephraim and Laish, leaving their name attached to the spot for long after (Judg. xviii, 12). See MAHANEH-DAN. Hitherto, beyond the early sanctity implied in its bearing the name of BAAL, there is nothing remarkable in Kirjath-jearim. It was no doubt this reputation for sanctity which made the people of Beth-shemesh appeal to its inhabitants to relieve them of the ark of Jehovah, which was bringing such calamities on their untutored inexperience. From their place in the valley they looked anxiously for some eminence, which, according to the belief of those days, should be the appropriate seat for so powerful a Deity [see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 539] (1 Sam. vi, 20, 21). In this high place—'the hill' (הַגִּבְעָה)—under the charge of Eleazar, son of Abinadab, the ark remained for twenty years (vii, 22), during which period the spot became the resort of pilgrims from all parts, anxious to offer sacrifices and perform vows to Jehovah (Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 2, 1). Sixty-two years after the close of that time Kirjath-jearim lost its sacred treasure, on its removal by David to the house of Obed-edom the Gittite (1 Chron. xiii, 5, 6; 2 Chron. i, 4; 2 Sam. vi, 2, etc.). It is very remarkable and suggestive that in the account of this transaction the ancient and heathen name Baal is retained. In fact, in 2 Sam. vi, 2—probably the original statement—the name Baale is used without any explanation, and to the exclusion of that of Kirjath-jearim. In the allusion to this transaction in Psa. cxxxii, 6, the name is obscurely indicated as the 'wood'—*yaar*, the root of Kirjath-*jearim*. We also hear of a prophet Urijah ben-Shemaiah, a native of the place, who enforced the warnings of Jeremiah, and was cruelly murdered by Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi, 20, etc.), but of the place we know nothing beyond what has already been said. A tradition is mentioned by Adrichomius (*Descr. T. S.* Dan. § 17), though without stating his authority, that it was the native place of 'Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, who was slain between the altar and the Temple'" (Smith). Josephus says it was near Beth-shemesh (*Ant.* vi, 1, 4). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Βαάλ, *Baal-carathiarim*) speak of it as being in their day a village nine or ten miles from Diospolis (Lydda), on the road to Jerusalem; consequently north-west (Hamesveld, iii, 266). With this description, and the former of these two distances, agrees Procopius (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 503). On account of its presumed proximity to Beth-shemesh, Williams (*Holy City*) endeavors to identify Kirjath-jearim with *Deir el-Howa*, east of Ain Shems. But this, though sufficiently near the latter place, does not answer to the other conditions. Dr. Robinson thinks it possible that the ancient Kirjath-jearim may be recognised in the present *Kuryet el-Enab*. The first part of the name (Kirjath, Kuryet, signifying *city*) is the same in both, and is most probably ancient, being found in Arabic proper names only in Syria and Palestine, and not very frequently even there. The only change has been that the ancient "city of forests" has, in modern times, become the "city of grapes." The site is also about three hours, or nine Roman miles from Lydda, on the road to Jerusalem, and not very remote from Gibeon, from which Kirjath-jearim could not well have been distant. So close a correspondence of name and position seems to warrant the conclusion in favor of Kuryet el-Enab (see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi, 108–110). This place is that which ecclesiastical tradition has identified with the Anathoth of Jeremiah (i, 1; comp. Jerome, ad loc.; also *Onomasticon*, s. v.; Josephus, *Ant.* x, 7, 3), which, however, is at Anata. Kuryet el-Enab is now a poor village, its principal buildings being an old convent of the Minorites and a Latin church. The latter is now deserted, and is used for a stable, but is said to be one of the largest and most solidly constructed churches in Palestine (Robinson, ii, 109, 334–337). The village is prettily situated in a basin, on the north side of a spur jutting out from the western hills. The only well-built houses are those belonging to the family of the sheiks Abu-Ghosh, who for the last half century have been the terror of travellers, but have lately been overtaken with punishment by the Turkish government. Dr. Robinson remarks that "a pretty direct route from Beth-shemesh would pass up on the east of Yeshua and along wady Ghurab; but no such road now exists, and probably never did, judging from the nature of the country. In all probability, the ark was brought up by way of Saris" (*Researches*, new ed., iii, 157). Schwarz, who identifies Kirjath-jearim with the same site, suggests that the hill

(which he calls Mount Midan) south-west of the village, and just south of Kuryet es-Saideh, may be the "Mount Jearim" spoken of in Josh. xv, 10 (but different from Mount Baalah of ver. 11); both places having taken the title Jearim from the intervening tract of land, perhaps once covered with wood (*Palest.* p. 97). It is the testimony of a recent traveller (Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 178) that in the immediate neighborhood, on the ridge probably answering to Mount Jearim, there still are "real woods, so thick and so solitary, he had seen nothing like them since he left Germany."

Kir'jath-san'nah (Hebrew *Kiryath'-Sannah'*, קִרְיַת־סַנָּה, perh. *city of Sannah;* Josh. xv, 49; Sept. πόλις γραμμάτων), usually *Kirjath-se'pher* (Heb. *Kiryath'-Se'pher*, קִרְיַת־סֵפֶר, *book-city;* Sept. πόλις γραμμάτων, Josh. xv, 15, 16; Judg. i, 11; πόλις τῶν γραμμάτων, Judg. i, 12; v. r. Καριαθσέφερ, Judg. i, 11), in later times (Josh. xv, 15, 49; Judg. i, 11) called DEBIR (q. v.), a Canaanitish royal city (Josh. x, 38), afterwards included within the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 48; comp. Judg. i, 11), but assigned to the priests (Josh. xxi, 15; 1 Chron. vi, 58; compare Hamesveld, iii, 224). The name Debir means a *word* or *oracle*, and is applied to that most secret and separated part of the Temple, or of the most holy place, in which the ark of the covenant was placed, and in which responses were given from above the cherubim. From this, coupled with the fact that Kirjath-sepher means "city of writing," it has been conjectured that Debir was some particularly sacred place or seat of learning among the Canaanites, and a repository of their records. "It is not, indeed, probable," as professor Bush remarks (note ad loc. Josh.), "that writing and books, in our sense of the words, were very common among the Canaanites; but some method of recording events, and a sort of learning, was doubtless cultivated in those regions." Bochart (*Canaan*, ii, 17) explains the latter part of the name Kirjath-sannah as being a Phœnician term equivalent to the Arabic *sunna* or "precept," which would be in keeping with the above explanation of the other terms. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 962, 1237) thinks it a term expressive of the *palm*, and Fürst (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.) thinks it denotes the *senna* plant. Debir was taken by Joshua (x, 38); but it being afterwards retaken by the Canaanites, Caleb, to whom it was assigned, gave his daughter Achsah in marriage to his nephew Othniel for his bravery in carrying it by storm (Josh. xv, 16). It was situated in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 49), to the south of Hebron (Josh. x, 38; see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.), and on a high spot not very far from it (Josh. xv, 15), and appears to have been strongly fortified (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii, 289). These circumstances and the associated names (Josh. xv, 48–50) appear to indicate a position on the mountains southwest of Hebron, in the vicinity of *ed-Dhoheriyeh*, which has a commanding situation and some ruins (Robinson's *Researches*, i, 311).

Kirk, a word meaning *circle*, in the sense of "assembly" or "company;" the original word being Saxon, and supposed by some to have come from the Greek κυριακόν, *dominicum*, "The Lord's house." The word *Church* is the same as "Kirk," and has the same signification as "congregation" or assembly, which are elsewhere given as translations of the original word ἐκκλησία. The established religion of Scotland (the Presbyterian) is usually called the *Kirk of Scotland*. See SCOTLAND.

Kirkland, John Thornton, D.D., LL.D., an eminent American Unitarian divine, was born at Herkimer, N. Y., Aug. 17, 1770. His youthful days were spent at Stockbridge, Mass. At the age of thirteen he went to Phillips Academy, then under the care of Dr. Eliphalet Pearson, and in 1785, with the patronage of the excellent judge Phillips, he entered Harvard University. He passed through college with a high reputation for scholarship, especially excelling in the departments of languages and metaphysics, and graduated in 1789 with distinguished honors. Shortly after he went to Stockbridge, and commenced the study of theology under the direction of Dr. Stephen West; but the strict views of theology to which he was here introduced were little to his taste, and he soon after returned to Cambridge, where he found himself in a much more congenial theological atmosphere. In November, 1792, while still prosecuting his theological studies, he was appointed tutor of metaphysics in Harvard University, and held this office until February, 1794, when he was ordained, and installed pastor of the New South Church, Boston. Here he soon drew around him an intelligent and discriminating congregation, among whom were some of the leading men of the times. In 1802 he was honored with the degree of doctor of divinity from the College of New Jersey, and in 1810 with the degree of doctor of laws from Brown University. So high was his professional reputation at that time, and so commanding the influence he had acquired, that in 1810 he was elected to the presidency of Harvard University. Dr. Kirkland's presidency marked a brilliant epoch in the history of the college. Under his administration the course of studies was greatly enlarged; the law school was established; the medical school reorganized; four different professorships in the academical department endowed and filled; three new buildings erected, and immense additions made to the library. In August, 1827, he suffered a stroke of paralysis, which led him, in March, 1828, to resign his office as president; and in April he set out on a long journey through the Western and Southern States, and afterwards spent three years and a half in visiting foreign countries. He died April 26, 1840. Dr. Kirkland was a person of simple, dignified, and winning manners; he had great natural dignity; there was an unstudied grace in his whole bearing and demeanor. His mind was of an ethical turn; he was distinguished as a moralist, and seemed to possess a thorough, intimate, and marvellous knowledge of men. He was remarkable, too, for the comprehensiveness of his views and the universality of his judgments. He always generalized on a large scale, and even his conversation was a succession of aphorisms, maxims, and general remarks. His publications consisted of a few occasional *Discourses*, several contributions to the periodicals of that day, and a *Memoir of Fisher Ames*. See Ware, *Amer. Unitarian Biog.* i, 273; *Christian Examiner*, xxix, 232. (J. L. S.)

Kirkland, Samuel, a Congregational minister, was born Dec. 1, 1741, at Norwich, Conn. He received his degree from the College of New Jersey, 1765, though not present himself. In Nov. 1765, he went on a missionary visit to the Seneca Indians, and returning in May, 1766, he was duly ordained and appointed missionary by the Connecticut Board of Correspondents of the society in Scotland. He settled at Oneida in the midst of the Oneida tribe, and labored until the Revolution suspended his mission. During the war he served as chaplain in the army, and was engaged in negotiations with the Indians, for which services he was rewarded by Congress in 1785. As soon as the war was ended he continued his missionary labors among the Indians. In 1788 the Indians and New York State presented him with valuable lands, part of which he improved and occupied. During the year 1791 he made a *Statement of the Numbers and Situation of the Six United Nations of Indians in North America*, and in the winter conducted a delegation of some forty warriors to meet Congress in Philadelphia. In 1793 he was instrumental in procuring a charter for the Hamilton Oneida Academy, which has since become a college. His connection with the society in Scotland was broken off in 1797, for what reason he knew not, but he continued his accustomed work until his death, Feb. 28, 1808.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 623.

Kirkpatrick, Hugh. See KIRKPATRICK, JAMES.

Kirkpatrick, Jacob, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born near Baskingridge, N. J., August 7, 1785; pursued his classical studies under the direction of the Rev.

Robert Finley, D.D., and graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1804. After this he studied law three years, but in 1807 he decided definitely in favor of the ministry, and resumed his studies under John Woodhull, D.D., of Freehold, N. J. In August, 1809, he was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and was ordained and installed pastor of the United First Church of Amwell, Ringoes, N. J., June 20, 1810, where he continued to labor for fifty-six years. He was one of the founders of the Hunterdon County Bible Society (1816), and also among the earliest and most energetic promoters of the temperance reformation in that county. He died at Ringoes, N. J., May 2, 1866. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a man of a large and generous heart; his preaching was full of tenderness, pathos, and earnestness; his Christian character unassuming, and adorned with meekness and piety.—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867. (J. L. S.)

Kirkpatrick, James, a noted minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, was the son of Hugh Kirkpatrick, a minister in Lurgan, Scotland, from about 1686 to the Revolution, when he retired to Dalry, Ireland, where he preached until 1691, then removed to Old Cumnock, and in 1695 again returned to Scotland, and died at Ballymoney in 1712. James was educated at Glasgow, entered the ministry, and became one of the most promising Irish Presbyterians in the pulpit. In 1706 he was the preacher of the Second Belfast congregation. During the opposition of the House of Parliament to the Presbyterians, James Kirkpatrick became one of the ablest champions of the Presbyterian cause. In 1713 he published *An Historical Essay upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to the present Year* (Belfast, 1713, 4to), to which neither he nor the printer dared to affix their names for fear of persecution. He died about 1725.—Reid and Killen, *Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland*, iii, 91 sq.

Kirk-Sessions is the name of a petty ecclesiastical judicatory in Scotland. Each parish, according to its extent, is divided into several particular districts, every one of which has its own elder and deacons to govern it. A Consistory of the ministers, elders, and deacons of a parish form a kirk-session. These meet once a week, the minister being their moderator, but without a negative voice. It regulates matters relative to public worship, elections, catechizing, visitations, membership, etc. It judges in matters of less scandal; but greater, as adultery, are left to the Presbytery, and in all cases an appeal lies from it to the Presbytery. The functions of the kirk-session were in former times too often inquisitorially exercised; but this is now less frequently attempted, and the danger of it is continually diminishing through the growth of an enlightened public opinion. In former times, also, the kirk-session in Scotland often imposed fines, chiefly for offences against the seventh commandment; but this practice had no recognition in civil nor even in ecclesiastical law, and is now wholly relinquished. The kirk-session of the Established Church in each parish is fully recognised in Scottish law as having certain rights and duties with respect to the poor, but recent legislation has very much deprived it of its former importance in this relation.—Buck, s. v.; Chambers, s. v.

Kirkton, James, a Scottish divine, who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, is noted as the author of *The secret and true History of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to* 1678, etc. (edited by C. K. Sharpe, Edinb. 1817, 4to), a work which has been highly commended by Sir Walter Scott (*London Quart. Review*, xviii, 502 sq.). Kirkton died in 1699.—*Blackwood's Magazine*, ii, 305 sq.

Kirkwood, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, born in Paisley, Scotland, May 25, 1793, was educated in Glasgow College, and studied divinity with Rev. John Dick, D.D., at Theological Hall, Glasgow. He was licensed in 1828. In response to a pressing call for ministerial workers in New York, he went thither and connected himself with the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, under the Missionary Society of which he labored until 1830, when he became pastor at Cortlandville, N. Y. He officiated there and at Auburn and Sandbeach, N. Y., until 1839, and then served as a domestic missionary for seven years in Illinois. For the next eleven years he labored as agent for the Bible and Tract Societies. In 1857 he transferred his connection from the Reformed to the Presbyterian Church, and settled at Yonkers, N. Y., devoting the remainder of his life to literary labors. He died August 26, 1866. In addition to numerous contributions to the *Christian Intelligencer*, *New York Observer*, and *The Presbyterian*, he published *Lectures on the Millennium* (New York, 1855):—*Universalism Explained* (New York, 1856):—*A Plea for the Bible* (New York, 1860; a very popular work and extensively sold):—*Illustrations of the Offices of Christ* (New York, 1862; a practical treatise on divine influences); together with a selection of sermons. Mr. Kirkwood having enjoyed the superior advantages of instruction by the distinguished Dr. Dick, was thoroughly and systematically trained in the great evangelical doctrines. His preaching was characterized by a practical scriptural tone. "His only peculiarity of doctrine was his pre-millennial views, in which, however, as his work on this subject shows, he was moderate, cautious, and never went to the extreme of fixing the time and seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*.

Kir-Mo'äb (Heb. *Kir-Moäb'*, קִיר־מוֹאָב, *fortress of Moab* [see Kir]; Isa. xv, 1; Sept. *τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Μωαβιτιδος*, Vulg. *murus Moab*, Auth. Vers. "Kir of Moab"), usually KIR-HERES (Heb. *Kir-che'res*, קִירֶ חֶרֶשׂ, *brick fortress*, Jer. xlviii, 31, 36; Sept. *κειράδες*, Vulg. *murus fictilis;* in pause קִיר חָרֶשׂ, Isa. xvi, 11; Sept. *τεῖχος ὃ ἐνεκαίνισας*, Vulgate *murus cocti lateris*, Auth. Vers. "Kir-haresh"), or KIR-HARESETH (Heb. *Kir-Chare'seth*, קִירֹ־חֲרֶשֶׂת, *id.*, Isa. xvi, 7; Sept. *οἱ κατοικοῦντες Σές*, Vulgate *muri cocti lateris;* in pause קִיר חֲרֶשֶׂת, 2 Kings iii, 25; Sept. *τὸ τεῖχος*, Vulgate *muri fictiles*, Auth. Vers. "Kir-haraseth"), one of the two strongly fortified cities in the territory of Moab, the other being Ar of Moab. Joram, king of Israel, took the city, and destroyed it, except the walls (2 Kings iii, 25); but it appears from the passages here cited that it must have been rebuilt before the time of Isaiah, and again ravaged by the Babylonians. In his prophecy (xv, 1), the Chaldee paraphrast has put כִּרכָּא דְמוֹאָב, *kerakka de-Moab*, "the castle of Moab;" and the former of these words, pronounced in Arabic *karak*, *kerak*, or *k'rak*, is the name it bears in 2 Macc. xii, 17 (*Χάρακα*, *Characa*), in Steph. Byzant. (*Χαρακμῶβα*, *Characmoba*), in Ptolemy (v, 17, 5, *Χαράκωμα*, *Characoma*), in Abulfeda (*Tab. Syr.* p. 89), and in the historians of the Crusades. Abulfeda (who places it twelve Arabic miles from Ar-Moab) describes *Kerak* as a small town, with a castle on a high hill, and remarks that it is so strong that one must deny himself even the wish to take it by force (comp. 2 Kings iii, 25). In the time of the Crusades, and when in possession of the Franks, it was invested by Saladin; but, after lying before it a month, he was compelled to raise the siege (Bohæddin, *Vita Saladin.* p. 55). The Crusaders had erected here a fortress still known as *Kerak*, which formed one of the centres of operations for the Latins east of the Jordan. On the capture of these at length by Saladin after a long siege, in A.D. 1188, the dominion of the Franks over this territory ceased (Wilken, *Kreuzz.* iv, 244–247). "It was then the chief city of *Arabia Secunda* or *Petraeensis;* it is specified as in the *Belka*, and is distinguished from 'Moab' or 'Rabbat,' the ancient Ar-Moab, and from the *Mons regalis* (Schultens, *Index Geogr.* s. v. Caracha; see also the remarks of Gesenius, *Jesaia*, i, 517, and his notes to the German translation of Burckhardt). The Crusaders, in error, believed it to be Petra, and that

name is frequently attached to it in the writings of William of Tyre and Jacob de Vitry (see quotations in Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 167). This error is perpetuated in the Greek Church to the present day; and the bishop of Petra, whose office, as representative of the patriarch, it is to produce the holy fire at Easter in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 467), is in reality bishop of Kerak (Seetzen, *Reisen*, ii, 358; Burckhardt, p. 387)" (Smith). The first person who visited the place in modern times was Seetzen, who says, "Near to Kerak the wide plain terminates which extends from Rabbah, and is broken only by low and detached hills, and the country now becomes mountainous. Kerak, formerly a city and bishop's see, lies on the top of the hill near the end of a deep valley, and is surrounded on all sides with lofty mountains. The hill is very steep, and in many places the sides are quite perpendicular. The walls round the town are for the most part destroyed, and Kerak can at present boast of little more than being a small country town. The castle, which is uninhabited, and in a state of great decay, was formerly one of the strongest in these countries. The inhabitants of the town consist of Mohammedans and Greek Christians. The present bishop of Kerak resides at Jerusalem. From this place one enjoys, by looking down the wady Kerak, a fine view of part of the Dead Sea, and even Jerusalem may be distinctly seen in clear weather. The hill on which Kerak lies is composed of limestone and brittle marl, with many beds of blue, black, and gray flints. In the neighboring rocks there are a number of curious grottoes; in those which are under ground wheat is sometimes preserved for a period of ten years" (Zach's *Monatliche Correspond.* xviii, 434). A fuller account of the place is given by Burckhardt (*Travels in Syria*, p. 379–387), by whom it was next visited; and another description is furnished by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 361–370). From their account it would seem that the caverns noticed by Seetzen were probably the sepulchres of the ancient town. We also learn that the Christians of Kerak (which they and Burckhardt call *Kerek*) are nearly as numerous as the Mohammedans, and boast of being stronger and braver (see Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 566–571). On account of the notoriously savage character of its Mohammedan inhabitants, Kerak has not often been visited by travellers. Lieut. Lynch, of the United States expedition to the Dead Sea, penetrated this fastness of banditti, having boldly seized the sheik and detained him as a hostage for their safety. He describes the town as situated upon the brow of a hill 3000 feet above the Dead Sea. The houses are a collection of stone huts, built without mortar. They are from seven to eight feet high; the ground floors about six feet below, and the flat terrace mud-roofs mostly about two feet above the streets; but in many places there were short cuts from street to street across the roofs of the houses. The houses, or rather huts, without windows and without chimneys, were blackened inside by smoke, and the women and children were squalid and filthy. Kerak contains a population of about 300 families; these include about 1000 Christians, who are kept in subjection by the Moslem Arabs. The Moslem inhabitants are wild-looking savages, but the Christians have a mild and hospitable character. The males mostly wear sheep-skin coats, the women dark-colored gowns; the Christian females did not conceal their faces, which were tattooed like the South Sea islanders. The entrance to Kerak is by a steep and crooked ravine, which is completely commanded at the summit by the castle. This latter, partly cut out of and partly built upon the mountain top, presents the remains of a magnificent structure, its citadel cut off from the town by a deep ditch. It seems to be Saracenic, although in various parts it has both the pointed Gothic and the rounded Roman arch, the work doubtless of the various masters into whose hands it has fallen during its eventful history. Its walls are composed of heavy, well-cut stones, with a steep glacis-wall surrounding the whole. It is of immense extent, having five gates, seven wells and cisterns, with subterranean passages, and seven arched store-houses, one above another, for purposes of defence (see Lynch's *Narrative*, p. 355–359). Mr. De Saulcy also entered this "den of robbers," as he terms it, and he has added some particulars to the above description (*Narrative*, i, 302–330, 390). His account illustrates the character of the inhabitants, who have for many years been the terror of the vicinity (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 60; Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 216). See also Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xv, 916, 1215. A map of the site and a view of part of the keep will be found in the Atlas to De Saulcy (*La Mer Morte*, etc., feuilles 8, 20). See MOAB.

Kirwan. See MURRAY, NICHOLAS.

Kirwan, WALTER BLAKE, an eminent Irish divine, and one of the most celebrated and popular preachers of the last half of the 18th century, was born at Galway about 1754. He was educated at the college of the English Jesuits at St. Omer; was ordained priest, and was for a time professor of natural and moral philosophy at Louvain. Having embraced Protestantism in 1787, he became successively minister of St. Peter's Church, Dublin; prebendary of Howth, minister of St. Nicholas Without in 1788, and dean of Killala in 1800. He died in 1805. Few preachers of any age have enjoyed such popularity as Walter Blake Kirwan. So great was the throng to listen to his sermons that it was found necessary to defend the entrance of the church where he was to preach with guards and palisades. He was a man of fine feelings, amiable and benevolent, and his irresistible powers of persuasion were chiefly devoted to the preaching of charity sermons. It is said that the collections taken up after his sermons seldom fell short of £1000. These addresses have been published under the title of *Sermons*, with a sketch of his life (London, 1814, 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1735; Allibone, *Dict. of English and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1038; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* xi, 130 sq.; Lord Brougham, *Contrib. to the Edinb. Rev.* (Lond. and Glasgow, 1856), i, 104 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kish (Heb. *id.*, קִישׁ, a *trap*, otherwise a *horn;* Sept. Κείς or Κίς, N. T. Κίς, Auth. Vers. "Cis," Acts xiii, 21), the name of five men.

1. The second of the two sons of Mahli (grandson of Levi); his sons married their cousins, heiresses of his brother Eleazar (1 Chron. xxiii, 21, 22). One of these sons was named Jerahmeel (1 Chron. xxiv, 29). B.C. cir. 1658.

2. A Benjamite of Jerusalem (i. e. the northern neighborhood of Jebus), third named of the sons of Jehiel (of Gibeon) by Maachah (1 Chron. viii, 30; ix, 36). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

3. A wealthy and powerful Benjamite, son of Ner (1 Chron. viii, 33; ix, 39), and father of king Saul (1 Sam. ix, 3; x, 11, 21; xiv, 51; 1 Chron. ix, 39; xii, 1; xxvi, 28). He was thus the grandson (1 Sam. ix, 1, "son" [q. v.]) of Abiel (q. v.). See NER. No incident is mentioned respecting him excepting his sending Saul in search of the strayed asses (1 Sam. ix, 3), and that he was buried in Zelah (2 Sam. xxi, 14). B.C. 1093. In Acts xiii, 21 he is called CIS. See SAUL.

4. A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Abdi, and one of those who assisted Hezekiah in restoring the true religion (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. 726.

5. A Benjamite, the father of Shimei, and great-grandfather of Mordecai (Esth. ii, 5). B.C. considerably ante 598.

Kish'i (1 Chron. vi, 44). See KUSHAIAH.

Kish'iön (Heb. *Kishyon'*, קִשְׁיוֹן, so called from the *hardness* of the soil; Sept. Κεσιών, Auth. Vers. "Kishon" in Josh. xxi, 28), a city of the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix, 20, where it is mentioned between Rabbith and Abez), assigned to the Levites of the family of Gershom, and for a place of refuge (Josh. xxi, 28); elsewhere (1

Chron. vi, 72) called KEDESH (q. v.). De Saulcy found ruins called *Kashaneh* (or *Kabshaneh*), an hour and a half from Kefr-Kenna, commanding the Merj-es-Serbal, north of Mt. Tabor, which he is inclined to identify with the ancient Kishion (*Narrat.* ii, 325, 326). Schwarz, citing from Astori, places it 2½ miles south of Chesulloth (Iksal); but he appears to be misled by the analogy of the name of this place with that of the brook Kishon (*Palest.* p. 166), which has no connection in origin (see Hamesveld, iii, 241).

Ki'shon (Heb. *Kishon'*, קִישׁוֹן, *winding;* Septuag. Κισῶν; but in Psa. lxxxiii, 9, Κισσών v. r. Κεισών, Auth. Vers. "Kison"), a torrent or winter stream (נַחַל, A. V. "river") of central Palestine, the scene of two of the grandest achievements of Israelitish history—the defeat of Sisera (Judg. iv, 7, 13; v, 21), and the destruction of the prophets of Baal by Elijah (1 Kings xviii, 40). It formed the boundary between Manasseh and Zebulon (Josh. xix, 11). See JOKNEAM. Some portion of it is also thought to be designated as the "waters of Megiddo" (Judg. v, 19). See MEGIDDO. The term coupled with the Kishon in Judg. v, 21, as a stream *of the ancients* (הַקְּדוּמִים, A. V. "that *ancient* river"), has been very variously rendered by the old interpretors. 1. It is taken as a proper name, and thus apparently that of a distinct stream—in some MSS. of the Sept. Καδημείμ (see Barhdt's *Hexapla*); by Jerome, in the Vulgate, *torrens Cadumim;* in the Peshito and Arabic versions, *Carmin.* This view is also taken by Benjamin of Tudela, who speaks of the river close to Acre (doubtless meaning thereby the Belus) as the נחל קדומים. It is possible that the term may refer to an ancient tribe of Kedumim—wanderers from the Eastern deserts—who had in remote antiquity settled on the Kishon or one of its tributary wadys. See KADMONITES. 2. As an epithet of the Kishon itself: Sept. χειμάῤῥους ἀρχαίων; Aquila, καυσώνων, perhaps intending to imply a scorching wind or simoom as accompanying the rising of the waters; Symmachus, αἰγίων or αἰγῶν, perhaps alluding to the swift springing of the torrent (αἴγες is used for high waves by Artemidorus). The Targum, adhering to the signification "ancient," expands the sentence—"the torrent in which were shown signs and wonders to Israel of old;" and this miraculous torrent a later Jewish tradition (preserved in the *Commentarius in Canticum Debboræ*, ascribed to Jerome) would identify with the Red Sea, the scene of the greatest marvels in Israel's history. The rendering of the A.V. is supported by Mendelssohn, Gesenius, Ewald, and other modern scholars. The reference is probably to exploits among the aboriginal Canaanites, as the plain adjoining the stream has always been the great battle-ground of Palestine. See ESDRAELON. For the Kishon of Josh. xxi, 28, see KISHION.

By Josephus the Kishon is never named, neither does the name occur in the early Itineraries of Antoninus Augustus, or the Bordeaux Pilgrim. Eusebius and Jerome dismiss it in a few words, and note only its origin in Tabor (*Onomast.* Cison), or such part of it as can be seen thence (*Ep. ad Eustochium*, § 13), passing by entirely its connection with Carmel. Benjamin of Tudela visited Akka and Carmel. He mentions the river by name as "Nachal Kishon," but only in the most cursory manner. Brocardus (cir. 1500) describes the western portion of the stream with a little more fulness, but enlarges most on its upper or eastern part, which, with the victory of Barak, he places on the east of Tabor and Hermon, as discharging the water of those mountains into the Sea of Galilee (*Descr. Terræ S.* cap. 6, 7). This has been shown by Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* ii, 364) to allude to the wady el-Bireh, which runs down to the Jordan a few miles above Scythopolis.

The Kishon is beyond all doubt the river now called *Nahr el-Mokattah* (or *Mukatta*), which, after traversing the plain of Acre, enters the bay of the latter name at its south-east corner. It has been usual to trace the source of this river to Mount Tabor (as above by Jerome), but Dr. Shaw affirms that in travelling along the south-eastern brow of Mount Carmel he had an opportunity of seeing the sources of the river Kishon, three or four of which lie within less than a furlong of each other, and are called Ras el-Kishon, or the head of the Kishon. These alone, without the lesser contributions near the sea, discharge water enough to form a river half as large as the Isis. During the rainy season all the waters which fall upon the eastern side of Carmel, or upon the rising grounds to the southward, empty themselves into it in a number of torrents, at which time it overflows its banks, acquires a wonderful rapidity, and carries all before it. It was doubtless in such a season that the host of Sisera was swept away in attempting to ford it. But such inundations are only occasional, and of short duration, as is indeed implied in the destruction in its waters of the fugitives, who doubtless expected to pass it safely. The course of the stream, as estimated from the sources thus indicated, is not more than seven miles. It runs very briskly till within half a league of the sea; but when not augmented by rains, it never falls into the sea in a full stream, but insensibly percolates through a bank of sand, which the north winds have thrown up at its mouth. It was in this state that Shaw himself found it in the month of April, 1722, when it was crossed by him.

Notwithstanding Shaw's contradiction, the assertion that the Kishon derives its source from Mount Tabor has been repeated by modern travellers as confidently as by their ancient predecessors (*Summer Ramble*, i, 281). Buckingham's statement, being made with reference to the view from Mount Tabor itself, deserves attention. He says that near the foot of the mountain on the south-west are "the springs of the Ain es-Sherrar, which send a perceptible stream through the centre of the plain of Esdraelon, and form the brook Kishon of antiquity." Further on, the same traveller, on reaching the hills which divide the plain of Esdraelon from that of Acre, saw the pass through which the river makes its way from the one plain to the other (*Travels in Palestine*, i, 168, 177). Schwarz also states that the sources of the Kishon are at a village called Sheik Abrik, south-west of Tabor (*Palest.* p. 166). On further inquiry, and more extensive comparison of observations made at different times of the year, it will probably be found that the remoter source of the river is really in Mount Tabor, but that the supply from this source is cut off in early summer, when it ceases to be maintained by rains or contributory torrents; whereas the copious supply from the nearer springs at Ras el-Kishon, with other springs lower down, keep it up from that point as a perennial stream, even during the drought of summer. (See Kitto's *Pict. Hist. of Palestine*, p. cxci.) Mariti (ii, 112) mentions the case of the English dragoman who was drowned, and his horse with him, in the attempt to cross this temporary stream from Mt. Tabor, in Feb. 1761. During the battle of Mount Tabor, between the French and Arabs, April 16, 1799, many of the latter were drowned in their attempt to cross a stream coming from Deburieh, which then inundated the plain (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 339). Monro, who crossed the river early in April (in its lower or perennial part), in order to ascend Mount Carmel, describes it as traversing the plain of Esdraelon. The river, where he crossed it, *in a boat*, was then thirty yards wide. In the plain from Solam to Nazareth he crossed "a considerable brook, and afterwards some others, which flow into a small lake on the northern side of the plain, and eventually contribute to swell the Kishon" (*Ramble*, i, 55, 281). Dr. Robinson says that this account corresponds with channels that he observed (*Biblical Researches*, iii, 230). Prokesch also, in April, 1829, when travelling directly from Ramleh to Nazareth, entered the plain of Esdraelon at or near Lejjun, where he came upon the Kishon, flowing in a deep bed through marshy ground; and after wandering about for some time to find his way

through the morass, he was at last set right by an Arab, who pointed out the proper ford (*Reise ins H. Land*, p. 129). The scriptural account of the overthrow of Sisera's host manifestly shows that the stream crossed the plain, and must have been of considerable size. The above arguments, to show that it did so, and still does so, are confirmed by Dr. Robinson, who adds that "not improbably, in ancient times, when the country was perhaps more wooded, there may have been *permanent* streams throughout the whole plain." The transaction of the prophet Elijah, who, after his sacrifice on Carmel, commanded the priests of Baal to be slain at the river Kishon, requires no explanation, seeing that it took place at the perennial lower stream. This also explains, what has sometimes been asked, whence, in that time of drought, the water was obtained with which the prophet inundated his altar and sacrifice.

The Kishon is, in fact, the drain by which the waters of the plain of Esdraelon, and of the mountains which inclose that plain, namely, Carmel and the Samaria range on the south, the mountain of Galilee on the north, and Gilboa, "Little Hermon" (so called), and Tabor on the east, find their way to the Mediterranean. Its course is in a direction nearly due north-west along the lower part of the plain nearest the foot of the Samaritan hills, and close beneath the very cliffs of Carmel, breaking through the hills which separate the plain of Esdraelon from the maritime plain of Acre, by a very narrow pass, beneath the eminence of Harothieh or Harti, which is believed by some still to retain a trace of the name of Harosheth of the Gentiles. It has two principal feeders: the first from Deburieh (Daberath), on Mount Tabor, the north-east angle of the plain; and, secondly, from Jelbûn (Gilboa) on the south-east. It is also fed by the copious spring of Lejjun, the stream from which is probably the "waters of Megiddo" (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 385). The highest source of the Kishon on the south-east is the large fountain of Jenîn, the ancient En-gannim, the water from which, increased by a number of the streamlets from the surrounding hills, flows westward across the plain through a deep channel during the winter months; but in summer this channel, like the northern one, is perfectly dry (Van de Velde, *Travels*, i, 362). The two channels unite at a point a few miles north of the site of Megiddo. The channel of the united stream is here deep and miry, the ground for some distance on each side is low and marshy, and the fords during winter are always difficult, and often, after heavy rain, impassable; yet in summer, even here, the whole plain and the river bed are dry and hard (Robinson, ii, 364). These facts strikingly illustrate the narrative of the defeat of Sisera. The battle was fought on the south bank of the Kishon, at Megiddo (Judg. iv, 13; v, 19). While the battle raged a violent storm of wind and rain came on (Judg. v, 4, 20; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* v, 5, 4). In a short time the hard plain was turned into a marsh, and the dry river-bed into a foaming torrent. The Canaanites were driven back on the river by the fiery attack of Barak and the fury of the storm; for "the earth trembled, the heavens dropped . . . the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." The war-horses and chariots dashing madly through the marshy ground made it much worse; and the soldiers, in trying to cross the swollen torrent, were swept away.

But, like most of the so-called "rivers" of Palestine, the perennial stream forms but a small part of the Kishon. During the greater part of the year (as above noted) its upper portion is dry, and the stream confined to a few miles next the sea. The sources of this perennial portion proceed from the roots of Carmel—the "vast fountains called Sa'adiyeh, about three miles east of Chaifa" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 140), and those, apparently still more copious, described by Shaw (Robinson, ii, 365), as bursting forth from beneath the eastern brow of Carmel, and discharging of themselves "a river half as big as the Isis." It enters the sea at the lower part of the bay of Akka, about two miles east of Chaifa, "in a deep, tortuous bed, between banks of loamy soil some fifteen feet high, and fifteen to twenty yards apart" (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 383). Between the mouth and the town the shore is lined by an extensive grove of date-palms, one of the finest in Palestine (Van de Velde, i, 289). The part of the Kishon at which the prophets of Baal were slaughtered by Elijah was doubtless close below the spot on Carmel where the sacrifice had taken place. This spot is now fixed with all but certainty as at the extreme east end of the mountain, to which the name is still attached of *El-Mahraka*, "the burning." See CARMEL. Nowhere does the Kishon run so close to the mountain as just beneath this spot (Van de Velde, i, 324). It is about 1000 feet above the river, and a precipitous ravine leads directly down, by which the victims were perhaps hurried from the sacred precincts of the altar of Jehovah to their doom in the torrent bed below, at the foot of the mound, which from this circumstance may be called tell Kûsis, the hill of the priests. Whether the Kishon contained any water at this time we are not told; that required for Elijah's sacrifice was in all probability obtained from the spring on the mountain side below the plateau of El-Mahraka. At the mouth of the river are banks of fine sand, which any unusual swell in the river converts into dangerous quicksands (Van de Velde, i, 289).

The modern name *Nahr el-Mukatta* some have thought means "the river of slaughter," in allusion to the slaughter of the prophets of Baal on its banks; but the name may also signify "river of the ford," from another meaning of the same root (compare Robinson, ii, 365); the latter is the interpretation given of the name by the people of the country.—Kitto; Smith. See further in Hamesveld, i, 522 sq.; Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 49; Hackett, *Illustra.* p. 321–323; Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 704; Maundrell, *Early Travels*, p. 430; Pococke, *East*, II, i, 55; G. Robinson, *Palest.* i, 203 (Par. 1835); Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 492; Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* p. 347; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 86; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 95, 494.

Mouth of the Kishon.

Kishshu. See CUCUMBER.

Kisker, JOHANN JUSTUS, a German theologian, was born at Rödinghausen in 1660, and was educated at the universities of Jena and Giessen. In 1694 he became professor of philosophy at Rinteln University, and the year following professor of theology. He died March 25, 1714. For a list of his writings, mainly dissertations, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands des* 18*ten und* 19*ten Jahrh.* ii, 102.

Ki'son (Psa. lxxxiii, 9). See KISHON.

Kiss (נָשַׁק, *nashak'*; Gr. φιλέω, to *love*, and derivatives). Originally the act of kissing had a symbolical character, as a natural species of language, expressive of tender affection and respect. It appears from the case of Laban and Jacob (Gen. xxix, 13) that this method of salutation was even then established and recognised as a matter of course. In Gen. xxvii, 26, 27, a kiss is a sign of affection between a parent and child; in Cant. viii, 1, between a lover and his bride. It was also, as with some modern nations, a token of friendship and regard bestowed when friends or relations met or separated (Tobit vii, 6; x, 12; Luke vii, 45; xv, 20; Acts xx, 37; Matt. xxvi, 48; 2 Sam. xx, 9); the same custom is still usual in the East (Tischendorf, *Reise*, i, 255). The Church of Ephesus wept sore at Paul's departure, and fell on his neck and kissed him. When Orpah quitted Naomi and Ruth (Ruth i, 14), after the three had lifted up their voice and wept, she "kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth clave unto her."

That it was usual to kiss the mouth (Prov. xxiv, 26) may be presumed (Gen. xxxiii, 4; Exod. iv, 27; xviii, 7; 1 Sam. xx, 41). Kissing the lips was not only permitted, but customary among near relatives of both sexes, both in patriarchal and in later times (Gen. xxix, 11; Cant. viii, 1). Between individuals of the same sex, and in a limited degree between those of different sexes, the kiss on the cheek as a mark of respect or an act of salutation has at all times been customary in the East, and can hardly be said to be extinct even in Europe. Mention is made of it (1) between parents and children (Gen. xxvii, 26, 27; xxxi, 28, 55; xlviii, 10; l, 1; Exod. xviii, 7; Ruth i, 9, 14; 2 Sam. xiv, 33; 1 Kings xix, 20; Luke xv, 20; Tobit vii, 6; x, 12); (2) between brothers, or near male relatives or intimate friends (Gen. xxix, 13; xxxiii, 4; xlv, 15; Exod. iv, 27; 1 Sam. xx, 41); (3) the same mode of salutation between persons not related, but of equal rank, whether friendly or deceitful, is mentioned (2 Sam. xx, 9; Psa. lxxv, 10; Prov. xxvii, 6; Luke vii, 45 [1st clause]; xxii, 48; Acts xx, 37); (4) as a mark of real or affected condescension (2 Sam. xv, 5; xix, 39); (5) respect from an inferior (Luke vii, 38, 45, and perhaps viii, 44). In other cases the kiss is imprinted on the beard (see Arvieux, iii, 182); sometimes on the hair of the head (see D'Orville, *Ad Chariton*, viii, 4), which was then taken hold of by the hand (2 Sam. xx, 9). Among the Arabs the women and children kiss the beards of their husbands or fathers. The superior returns the salute by a kiss on the forehead. Kissing the hand of another appears to be a modern practice. In Egypt an inferior kisses the hand of a superior, generally on the back, but sometimes, as a special favor, on the palm also. To testify abject submission, and in asking favors, the feet are often kissed instead of the hand (Luke vii, 38). "The son kisses the hand of his father, the wife that of her husband, the slave, and often the free servant, that of the master. The slaves and servants of a grandee kiss their lord's sleeve, or the skirt of his clothing" (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* ii, 9; compare Arvieux, *Trav.* p. 151; Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 369; Niebuhr, *Voy.* i, 329; ii, 93; Layard, *Nin.* i, 174; Wellsted, *Arabia*, i, 341; Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia*, p. 271). Friends saluting each other join the right hand, then each kisses his own hand, and puts it to his lips and forehead, or breast; after a long absence they embrace each other, kissing first on the right side of the face or neck, and then on the left, or on both sides of the beard (Lane, ii, 9, 10; comp. Irby and Mangles, p. 116; Chardin, *Voyage*, iii, 421; Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 369; Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 240). The passage of Job xxxi, 27, "Or my mouth hath kissed my hand," is not in point (see Menken, *Dissert.* in p. l., Lipsiæ, 1711; Doughtæi, *Analect.* i, 211; Kieseling, in the *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* ix, 595; Böttiger, *Kunstmythol.* i, 52), and refers to idolatrous usages (see L. Weger, *De osc. manus idolatrica*, Regiom. 1698), namely, the adoration of the heavenly bodies (comp. Cicero, *Ver.* iv, 43; Gesenius, *Comment.* on Isa. xlix, 23). See ADORATION. It was the custom to throw kisses towards the images of the gods, and towards the sun and moon (1 Kings xix, 18; Hos. xiii, 2; comp. Minuc. Felix, ii, 5; Tacit. *Hist.* iii, 24, 3; Lucian, *De Salt.* c. 17; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxviii, 5). The kissing of princes was a token of homage (Psa. ii, 12; 1 Sam. x, 1; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* vii, 5, 32). So probably in Gen. xli, 40, "Upon thy mouth shall all my people kiss," where the Auth. Vers. interpets, "According to thy word shall all my people be ruled" (see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 923). We may compare the Mohammedan custom of kissing the Kaaba at Mecca (Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 250, 298, 323; Crichton, *Arabia*, ii, 215). Xenophon says (*Agesil.* v, 4) that it was a national custom with the Persians to kiss whomsoever they honored; and a curious passage to this effect may be found in the *Cyropædia* (i, 4, 27). Kissing the feet of princes was a token of subjection and obedience, which was sometimes carried so far that the print of the foot received the kiss, so as to give the impression that the very dust had become sacred by the royal tread, or that the subject was not worthy to salute even the prince's foot, but was content to kiss the earth itself near or on which he trod (Isa. xlix, 33; Micah vii, 17; Psa. lxxii, 9; comp. Gen. xli, 40; 1 Sam. xxiv, 8; Matt. xxviii, 9; see Dion Cass. lix, 27; Seneca, *De Benef.* ii, 12). Similar usages prevail among the Orientals to the present day (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 203; Layard, *Ninev.* i, 274; Harmer, *Obs.* i, 336; Niebuhr, *Travels*, i, 414; comp. Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* i, 377; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 233; Barhebr. *Chron.* p. 148, 189, 569). The Rabbins, in the meddlesome, scrupulous, and falsely delicate spirit which animated much of what they wrote, did not permit more than three kinds of kisses—the kiss of reverence, of reception, and of dismissal (*Breshith Rabba* on Gen. xxix, 11).

The peculiar tendency of the Christian religion to encourage honor towards all men, as men, to foster and develop the softer affections, and, in the trying condition of the early Church, to make its members intimately known one to another, and unite them in the closest bonds, led to the observance of kissing as an accompaniment of that social worship which took its origin in the very cradle of our religion. (See Coteler, *Ad constitut. Apost.* ii, 57; Fessel, *Advers. sacr.* p. 283.) Hence the exhortation, "Salute each other with a holy kiss" (Rom. xvi, 16; see also 1 Cor. xvi, 20; 2 Cor. xiii, 12; 1 Thess. v, 26; in 1 Pet. v, 14 it is termed "a kiss of charity"). "It might, perhaps, be understood among the members of the Church that the kiss was to be exchanged between persons of the same sex only, though no direction to this effect is found in the apostolic epistles, and it is known that in process of time the heathen took occasion from the practice to reproach the Christians for looseness of manners. On this account care was taken (as appears from the *Apostolical Constitutions*) to maintain in respect to it the distinction of sexes; but the practice itself was kept up for centuries, especially in connection with the celebration of the Supper. It was regarded as the special token of perfect reconciliation and concord among the members of the Church, and was called simply the *peace* (εἰρήνη), or the *kiss of peace* (osculum pacis). It was exchanged in the Eastern Church before, but in the Western after the consecration prayer. Ultimately, however, it was discontinued as a badge of Christian fellowship, or a part of any Christian solemnity" (Fairbairn). (See *Apost. Constit.* ii, 57; viii, 11; Just. Mart. *Apol.* i, 65; Palmer, *On Lit.*

ii, 102, and note from Du Cange; Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* b. xii, c. iv, § 5, vol. iv, 49; b. ii, c. xi, § 10, vol. i, 161; b. ii, c. xix, § 17, vol. i, 272; b. iv, c. vi, § 14, vol. i, 526; b. xxii, c. iii, § 6, vol. vii, 316; see also *Cod. Just. V. Tit.* iii, 16, *de Don. ante Nupt.*; Brande, *Pop. Antiq.* ii, 87). The peculiar circumstances have now vanished which gave propriety and emphasis to such an expression of brotherly love and Christian friendship. (See Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*, s. v.) The kiss of peace still forms part of one of the rites of the Romish Church. It is given immediately before the communion; the clergyman who celebrates mass kissing the altar, and embracing the deacon, saying, "Pax tibi, frater, et ecclesiæ sanctæ Dei;" the deacon does the same to the subdeacon, saying, "Pax tecum;" the latter then salutes the others.

Kissing the foot or toe has been required by the popes as a sign of respect from the secular power since the 8th century. The first who received this honor was pope Constantine I. It was paid him by the emperor Justinian II, on his entry into Constantinople in 710. Valentine I, about 827, required every one to kiss his foot, and from that time this mark of reverence appears to have been expected by all popes. When the ceremony takes place, the pope wears a slipper with a cross, which is kissed. In more recent times, Protestants have not been required to kiss the pope's foot, but merely to bend the knee slightly. See Adoration.

On the subject of this article generally, consult Emmerich, *De Osculis ap. Vet. in discessu* (Meining. 1783); Heckel, *De Osculis* (Lipsiæ, 1689); Pfanner, *De Osculis Christianor. Veter.*, in his *Obs. Sacr.* ii, 131-201; Kempius, *De Osculis* (Francof. 1680); Jac. Herrenschmidius, *Osculogia* (Viteb. 1630); Müller, *De Osculo Sancto* (Jena, 1674); Boberg, *De Osculis Hebr.*; Lomeier, *Diss. genial.* p. 328; also in Ugolini, *Thesaur.* vol. xx; Götz, *De Osculo* (Jena, 1670); Lange, *Friedenkuss d. alten Christen* (Leipz. 1747); compare Fabricius, *Bibliogr. antiquar.* p. 1016 sq.; and other monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 55, 147. See Salutation.

Kissos. See Ivy.

Kistemaker, Johann Hyacinth, a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, was born August 15, 1754, at Nordhorn, in Hanover, and was educated at the University of Münster. He was ordained priest Dec. 22, 1777, but filled the rostrum instead of the pulpit, and became quite celebrated for his attainments as a linguist. In 1786 he was elected professor of philology at his alma mater, and in 1795 was transferred to the chair of Biblical exegesis. He died March 2, 1834. Of his numerous works we have room here only for the titles of those most important in theology, which are, *Commentatio de nova exegesi præcipue Veteris Testamenti ex collatis scriptoribus Græcis et Romanis scripta* (Münster, 1806):—*Exeget. Abhandlung über Matt.* xvi, 18, 19, and xix, 3–12, *oder über den Primat Petri und das Eheband*:—*Exegesis critica in Psalmos lxvii, et cix, et excursus in Daniel iii de fornace ignis* (1809):—*Weissagung Jesu vom Gericht über Judäa und die Welt*, etc. (1816):—*Canticum canticorum illustratum ex Hierographia Orientalium* (1818):—*Weissagung vom Immanuel* (1824); and especially *Biblia sacra Vulgatæ editionis juxta exemplar Vaticanum* (1824, 3 vols.), dedicated to pope Leo XII; and his translation of the New Testament (1825), which is largely circulated among the Roman Catholics of Germany. See Hamberger, *Das gelehrte Deutschland*, Appendix, vols. xviii and xxiii; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s. v.; xii, 671 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kite (אַיָּה, *ayyah'*, so called from its clamorous *cry*; Sept. *ἰκτίν* v. r. *ἴκτινος*, Vulg. *vultur*; but in Job. xxviii, 7, *γύψ*, Auth. Version "vulture"), an unclean and keen-sighted bird of prey (Lev. xi, 14; Deut. xiv, 13). The version of Pseudo-Jonathan has the *black vulture*; the Venetian Greek *κολοιόν*, or *jackdaw*; Kimchi גאזא, or *magpie*; Saadias and Abelwahd the male *horned owl*—most of which are evidently mere conjectures, with little regard to the context, which classes the bird in question with other species of the falcon tribe. See Glede. The allusion in Job alone affords a clew to its identification. The deep mines in the recesses of the mountains from which the labor of man extracts the treasures of the earth are there described as "a track which the bird of prey hath not known, nor hath the eye of the *ayyah* looked upon it." Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 193 sq., 779), regarding the etymology of the word, connected it with the Arabic *al-yuyu*, a kind of hawk, so called from its cry *yâyâ*, described by Damir as a small bird with a short tail, used in hunting, and remarkable for its great courage, the swiftness of its flight, and the keenness of its vision, which is made the subject of praise in an Arabic stanza quoted by Damir. The English designate it as the *merlin*, the *Falco æsalon* of Linnæus, which is the same as the Greek *αἰσαλών* and Latin *æsalo*. This smallest of British hawks is from ten

English Merlin.

to twelve inches long; the male with blue-gray back and wings, body rufous; the female dark brown back and wings, with brownish-white body (see *Penny Cyclop.* s. v. Merlin). Gesenius, however (*Thesaur.* p. 39), is inclined to regard the Hebrew term as a general denomination of the hawk genus, on account of the addition לְמִינָהּ, *after its kind*. See Hawk. "The Talmud goes so far as to assert that the four Hebrew words rendered in the A. V. 'vulture,' 'glede,' and 'kite,' denote one and the same bird (Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, § 196). Seetzen (i, 310) mentions a species of falcon used in Syria for hunting gazelles and hares, and a smaller kind for hunting hares in the desert. Russell (*Aleppo*, ii, 196) enumerates seven different kinds employed by the natives for the same purpose. Robertson (*Clavis Pentateuchi*) derives *ayyah* from the Heb. אִיָּה, an obsolete root, which he connects with an Arabic word, the pri-

Red Kite.

mary meaning of which, according to Schultens, is 'to turn.' If this derivation be the true one, it is not improbable that 'kite' is the correct rendering. The habit which birds of this genus have of 'sailing in circles, with the rudder-like tail by its inclination governing the curve,' as Yarrell says, accords with the Arabic derivation" (Smith). Wood (*Bible Animals*, p. 358) inclines to adopt Tristram's identification of the *ayyah* with the red kite (*Milvus regalis*), which is scattered all over Palestine, feeding chiefly on the smaller birds, mice, reptiles, and fish. Its piercing sight and soaring habits peculiarly suit the passage in Job. See VULTURE.

Kith'lish (Heb. *Kithlish'*, כִּתְלִישׁ, prob. for כֶּתֶל אֶרֶשׁ, a *man's wall;* Sept. Χαθαλείς v. r. Καθαλώς and Μααχώς, Vulg. *Cethlis*), a town in the valley or plain (Shephelah) of Judah, mentioned between Lahmam and Gederoth (Josh. xv, 40); evidently situated in the south-western group, possibly at the "mound and some foundations called *Jelumeh*" (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 386), on wady el-Heroy, between Gaza and Lachish (Van de Velde, *Map*). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary*, s. v., proposes the ruined site *el-Jilas* given by Smith (in Robinson's *Res.* iii, Appendix, p. 119) in this vicinity; but this is not laid down on any map, if, indeed, it be not the same place as the above. The derivation proposed by the same writer for the name Kithlish, from כָּתַת, *to crush*, and לַיִשׁ, *a lion*, as if it were the haunt of that animal, is fanciful, and unwarranted by any allusion of the kind in the text; the form, moreover, would then have been כִּתְלִישׁ.

Kit'ron (Heb. *Kitron'*, קִטְרוֹן, *knotty*, otherwise *curtailed*, or *castle;* Sept. Κετρών v. r. Κέδρων, and even Χεβρών), a city of Zebulun from which the Israelites were long unable to expel the native Canaanites (Judg. i, 30). It is very possibly the same elsewhere called KATTATH (Josh. xix, 15), notwithstanding the objection of Keil (*Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.) that this and all the other names are needed as distinct cities in order to make up the number *twelve* there specified; for even thus the number will be incomplete, without either supposing the text corrupt or borrowing from those enumerated in the preceding verses (doubtless the true solution), in either of which cases these three names, so nearly identical (Kattah, Kartah, Kitron), may be assigned to one place. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 173), on Talmudical grounds, apparently incorrectly, identifies it with Sepphoris (q. v.).

Kit'tim (Gen. x, 4; 2 Chron. i, 7). See CHITTIM.

Kittle, ANDREW N., a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Kinderhook, N. Y., in 1785, graduated at Union College in 1804, studied theology under Drs. Froeligh and Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1806. Until 1846 he was successively pastor of the churches of Red Hook Landing and St. John's, Linlithgo, Upper Red Hook, and Stuyvesant. Early consecrated to the Lord, he was an able, vigorous, and indefatigable minister of Jesus Christ. Though he was of good record as a theologian and a general scholar, possessed of strong common sense, and fond of reading, his retiring disposition kept him aloof from the agitating controversies and public excitements of the times. Aspiring only to be a preacher and pastor, he dwelt among his people until the infirmities of age constrained him to give up the active ministry. He died in 1864. Kittle was a man of fine features and noble form, a dignified Christian gentleman, and a true man of God.—Corwin, *Manual of Ref. Church*, p. 126. (W. J. R. T.)

Kitto, JOHN, one of the most eminent Biblical scholars of this age, was born at Plymouth, England, Nov. 4, 1804. To humble birth was added, in his twelfth year, the affliction of a total loss of his sense of hearing; but neither poverty nor bodily defect were sufficient to deter the ambitious and energetic youth from the acquisition of knowledge. Every effort that could possibly be put forth to secure books was made; to pay for a few books from a circulating library, he groped for old iron and ropes in Sutton Pool, and with the few pennies obtained by this irksome task he supplied himself with the elements of an education. The destitution of his parents obliged them at last to place John in the "workhouse" at Plymouth, where he was admitted Nov. 15, 1819, and taught the shoemaker's trade. In this place his powerful will soon asserted his position against older and stronger boys, and here he began in 1820 a diary which is still preserved, and large excerpts from which have been printed in his *Life*. It contains many self-portraits, physical and mental, and shows the awakening of his mind to literary tastes and ambition. In his trade, however, he was often so dull and dispirited that he called himself "John the Comfortless," and twice had thoughts of bringing his life to a premature end. In 1821 he was hired out to a shoemaker, but his awkwardness and tendency to books greatly irritated his master, and John was submitted to such harsh treatment that he was readmitted to the workhouse about six months later. In the year following he finally brought out some essays in Nettleton's *Plymouth Journal*, and also wrote some imaginary correspondence. These efforts attracted attention, and he was by the interposition of several gentlemen removed to Exeter to become a dentist. In 1825 he published a volume of *Essays and Letters*, which, though it afforded him but a small pecuniary remuneration, secured him many friends, made him quite generally known, and finally resulted in a complete change of basis for life. Instead of perfecting himself in the art of dentistry, he accepted an offer to enter the Missionary College at Islington, where he was to be taught the art of printing with a view to service in some foreign missionary institution. In June, 1827, he was sent out to Malta; but, his health declining, he returned to England in 1829. Shortly after this his former employer, Mr. Groves, the dentist, desired a tutor for his children, to accompany him on a tour East, and selected Kitto for the position. He was now afforded a sight of a large part of Europe and Asia, and acquired that familiarity with the scenery and customs of the East which was afterwards of such signal service in the department of literature to which he became devoted. In turn he visited St. Petersburg, Astrachan, the Calmucks, Tatars, the Caucasus, Armenia, Persia, and Bagdad, and by way of Trebizond and Constantinople returned to England in 1833. Through the influence of friends he gained attention by a series of papers in the *Penny Magazine* (one of these under the suggestive title "The Deaf Traveller"), and by other literary efforts.

In 1835 Kitto finally entered upon the preparation of that class of works which have so justly secured him a prominent place in the field of letters. In this year Mr. Charles Knight, then the editor of the *Penny Magazine*, suggested to Kitto the preparation of a "Pictorial Bible." All that Kitto needed was the suggestion. He not only eagerly embraced the proposal, but earnestly entreated to be allowed to undertake the responsibility of the entire work. The expiration of scarcely more than two years saw the *Pictorial Bible* finished (new edit. 1847, 4 vols. 8vo), and shortly after (in 1838) he embodied a great portion of his experience in Persia in two small volumes, *Uncle Oliver's Travels*. Next followed (1839–40) a *Pictorial History of Palestine and the Holy Land*. From 1841 to 1843 he found employment in preparing the letter-press for the *Gallery of Scripture Engravings*, in 3 vols. In 1843 he wrote a *History of Palestine* (published by A. and C. Black, of Edinburgh), and *Thoughts among Flowers* (published by the Religious Tract Society). In 1845 he prepared *The Pictorial Sunday Book*, and commenced the work which, in its latest form (3d edition), still constitutes one of the best works of the kind in any language, the *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*. See DICTIONARIES, BIBLICAL. Though the work already accomplished (up to 1848)

would have sufficed for the lifetime of almost any man, Kitto labored on indefatigably, and not only brought out contributions of great value, but originated and edited the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, a quarterly, which, by its masterly productions, has made English scholarship famous even among the all-knowing Teutons. He continued the editorship of the *Journal* until 1853. His last and most popular work was the *Daily Bible Illustrations*, completed in eight volumes. During its progress his health gave way, and he retired to Cannstadt, near Stuttgard, in Germany, where he died, Nov. 25, 1854. Dr. Kitto's services to the cause of Scripture learning were great in his own sphere. He revived and freshened the study of Eastern manners, and his origination of his *Cyclopædia* marks an epoch in the Biblical literature of England. Our own work is not unfrequently dependent upon the labors of this extraordinary character. His life itself, with his physical defect and early privations, was a marvel of self-education and heroic perseverance. The University of Giessen in 1844 honored him with the doctorate of divinity, though he was a layman. An interesting autobiography is contained in his *Lost Senses*. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* s. v.; *Memoirs of John Kitto, D.D.*, compiled chiefly from his letters and journals, by J. E. Ryland, M.A.; with a *Critical Estimate of Dr. Kitto's Life and Writings*, by Prof. Eadie, D.D. (Edinb. and London, 1856, 8vo); Eadie, John, *Life of Kitto* (Edinb. 1857, 8vo); *Lond. Athenæum*, 1857, June 27; *North Brit. Rev.* Feb. 1847; Littell, *Living Age*, lii, 445 sq. (J. H. W.)

Klaiber, Christian Benjamin, a German theologian, was born Sept. 15, 1795, in Würtemberg, and was educated at the University of Tübingen, where he became a professor of theology in 1823. Later he removed to Stetten, in Remsthal, as pastor, and died in 1836. He published *Studien der Württembergischen Geistlichkeit.*

Klarenbach, Adolf, a noted martyr of the Reformation, was born at the close of the 15th century, near the city of Lennep, in the duchy of Berg, and eagerly pursued his studies first at Münster, then at Cologne, under two instructors who afterwards became his inquisitors. He became master of a school at Münster in 1520, and sought to impart his new views of faith to his pupils. On this account he was driven successively from Münster, Wesel, Buderich, and Osnabrück, followed sometimes by those who had come under his instruction. He became at last a preacher in his native region, boldly fulfilling his mission, notwithstanding the anxious remonstrances of his parents and the threats of the magistrates, and on finally leaving Lennep he addressed to the authorities of the city a defence from Scripture of his decidedly Lutheran position, declaring that, should they even take his life, "they could not take from him Christ, his everlasting life." At Cologne, in the spring of 1528, he undertook the defence of an old friend and colaborer, Klopreiss, and was himself thereupon imprisoned with his friend. He was heard before the civil, and later before the ecclesiastical court, in presence of his two former instructors, Arnold von Zongern and Johann von Venradt. Theodore Fabricius, who had himself suffered much in Cologne in behalf of the evangelical doctrine, made great efforts for Klarenbach's release. He succeeded in delivering Klopreiss, and there came an imperial requisition from Speier upon the city of Cologne to show cause why Klarenbach was detained. The city disregarded the subsequent judgment of the imperial court in the prisoner's favor, and said "it knew no supreme court, but only a dungeon court." Into the archbishop's dungeon Klarenbach was now thrown with others, especially Peter Flysteden. On the 4th of March, 1529, Klarenbach, exhorted to firmness and bravery by his friend Peter, was taken from the dungeon for final judgment before the inquisitors. The grand inquisitor, Köllin, solemnly admonished him to a definite retraction. No free address, notwithstanding the clamors of the spectators for it, was permitted him. After the example of Paul he appealed to the emperor, but the appeal was only set down as another strong evidence of heresy; sentence of death was pronounced on the 19th of March, and the city council determined upon its execution. Farther attempts were made during the subsequent months of his imprisonment to turn the martyr from his faith. "It will cost you your neck," it was said. "Here it is," replied he, bending his neck; "this you can have, but not your will with me." In the autumn a destructive pestilence visited Cologne, and the priests declared it a judgment of heaven upon heresy and the sin of forbearance with heretics. The 27th of September had come. Through an air-hole of the dungeon, the prisoners were asked if they still stood by their opinions. "As long as God will," replied Klarenbach. Efforts of his relatives at persuasion, and of the monks who accompanied them, were unavailing. Both the prisoners went forth courageously. Minute events in the passage of the procession, the contending sentiments which it awakened in the spectators, and the whole dramatic power of the scene, are depicted in a publication of that day entitled *Alle Acta Adolphi Klarenbach*—written professedly by an eye and ear witness. The prophecy uttered by Klarenbach on his way to the stake has met its fulfilment: "Oh Cologne, Cologne, how thou dost persecute the Word of God! a cloud is in the sky which will yet bring down a rain of righteousness."—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. xix, s. v.

Klaus, Brother. See Flue, Nicholas of.

Klauser, Salomon, a German theologian, was born at Zürich, Switzerland, in 1745; entered the ministry in 1768, and was called to a pastorate in his native place in 1784, where he died April 14, 1796. Klauser has left us only a few of his sermons, but these all evince superior scholarship. A selection of them was printed in 1798, and was accompanied with an introduction by Dr. H. A. Niemeyer. A list of those printed is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Klausing, Anton Ernst, a German theologian of some note, was born at Hervorden, in Westphalia, April 11, 1729, and educated at the University of Leipzig. He travelled for three years in Holland, Italy, and England, and on his return taught at Leipzig. He died July 6, 1803. Klausing was thoroughly conversant with several modern languages, and besides translations of the *Sermons of Sterne*, *King's Usages in the Greek Church of Russia*, a collection of the latest works on the *History of the Jesuits in Portugal*, etc., he published several valuable theological works. The most important of his original productions are, perhaps, *Commentatio super loco Pauli ad Rom. ix*, 23, 24 (Halæ, 1754, 4to):—*Historiæ controversiæ recentissimæ inter Pontificem Romanum et rempublicam Genuensem*, etc. (Lips. 1765, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* ii, 106 sq.

Klebitz (Klebitus), Wilhelm, a German theologian of the Reformation period, and favorably inclined to the reformatory movement, flourished at Freyburg about 1560. Nothing further is known of his personal history. He wrote *De buccella intincta, quam comedit Judas, Matt. xxvi*, contained in the *Crit. Sac.* vol. vi; and, in the bitter controversy which he waged with Heshusius (q. v.), *Victoriam veritatis ac ruinam Papatus Saxonici contra Tilemannum Heshusium de S. Synaxi.*

Klee, Heinrich, one of the most distinguished German Roman Catholic theologians of modern times, was born at Münstermaifeld, near Coblentz, April 20, 1800. In 1809 he entered the *Seminarium puerorum* of Mayence, and in 1817 the great theological school under Liebermann. At the early age of nineteen he became a professor in the minor theological school, a situation which he held for some ten years, and, in connection with pastor Schmitz, greatly developed the sciences of philology and pædagogics. He was ordained priest in 1823, became professor of Biblical exegesis and Church history in the theological seminary in 1825, and a few years after professor of philosophy. In 1825 he attained

the degree of D.D. at Würzburg by his able dissertation *De chiliasmo primorum sæculorum*. In 1827 he wrote a treatise on *Auricular Confession*, and in 1829 a commentary on the Gospel of St. John. He acquired at the same time great popularity at Mayence as a preacher. So great, indeed, was his renown, that several high-schools endeavored to secure him, but he finally accepted a call to Bonn University. Here he gave great satisfaction to the strict Roman Catholic party, but had a long and severe controversy with Hermes (q. v.) and the Hermesians, who were then protected by the archbishop. Klee taught the popular doctrine that faith was the basis of theology; Hermes, on the other hand, inclined more to accept philosophy as its basis. With Klee, who evidently endeavored to infuse into the theological system of Romanism a philosophical method, objective reason, revelation, Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church, all having the same origin, must naturally constitute part of an indivisible whole, which it remained only for subjective reason to prove by the testimony of history, and to arrange in obedience to faith. Thus, with him, the definition of religion was chiefly objective: "Religion is a union between God, as truth, and man, as recognising him," etc.; "Religion is realized by revelation on the part of God, and by faith on the part of man;" "The Church is Christianity in its present state and activity;" "The Church, in its nature, is such as Christ has made it;" "The inward and outward life of the Church is established and preserved by the hierarchy;" "It is the most perfect divine-human polity;" "Christ established the primacy in order to preserve the unity of the hierarchy." He argued against Hermes that the Roman Catholic doctrine of faith has for the theologian and thinker the same authoritative evidence as the empiric laws of nature for the student of natural philosophy. This is losing sight of the fact that nature is the result of necessary laws, and a pure action of God, while Church tradition is but the result of historical freedom, which we find full of defects, and has therefore to be judged on the ground of its origin and of its continued validity. In his theory Klee was a Kantian, but in practice he was an ardent Roman Catholic apologist. It may even be questioned whether the strong traditionalistic faith of Klee and his school, which permits only a historical demonstration of the truth of revelation, has rendered any great and lasting service to Roman Catholic theology. Klee's system coincides with the final development of abstract Protestant supranaturalism, inasmuch as he makes the truth of the whole system of revelation to depend upon historical proofs. Nevertheless his system is much more dangerous than Hermes's, for while the latter identified philosophical certainty with confidence of faith, Klee identified philosophy with ecclesiastical Christianity itself. He gave permanent form to these doctrines in *System der Kathol. Dogmatik* (Bonn, 1831). When Clement August became archbishop, Klee's system prevailed; he was appointed examinator, and his lectures on dogmatics, which had always been well attended, were crowded. The exile of the archbishop, however, changed his position, and he accepted a call to Munich in 1839. He died there July 28, 1841. Besides the above mentioned works he wrote *Commentar über d. Apostels Paulus Sendschreiben a. d. Römer* (Mentz, 1830):—*Encykl. d. Theologie* (ibid. 1832):—*Auslegung d. Briefes a. d. Hebräer* (ibid. 1833):—*Die Ehe* (ibid. 1833):—*D. Kathol. Dogmatik* (ibid. 1834–35, 3 vols.; 3d ed. 1844):—*Dogmengeschichte* (ibid. 1835–37, 2 vols.). His *Grundriss d. Kathol. Moral* was published after his death (in 1843) by Himioben. See, besides the authorities cited in the article Hermes, Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 711; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 213 sq.; Migne, *Conclusions*, p. 1239.

Klefeker, Bernhard, a German preacher of distinction, was born at Hamburg Jan. 12, 1760, and was educated at Leipzig University, which he entered in 1779, and where, under the instruction of that eminent German pulpit orator Zollikoffer, he laid the foundation for his future excellency as a preacher. In May, 1791, he was called as regular preacher to Osnabrück, and, after a stay of five years, removed thence to his native city to assume the pastorate of St. James's Church. Here he labored with great acceptance and success until his death, June 10, 1825. Though Klefeker aimed to be eminently successful in the pulpit, his literary efforts betoken a mind of rare activity. He published, besides several works on practical religion and his *Sermons*, a homiletical magazine (*Homiletisches Ideenmagazin*, 1809–19, 8 vols. 8vo):—*Praktische Vorlesungen ü. das N. Test.* (1811–12, 3 vols. 8vo). See Döring, *Deutsche Kanzelredner*, p. 158 sq.

Klein, Friedrich August, a German theologian, was born at Friedrichshaide, near Ronneburg, Nov. 7, 1793; entered the University of Jena in 1811, and became a minister at Jena in 1819; but only two years later he was suddenly taken ill, and died Feb. 12, 1823, having a year before his death received the honorable appointment of professor of theology at the university. Klein published in 1817 *Vertraute Briefe ü. Christenthum u. Protestantismus*, and in 1817 began with Schröter the publication of the theological journal *Für Christenthum und Gottesgelahrtheit*. Of his other publications the following deserve our notice: *Beredsamkeit des Geistlichen* (1818, 8vo):—*Grundlinien des Religiösismus* (1819, small 8vo):—*Dogmatik d. evangel. protest. Kirche* (1822, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 108 sq. (J. H. W.)

Klein, Georg Michael, a German Roman Catholic priest, was born at Alizheim in 1777, and was educated at the high-school in Würzburg. He was ordained priest in 1800, but, securing the friendship of the celebrated German philosopher Schelling, Klein thereafter devoted himself zealously to the study of metaphysics. He became professor at Würzburg in 1804, and in 1808 removed to Bamberg in the same capacity. In 1815 he went to Regensburg University as professor of philosophy, but in the year following he returned again to Würzburg. He died in 1819. His works are, *Beiträge zum Studium der Philosophie des All* (Würzb. 1805, 8vo):—*Verstandeslehre* (1810):—*Versuch d. Ethik als Wissenschaft zu begründen* (Rudolfst. 1811, 8vo):—*Darstellung der philosophischen Religions- u. Sittenlehre* (Würzb. 1818, 8vo)—by far his ablest work.—*Kathol. Real-Encyklop.* xi, 850.

Kleinknecht, Conrad Daniel, a German theologian, was born at Leipheim Aug. 22, 1691, and was educated at the University of Jena. By advice of the celebrated Orientalist and theologian Buddeus, in whom Kleinknecht found a warm friend, he accepted a position as teacher in the Orphanage of Halle, which he held until 1719. In 1725 he became pastor at Pfuhl, in 1731 at Leipheim, and died July 11, 1753. He was especially active in behalf of missions, and sought to interest the state authorities for them. For a list of his writings, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 115 sq.

Klemm, Johann Christian, a German theologian, born at Stuttgard Oct. 22, 1688, was the son of Johann Conrad Klemm, who, at the time of his death in 1717, was professor of theology at Tübingen. Young Klemm was educated at the universities of Stuttgard and Tübingen, and secured the degree of A.M. in 1707. Shortly after he began to lecture at the university, in 1717 he became professor extraordinary of philosophy, in 1725 of theology, and the year following of the Oriental languages. The degree of D.D. was bestowed upon him in 1730. He was promoted to a full or regular professorship in 1736. He died Oct. 1, 1754. A list of his works is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 118 sq. See also *Allgemeines Hist. Lex.* s. v.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.

Kleptomania (κλέπτω, to *steal*, and μανία, *madness*), a form of partial mental derangement which is manifested by a propensity to steal and hoard articles

that can be surreptitiously appropriated. The propensity to acquire becomes, in such cases, so irresistible, and the will so impotent, that the appropriation is generally regarded as involuntary, and the perpetrator, therefore, irresponsible; but, in order to constitute a case of moral irresponsibility, it should undoubtedly be insisted on that to the phenomena of *moral* there should always be superadded those of *intellectual* disorder, the assumption being that so long as the intellect is unperverted the person will be found to possess a consciousness of the nature of the criminal act in relation to law. The plea of insanity in the agent should not be admitted where it is evident that the subject is perfectly aware of the tendency of his or her actions; the simple moral inability to resist this temptation is only in the same predicament with that of every unquestioned candidate for the penitentiary or gallows. A state which may seem to deserve the name of moral insanity, as exhibiting a perversion of the moral sentiments, tendencies, and perceptions, with a loss, to a great extent, of self-control, is often prominent in the early stages of mental disease, and before the intellect is palpably affected. Up to this point the patient should undoubtedly be held personally responsible for his or her conduct in a criminal sense. When certain delusions, when delirium or incoherency supervene, the case then, without question, may be set down as that of insanity, which would absolve the patient from responsibility. The question here suggests itself as to the place which morbid impulses ought to have—how nearly are they allied to insanity, and how far can they be urged as extenuating, or even excusing misdemeanors or crimes? This strange thraldom to a morbid prompting not unfrequently has its outlet in crimes of the deepest dye. When lord Byron was sailing from Greece to Constantinople, he was observed to stand over the sleeping body of an Albanian with a poniard in his hand, and after a while to turn away muttering, "I should like to know how a man feels who has committed a murder!" There can be no doubt that lord Byron, urged by a morbid impulse, was on the very eve of knowing what he desired to know. But one of the most singular instances of morbid impulses in connection with material things is related in the case of a young man who, in visiting a large manufacturing establishment, stood opposite a large hammer, and watched with great interest its perfectly regular strokes. At first it was beating immense lumps of crimson metal into thin black sheets, but the supply becoming exhausted, at last it only descended on the polished anvil. Still the young man gazed intently on its motion; then he followed its strokes with a corresponding motion of his head; then his left arm moved to the same tune; and, finally, he deliberately placed his fist on the anvil, and in a second it was crushed to a jelly. The only explanation he could afford was that he felt an impulse to do it; that he knew he should be disabled; that he saw all the consequences in a misty kind of manner, but that he still felt a power within above sense and reason—a morbid impulse, in fact, to which he succumbed, and by which he lost a good right hand. This incident suggests many things besides proving the peculiar nature and power of morbid impulses—such, for instance, as a law of sympathy on a scale hitherto undreamt of, as well as a musical tone pervading all things. An illustrious physician has lately left on record the opinion that "one of the chief causes of the terrible scenes which accompanied the final suppression of the Communist outbreak was a contagious mental alienation. The minds of the Parisians were gradually unhinged by the privations of the siege. The revolt of the 18th of March gave the last blow to brains which were already shaken, and at length the greater part of the population went raving mad. Women are, under such circumstances, fiercer and more reckless than men. This is because their nervous system is more fully developed; their brain is weaker, and their sensibilities are more acute than those of the stronger sex; and they are consequently far more dangerous in such paroxysms. None of them knew exactly what they were fighting for; they were possessed by one of the various forms of mania—that which impelled the French Jansenists of the latter half of the 18th century to torture themselves with a strange delight in pain of the acutest kind. The men who threw themselves on the bayonets of the soldiers in a paroxysm of passion were a few moments afterwards utterly prostrate and begging for mercy. They were no more cowards in the last state than they were heroes in the first—they were simply madmen." In recurring to the "Reign of Terror" of the first French Revolution, Lewis Cass has this profound reflection: "In surveying the French national character of the present day" (this was written in 1840), "it is difficult to recognise those traits of cruelty which were so shockingly developed during the Revolution. A *monomania* must have prevailed, hurrying the nation into acts inconsistent with its general feeling, and marking that time of political effervescence as an extraordinary period in human history." The general term *mono*mania implies that the individual is deranged only on *one* subject, or in reference to one object, or in one particular train of thought or faculty of thinking, and that his intellect, judgment, and emotions are otherwise sound, at least when not exercised on the subject of his derangement. This, however, is not strictly true. In almost all cases of so-called monomania there are other morbid indications besides the salient one—morbid dislikes or suspicions, morbid vanity or irritability. Monomania seems to arise in the failure of the faculties round a given centre of thought, in a paralysis of power along a given line of mental direction, unaccompanied by any parallel paralysis of *interest*, so that the patient busies himself involuntarily on a subject on which he has lost the power of bringing his faculties properly to bear. It is the attempt of weakened faculties to work upon an overstrained nervous string, so that all mental power disappears just where the wish to apply it is greatest. Now these morbid centres of partial imbecility are, *cæteris paribus*, more likely to spring up in minds below the average in general power than in those above them, though the centre of the disease itself will often be on the noblest or most sensitive part of the mind. These peculiarities are nearly always distinctly marked in monomania, particularly in that form of it which is called kleptomania. It is usually exhibited by persons who have no motive to steal, and is frequently satisfied by purloining articles of no value. A baronet of large fortune stole, while on the Continent, pieces of old iron and of broken crockery, and in such quantities that tons of these collections were presented to the custom-house officers. In the second volume of the *Medical Critic* the case of a female is detailed who could not resist the impulse of appropriating everything within her reach. In searching this woman on one occasion there were found 15 bags upon her person, in which there were 1182 articles, mostly worthless, viz., 104 bits of paper, 82 sewing-needles, 18 old gloves, 12 moulds for wax leaves, 19 buttons, 60 feathers, 8 parcels of dried fish, 135 bits of ribbons, 9 bottles, 61 lozenges, and a variety of other articles, the refuse of the place, to which she had at various times taken a fancy. Another case reported by high medical authority is that of a rich but eccentric gentleman living in an old manor-house in Lincolnshire, England. He was a good business man, and managed his estate with care and prudence, auditing his steward's yearly accounts with the skill of an expert. His neighbors were all kindly disposed towards him, and he was charitably disposed towards the poor. Even the servants who saw him every day, although they confessed that he was "certainly very peculiar at times," never once dreamed of impugning his intellect. He was insane in one direction only, and one might have passed a lifetime with him without discovering it. He would be seized by a sudden determination to travel, and on such occasions he would travel in state, with a retinue of servants. After a fortnight's or perhaps a month's ab-

sence, he would return home. Invariably, on the morning of the next day after his return, towels, which had been taken from an open portmanteau, were found scattered about the room. After breakfast, his custom was to retire to the library and write the addresses of all the hotel-keepers at whose houses he had slept during his absence on so many slips of writing-paper, with directions to his servants to inclose to each address the number of towels specified upon each piece of paper, and to copy such other writing as they might find there, and send this in a letter, with the towels, to the hotel-keeper. This gentleman was one of the unhappy race of kleptomaniacs, whose particular mania impelled him to purloin towels. He subsequently gave to a friend a history of his case, and said he was goaded to these journeyings and pilferings by an irresistible impulse, which he insisted was the result of demoniacal possession. He was never impelled, however, a second time on the same journey; so that, while no hotel-keeper would be likely to suspect, during his visit, a gentleman of his rank and style as one who would steal his towels, it never transpired publicly, so far as is known, that he was a thief, although his own consciousness of the fact embittered his existence. Sometimes, in the case of this form of monomania, there exists, in the mind of the sufferer, the delusion that what he steals is his own property, or has been stolen from him, and that he merely reclaims his own. Sometimes he imagines that God orders him to steal. The case is recorded of a Scotch clergyman, distinguished for his learning, piety, and charity; he stole Bibles with a special view to the glory of God by the propagation of the Gospel. His manse was a little "missionary society of stolen Bibles," and he was as much in earnest in the conversion of souls by the contraband process as the most enthusiastic foreign missionary could be in his calling. He was at last detected in wholesale Bible-stealing. It was farther discovered that he had organized a wide missionary district, and left a Bible or a Testament at every cottage where it was needed along the route. The most touching fact in the story is that he was arrested while on his knees by the bedside of a dying old man, with a stolen Bible lying wide open before him on the bed. "What made you steal the Bible, Mr. B.?" asked the sheriff, with pious horror on his face. "God made me steal them, good man," was the reply; "he was weary of seeing his poor people perish of Gospel-hunger because the rich Bible Society could not afford to feed them without the baubees, and so God set me to steal for them and save them." He could not be persuaded that he had done wrong. The delusion of the clergyman, who was a very poor man, naturally suggested insanity. But he was perfectly sane upon all other points, and it is doubtful whether he would have received the benefit of his malady—whether, indeed, it would have been admitted as a malady at all—if a learned and philosophical physician in a neighboring town had not positively sworn that he was the "victim of moral mania." There is this peculiarity sometimes in the case of kleptomaniacs, that their purloining is confined to single articles. The case is reported of a lady who could not resist the temptation to steal silk stockings. Another lady would steal gloves whenever the opportunity was afforded. A boy was arrested some months since in Brooklyn for stealing slippers from the feet of ladies while walking in the street. His friends came forward and testified that he had been in the habit of stealing slippers, and was never known to have stolen anything else, all his life. A letter-carrier in Harlem, N. Y., was detected in abstracting letters and concealing them under a rock, which he had practiced for more than a year. They were most carefully hoarded in his place of concealment, and were found unopened. It was proven in his case, we believe, that he had a mania for stealing letters without any apparent motive, as he never made any use of them except to hoard them.

The cases quoted are sufficient to prove that the form of moral insanity to which the name of kleptomania has been given really exists. From these, as well as many other instances which will readily occur to the reader, it will be seen that there can be little difficulty for a skilful physician, after a short examination, in distinguishing between a real victim of this disease and an ordinary thief. And this, as well as every other true form of insanity, we presume, frees every one, whether previously bad or good, from moral responsibility in this particular regard. When the actual condition exists, no matter what the conduct may have been which preceded and conduced to it, the earthly account of the subject has already been closed, and the deeds that follow, we are sure, will be mercifully judged of by him who knows whereof his poor frail creatures are made, and remembers that they are but dust. (E. de P.)

It is proper to add to the above remarks, which are evidently just in their conclusion, some considerations setting the question of moral responsibility in such cases in a fuller light.

1. The distinction is well made in the beginning of the article that some *intellectual* defect must be proven in order to constitute real insanity in any case. It is not enough that a perversion of the moral faculties exists, for that is the quintessence of guilt; and on this ground he who should most effectually obliterate his own conscience would thereby the most completely excuse himself in whatever crime he might thus render himself capable of committing. The mere fact that the persons laboring under kleptomania are frequently not conscious of any wrong-doing on their own part is not of itself an adequate plea in their justification.

2. The actual presence of mental imbecility in these peculiar cases is proved by the fact of the *absurd* manner in which the subjects of the disease steal. In the first place, they do not commit theft *for their own benefit;* they do not appropriate the articles taken to their own use, nor do they have any occasion for them. The *moral motive*, i. e. gain, is evidently absent, and their conduct is at once understood, when the circumstances become known, as very different from ordinary cases of shop-lifting. In the second place, there is usually a *pettiness*, oftentimes an absolute puerility in the acts committed, that marks the person as for the time "non compos mentis." The articles purloined are frequently worthless in themselves, and always relatively so. The conduct of the individual so strongly resembles that harmless and unmeaning gathering of sticks and straws which is one of the most common signs of lunacy, that every one informed with the case spontaneously sets it down in the same category. In the third place, the impulse to these acts comes on *in sudden fits, quite at variance with the usual course* of the individual's conduct. A general good character is always held to be one of the strongest evidences against the probability of a particular offence; in these cases, the isolated nature of the acts, their sporadic occurrence, the peculiar line in which they take place, all go to show the abnormal condition of the mind at the time. The mere *violence* of the impulse to commit them, it is true, is not a valid excuse; for it is hard even for the subject himself to be sure that this is really irresistible; but the *frantic* character of it, as he experiences it, and as it appears to others, is a legitimate proof of its insanity. In short, the utter and marked want of congruity between the behavior of the person under these circumstances and ordinary rational life stamps the act as that of a special mania, unaccountable to the individual himself in his lucid moments. The foregoing criterion, we may remark, will serve to distinguish genuine cases of irresponsible kleptomania from deliberate and culpable thievishness, whether habitual or occasional.

3. The question whether this may be a *congenital* tendency we cannot here digress to consider, except so far as to remark that this, if proved in the affirmative, would not really affect the main issue of moral responsibility; for human depravity is all confessedly inherited, but we do not, on that account, hold any one free from

the obligation to restrain its manifestation, and, by using the helps within his reach, even ultimately eradicating it. In like manner we pass by the interesting cognate subject of the peculiar passion for intoxicating drinks experienced by the habitual inebriate, and its violent—seemingly overwhelming—tendency to return on the slightest stimulus, even after years of reform; merely observing that here, whether in instances of inherited or acquired appetite, the disease—for it undoubtedly is such—is a *compound* one, i. e. both of the body and the mind, the latter only—as being the controlling element—being the subject of moral consideration; and that the responsibility in these cases is at most simply shifted to *total abstinence* henceforth from the deadly seducer. This last thought, however, may essentially apply to kleptomania likewise; for just as it is the *first drop* that brings back the drunkard's fatal appetite, so perhaps it was the indulgence in the first petty theft that developed the uncontrollable passion for purloining. In this light the subject has a grave lesson for all fallen humanity, inasmuch as each son of man bears within his bosom the germ of every hydra sin, which perchance needs but one fecundative act to cause it to spring forth into virulent life.

Kleschius, DANIEL, a German theologian, born at Iglau, in Moravia, in the early part of the 17th century, was educated at the universities of Strasburg and Wittenberg, and then preached for a number of years in Hungaria and Croatia. In 1673 he went to Jena, taught there for a time, and then removed to Weissenfels, where he became a professor at the gymnasium. Kleschius was a very peculiar character. He made many predictions, among others that the year 1700 would bring the final judgment day. He lived, however, beyond the time appointed. He died about 1701. See *Allgemeines Hist. Lex.* vol. iii, s. v.

Klesel. See KHLESL.

Klette, JOHANN GEORG, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Radeberg, in Meissen, October 12, 1650, and studied theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg. He was made professor of theology and metaphysics at Zerbst in 1684. In 1696 he became pastor in that place, and died Dec. 28, 1697.

Kleuker, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, one of the most eminent modern German theologians, was born at Osterode Oct. 24, 1749. He studied history, philosophy, and theology at the University of Göttingen. In 1773 he became a private tutor in Bückeburg, and there made the acquaintance of Herder, through whose influence he was appointed prorector of the gymnasium of Lemgo, and, in 1778 rector of the gymnasium of Osnabrück. Herder also induced and encouraged him to write on the theological questions of the day. In acknowledgment of his literary activity and profound learning, he was made D.D. by the University of Helmstädt in 1791. In 1798 he was appointed fourth ordinary professor of theology at Kiel, which position he filled with great success, lecturing on the exegesis of the O. and N. Test., Christian apologetics, Christian antiquities, ancient Church history, the doctrine of Christ and of the apostles, symbolics, and Christian science, of which, in 1800, he published a *Grundriss* or *Encyklopädie d. Theologie* in 2 vols., for the use of his numerous pupils. The last few years of his life were spent in retirement after he had vainly tried to oppose the progress of scientific rationalism. Kleuker, says Hagenbach (see below), "was one of the few men who, in doctrine and writings, stood in avowed opposition to the prevailing theological spirit of his times, of which he said that 'it had so poisoned the whole atmosphere that men hardly dared to speak of Christ as anything more than a passing shadow.'" He was not even satisfied with Herder, who, as he held, made too many concessions to the new style of doctrine and thinking. Yet his simple, evangelical faith, his humble piety, and his active interest in all that was grand and good, secured him the intimate friendship of that class of men, while his profound learning, especially in Oriental and in classical antiquities, procured him the respect and consideration of all scholars. In judging a theologian, his influence on his associates and on the age in which he lived, it does not suffice to examine simply his writings; as much, if not more, can be determined of his character by the testimony of his life and death. With pleasure, then, do we point to the dying testimony of this celebrated German theologian. His biographer (see below) says of his last moments: "I had the fortune to be present when Kleuker died, for I must call it a good fortune to see a true Christian die as calmly as he did. As I came in, the approach of death was clearly indicated by his cold hands, almost motionless pulse, and difficult breathing. A kind of prophetic spirit appeared to come over him when he once more warned against the errors of his contemporaries by proclaiming the great truths that he had so often taught. After saying, 'It is plainly recorded in all passages of the Old and New Testament that there is only one true Saviour, and by them all the error of our day which looks to self-redemption for salvation is refuted,' he sweetly fell back into the corner of the sofa, bowed his head, and, without experiencing the least convulsive struggle with death, fell asleep, and passed away into the better world," May 23, 1827. Kleuker's activity as a writer was wonderful. He wrote first a Latin programme, entitled *Genius e scriptis antiquitatis monumentis hauriendus* (1775), which was followed in quick succession by *Zend-Avesta nach Anquetil du Perron* (1776–1777, 3 parts):—*Anhang z. Zend-Avesta* (1781–1783, 2 vols.):—*Zend-Avesta im Kleinen* (1789):—*Menschlicher Versuch ü. d. Sohn Gottes u. d. Menschen, in d. Zeit wie ausser d. Zeit* (1776):—*Gedanken Pascals* (1777):—*Uebersetzung u. Erklärung d. Schriften Salomo's u. d. Salomonischen Denkwürdigkeiten; Uebersetzung der Werke Plato's* (1778–1797, 6 vols.):—*Johannes, Petrus, und Paulus als Christologen betrachtet* (1785):—a prize essay, entitled *Ueber d. Natur u. d. Ursprung d. Emanationslehre b. d. Kabbalisten* (1785):—*Hollwells merkwürdige historische Nachrichten v. Indostan u. Bengalen*, etc. (from the English, 1778):—*Abhandlungen ü. d. Gesch., etc., Asiens, von Sir William Jones* (from the English, 1795–1797, 4 vols.):—*Einige Belehrungen über Toleranz, Vernunft, Offenbarung, Wanderung d. Israeliten durchs rothe Meer und Auferstehung Christi von d. Todten* (1778):—*Neue Prüfung u. Erklärung d. vorzüglichsten Beweise f. d. Warheit u. d. göttlichen Ursprung d. Christenthums w. d. Offenbarung überhaupt* (3 parts, 1788):—*Ausführliche Untersuchung d. Gründe f. d. Aechtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit d. schriftlichen Urkunden d. Christenthums* (5 vols.):—*Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus's Vertheidigung d. christlichen Sache gegen d. Heiden mit erläuternden Anmerkungen* (from the Latin, 1798):—*Briefe an eine christliche Freundin über d. Herder'sche Schrift v. Gottes Sohn* (1802):—*Ueb. d. Ja u. Nein d. biblisch-christlichen u. d. Vernunftheolog.* (1819):—*Biblische Sympathien od. erläuternde Bemerkungen u. Betrachtungen ü. d. Berichte d. Evangelisten v. Jesu Lehren u. Thaten* 1820):—*Ueb. d. alten und neuen Protestantismus* (1823). See H. P. Sexto, *Expositio Sermonis Jesu. Joh. V*, 39 *et super ejus sententia de nexu inter scriptorum Mosaicorum argumentum et doctrinam suam nonnulla* (Helmst. 1792, 8vo); *Notiz und Karakteristik d. iztlebenden theologischen Schriftsteller Deutschlands* (1797, p. 108 sq.); *Neue Kielische gelehrte Zeitung* (2 Jahrg. 1798), p. 282–286; J. O. Thiess, *Gelehrtengesch. d. Universität zu Kiel*, i 375–447; Ratjen, *J. F. Kleuker u. Briefe seiner Freunde* (Göttingen, 1842); Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* ii, 190 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* vii, 742. (J. H. W.)

Kley, EDUARD, a Jewish preacher and educator of note, born June 10, 1789, at Bernstadt, in Silesia, was prominently connected with the reformatory movements in the synagogue at the opening of the 19th century. He was a teacher and preacher at Berlin when, in 1818, the Progressive Jews of Hamburg called him to the superintendency of their schools, and later to the duties of a pastorate. Kley was the first Jew who preached in a

temple (the name for the houses of worship of Reformed Jews), and who used a German liturgy and introduced an organ. May 9, 1840, he resigned his pastoral office, but the superintendence of the Jewish schools he held until 1848, when his advanced age obliged him to forego all active labors. His admirers presented him with a large fund for his support, but he declined to use it for himself, and founded the "Eduard Kley Stiftung" for the support and assistance of old teachers not sufficiently provided for by the state. He died Oct. 4, 1867. His sermons, which are generally acknowledged to be of superior order, were published at Hamburg in 1826–27, 1844, 8vo. He also published two volumes of homilies: *Predigt Skizzen*, or *Beiträge zu einer künftigen Homiletik* (Leipz. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo), and *Die deutsche Synagogue oder Ordnung des Gottesdienstes* (Berlin, 1817–18, 2 vols. 8vo):—רוח עברות, *Katechismus d. Mosaischen Religionslehre* (Berl. 1814; 3d ed. Leipz 1839 and 1850). Kley is often and justly called the Schleiermacher of the Jewish pulpit of Germany in our age. See Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 336; Kayserling (Dr. M.), *Bibliothek Jüd. Kanzelredner* (Berl. 1870, 8vo), i, 47 sq.; *Illustrirtes Monatsheft f. d. gesammten Int. d. Judenthums*, ii, 419 sq.; Jonas, *Lebensskizze v. Herrn Dr. E. Kley* (Hamburg, 1859, 12mo); Fürst, *Bib. Jud.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Kling, Christian Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Altdorf, in Würtemberg, Nov. 4, 1800, and was educated at the University of Tübingen, where he became "repetent" in 1824. Two years later he entered the ministry, and settled at Waiblingen until 1832, when he removed to Marburg as professor of theology. In 1840 he was appointed to and accepted a like position at Bonn University, which he held until 1847; then became preacher at Ebersbach, in Würtemberg; later deacon at Marbach, and died in 1861. Kling was a ready writer, and contributed largely to the different German periodicals; he was one of the ablest assistants on the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*. He edited J. F. von Flatt's *Vorlesungen über die Pastoral Briefe* (1831), and contributed a *Commentary to the Corinthians* to Lange's *Bibelwerk* (translated by Daniel W. Poor, D.D., Scribner's edit. New York, 1871, royal 8vo).

Klinge, Zacharias Laurentius, a Swedish theologian who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was first professor of theology at Dorpat, then preacher at the Swedish court, and later pastor at Stockholm and bishop of Gothenburg. He died Sept. 3, 1671. He wrote *Theatrum Biblicum*, etc. See *Allgemeines Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 38.

Klingler, Antonius, a German Reformed theologian, was born at Zürich, Switzerland, Aug. 2, 1649; was educated at several of the most celebrated German universities; and became doctor theologiæ in 1677, and professor at the gymnasium at Hanau in the same year. In 1680 he was offered a professorship at the University of Groningen, but he declined this honor in favor of a pastorate in his native place. He died there in August, 1713. Klingler published several theological works, of which his best is *Bella Jehovæ*. See *Allgemeines Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 38.

Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb, an eminent German poet, one of the forerunners of the great German poetic renaissance of the 18th century—"the German Milton," as he is frequently styled—was born at Quedlinburg, Saxony, July 2, 1724. He received his early education at the school of his native place, and when sixteen years of age was admitted to the Gymnasium at Naumburg, where he became acquainted with the style of the classical authors of his country. While here his private hours were devoted to compositions both in prose and verse, particularly to the writing of pastorals, which were in great vogue among the Germans, and it is said that even at that early period he had decided to write a poem of greater length than any that had hitherto been attempted by his countrymen, and one that should do honor to German literature, which was at this time rather at low ebb. France was in the avantguard of political influence, and everything French was considered worthy of imitation; but French influence was most completely manifest in the social life of the Germans, particularly in their literature, and, as a late writer in the *Westminster Review* (Oct. 1871, p. 212) has it, "at no time, perhaps, was it more difficult to form and express original views in Germany." Klopstock had acquired the English language, and in his readings of English works his eye had fallen upon the immortal production of Milton. Trained from his youth to a religious life, and destined for the ministry, he naturally decided to present his nation with a like work that should stand by the side of the English production. If no more, he was determined that the German mind should turn towards English literature, and drink at its fountains, rather than be any longer subjected to that cold, correct, and unimaginative spirit which had hitherto tyrannized over their thoughts and habits. Bodmer, the great leader of the so-called "Swiss school" of German literature, and others of the Swiss school, were already furnishing his countrymen with able translations of English poets; among other works, he translated Milton's *Paradise Lost*. In 1745 Klopstock went to the University of Jena to study theology, but, amid the pursuit of studies in divinity, his attention at every convenient moment was occupied with the great work which he had projected. During his residence at that institution he composed the first three cantos in prose; but after his removal to Leipzig (in 1746), having made trial of hexameters in imitation of the melodious strains of Homer and Virgil, and being pleased with the success of the experiment, he resolved to execute the whole poem in that measure. Finally, in 1748, the first three cantos of his *Messiah* were published in the *Bremer Beiträge*, a journal which had been started by men determined, like Klopstock, to break loose from that shallow despotism which, under the leadership of the pedantic Gottsched, had so long hung over them. The fame of Klopstock, whom the year previous such men as Gellert, Rabener, Hagedorn, and Gleim had pointed out as the man likely and competent to inaugurate a new era in German poetry, now spread far and wide; for that poem enjoyed an extraordinary popularity among all who could appreciate the attractions of elegant diction and high devotional feeling. It was the subject of admiration in every circle—even in the pulpit it attracted notice, and was often quoted with applause. It gratified its pious author by its subserviency to the purposes of practical religion, for many portions of it were set to sacred music, and sung at the family worship of the Germans, and many of its finest passages were introduced to give point and liveliness to the pages of religious and devotional works of that day. It raised the name of Klopstock to the highest pinnacle of renown, insomuch that all classes of his countrymen, even the peasantry, learned to understand and love him as a sacred poet. His fame was spread even to foreign countries—for in 1750, when, on the invitation of some friends, he went to spend some time in German Switzerland (at Zürich), in the enjoyment of its wild and romantic scenery, he was received with a degree of respect almost bordering on veneration. While in that country his mind seems to have taken a patriotic tendency: the ancient Hermann (the Arminius of Tacitus) became his favorite hero, whose deeds he afterwards celebrated in some dramatic works. In Denmark the minister Bernstorff had become acquainted with the three cantos of the *Messiah*, and Klopstock was offered a pension of $400 by the Danish king on condition of coming to Copenhagen, and there finishing his poem. He set out in 1751, travelled through Brunswick and Hamburg, and at the latter place formed an intimacy with Margaretha Moller, daughter of a respectable merchant. At Copenhagen he was received by Bernstorff with the greatest respect, and introduced to the king, Frederick V, whom he accompanied on his travels. In 1754 he

went to Hamburg, which was at this time a sort of literary capital of Germany, and more particularly of its northern half, as Weimar became some years later of the southern half. Not only could Klopstock claim it as his residence, but it also contained for some time the great Lessing, who, by the way, was no mean defendant of Klopstock in the attacks made against the latter by Gottsched and his school; Herder occasionally visited the Hanse city, and a number of lesser lights, such as Voss, Claudius, Reimerus, the Stolbergs, etc., gathered there about the two chief luminaries. "Klopstock," says Mrs. Winkworth (*Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 326 sq.), speaking of his residence at Hamburg, "enjoyed a sort of reverence not unlike that paid to Dr. Johnson in England, but in some respects more flattering, as he was a man of whom it was much easier to make a popular, and especially a ladies' hero." Here the *Messiah* was at last finished in 1773, having thus occupied twenty-seven years in preparation. A complete edition of his odes and lyrics was brought out, and here he devoted the autumn of his long life to the study and purification of the German language and its grammar. He had always been a passionate lover of his country, but this did not prevent him from taking the keenest interest in the American War of Independence, and the opening of the French Revolution. He was among those who hailed the earlier years of the latter with eager sympathy, and the hope of a coming brighter æra for humanity, and who afterwards underwent the bitterness of profound disappointment. The National Assembly had marked their recognition of his friendship for the French people by according him the rights of a French citizen, but when the terrible massacres of 1793 took place he sent back to them his diploma. In Hamburg he married his "beloved" Margaretha, with whom, however, he enjoyed only a short union; she died in childbed in 1758. In 1771 he was honored with the appointment of Danish ambassador to Hamburg, and flourished at this place the remainder of his days, dividing his time between his public duties and the pursuits of literature. In 1792 Klopstock married for the second time, choosing the Frau von Winthern, an old love of his, who had meanwhile become a widow, and who survived him. He died in 1803, and was buried (March 22) by Hamburg with royal honors, a distinction which in Germany is generally accorded only to royal personages.

His work of next importance to the *Messiah* is a drama, above alluded to, entitled *Hermann's Schlacht* (the Battle of Arminius), the subject of which is the defeat of the Roman general Varus by the ancient Germans. It is scarcely so much a drama as a lyric poem in a dramatic form. It was composed in 1764. His other dramas are of a similar character, and were written evidently with intent to arouse German patriotism from its lethargy, and to breathe into the German heart the air of freedom. But the *Messiah* alone is of special interest to our readers, and we therefore give a particular description of it.

Klopstock's *Messiah* is a poem in twenty cantos, written in hexameters, except where certain choral songs occur in unrhymed lyrical measure. "The action opens after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when the Messiah withdraws from the people, and, alone on the Mount of Olives, renews his solemn vow to the Almighty Father to undertake the work of redemption; it closes when that work is completed, and he sits down at the right hand of God. Around the central figure of the God-man are grouped an infinite variety of spectators and actors: angels and seraphs, among whom Elva and Gabriel are especially appointed to attend on the divine sufferer; evil spirits who conspire against him, but one of whom, Abbadonna, repents and at last obtains mercy; Adam and Eve, and the patriarchs, who watch with profound interest and gratitude the reparation of the fall; and the inhabitants of another world, like in nature to man, but unfallen, who are permitted to know what is taking place among their sinful kindred. Even the Father himself is introduced as speaking, and the scene is sometimes laid in the highest heaven. The earthly actors are the mother and disciples of Jesus, the Jews, and the Romans, who lead him to death, and a number of those who have come in contact with him in his ministrations, among whom the most clearly drawn are two female figures, both named Cidli: one, the wife of Gedor, is a reminiscence of Meta, and her death is an exact transcript of Meta's death-bed; the other is the daughter of Jairus, between whom and Semida, the youth of Nain, there exists a pure but ardent attachment, which at last finds satisfaction in heaven. The immense number of personages thus introduced produces a confused impression; everything is described by one or another of them, and talked over at length; scarcely anything actually takes place before the reader; there is an absence of local coloring and of character, and very few of the actors have any distinct individuality at all; while the effort to keep the whole tone of the poem at the highest possible pitch of intensity and awe gives rise to an overstrained inflation of both thought and style, which becomes in the long run inexpressibly fatiguing. Yet Klopstock's poem has made for itself and for him a place in the literature of his country which does not depend on the number of readers it now attracts. Its subject is linked by a thousand invisible fibres to the whole Christian thought of centuries past, while its spirit of mercy, forgiveness, and tolerance—in a word, of redemption—is essentially characteristic of the later developments of Christianity. To treat such a theme worthily at all—to embody it in a form which, however full of defects, yet possesses a certain dignity and real genius—marks its author as a great poet, if not one of the greatest, and gives him a place historically even higher, perhaps, than he has a right to command as an artist." The poem certainly abounds in passages of the most beautiful and splendid poetry. An exuberant imagination everywhere scatters its wealth, and Klopstock has been said by one critic to be "as superior to Pindar in richness and deep feeling as the spiritual world he paints transcends in intrinsic magnificence the scenes celebrated by the Grecian bard;" and by another critic, "now to rival the tenderness of David, now to soar in the loftiest flights like Isaiah. The purity and pathos of its religious sentiments are equal to the excellence of its poetry. But all good and candid judges will allow that, though exhibiting a sublimity and beauty of no common order, it has failed to accomplish the confident expectations of the Germans, that it would eclipse the *Paradise Lost* of Milton." For, notwithstanding its grandeur, it is exceedingly tedious to read; and even at the time of Klopstock's greatest popularity this seems to have been felt, for Lessing observes, in an epigram, that everybody praises Klopstock, but few read him. His odes are valued by his own countrymen more than his epic, and some are truly sublime; but the construction of the language is so singular, and the connection of the thoughts so often non-apparent, that these odes are reckoned among the most difficult in the language. Both in his *Messiah* and his odes he is dignified and sublime, but his rhapsodical manner contrasts strangely with the pedantry which is always apparent. Goethe, in his conversations with Eckermann, expressed his opinion that German literature was greatly indebted to Klopstock, who was in advance of his times, but that the times had since advanced beyond Klopstock. The young Hardenberg (who wrote under the name of "Novalis") has happily said that Klopstock's works always resemble translations from some unknown poet, done by a clever but unpoetical philologist. As for the theological aspect of his poem of the *Messiah*, Klopstock fell into the almost inevitable fault, in treating this subject poetically, of dividing the kingdom of heaven between the Father and the Son (ditheism), and even opposing them to each other, as when he makes Christ say to God, "I, who am God as well as thou, swear to thee by myself

that I will redeem mankind." (Comp. Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church History of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, i, 249; ii, 277 sq.)

The *Messiah* was first published in fragments, and then as a whole (Altona, 1780; 7th ed. Lpz. 1817): it has been translated into Latin, English, French, Polish, Dutch, and Swedish. Klopstock also wrote the following shorter poems: *Oden u. Elegien* (Hamb. 1771, 2 vols.; 6th ed. Lpz. 1827; trans. into English by W. Nind, 1847):—*Geistliche Lieder* (Kopenh. 1758–69, 2 vols.); besides dramas under the following titles: *Adam's Tod* (Kopenh. 1757; 4th ed. 1773):—*Salomo* (Magdeb. 1764):—*David* (Hamburg, 1772); etc. His complete works have been published under the title *Klopstock's sämmtliche Werke* (Lpzg. 1798–1817, 12 vols.; 1822–24, 12 vols; 1823–29, 18 vols.; 1839, 9 vols.; 1839, 1 vol.; Kopenh. 1844, 10 vols., with 3 supplements. See Cramer, *Klopstock, er u. über ihn* (Dessau, 1780, 5 vols. 8vo); Mme. de Stael, *De l'Allemagne*; Klamer-Schmidt, *Klopstock u. s. Freunde* (Halberstadt, 1810); H. Döring, *Klopstock's Leben* (Weimar, 1825); *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vii, s. v.; Kurtz, *Literaturgesch.* vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); and especially the valuable work of Koberstein, *Grundriss d. Gesch. der deutschen Literatur*, iii, 260 sq., 2884 sq., etc.; Löbell, *Entwickelung d. deutschen Poesie v. Klopstock bis Goethe* (Braunschw. 1856), vol. i; Gervinus, *Gesch. d. deutschen Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1844, 5 vols. 8vo, 2d ed.), iv, 115 sq.; *British and Foreign Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1843. (J. H. W.)

Kluge, David, a German theologian, was born at Tilsit, Prussia, April 14, 1618, and, upon the urgent request of his father, studied theology, although his own inclinations were in favor of medicine. In 1641 he began to lecture at the University of Rostock, where he had pursued his theological studies for several years, in addition to his course at Königsberg University. Later he travelled abroad, and visited the high-schools of Sweden and the Netherlands. He began to preach in 1644 at Marienwerder; removed in 1646 to Saalfeld, and in 1657 to Elbingen, in 1660 to Wissmar, and in 1665 to Hamburg. He died there April 14, 1688. For a list of his works, see Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 2118 sq.

Kluge, Johann Daniel, a German theologian, was born at Weissenfels June 6, 1701, and educated at the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg. He was made a professor at the gymnasium in Dortmund in 1730; in 1735 he removed to Weissenfels as preacher and superintendent of the churches, and in 1745 accepted a call as court preacher to Zerbst, where he died July 5, 1768. Kluge was well acquainted with dogmatics and the exegesis of the N. T., as is evinced by his writings in those departments. He contributed largely to periodicals, and published in book form *Concilium syntagmatis confessionum Eccles. Luther* (Hamb. 1728, 4to):—*Commentatio de Mart. Chemnitii auctoritate commentitiæ honorum operum in actu justificationis præsentiæ falso prætexta* (ibid. 1734, 4to):—*Commentatio in locum* (Tim. iii, 2) (Dortm. 1747, 4to):—*Eclogæ in pericopas epistolicas* (ibid. 1748, 4to), etc. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 131 sq.

Klüpfel, Emanuel Christoph, a German theologian, was born Jan. 29, 1712, at Hattenhofen, in Würtemberg, and educated at Tübingen. In 1741 he became pastor at Geneva of a German Lutheran church, and in 1745 he became the instructor and travelling preacher of the king of Saxony, and resided for some time at Paris. On his return to Saxony he was promoted, and finally, in 1752, became one of the highest dignitaries in the Church of Saxony. He died Nov. 21, 1776. Although a superior scholar and a ready writer, Klüpfel has left us only two small contributions to theological literature: *Dissert. de nominibus Hebræis appellativis Aleph præformativo* (Tübingen, 1733, 4to):—*Bedenken über die Frage; ob die Ehe mit des Bruders Wittwe erlaubt sei* (Gothæ, 1752, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theolog. Deutschlands*, ii, 123 sq.

Klüpfel, Engelbert, a German Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born at Wipfelda, between Würzburg and Schweinfurt, Jan. 18, 1733. He received his early education in the school of Würzburg, and in 1750 joined the Augustinian Hermits of that city. In 1751, however, he renounced his vows at Oberndorf, and went to study philosophy at Freiburg. Next he removed to Erfurt, and was finally ordained priest at Constance in 1756. In 1758 he became professor of philosophy at Männerstadt, and in 1763 at Oberndorf; afterwards professor of theology at Mentz, and finally at Constance. The Austrian court wishing to replace the Jesuits by the Augustinians, he was made professor of the University of Freiburg, in Breisgau, in 1768. The Jesuits, however, tried to revenge themselves, and Klüpfel's *Theses de statu naturæ puræ impossibili* were attacked by professor Waldner as tending to Jansenism. But Klüpfel was sustained by the court. After the expulsion of the Jesuits he undertook the publication of that gigantic task, *Nova bibliotheca ecclesiastica* (Freib. 7 vols. 8vo, 1775–1790, after the plan of Ernesti's *Bibliotheca Critica*), an effort which was highly commended by his contemporaries, and even brought him a recognition from Maria Theresa in her own handwriting, with the proffer of assistance, if needed, to complete the work. The Roman Catholic population, nevertheless, were opposed to him, and when, in a discourse at the jubilee of 1776, he attacked the system of indulgences, he was called by them "Martin Luther," and "the enemy of indulgences." He was involved in a controversy also with the Protestants by his recension of Semler's *Institutio ad Christianam doctrinam liberaliter discendam*. His principal work is his *Institutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ* (1789), which has been used as a textbook in many universities, but was quite transformed by Ziegler. He resigned his professorship in 1805, and died July 8, 1811. Klüpfel was a man of very varied scholarship, and, being blessed with a long life and good health, he furnished the world, besides the extraordinary works already mentioned, as a result of his study of the Church fathers, a treatise entitled *Tertulliani mens de indissolubilitate matrimonii in infidelitate contracti, conjuge alterutro ad fidem Christi converso* (in the first vol. of Riegger's *Oblectamenta Historiæ et Juris ecclesiastici* [1776]):—*Vindiciæ vaticinii Jesaiæ* vii, 14 *de Immanuele* (1779, 4to), etc. See *De vita et scriptis Conradi Celtis opus posthumum Engelberti Klueffelii* (pub. by J. C. Ruef and C. Zell, Friburgi, 1827); J. L. Hug, *Elogium Klueffelii Friburgi*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 761; also Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 126 sq. (where, by mistake, he is treated as Klüpfel, Johann Andreas). (J. H. W.)

Knapp, Albert, a German theologian, and one of the ablest workers in the Würtemberg Church of the 19th century, peculiarly distinguished for his poetical gifts and influence in establishing a school of religious poetry, was born in Tübingen July 25, 1798. His childhood was passed in the village of Alpirsbach, under the old 11th-century Benedictine cloister, and he enjoyed the careful instruction of Handel, afterward pastor at Stammheim. Night and day he dreamed poetry. His university studies, upon which he entered in 1816, were rather poetic than theological; the authorities did not restrain his choice, and for that he always expressed his gratitude. In 1820 he was established vicar near Stuttgard, and here, through intercourse with the pious Wilhelm Hofacker (q. v.), he received that deep religious impression which ever after characterized his work. In 1831 he became deacon at Kirchheim, where, at the instance of a friend, he began the publication of the *Christoterpe*, an annual which contained religious selections from various eminent authors, was popular, and often sought as a Christmas gift in families, but ceased with the year 1853. In 1836 he was made pastor at Stuttgard, and labored there with great zeal for the cause of his Master, exercising a large influence until his death, June 18, 1864. The prayer expressed in one of his best hymns was answered: "Grant me one thing here below—thy

Spirit and thy peace, and the honor in my grave of having known thy love."

Albert Knapp is chiefly known by his religious poems, and as the best of these may be pointed out his *Christliche Gedichte* (in 2 vols. Stuttg. 1829; 3d ed. Basle, 1843), *Herbstblüthen* (1859), and *Christoterpe*, already referred to. To the hymnology of the Church Knapp rendered special service in preserving, in the revision of the Church hymn-book, many forgotten treasures. His *Liederschatz*, generally acknowledged to be one of the most valuable collections of Christian hymns of all ages, was first published in 1837 (2d ed. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo), and the *Evangelische Gesangbuch* in 1855. His avowed principle of modernizing obsolete forms in the old hymns was sharply assailed, and he himself restored at a later day some of the original expressions. As a preacher the manifold richness of his thought and delicacy of diction was his attraction. He did not suffer himself to appear the poet in his sermons, never having once so used a poem of his own, nor even having appointed one of his own hymns to be sung, yet no one could listen to him without acknowledging a rare union of extensive learning with original genius. His singular merit as a hymnmaker remains, notwithstanding a haste of composition and lightness of tone in some of his poems, and although the subjective individuality of the author, according to the spirit of the times, often characterizes his weightier pieces, yet his individuality is one of simple faith. In theology he was fully evangelical in his doctrine of salvation, which he defended not in mere polemic, but in heart-devotion against all opposers. See his preface to the *Christoterpe* of 1846 for a statement of his belief. He grounded all defence of doctrine upon the necessities and joyful faith of spiritual experience, and severely condemned a merely external method and the zeal of argumentative orthodoxy. He had no sympathy with sects as such. Knapp's biographical contributions in the *Christoterpe* are of great interest and beauty; we name that on his own "Childhood Days" in the issue of 1849, on Ludwig Hofacker (1848), Hedinger (1836), Steinhofer (1837), Jacob Balde (1848), Jeremias Flatt (1852). The writer's poetic humor and narrative power, joined with love for his theme, make these sketches perfect artworks. Dr. Friederich Wilhelm Krummacher, in his autobiography (translated by Easton, Edinb. 1869, 8vo, p. 203, 204), pays the following tribute to the high poetical talents of our subject: "That in Albert Knapp there was a true poetic inborn genius no one will seriously deny, and yet he is not generally mentioned in our recent histories of literature as ranked among the 'Suabian poets,' although, without doubt, he would have been named among them, and in the very foremost rank, had he consecrated his harp to the spirit of the world instead of seeking all his inspiration from the Spirit of God; but worldly fame, to which the way and the door stood wide open for him, he gladly cast at his feet, and recognised it as his calling, as it indeed was the impulse of his heart, to sing the praises of the heavenly Prince of Peace, through whom he knew he was redeemed and ordained 'to the inheritance of the saints in light.' Instead of worldly fame, there was destined for him, so long as a Church of Christ shall remain on earth, the glorious reward of God, that his *Eines wünsch ich mir vor allem Andern*, his *An dein Bluten und Erbleichen*, his *Abend ist es, Herr, die Stunde*, and many others of his hymns, will never cease to be sung in it. We bless him in the name of many thousands to whom the melodies of his harp, breathing peace and joy, have lightened their steps on the way to the city of God, and we hope that the people of Stuttgard may long refresh themselves at the 'streams of living water' which, according to the word of the Lord, yet flow for them to this hour from the life and labors of their highly-gifted pastor." See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, s. v.

Knapp, Georg Christian, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Glaucha, near Halle, in 1753. He entered the university of that city in 1770, and afterwards also spent a semester at the University of Göttingen. He began lecturing on philosophy in 1775, was appointed professor extraordinary in 1777, and regular professor in 1782. In 1785 he became director of Franke's celebrated orphan asylum and educational institute, previously presided over by his father, which he managed for forty years in conjunction with Niemeyer. In the division of labor he had charge of the orphan asylum, the Latin school, and the Biblical and missionary departments, which, notwithstanding delicate health, he conducted in a manner that gained him the esteem of all. He died Oct. 14, 1825. Naturally inclined to mysticism, which in latter years caused his writings and teaching to assume a supernaturalistic form, he did not succeed, notwithstanding the popularity of his lectures, in forming a school of his own in the midst of the Rationalistic tendencies of his colleagues. Constitutional timidity also impaired much of his influence, as he shrank from all personal arguments either with the students or with the other professors. Dr. F. W. Krummacher has described him as "the last descendant of the old theological school of Halle," and assures us that he "was well able, from intellectual ability and scientific attainment, to have waged a successful war against the then reigning Rationalism, and to have tossed from their airy saddles its champions among his colleagues who were intoxicated with triumph," but that "his excessive gentleness and modesty, bordering even on timidity, led him carefully to avoid everything like direct polemics." (Compare, for a fuller description of his character, etc., F. W. Krummacher's *Autobiography*, translated by the Rev. M. G. Easton [Edinb. 1869, 8vo], p. 55 sq.). His principal works are, *Psalmen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen* (1778; 3d ed. 1789):—a very carefully edited and useful edition of the Greek Testament, *Novum Testamentum Græce recognovit atque insignioris lectionum varietatis et argumentorum notitiam subjunxit* (Halle, 1797, 4to; the last ed. in 1829, 2 vols. 8vo; also N. Y. 1808):—*Scripta varii argumenti maximam partem exegetica atque historica* (Halle, 1805, 8vo; a second and enlarged edition in 1823, 2 vols. 8vo):—the following dissertations—*Ad vaticinium Jacobi* (1774); *De versione Alexandrina in emendenda lectione exempli Hebraici caute adhibenda* (Halle, 1773, 1776). After his death K. Thilo published his *Vorlesungen über d. Glaubenslehre* (1836, 2 parts, which were translated by Dr. Leonard Woods under the title *Lectures on Christian Theology* [Andover, 1831–39, 2 vols. 8vo, and often since], and have been extensively used, especially in this country); and Guerike his *Bibl. Glaubenslehre z. praktischen Gebrauch* (1840). Knapp also wrote *Traktat ü. d. Frage: Was soll ich thun, dass ich selig werde?* (1806):—*Anleitung z. einem gottseligen Leben* (1811). Some valuable biographical sketches which he contributed to the paper entitled *Franke's Stiftungen*, were republished under the title *Leben und Karakter einiger gelehrten u. frommen Männer d. vorigen Jahrh.* (1829). See Niemeyer, *Epicedien zum Andenken auf Knapp* (1825); K. Thilo, in the preface to Knapp's *Vorlesungen ü. d. Glaubenslehre;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 763; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.; Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Knapp, Johann Georg, father of Georg Christian, was himself a theologian of some note. He was born at Oehringen Dec. 27, 1705, of pious parents, and went to the University of Altdorf to study theology. He removed to Jena in 1723 to continue his preparatory studies for the ministerial office, and completed them at Halle, where, in 1728, he was appointed instructor at the royal pædagogium. In 1732 he became pastor to the Prussian military school at Berlin, but remained there only one year, and then returned to Halle to fill an adjunct professorship in theology at the university. He was made ordinary or regular professor in 1739. After the decease of the celebrated Franke he was placed over the orphan asylum, and held this position until his death, July 30, 1771. Knapp took a particular interest in the cause of missions, and published *Neuere Gesch. d. evan-*

gel. Missionsanstalten zur Bekehrung d. Heiden in Ostindien (Halle, 1770, 8vo), and other reports of missions. He also published several valuable dissertations, for a list of which, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theolog. Deutschlands*, ii, 144. (J. H. W.)

Knatchbull, Sir Norton, a learned English baronet, born in Kent in 1601, was a man of considerable erudition, and devoted himself with some success to the study of the Biblical writings. In 1659 he gave to the world *Animadversiones in Libros Novi Testam.*, which speedily went through a considerable number of editions (a translation of it, prepared by himself or under his superintendence, appeared at Cambridge in 1693), and was reprinted both at Amsterdam and Frankfort, at which latter place it formed part of the supplement to N. Gurtler's edition of Walton's *Polyglot*, 1695–1701. He died in 1684. "Knatchbull's remarks are sensible, and show very fair learning; but they are entirely wanting in depth, and we cannot read them without wonder at the small amount of knowledge which procured for their author such a wide-spread reputation" (Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.). Dr. Campbell calls Knatchbull "a learned man, but a hardy critic."

Knauer, Joseph, a German Roman Catholic prelate of note, was born at Rothflössel, near Mittelwalde, in the duchy of Glatz, Dec. 1, 1764, and was educated at Breslau University. He was ordained priest March 7, 1789, and became at once chaplain to the dean of Mittelwalde. In 1794 he was appointed priest at Alpendorf, and rose gradually to distinction in his Church until in 1841 (August 27) he was honored with the appointment of archbishop of Breslau. He died May 16, 1844.—*Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie*, xi, 852.

Knead (לוּשׁ, *lush*), to prepare dough by working it with the hands; a task usually performed by women (Gen. xviii, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 24; 2 Sam. xiii, 8; Jer. vii, 18); once spoken of a male baker (Hos. vii, 4). See Dough.

KNEADING-TROUGH (מִשְׁאֶרֶת, *mishe'reth*, so called from the *fermentation* of the dough), the vessel in which the materials of the bread, after being mixed and leavened, is left to swell (Exod. viii, 3, xii, 34, rendered "store" in Deut. xxviii, 5, 17); probably like the wooden bowl used by the modern Arabs for the same purpose. On the monuments of Egypt we find the various processes of making bread represented with great minuteness. Men were chiefly occupied in it, as with us at the present day. Their grain was ground in hand-mills, or pounded in mortars, and then kneaded into dough, which was sometimes done by the hand, in a large circular bowl, or in a trough with the feet (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 174–6). See Bake. The process of making bread in Egypt is now generally performed in villages by women, among whom proficiency in that art is looked upon as a sort of accomplishment. Except in large towns, each family bakes its own bread, which is usually made into small cakes and eaten new, the climate not admitting of its being kept long without turning sour. When the dough is sufficiently kneaded, it is made up into a round flat cake, generally about a span in width, and a finger's breadth in thickness. See Cake. A fire of straw and dung is then kindled on the floor or hearth, which, when sufficiently heated, is removed, and the dough being placed on it, and covered with hot embers, is thus soon baked. Sometimes a circle of small stones is placed upon the hearth after it has been heated, into which some paste is poured, and covered with hot embers: this produces a kind of biscuit. See Oven. "The modern Oriental *kneading*-troughs, in which the dough is prepared, have no resemblance to ours in size or shape. As one person does not bake bread for many families, as in our towns, and as one family does not bake bread sufficient for many days, as in our villages, but every family bakes for the day only the quantity of bread which it requires, but a comparatively small quantity of dough is prepared. This is done in small wooden bowls, and that those of the ancient Hebrews were of the same description as those now in use appears from their being able to carry them, together with the dough, wrapped up in their cloaks, upon their shoulders without difficulty. The Bedouin Arabs, indeed, use for this purpose a leather, which can be drawn up into a bag by a running cord along the border, and in which they prepare and often carry their dough. This might equally, and in some respects better answer the described conditions; but, being especially adapted to the use of a nomade and tent-dwelling people, it is more likely that the Israelites, who were not such at the time of the Exode, then used the wooden bowls for their 'kneading-troughs' (Exod. viii, 3; xii, 34; Deut. xxviii, 5, 7). It is clear, from the history of the departure from Egypt, that the flour had first been made into a dough by water only, in which state it had been kept some little time before it was leavened; for when the Israelites were unexpectedly (as to the moment) compelled in all haste to withdraw, it was found that, although the dough had been prepared in the kneading-trough, it was still unleavened (Exod. xii, 34; compare Hos. vii, 4); and it was in commemoration of this circumstance that they and their descendants in all ages were enjoined to eat only unleavened bread at the feast of the Passover." See Bread.

Knee (Heb. and Chald. בֶּרֶךְ, *be'rek*; Gr. γόνυ; Psa. cix, 24; in Dan. v, 6, the Chald. term is אַרְכָּבָה, *arkubah'*). The Hebrew word, as a verb, signifies to *bend* the knee (2 Chron. vi, 13), also to *bless*, to pronounce or give a blessing, because the person blessed kneels. See Blessing. In this sense it refers to the benediction of dying parents (Gen. xxvii, 4, 7, 10, 19), of the priest to the people (Levit. ix, 22, 23), of a prophet (Numb. xxiv, 1; Deut. xxxiii, 1). It also signifies to salute, which is connected with blessing (2 Kings iv, 29). In relation to God, to praise, to thank him (Deut. viii, 10; Psa. xvi, 7).

The expression is also, in another form, used in reference to camels, as to make them bend the knee in order to take rest: "And he made his camels to kneel down without the city" (Gen. xxiv, 11). See Camel.

To bow the knee is to perform an act of worship (1 Kings xix, 18), and in this sense it is used in the Heb. in Isa. lxvi, 3; "He that worships idols" is, literally, "He that bows the knee" to them. See Worship.

That kneeling was the posture of prayer we learn from 2 Chron. vi, 13; Dan. vi, 10; Luke xxii, 41; Acts vii, 60; Eph. 3, 14. See Prayer.

Knees are sometimes put symbolically for persons, as in Job iv, 4; Heb. xii, 12 (Wemyss). See Kneel.

For the peculiar term in Gen. xli, 43 (see Reineccius, *De nomine* אַבְרֵךְ, Weissenf. 1726), see Abrech.

Kneel (בָּרַךְ, to bend the knee [q. v.], γονυπετέω), the act of reverence and worship (Psa. xcv, 6; Dan. vi, 10; Acts ix, 40; xxi, 5). See Attitude.

Kneelers. See Genuflectentes; Catechumens.

Kneeling, the act of bending the knee in devotional exercises, is a practice of great antiquity. Reference to it is made in all parts of the Scriptures, both of the O.-T. and N.-T. writings, as in Isaac's blessing on Jacob (Gen. xxvii, 29), compared with his brother's subsequent conduct (xlii, 6), and with an edict of Pharaoh, "Bow the knee" (xli, 43), and again in the second commandment (Exod. xx, 5). Then we find David exclaiming, "Let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker" (Psa. xcv, 6); "We will go into his tabernacle, and fall low on our knees before his footstool" (cxxxii, 7). Solomon "kneeled on his knees" before the altar of the Lord, with his hands spread up to heaven (1 Kings viii, 54); Ezra fell upon his knees, and spread out his hands unto God, and made his confession (Ezra ix, 5–15); Daniel "kneeled upon his knees three times a day," and prayed "as he did aforetime" (Dan. vi, 10); the holy martyr Stephen "kneeled down, and cried with

a loud voice," praying for his murderers (Acts vii, 60); Peter likewise "kneeled down and prayed" (Acts ix, 40); Paul also (Acts xx, 36; xxi, 5). That the posture was a customary one may be inferred from the conduct of the man beseeching Christ to heal his son (Matt. xvii, 14), and of the rich young man (Mark x, 17), as also of the leper (Mark i, 40); yea, we have even the example of Christ himself, who, according to Luke (xxii, 14), "kneeled down" when he prayed. That the practice was general among the early Christians is plain from the *Shepherd* of Hermas, from Eusebius's *History* (ii, 33), and from numberless other authorities, and especially from the solemn proclamation made by the deacon to the people in all the liturgies, "Flectamus genua" (Let us bend our knees), whereupon the people knelt till, at the close of the prayer, they received a corresponding summons, "Levate" (Arise), and from the fact that prayer itself was termed κλίσις γονάτων, *bending the knees*.

In the days of Irenæus, and for some time after, four postures were in use among Christians, namely, standing (for which see reason below), prostration (as a sign of deep and extraordinary humiliation), bowing, and kneeling. The posture of sitting during the time of public prayer, of modern days, seems to have been unknown to the early Christians. Kneeling at public devotions was the common practice during the six working days, and was understood by the early Church to denote humility of mind before God, and "as a symbol of our fall by sin." A standing posture in worship (explained as being emblematic of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and the forgiveness of sins, and also as being a sign of the Christian's hope and expectation of heaven) was assumed by the early Christian worshippers (except penitents) on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, "as a symbol of the resurrection, whereby, through the grace of Christ, we rise again from our fall." Cassian says of the Egyptian churches that from Saturday night to Sunday night, and all the days of Pentecost, they neither knelt nor fasted. The *Apostolical Constitutions* order that Christians should pray three times on the Lord's day, standing, in honor of him who rose the third day from the dead, and in the writings of Chrysostom we meet with frequent allusions to the same practice, especially in the oft-repeated form by which the deacon called upon the people to pray, "Let us stand upright with reverence and decency." Tertullian says, "We count it unlawful to fast, or to worship kneeling, on the Lord's day, and we enjoy the same immunity from Easter to Pentecost." This practice was confirmed by the Council of Nice, for the sake of uniformity, and it is from this circumstance, probably, that the Ethiopic and Muscovitish churches adopted the attitude of standing generally, a custom which they continue to this day. From Cyril's writings it would appear that also at the celebration of the Eucharist a standing attitude was assumed by the early Christians. He says "it was with silence and downcast eyes, bowing themselves in the posture of worship and adoration." The exact period when *kneeling* at the Lord's Supper became general cannot be ascertained, but it has prevailed for many centuries, and it is now generally, though not altogether, practiced as the proper posture for communicants.

In ordination, also, a kneeling posture was early practiced. Dionysius says, "The person to be ordained kneeled before the bishop at the altar, and he, laying his hand upon his head, did consecrate him with a holy prayer, and then signed him with the sign of the cross, after which the bishop and the clergy present gave him the kiss of peace." It would appear, however, that bishops elect did not relish much the humiliating posture of kneeling at their ordination, for Theodoret informs us that "it was a customary rite to bring the person about to be ordained bishop to the holy table, and make him kneel upon his knees *by force*." But this, no doubt, was a significant mode of showing with what reluctance men should undertake so important, so weighty a charge as that of bishop in the Church of Jesus Christ. Indeed, so solemn and onerous were its responsibilities esteemed, that we read of several who absconded as soon as they understood that the popular voice had chosen them to fill this honorable post; and many of them, when captured, were brought by force to the holy altar, and there, against their will and inclination, were ordained by the imposition of hands, being held down on their knees by the officers of the church. See ELECTION OF CLERGY.

In the *Roman Catholic Church* the act of kneeling belongs to the highest form of worship. It is especially practiced in the performance of monastic devotions and in acts of penance. It is also frequently employed during the mass, and in the presence of the consecrated elements when reserved for subsequent communion. In acts of penance this Church has carried the practice to great excess, subjecting the penitent to sufferings which remind us of the legend told of St. James, that he contracted a hardness on his knees equal to that of camels because he was so generally on his knees. "Instances," says Eadie, "are innumerable, and ever recurring in the Romish Church, of delicate women being obliged to walk on rough pavements, for hours in succession, on their bare knees, until at length nature, worn out by the injurious and demoralizing exercise, compels them to desist. To encourage the penitent and devout in acts of this nature, the most wonderful tales are related of the good resulting from self-mortification and entire submission to the stern discipline of the Church." See the article GENUFLEXION.

In the Anglican Church the rubric prescribes the kneeling posture in many parts of the service, and this, as well as the practice of bowing the head at the name of Jesus, was the subject of much controversy with the Puritans. A like controversy was in 1838 provoked in Bavaria by a ministerial decree obliging Protestants to join Romanists in this ceremony when required of them, and ended only with its repeal in 1844 (for details on this point, see the Roman Catholic version in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lex.* vi, 236; the Protestant side in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v. Baiern). See Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Hook, *Church Dict.* s. v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, 391 sq., 631 sq.; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index).

Kneph or **Knuphis**, also known under the name of NUM or NEF, in Egyptian mythology is the oldest designation of deity, and signifies either *spirit* or *water*, perhaps in allusion to the Spirit of God, who "in the beginning moved upon the face of the waters." Greatly distorted by the priests, the legend is in brief that from his mouth came the egg which gave existence to all things temporal; hence the egg is his symbol; likewise the snake, which assumes the shape of a ring, to indicate his eternal existence. His representation is frequently found on Egyptian monuments, sometimes with a snake holding an egg between its head and tail. The Egyptians of Thebes knew only this one god to be *immortal;* all others they supposed to be more or less subject to temporal changes.


Figure of Kneph.

In the later idolatry Kneph was the special god of Upper Egypt, where he was represented in human shape, with the head of a ram; still regarded as the creator of other gods, he was figured at Elephantine sitting at a potter's wheel fashioning the limbs of Osiris, while the god of the Nile is pouring water on the clay. "The idea," says Trevor (*Anc. Egypt*, p. 131), "seems to be the same as in Job (x, 8, 9; Rom. ix, 23): 'Thine

hands have made me and fashioned me together round about. Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay.'" (Comp. Herodotus, ii, 41.) See Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 1066. See Egypt. (J. H. W.)

Knibb, William, a Baptist missionary to Jamaica, was born at Kettering, in Northamptonshire, England, about 1800. He sailed as a missionary to Kingston, Jamaica, in 1824; in 1828 removed to the Ridgeland Mission, in the north-western part of the island, and subsequently became pastor of the mission church at Falmouth. He exercised a very important part in bringing about the Emancipation Act of 1833, by which slavery was abolished in the island, and afterwards so exposed the apprenticeship system established by the same act as to secure the complete emancipation of apprentices in the island. In 1838 he erected a normal school at Kettering, in Trelawney, for training native and other schoolmistresses for both Jamaica and Africa, and in 1842 he visited England to promote the establishment of a theological seminary in connection with the native mission to Africa. He died at Kettering July 15, 1845.

Knife is the representative in the Auth. Version of several Heb. terms: חֶרֶב (*che'reb*, from its *laying waste*), a sharp instrument, e. g. for circumcising (Josh. v, 2, 3); a *razor* (Ezek. v, 1); a graving-tool or *chisel* (Exod. xx, 25); an *axe* (Ezek. xxvi, 9); poet. of the curved *tusks* of the hippopotamus (Job xl, 19); elsewhere usually a "sword." מַאֲכֶלֶת (*maake'leth*, so called from its use in *eating*), a large knife for slaughtering and cutting up food (Gen. xxii, 6, 10; Judg. xix, 29; Prov. xxx, 14). שַׂכִּין (*sakkin'*, so called from *separating* parts to the view), a knife for any purpose, perhaps a table-knife (Prov. xxiii, 2). מַחֲלֶפֶת (*machalaph'*, so called from *gliding* through the flesh), a *butcher's knife* for slaughtering the victims in sacrifice (Ezra i, 9). See Sword.



Ancient Etruscan Sacrificial Knife.

"The probable form of the knives of the Hebrews will be best gathered from a comparison of those of other ancient nations, both Eastern and Western, which have come down to us. No. 1 represents the Roman *culter*, used in sacrificing, which may be compared with No. 2, an Egyptian sacrificial knife. Nos. 3, 4, and 5 are also Egyptian knives, of which the most remarkable, No. 3, is from the Louvre collection; the others are from the *Monumenti Reali* of Rosellini. Nos. 6–9 are Roman, from Barthelemy. In No. 7 we have probably the form of the pruning-hook of the Jews (מִזְמֵרָה, Isa. xviii, 5), though some rather assimilate this to the sickle (מַגָּל). It was probably with some such instrument as No. 9 that the priests of Baal cut themselves." See Armor. The knife used by the fisherman for splitting his fish (q. v.) was of a circular form, with a handle, as likewise that used by the currier for cutting leather (q. v.), only larger and heavier. In the



Ancient Egyptian semicircular Knives.

British Museum various specimens of ancient Egyptian knives may be seen. There are some small knives, the blades of bronze, the handles composed of agate or hematite. There is likewise a species of bronze knife with lunated blade; also the blade of a knife composed of steatite, inscribed on one side with hieroglyphics. There is also an iron knife of a late period and peculiar construction: it consists of a broad cutting-blade, moving on a pivot at the end, and working in a groove by means of a handle. The following summary comparison of the Biblical instruments of cutlery with those used at various times in the East, as to materials and application, is well illustrated from the Egyptian monuments.



Various Forms of ancient Knives.

1. The knives of the Egyptians, and of other nations in early times, were probably only of hard stone, and the use of the flint or stone knife was sometimes retained for sacred purposes after the introduction of iron and steel (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxv, 12, § 165). Herodotus (ii, 86) mentions knives both of iron and of stone in different stages of the same process of embalming (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 163). The same may perhaps be said, to some extent, of the Hebrews (compare Exod. iv, 25).



Ancient Egyptian Flint Knives (from the Berlin Museum). No. 1 for general purposes; No. 2 probably for incisions in embalming.

2. In their meals the Jews, like other Orientals, made little use of knives, but they were required for slaughtering animals either for food or sacrifice, as well as for cutting up the carcase (Lev. vii, 33, 34; viii, 15, 20, 25; ix, 13; Numb. xviii, 18; 1 Sam. ix, 24; Ezek. xxiv, 4; Ezra i, 9; Matt. xxvi, 23; Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 172; Wilkinson, i, 169; Mishna, *Tamid*, iv, 3). See Eating.



Ancient Egyptian Slaughtering-knives. No. 1 is cutting up an ibex. No. 2 is sharpening a knife on a steel attached to his apron. Over them is the hieroglyph for the act.

Asiatics usually carry about with them a knife or dagger, often with a highly-ornamented handle, which may be used when required for eating purposes (Judg. iii, 21; Layard, *Nin.* ii, 342, 299; Wilkinson, i, 358, 360; Chardin, *Voyage*, iv, 18; Niebuhr, *Voyage*, i, 340, pl. 71). See Girdle.

Ancient Assyrian Knives (from the British Museum). Two of them have a hook at the handle, as if for suspending in the girdle. For another form used by soldiers, see Bucket.

3. Smaller knives were in use for paring fruit (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 7; *War*, i, 33, 7) and for sharpening pens (Jer. xxxvi, 23). See Penknife.

4. The razor was often used for Nazaritish purposes, for which a special chamber was reserved in the Temple (Numb. vi, 5, 9, 19; Ezek. v, 1; Isa. vii, 20; Jer. xxxvi, 23; Acts xviii, 18; xxi, 24; Mishna, *Midd.* ii, 5). See Razor.

5. The pruning-hooks of Isa. xviii, 5 were probably curved knives. See Pruning-hook.

6. The lancets of the priests of Baal were doubtless pointed knives (1 Kings xviii, 28). See Lancet.

Knight, James (1), D.D., an English divine, who flourished in the early part of the 18th century, was vicar of St. Sepulchre's, London. Nothing further is known to us of his personal history. He wrote in *Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity* two treatises (1714–15), which are highly commended by Dr. Waterland (Moyer's Lectures). Knight also published five separate *Sermons* (1719–36), and eight sermons delivered at lady Moyer's Lecture in 1720–21 (1721, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knight, James (2), a Congregational minister, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, England, July 19, 1769, and was educated for the ministry at Homerton College, where he is said to have made rapid attainments in Biblical science. Upon his graduation he was called to the Church in Collierskents, Southwark, where he was ordained in 1791. In 1833 he resigned his pastorate there, after a faithful and successful service. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Knight's sermons, some of which have been published, were celebrated for their sacred unction, and their thorough and searching appeals to the conscience. His eminent piety was both the strength and ornament of his character. He knew how not only to discuss a subject with logical precision, but also to infuse into it the spirit of vital evangelical piety. See Morison, *Missionary Fathers*.

Knight, Joel Abraham, a Methodist minister, was born at Hull, Yorkshire, England, April 23, 1754; was ordained at Spafields Chapel, London, March 9, 1783, where he was also appointed master of the charity school and assistant preacher. In 1788 he preached at Pentonville Chapel, and in 1789 became pastor of the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court chapels, London, a position which he occupied until his death, April 22, 1808. Mr. Knight was a zealous worker in the formation and proceedings of the London Missionary Society in 1795. His sermons, some of which were published in London in 1788–9, were always richly imbued with the distinguishing doctrines of evangelical Christianity, but they especially taught that "the cordial reception of the doctrine of salvation by grace must necessarily produce obedience to the law of God." In speech he was invariably chaste, and in manner affectionate and pathetic. —Morison, *Missionary Fathers*.

Knight, Samuel, D.D., an English divine of note, was born in London in 1675, and was educated at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He first became chaplain to Edward, earl of Oxford, and was by him presented to the rectory of Borough-green, in Cambridgeshire, in 1707; was made prebendary of Ely and rector of Bluntesham (Huntingdonshire) in 1714; became chaplain to George II in 1730, and was promoted to the archdeaconry of Berks in 1735. He died Dec. 16, 1746. Between the years 1721 and 1738 he published several of his *Sermons*. He also wrote *Life of Dr. John Coles, Dean of St. Paul's* (London, 1724, 8vo; new edit. Oxford, 1823, 8vo):—*Life of Erasmus* (Cambridge, 1726, 8vo).—*General Biog. Dict.* viii, 46 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knighthood, the condition, honor, and rank of a knight, also the service due from a knight, and the tenure of land by such service. In a secondary sense, the word is employed to denote the class of knights—the aggregate body of any particular knightly association; the institution itself, and the spirit of the institution. In these remoter meanings it becomes identical with *Chivalry*, and it is in this point of view that it will principally be considered here. The term is one of various significance, and is, therefore, apt for ambiguities; it is one whose applications were of gradual development, and which is, accordingly, of diverse historical import. Its explanation is thus necessarily intricate and multifarious, and care is requisite to avoid confounding different things, or different phases of the same thing, under the single common name. Neglect of this precaution has occasioned much of the extrava-

gance and complexity which are noticeable in speculations on this subject.

A knight under the feudal system—*milés* in the Latinity of feudal jurisprudence—was one holding land by military service (*servilium militare*), with horse, and shield, and lance, and armor *cap-à-pie* (Blackstone, *Commentaries*, ii, 62–3). Knighthood in this application corresponds closely with the French designation *chevalerie*, and its consideration is inextricably intertwined with that of chivalry.

The characteristics of knighthood have undergone many modifications in the lapse of long centuries. The lord mayor of London is knighted for the presentation of an address to the sovereign, and Michael Faraday is deservedly made an officer of the Legion of Honor for chemical and other scientific discoveries; but in the main conception and strict usage of the term knighthood, liege service in war is implied.

"A knight ther was, and that a worthy man,
That from the tyme that he ferst bigan
To ryden out, he lovede chyvalrye,
Trouthe and honour, fredom and curtesye.
Ful worthi was he in his lordes werre,
And therto had he riden, noman ferre,
As wel in Cristendom as in hethenesse,
And ever honoured for his worthinesse."

The character of knighthood, however, as distinguished from the mere tenure of land by knight-service, was entirely personal, and hence it is conferred and attaches only for life, and is not descendible by inheritance. It cannot be assumed by one's own act, but must be bestowed by another of knightly or of superior rank. The knight's estate was held by knight-service, or chivalry, and the heir at full age was entitled and could be compelled to receive knighthood. Compulsory writs for the latter purpose were frequently issued from the proper courts. But, until the dignity was conferred, the aspirant was no knight. Many entitled to claim the dignity declined to do so, though holding land by knightly tenure, because unable to bear the expenses incident to the rank. Hence arose the old adage: "*Bon escuyer vault mieulx que pauvre chevalier.*" But the reality or the obligation of personal military service was always entailed by knighthood.

I. *Origin of Knighthood or Chivalry.*—Under the impulse of the same uncritical spirit which referred the descent of the Britons to Brutus and wanderers from Troy, the origin of knighthood has been traced back to the judges of Israel or to the heroes of the Iliad. More modest inquirers have been content to go no further back than to Constantine's supposed "Order of the Golden Angel" (313), or to the equally imaginary Ethiopian "Order of St. Anthony," and the anchorites of the African deserts. Others, more modest still, ascend only to "King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table," or to Charles Martel and the "Order of the Gennet," or to "Charlemagne and his Paladins." In all such genealogies there is much fantasy, confusion, and retrospective legend. The incidents of war must in all ages present some general resemblances. There must always have been leaders and followers, brothers in arms, and associations of warriors—"*vixere fortes ante Agamemnona.*" Such tendencies in human nature as prompted these military unions might furnish the impulse to subsequent institutions, but to ascribe the origin of the institutions themselves to the first recorded manifestation of these tendencies is to renounce all historical discrimination. When the origin of knighthood is investigated, what is desired is the discovery of the existence of a definite institution, with precise and distinctive characteristics, animated by a peculiar spirit, which gave its coloring to society for many generations, and which still exercises a potent influence over life and manners. What is contemplated is "a military institution, prompted by enthusiastic benevolence, sanctioned by religion, and combined with religious ceremonies, the purpose of which was to protect the weak from the oppression of the powerful, and to defend the right against the wrong" (James, *History of Chivalry*, chap. i). The only important omissions in this definition are the obligation of "*honneur aux dames*," knightly truth, and the thorough interpenetration of Christian profession, if rarely of Christian practice.

The germ of knighthood, but only the germ, may unquestionably be found in the ancient usages of the Teutonic tribes and in the Teutonic *comitatus*, which coalesced with Roman customs and with the suggestions of the times in shaping feudalism. The very name of knight—*cniht*, *cnicht*, boy, servant, military follower—would indicate such a derivation. "Arma sumere non ante cuiquam moris quam civitas suffecturum probaverit. Tum in ipso concilio principum aliquis, vel pater, vel propinqui, scuto frameaque juvenem ornant. Hoc apud illos toga, hic publicus juventæ honos; ante hoc domus pars videntur, mox reipublicæ. . . . Ceteris robustioribus et jam pridem probatis adgregantur; nec rubor inter comites aspici" (Tacitus, *Germ.* c. xiii; comp. c. xiv). To this same source must be ascribed in part, but only in part, the chivalrous deference for women: "in esse quin etiam sanctum aliquid et providum pertant; nec aut consilia earum aspernantur aut responsa neglegunt" (*ibid*, c. viii). The intensification and spiritualization of this deference are due to Christianity.

Ethnical temperaments, ethnical tendencies, and ethnical usages are seldom entirely eradicated. They continue under many transmutations and disguises; lurk under new forms, animate new institutions, and enter into strange and often undetected combinations. With this explanation, knighthood may be, in some measure, referred to the rude warriors of the forests of Germany, who are described in the satirical romance of Tacitus in terms more appropriate to the Indians of North America than to any populations which really occupied the provinces of the crumbling empire of Rome. The actual historical origin of knighthood, though very obscure, may be safely assigned to a much later age, and to other more potent influences than those which flowed from the Rhine, and the Elbe, and the shores of the Baltic.

Without recurring to the details of the feudal system [see FIEF], it may be stated that feudal services (*servilia*) were strictly limited, and prescribed military service for a fixed time and of a fixed amount. Circumstances might occur which would demand longer, less restricted, and less formally organized warfare. Such circumstances did occur in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. During the Norman ravages of France, on the disruption of the Carlovingian empire and the decay of the Carlovingian dynasty, universal anarchy, misery, and outrage covered the land. The perils from the barbarous enemy were scarcely greater than those from violent and rapacious barons, and from lawless and lordless plunderers. The multiplied horrors of the dismal period were aggravated by general destitution, by famine, by plague, and by disastrous prodigies on the earth and in the heavens. The bonds of authority were snapped; the regular organization of the feudal society was rent and suspended; immediate protection and prompt redress, without too nice distinction of rank and subordination, were demanded on all sides. Those who had the power, the heart, and the will, found abundant work for active hands to do in the defence of women and children, of the old and infirm, of unarmed merchants and pilgrims, of priests and monks; and rode through the country endeavoring to repress disorder, if unable to establish order. The condition of things was even worse than such as might now provoke Lynch law or instigate vigilance committees. Of course, the vigilance committees of the closing millennium assumed the mould of the time in which their services were rendered. Accordingly, the avengers of iniquity were guided by an earnest, though usually rude and blundering sense of Christian obligation in their generous warfare. It thus became the avowed duty of the true knight to serve women, to protect the feeble, to minister to the wound-

ed, to comfort the wretched, to repress or punish wrong, and in all honor to uphold and to do the right.

"He had abroad in armes wonne muchell fame,
And fild far landes with glorie of his might;
Plaine, faithful, true, and enimy of shame,
And ever lov'd to fight for ladies right;
But in vaine-glorious frayes he litle did delight."

While these calamitous generations writhed through their long agony in France, the progress of the Holy Warfare in Spain against the Saracens invited and enriched the princes, nobles, and adventurers who fought for the Cross against the Crescent. Religious fervor was thus intimately conjoined with martial prowess. But, both in France and Spain, and, in less degree, in other countries, similar necessities concurred in the production of like phenomena. In all cases there was a relaxation of the direct connection of military achievement with landed estates and feudal subordination. High moral qualities and Christian zeal were required of the landless or lonely knight, or were annexed as requirements to complete the character of the accomplished feudal vassal. Thus the true knight came to be distinguished from the knight by feudal tenure; though the feudal knight might possess, and was expected to possess, knightly characteristics in addition to his feudal domain and its attendant obligations.

Doubtless in France and Spain, and elsewhere, chivalrous emprise was encouraged, if not originated by the Church, the sole moral authority of those days, which was anxious for peace, earnest for order, vowed to the maintenance of right, and eager to subordinate to spiritual rule and guidance the military ardor and the temporal power of the time.

All these influences and all these tendencies, of various age and origin, converged and commingled, with augmented energy in each, in the Crusades. These romantic and persistent enterprises may have been undertaken and prolonged by the instigation and for the interest of the Papacy, but they were none the less the outburst of popular enthusiasm, and of a popular enthusiasm which gave form and active reality to an instinctive perception of urgent policy. Whole nations are not impelled for centuries to arduous and perilous undertakings by any extrinsic force; the enduring impulse by which they are set and kept in motion must be a living power in their own bosoms, "bequeathed by bleeding sire to son." Looking back from the safe vantange ground, which has been secured only within two hundred years, it is difficult to appreciate justly the alarming dangers to which Christianity and Christian nations were exposed from Moslem aggression at the commencement of the second millennium of our æra. The apprehension was not dispelled entirely till the victory of John Sobieski under the walls of Vienna (1683). It is equally difficult to estimate now the effect of a wild, warlike fanaticism against Saracens and Pagans in implanting the recently acquired and imperfectly received creed in turbulent spirits, and perhaps still more difficult to recognise the service rendered by the Holy Wars in diffusing and deepening the sentiment of a common faith, a common interest, a common civilization throughout Western Europe—a Christendom, or dominion of Christ.

All of these feelings were quickened by the Crusades, and were both exalted and rendered, in some sort, self-conscious by them. It must be remembered that the Crusades did not begin with Peter the Hermit and the Council of Clermont, but that the crusading spirit had been previously manifested and cherished in Spain, in Sicily, and in Northern Africa. This spirit only received its full development and definite purpose by being directed to the recovery of Jerusalem. Through distant Asiatic expeditions the desultory and unregulated adventure for the maintenance of Christian belief and Christian security was generalized, organized, disciplined, and refined. The disorderly violence of martial barons was withdrawn from domestic discords, and guided to a great European aim. War was in some degree sanctified; it was ennobled, at least in the conception of the warrior, by being employed for the defence and maintenance of the faith. A strange but not unfruitful union was thus effected between devotion and military prowess. There is no question here of the use which was made of this combination for the extension of ecclesiastical domination. All that is contemplated is the consequence of this union in the production of chivalry and of the knightly character—a magnificent and previously unimagined ideal, however far human vices, and passions, and frailties may have prevented the perfect realization of that ideal. Is Christianity to be condemned in these late ages because so few of those who profess its behests reach their performance, and because so many fail to add the Christian graces to the plainer merits of Christian belief and morals? The vision of the Holy Grail may visit this sorrowful earth, but it is not on earth that it can be won even by Sir Galahad.

Another influence must be admitted to have exercised a beneficial effect on the formation of knighthood. This is the contact and comparison with the intellectual and social culture of the degenerate Greeks, and with the elegance and courtesy of the Saracens. This influence must have commenced early, for Bohemond, and Tancred, and Raymond of Toulouse, and Godfrey of Bouillon, and Robert of Normandy carried with them to the Holy Land in the First Crusade much of that courtly bearing and generous sentiment which did not become generally disseminated through the Christian West, or through the nobility at home, till the Second and Third Crusades. These qualities may have been directly and indirectly communicated by the Saracens in Spain, Sicily, and Southern France.

Old institutions of the German forest life; the effects of feudal organization and of feudal society; the necessities of a ravaged, ruined, and distracted country; the operation of religious zeal, and even of general religious fanaticism; the action of the priesthood, and collision with cultivated Greeks and brilliant Saracens, all contributed to the formation of the type of a Christian soldier—a true knight, a *preux chevalier, sans tâche et sans reproche.* The judgment is accordingly correct which regards the æra of the Crusades, when the regular and permanent Orders were instituted, as the true period of the formation of that ideal of knighthood which is one of the most precious bequests for which modern times are indebted to the Middle Ages. Undoubtedly there was a previous growth of the same kind, but the growth did not proceed to mature and perfect fruitage until all agencies were efficaciously combined on the sacred soil of Palestine.

It is a cause of great embarrassment in endeavoring to ascertain the characteristics and origin of any institution which has widely prevailed in obscure ages, that such institutions only gradually assume the complete form which is their familiar shape, that many concurrent streams flow in at different periods and add their contributions, and that the darkness of the foregone time affords every opportunity and every temptation to throw back into the past those characteristics which only belong to the institution in its final development. The same confusion which presented Virgil as a necromancer to mediæval fancy, and made Theseus a feudal duke of Athens in the imagination of Chaucer and Shakespeare, and exhibited Dan Hector and Sir Alexander to the admiring regards of baronial circles in the thirteenth century, pushed back the distinctions of knighthood to periods in which the germs of chivalry existed only in a loose and disconnected form. By this glamour the Arthurian cycle and the Carlovingian myths were fashioned, and the inventions and ideas of the twelfth century were provided with a historical existence in the sixth and eighth. After knighthood became an established institution, it prevailed so widely and so generally that it seemed to be a necessary part

of social order. Saladin is said to have sought and received the *accolade* from a Christian captive, and the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus held jousts and tourneys on the plains of Antioch (*Nicet. Chomat.* iii, 3; comp. Joann. Cantacuzenus, I, 42).

II. *Nature of Knighthood.*—A knight was a soldier (*miles*), usually, but not necessarily, of gentle blood—a soldier who fought on horseback (*caballarius, chevalier, caballero*) with panoply complete—

> "From top to toe no place appeared bare,
> That deadly dint of steele endanger may."

In the feudal hierarchy he was the holder of a knight's fee, but, as chivalry was developed, he might be "lord of his presence and no land beside." The quality was thus distinguished from the estate, and, although penalties were imposed for conferring the character on any one not of knightly blood and of knightly havings, yet the honor, once bestowed, was indelible except by degradation for unworthy conduct. This point was decided in an English court of law by lord Coke, and the decision was more recently confirmed by lord Kenyon in the case of "Sir John Gallini," a ballet-master. Knighthood thus came to designate personal character and station, in contradistinction to political rank. The impoverished warrior, like "Walter the Penniless," or Bertrand du Guesclin, or the Chevalier Bayard, might be the pearl of knights, and might sit down with princes; the powerful and wealthy baron might be wholly destitute of knightly estimation.

It was a precious service that was rendered to morals and civility when lofty virtues were thus broadly discriminated from territorial possessions and worldly rank. It was a noble model of personal purity and elevation which was presented for imitation to a warlike and stormy age. The knightly character, and the obligations imposed by that character, are strikingly delineated in the instructions of Alphonso V of Portugal to his son and heir, when he knighted him after the conquest of Arzilla (1471), in the presence of his slain Count de Marialva. "First, to instruct you," said the king, "what the nature of knighthood is, know, my son, that it consists in a close confederacy or union of power and virtue, to establish peace among men, whenever ambition, avarice, or tyranny troubles states or injures particulars; for knights are bound to employ their swords on these occasions, in order to dethrone tyrants and put good men in their place. But they are likewise obliged to keep fidelity to their sovereign, as well as to obey their chiefs in war, and to give them salutary counsels. It is also the duty of a knight to be frank and liberal, and to think nothing his own but his horse and arms, which he ought to keep for the sake of acquiring honor with them, by using them in defence of his religion and country, and of those who are unable to defend themselves; for, as the priesthood was instituted for divine service, so was chivalry for the maintenance of religion and justice. A knight ought to be the husband of widows, the father of orphans, the protector of the poor, and the prop of those who have no other support; and they who do not act thus are unworthy to bear that name. These, my son, are the obligations which the order of knighthood will lay upon you." Striking the infant thrice on the helmet with his sword, Alphonso added, "May God make you as good a knight as this whose body you see before you, pierced in several places for the service of God and of his sovereign" (cited by lord Lyttelton, *Hist. of Hen. II*, iii, 159, 160. See also Digby, *Mores Catholici*, bk. ix, chap. x; James, *Hist. of Chivalry*, chap. i).

This lofty exemplar may have been rarely approached in the ages of chivalry. The Black Prince was guilty of sanguinary atrocities. The passions of men were brutal and untamed; temptations were great and frequent; but continual failures would not furnish strange instances of the disproportion between conception and performance. Much, however, was achieved by the constant contemplation of excellence, even though it was unattained, and by the repeated efforts after each declension to aspire to the perfection so often abandoned. Much, too, was gained by the partial and occasional accomplishment of the high duties prescribed. Even more, perhaps, was slowly secured by the bitter shame and repentance which ever revived, and thus perpetuated, the desire and the image of better things. "Altius ibunt qui ad summa nituntur."

Much corruption undoubtedly flowed from the conjunction of chivalry with the Provençal courts of love, which were of mingled Greek and Saracenic descent. They contributed much to the obscuration and debasement of the wise ideal, but they contributed fully as much to the refinement and polish of the intercourse between the sexes. They added literary and intellectual culture to martial bearing; they toned down the rough, blunt manner of the battle-field to the elegant and respectful courtesies of the boudoir. They exacted from "the dauntless in war" that he should be equally gentle in peace and "faithful in love." Thus gallantry was mellowed and softened into civility, which was the antithesis of military *brusquerie*, as in the abbé Talleyrand's celebrated witticism. Hence sprung that thoroughly modern and Christian product, "the gentleman of the olden time," of which Sir Harry Lee of Ditchley may be taken as a specimen. If fearful licentiousness accompanied these amiable graces in Provence, Languedoc, Aquitaine, and other sunny southern lands, at any rate vice was stripped of its brutality and coarseness, and lost its brazen shamelessness and virulent contagion. But, though truth and fidelity to his "faire ladye" were always demanded of the knight, the sensualism of the countries of romance was only accidentally connected with knightly conduct, and never formed any part of its nature. Moreover, though it be true that

> "The evil that men do lives after them,
> The good is oft interred with their bones,"

the converse is equally true; and modern generations unquestionably owe much of those rarely-attained perfections which are now most admired to the fragrant nastiness and ornate prurience of the *Cours d'Amour* and *Jeux Floraux*.

In the splendid Arthurian cycle—a brighter realm of romance than all the legends of Homer and the Homeridæ—the heroes and heroines are sadly stained and spotted with moral blurs and blotches, and even with gross crimes. Sir Lancelot, "first of knights," bears an ineradicable brand; but still is scarce

> "Less than archangel ruined, and the excess
> Of glory obscured."

The birth and the marriage of king Arthur are equally foul; and the champions and dames that encircled him are all tainted, except Sir Galahad—"among the faithless, faithful only he." But, despite the endless detail of weakness, of ruth, and of sin, the central idea comes forth, like the sun emerging from a bank of clouds—the noblest dream of human fantasy, the highest evidence of ethereal aspirations from the midst of vicious indulgences and multiplied contaminations. This type is true knighthood. What knighthood was has been already partly explained; what it is in the Arthurian romances is shown by Arthur's latest bard:

> "In that fair Order of the Table Round,
> A glorious company, the flower of men,
> To serve as model for the mighty world,
> And be the fair beginning of a time.
> I made them lay their hands in mine, and swear
> To reverence the king, as if he were
> Their conscience, and their conscience as the king;
> To break the heathen, and uphold the Christ;
> To ride abroad redressing human wrongs;
> To speak no slander, no, nor listen to it;
> To lead sweet lives in purest chastity;
> To love one maiden only, cleave to her,
> And worship her by years of noble deeds,
> Until they won her; for indeed I knew
> Of no more subtle master under heaven
> Than is the maiden passion for a maid,
> Not only to keep down the base in man,
> But teach high thoughts, and amiable words,
> And courtliness, and the desire of fame,
> And love of truth, and all that makes a man."

III. *Classes and Degrees of Knighthood.*—Knighthood may be loosely distributed into six classes: 1. Feudal knighthood; 2. Simple knighthood; 3. Regular knighthood, or the knighthood of the spiritual orders, like the Knights of Malta; 4. Honorary knighthood, as of the Garter; 5. Titular knighthood, as in England and many other countries, constituting a dignity of lesser nobility; 6. Social, or fantastic knighthood, as the Templars in Freemasonry, the Knights of Pythias, etc. The first of these classes furnishes the foundation and origin of all the rest, but needs no further notice than has been already given. The last is foreign to the present purpose. The fifth may be excluded, as it is political rather than chivairous. Simple, regular, and honorary knighthood require further, but brief consideration.

Each of these classes exhibits the same general constitution, though the third is only an imitation, and a *preposterous* prolongation of the first with the forms of the second. In each there are usually three degrees. In actual chivalry, these were the page, the squire, and the knight. The young son of a knight, or of a noble who was also a knight, was placed at the age of seven years in the service and charge of another knight, selected on account of family connection, friendship, or personal renown. The education of the young in the ages of chivalry was secured by attendance on their elders in the field, in hunting, at the table, and in the concerns of domestic life (see *Correspondence of Simon de Montfort and bishop Grosseteste*, and the *Treatises on Manners* in *The Babees' Boke*). The page, or varlet, or valet (*vassaletus, varletus, valetus*) was taught to ride, to run, to leap, to shoot with the bow, to hawk, to play on the lute. He was taught obedience and attention to his superiors, and was supposed to be kept in the observance of religion and morals. He attended his patron in war, but armed only with a short dagger. His person was safe in the mêlée, for it was dastardly to assail a page. In the intervals of serious occupation he received guests and ministered to their comforts, and waited on the *châtelaine* and the other ladies of the household, receiving instruction in legend, and poesy, and song; in manners, and in the formalities of love. The character of the instruction in the last easy science may perhaps be conjectured from the tenor of the lessons composed for his daughters by the knight De la Tour Landry in 1371.

At the age of fourteen the young valet—the term is often extended to the second stage—received a sword, consecrated by religious benedictions, in exchange for his dagger, and entered on the degree of squire (*escuyer, scutifer, armiger*). His exercises were now mainly directed to the pursuits of war. He was trained to vault on horseback without touching the stirrup. He was taught the *manège*, and the whole art of "noble horsemanship." He carried the knight's lance, or shield, or helmet, or groomed his horse, or led his *destrier*. He attended him in the tourney and in the battle. He was not a regular combatant in the fight, but he rescued, or defended, or remounted his principal. He cultivated *courtsisie*, prosecuted his pleasant studies in the art of love, began to wear ladies' favors, sought to become *debonnair*—that is, neither shy, nor haughty, nor awkward; and diligently imitated the procedure and imbibed the spirit of his senior.

At full age—though the honor was often postponed, and sometimes accelerated—the squire was advanced to the complete knightly dignity, which was bestowed with much solemnity, ceremonial, and religious intervention. These accompaniments were, of course, dispensed with when the promotion was conferred on the battle-field. Usually, however, the reception of knighthood was ordered at some high festival, and was surrounded with imposing and onerous rites.

IV. *Institution of a Knight.*—Various procedures were adopted in different countries, in different orders, and at different times. They were all symbolic, in accordance with that love of symbol and allegory which characterizes unlettered times. There was, however, such a general resemblance in the form and spirit of the ceremonial that a general description of the procedure may be readily given. It is only necessary to understand that some of the incidents were at times omitted, and that others were frequently modified.

The most elaborate of all investitures appears to have been the old procedure of the Order of the Bath, as described in a manuscript in Frend, first published by Eduardus Bissæus, and cited textually by Du Cange (s. v. Miles). The novice was intrusted to the charge of select squires. His beard was shaven and his hair was shorn. In the evening, prudent and distinguished knights were sent to instruct him in his obligations. Minstrels and squires came singing and dancing to conduct him to the bath that had been prepared. He was stripped naked and put into the bath. He then received further instructions. When he issued from the bath, he was put to bed to dry off. When dry, he was taken up and clad warmly, with a red garment over the rest, having sleeves and a cowl like a hermit's. The knights led him to the chapel, the attendant squires singing and dancing again. He remained at his vigils and prayers all night. At break of day he confessed and received mass, after which he was put to bed. After he had rested, the knights and squires reappeared, and clothed him. He was then conducted on horseback, with song and dance, to the great hall. His spurs were fastened on by the two noblest knights present, who crossed and kissed him when they had discharged their office. His sword, suspended from a baldric (*cingulum*), was buckled on by another knight. The king, or officiating knight, then struck him thrice on the cheek (*alopa*, a slap), or on the neck or helmet, with the flat of his sword (*accollare, adobare, adoptaro:* see these titles in Du Cange, and that author's *Dissertation xxii sur Joinville*), and kissed him. The spurred and belted knight was now led back to the chapel, when he knelt, and, laying his hand on the altar, swore to uphold Holy Church through life. Guizot enumerates twenty-six engagements in a knightly oath. The postulant, with his attendant knights, next proceeded to hold high festival, but the young knight was not allowed to eat, to drink, or to move, or to look about him, while the rest were feasting. After further ceremonial, he mounted his horse, assumed his arms, and exhibited feats of warlike dexterity for the entertainment and admiration of the assembled ladies.

This is an abridged, if not a brief account of knightly investiture. These minute and tedious formalities, which are travestied by Don Quixote, belong only to times of peace, and subsequent to the establishment of the regular orders.

V. *The Regular Orders* grew out of the necessities of the Holy War in Spain and in Palestine. The knights, like priests, were vowed to celibacy, and were designed to be ecclesiastical soldiers. They were to protect pilgrims, to feed the hungry, to entertain the poor, to shield the weak, to nurse the sick and the wounded, to assert the faith, to defend the Christian land, and to do zealously all duties of charity, devotion, and war. The most noted of these Orders were—

(I.) *The Knights of the Holy Sepulchre*, instituted by Godfrey de Bouillon in 1099 to guard the sepulchre of Christ. They were distinguished by a golden cross, cantoned with four crosses of the same, pendent from a black ribbon. They languished and expired after the fall of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

(II.) *Knights of St. John of Jerusalem*, or *Knights Hospitallers*, afterwards successively *Knights of Rhodes* (q. v.) and *Knights of Malta* (q. v.). They were founded about 1048 by some Neapolitan merchants, and organized in 1104. In peace they wore the black robe of the Augustinian fraternity, with a cross of white cloth; in war they exchanged the black robe for a white gown. On the expulsion of the Christians from Palestine they passed over to Cyprus, where they remained till their

conquest of Rhodes, 1308. Driven out of Rhodes by the Turks, 1522, they received Malta from the emperor Charles V, 1530. The order expired with the surrender of the island to Napoleon in 1798. See HOSPITALLERS.

(III.) *The Knights of the Temple*, or *Red Cross Knights*, founded in 1118 by two French Crusaders, Hugo de Paganis and Godfrey Aldemar (or of St. Omer), and organized in 1128. Their rules were drawn up for them by Bernard of Clairvaux. Their badge was a red cross embroidered on a white cloak; their emblem, two knights on one horse, to indicate their vow of poverty. They soon, however, acquired immense wealth, and were accused of horrid vices and crimes; but Ashmole remarks that many sober men judge that their wealth was their greatest crime. After sharp persecutions and iniquitous trials, they were suppressed with savage cruelty in France by Philippe le Bel, 1310, and soon after in other countries. They were charged with the possession of 40,000 lordships in Europe. See TEMPLARS.

(IV.) *The Knights of Mary*, or *the Teutonic Order*, established for the support of poor pilgrims of all nations by wealthy German knights, organized in 1190 by the survivors of the army of Frederick Barbarossa. Their distinctive garb was a white mantle, having on the front a black cross with a white potence. Before the loss of Palestine, the Teutonic knights, under their grand-master Hermann von Salza, had directed their efforts and arms against the Prussians, Lithuanians, and heathen tribes of north-eastern Europe. By the secularization of Prussia, in 1525, under their grand-master Albert of Brandenburg, the order was broken up, was deprived of its most valuable possessions, and passed out of notice. See TEUTONIC KNIGHTS.

(V.) *The Knights of San Salvador*, founded by Alphonso V of Aragon in 1118. Extinguished, and its commanderies added to the crown, by Charles II, 1665.

(VI.) *The Knights of Santiago de la Espada*, in Spain, refer their origin to 837, but received their definite constitution in 1170.

(VII.) *The Knights of Alcantara*, 1158, and,

(VIII.) *The Knights of Calatrava*, 1199, were instituted to guard the western and southern portions of Spain against the Moors. The grand-mastership of both was ultimately assumed by the crown of Spain.

The regular orders of knighthood were designed to promote Christian virtues and Christian conduct, and to employ chivalrous energies for the maintenance and extension of Christianity, and the protection of Christendom against Saracens and Pagans. These functions they unquestionably discharged in their better age, and while such services were essentially necessary. With merit came favor, and power, and wealth, and arrogance, and negligence, and idleness, and luxury, and other vices. It is the old and oft-repeated story of energy declining into corruption. But they had afforded Europe time and security to develop, knit together, and confirm its civilization and its strength. When they were extinguished by secular greed for their possessions, their aptitude had disappeared. "Othello's occupation was gone" when "villainous saltpetre" had totally changed the organization of armies and the conduct of battles. It was chiefly during this period of confusion that sovereigns and princes, desirous of preserving the amusements, exercises, attachments, loyalty, splendors, and honors of knighthood—perhaps, also, of perpetuating its spirit—instituted princely in imitation of the regular orders. The enumeration and description of the multitude of such associations would afford little additional illustration of knighthood. It must suffice to name a few of these imitative establishments.

VI. *Honorary Knighthood.*—Of this there were the following orders:

	Instituted
The Order of the White Elephant of Denmark	1190.
" the White Eagle of Poland	1325.
" the Garter	1343.
" the Bath	1399.
" the Golden Fleece	1430.
" the Thistle	1540.
The Order of Saint Esprit	1578.
" Saint Louis	1693.
" Saint Andrew and Saint Catharine	1698.
" the Black Eagle of Prussia	1705.
" Saint George (for Russia)	1769.
" Saint Patrick	1783.
" the Legion of Honor	1802.
" the Iron Crown (for Italy)	1805.

There is no necessity, and would be little propriety in noticing titular and social, or fantastic knighthood here.

In 1790, Burke lamented that "the age of chivalry was gone." Its expiring gleams gilded the stark forms of Bayard at the Sesia and of Sir Philip Sidney at Zutphen. An institution which, even after a long decline, could breed such characters as these, had obviously rendered an enduring service to humanity. The age of chivalry may be gone, and the forms of chivalry may be relegated to the domain of Romance, but its spirit lives on, offering examples which the young still welcome in their dreamy and joyous days, and which the mature and the old still contemplate with fond and reverential regard. The ideal remains—purified by time, freed from the frailities and alloys of its former embodiment—and aids in fashioning modern sentiment to the conception and admiration of the Christian gentleman. Disregarding the vices which connected themselves with chivalry, but which were not of its essence, knighthood merits the commendation invariably bestowed upon it by discerning historians. It aimed to achieve—as far as the circumstances of its actual manifestation permitted; it did achieve, in thought, if rarely in act—what the oath of the new-made knight bound him to pursue as his rule of action through life. Its influences are transmitted to the passing generation, which has itself witnessed shining illustrations of their abiding efficacy.

VII. *Literature.*—Mills, *History of Chivalry* (London, 1825); James, *History of Chivalry and the Crusades* (London, 1830), are well known to general readers. Familiar also are the notices in Blackstone's *Commentaries*, bk. ii, chap. v; Robertson, *History of Charles V*, Introduction; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, and Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, ii Cours, chap. vi. The more important and authoritative works on the subject are less known, and some of them are inaccessible to students in this country. Among them may be specified, Lord Lyttelton, *Life and History of Henry II* (London, 1777, 6 vols. 8vo; tedious, but full of information); K. H. Digby, *The Broadstone of Honor* (London, 1845–8, 3 vols. 12mo), and *Mores Catholici*, or *The Ages of Faith* (London, 1844–7, 3 vols. 8vo); Dugdale, *Dissertation upon Knighthood* in *The Antiquities of Warwickshire* (London, 1656, folio); Selden, *Titles of Honor* (1614, 4to); Segar, *Honor, Military and Civill* (1602, folio); Spelman, *Dissertatio de Milite*; Upton, *De Studio Militari*, etc. (London, 1654, folio); Clarke, *History of Knighthood*; Sir H. N. Nicolas's *Heraldic Works*; Du Cange, *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latin.* title Miles, Adobare, Alopa, Armiger, Calcar, Cingulum, Valetus, etc., and *Dissertations sur Joinville*; Muratori, *Antiq. Italicæ*; Miræus, *Origines Equestrium sive Militarium Ordinum*; Favin, *Théâtre d'Honneur et de Chevalerie*; Menestrier, *De la Chevalerie ancienne et moderne*; Vulson de la Colombière, *Le Vrai Théâtre d'Honneur et de la Chevalerie*; De la Curne de St. Palaye, *Mémoires sur l'ancienne Chevalerie* (Paris, 1759–1780); Ampère, *De la Chevalerie*; Perrot, *Collection Historique des Ordres de Chevalerie* (Paris, 1836); Gourdon de Genouillac, *Dictionnaire Historique des Ordres de Chevalerie* (Paris, 1853); Reibisch, *Geschichte des Ritterwesens* (Stuttgard, 1842). A very copious account of the regular and natural Orders of Honorary Knighthood—extending to 137 associations, but not including the Order of the Victoria Cross and other recent orders—may be found in the *Encyclopædia Londinensis*. (G. F. H.)

Knill, RICHARD, an English missionary of the Independents, was born of humble parentage, at Braunton, April 14, 1787. In 1816 he proceeded as a missionary to India under the London Society, where he continued until 1819, and then returned to England.

Shortly after his arrival he went to St. Petersburg, Russia, to take charge of an English congregation in that city, over which he presided many years. Subsequently he was appointed travelling agent for the London Missionary Society, and for eight consecutive years labored to awaken the Christian mind to the duty of sending the Gospel to the heathen, a work for which he was peculiarly qualified. In 1842 he became minister of a congregation in Wotton-under-Edge, and finally received a unanimous invitation to the pastorate of Queen-Street Chapel, Chester, where he finished his eminently useful career in 1857. His style of preaching was simple, graphic, chaste, and full of unction, with a fund of illustration that rendered it always effective. See *Life of Rev. Richard Knill*, by the late Rev. Angell James and Charles M. Birrell (Lond. 2d ed. 1859, 12mo; N. Y. 1860, 16mo).

Knipperdolling, Bernard, one of the leaders of the Anabaptists of Münster, was born, probably in that city, towards the close of the 15th century. His attachment to Lutheran principles caused him to be exiled from Münster, and in his travels he connected himself with the Anabaptists in Sweden. Returning to Münster, he became the leader of the religious enthusiasts there, together with Rothmann, Matthiesen, and Bockhold, and, creating disturbances, he was imprisoned by order of the bishop of Münster. Imprisonment by no means dampened his ardor, and no sooner had he been released than he placed himself at the head of his partisans, and actually succeeded in becoming master of the city. Taken and imprisoned again, he was released by his friends, and soon acquired such reputation that the Anabaptists elected him in 1534 burgomaster of Münster. The same rabble which had succeeded in electing him to the principal office of the city now assumed control over him, and, making common cause with the fanatical Bockhold, better known as John of Leyden, and with Matthiesen, they immediately filled all public offices with their adherents, and proclaimed equality of estates, community of goods, and polygamy. All who showed the least signs of opposition were summarily dealt with; but so severe became Knipperdolling, who had subsequently been elected stadtholder, and had appointed John of Leyden king of Münster, that he was arrested by order of the "king" and imprisoned. The Roman Catholic party finally gained the upper hand in 1536, when Knipperdolling was taken, condemned to have his body torn with red-hot pincers, and to be afterwards put to the sword, which sentence was executed Jan. 23, 1536. He persisted to the last in his opinions, and refused to become reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church. His body was exhibited in an iron cage (which still remains) suspended from the belfry of St. Lambert's Church, Münster. See Catrou, *Hist. des Anabaptistes*, vol. ii; Mencken, *Scriptores Rev. Germ.* iii, 1534 sq.; Hamelmann, *Hist. Eccles. renati Evang. in Urbe Monast. Opp.*; Conr. Heresbachie, *Hist. factionis Monasteriensis*, edit. Bouterwek (Elberf. 1866, 8vo). See Anabaptists. (J. H. W.)

Knipstro (also Kniepstroh or Knipstrow, Latin *Knipstrovius*), John, a German reformer, was born at Sandow, near Lovelberg, Silesia, May 1, 1497. Educated among the Franciscans, he was sent by the abbot of his convent to finish his studies at the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Here he was a witness of the famous "Actus disputationis" in which John Tetzel attempted to overthrow Luther's *theses* against indulgences. Knipstro, who had read the theses, answered Tetzel so conclusively that the latter withdrew from the contest. Knipstro was then sent to the convent of Pyritz, in Pomerania, in the hope that quiet and rest would calm his revolutionary ardor; but he improved his time in reading the Bible and Luther's works, and finally brought the whole convent to share in his views. The town heard of this, and Knipstro was invited by the citizens to preach to them, which he did with such success that the whole town soon became Protestant, but the bishop interfered in favor of Roman Catholicism, and Knipstro was obliged in 1522 to flee to Stettin, where he married. In 1524 he went to Stargard, and thence to Stralsund, where his eloquence proved fatal to the Roman Catholic party, and where, in 1525, he was appointed superintendent of ecclesiastical affairs. He took part as such in the General Synod of Pomerania in 1535, and was then appointed the first general superintendent of the Church in Wolgast. In 1539 he was made professor at the University of Greifswald, Pomerania, and in 1547 became its rector. A controversy with Frever, a professor in the same institution, gave him such annoyance that he withdrew to Wolgast, and devoted the remainder of his life to teaching and to Church administration. He died at the last-named place Oct. 4, 1556. His works are: *Vom rechten Gebrauch d. Kirchen-Güter* (Stralsund, 1533):—*Bedenken wider d. Interim*, etc. (Stralsund, 1548):—*Epistola ad D. Melanchthonem, qua Consensus Ecclesiæ Pomeranicæ ad suspiciendam Aug. Confessionem repetitionem declaratur* (1552):—*Widerlegung d. Bekenntniss Andr. Osiandri v. d. Rechtfertigung* (1555?):—*Forma repetendi catechismi* (1555?). See Mayer, *Vita Knipstrovii*; Jänicke, *Gelehrtes Pommerland*; H. Schmid, *Einleitung z. Brandenburg Kirchen Gesch.*; J. H. Balthasar, *Sammlung einiger Pommerschen Kirchen-Hist. gehörigen Schriften*, i, 93; ii, 317 sq.; Zeller, *Universal Lexikon*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 896; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 765. (J. N. P.)

Knittel, Franz Anton, a German theologian of note, was born at Salzdahlum, April 3, 1721, and was successively archdiaconus, general superintendent, and consistorialrath at Wolfenbüttel. He died April 13, 1792. He is celebrated as the discoverer (in the library at Wolfenbüttel) of a MS., a fragment of Ulfila's Gothic version of the Epistle to the Romans. It is a palimpsest, the newer surface being occupied with the Origines and some letters of Isidorus Hispalensis. The portions of the Gothic version of the Epistle to the Romans contained in it are xi, 33–36; xii, 1–5, 17–21; xiii, 1–5; xiv, 9–20; xv, 3–13. These Knittel printed (in all probability in 1762 or 1763) in a volume entitled *Ulphilæ Versio Gothica nonnullorum capitum Ep. ad Rom. venerandum antiquitatis monumentum . . . e Latina codicis cujusd. MSti rescripti . . . una cum variis variæ litteraturæ monimentis huc usque ineditis*, etc. The text is printed on one side of the page in Gothic letters, under each word is Knittel's reading of it in italics, and under that a Latin translation of each. On the other side there is a Latin version found in the Codex, under that the reading in the Vulgate, and under that the Greek text. There are also twelve plates, containing admirably-executed fac-similes of different codices; and among the notes is found an extract of considerable length from Otfried's *Gospel Harmony*. The volume contains also two fragments from ancient Greek codices of the N. T. in the Wolfenbüttel library, and a copious critical commentary by Knittel, and is altogether a splendid one; but, as Knittel's knowledge of Gothic was rather imperfect, its literary merits are not quite equal to its sumptuous appearance. Knittel deserves, however, the praise of great laboriousness, as is evinced by his collection of a vast amount of curious matter not elsewhere to be found. The book is very rarely to be met with at present; at least copies containing all the plates.—Kitto, *Dict. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.; Döring, *Gelehrten Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v. See Gothic Version.

Knobel, Karl August, a German theologian, highly distinguished as an exegetical scholar in the Old Testament and as archæologist, was born Aug. 7, 1807, near Sorau, Silesia. In this town he studied under associate principal Scharbe, who inspired Knobel with a zeal for learning, and also befriended him with money to pursue his university course at Breslau after his father's death. David Schultz, to whose children he be-

came tutor, exerted a special influence in determining his choice of teaching as a profession, and in fixing the unfailing rationalistic tendency of his mind. He began lecturing in 1831, and his freshness, power, and genuine worth at once drew and ever attracted to him numerous hearers. In 1835 he was made extraordinary professor, and in 1837 he received from Breslau the degree of doctor in theology, chiefly in recognition of his exceedingly valuable work on Hebrew Prophecy (*Prophetismus d. Hebräer*, Breslau, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo). The fame of this work brought him at once the offer of a professorship in Göttingen, in Ewald's place, and of one in Giessen, which latter he accepted. Thenceforth his attention was confined to the study of the Old Testament; but his cold, critical, rationalistic spirit avails but little to a right appreciation of the theological import or even poetical beauty of the Scriptures. His publications during his twenty-four years' labor at Giessen (nearly all exegetical) bear the same defect of insight, with the display of great learning. The *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah* appeared in the *Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. z. A. T.* in 1843 (2d ed. 1854, 3d ed. 1861); on *Genesis* in 1852 (2d ed. 1860); *Exodus and Leviticus*, 1857; *Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, 1861. These commentaries are characterized by special sobriety and thoughtfulness, healthy linguistic and historical views, with comprehensive knowledge of Oriental antiquity. In the first-mentioned feature they have the advantage of Hitzig. Knobel is independent, and gives positive views on many points which he was obliged earnestly to defend. He was in conflict with Ewald, as also specially in reference to the origin of the Pentateuch with Hupfeld, Tuch, Bertheau, and Stächlin. He is deserving of credit for his ingenuity in bringing out the "Composition theory" concerning the production of the Pentateuch. Knobel died, after long and severe suffering, from a cancer in the stomach, May 25, 1863. In addition to the works already mentioned, Knobel published *Commentar über Koheleth* (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); and *Völkertafel der Genesis* (1850, 8vo), a very learned work, and frequently cited in the exegetical department of this *Cyclopædia*. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. xix, s. v.

Knobelsdorff, Eustachius of, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born of noble parentage in 1519, at Heilsberg, Prussia; was educated at the universities of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Paris, and upon the completion of his studies took orders in the Church. During a visit of the bishop and cardinal of Wermeland to Rome, Knobelsdorff administered the duties of the episcopal office, and in 1563, upon the return of the bishop, was appointed dean-cathedral. He died in 1571. His writings are of but little account. See *Allgem. Hist. Lex.* iii. 41.

Knock (דָּפַק, Cant. v, 2; "beat," Judg. xix, 22; κρούω, Matt. vii, 7; Rev. iii, 20, etc.). "Though Orientals are very jealous of their privacy, they never knock when about to enter your room, but walk in without warning or ceremony. It is nearly impossible to teach an Arab servant to knock at your door. They give warning at the outer gate or entrance either by calling or knocking. To stand and *call* is a very common and respectful mode. Thus Moses commanded the holder of a pledge to stand without, and call to the owner to come forth (Deut. xxiv, 10). This was to avoid the violent intrusion of cruel creditors. Peter stood knocking at the outer door (Acts xii, 13, 16), and so did the three men sent to Joppa by Cornelius (Acts x, 17, 18). The idea is that the guard over your privacy is to be placed at the entrance to your premises" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 192 sq.). See House.

Knollis, Francis, a distinguished English statesman, was born at Grays, Oxfordshire, about 1530. He studied at the University of Oxford. Admitted at court, he showed great zeal for the Reformation, and when queen Mary ascended the throne he was obliged to retire to the Continent. At Elizabeth's accession he returned, became privy counsellor, treasurer of the queen's household, and knight of the Garter. He was one of the judges of Mary Stuart. He died in 1596. Knollis wrote a treatise on the *Usurpation of papal Bishops* (1608, 8vo). See Turner, *History of the Reign of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth;* Rose, *New General Biographical Dictionary;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 915. (J. N. P.)

Knollys, Hanserd, an eminent English Baptist minister, was born in Chalkwell, Lincolnshire, in 1598. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, and after his graduation was ordained as a deacon, and then as a presbyter of the Church of England, and was presented by the bishop of Lincoln with the living at Humberstone. About 1632, beginning to doubt the lawfulness of conformity to the Church of England, he resigned his living, but continued to preach several years longer. In 1636 he was arrested for preaching the Gospel, and thrown into prison; but his keeper, being conscience-stricken, connived at his escape, and he came over to America early in 1638. He arrived at Boston, Mass., a persecuted fugitive, in a state of utter destitution, and was obliged to work daily at manual labor for his subsistence. At first he met with a cold reception in Boston, which was then in a ferment on the question of Antinomianism, and suspicious of all new-comers; but, being invited to preach in Dover, N. H., he went thither, and in 1638 founded the first church in that place. He returned to England in 1641, where he spent the next fifty years of his life, during that most agitated period of English history, and died Sept. 19, 1691. Mr. Knollys was an able minister, a most accomplished teacher of youth, a bold pioneer of religious liberty, a man of large public spirit, and pre-eminently great in the purity of his character. He published a little work on the *Rudiments of Hebrew Grammar* (1648, 12mo); also *Flaming Fire in Zion* (1646, 4to); and his *Autobiography* in 1672, which was brought down to his death by Wm. Kiffin (1692, 8vo; 1813, 12mo). See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vi, 1. (J. L. S.)

Knop, that is, Knob (Anglo-Saxon *cnæp*), a word employed in the A. V. to translate two terms, of the real meaning of which all that we can say with certainty is that they refer to some architectural or ornamental object, and that they have nothing in common.

1. *Kaphtor'* (כַּפְתּוֹר or כַּפְתֹּר) occurs in the description of the candlestick of the sacred tent (Exod. xxv, 31–36, and xxxvii, 17–22, the two passages being identical). The knops are here distinguished from the shaft, branches, bowls, and flowers of the candlestick; but the knop and the flower go together, and seem intended to imitate the produce of an almond-tree. In another part of the work they appear to form a boss, from which the branches are to spring out from the main stem. In Amos ix, 1 the same word is rendered, with doubtful accuracy, "lintel." The same rendering is used in Zeph. ii, 14, where the reference is to some part of the palace of Nineveh, to be exposed when the wooden upper story —the "cedar work"—was destroyed. The Hebrew word seems to contain the sense of "covering" and "crowning" (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 709). Josephus's description (*Ant.* iii, 6, 7) names both balls (σφαιρία) and pomegranates (ῥοΐσκοι), either of which may be the *kaphtor*. The Targum agrees with the latter, the Sept. (σφαιρωτῆρες) with the former. See Lintel. All these circumstances point to a signification corresponding essentially to that of *crown;* and in the case of the sacred candelabrum, the term seems to point to a sharp ornamental swell placed (like a horizontal button) immediately beneath the cups that surmounted each arm and section of the shaft. See Tabernacle.

2. The second term, *pekaïm'* (פְּקָעִים), is found only in 1 Kings vi, 18, and vii, 24. It refers in the former to carvings executed in the cedar wainscot of the interior of the Temple, and, as in the preceding word, is associated with flowers. In the latter case it denotes an or-

nament cast round the great reservoir or "sea" of Solomon's Temple below the brim: there was a double row of them, ten to a cubit, or about two inches from centre to centre. The word no doubt signifies some globular thing resembling a small *gourd* (being only the masc. of the fem. term so rendered in 2 Kings iv, 39) or an egg, though as to the character of the ornament we are quite in the dark. The following wood-cut of a portion of a richly ornamented door-step or slab from Kouyunjik probably represents something approximating to the "knop and the flower" of Solomon's Temple. But as the building from which this is taken was the work of a king at least as late as the son of Esar-haddon, contemporary with the latter part of the reign of Manasseh, it is only natural to suppose that the character of the ornament would have undergone considerable modification from what it was in the time of Solomon.—Smith.



Ornamental Border of a Slab from Kouyunjik.

Mr. Paine suggests (*Temple of Solomon*, p. 41) that the difference in gender (above noted) of the terms for the gourds (or *cucumbers*, as he renders) is accounted for by the circumstance that these ornaments were artificial (hence in the masc.), while the real fruit is fem. He thinks that on the laver they were arranged in vine-form, ten in each of the two rows, like a netting (*ib.* p. 50). See SEA, BRAZEN.

Knorr, GEORG CHRISTIAN VON, a German divine, was born at Oettingen in 1691, and was educated at Jena from 1708 to 1712. His dissertation for the master's degree was an attack on Leibnitz, and created quite a sensation at the time; it was entitled *Doctrinæ orthodoxæ de origine mali contra recentiorum quorundam hypotheses modesta assertio* (Jenæ, 1712, 4to). In 1716 he became conrector, and a few months later rector over the schools at Oettingen; and in 1726 was called to Blankenburg, as librarian to the duke of Brunswick. Some time after this he joined the Romanists. He died in 1762. There are no works of special merit from the pen of Knorr except the dissertation already mentioned.—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knorr von Rosenroth, Abraham, a Lutheran divine, descended from a noble family noted in the annals of the history of Silesia, flourished in the 17th century as pastor at Alt Rauden, in the duchy of Wohlau, and was the father of Christian and Caspar, both also noted Lutheran pastors.

The former of these two sons, namely, Christian, was born July 15, 1631, and was educated at the high-schools in Wittenberg and Leipzig. He was then sent abroad, and visited Holland, France, and England in turn, and on his return devoted himself at Sulzbach to the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew, of which he had acquired the rudiments while abroad. He took up the writings of the Cabalists, and even attempted to prove the authenticity of the N.-T. Scriptures by this Jewish philosophical system, in his *Kabbala denudata, sive doctrina Hebræorum transcendentalis* (part i, Sulzbach, 1677–8, 4to; pt. ii, F. ad M. 1684, 4to; a third part was supplied by Pagendorm). His other writings, all of this eccentric nature, do not deserve mention here, as they have lost all value as literary contributions. See, for details, *Allgem. Hist. Lex.* iii, 42; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 295 sq. (J. H. W.)

Knorr von Rosenroth, Christian. See KNORR VON ROSENROTH, ABRAHAM.

Knott, Edward, an English Jesuit, whose true name was *Matthias Wilson*, and memorable for his controversy with Chillingworth, which called forth the famous book called *The Religion of Protestants*, was born at Pegsworth, near Morpeth, in Northumberland, in 1580. He was entered among the Jesuits in 1606, being already in priests' orders; and is represented in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Societatis Jesu* as a man of low stature, but of great abilities. He taught divinity a long time in the English college at Rome, and was a rigid observer of that discipline himself which he as rigidly exacted from others. He was then appointed sub-provincial of the province of England; and, after he had exercised that employment out of the kingdom, he was twice sent thither to perform the functions of his office. He was present, as provincial, at the general assembly of the orders of the Jesuits held at Rome in 1646, and was elected one of the definitors. He died at London January 4, 1655–6. Knott was a great controversialist, and wrote largely, displaying in all his works great acuteness and learning. His first book was a little work entitled *Charity Mistaken* (Lond. 1630), with the "want whereof Catholics are unjustly charged, for affirming, as they do with grief, that Protestancy, unrepented, destroys salvation," which was answered by Dr. Potter, provost of Queen's College, Oxford (in 1633), by a piece entitled *Want of Charity justly charged on all such Romanists as dare, without truth or modesty, affirm that Protestancy destroyeth Salvation.* To this Knott replied, under the title *Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholics* (in 1634), which occasioned Chillingworth to publish *The Religion of Protestants.* See CHILLINGWORTH. Knott came to the defence in 1638, in a pamphlet entitled *Christianity Maintained*, and later in a work under the title of *Infidelity Unmasked*, etc. (Ghent, 1652, 4to). At this time, however, Chillingworth had been dead nine years, and in behalf of the noted deceased a reply was made by Thomas Smith, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge (in 1653), in the preface to an English translation of Daille's *Apology for the Reformed Churches.* See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 49 sq.; Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*; De Maizeaux, *Life of Chillingworth.* (J. H. W.)

Knott, John W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Blairsville, Westmoreland County, Pa., Oct. 7, 1812. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., and studied theology at Western and Princeton theological seminaries. After graduation he preached at Gilgal, Pa., for about a year, when he removed to Ohio, and was installed over the churches of Leesville and Ontario; there he continued three years, and then for four years served as pastor of the churches at Hayesville and Jeromeville. He was next called to the churches of Keene and Jefferson, where he officiated for seven years. During the remainder of his life, with intervals of relaxation on account of ill health, he preached at Eden, Caroline, Waynesburg, Nevada, and Sandusky, Ohio. He died at Shelby, Ohio, Sept. 3, 1864. Mr. Knott made many sacrifices of personal advancement and comfort to further the cause of religion. He was a man of unbounded faith in the Bible, from which he drew all his theology and philosophy. The burden of his preaching was Jesus Christ and him crucified. He believed, "when he had proven his position from the Bible, he had established it immovably." See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1865.

Know (properly יָדַע, γινώσκω) is a term used in a variety of senses in the Scriptures. It signifies particularly to understand (Ruth iii, 11), to approve of and delight in (Psa. i, 6; Rom. viii, 29), to cherish (John x, 27), to experience (Eph. iii, 19). In Job vii, 10 it is used of an inanimate object: "He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more." By a euphemism it frequently denotes sexual connection (Gen. iv, 1; Matt. i, 25). The other scriptural applications of the word are mostly obvious, as follows: (1.) It imports to have acquired information respecting a subject. (2.) It implies discernment, judgment, discretion; the power of discrimination. It may be partial; we see but in part, we know but in part (1 Cor. xiii, 9). (3.)

It frequently signifies to have ascertained by experiment (Gen. xxii, 12). (4.) It implies discovery, detection; by the law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii, 20).

Natural knowledge is acquired by the senses, by sight, hearing, feeling, etc.; by reflection; by the proper use of our reasoning powers; by natural genius; dexterity improved by assiduity and cultivation into great skill. So of husbandry (Isa. xxviii, 36), of art and elegance (Exod. xxxv, 31), in the instance of Bezaleel. Spiritual knowledge is the gift of God, but may be improved by study, consideration, etc. See KNOWLEDGE.

Particular Phrases.—The priests' lips should keep knowledge (Mal. ii, 7); not keep it to themselves, but keep it in store for others; to communicate knowledge is the way to preserve it. Knowledge is spoken of as an emblematical person, as riches, and treasures, as excellency, and as the gift of God (Prov. i, 29; viii, 10, etc.). See WISDOM. "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth" (1 Cor. viii, 1); i. e. the knowledge of speculative and useless things, which tend only to gratify curiosity and vanity, which contribute neither to our own salvation nor to our neighbor's, neither to the public good nor to God's glory; such knowledge is much more dangerous than profitable. The true science is that of salvation; the best employment of our knowledge is in sanctifying ourselves, in glorifying God, and in edifying our neighbor: this is the only sound knowledge (Prov. i, 7).

God is the source and fountain of knowledge (1 Sam. ii, 3; 2 Chron. i, 10; James i, 5). He knows all things, at all times, and in all places. See OMNISCIENCE. Jesus Christ is possessed of universal knowledge; knows the heart of man, and whatever appertains to his mediatorial kingdom (John ii, 24, 25; xvi, 30; Col. ii, 3). Men know progressively, and ought to follow on to know the Lord (Hos. vi, 3); what we know not now we may know hereafter (John xiii, 7). Holy angels know in a manner much superior to man, and occasionally reveal part of their knowledge to him. Unholy angels know many things of which man is ignorant. The great discretion of life and of godliness is to discern what is desirable to be known, and what is best unknown; lest the knowledge of "good lost and evil got," as in the case of our first parents, should prove the lamentable source of innumerable evils (Gen. ii, 9; iii, 7).

Knowledge of God is indispensable, self-knowledge is important, knowledge of others is desirable; to be too knowing in worldly matters is often accessory to sinful knowledge; the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ is a mean of escaping the pollutions which are in the world (John xvii, 3). Workers of iniquity have no knowledge, no proper conviction of the divine presence (Psa. xiv, 4). Some men are brutish in their knowledge (Jer. li, 17); e. g. he who knows that a wooden image is but a shapely-formed stump of a tree, yet worships it; he boasts of his deity, which, in fact, is an instance of his want of discernment, degrading even to brutality (Isa. xlv, 20). Some are wicked in their knowledge, "knowing the depths of Satan, as they speak" (Rev. ii, 20). See GNOSTICISM.

Knowledge. By this, according to Sir William Hamilton, "is understood the mere possession of truths," and the *possession* of those truths about which our faculties have been previously employed, rather than any separate power of the understanding by which truth is perceived. "I know no authority," says Dr. Reid, "besides that of Mr. Locke, for calling knowledge a *faculty*, any more than for calling opinion a faculty." Knowledge is of two kinds, viz. *historical* or *empirical*, and *philosophical*, or *scientific* or *rational*. Historical is the knowledge that the thing is, philosophical is the knowledge why or how it is. The first is called historical, because in this knowledge we know only the fact—only that that phenomenon is; for history is properly only the narration of a consecutive series of phenomena in time, or the description of a co-existent series of phenomena in space; the second philosophical, to imply that there is a way of knowing things more completely than they are known through simple experiences mechanically accumulated in memory or heaped up in cyclopædias. It seeks for wide and deep truths, as distinguished from the multitudinous detailed truths which the surface of things and actions presents, and therefore a knowledge of the highest degree of generality. "The truth of philosophy," says Herbert Spencer, "bears the same relation to the highest scientific truths that each of these bears to lower scientific truths. As each widest generalization of science comprehends and consolidates the narrower generalizations of its own division, so the generalizations of philosophy comprehend and consolidate the widest generalizations of science. It is therefore a knowledge the extreme opposite in kind to that which experience first accumulates. It is the final product of that process which begins with a mere colligation of crude observations, goes on establishing propositions that are broader and more separated from particular cases, and ends in universal propositions. Or, to bring the definition to its simplest and clearest form, knowledge of the lowest kind is *ununified* knowledge; science is *partially unified* knowledge; philosophy is *completely unified* knowledge."

This term, however, is associated with the greatest problems and controversies of philosophy, all of which are involved in the discussion of what is meant by knowledge. The different problems, therefore, of the philosophy of mind will be found discussed under those names that severally suggest them.—Watts, *On the Mind;* Dr. John Edwards, *Uncertainty, Deficiency, and Corruption of Human Knowledge;* Reid, *Intellectual Powers of Man;* Stennett, *Sermon on Acts xxvi*, 24, 25; Upham, *Intellectual Philosophy;* Douglas, *On the Advancement of Society;* Robert Hall, *Works; Amer. Library of Useful Knowledge.* See FAITH AND REASON; IDEALISM; JUDGMENT; MORAL PHILOSOPHY; RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.

KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. By this is not meant a mere knowledge of his *existence*, for the devils believe that God is; they tremble as they believe it, and they hate the God before whom they tremble. It cannot be a mere partial acquaintance with the *character* of God, because we cannot for a moment doubt that the *Jews* were partially acquainted with God's character, and yet our Lord said to them, "Ye neither know me nor my Father." Neither can it be a *dry, uninfluential, notional* knowledge of God, however accurate in its outline that knowledge may be. The knowledge of God includes far more than this. It implies a real, personal, experimental, sanctifying acquaintance with him. It especially regards him as *a reconciled God in Christ*—that is, the reconciliation of all his perfections in the way of his mercy, unfolding them as the basis for the soul's confidence; that he is righteously and holily merciful, pardoning sin at the expense of no other perfection, but in the full and perfect harmony of all his perfections. Without this knowledge, all our advances in other branches of knowledge are but vain and unprofitable. All other knowledge is *useful, entertaining;* this alone is *needful.* This may do without other knowledge, but no other knowledge will do without this. If you teach men the elements of education, you put into their hands a powerful weapon either for good or for evil, according to the direction that may be given to it. If you put into their hands the elements of sound religious knowledge, you give their minds a right and safe exercise, while the knowledge will keep them from the abuse of the tremendous power you put into their hands. See Charnock, *Works*, ii, 381; Saurin, *Sermons*, i, serm. 1; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, iii, 12 (8vo); Tillotson, *Sermons*, serm. 113; Watts, *Works*, i, serm. 45; Hall, *Sermon on the Advantages of Knowledge to the lower Classes;* Foster, *Essay on Popular Ignorance;* Dwight, *Theology;* Martensen, *Dogmatics.* See KNOW.

Knowledge, DIVINE. See OMNISCIENCE.

Knowler, WILLIAM, LL.D., an English divine, was born in May, 1699, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was first chaplain to the first marquis of Rockingham, and was by him presented with the rectory of Irthlingborrow, and afterwards with Boddington, both in Northamptonshire. He died, in all probability, in 1773. Dr. Knowler published an English translation of Chrysostom's *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, with an account both of Chrysostom and of Jerome.—*New Gen. Biogr. Dict.* viii, 53; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knowles, James Davis, a Baptist minister, was born in Providence, R. I., July, 1798. He learned the printing business, and in 1819 became co-editor of the *Rhode Island American*. Having joined the Baptist Church in March, 1820, he was in the fall following licensed to preach. Shortly after he entered the sophomore class of Columbian College, Washington, D. C., graduated in 1824, and was immediately appointed one of the tutors of the college, which position he held until called as pastor to the Second Baptist Church of Boston, where he was ordained Dec. 28, 1825. In 1832 impaired health obliged him to resign his pastoral charge, and he became professor of pastoral duties and sacred rhetoric in the Newton Theological Institution, acting at the same time for over two years as editor of the *Christian Review*, a Baptist quarterly. He died May 9, 1838. Mr. Knowles published a number of occasional *Sermons, Addresses*, etc.; *Memoir of Mrs. Ann H. Judson, late Missionary to Burmah* (1829); and *Memoir of Roger Williams, the Founder of the State of Rhode Island* (Boston, 1834).—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 707; Appleton, *New American Cyclopædia*, x, 192.

Knowles, James Sheridan, the celebrated modern dramatist of England, in later years a minister in the Baptist Church, was born at Cork, Ireland, in 1784, and early distinguished himself as a dramatic writer. About 1845 he began to entertain religious scruples about his connection with the stage, was finally converted, and in 1852 joined the Baptist Church and entered the ministry. He died Dec. 1, 1862, at Torquay, in Devonshire. Several of his sermons have been published, but they do not so greatly merit our notice as his exposition of the Protestant view on the Lord's Supper, which he defended in *The Idol demolished by its own Priest* (Lond. 1851, 12mo), an answer to cardinal Wiseman's lectures on transubstantiation. He also wrote *The Rock of Rome, or the Arch Heresy* (London, 1849, 1850, 1851). His *dramatic works* have been collected and published in 3 vols. sm. 8vo, in 1843 and since. See Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; *North Amer. Review*, xl, 141 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Knowles, John, a Congregational minister, was born in Lincolnshire, England, and educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge. In 1625 he was chosen fellow of Katharine Hall, and while employed in his duties as a teacher, upon the invitation of the mayor and aldermen of Colchester, became their lecturer. In consequence of his opposition to archbishop Laud, his license was revoked in 1639, and he immediately removed to New England, and was ordained co-pastor at Watertown, Mass., Dec. 19. In October, 1649, he departed to Virginia, in response to a call for ministerial aid in that destitute region. In a few months, however, he returned to Watertown, whence he returned to England in 1650, where he soon became preacher in the cathedral at Bristol. From this place he was ejected at the Restoration, and in 1662 was prevented from public ministrations by the Act of Uniformity. By permission of king Charles in 1672, he became colleague of the Rev. Thomas Kentish at St. Katharine's, London, where he preached till near the close of his life, April 10, 1685. It is said of him that sometimes, while preaching, his very earnestness and zeal so exhausted him that he fainted and fell. Mr. Knowles is represented as having been "a godly man and a prime scholar."—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*.

Knowles, Thomas, D.D., an English divine of great learning and talents, was born at Ely in 1723; studied at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, of which he was chosen fellow, and was afterwards, for over thirty years, lecturer of St. Mary's, in Bury St. Edmund's. He became successively prebendary of Ely, rector of Ickworth and Chedburgh, and, finally, vicar of Winston, Suffolk. He died in 1802. His principal works are, *The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Lond. 1780, 12mo; a new ed., with additions, by the Rev. H. Hasted, London, 1830, 12mo):—*Twelve Sermons on the Attributes* (Camb. 1750, 8vo):—*Answer to Bp. Clayton's Essay on Spirit* (Lond. 1753, 8vo):—*Primitive Christianity* (1789, 8vo). He also wrote several pamphlets on religious subjects. See *Gent. Magazine*, vol. lxxii; Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knowlton, GIDEON A., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in East Haddam, Conn., entered the itinerancy in Central New York in 1800, was mostly employed in what was the old Genesee Conference, stationed at Albany in 1804, at Saratoga in 1805, and died at Whitestown, N. Y., Aug. 15, 1810. He was deeply pious, a "plain, practical, and useful preacher," and of great and exemplary faithfulness in the work of his Master.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i. 195.

Knowne Men, or *just-fastmen*, a name for persons who, in the reign of Henry VII, suffered martyrdom at the instigation of John Longland, bishop of Lincoln, either for reading the Scriptures or treatises of Scripture in English, or for hearing the same read. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 180, note 3; Fox, *Book of Martyrs* (Lond. 1583), p. 820–37; Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation* (London, 1681), i, 27 sq.

Knox, John (1), the Reformer of Scotland.

I. *Early Life.*—He was born in Gifford, a village in East Lothian, in 1505, of respectable parents, members of the Romish Church, who were able to give their son a liberal education. After spending some time at the grammar-school of Haddington, he was sent by his father, in 1521, to the University of Glasgow. Here he studied under Mayor, a famous professor of philosophy and theology. A disciple, by the way, of Gerson and Peter d'Ailly, he advocated the supremacy of general councils over the popes, and, carrying this view into politics, held also that the king's authority is derived from the people—a doctrine which he inculcated in his pupils (Knox as well as Buchanan), and which fully explains the democratic tendencies of the Scottish reformer. Soon after taking the degree of M.A., Knox became an assistant professor, and rivalled his master in the subtleties of the dialectic art. He obtained clerical orders even before he reached the age fixed by the canons, and about 1530 went to St. Andrew's, and began to teach there. A veil of obscurity hangs over his life for several of the following years. It is supposed, however, that the study of the fathers, especially Jerome and Augustine, shook his attachment to the Romish Church as early as 1535, but he did not become an avowed Protestant until 1542—a fact which shows that he did not act from hasty or turbulent impulses, but with prudence and deliberation. His reproof of existing corruptions compelled him to retire from St. Andrew's to the south of Scotland, and he was degraded from his orders as a heretic. He now became a tutor to the sons of two noble families, and occasionally preached to the people in the neighborhood. During this period he became a frequent companion of the reformer and martyr Geo. Wishart, to whose instructions he was greatly indebted. When Wishart was apprehended, Knox would fain have clung to him and shared his fate, but his friend refused, saying, "Nay, return to your bairns, and God bless you; one is sufficient for a sacrifice." Wishart was burnt at the stake, under cardinal Beaton's orders, in March, 1546, and within two months afterwards the cardinal was put to death

in his own castle of St. Andrew's by a band of nobles and others who held the castle as a stronghold of the reforming interest. Knox, who was daily in danger of his life from Beaton's successor, determined to go to Germany to pursue his studies, but was induced by the parents of his pupils to give up his purpose and take refuge in the castle, which he did with many other Protestants in Easter, 1547. Here for the first time he entered upon the public ministry of the Gospel, and he distinguished himself both as a powerful preacher and a fearless opponent of the papacy. But this did not continue long.

II. *His Exile.*—The arrival of a French fleet enabled the regent of Scotland to invest the castle by sea and by land, and on the last day of July the garrison was compelled to surrender, which they did upon honorable terms. But instead of being simply expatriated according to the engagement, they were taken to France, where the principal gentlemen were held as prisoners, and Knox and others were made galley-slaves. The following winter the galleys lay on the Loire, but the next summer they cruised on the east coast of Scotland, often in sight of the steeple of St. Andrew's. Knox's constancy continued unshaken under all toils and trials, which were greatly increased at one time by disease, until in Feb. 1549, after nineteen months of bondage, he was released through the personal interposition of Edward VI of England with the king of France. He immediately repaired to England, where he was warmly welcomed by Cranmer and the council. He was stationed in the north at Berwick, and afterwards at Newcastle, where he labored indefatigably, preaching often every day in the week, notwithstanding many bodily infirmities. He enjoyed the confidence of the English reformers, was made one of king Edward's chaplains, was consulted in the revision of the Prayer-book, and also of the Articles of Religion, and was offered the bishopric of Rochester, but declined it from scruples as to the divine authority of the office. After five years of great and faithful activity, at the end of which he married a Miss Bowes, of Berwick, the accession of Mary to the throne put an end to his usefulness and endangered his life. His own desire was to remain and meet the issue, for, as he said, "never could he die in a more honest quarrel," but the tears and importunity of friends prevailed on him to fly. Accordingly, in January, 1554, he took ship to Dieppe, where he spent his first leisure in writing suitable advices to those whom he could no longer reach by his voice. Afterwards he travelled in France and Switzerland, visiting particular churches and conferring with the learned. At Geneva he studied Hebrew, and formed with the celebrated Calvin an intimate friendship, which ended only with Calvin's death. By Calvin's influence he was induced to take charge of the Church of English exiles at Frankfort-on-the-Main, but unhappy disputes about the service-book led to his withdrawal after less than six months' service, in March, 1555. He immediately turned his steps to Geneva, where he took charge of an English congregation. But in the same year he made a flying visit to Scotland, during which he preached incessantly, and labored night and day. Among the many distinguished converts he made at this time figured three young lords, who afterwards played no unimportant part in the affairs of their country: Archibald Horn, later earl of Argyle; James Stuart, natural brother of Mary, and later earl of Murray, and regent during the minority of James VI; and John Erskine, who, under the title of earl of Marr, also acted as regent. His influence rendered the reformers more decided in their course, and he instituted in 1556 the first of those religious bonds or covenants which are so marked a feature in Scottish ecclesiastical history. But he judged that the time was not ripe for a general movement, and accordingly returned to Switzerland. After his departure he was cited to appear before an assembly of the Romish clergy, and in his absence was condemned to be burnt as a heretic, and the sentence was executed upon his effigy. In Geneva he spent nearly three years, the happiest and most tranquil of his life. He counted it "the most perfect school of Christ that ever was in the earth since the days of the apostles." He was surrounded by his family, and lived in the greatest harmony with his colleague, Goodman, and the small flock under his charge. During his stay he took part in the preparation of what is called the *Geneva Bible.* He also wrote a number of letters and appeals which were forwarded to Scotland, and had great influence in guiding the counsels of the friends of the Reformation. His most singular treatise was a volume entitled *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women.* Although undoubtedly honest in his opinions, it is certain that he was led to them by his abhorrence of Bloody Mary, who was then wearying England by her cruelties. But it was an unfortunate publication, for it subjected him to the resentment of two queens, during whose reign it was his lot to live; the one his native princess, Mary, queen of Scots, and the other Elizabeth, exercising a sway in Scotland scarcely inferior to that of any of its own sovereigns. Although his residence at Geneva was so agreeable in many ways, yet duty to Scotland was always uppermost in his mind, and when a summons came from the leading Protestants there for his return, he yielded at once.

III. *His Life-work in Scotland.*—The inducement for him to return was the concession of liberty of worship promised by the queen regent, but upon his arrival at Leith in May, 1559, he found that she had thrown off all disguises (she had just stipulated to assist the Guises in their plans against Elizabeth), and was determined to suppress the Reformation by force. Not only did she refuse the demands of the Protestants, but even summoned a number of the preachers for trial at Stirling. But Knox was not disheartened. He wrote to his sister, "Satan rageth to the uttermost, and I am come, I praise my God, even in the brunt of the battle." The regent, alarmed at the attitude of the Protestants, promised to put a stop to the trial, and induced the accused to stay away, and then outlawed them for not appearing. The news of this outrage came to Perth on the day when Knox preached against the idolatry of the mass and of image worship. At the conclusion of the service, an encounter between a boy and a priest who was preparing to celebrate mass led to a terrible riot. The altar, the images, and all the ornaments of the church were torn down and trampled under foot; nor did the "rascall multitude," as Knox called them, stop till the houses of the Gray and Black Friars and the Carthusian Monastery were laid in ruins. Treating this tumult as a designed rebellion, the regent advanced upon Perth with a large force, but finding the Protestants prepared to resist, made an accommodation. Henceforth the latter came to be distinguished as the Congregation, and their leaders as the lords of the Congregation. Under the advice of Knox, they reformed the worship wherever their power extended, and the iconoclasm of Perth was repeated at St. Andrew's and many other parts of the kingdom, not, however, by a riotous proceeding, but by the harmonious action of the authorities and the people. The briefest and best defence of this course is the reformer's pithy saying, that "the rookeries were demolished that the rooks might not return." The contest between the two parties went on for a year, during part of which Knox prosecuted a flaming evangelism in the southern and eastern counties, while at other times he acted as chief agent in securing foreign help for his oppressed countrymen. In this occurred the only serious blot on his fair fame. He wrote to the English governor of Berwick that England might send troops to their aid, and then, to escape reproach from France, might disown them as rebels. The rebuke which he received from Sir James Croft was well deserved. The civil war was at length terminated by the entrance of an English army, which invested Edinburgh, and by the death of the queen regent. These events led to a truce,

and the calling of a free Parliament to settle religious differences.

This body met in August, 1560, and, carrying out what was undoubtedly the wish of the greater part of the people, established the Reformed religion, and interdicted by law any performance of Roman Catholic worship. In all this Knox was not only an active agent, but *the* agent above all others. The Confession of Faith and the First Book of Discipline both bear the impress of his mind. Thus a great step was taken, from which there never afterwards was any serious recession. Knox did not attain all that he desired, especially in respect to the provision for the support of the Church and of education throughout the country. Still he accomplished a radical work, of which all that followed was only the expansion and consolidation. The arrival in the next year (1561) of the youthful queen Mary, who had high notions of prerogative, as well as an ardent attachment to Romanism, occasioned new difficulties, in which Knox, as minister in the metropolis, was actively engaged. He had prolonged interviews with her, in which she exerted all her wiles to win him to her side, but in vain. He was always uncompromising, and once drove her into tears, for which he has often been censured; but his own statement to Mary at the time was that he took no delight in any one's distress, that he could hardly bear to see his own boys weep when corrected for their faults, but that, since he had only discharged his duty, he was constrained, though unwillingly, to sustain her majesty's tears rather than hurt his conscience and betray the commonwealth through his silence. Meanwhile his activity in the pulpit was unabated. In the Church of St. Giles, where sometimes as many as three thousand hearers were gathered, he preached twice on Sundays, and thrice on other days of the week. To these were added other services in the surrounding country. The effect of these prodigious labors was immense, as we learn from what the English ambassador wrote to Cecil: "Where your honor exhorteth us to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man is able in an hour to put more life in us than six hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears." The vehemence, however, of his public discourses offended some of his friends, and his unyielding opposition to the court led to his alienation from the more moderate party who tried to govern the country in the queen's name; so that from 1563 to 1565 he retired into comparative privacy, but he continued his labors in the pulpit and in the assembly of the kirk. The rapid series of events which followed Mary's marriage with Darnley in July, 1565, the murder of Rizzio in the next year, the murder of Darnley in 1567, and the queen's marriage with Bothwell, brought Knox again to the front. Mary was compelled to abdicate in favor of her son, and Murray, Aug. 1567, became regent. Further reforms were effected by the Parliament of 1567. The sovereign was bound to be a Protestant, and some better provision was made for the support of the clergy. Knox and Murray were in complete accord, and the affairs of religion seemed so settled that the former deemed his work done, and thought of retiring to Geneva to end his days in peace. But in 1570 Murray was assassinated. Knox shared in the general grief, and this event, with the confusions that followed, led to a stroke of apoplexy, which affected his speech considerably. He recovered in part, and was able to resume preaching, but misunderstandings sprang up between him and the nobles, and even some of his brethren in the General Assembly. His life having been threatened, he, in 1571, by the advice of his friends, who feared bloodshed, retired to St. Andrew's, where he preached with all his former vigor, although unable to walk to the pulpit without assistance. In the latter part of 1572 he was recalled to Edinburgh, and came back to die, "weary of the world," and "thirsting to depart." One of his last public services was an indignant denunciation of the inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew's. On the 24th of November he quietly fell asleep, not so much oppressed with years as worn out by his incessant and extraordinary labors of body and mind. In an interview with the session of his Church a few days before, he solemnly protested the sincerity of his course. Many had complained of his severity, but God knew that his mind was void of hatred to those against whom he had thundered the severest judgments, and his only object was to gain them to the Lord. He had never made merchandise of God's word, nor studied to please men, nor indulged his own or others' private passions, but had faithfully used whatever talent was given to him for the edification of the Church.

IV. *His Character.*—Knox was a man of small stature, and of a weakly habit of body, but he had a vigorous mind and an unconquerable will. Firmness and decision characterized his entire course. His piety was deep and fervent, and the zeal which consumed him never knew abatement. Yet it was not unintelligent. He was well educated for his time, and always endeavored to increase his knowledge, even in middle life seizing his first opportunity to learn Hebrew. An inward conviction of eternal realities inspired him with a bold and fervid eloquence which often held thousands of his countrymen as if under a spell. In dealing with men, he was shrewd and penetrating to the last degree. No outward show or conventional pretence deceived him. Whether he encountered queens, nobles, or peasants, he went straight to the heart of things, and insisted upon absolute reality. His mind was not of a reflective or speculative cast, and his writings, which are not few, have at this day mainly an antiquarian interest. His earnestness was all in a practical direction, as, indeed, his life was one long conflict from his flight from St. Andrew's in 1542 until his return thither in 1571. His language was such as became his thought — simple, homely, and direct. "He had learned," as he once said in the pulpit, "plainly and boldly to call wickedness by its own terms, a fig a fig, and a spade a spade." Nor did he ever quail. Nothing daunted him; his spirit rose high in the midst of danger. The day his body was laid in the grave, the regent Morton said truly, "There lies he who never feared the face of man." Just such a man was needed for the work to which Providence called him. To lay the axe to the root of the tree and warn a generation of vipers requires one stern as Elijah, vehement as John the Baptist. It has been asked if the work would not have been done better had the spirit of love and moderation, as well as of power, presided over it: the answer is that, considering the character of the times and the people, in that case perhaps the thing would not have been done at all. But it was done, thoroughly done, and more effectually than in any other country in Europe. The First Book of Discipline required a school in every parish, a college in every "notable town," and three universities in the kingdom. The burst of Carlyle (*Essay on Sir Walter Scott*) is well deserved: "Honor to all the brave and true; everlasting honor to brave old Knox, one of the truest of the true! That, in the moment while he and his cause, amid civil broils, in convulsion and confusion, were still but struggling for life, he sent the schoolmaster forth into all corners, and said, 'Let the people be taught;' this is but one, and, indeed, an inevitable and comparatively inconsiderable item in his great message to men. His message in its true compass was, Let men know that they are men; created by God, responsible to God; who work in any meanest moment of time what will last through eternity. This great message Knox did deliver with a man's voice and strength, and found a people to believe him . . . . The Scotch national character originates in many circumstances; first of all, in the Saxon stuff there was to work on; but next, and beyond all else except that, in the Presbyterian Gospel of John Knox."

Says Cunningham (*Church Hist. of Scotland* [Edinb. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo], i, 407 sq.), "Knox was not perfect, as no man is. He was coarse, fierce, dictatorial; but he had

great redeeming qualities—qualities which are seldom found in such stormy, changeful periods as that in which he lived. He was consistent, sincere, unselfish. From first to last he pursued the same straight, unswerving course, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left; firm amid continual vicissitudes; and if he could have burned and disembowelled unhappy Papists, he would have done it with the fullest conviction that he was doing God service. He hated Popery with a perfect hatred; and regarding Mary and her mother as its chief personations in the land, he followed them through life with a rancor which was all the more deadly because it was rooted in religion. He was, perhaps, fond of power and popularity, but he gained them by no mean compliances. On a question of principle he would quarrel with the highest, and, having quarreled, he would not hesitate to vilify them to their face. His hands were clean of bribes. He did not grow rich by the spoils of the Reformation. He was content to live and die the minister of St. Giles's. Is not such a one, rough and bearish though he be, more to be venerated than the supple, time-serving Churchmen who were the tools of the English Reformation? Does he not stand out in pleasing relief from the grasping barons with whom he was associated, who hated monks because they coveted their corn-fields, and afterwards disgraced the religion they professed by their feuds, their conspiracies, and cold-blooded assassinations?" But perhaps the greatest tribute that has ever been paid to the memory of John Knox has of late been penned by Froude (*Hist. of England*, x, 457 sq.). Frequently the charge of fanaticism has been laid at the door of the great Scottish reformer; this Froude unhesitatingly refutes, and assures us that it was only against Popery, the system that enslaves both the Church and the State, that he fought. "He was no narrow fanatic who, in a world in which God's grace was equally visible in a thousand creeds, could see truth and goodness nowhere but in his own formula. He was a large, noble, generous man, with a shrewd perception of actual fact, who found himself face to face with a system of hideous iniquity. He believed himself a prophet, with a direct commission from heaven to overthrow it, and his return to Scotland became the signal, therefore, for the renewal of the struggle."

V. *Works and Literature.*—Besides the Geneva Bible and occasional pamphlets, John Knox wrote, *History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland from* 1422 *to* 1567 (Lond. 1644, folio; Edinb. 1732, folio). His *Works* have been collected and edited by Duv. Laing (Edinb. 1846, 8vo). See M'Crie, *Life of John Knox* (Edinb. 1814, and often since); Ch. Niemeyer, *Knox Leben* (Lpz. 1824, 8vo); T. Brandes, *Life of John Knox* (London, 1863); Hetherington, *Hist. of Ch. of Scotland;* Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, particularly ch. xxxviii; Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland*, vols. vi and vii; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 142 sq.; Russell, *Ch. in Scotland;* Hallam, *Const. Hist. Engl.* i, 140, note, 171, 280; iii, 210; Froude, *Hist. of Engl.* vols. iv, v, vi, vii, ix, and x, and his *Studies on great Subjects*, series i and ii; *Edinb. Rev.* xcv, 236 sq.; *Westminster Rev.* xli, 37 sq.; *London Qu. Rev.* ix, 418 sq.; lxxxv, 148 sq.; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* ii, 325 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1853. (T.W. C.)

Knox, John (2), D.D., an American divine of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1790 near Gettysburgh, Pa., graduated at Dickinson College in 1811, studied theology under Dr. John M. Mason in New York, was licensed to preach by the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1815, became pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York, in 1816, and remained there until his death in 1858. This brief chronological record covers the life and ministry of one of the most eminent and useful of American pastors. Without the rare gift of popular eloquence, he was remarkable for clearness of thought and purity of diction, for comprehensive and instructive discourses, and for practical usefulness. The best designation of his character is that of its completeness. He was a judicious counsellor, a safe guide, a devout believer, and a model pastor. In the ecclesiastical assemblies of the Church he was often a conspicuous leader. In the American Tract Society, with which he was for many years closely identified as a member of its executive committee, he did much to shape the policy and direct the publications of that grand catholic institution. He was active in many other public charities of the country. Dr. Knox published a number of *occasional sermons*, among which, those on "Parental Responsibility" and on "Parental Solicitude" are worthy of particular notice. He was also the author of several useful tracts and addresses, and was a frequent contributor to the religious newspapers. He was, in respect of piety, a very Barnabas, "a son of consolation," "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost."—*Memorial Sermon*, by Dr. Thomas De Witt; Sprague, *Annals*, vol. ix. (W. J. R. T.)

Knox, Vicesimus, D.D., a distinguished English writer and divine, born at Newington Green, Middlesex, Dec. 8, 1752, was a son of the Rev. Vicesimus Knox, LLB., fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and head master of Merchant Taylors' School, London. Young Vicesimus Knox was also educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1778 was elected master of Tunbridge School, Kent, where he remained some thirty-three years, and was then succeeded by his eldest son. He was also rector of Rumwell and Ramsden Crays, in Essex, and minister of the chapelry of Shipbourne, in Kent. In the latter part of his life he resided in London. He was much admired as a preacher, and frequently gave his aid in behalf of public charities by delivering a sermon. He died while on a visit to his son at Tunbridge, Sept. 6, 1821. Dr. Knox's chief theological works were: 1. *Essays, Moral and Literary* (Lond. 1777, 12mo, anonymously; republished in 1778, with additional essays, in 2 vols. 12mo: many additions have been since published):—2. *Liberal Education, or a practical Treatise on the Methods of acquiring useful and polite Learning* (1781, 8vo; enlarged in 1785 to 2 vols. 8vo): this work was chiefly intended to point out the defects of the system of education in the English universities, and is said to have had some effect in producing a reformation:—3. *Sermons intended to promote Faith, Hope, and Charity* (1792, 8vo):—4. *Christian Philosophy, or an Attempt to display the Evidence and Excellence of Revealed Religion* (1795, 2 vols. 12mo):—5. *Considerations on the Nature and Efficacy of the Lord's Supper* (1799, 12mo). He also published occasional sermons and pamphlets. Dr. Knox's writings were once much esteemed. His style has considerable neatness and elegance, but he has little originality or power of thought, and his popularity has for some years been gradually decreasing. They have been reprinted under the style *Works* (Lond. 1824, 7 vols. 8vo).—*Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Knutzen, Martin, a German writer and philosopher of the Leibnitz-Wolfian school, was born in Königsberg, Prussia, in 1713, and held a professorship of philosophy in the university of his native place. He died there in 1751. His most important work is *Von der immateriellen Natur d. Seele* (Frankfort, 1744, 8vo). See Krug, *Philosoph. Wörterb.* ii, 627.

Knutzen, Matthias, a noted German atheist, was born at Oldensworth, in Schleswig-Holstein, in the early part of the 17th century, and was educated at Königsberg and Jena Universities. He was the founder of the *Conscientiarians*, advocating the doctrine that reason and conscience are sufficient to guide all men; besides conscience, he asserted there is no other God, no other religion, no other lawful magistracy. He gave the substance of his system in a short letter (preserved in the edition of *Micrælii syntagma historiæ ecclesiasticæ* [1699]), dated from Rome, the contents of which may be reduced to the following heads: "First, there is neither a God nor a devil; secondly, magistrates are not

to be valued, churches are to be despised, and priests rejected; thirdly, instead of magistrates and priests, we have learning and reason, which, joined with conscience, teach us to live honestly, to hurt no man, and to give every one his due; fourthly, matrimony does not differ from fornication; fifthly, there is but one life, which is this, after which there are neither rewards nor punishments; the holy Scripture is inconsistent with itself." Knutzen boasted of numerous followers in the principal cities of Europe; and, as he prided himself in having found adherents to his doctrine at Jena, Prof. John Musæus attacked and refuted him, mainly to dispel the impression which Knutzen had sought to make that Jena was likely to become a convert to his views. He died about 1678, or later. See Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.; *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.: Rossel, in *Stud. und Krit.* 1844; Hall, *Encyklop.* vol. lxvi. (J. H. W.)

Ko'ä (Heb. *id.* קוֹעַ, Sept. Ἰχουέ v. r. Κούθ, Κουδέ, Λούδ; Vulg. *principes*), a word that occurs but once, in the prophetic denunciations of punishment to the Jewish people from the various nations whose idolatries they had adopted: "The Babylonians and all the Chaldæans, Pekod, and Shoa, and *Koa*, and all the Assyrians with them: all of them desirable young men, captains and rulers, great lords and renowned, all of them riding upon horses" (Ezek. xxiii, 23). The Sept., Symmachus, Theodotion, Targums, Peshito, and Engl. Vers., followed by many interpreters, regard it as a proper name of some province or place in the Babylonian empire; but none such has been found, and the evident paronomasia with the preceding term in the same verse suggests a symbolical signification as an appellative, which appears to be furnished by the kindred Arabic *kua*, the designation of a *he-camel* or stallion for breeding (a figure in keeping with the allusions in the context to gross lewdness, as a type of idolatry), and hence tropically a *prince* or noble. This is the sense defended by J. D. Michaelis (*Suppl.* 2175), after Jerome and the Heb. interpreters, and adopted by Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1207). See Shoa; Pekod.

Koäch. See Chameleon.

Kobavius, Andreas, a noted Jesuit, was born at Cirkwitz in 1594, and died at Trieste Feb. 22, 1644. Of his personal history nothing further seems to be known. He wrote *Vita B. Johannis fundatoris fratrum misericordiæ.—Allgem. Histor. Lex.* iii, 43.

Kobler, John, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Culpepper Co., Va., Aug. 29, 1768; was converted in 1787; entered the itinerancy in 1789; volunteered as missionary to the North-western Territory, and for eighteen years labored with great success in that vast and varied field. In 1809 his health obliged him to locate, but he labored as his strength permitted till his death. In 1839 the Baltimore Conference, unsolicited, placed his name on its list as a superannuate. The remainder of his life was spent with great usefulness at Fredericksburg, Va., where he died July 26, 1843, full of years and honored labors.—*Minutes of Conf.* iii, 465.

Kobudaïsi, a celebrated Buddhist pilgrim of Japan, was born in the year 774. In early youth he began studying the Chinese and Japanese writers, and, in order to have more time to indulge in his studies, he embraced religious life at the age of twenty. Having become high-priest, he accompanied a Japanese ambassador to China in 804, to study more thoroughly the doctrines of Chakia. A learned Indian named Azari gave him the information he desired, and presented him with the books he had himself collected in his pilgrimages. Another hermit of northern Hindustan gave him also a work he had translated from the Sanscrit, and several MSS. on religious subjects. With these Kobudaïsi returned to Japan in 806, where, by his preaching and miracles, he succeeded in converting the religious emperor of Japan, who embraced Indian Buddhism, and was baptized according to the rite of Chakia. Encouraged by his success, Kobudaïsi published a number of ascetic works, and a treatise in which he exposed the fundamental dogmas of Buddhism. According to Kobudaïsi, the four scourges of humanity are hell, women, bad men, and war. There is no end to the number of miracles he is said to have wrought, or to the number of pagodas he caused to be built. He also caused the foundation of three chairs of theology for the interpretation of the sacred writings. He died in 835. See Titsing, *Bibliothèque Japonaise;* Abel Remusat, *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 935. (J. N. P.)

Koburg. See Saxony.

Koch, Henry, a pioneer minister of the German Reformed Church in Western Pennsylvania, was born in Northampton Co., Pa., in 1795; pursued his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md.; was licensed and ordained in 1819, and settled in what is now Clarion Co., Pa. He died August 7, 1845. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations. Five charges have grown up on his field, which constitute the heart of what is now Clarion Classis. His memory is blessed.

Koch, John Henry, a German Methodist minister, was born of Lutheran parentage in Wollmar, electorate of Hessen, Germany, Feb. 14, 1807, and emigrated in 1834 to this country. At New Orleans, La., he was attacked with yellow fever, and resolved on his sick-bed to serve God with his whole heart. He removed afterwards to Cincinnati, where brother Nuelson invited him to attend the meetings of German Methodists, and there, under the preaching of father Schmucker and Dr. William Nast, he was awakened and converted. He was licensed to preach in 1841, and in 1845 joined the Kentucky Conference. He was successively appointed to the following charges: West Union, Pomeroy, Captina, in Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va.; Portsmouth, Madison, New Albany, Mount Vernon, Ind.; Louisville, Ky.; Madison Street, Lawrenceburgh, Batesville, Poland and Greencastle, La Fayette and Bradford. His health failing, he retired from the effective service, but re-entered the active work three years later, and served two years at Madison and one year at Charlestown, Ind., where he died Oct. 1, 1871. "Brother Koch was an earnest Christian and a faithful itinerant. Many were converted under his ministry, and great is his reward in heaven."—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1871, p. 227.

Kochanowski, John, a Polish nobleman and distinguished poet, who was born in 1532, and died in 1584, deserves our notice for his translation of the Psalms into Polish verse, which he performed in so masterly a manner that he was surnamed the "Pindar of Poland." See Bentkowski, *History of Polish Literature* (see Index).

Kochberg, Johannes, a German theologian and descendant of a noble family, flourished in the early part of the second half of the 14th century. He was in high position at the convent St. Michael, at Jena, about 1366. —*Allgem. Histor. Lex.* iii, 43.

Köcher, Johann Christoph, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Lobenstein April 23, 1699. He was successively rector of the gymnasium at Osnabrück, superintendent at Brunswick, and professor of theology at Jena, and died there Sept. 21, 1772. He published a continuation of Wolf's *Curæ Philologicæ*, under the title *Analecta Philologica et Exegetica in Quatuor Evangelia* (Altenburg, 1766, 4to). "It supplies," says Orme, "some of the desiderata of Wolf's work, and brings down the account of the sentiments of the modern writers on the Gospels to the period of its publication" (*Biblioth. Bib.* p. 276). For a list of all his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 147 sq.

Kodashim. See Talmud.

Koeberger, Wenceslaus, a noted Flemish painter and architect, was born in Antwerp about 1550; studied in his native city, and later at Rome; and died either in 1610 or in 1634. He selected chiefly religious sub-

jects, and among his best paintings are "the Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian," and "Christ taken from the Cross and supported by Angels." See Descamps, *Vies des Peintres Flamands*, etc.

Koffler, John, a Roman Catholic missionary to Cochin China. We have no details of his life until after he departed for that country in 1740. He remained there fourteen years, and, being made physician to the king, availed himself of this position to further his missionary purposes. The persecution of the Christians in China led, however, to similar measures in Cochin China, and, with the exception of Koffler, whom the king prized highly on account of his medical knowledge, all the missionaries were arrested and shipped to Macao Aug. 27, 1750. The same fate also overtook Koffler in 1755. Arriving at Macao, he was arrested, and sent with his colleagues to Portugal, where they were imprisoned as having encroached upon the monopoly granted to the Portuguese government by the Holy See, and which it claimed gave that nation the exclusive right of evangelizing the East Indies. Koffler was finally released through the intervention of the empress Maria Theresa in 1765, and was sent on a mission to Transylvania, where he labored until his death in 1780. While in prison he wrote a memoir of his travels, which was published by Eckart, and reprinted by De Murr, under the title, *Joannis Koffler historica Cochinchinæ Descriptio in epitome redacta ab J. F. Eckart, edente De Murr* (1805, 8vo). See Migne, *Biog. Chrétienne et Antichrétienne;* De Monteron et Estève, *Mission de la Cochinchine et du Tonkin*, 1858.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 28. (J. N. P.)

Kögler, Ignaz, a Jesuit German missionary to China, was born at Landsberg, Bavaria, in 1680, entered the order of Jesuits in 1696, prepared for missionary work in 1715, and departed the year following for China, where he enjoyed the favor of the emperor in a remarkable degree. Kögler was master of the sciences, and especially in astronomy displayed superior acquisition. He died in Pekin in 1746.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvii, 959.

Ko'hath (Heb. *Kohath'*, קְהָת, *assembly*, Numb. iii, 19, 29; iv, 2, 4, 15; vii, 9; xvi, 1; oftener *Kehath'*, קְהָת, Gen. xlvi, 11; Exod. vi, 16, 18; Numb. iii, 17, 27; xxvi, 57, 58; Josh. xxi, 5, 20, 26; 1 Chron. vi, 1, 2, 16, 18, 22, 38, 61, 66, 70; xv, 5; xxiii, 6, 12; Sept. Καάθ, but Κάθ in Gen. xlvi, 11), the second son of Levi, and father of Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (Gen. xlvi, 11; Numb. iii, 19, etc.). B.C. 1873. The descendants of Kohath formed one of the three great divisions of the Levitical tribe. This division contained the priestly family which was descended from Aaron, the son of Amram. In the service of the tabernacle, as settled in the wilderness, they had the distinguished charge of bearing the ark and the sacred vessels (Exod. vi, 16; Numb. iv, 4–6). See Kohathite.

Ko'hathite (collective הַקְּהָתִי, *Kohathi'*, Numb. iii, 27, 30; iv, 18, 34, 37; x, 21; xxvi, 57; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12; or קְהָתִי, *Kehathi'*, Josh. xxi, 4, 10; 1 Chron. vi, 33, 54; ix, 32; 2 Chron. xx, 19; xxix, 12; Sept. Καάθ; Auth. Vers. "Kohathites"), the descendants of Kohath, the second of the three sons of Levi (Gershon, Kohath, Merari), from whom the three principal divisions of the Levites derived their origin and their name (Gen. xlvi, 11; Exod. vi, 16, 18; Numb. iii, 17; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12, etc.). Kohath was the father of Amram, and he of Moses and Aaron. From him, therefore, were descended all the priests; and hence those of the Kohathites who were not priests were of the highest rank of the Levites, though not the sons of Levi's first-born. Korah, the son of Izhar, was a Kohathite, and hence, perhaps, his impatience of the superiority of his relatives, Moses and Aaron. In the journeyings of the tabernacle the sons of Kohath had charge of the most holy portions of the vessels, to carry them by staves, as the vail, the ark, the tables of show-bread, the golden altar, etc. (Numb. iv); but they were not to touch them or look upon them "lest they die." These were all previously covered by the priests, the sons of Aaron. In the reign of Hezekiah the Kohathites are mentioned first (2 Chron. xxix, 12), as they are also 1 Chron. xv, 5–7, 11, when Uriel their chief assisted, with 120 of his brethren, in bringing up the ark to Jerusalem in the time of David. It is also remarkable that in this last list of those whom David calls "chief of the fathers of the Levites," and couples with "Zadok and Abiathar the priests," of six who are mentioned by name four are descendants of Kohath, viz., besides Uriel, Shemaiah, the son of Elzaphan, with 200 of his brethren; Eliel, the son of Hebron, with 80 of his brethren; and Amminadab, the son of Uzziel, with 112 of his brethren. For it appears from Exod. vi, 18–22, comp. with 1 Chron. xxiii, 12, and xxvi, 23–32, that there were four families of sons of Kohath—Amramites, Izharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites; and of the above names Elzaphan and Amminadab were both Uzzielites (Exod. vi, 22), and Eliel a Hebronite. The verses already cited from 1 Chron. xxvi; Numb. iii, 19, 27; 1 Chron. xxiii, 12, also disclose the wealth and importance of the Kohathites, and the important offices filled by them as keepers of the dedicated treasures, as judges, officers, and rulers, both secular and sacred. In 2 Chron. xx, 19 they appear as singers, with the Korhites.

The number of the sons of Kohath between the ages of thirty and fifty, at the first census in the wilderness, was 2750, and the whole number of males from a month old was 8600 (Numb. iii, 28; iv, 36). Their number is not given at the second numbering (Numb. xxvi, 57), but the whole number of Levites had increased by 1300, viz. from 22,000 to 23,300 (Numb. iii, 39; xxvi, 62). The place of the sons of Kohath in marching and encampment was south of the tabernacle (Numb. iii, 29), which was also the situation of the Reubenites. Samuel was a Kohathite, and so of course were his descendants. Heman the singer and the third division of the singers which was under him. See Heman; Asaph; Jeduthun. The inheritance of those sons of Kohath who were not priests lay in the half tribe of Manasseh, in Ephraim (1 Chron. vi, 61–70), and in Dan (Josh. xxi, 5, 20–26). Of the personal history of Kohath we know nothing, except that he came down to Egypt with Levi and Jacob (Gen. xlvi, 11), that his sister was Jochebed (Exod. vi, 20), and that he lived to the age of 133 years (Exod. vi, 18). He lived about eighty or ninety years in Egypt during Joseph's lifetime, and about thirty more after his death. He may have been some twenty years younger than Joseph his uncle. A full table of the descendants of Kohath may be seen in Burrington's *Genealogies*, Tab. X, No. 1. See Levite.

Koheleth. See Ecclesiastes.

Kohen, Naphthali, a great Cabalistic rabbi, "a man whose life was full of incidents which would give a biography of him the air of a romance," was born at Ostrow, in the Ukraine, Poland, about 1660. While yet a youth he was carried off by some Cossacks into the wilds of Poland, and for several years there followed the employments of a hunter and a shepherd. He learned to excel in horsemanship and archery, in which he took great delight all his after life. At length he succeeded in making his escape from the Tartars, and travelled in Poland. Here new impulses stirred within him, and his naturally vigorous mental powers were roused to earnest efforts after learning. He made rapid progress in the study of the Talmud and Cabala, was ordained rabbi, and subsequently elected chief rabbi at Posen. He studied the Cabala profoundly, and was at once admired and feared for his supposed ability to command the intervention of the supernatural powers. But in 1711, while he was in charge of the Hebrew congregations at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, where, as in Poland, he enjoyed for a time a high reputation as an expound-

er of the law and a Cabalistic hierophant, there occurred a frightful conflagration, in which all the Jewish quarter was burned to ashes. In this woful calamity Kohen, as a potent Cabalist, was called upon by the distracted people to bring into exercise those supernatural resources which he professed to command, in order to stay the progress of the fiery flood. He was weak enough to make the trial. Of course he utterly failed. This exposure, combined with the circumstance that the fire had first broken out in his own house, turned the popular feeling of the Jews against him, and Rabbi Naphthali Kohen was once more obliged "to grasp the wandering staff," and begin the world anew. He now bent his steps towards the place of his birth, and ended his days in connection with the synagogue at Ostrow. Kohen was quite a poet, and wrote several hymns and anthems which have become the common property of the synagogue and the Jewish people. Many curious notices of him may be found in the *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten* of Johann Jacob Schudt. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 348 sq.; see also Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 445 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kohen, Nehemiah, a noted Jewish fanatic, who flourished in Poland in the second half of the 17th century, and pretended to be a prophet or precursor of the Messiah, was a rival of the celebrated Sabbathai Zewi, who claimed about the same time to be the veritable Messiah so long looked for by his people. Invited by Sabbathai to visit him, Nehemiah quickly set out for Abydos, and was immediately upon arrival admitted to an audience which lasted some three days. The rivalry which, on account of their peculiar profession, naturally existed between the two pretenders, made each fear for his life from the other, and, as Sabbathai had actually hired several base fellows to assassinate Nehemiah, the latter fled to Adrianople. He there embraced Mohammedanism, and revealed to the Turkish government the plottings of Sabbathai, and this course ultimately led to the accession of this pretended Messiah likewise to the fold of the prophet of Islam. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 241 sq. See SABBATHAI.

Kohen-Zedek, BEN-JOSEPH, a noted Jewish rabbi, and head of the school at Pumbaditha, flourished from 917 to 936. He was one of the ablest presidents of this Jewish high-school, and labored earnestly, and for some time with considerable show of success, to make it the first and best authority of Rabbinic learning. Sura Academy was several times worsted in the struggle, and Kohen-Zedek well-nigh succeeded in abolishing the exiliarchate which Sura possessed, but in 925 he was finally led to acknowledge David ben-Sakkai as exiliarch, and in turn secured Sura's confirmation of his gaonate at Pumbaditha. Kohen-Zedek died in 936. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 296 sq.

Kohl, JOHANN PETER, a learned German, was born at Kiel March 10, 1698. In 1725 he was called to St. Petersburg to teach belles-lettres and ecclesiastical history. Three years after he left that city because he became passionately in love with Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, a passion which caused him to commit many extravagances. He retired first to Hamburg, afterwards to Altona, where he passed the remainder of his life in study. He bequeathed his fine library, which contained some rare manuscripts, to the library of the gymnasium at Altona. He died October 9, 1778. His works are, *Theologiæ gentilis Cimbricæ purioris specimen* (Kiel, 1723, 8vo):—*Ecclesia Græca Lutherizans, sive exercitatio de consensu et dissensu orientalis Græcæ speciatim Russicæ et occidentalis Lutheranæ ecclesiæ in dogmatibus* (Lübeck, 1723, 8vo):—*Introductio in historiam et rem literariam Slavorum in primis sacram, sive historia critica versionum Slavonicarum maxime insignium, nimirum codicis sacri et Ephremi Syri; accedunt duo sermones Ephremi, nondum editi, de S. Cœna fidei Lutheranæ testes* (Altona, 1729, 8vo). The conclusions of these two sermons of saint Ephrem by Kohl have been refuted by Le Brun and Renaudot; also by an unknown person, who has published *Antiruthicon, seu confutatio annotationum Kohlii ad S. Ephremi Sermones* (Rome, 1840, 8vo):—*Deliciæ Epistolicæ, sive epistolarum argumenti non minus raritate quam orationis cultu insignium fasciculus, Majoragii, Grævii, Bartholini, Schefferi aliorumque virorum, cum præfatione de vita scriptisque Majoragii* (Leipzig, 1731, 8vo):—*De Epistolis a Jo. Hevelio partim, partim ad ipsum scriptis adhuc ineditis*—dissertations placed in the supplement of the Leipzig *Acta Eruditorum*, ix, 359. Kohl also intended to publish several works on the ecclesiastical history of the Slavic nations, but the MSS. of only a few have been found.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 30.

Kohler, Christian and **Jerome**, two brothers who distinguished themselves among the enthusiasts of Berne in the middle of the 18th century, were natives of Brügglen. Ignorant and poor, Christian became a mechanic and Jerome a wagoner, and they appear to have led very irregular lives until 1745, when they were converted in a revival then taking place in the country. They soon claimed to have dreams and visions in which Christ and other persons appeared to them, and they went about preaching and exhorting. They may at first have been sincere, but appear afterwards to have made popular credulity a means of gain. They claimed to be the two witnesses spoken of in the book of Revelation, and made many followers. Among other things, they predicted the end of the world for Christmas, 1748, and afterwards renewed their prediction for later periods. They pretended to be able to redeem souls out of purgatory, and thus swindled a great many persons. Finally, a price was set on their heads. On Oct. 8, 1752, Jerome was caught; he was brought to Berne, judged, and executed, Jan. 16, 1753. His brother, in the mean time, was made prisoner at Neueburg, but of his subsequent fate there is no record. Their principal disciple in Viel, John Sahli, was condemned to death for contumacy March 19, 1753; but their other followers were not much disturbed, and the sect died out slowly. See Kyburg, *Das entdeckte Geheimniss d. Bosheit in d. Brügler-Sekte* (Zür. 1753); *Originalakten im Berner Staatsarchiv.*; Simler, *Sammlung z. Kirchengesch.* pt. i, p. 249; Meister, *Helvetische Scenen d. neuern Schwärmerei u. Intoleranz* (Zürich, 1785), p. 161; Schlegel, *Kirchengesch. d. 18 Jahrh.* (pt. ii, Heilbronn, 1788); Tillier, *Gesch. d. eidgenössischen Freistaates Bern* (Berne, 1839), vol. v; Hagenbach, *D. evangel. Protestantismus in s. geschichtl. Entwickelung*, iii, 193 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 239.

Köhler, Johann Bernhard, a German philosophical writer, was born at Lübeck Feb. 10, 1742, and was educated in the celebrated universities of Germany, France, and Holland. In 1781 he was appointed professor of the Greek and Oriental languages at the University of Königsberg. He died April 3, 1802, at Basle, Switzerland. Those of his works of special interest to us are, *De Dote apud veteres Hebræos nubentium* (Lüb. 1757):—*Observationes in Sacrum Codicem, ex scriptoribus profanis* (Gött. 1759):—*Observ. in Sacrum Codicem, maxime ex scriptoribus Græcis et Arabicis* (Lpzg. 1763; Leyd. 1765):—*Emendationes in Dionis Chrysostomi Orationes Parsicas* (Gött. 1770, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xxviii, 4; *Neue Allgem. deutsche Biblioth.* lxxii, 339.

Kohlreif, GOTTFRIED, a German theologian, born at Strelitz Oct. 11, 1674, was the son of M. C. Kohlreif, a noted preacher at the court of the duke of Strelitz. Gottfried was educated at the University of Rostock, where he entered in 1692. Shortly after the opening of the University at Halle he went thither to attend lectures on philosophy, but returned, after a short stay at that place, and at Leipzig, Wittemberg, and Berlin, to Rostock (1695). About 1699 he went to Hamburg, and resided there until 1701, when he became pastor of a church at New Brandenburg; later he removed to

Ratzeburg, where he died, August 13, 1750. Kohlreif wrote largely in the different departments of theological science, but he has earned special credit by his contributions to Biblical chronology. His most important works are, *Chronologia Sacra* (Hamburg, 1724, 8vo):—*Chronologia Liphratkon* (Lüb. and Lpzg. 1732, 8vo):—*Gesch. d. Philister u. Moabiter* (Ratzeb. 1738, 8vo). A complete list of his writings is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 163 sq.

Koinonia (κοινωνία), the Greek word for *communion*, was one of the names by which the early Church referred to the Lord's Supper. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 542 sq. See COMMUNION.

Kokabim. See TALMUD.

Koken, JOHANN KARL, a German theologian, was born at Hildesheim June 9, 1711, and was educated at the universities of Helmstädt and Göttingen. In 1740 he accepted a call to Martin's Church, Hildesheim, and in 1756 became superintendent of the Hildesheim churches. In 1757 the theological faculty of Rinteln conferred on Koken the doctorate of theology. He died March 15, 1773. Besides a number of small but valuable contributions to practical religious literature, he wrote *Vortrefflichkeit d. christl. Religion* (Hildesh. 1761, 4to; 1762, 4to):—*Kern der Sittenlehre Jesu u. seiner Apostel* (Brem. 1766–72, 6 vols. 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 168 sq.

Kolaï'ah (Heb. *Kolayah'*, קָלָיָה, *voice of Jehovah*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Κωλέας v. r. Κωλίας or Κωλιᾶς; Vulg. *Colias.*) The father of Ahab, which latter was one of the false and immoral prophets severely denounced by Jeremiah (Jer. xxix, 21). B.C. ante 594.

2. (Sept. Κωλεῖα, Vulg. *Colaja.*) Son of Maaseiah and father of Pedaiah, a Benjamite, and ancestor of Sallu, which last led back a party from Babylon (Neh. xi, 7). B.C. much ante 536.

Kollar, JAN, one of the most conspicuous Slavic poets and preachers, was born July 29, 1793, at Moschowze, in the north-west of Hungary, studied at Presburg and Jena, and in 1819 became pastor of a Protestant congregation at Pesth. He wrote many poems of great literary value, and was one of the earliest and most zealous advocates of Panslavism. In 1831 he published a volume of his sermons, *Kazne* (Pesth, 1831, 8vo), which were found so eloquent that they were at once translated into several of the modern languages. The revolution in Hungary compelled him to abandon his country. He withdrew to Vienna, where he was made professor of archæology in 1849, and died there Jan. 29, 1852. See *For. Quart. Rev.* April, 1828; Jungmann, *Gesch. d. Böhmischen Litteratur.*

Kölle, JOHN, a German Methodist minister, was born at Billenhausen, Würtemberg, Germany, on the 19th of July, 1823; came to the United States Aug. 25, 1852; became acquainted with some intelligent and pious members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon was led to a knowledge of his sins, and was enabled to realize by faith that Jesus was his Saviour. In 1857 he was licensed to preach, and in the spring of 1858 was sent to Cape Girardeau, and joined the Southern Illinois Conference. In 1861 he was ordained a deacon, and sent to Benton Street, St. Louis, where he labored two years with great acceptability. In 1863 he was ordained an elder, and sent to St. Charles, where he again labored successfully for two years. His next appointments were Manchester Mission, one year, and Union Mission, three years. After this he was sent to Booneville and Manito Mission, where he labored till his course was finished on the 18th of March, 1870. "As a preacher, Kölle was faithful and punctual. He was a diligent student, and acquired a considerable amount of theological knowledge. In his preaching he was original and practical, and it was easy to perceive that he loved the souls of those to whom he ministered. His motto was 'Holiness to the Lord,' and that in an especial sense, as he considered it to be his calling to bear the vessels of the Lord." He contributed largely to the *Christliche Apologete*, the German organ of the M. E. Church.—*Conference Minutes*, 1871.

Kollenbusch (also COLLENBUSCH), SAMUEL, M.D., an eminent German pietist, and the founder of a theological school, was born of pious parents in the town of Barmen (Rhenish Prussia), Sept. 1, 1724. He hesitated long between theology and medicine, but finally decided for the latter, and studied at Duisburg and Strasburg. Through all his studies, however, he did not forget to attend to his spiritual improvement, and attained great Christian self-control and perfection. While studying at Strasburg he began to inquire into mysticism and alchemy, which were then considered as having a close connection with each other. Upon the completion of his university studies he began the practice of medicine at Duisburg, but in 1784 retired to Barmen, and there spent the remainder of his life, partly in the practice of medicine, partly in disseminating his peculiar religious views. He died Sept. 1, 1803. Dr. Kollenbusch can, in many respects, be considered entitled to a place between the mystic separatist Tersteegen (q. v.), born twenty-seven years before him, and Jung-Stilling (q. v.), sixteen years younger. Like the latter, he first inclined to Leibnitz and Wolf's philosophical system, then became a Bengelian, though without approving all Bengel's views. He attached especial importance to the visions of Dorotheo Wuppermann, of Wichlinghausen, a patient of his attacked with hysterics. Among the results of Dr. Kollenbusch's practical activity are to be named the Barmen Missionary Society, and the Barmen Mission establishment. He wrote *Erklärung biblischer Wahrheiten* (Elberf. 1807):—*Goldene Aepfel in silbernen Schalen* (Barmen, 1854). See T. W. Krug, *Die Lehre d. Dr. K.*, etc. (Elberfeld, 1846); same, *Kritische Gesch. d. protest.-relig. Schwärmerei*, etc. (Elberfeld, 1851); Baur, *Die Dreieinigkeitslehre*, p. 655 sq.; Hase, *Dogmatik*, p. 344 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, § 300.

Kollock, Henry, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born Dec. 14, 1778, at New Providence, Essex County, N. J., and graduated at New Jersey College in 1794. Having devoted himself to study for the three successive years, he was appointed tutor in his alma mater. In this position he distinguished himself for his skill in debate, passing his leisure hours in the study of theology. In 1800 he was licensed, and preached for five months at Princeton, where he also delivered a series of discourses on the life and character of St. Peter, which were remarkable for their brilliancy and attraction. On leaving Princeton he took charge of the Church at Elizabethtown, and was a zealous promoter of missions to the destitute regions in Morris and Sussex Counties. In 1803 he returned to Princeton as pastor and professor, and in 1806 accepted a call from the Independent Presbyterian Church at Savannah, Ga., where his labors were abundant. He sailed for England in 1817, not only in quest of health, but also to collect materials for a life of John Calvin, and after an absence of eight months returned to Savannah, where he died, Dec. 29, 1819. A collection of his *Sermons* was published in 1822 (Savannah, 4 vols. 8vo). Dr. J. W. Alexander (*Life of Dr. Archibald Alexander*, p. 359) pays Dr. Kollock a very high tribute as a scholar, and says of him as a preacher that he was "one of the most ornate yet vehement orators whom our country has produced."—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 263 sq. See *Cambridge General Repository*, i, 135; *Christian Review*, vol. xiv; Kollock (S. K.), *Biography of H. Kollock.*

Kollock, Shepard Kosciusko, a Presbyterian minister, and brother of the preceding, was born at Elizabeth, N. J., June 25, 1795; graduated with high honors from Princeton College when but sixteen years of age, and soon thereafter pursued a course in theology with the Rev. Dr. M'Dowell, and afterwards with his

brother, Rev. Dr. Henry Kollock. He was licensed June, 1814, and preached with abundant success for three years in Georgia, when he was called in May, 1818, to Oxford, N. C., where he was ordained. He soon after accepted the position of professor of rhetoric and logic in the University of North Carolina. In 1825 he was called to the Church at Norfolk, and labored there ten years; and was next agent of the Board of Domestic Missions. From 1833 to 1848 he was pastor at Burlington, N. J., and subsequently, till 1860, had charge of a Church at Greenwich, N. J. For the last five years of his life he filled the position of preacher to the benevolent institutions of Philadelphia, where he died, April 7, 1865. The following writings from his pen give evidence of uncommon culture and breadth of mind: *Hints on Preaching without Reading; Pastoral Reminiscences* (translated into French):—*The Bards of the Bible*:—*Eloquence of the French Pulpit* (1852):—*Character and Writings of Fénelon* (1853):—*Character and Writings of Pascal*:—*St. Ignatius and the Jesuits* (1854):—*Character and Writings of Nicole*:—*Sidney Smith as a Minister of Religion* (1856):—*Pastoral Reminiscences* (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); etc. See *Princeton Review*, Index, ii, 229; *Amer. Ann. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 469; Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1866, p. 126 sq.

Kolontaj, Hugo, a Polish Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the county of Sandomir April 1, 1759; was educated at Piuczow and Cracow, and in 1774 became canon at the cathedral of Cracow. He was a decided opponent of the Jesuits, and did all in his power to purge the schools of Poland from Jesuitical aid or influence. In 1782 the University of Cracow, in recognition of his services, elected him rector for three years, but his opponents succeeded in driving him from the place after only two years of his term had expired. During the Polish Revolution he worked earnestly in behalf of reform, and when the Revolution failed he was obliged to flee from the country, and thereafter he never held office again, though he was permitted to return to his native country. He died at Warsaw February 28, 1812. His works are all of a secular nature; their titles are given in Brockhaus, *Conversations Lexikon* (11th edition), viii, 923.

Komander, Johann (*Dorfmann*), a German theologian of the Reformation period, became interested in the cause of the Reformers while pursuing his studies at Zürich, and was highly prized as a friend by Zwingle, and after his secession from the Romish Church (in 1525), in which he had been priest, became the chief support of the Reformation in the Bünden region. Here the worthlessness of the clergy, who were often ignorant of the language of the people, and guilty of gross immorality, necessitated reform, for which a people of truly independent spirit were also ready. Many prominent laymen early favored the movement, particularly Jacob Salzmann, at Chur. At the Bundestag of 1524, held at Ilanz, a complaint, set forth in an act of eighteen articles, was entered against the corruptions of the Church, and especially the malpractices of the clergy. In accord with the spirit of this "Artikelbrief," which was adopted by the Assembly, and remained for centuries the fundamental law in Graubünden, Komander was appointed pastor at St. Martin's Church, of which position the former incumbent confessed himself incapable, and he there began and continued his labors for thirty-three years. He met bitter opposition and yet encouraging success. Zwingle, especially, sent a letter of congratulation in January, 1525, addressed to the "three Rhætian Federations." The most troublesome obstacles to the movement were the Anabaptists, whom the Papists themselves encouraged for the sake of creating division. Brought under accusation in the Bundestag of 1525, Komander asked opportunity for a public defence of his position, which he made at Ilanz in January, 1526, in eighteen theses. He could only with difficulty secure a fair and orderly debate, but finally brought all his opponents to acknowledge his first thesis, viz. "That the Church is born of the Word of God, and must abide by it alone." In the whole affair the learning of the Reformers was confessed; seven priests were won to the evangelical faith, and the accusations were not established. Komander administered the Lord's Supper in the evangelical form on Easter of 1526, and had the images removed. The Bundestag of this year granted full liberty and protection of worship under the new form. Against the intrigues of the Catholic bishop twenty new reform articles were established. The abbot Schlegel, former accuser of Komander, was beheaded for connivance with the declared enemies of the Confederacy, and the bishop fled. Komander, in order more perfectly to organize the reform movement, secured the formation of a synod that should have authority in the examination and appointment of pastors. A disputation sustained at Sus, in the Eugadine, in 1537, in the Romance language, chiefly by Gallienus, the fast friend of Komander, and Blasius his colleague, where the eighteen theses defended by Komander at Ilanz were adopted, secured the entire prevalence of the reform in the Eugadine. Komander prepared a catechism, and succeeded, with the aid of Bullinger's influence, in establishing a gymnasium at Chur in 1543. He was deeply interested for the Italians of the southern districts, but found his work with them chiefly a matter of dispute on sceptical points. The Rhætian Confession was adopted by the synod with particular reference to the errors of the Italians. Komander rejoiced at the sudden end of the Council of Trent in 1552. In the following year he had to counteract the pope's endeavors to bring in the Inquisition. Prostrated by the plague of 1550, which carried off 1500 of the population of Chur, he never recovered full strength, though he worked on till his death early in 1557.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Komano-Bikuni, a female order of Japanese Beghards, or begging nuns, who accost travellers for their charity, singing songs to divert them, though upon a strong, wild sort of tune, and stay with travellers who desire their company. Most of them are daughters of the Jamabos (q. v.), and are consecrated as sisters of this begging order by having their heads shaved. They are neatly and well clad, and wear a black silk hood, with a light hat over it, to protect their faces from the sun. Their behavior is, to all appearance, free, yet modest. They always go two and two, and are obliged to bring a certain portion of their alms to the temple of the sun goddess at Isye. See M'Farlane, *Japan*, p. 219, 220.

Komp, Heinrich, a German Roman Catholic theologian of note, born at Fulda in 1765, was educated at the University of Heidelberg; became priest in 1789, in 1790 professor at the gymnasium of his native place, in 1792 professor of theology, etc., in 1811 court chaplain to prince Primas, grand duke of Frankfort-on-the-Main and archbishop of Regensburg, and in 1829 cathedral scholastic. He died Feb. 14, 1846.—*Kathol. Real-Encyklop.* xi, 858.

Konarski, Adam, a Roman Catholic prelate, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. He was bishop of Posen from 1562 to 1574. He is noted for his efforts to improve the religious educational advantages of the youth of his Church. Upon the model of the school at Braunsberg, one of the most noted Roman Catholic literary institutions, he founded a Jesuit college at Posen in 1572, furnishing for its support a great part of his own income. He was at the head of the Polish delegation of magnates that went to France to meet Henry of Valois, afterwards king of Poland.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 243.

König, Christian Gottlieb, a German theologian of note, was born at Altdorf March 26, 1711, and was educated at the university of his native place. In 1734 he was appointed professor at Giessen University, but resigned this position only two years later. In 1742

he became pastor at Elberfeld, and remained there until 1747, when he removed to Amsterdam, where he taught the Oriental languages. He died at Leyden in 1782. His principal work is *Weissagung Mosis in den letzten Tagen* (Frankfort, 1741, fol.). A list of his writings is given in Döring's *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* ii, 152 sq.

König, Georg, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Amberg Feb. 2, 1590, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena. In 1614 he was called as professor of theology to Altdorf, and in 1644 he added to the duties of his chair the librarianship of that high-school. He died Sept. 10, 1654. He wrote *Casus Conscientiæ*, etc.—*Allgem. Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 45.

König, Johann Friedrich, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Dresden October 16, 1619. He studied at Leipzig and Wittenberg; became professor of theology at Greifswalde in 1651, superintendent of Mecklenburg and Ratzeburg in 1656, and finally professor of theology at Rostock in 1659, where he died Sept. 15, 1664. His *Theologia positiva acroamatica* (Rost. 1664; 6th ed. Rost. 1680, 8vo; Wittenb. 1755) became, notwithstanding its dryness, a very popular text-book of dogmatics. Hahn, Richter, and Haferung have expounded and commented upon it, and it became the foundation of J. A. Quenstädt's celebrated work. See Walch, *Bibl. theol. sel.* i, 39; Heinrich, *Versuch einer Geschichte d. verschiedenen Lehrarten d. christlichen Glaubenswarheiten*, etc. (Leipz. 1790); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Refor.* viii, 11 sq.; Gass, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik*, i, 321 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, viii, 1 sq.

König, Mauritius, a Danish prelate of note, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was professor of theology at Copenhagen, and later bishop of Aalburg, and died May 2, 1672.—*Allgem. Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 46.

König, Samuel, celebrated in the annals of Swiss pietism, was born at Gergensee, in the canton of Berne, about 1670. He studied at Berne and Zürich, and afterwards made a journey to Holland and England, as was customary in those days. He evinced great zeal and talents in the Oriental languages, which were then much studied by the Protestants, and was considered by his followers as a first-class Orientalist. He was also noted for his participation in the mystic tendencies of his day, and after studying Petersen's chiliastic expositions, became himself a zealous partisan of the doctrine of the Millennium. After his return to Berne he was ordained, and appointed at first preacher in the hospital attached to the Church of the Holy Ghost. About the same time Spener's pietism was beginning to gain adherents in Berne, especially through the efforts of Lutz (Lucius). König, who at first held aloof, was gradually drawn into connection with them, and thus became identified with the development of pietism in Berne. Here, as elsewhere, pietism was strenuously opposed by the orthodox party in the Church, who, on April 3, 1698, appointed a special committee to proceed against "Quakerism, unlawful assemblies, and doctrinal schisms." In August of the same year the upper council appointed a committee on religion, for the purpose of ascertaining all about pietism (in Berne), and reporting thereon to the council. König was several times summoned before this committee, and courageously defended his views on these occasions on chiliasm, as also his sermons, in which he insisted with peculiar force on the necessity of repentance and of regeneration. Among his theological opponents the most distinguished were the professors of theology, Wyss and Nudorf. König was finally ejected and exiled, the pietists were persecuted, and the so-called "association oath" was instituted, July, 1699, with a view to prevent separation. To these measures were added a strict censorship of books, and the prohibition of religious reunions. König retired to Herborn, but was soon driven out from that place also, and went to the county of Sayn-Wittgenstein, the general refuge of all pietists and illuminati. In 1700 he went to Halle, where he gained many adherents, and afterwards to Magdeburg, where he found congenial spirits, especially in Petersen and his wife, Johanna Eleonora von Merlau, Nik. von Rodt, and Fellenberg. Finally he returned to active life as pastor of a French Church in Büdingen. Here he resided eighteen years, during which he wrote a number of works. In 1730 he returned to Berne, and secured an appointment as professor of modern languages and mathematics in the university. He continued to hold religious meetings, and travelled occasionally in the interest of pietism, but, having attempted to establish meetings for mutual edification at Basel (in 1732), he was expelled from the city. König died May 30, 1750. His principal works are, *Betrachtung d. inwendigen Reichs Gottes, wie es im Herzen d. Menschen aufgerichtet wird* (Basel, 1734):—*Theologia Mystica* (Berne, 1736). See F. Trechsel, *Samuel König u. d. Pietismus in Berne* (*Berner Taschenbuch*, 1852); Schlegel, *Kirchengeschichte d. 18ten Jahrhunderts*, ii (1), 367 sq.; Schuler, *Thaten und Sitten d. Eidgenossen*, iii, 268 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 179, 183.

Königsdorfer, Cölestin Bernhard, a German Roman Catholic monastic, was born Aug. 18, 1756, at the village of Flotzheim; was educated at Augsburg from 1768 to 1776, and entered the Benedictine order in 1777, at Donauwörth. He was ordained priest Dec. 23, 1780, and was sent to the university at Ingolstadt to continue his theological studies and the acquisition of the Oriental languages. In 1790 he was called to a professorship at Salzburg University; in 1794 was elected abbot of his convent, and remained its head until 1803, when the convent was suppressed. He died March 16, 1840. Königsdorfer wrote *Theologia in Compendium redacta* (Kopenh. 1787)—a theological compend which he intended mainly for his monastic brethren:—*Gesch. d. Klosters z. heiligen Kreuze in Donauwörth* (1819–1829, 3 vols. in 4 parts). He also published several sermons (1800, 1812, 1814).—*Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 328.

Königsdorfer, Martin, brother of the preceding, a popular pulpit orator, was born at Flotzheim Oct. 20, 1752; studied theology at Dillingen; was ordained priest at Augsburg March 15, 1777, and was successively appointed to Monheim, Heideck, Seiboldsdorf near Neuburg, and Lutzungen near Hochstädt. He died about 1815. Königsdorfer was noted as a preacher for his rare ability in adapting himself to the standard of his audiences; thus, in his appointments in rural districts, he knew how to interest the peasants in his preaching, and did much good among them. He published *Katholische Homilien und Erklärungen d. heil. Evangelien auf alle Sonn- u. Feiertage* (Augsburg, 1800, and often):—*Kathol. Geheimnisse u. Sittenreden* (1812–32, 8 vols. 8vo):—*Kathol. Christenlehren* (1806, 2 vols.):—*Die christliche Kinderzucht* (six sermons, 1814):—*Das ewige Priesterthum d. Kathol. Kirche* (1832).—*Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 329.

Königswarter, Baron Jonas, a celebrated Jewish philanthropist, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main about 1806, and removed to Vienna about 1830, when a man of only moderate wealth. There his means increased rapidly, and he died Dec. 24, 1871, leaving an only son heir to a property worth fifteen million dollars. He was a great benefactor to the Jews of the Austrian capital, over whom he presided as chief, and took particular interest in all the charitable institutions of Vienna. He left large sums to benefit each of these, without any regard to confession or creed.—*New York Jewish Messenger*, Jan. 26, 1872.

Konrad of Marburg, a German Dominican of the 13th century, one of the most trusted of Rome's votaries, was confessor of princess St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, and inquisitor of Germany. Of his personal history but little is known. Some suppose him to be identical with the Konrad who, as a scholastic of Mentz, enjoyed the favor of Honorius III (q. v.). Konrad of Marburg

was a particular favorite of pope Gregory IX, by whom he was intrusted with various disciplinary offices, particularly with the punishment of heretics and the extirpation of heresy. His conduct towards St. Elizabeth (q. v.) was perfectly atrocious, but no less inhuman was the treatment which the *Patarenes* (q. v.) received at his hands. He was finally slain in 1233 by, or at the instigation of, some German nobles whom he had opposed. See Hausrath, *Konrad von Marburg* (1861); Henke, *K. v. Marburg* (1861); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 25; and the Roman Catholic *Kirchen-Lexikon*, by Wetzer und Welte, ii, 805 sq. (J. H. W.)

Konrad III, emperor of the Germans, the founder of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, eminent among the Crusaders, was the son of Frederick of Suabia, and was born in 1093. He was elected successor to Lothaire by the princes of Germany at Aix-la-Chapelle, Feb. 21, 1136, to prevent the increasing preponderance of the Guelf party. For his quarrels with Henry the Proud, duke of Bavaria and Saxony, and head of the Guelf party in Germany, etc., see GUELFS AND GHIBELLINES. When St. Bernard of Clairvaux commenced to preach a new crusade, Konrad, seized with the general infatuation, set out for Palestine at the head of a large army [see CRUSADES] in company with his old enemy, Guelf of Bavaria, who proved treacherous, however, returned to Germany before Konrad, and with his nephew, Henry the Lion, renewed, though unsuccessfully, the former attempt to gain possession of Bavaria. Konrad took sides with the pope and the northern Italians against Roger of Sicily, but, while preparing for an expedition against the latter, he was poisoned, Feb. 15, 1152, at Bamberg. Konrad was largely endowed with the virtues necessary for a great monarch, and, though himself unlearned, was a warm patron of science and letters. His marriage with a Greek princess was symbolized by the two-headed eagle which figured on the arms of the emperor of Germany, and now appears on the arms of the sovereign of Austria. See GERMANY.

Konradin OF SUABIA, the last descendant of the house of the Hohenstaufen, son of the excommunicated Henry IV, was born in 1252. He deserves our notice for the relation he sustained to the intriguing pope Innocent IV, and the treatment he received at the pope's hands. His Italian possessions were seized by Innocent IV on the plea *that the son of a prince who dies excommunicated has no hereditary rights*, an example which the other enemies of the house of Hohenstaufen rejoiced to follow. Konradin's cause was befriended by his uncle Manfred, who took up arms in his behalf, drove the pope from Naples and Sicily, and, in order to consolidate his nephew's authority, declared himself king till the young prince came of age. The pope's inveterate hatred of the Hohenstaufen induced him thereupon to offer the crown of the Two Sicilies to Charles of Anjou, a consummate warrior and able politician. Charles immediately invaded Italy, met his antagonist in the plain of Grandella, where the defeat and death of Manfred, in 1266, gave him undisturbed possession of the kingdom. But the Neapolitans, detesting their new master, sent deputies to Bavaria to invite Konradin, then in his sixteenth year, to come and assert his hereditary rights. Konradin accordingly made his appearance in Italy at the head of 10,000 men, and, being joined by the Neapolitans in large numbers, gained several victories over the French, but was finally defeated, and, along with his relative, Frederick of Austria, taken prisoner near Tagliacozzo, Aug. 22, 1268. The two unfortunate princes were, *with the consent of the pope, executed in the marketplace of Naples on the 20th of October*. A few minutes before his execution, Konradin, on the scaffold, took off his glove, and threw it into the midst of the crowd, as a gage of vengeance, requesting that it might be carried to his heir, Peter of Aragon. This duty was undertaken by the chevalier De Waldburg, who, after many hair-breadth escapes, succeeded in fulfilling his prince's last command. See INNOCENT IV; SICILIAN VESPERS.

Koolhaas, CASPAR, often named with Koornhert, in Holland, as the predecessor of Arminius, was born at Cologne in 1536. He studied at Düsseldorf, and in 1566 renounced many advantages to join the Reformation. He afterwards held some situations as pastor in the duchies of Zweibrück and Nassau. In 1574 he was called to the University of Leyden, then opening, as a professor. He subsequently resigned the professorship, and died a private teacher at Leyden in 1615. His opinions had been the cause of his resignation: he maintained nearly the same views professed afterwards by the Arminians on the extension of the authority of superiors in ecclesiastical affairs, reduction of the doctrine of the Church to a few simple, fundamental points, and the correction or absolute rejection of the doctrine of predestination. His work *De jure Christiani magistratus circa disciplinam et regimen ecclesiæ* gave great offence. He was summoned before a synod held at Middelburg in 1581, and requested to recant and sign the Belgian Confession, but refused, and appealed to the States. A provincial synod of Haarlem excommunicated him in 1582, but he was protected by the chief magistrate of Leyden, who reported to the Dutch States against the renewal of religious persecution, as well as against the acts of the synods, and the encroachments of the ecclesiastical college on the rights of the authorities. See A. Schweizer, *Gesch. d. ref. Centraldogmen*, ii, 40; Benthem, *Holland Kirchen-u. Schulenstaat*, ii, 33; *Uytenbogaert Kerkel. Hist.* p. 214.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 26.

Koordistan. See KURDISTAN.

Koornhert. See CORNARISTS.

Kopacsy, JOSEPH VON, a Hungarian Roman Catholic prelate, was born of noble parentage at Wessprim in 1775, and was educated at the seminary in Presburg. He was ordained priest in 1798, and shortly after received an appointment as professor of Church history and ecclesiastical law. In 1806 he became preacher at Wessprim, in 1822 he was made bishop of Stuhlweissenburg, and in 1824 bishop of Wessprim. In 1839 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Grau, and at the same time was made primate of Hungary. He died Sept. 18, 1847. Bishop Kopacsy published a German translation of Fleury's *Customs and Usages of Jews and Christians* (1803).—*Kathol. Real-Encyklop.* xi, 861.

Koph. See APE.

Kopher. See CAMPHIRE.

Kopiatai. See COPIATÆ.

Kopistenski, ZACHARIAS, a Russian theologian, flourished in the beginning of the 17th century as archimandrite of the convent of St. Anthony at Kief, and died there April 18, 1626. He translated into Slavonic the commentary of St. Chrysostom on the Acts and Paul's epistles (Kief, 1623 and 1624, folio). He also published a *Funeral Sermon*, in which he seeks to prove that the doctrine of Purgatory is sanctioned by apostolic authority; and a *Nomucanon*, or review of the canons (Kief, 1624 and 1629; Moscow, 1639; Lemberg, 1646).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 75.

Kopitar, BARTHOLOMÄUS, a learned Orientalist, was born at Repnje in 1780, and educated at the University of Vienna. In 1809 he was appointed assistant at the Imperial Library, was promoted to the head librarianship in 1843, and died Aug. 11, 1844. He published an edition of the Polish Psalter found in the convent of St. Flarian, with a German and Latin translation (Vienna, 1834), etc.—*Kathol. Real-Encyklop.* vi, 362.

Köpke, ADAM, a German fanatic, who flourished in the first half of the 18th century as pastor at Walmo, was an ardent follower of Dippel (q. v.), and, with Hagenbach (*Church Hist. 18th and 18th Cent.*, transl. by Dr. Hurst, i, 168 sq.), we are in doubt what place to assign any of Dippel's followers; he was measurably a Mystic, yet he can neither be definitely classed with them nor with any of the sects known as Pietists or Rational-

ists, fanatics or scoffers, Mystics or Illuminists. He wrote *Histor. Nachricht v. Caspar Schwenkfeld* (Prenzlau, 1745, 8vo):—*Wegweiser zum göttlichen Leben*, etc. (ibid, 1744, 8vo):—*Die reinigende Kraft des Gottes-Blutes Jesu Christi* (ibid, 1744, 8vo). See Kraft, *Theol. Bibliothek*, i, 262; Walch, *Comp. hist. eccl. recentiss.* p. 233 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 591.

Koppe, Johann Benjamin, a distinguished German Biblical scholar, was born at Dantzig Aug. 19, 1750. He studied philology and theology at the universities of Leipzig and Göttingen, and became professor of Greek at the college of Mittau in 1774, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1775. He subsequently became (in 1777) director of the seminary for preachers, superintendent and president of the consistory at Gotha (in 1784), and preacher at the court of Hanover (in 1788). He died Feb. 12, 1791. He wrote *De Critica Veteris Testamenti caute adhibenda* (Göttingen, 1769):—*Vindiciæ oraculorum a dæmonum æque imperio ac sacerdotum fraudibus* (Götting. 1774, 8vo):—*Israelitas non* 215 *sed* 430 *annos in Ægypto commoratos esse* (Göttingen, 1777, 4to; reprinted in Post and Ruperti's *Sylloge Commentationum theologicarum*, vol. iv):—*Interpretatio Isaiæ*, viii, 23 (Gött. 1780, 4to):—*Ad Matthæum*, xii, 31, *De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum* (Gött. 1781, 8vo):—*Super Evangelio Marci* (Gött. 1782, 4to):—*Explicatio Moisis*, iii, 14 (Götting. 1783, 4to):—*Marcus non epitomator Matthæi* (Gött. 1783, 4to):—*Predigten* (Gött. 1792–3, 2 vols. 8vo). He also edited three vols. of the *Novum Testamentum Græce perpetua annotatione illustratum*, published at Göttingen, 10 vols. 8vo, at the close of the 18th century. This work, which he began, but did not live to complete, bears his name, as the plan, which is excellent, is his. It furnishes "a corrected edition of the Greek text, mostly agreeing with Griesbach, with critical and philological notes on the same page, with prolegomena to each book, and excursus on the more difficult passages. On this plan Koppe gave a volume on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians, and another on the Epistle to the Romans, which closed his labors. Heinrichs, in continuation of the original design of Koppe, has published the Acts, and all the remaining epistles of Paul, except those to the Corinthians; and Pott has published the Epistles of Peter, and that of James. Koppe is esteemed a safe and judicious critic; Heinrichs and Pott less so. Koppe's Romans has been republished by Ammon, the well-known neologist, with characteristic notes of his own" (Orme). See Koppenstadt, *Ueb. Koppe* (1791, 8vo); Schlichtegroll, *Necrolog.* vol. i; *Annalen d. Braunschw. Lüneburg. Churlande*, vi, 60–84; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxviii, 79; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 27. (J. H. W.)

Köppen, Daniel Joachim, a German divine, was born at Lübeck in 1736. He was pastor at Zettemin for thirty-nine years, and died June 7, 1807. Köppen secured for himself, by earnest literary labors, the reputation of great scholarship, and his works are all valuable. He wrote *Hauptzweck des Predigtamtes* (Leipzig, 1778, 8vo):—*Die Bibel, ein Werk der göttlichen Weisheit* (ibid, 1787–88, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d edition, much enlarged, 1797–98):—*Wer ist Christ* (ibid, 1800, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 155 sq.

Köppen, Friedrich, a German theologian and philosopher, was born at Lübeck in 1775; became preacher in Bremen in 1805; professor of philosophy in 1807, at Landshut; and in 1826 was appointed professor at Erlangen. He died Sept. 4, 1858. Köppen was an ardent follower of Jacobi (q. v.), and wrote *Ueber die Offenbarung in Beziehung auf Kantsche u. Fichtesche Philosophie* (Lüb. 1797; 2d ed. 1802):—*Schelling's Lehre oder das Ganze der Philosophie des absoluten Nichts* (Hamb. 1805):—*Darstellung des Wesens d. Philosophie* (Nuremb. 1810):—*Philosophie des Christenthums* (Leipz. 1813–15, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1825); etc.—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix; 711.

Kor. See Cor.

Ko'rah (Heb. *Ko'rach*, קֹרַח, *ice*, as in Psa. cxlvii, 17; Sept. Κορέ, also N. T. in Jude 11; Josephus Κορῆς, *Ant.* iv, 2; Vulg. *Core;* Auth. Vers. "Kore" in the patronymic, 1 Chron. xxvi, 19, and "Core" in Jude 11), the name of several men.

1. The third son of Esau by his second Canaanitish wife Aholibamah (Gen. xxxvi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 35). B.C. post 1964. He became the head of a petty Edomitish tribe (Gen. xxxvi, 18). In ver. 16 his name appears as a son of Eliphaz, Esau's son; but probably by a confusion of the parentage, for in the parallel passage (1 Chron. i, 36) this name is omitted, and "Timna" inserted after the next name—probably another interpolation for Timnah. See Esau.

2. A Levite, son of Izhar, the brother of Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron, who were therefore cousins to Korah (Exod. vi, 21). B.C. probably not much ante 1619. From this near relationship we may, with tolerable certainty, conjecture that the source of the discontent which led to the steps afterwards taken by this unhappy man, lay in his jealousy that the high honors and privileges of the priesthood, to which he, who remained a simple Levite, might, apart from the divine appointment, seem to have had as good a claim, should have been exclusively appropriated to the family of Aaron. When to this was added the civil authority of Moses, the whole power over the nation would seem to him to have been engrossed by his cousins, the sons of Amram. Under the influence of these feelings he organized a conspiracy, for the purpose of redressing what appeared to him the evil and injustice of this arrangement. Dathan, Abiram, and On, the chief persons who joined him, were of the tribe of Reuben; but he was also supported by many more from other tribes, making up the number of 250, men of name, rank, and influence, all who may be regarded as representing the families of which they were the heads. The appointment of Elizaphan to be chief of the Kohathites (Numb. iii, 30) may have further inflamed his jealousy. Korah's position as leader in this rebellion was evidently the result of his personal character, which was that of a bold, haughty, and ambitious man. This appears from his address to Moses in ver. 3, and especially from his conduct in ver. 19, where both his daring and his influence over the congregation are very apparent. Were it not for this, one would have expected the Gershonites — as the elder branch of the Levites—to have supplied a leader in conjunction with the sons of Reuben, rather than the family of Izhar, who was Amram's younger brother. The private object of Korah was apparently his own aggrandizement, but his ostensible object was the general good of the people: and it is perhaps from want of attention to this distinction that the transaction has not been well understood. The design seems to have been made acceptable to a large body of the nation, on the ground that the first-born of Israel had been deprived of their sacerdotal birthright in favor of the Levites, while the Levites themselves announced that the priesthood had been conferred by Moses (as they considered) on his own brother's family, in preference to those who had equal claims; and it is easy to conceive that the Reubenites may have considered the opportunity a favorable one for the recovery of their birthright—the double portion and civil pre-eminence—which had been forfeited by them and given to Joseph. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrat.* ad loc.) These are the explanations of Aben-Ezra, and seem as reasonable as any which have been offered. (See below.)

The leading conspirators, having organized their plans, repaired in a body to Moses and Aaron, boldly charged them with public usurpation, and required them to lay down their arrogated power. Moses no sooner heard this than he fell on his face, confounded at the enormity of so outrageous a revolt against a system framed so carefully for the benefit of the nation. He left the matter in the Lord's hands, and desired them to come on the morrow, provided with censers for incense, that the

Lord himself, by some manifest token, might make known his will in this great matter. As this order was particularly addressed to the rebellious Levites, the Reubenites left the place, and when afterwards called back by Moses, returned a very insolent refusal, charging him with having brought them out of the land of Egypt under false pretences, "to kill them in the wilderness" (Numb. xvi, 1–17).

The next day Korah and his company appeared before the tabernacle, attended by a multitude of people out of the general body of the tribes. Then the Shekinah, or symbol of the divine presence, which abode between the cherubim, advanced to the entrance of the sacred fabric, and a voice therefrom commanded Moses and Aaron to stand apart, lest they should share in the destruction which awaited the whole congregation. On hearing these awful words the brothers fell on their faces, and, by strong intercession, moved the Lord to confine his wrath to the leaders in the rebellion, and spare their unhappy dupes. The latter were then ordered to separate themselves from their leaders and from the tents in which they dwelt. The terrible menace involved in this direction had its weight, and the command was obeyed; and after Moses had appealed to what was to happen as a proof of the authority by which he acted, the earth opened, and received and closed over the tents of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The Reubenite conspirators were in their tents, and perished in them; and at the same instant Korah and his 250, who were offering incense at the door of the tabernacle, were destroyed by a fire which "came out from the Lord;" that is, most probably, in this case, from out of the cloud in which his presence dwelt (Numb. xvi, 18–35). The censers which they had used were afterwards made into plates, to form an outer covering to the altar, and thus became a standing monument of this awful transaction (Numb. xvi, 36–40). The rebellious spirit excited by these ambitious men vented itself afresh on the next day in complaints against Moses as having been the cause of death to these popular leaders! a degree of obduracy and presumption that called forth the divine indignation so severely as not to be allayed till a sudden plague had cut off thousands of the factious multitude, and threatened still further ravages had it not been appeased by Aaron's offering of incense at the instance of Moses (Numb. xvi, 41–50). The recurrence of a similar jealousy was prevented by the divine choice of the family of Aaron, attested by the miraculous vegetation of his rod alone out of all the tribes (Numb. xvii). On, although named in the first instance along with Dathan and Abiram (ver. 1), does not further appear either in the rebellion or its punishment. It is hence supposed that he repented in time; and Abendana and other Rabbinical writers allege that his wife prevailed upon him to abandon the cause.

It might be supposed from the Scripture narrative that the entire families of the conspirators perished in the destruction of their tents. Doubtless all who were in the tents perished; but, as the descendants of Korah afterwards became eminent in the Levitical service [see KORAHITE], it is clear that his sons were spared (Exod. vi, 24). They were probably living in separate tents, or were among those who sundered themselves from the conspirators at the command of Moses. There is no reason to suppose that the sons of Korah were children when their father perished. Perhaps the fissure of the ground which swallowed up the tents of Dathan and Abiram did not extend beyond those of the Reubenites. From Numb. xvi, 27 it seems clear that Korah himself was not with Dathan and Abiram at the moment. His tent may have been one pitched for himself, in contempt of the orders of Moses, by the side of his fellow-rebels, while his family continued to reside in their proper camp nearer the tabernacle; but it must have been separated by a considerable space from those of Dathan and Abiram. Or, even if Korah's family resided among the Reubenites, they may have fled, at Moses's warning, to take refuge in the Kohathite camp, instead of remaining, as the wives and children of Dathan and Abiram did (verse 27). Korah himself was doubtless with the 250 men who bare censers nearer the tabernacle (ver. 19), and perished with them by the "fire from Jehovah" which accompanied the earthquake. It is nowhere said that he was one of those who "went down quick into the pit" (compare Psa. cvi, 17, 18), and it is natural that he should have been with the censer-bearers. That he was so is indeed clearly implied by Numb. xvi, 16–19, 35, 40, compared with xxvi, 9, 10.

The apostle holds up Korah as a warning to presumptuous and self-seeking teachers, and couples his crime with those of Cain and Balaam, as being of similar enormity (Jude 11). The expression there used, "gainsaying" (ἀντιλογία, *contradiction*), alludes to his speech in Numb. xvi, 3, and accompanying rebellion. Compare the use of the same word in Heb. xii, 3; Psa. cvi, 32, and of the verb, John xix, 12, and Isa. xxii, 22; lxv, 2 (Sept.), in which latter passage, as quoted Rom. x, 21, the A. V. has the same expression of "gainsaying" as in Jude. The Son of Sirach, following Psa. cvi, 16, קִנְאוּ לְמֹשֶׁה, etc. (otherwise rendered, however, by the Sept., παρώργισαν), describes Korah and his companions as envious or jealous of Moses, where the English "maligned" is hardly an equivalent for ἐζήλωσαν (Ecclus. xlv, 18). A late ingenuous writer (Prof. Reichel, of Dublin, *Sermons*, Cambr. 1855) distinguishes the crime of Korah from that of Dathan and Abiram (q. v.) as being an *ecclesiastical* insubordination, whereas the latter was a *political* rebellion; he also draws a parallel between the position of Aaron as representing the high-priesthood of Christ—the one underived, perpetual, and untransferable pontificate "after the order of Melchizedek," and the Levitical order represented by Korah corresponding to the Christian ministry; and he arrives at the following conclusion: "The crime in the Christian Church corresponding to that which Korah and his followers committed in the Jewish Church consists, not, as is often stated, in the people taking to themselves the functions of the ministry, but in the Christian ministry impiously usurping the functions of Christ himself; and, not contented with their Master's having separated them from the congregation of his people to bring them near unto himself, to do the service of his house, and to stand before the congregation to minister to them, *in their 'seeking the priesthood also.'* This is the gainsaying of Korah, which the authority of inspiration declares should be repeated even in the earliest ages of the Christian Church, and which is significantly coupled by the apostle Jude with the way of Cain, and with the running greedily after the error of Balaam for reward." In short, it was an attempt on the part of such as were *already* invested with an official rank in the Levitical cultus to supplant those occupying the *higher* offices in the same economy, and even to derogate the supreme and exclusive control of its dispensation; and all this for the sake merely of the honors and emoluments of the promotion. It is therefore at once apparent how little this narrative supports the arrogant claims of any class of so-called priests in the modern Church, and that it altogether fails to warrant their exclusion and condemnation of others who have as clear a divine call as themselves to the same order of functions, especially when the latter move in a different community, are actuated by the most unselfish motives, and proceed in accordance with the most imperative demands of circumstances.

Korah is elsewhere referred to in Numb. xxvi, 9–11; xxvii, 3; 1 Chron. vi, 22, 37; ix, 19. See *Journ. Sac. Lit.* App. 1852, p. 195; Forster, *Israel in the Wilderness* (Lond. 1865). On the Korachidæ, see Carpzov, *Introduct.* ii, 105; Van Iperen, *De filiis Korachi psalmor. quorund. auctorib.*, in the *Bibl. Hagan.* II, i, 99 sq.; comp. Eichhorn, *Bibl. d. bibl. Lit.* i, 911 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Mythol.* i, 302; *Erklär. d. Mund. d. A. Test.* i, 219 sq. On the Arabic legends, see Fleischer, *Hist. anteislam.* p. 321.

3. The first named of the four sons of Hebron, of the family of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 43). B.C. considerably post 1612.

Ko'rahite (Hebrew *Korchi'*, קָרְחִי, Exod. vi, 24; Numb. xxvi, 58; 1 Chron. ix, 31; xxvi, 19; plur. *Korchim'*, קָרְחִים, 1 Chron. ix, 19; xii, 6; xxvi, 1; 2 Chron. xx, 19; Septuag. Κοριτης, 1 Chron. ix, 31; Κορῖται, 1 Chron. ix, 19; xii, 6; elsewhere paraphrases *υἱοὶ, δῆμος,* or *γενέσεις* Κορέ; Auth. Vers. "Korahites," 1 Chron. ix, 19; "Korahite," 1 Chron. ix, 31; "Korathites," Numb. xxvi, 58; "Kore," 1 Chron. xxvi, 19; elsewhere "Korhites"), the patronymic designation of that portion of the Kohathites who were descended from Korah, and are frequently styled by the synonymous phrase Sons of Korah (q. v.). Comp. ASAPH. It would appear at first sight, from Exod. vi, 24, that Korah had three sons —Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph—as Winer, Rosenmüller, etc., also understand it; but as we learn from 1 Chron. vi, 22, 23, 37, that Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph were respectively the son, grandson, and great grandson of Korah, it seems obvious that Exod. vi, 24 gives us the chief houses sprung from Korah, and not his actual sons, and therefore that Elkanah and Abiasaph were not the sons, but later descendants of Korah. See SAMUEL. The offices filled by the sons of Korah, as far as we are informed, are the following:

1. They were an important branch of the *singers* in the Kohathite division, Heman himself being a Korahite (1 Chron. vi, 33), and the Korahites being among those who, in Jehoshaphat's reign, "stood up to praise the Lord God of Israel with a loud voice on high" (2 Chron. xx, 19). See HEMAN. Hence we find eleven psalms (or twelve, if Psa. xliii is included under the same title as Psa. xlii) dedicated or assigned to the sons of Korah, viz. Psa. xlii, xliv–xlix, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvii, lxxxviii. Winer describes them as some of the most beautiful in the collection, from their high lyric tone. Origen says it was a remark of the old interpreters that all the psalms inscribed with the name of the sons of Korah are full of pleasant and cheerful subjects, and free from anything sad or harsh (*Homil. on* 1 *Kings*, i. e. 1 *Sam.*), and on Matt. xviii, 20 he ascribes the authorship of these psalms to "the three sons of Korah," who, "because they agreed together, had the Word of God in the midst of them" (*Homil.* xiv). St. Augustine has a still more fanciful conceit, which he thinks it necessary to repeat in almost every homily on the eleven psalms inscribed to the sons of Kore. Adverting to the interpretation of Korah, *Calvities*, he finds in it a great mystery. Under this term is set forth Christ, who is entitled Calvus because he was crucified on Calvary, and was mocked by the by-standers, as Elisha had been by the children who cried after him "*Calve, calve!*" and who, when they said "*Go up*, thou bald pate," had prefigured the crucifixion. The sons of Korah are therefore the children of Christ the bridegroom (*Homil. on Psalms*). Of moderns, Rosenmüller thinks that the sons of Korah, especially Heman, were the authors of these psalms, which, he says, rise to greater sublimity and breathe more vehement feelings than the Psalms of David, and quotes Hensler and Eichhorn as agreeing. De Wette also considers the sons of Korah as the authors of them (*Einl.* p. 335–339), and so does Just. Olshausen on the Psalms (*Exeg. Handb.* Einl. p. 22). As, however, the language of several of these psalms, e. g. of xlii, lxxxiv, etc., is most appropriate to the circumstances of David, it has seemed to other interpreters much simpler to explain the title "for the sons of Korah" to mean that they were given to them to sing in the Temple services. If their style of music, vocal and instrumental, was of a more sublime and lyric character than that of the sons of Merari or Gershon, and Heman had more fire in his execution than Asaph and Jeduthun, it is perfectly natural that David should have given his more poetic and elevated strains to Heman and his choir, and the simpler and quieter psalms to the other choirs. A serious objection, however, to this view is that the same titles contain another phrase dedicating the psalms in question "to the chief musician," so that the following expression must be rendered *by* (לְ "auctoris") the Korahites. See PSALMS. J. van Iperen (ap. Rosenmüller) assigns these psalms to the times of Jehoshaphat; others to those of the Maccabees; Ewald attributes the 42d Psalm to Jeremiah. The purpose of many of the German critics seems to be to reduce the antiquity of the Scriptures as low as possible.

2. Others, again, of the sons of Korah were "porters," i. e. doorkeepers, in the Temple, an office of considerable dignity. In 1 Chron. ix, 17–19, we learn that Shallum, a Korahite of the line of Ebiasaph, was chief of the doorkeepers, and that he and his brethren were over the works of the service, keepers of the gates of the tabernacle (compare 2 Kings xxv, 18) apparently about the time of the Babylonian captivity. See also 1 Chron. ix, 22–29; Jer. xxxv, 4; and Ezra ii, 42. But in 1 Chron. xxvi we find that this official station of the Korahites dated from the time of David, and that their chief was then Shelemiah or Meshelemiah, the son of (Abi)asaph, to whose custody the east gate fell by lot, being the principal entrance. Shelemiah is thought to have been the same as Shallum in 1 Chron. ix, 17, and perhaps Meshullam, 2 Chron. xxiv, 12; Neh. xii, 25, where, as in so many other places, a name may designate, not the individuals, but the house or family. In 2 Chron. xxi, 14, Kore, the son of Imnah the Levite, the doorkeeper towards the east, who was over the free-will offerings of God to distribute the oblations of the Lord and the most holy things, was probably a Korahite, as we find the name Kore in the family of Korah in 1 Chron. ix, 19. In 1 Chron. ix, 31 we find that Mattithiah, the first-born of Shallum the Korahite, had the set office over the things that were made in the pans. See LEVITE.

Koraidhites is a name sometimes applied to the unfortunate Jewish tribe of Koraidha, of Northern Arabia, which Mohammed extirpated upon their refusal to accept him as God's "prophet." For a detailed description of the sufferings of the Jews of Karaidha, see Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 125–127; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, iii, 99 sq.; Muir, *Life of Mohammed*, iii, 135 sq.; Sale's *Koran*, p. 345, note *h*. See MOHAMMED.

Korân, often Anglicized (when, as properly, it has the article prefixed) *Al-Coran*, but more precisely *Qŭrân*. The emphasis is not on the first syllable, as many persons place it. The word is from the Arabic root *karaa*, and means literally the *reading*—that which ought to be read; corresponding nearly to the Chaldee *Keri* (q. v.). The book is also called *Furqân*, from a root signifying to *divide* or distinguish; Sale says to denote a *section* or portion of the Scriptures; but Mohammedans say because it distinguishes between good and evil. It is furthermore spoken of as *Al-Moshaf*, "The Volume," and *Al-Kitâb*, "The Book," by way of eminence; and *Al-Dhikr*, "The Admonition." The Korân is the Mohammedan Book of Faith, or, as we may say, Bible.

Divisions.—It consists of one volume, which is divided into one hundred and fourteen larger sections or portions called *Surâs*, which signifies a regular series. These suras or sections are not numbered in the original, but bear each its own title, which is generally some keyword in the chapter, or the first word therein. In cases where it is taken from near the close of the chapter, it is probable that that portion was originally uttered first. Some suppose these titles to have been matter of revelation, as also the initial *Bism-illah*, "In the name of God," etc., which is likewise placed as a prefatory phrase in all Moslem books, but in the Koran stands at the head of each chapter or sura. There are twenty-nine chapters which begin with certain letters, and these the Mohammedans believe to conceal profound mysteries, that have not been communicated to any but the prophet;

notwithstanding which, various explanations of them have been proffered. For these curious but unimportant theories, see Sale, p. 43. The chapters or suras do not now stand in the order in which they were originally uttered. As the Mohammedan theory concerning the reconciliation of inconsistencies in the Koran is that the later revelation abrogates any former one with which it conflicts, and as some two hundred and twenty-five of the passages of the Koran are admitted thus to have been cancelled, their chronological order frequently becomes a matter of considerable importance. The real order in point of time, and, therefore, authority, as now determined, after immense painstaking, is the following: Suras numbered 103, 100, 99, 91, 106, 1, 101, 95, 102, 104, 82, 92, 105, 89, 90, 93, 94, 108, were delivered in the order in which they are here set down in the first stage of Mohammed's prophetic career. Suras numbered 96, 112, 74, 111, belong to the second period of his career, and extend to his fortieth year. Those numbered 87, 97, 88, 80, 81, 84, 86, 110, 85, 83, 78, 77, 76, 75, 70, 109, 107, 55, 56, belong to the third period. Numbers 67, 53, 32, 39, 73, 79, 54, 34, 31, 69, 68, 41, 71, 52, 50, 45, 44, 37, 30, 26, 15, 51, cover the time from the sixth to the tenth year of Mohammed's mission. Numbers 46, 72, 35, 36, 19, 18, 27, 42, 40, 38, 25, 20, 43, 12, 11, 10, 14, 6, 64, 28, 23, 22, 21, 17, 16, 13, 29, 7, to the fifth stage. The date of numbers 113, 114 is not known. Numbers 2, 47, 57, 8, 58, 65, 98, 62, 59, 24, 63, 48, 61, 4, 3, 5, 33, 60, 66, 49, 9, are those delivered at Medina. Most of the others were delivered at Mecca, though some were delivered partly at Medina and partly at Mecca. The Koran is further subdivided by the equivalent of our verses, called *Ayat*, which means *signs* or wonders, as the secrets of God's attributes, works, judgments, etc. It is again arranged in sixty equal portions called *Heizb*, each of which is divided into four equal parts (or into thirty portions twice the length of the former, and subdivided into four parts), for the use of the readers in the royal temples or in the adjoining chapels where the emperors and great men are interred. Thirty of these readers belong to each chapel, and each reads his section every day, so that the whole Koran is read through once a day (Sale, p. 42).

Contents.—The matter of the Koran is exceedingly incoherent and sententious, the book evidently being without any logical order of thought either as a whole or in its parts. This agrees with the desultory and incidental manner in which it is said to have been delivered. The following table of the suras (condensed from Sale) will give the reader some idea of its miscellaneous range of topics. Many of the headings, however, are, as above explained, simply catch-titles, taken from some prominent word or expression. Most of the contents are *preceptive* merely; some are a travesty of Bible history; others recount in a vague and fragmentary way incidents in the prophet's personal or public career; and a few are somewhat speculative. Generally these elements are indiscriminately mixed in the same piece.

Chapter.	Title in the Original.	No. of Verses.
1.	Preface	7
2.	The Cow	286
3.	The Family of Imrân	200
4.	Women	175
5.	The Table	120
6.	Cattle	165
7.	Al-Araf	206
8.	The Spoils	76
9.	The Declaration of Immunity [*Conversion*]	139
10.	Jonas	109
11.	Hud	123
12.	Joseph	111
13.	Thunder	43
14.	Abraham	52
15.	Al-Hejra [*The Flight*]	99
16.	The Bee	128
17.	The Night Journey	110
18.	The Cave	111
19.	Mary	80
20.	T. H.	134
21.	The Prophets	112
22.	The Pilgrimage	78
23.	The True Believers	118
24.	Light	74
25.	Al-Forkan [*The Koran*]	77
26.	The Poets	227
27.	The Ant	93
28.	The Story	87
29.	The Spider	69
30.	The Greeks	60
31.	Lokmân	34
32.	Adoration	29
33.	The Confederates	73
34.	Saba	54
35.	The Creator [*Angels*]	45
36.	Y. S. [I. S.]	83
37.	Those who rank themselves in Order [*The Classes*]	182
38.	S.	86
39.	The Troops	75
40.	The True Believers	85
41.	Are distinctly Explained [*Explanation*]	54
42.	Consultation	53
43.	The Ornaments of God [*Dress*]	89
44.	Smoke	57
45.	The Kneeling	36
46.	Al-Ahkaf	35
47.	Mohammed [*The Battle*]	38
48.	The Victory	29
49.	The Inner Apartments [*Sanctuary*]	18
50.	K.	45
51.	The Dispersing [*Breath of the Winds*]	60
52.	The Mountain	48
53.	The Star	61
54.	The Moon	55
55.	The Merciful	78
56.	The Inevitable [*Judgment*]	99
57.	Iron	29
58.	She who Disputed [*The Complaint*]	22
59.	The Emigration [*The Assembly*]	24
60.	She who is tried [*The Proof*]	13
61.	Battle Array	14
62.	The Assembly [*Friday*]	11
63.	The Hypocrites [*Impious*]	11
64.	Mutual Deceit [*Knavery*]	18
65.	Divorce	12
66.	Prohibition	12
67.	The Kingdom	30
68.	The Pen	52
69.	The Infallible [*The Inevitable Day*]	52
70.	The Steps [*The Classes*]	44
71.	Noah	28
72.	The Genii	28
73.	The Wrapped up [*The Prophet in his Dress*]	19
74.	The Covered [*The Mantle*]	55
75.	The Resurrection	40
76.	Man	31
77.	Those who are sent [*The Messengers*]	50
78.	The [Important] News	40
79.	Those who tear forth [*The Ministers of Vengeance*]	46
80.	He Frowned [*The Frown*]	42
81.	The Folding up [*Darkness*]	29
82.	The Cleaving asunder	19
83.	Those who give short Measure or Weight	36
84.	The Rending asunder	23
85.	The Celestial Signs	22
86.	The Nocturnal Star	17
87.	The Most High	19
88.	The Overwhelming [*The Gloomy Veil*]	26
89.	The Daybreak	30
90.	The Territory [*The City*]	20
91.	The Sun	15
92.	The Night	21
93.	The Brightness [*The Sun in Meridian*]	11
94.	Have we not opened? [*The Exposition*]	8
95.	The Fig-[tree]	8
96.	The Congealed Blood [*The Union of the Sexes*]	19
97.	Al-Kadir [*The Celebrated Night*]	5
98.	The Evidence	8
99.	The Earthquake	8
100.	The War Horses	11
101.	The Striking [*Day of Calamities*]	10
102.	The Emulous Desire of Multiplying [*Love of Gain*]	8
103.	The Afternoon	3
104.	The Slanderer	9
105.	The Elephant	5
106.	Koreish	4
107.	Necessaries [*The Succoring Hand*]	7
108.	Al-Kâthar	3
109.	The Unbelievers	6
110.	Assistance	3
111.	Abu Laheb	5
112.	The Declaration of God's Unity	4
113.	The Daybreak [*God of Morning*]	5
114.	Man	6

Manner of Preservation.—Mohammed's professed revelations were made at intervals extending over a period of twenty-three years, when the canon was closed. We have no certain information about the manner of their preservation during the prophet's life. Many persons wrote them on palm-leaves and various other substances, which were conveniently at hand. A writer in the *Calcutta Review* (xix, 8) says: "In the latter part of his career the prophet had many Arabic amanuenses; some of them occasional, as Ali and Othman, others official, as Zeid ibn-Thâbit (who also learned Hebrew expressly in order to conduct Mohammed's business at Medina). In Wâckidy's collection of dispatches the writers are mentioned, and they amount to fourteen. Some say there were four-and-twenty of his followers whom he used more or less as scribes, others as many as forty-two (Weil's *Mohammed*, p. 350). In his early life at Mecca he could not have had these facilities, but even then his wife, Khadija (who could read the sacred Scriptures), might have recorded his revelations; or Waraca, Ali, or Abu-Bekr. At Medina, Obey ibn-Kab is mentioned as one who used to record the inspired recitations of Mohammed (Wâckidy, p. 277½). Abdallah ibn-Sad, another, was excepted from the Meccan amnesty because he had falsified the revelation *dictated* to him by the prophet (Weil's *Mohammed*). It is also evident that the revelations were recorded, because they are frequently called throughout the Koran itself *Kitab*, 'the writing,' i. e. Scriptures." Besides this, however, there were many persons who recited these sayings daily, considering their repetition to be a duty, and persons generally repeated some parts of them. It was said that some could repeat literally every word of the Koran. The recital of a portion of it was essential in every celebration of

public worship, and its private perusal was urged as a duty and considered a privilege. No order was, however, observed in their perusal, in public the imâm or preacher selecting according to his own pleasure.

Collected by Zeid.—Many of the best memorizers of the Koran were slain in battle at Yemana, whereupon Omar advised caliph Abu-Bekr, "as the battle might again wax hot among the repeaters of the Koran," that he should appoint Zeid to collect from all sources the matter of the Koran. This Zeid did from date-leaves, tablets of white stones, breasts of men, fragments of parchment and paper, and pieces of leather, and the shoulder and rib bones of camels and goats. Sale supposes that Zeid did not compile, but merely reduced to order the various surâs. This, however, was but imperfectly done. Zeid's copy was committed to the care of Hafza, the daughter of Omar.

Recension in Othman's Time.—A variety of expression either originally prevailed, or soon crept into copies made from Zeid's edition. The Koran was "one," but if there were several varying texts where would be its unity? There were marked differences between the Syrian and Iranian readings. The caliph Othman ordered Zeid and three of the Koreish (q. v.) to reproduce an authorized version from the copy of Hafza, and this was subsequently sent into all the principal cities, all previous copies being directed to be burned. This recension being objected to in modern times on the ground that the Koran is incorruptible and eternal, and preserved from all error and variety of readings by the miraculous interposition of God, the Mohammedans now say that it was originally revealed in seven different dialects of the Arabic tongue, and that the men in question only selected from these. The variations in the copies of Othman's edition are marvellously few. There is probably no other work which has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text.

Authenticity.—It would appear difficult, notwithstanding the care taken since Othman's day, to prove that the Koran has been entirely uncorrupted. The Shiite Mussulmans say that Othman struck out ten sections, or one fourth part of the whole; and the *Dabistân*, translated by Shea and Iroyer (ii, 368), contains one of the sections said to have been struck out. Again, while the Koran was in the care of Hafza, one of Mohammed's wives, we cannot say that it was not in any way tampered with. The balance of evidence, however, is probably against the views of the Shiite sect. At the time of the recension there were multitudes who had transcripts, and who remembered accurately what they had heard. There was bitter political enmity to Othman, headed by Ali, who would gladly have seized on any such flaw or failure. Abu-Bekr was a sincere follower of Mohammed, and all the people seem to hav been earnest in their endeavor to reproduce the divine message. The compilation was made within two years of the prophet's death, while yet there were official reciters and tutors of the Koran in every quarter. The very fragmentary and patchwork character of the arrangement of the book bears marks of honesty; yet passages revealed at various periods may, after all, not be all included. The very call for the recension of Othman's is, on the other hand, urged as evidence of acknowledged corruption.

The Koran as a Revelation.—The Mohammedan theory is that the Koran is eternal and uncreated, and was first written in heaven on a table of vast size, called "the Preserved Table;" that a copy of this volume was made on paper, and brought by Gabriel down to the lowest heaven in the month of Ramadan, from which copy the work was at various times communicated to the prophet. The whole was shown to Mohammed once a year, and the last year of his life he saw it twice.

The evidence relied on to prove its inspiration, so far as found within the Koran itself, is as follows:

1. That Mohammed was foretold by Jesus in these words: "Oh children of Israel, I bring glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad" (sura 6). *Ahmad* is from the same root, and has almost the same meaning as *Mohammed*. A passage of the New Test. (John xvi, 7), in which Christ promises to send the Comforter, is wrested for the same service, as also are Psa. i, 2, and Deut. xxxiii, 2.

2. Some suppose that the Koran contains accounts of miracles worked by Mohammed. The 24th sura contains what some Mohammedans interpret as an account of Mohammed's *splitting the moon*. The Mohammedan critics are not agreed themselves as to whether the prophet there speaks in the future or past tense. Whether he does not merely affirm that the moon *shall be* split before the day of judgment admits of question. Mohammed elsewhere in the Koran distinctly and repeatedly denies that he could or would work miracles (sura 13–17, etc.). The night journey of Mohammed from Mecca to Jerusalem (sura 17), and the conversion of the jinns or genii who heard him reading the Koran (sura 46, 72), are also referred to as miracles by the Mohammedans, but it is doubtful if the language in the Koran was intended to assert what it has since been made to support. Various passages are referred to by Mohammedans to show that their prophet foretold future events —as the account in the 30th sura about the Greeks being overcome; but the commentators are not agreed as to the reference (sura 24, 27–48).

3. But the predictions in the Koran were never referred to as evidence of Mohammed's inspiration. The real testimony to the inspiration of the Koran appealed to throughout by Mohammedans is the book itself. The author of it everywhere appeals to it as a literary miracle: it is "uncreated" and "eternal" (Sale, p. 46); it could not have been composed by any but God (Sale, p. 169); Mohammed challenges men and genii to produce a chapter like it (Sale, p. 169–235); no revelation could be more self-evident (Sale, p. 136); it contains all things necessary to know (Sale, p. 221, 273); it was so wonderful that it was traduced by its enemies as a piece of sorcery (Sale, p. 166), as a poetical composition (Sale, p. 364); it was not liable to corruption (Sale, p. 175), and should not be touched by the ceremonially unclean (Sale, p. 437).

The Style of the Koran.—It is difficult to make a precise judgment of its merits. It was written in a dialect of Arabic which may now almost be called a dead language. It is composed in a kind of balanced prose, with frequent rhyming terminations; a sort of composition once greatly admired by the Syrian Christians, but in Europe neither the poetic cadence nor the jingling sound is deemed suitable to prose composition. Some learned Mussulmans have not considered it remarkably beautiful (Pocock's *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, ed. White, p. 224; Maracci, *Prodromus*, iii, 75; Lee's *Martyn's Tracts*, p. 124, 135). Gibbon is probably too severe in his judgment if his remarks have reference to its manner and not to its matter, when he calls it an "incoherent rhapsody of fable, and precept, and declamation, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and sometimes is lost in the clouds" (*Decl. and Fall Roman Empire*, i, p. 365, Milman's edition). Some affirm that Hamzah ben-Ahmed wrote a book against the Koran with at least equal elegance; and Maslema another, which surpassed it, and occasioned a defection of a great number of Mussulmans. There is perhaps little reason to differ from the representations of Mr. Sale when he says, "The Koran is usually allowed to be written with the utmost elegance and purity of language in the dialect of the Koreish, the most noble and polite of all the Arabians, but with some mixture, though very rarely, of other dialects. It is confessedly the standard of the Arabic tongue, and, as the more orthodox believe, and are taught by the book itself, inimitable by any human pen (though some sectaries have been of another opinion), and therefore insisted on as a permanent miracle, greater than that of raising the dead, and alone sufficient to convince the world of its divine original" (*Koran*, p. 43).

Relation to the Bible.—The Koran maintains that revelation is *gradual*, and that God has given written revelations to many prophets from time to time, none of which are extant except the Pentateuch of Moses, the Psalms of David, and the Gospel of Jesus: that God revives, and republishes or reproduces from time to time his revelations through his prophets, according to the necessity of the case. The three revelations—Jewish, Christian, and that of the Mussulman—are equally inspired and divine. The preceding Scriptures are, however, to be interpreted according to the *latest* revelation, and are liable to have their ordinances modified in conformity therewith. A distinction is thus made between *belief* in and *obligation* to obey these precepts. The Jewish and Christian Scriptures are variously spoken of as "the Word of God," "Book of God," *Taurât*, etc.; they are described as "revelations made by God in ages preceding the Koran." Exhortations are given "to judge" in accordance therewith. Mohammed himself was sent "to attest the former Scriptures," etc. (Compare passages in the following suras: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 53, 54, 61, 62, 66, 74, 80, 87, 98.)

There are various correspondences with these Scriptures, as in the accounts of the fall of Adam and Eve, the narratives of Noah and the deluge, of Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Isaac, Moses, Joseph, Zacharias, John the Baptist, etc. The contradictions are, however, innumerable: e. g. one of Noah's sons was drowned in the Deluge (sura 11); the wife of Pharaoh saved Moses (sura 28); the wind was subject to Solomon (sura 21); Solomon was driven from his kingdom; devils built for Solomon, other devils dived for him (ibid.); thousands of dead Israelites were raised to life (sura 3); Ezra and his ass died for a hundred years, and were then raised to life (sura 2); the grossest being that *Jesus was not crucified*, and is not the Son of God (sura 4).

Sources of Jewish and Christian Elements.—The Jewish and Christian elements in the Koran are readily to be accounted for. Jews from all parts of Arabia were in yearly attendance at the great fairs of Ocâtz, Mujanna, Dzul, Majaz, etc., and great mercantile journeys were made from Mecca to Syria, Yemen, and Abyssinia at least once a year. Christianity was established in these quarters. Some Arabs even reached much further. Othman ibn-Huweirith, a citizen of Mecca, went to Constantinople, and subsequently returned a baptized Christian. Arabs frequented the Christian courts of Hira and Ghassân, which adjoined Arabia on the north. Mohammed himself had been twice to Medina. More than a hundred of his followers found refuge in the Christian court of Abyssinia, both before and after the Hegira. Embassies were sent by Mohammed to the Roman and Persian courts, to Abyssinian and other Christian chiefs. "Mohammed had connection with Jews and Christians of every quarter of the civilized world" (Muir's *Testimony*, p. 118, 119). There are, moreover, many prominent individual cases: *Zeid* was of Syria, among whom Christianity prevailed. He was captured and sold into slavery, and was presented to Khadija shortly after her marriage to Mohammed, who loved him, and adopted him as his own son. He learned Hebrew. *Waraca*, a cousin of Khadija, was a convert to Christianity, acquainted with the religious tenets and sacred Scriptures of the Jews and Christians, copied or translated some portion of the Gospel in Arabic or Hebrew, and was of the family of Mohammed. The slaves generally of Mecca knew something of Christianity and Judaism (Muir's *Mohammed*).

Mohammedans, however, do not admit that our present Scriptures are trustworthy, but believe them to have been interpolated and otherwise corrupted. They quote a great number of passages of the Koran to establish this. Mr. Muir (*Testimony*, p. 119 sq.) nevertheless shows that there is no charge in the Koran against the Christians on this account, and that even those against the Jews are of "hiding, concealing" the whole, and not of corrupting.

Doctrines and Morals.—The contents of the Koran as the basis of Mohammedanism will be considered under that head, while for questions more closely connected with authorship and chronology we must refer to MOHAMMED. Briefly it may be stated here that "the chief doctrine laid down in it is the unity of God, and the existence of but one true religion, with changeable ceremonies. When mankind turned from it at different times, God sent prophets to lead them back to truth; Moses, Christ, and Mohammed being the most distinguished. Both punishments for the sinner and rewards for the pious are depicted with great diffuseness, and exemplified chiefly by stories taken from the Bible, the apocryphal writings, and the Midrash. Special laws and directions, admonitions to moral and divine virtues, more particularly to a complete and unconditional resignation to God's will, legends, principally relating to the patriarchs, and, almost without exception, borrowed from the Jewish writings (known to Mohammed by oral communication only, a circumstance which accounts for their often odd confusion), form the bulk of the book, which throughout bears the most palpable traces of Jewish influence" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.).

Outward Reverence.—The Mohammedans regard the Koran with great esteem, never holding it below the girdle nor touching it without purification. It is consulted on all matters of importance, and is the basis of the entire civil code and procedure of all Mohammedan countries. Sentences from it are inscribed on their banners: they are written on tissue paper, and are suspended in gold and silver lockets from their necks. The materials of its binding are often costly, being emblazoned with gold and precious stones. Mohammedans much dislike to see the book in the hands of "infidels," as they call all but Islamites. The bazaars or streets in which it is sold in Constantinople have become almost as sacred as mosques, and the dealers in the Koran have come to be as much reverenced as the preacher. Kemal Bey has recently had photographed a famous copy of the Koran, written nearly two hundred years ago (in 1094 of the Hegira) by Hafiz Osman, from the MSS. of Al-Kari, a celebrated doctor (*Friend of India*, Nov. 2, 1871; also *Athenæum*). Multitudes of Mussulmans know the entire Koran by heart; these are called Hâfiz, and are much venerated in consequence.

Translations, Commentaries, Editions, etc.—Various versions of the Koran have been made. Mohammedans do not object to this (Sale, p. 50). Of French translations we have those of Du Royer, Savary (with notes, 1783), Garcia de Tassy (1829), and Kassi Mirski (1840). In Latin there is an early one (A.D. 1143) by Retenensis, an Englishman (Basle, 1543), and an Italian one from it—both condemned by Sale. The Latin translation of Maracci (1698) is much quoted by authors. In German we have those of Megerlin (1772), Wahl (1828), and Ullmann (1840). In English there is Rodwell's (1862), and the excellent one with notes by George Sale (first edit. 1734; last, Lond. 1861); also Lane's *Selections from the Koran* (Lond. 1843, 12mo). Besides these there are a great number of Persian, Turkish, Malay, Hindustani, and other translations, made for the benefit of the various Eastern Moslems.

Of concordances to the Koran may be mentioned that of Flügel (Leipz. 1842), and the Nûjûm al-Fûrkan (Calcutta, 1811).

The Koran has been commented upon so often that the names of the commentators alone would fill volumes. Thus, the library of Tripoli, in Syria, is reported to have once contained no less than 20,000 commentaries. The most renowned are those of Samachshari (died 539 Hegira), Beidhavi (died 685 or 716 Hegira), Mahalli (died 870 Hegira), and Sovuti (died 911 Hegira). The American Oriental Society has in its library at New Haven a superior copy of the Persian Commentary on the Koran, by Kamâl ed-Din Husain (2 vols. in one, folio). For a

full list of these and the Oriental translations and editions of the Koran, see Trübner's pamphlet, *A Catalogue of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Books printed in the East* (Egypt, Tunis, Oudh, Bombay, etc.). See ARABIC LANGUAGE.

The principal editions are those of Hinkelmann (Hamburg, 1694), Maracci (Padua, 1698), Flügel (Leipzig, 3d ed. 1838, a splendid one), besides many editions (of small critical value) printed in St. Petersburg, Kasan, Teheran, Calcutta, Cawnpore, Serampore, and the many newly-erected Indian presses.

Literature.—In addition to the above, special reference may be made to W. Muir, *The Testimony borne by the Koran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures* (Allahabad, India, 1860); Prof. Gerock, *Christologie des Koran* (Hamburg, 1839); Muir, *Life of Mahomet* (Lond. 1860), vol. iv (the first volume being almost entirely occupied with a discussion of the sources available for such a biography); a valuable article in the *Calcutta Review*, vol. xix; the *Journal Asiatique*, July, 1838, p. 41 sq.; De Tassy, *Doctrines et devoirs de la Religion Musulmane tirés du Coran;* White (*Bampton Lectures*), *Comparison of Mohammedanism and Christianity;* Neal, *Islamism, its Rise and Progress* (2 vols. 12mo—valueless); *Letters to Indian Youth*, by Dr. Murray Mitchell, of Bombay; *Life and Religion of Mohammed, in accordance with the Shiite Traditions of the Hezat al-Kúlud* (translated from the Persian by Rev. J. L. Merrick, Boston, 1850); Nöldeke (Theodor), *Gesch. d. Quoran* (Götting. 1860); Weil, *Historische Einleit. in den Koran* (Bielf. 1844); Weil, *Mohammed der Prophet sein Leben u. s. Lehre* (Stuttg. 1843, 8vo); Sprenger, *Leben u. Lehre von Muhammed* (Berlin, 1861); Kremer, Alfred von, *Gesch. d. herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Lpz. 1868); Perceval (Caussin de), *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes, avant l'Islamisme, pendant l'époque de Mahomet, et jusqu'à la réduction de toutes les tribus sous la loi Mussulmane* (Paris, 1847–8, 3 vols. 8vo); and especially *Series of Essays on the Life of Mohammed, and Subjects subsidiary thereto*, by Seyd Ahmed Khan Bahader (London, 1870); *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 754; *Revue des deux Mondes*, Sept. 1, 1865. On the Christology of the Koran, see the *Studien u. Krit.* 1838–1847; Kitto, *Journal Sacred Liter.* xxviii, 479; *Lond. Quart. Review*, Oct. 1869, p. 160 sq. (J. T. G.)

Ko'rathite (Numb. xxvi, 58). See KORAHITE.

Kordes, BERENNE, a German writer on exegetical theology, was born at Lübeck Oct. 27, 1762, and studied at the universities of Kiel, Leipzig, and Jena. In 1793 he became librarian of the university at Kiel, and died there Feb. 5, 1823. His exegetical works are, *Observationum in Jonæ Oracula Specimina* (Jena, 1788):—*Ruth ex versione Septuaginta interpretum* (Jena, 1788).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 84.

Ko're (Hebrew *Kore'*, קֹרֵא, but קָרֵא in 1 Chron. xxvi, 1, a *partridge*, as in 1 Sam. xxvi, 20; Sept. Κορέ, but Κωρή v. r. Κορή in 2 Chron. xxxi, 14), the name of two or three men. See also KORAH.

1. A Levite and Temple-warden of the Korahites, of the sons of Asaph, and father of Meshelemiah or Shelemiah (1 Chron. xxvi, 1). B.C. 1014. He was probably identical with the son of Ebiasaph and father of Shallum, Levites of the family of Korah, engaged in the same service (1 Chron. ix, 19).

2. Son of Imnah, a Levitical porter of the east gate, appointed by Hezekiah to take charge of the Temple offerings (2 Chron. xxxi, 14). B.C. 726.

3. By erroneous translation in the A.V. at 1 Chron. xxvi, 19 for KORAHITE (q. v.).

Koreish is the name of a celebrated aboriginal tribe of Arabia, from whose ranks came Mohammed, the founder of Islam. The influence which the Koreish must have exerted in the early days of Mohammed is apparent from the fact that they exercised the guardianship over the *Kaaba* (q. v.). When Mohammed claimed for himself the dignity of a prophet, and inveighed against the primeval superstition of the Koreish (or *Meccans*, as they are sometimes called, after their principal place of residence, the city of Mecca), he was denounced by all the Koreish tribe. Many of his people were still devoted to Sabaism (q. v.), a somewhat refined worship of the planetary bodies (in all probability the belief of the Koreish in the century preceding the establishment of the Mohammedan creed; compare Sprenger, *Life of Mohammed*, i, 170; Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, v, 92 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii, 127; and the article ARABIA, vol. i, p. 342, in this Cyclopædia), while many others, although disbelieving the general idolatry of their countrymen, and not yet believers in Judaism, or in the corrupt Christianity with which alone they were acquainted, were looking for a revival of what they called the "religion of Abraham." Indeed, the greater the number of Mohammed's converts, the greater the opposition of his tribe; for had not the new religionists dared to question the sacredness of the holy temple, and call their ancient gods idols, and their ancestors fools? With all the animosity of an established priesthood trembling for their dignity, their power, and their wealth, the Koreish resisted the inroads of the new prophet, and though there were of their number those who had actually longed for the propagation of a monotheistic faith, they now spurned its establishment, as it was likely to give superiority to the family of Hashem, only a side branch of the powerful tribe. Many of the converts suffered all manner of annoyance; not a few were subjected also to punishment. In consequence of this contest, Mohammed felt constrained to advise his followers to seek refuge in Abyssinia. He himself had hitherto escaped only by the heroic conduct of his adopted father, Abu Talib, who, though not a believer in the new religion, considered it his duty to afford protection to Mohammed and all his kindred. But the rapid spread of the Islamitish doctrines made the Koreish violent, and they now demanded that Mohammed should be delivered into their hands. Upon Abu Talib's refusal to comply with their demands a feud resulted, and all the Hashemites were excommunicated. The Prophet himself, however, they sought to remove by secret assassination; a price was set upon his head—100 camels and 1000 ounces of silver—and he escaped their vengeance only by the self-possession with which one of his converts, Nueim, met the would-be assassin Omar. "Ere thou doest the deed," said Nueim, "look to thine own near kindred." Omar rushed infatuated to the house of his sister Fatima to punish her apostasy, but there the Koran was presented to him; he read a few sentences, and was changed into a follower of the Prophet. Yet did not the Koreishites abate their hostility; and it is said that for three long years Mohammed was under the depressing influence of the interdict, and constantly obliged even to change his bed in order to elude the midnight assassin (comp. Sale's *Koran*, ch. xxxvi; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 445). A fugitive from his native city, and despairing of making Mecca, the metropolis of the national religion, the centre of his new spiritual empire, he turned to the friendly city of Medina, whither more than a hundred of his faithful flock had preceded him. Here he found a kind reception, and succeeded in winning for his cause and creed six of the most distinguished citizens. From this flight, or rather from the first month of the next Arabic year, the Mohammedan æra (*Hegira*, q. v.) is dated. See MOHAMMED.

Once successfully established at Medina, Mohammed's first object was to secure his native stronghold, and for this purpose he declared himself at war with the Meccans, and opened the contest even during the sacred month of the Rajab. The fair option of friendship, submission, or battle was proposed to the enemies of Mohammed. If they should profess the creed of Islam, they were to be admitted to all the temporal and spiritual benefits of his primitive disciples, and to march under the same banner to extend the religion which they had embraced. In his very first battle he routed the

Koreishites, and, notwithstanding a severe loss and a personal wound in the battle near Ohod, his power had increased so rapidly that in the sixth year of the Hegira he determined upon and proclaimed a pilgrimage to Mecca. Although the Meccans did not suffer him to carry out this project, he secured their recognition as a belligerent and equal power with themselves by a formal treaty of peace, into which they mutually entered. In the year following he was allowed to spend a three-days' pilgrimage undisturbed at Mecca. The unfortunate attitude of the Koreishites towards Mohammed during his wars with the Christians emboldened him to seek immediate revenge for their treachery, and at the head of an army of 10,000 men he marched against Mecca, before its inhabitants had time to prepare for the attack, without difficulty became master of the place, and readily secured acknowledgment as chief and prophet. Among the first to fall prostrate at his feet were the chiefs of the Koreish. "What mercy can you expect from the man whom you have wronged?" "We confide in the generosity of our kinsman." "And you shall not confide in vain; begone! You are safe, you are free." With the conquest of Mecca the victory of the new religion was secured in all Arabia, and for the history succeeding this event we must refer to MOHAMMED and MOHAMMEDANISM. For the detail of the three Koreishite wars, see references in Milman's Gibbon, ii, 133. See also MECCA; MEDINA. (J. H. W.)

Kor'hite (Exod. vi, 24; xxvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 6; 2 Chron. xx, 19). See KORAH.

Kormczai Kniga, the Russian "corpus juris canonici," or *canonical law*, is supposed to have become the possession of the Russians in the days of Vladimir the Great. The oldest Codex of the *Kormczai Kniga* dates from 1280, and was found in the cathedral at Novgorod; its style of language has led to the supposition that it was translated by a southern Russian. The Greek original has never yet been found. The Codex was first printed Nov. 7, 1650, at Moscow; in a somewhat modified form, it was printed by the Ras-Kolniki (q. v.), a Russian sect at Warsaw, in 1786. Since that date several editions have been published.

The Codex, in its treatment of ecclesiastical law, is divided into seventy chapters, of which forty-one, making part i, contain the canons of the apostles, the councils, and the canonical letters; the remaining chapters, making part ii, contain the laws of the Byzantine emperors, and different treatises on ecclesiastical law. The work also contains historical contributions on the Greek and Russian Church, the *Nomocanon* of Photius, a notice of the name and edition of the work, the edict and gift of Constantine to Sylvester (q. v.), and a polemical treatise against the Latins. See Schlosser, *Morgenl. orthodoxe Kirche Russlands* (Heidelb. 1845); Strahl, *Beiträge z. russischen Kirchengesch.* (Halle, 1827), p. 14; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexicon*, iii, 918. Comp. PHOTIUS; RUSSIAN CHURCH. (J. H. W.)

Körner, JOHANN GOTTFRIED, a German theologian, was born at Weimar Nov. 16, 1726, entered Leipzig University in 1743, and in 1749 became catechet at St. Peter's Church in that city. In 1752 he was made subdean at Thomas Church, in 1756 at St. Nicholas Church, and in 1775 became archdeacon. Some time after this he was appointed regular professor of theology and superintendent of the churches of Leipzig. He died January 4, 1785. Körner wrote considerably, but his contributions to Church History are of especial value. His most important works are, *Epitome controversiarum theologicarum* (Lipsiæ, 1769, 8vo):—*Vom Cölibat der Geistlichen* (ibidem, 1784, 8vo):—*Erasmi sententia de symbolo apostolico ex Rufino defensa* (ibid, 1749, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 157 sq.

Kornmann, RUPERT, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Ingolstadt in 1759; entered the cloister of Prifling in 1776; took the vow in 1777, and was made priest in 1780. In order further to prosecute his theological studies he went to the University of Salzburg, holding at the same time the chaplaincy at Nonnenberg. In 1790 he was made abbot of the cloister of Prifling. He retired from this monastery after its secularization, and died Sept. 23, 1817. Among his many writings we have *Die Sibylle der Zeit, aus der Vorzeit, oder politische Grundsätze durch die Geschichte bewährt, nebst einer Abhandlung üb. die politische Divination* (Frankf. and Leipz. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sibylle der Religion aus der Welt- und Menschen-geschichte, nebst einer Abhandlung über die goldenen Zeitalter* (Munich, 1813, 8vo):—*Nachträge zu den beiden Sibyllen* (with a biography of the author, Regensburg, 1818, 8vo).—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s. v.

Kornthal, Society of, a German religious community, which bears its name from the place where it originated, Kornthal, in Würtemberg. Rationalistic influences in the Würtemberg Church had occasioned changes in the liturgy (1809) obnoxious to many who adhered more strictly to the old Lutheranism. The millenarian influence of Jung Stilling and Michael Hahn incited among this class an inclination to migrate, especially to Russia, where, near Tiflis, in 1816–17, several Würtemberg settlements were formed, while many hundred families were making ready to follow. The king sought means to restrain this movement, and in 1819 accepted the suggestions of Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffmann, burgomaster of Leonburg. The latter, in consequence of deep religious impressions received in his youth, was in sympathy with the Pietists, and now proposed to retain for the state a valuable class of citizens by securing for them the establishment of a community similar to that authorized at Königsberg under king Frederick, simply independent in its religious matters of the Lutheran Consistory. The motive was Pietistic, and not schismatic. Hoffmann's scheme sought to realize the spirit of the apostolic age; required as condition of membership "a regenerate state of heart, manifested in a true life which springs from a sense of pardoned sin;" and demanded careful education of children both mental and industrial, as well as charitable and missionary work. The community, as established, arose from the combination of three distinct elements, viz., the Old-Church Pietism represented by Hoffmann, the Moravian ideas appearing in the constitution and Church service, and the partially millenarian views of Hahn to which the majority adhered.

Michael Hahn, known among the people as "Michel," was at this time sixty-two years old. His spirit was that of Jacob Böhme. Converted at the age of twenty, he passed at that period, and subsequently, through an experience of religious ecstasy. Persecuted by his family and neighbors, he lived ascetically, was much in prayer, addressed religious assemblies, and soon won thousands of adherents, who sought him in Sindlingen, where he settled in 1794. His writings were disseminated in manuscript, and in 1817 his followers numbered 18,000. Hahn's teaching, with its acknowledged defects, brought a spirit of practical activity to the aid of a too subjective Pietism. The Kornthal society was founded Jan. 12, 1819, and Hahn was chosen its president, but he died on the 20th of the same month. See HAHN, MICHAEL.

The *Constitution* of the community seeks to realize rather the union of the religious and civil orders than their separation. Truly patriarchal under the presidency of "Father" Hoffmann, who died in 1846, it is really based on the idea of the universal priesthood of Christians. Not the clergy, but the community, is the final authority. The latter ("die Güterkaufsgesellschaft") is the original possessor of the land, from whose authority it cannot be alienated. The lordship of Kornthal, 1000 acres, all its buildings, gardens, vineyards, woods, was purchased for 113,000 gulden, and given out by lot to each member. Money can be borrowed only from the common chest, and no debts can be contracted by members outside the community. A common council

and council of elders is periodically elected. The president, pastor, and schoolmaster are chosen by the community, with recognition of the government and Church. The pastor shares the functions of the Sunday service with the president, councilmen, and schoolmaster, each of whom has authority to conduct a week-day service. The community admits its members by vote, and the children of the members are received only upon their own recognition. The criminal administration is under the general state authority, the property census and tax assessment being controlled by the president.

The usual Church festivals are observed. Baptism is a public and solemn ceremony, the import of which the people are not allowed to forget. The Lord's Supper is administered once a month on Saturday evening, preceded by a week of preparatory meetings.

The *Christian activity* of the community is displayed in connection with foreign and domestic missions and in education. It has few of its own members in the foreign mission field, though many missionaries, male and female, were educated at its schools. It is a supporter especially of the Basle Mission House, and its yearly missionary festival is an occasion of great interest. The destitute of the neighborhood are systematically visited, and its institution for abandoned children is chief among those of its class at Würtemberg. In its separate educational institutions for the two sexes about 10,000 persons from various lands have received their training.

Kornthal has in all a population of about 1300. It has ever exerted a salutary influence for the prevention of schism in the Würtemberg Church, has furnished for the sentiment of Pietism a corrective model of practical life, and has in general shown a successful example of religious and moral principle directly applied to social laws. Here are uniformly neat dwellings, clean streets, a well-clad people; intemperance and brawls are unknown; not a beggar is seen except such as may come in from abroad; there has been no case of bankruptcy from the foundation of the community, but two illegitimate births, and not a case of civil or criminal process of law has been required, while remarkable fidelity to the government in times of trial has characterized its people.—Kapff, *Die Würtembergischen Brüdergemeinden Kornthal u. Wilhelmsdorf* (Kornth. 1839); Barth, *Ueber die Pietisten* (Tübing. 1819); *Zeitschr. f. hist. theol.* 1841; Haag, *Studien d. Württemb. Geistl.* ix, 1 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. xix, s. v. (E. B. O.)

Kortholt, Christian (1). See Cortholt.

Kortholt, Christian (2), an eminent Danish Protestant theologian, and a nephew of Christian Kortholt (1), was born at Kiel in 1709. He studied at the university of his native city, and afterwards visited Holland and England. On his return to Germany he was appointed rector of the College of Leipzig, and adjunct professor of philosophy in the university of that city. A few years after he became professor of theology in the University of Göttingen, and finally ecclesiastical superintendent. He died Sept. 21, 1751. Besides a number of articles published in the *Acta Eruditorum Lipsiensium*, and a collection of sermons in German, he wrote *De sacrorum Christianorum in Cimbria primordiis* (Kiel, 1728, 4to):—*Commentatio historico-ecclesiastica de ecclesiis suburbicariis, qua in diocœsin quam episcopus Romanus ætate concilii Nicæni habuit, inquiritur* (Leipz. 1732, 4to):—*De Societate Antiquaria Londinensi ad Knappium* (Lpz. 1735, 4to):—*De Matth. Tindalio* (Lpz. 1734, 4to):—*De Enthusiasmo Mohammedis* (Götting. 1745, 8vo):—*De Simone Petro primo Apostol. et ultimo* (Götting. 1748, 8vo); etc. He published also *Leibnitii epistolæ ad diversos* (Leipzig, 1733–42, 4 vols.). See Joach. Lindemann, *Christ. Kortholti Oratio funebris* (in *Sacer decadum septenarius memorium theologorum nostra ætate*, etc., Lpzg. 1705, 8vo); Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxxi; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvii, 93; Pierer, *Univ. Lexikon*, ix, 734. (J. N. P.)

Kos. See Owl.

Kosa. See Koreish.

Kosegarten, Bernhard Christian, a German theologian, was born at Parchim, in Mecklenburg, May 7, 1722; entered Rostock University in 1739; went to Halle in 1745, and became adjunct professor in 1750. He died June 17, 1803. Kosegarten made for himself quite a name by his *Versuch das Kirchliche Dogma vom Stande der Erniedrigung Christi einer Prüfung zu unterwerfen* (New Brandenburg, 1748, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 174.

Kosegarten, Hans Gottfried Ludwig, a German Orientalist and historian, was born at Altenkirchen, Isle of Rügen, Sept. 10, 1792; studied theology and philology at the University of Greifswald, and in 1811 went to Paris to continue the study of the Oriental languages. He became adjunct professor at Greifswald in 1815, and in 1817 professor of the Oriental languages at Jena, and of the same chair at Greifswald in 1824. He died in 1860. Kosegarten wrote *De Mohammede Ebn Batuta ejusque itineribus* (Jena, 1818), and published editions of Amru ben-Kelthum's *Moallaka* (Jena, 1820):—*Libri Coronæ legis, id est Commentarii in Pentateuchum Karaitici ab Aharone ben-Elihu conscripti aliquot particulæ* (Jena, 1824); etc. See Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 738.

Kosegarten, Ludwig Theobald, a German divine and poet, was born at Grevismühlen, in Mecklenburg, Feb. 1, 1758; became rector at Wolgast in 1785; pastor at Altenkirchen in 1792, and in 1808 professor of history at the university in Greifswald; later also professor of theology, and pastor at St. James's Church in that place, and died Oct. 26, 1818. He was at one time honored with the rectorate of the university. His writings belong to the domain of belles-lettres. See Koberstein, *Geschichte d. deutschen Nationallitteratur*, iii, 2623 sq.

Kossoff, Sylvestre, a Russian divine, who flourished near the middle of the 17th century, was metropolitan of Kief in 1647, and died April 13, 1657. Kossoff wrote a work *on the Seven Sacraments* (Koutimsk, 1653, 4to), which an ecclesiastical council at Moscow in 1690 declared heretical.

Köster, Johann Friedrich Burchardt, a German theologian, was born at Loccum in 1791. He became professor of theology in Kiel in 1839, and died about 1850. His works are, *Meletemata critica et exegetica in Zachariam Prophetam*, cap. 9–14 (Götting. 1818):—*Das Christenthum* (Kiel, 1825):—*Lehrb. der Pastoral Wissenschaft* (ibid, 1827):—translations of the Psalms (1837) and the Prophets (Leipzig, 1838).

Köster, Martin Gottfried, a German theologian, was born at Guntersblum Nov. 11, 1734; was educated at the University of Jena, which he entered in 1752, and in 1755 became pastor at Wallersheim. In 1761 he was called to Weilburg as pastor and prorector of the gymnasium in that place. In 1773 he was appointed professor at Giessen, and died there Dec. 6, 1802. Köster was decidedly orthodox in belief, and labored both by his tongue and his pen to stay the incoming tide of Rationalism. His most important work in this direction is his *Neueste Religionsbegebenheiten* (Giessen, 1778–1796), in which several eminent German theologians assisted him. He wrote also *Vorurtheile für und wider die christl. Religion nebst einer Abhandlung von Zulassung des Bösen* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1774, 8vo):—*Erörterung der wichtigsten Schwierigkeiten in der Lehre vom Teufel* (ibid, 1776, 8vo; another work on *Satan*, Giessen, 1776, 8vo); etc. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 159 sq.

Köster, Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born in 1765, and early devoted himself to the study of theology. He became pastor first at Oppenheim, later at Eppingen, and died May 8, 1802. He devoted much of his time to the study of practical theology, especially to liturgy, and wrote *Liturgie bei Beerdigungen* (March, 1797, 8vo):—*Allgem. Altarliturgie* (ibid, 1799, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 162.

Kostha Ibn-Lûka (or *Luca*), an Arabian philosopher, the originator of Heliopolis in Syria, flourished towards the close of the 9th century. He died, according to Abulfarag, about 890. He translated many works of Greek philosophers into Arabic, and wrote himself many original treatises, among which are, *De Animæ et Spiritus Discrimine:—De Morte inopinata:—Descriptio Sphæræ Cœlestis:—Liber apologeticus adversus librum astrologi Abu Isæ de Mohameti Apostolatu et Prophetia.* See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ii, 801; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 975.

Kots. See THORN.

Kotter, CHRISTOPH, a German religious fanatic, was born at Sprottau, Silesia, in 1585. He claimed to have visions (which were published at Amsterdam in 1657). The first of these was in June, 1616. He fancied he saw an angel, under the form of a man, who commanded him to go and declare to the magistrates that, unless the people repented, the wrath of God would make dreadful havoc. His pastor and friends kept him in for some time, nor did he execute his commission, even though the angel had appeared six times; but in 1619, when threatened with eternal damnation by the same spirit, he would suffer himself to be restrained no longer. Kotter was laughed at; nevertheless, his visions continued, and were followed by ecstasies and prophetic dreams. He waited on the elector palatine, whom the Protestants had declared king of Bohemia, at Breslau, in 1620, and informed him of his commission. He became acquainted, in 1625, with Comenius, whom he converted to be a believer in his prophecies, which at this time were rather of a political cast, presaging happiness to the elector palatine, and the reverse to the emperor, so he became at length obnoxious, and in 1627 was closely imprisoned as a seditious impostor. He was finally liberated again and banished from the empire; went to Lusatia, then subject to Saxony, and died there in 1647. Kotter's visions were related by Comenius in a work entitled *Lux in tenebris* (Amst. 1657; an epitome of this work appeared in 1660: see, for an account of it, under DRABICIUS). See Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 679 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kotzebur, JOHANN, a German divine, was born in Magdeburg about 1654. He was rector at Quedlinburg. He died September 3, 1692. Kotzebur wrote *Suscitabulum Catholico-Lutheranum:—Confutatio tractatus Becani de ecclesia*, etc.—*Allgem. Hist. Lex.* iii, 61.

Kouyunjik. See NINEVEH.

Koz (Heb. *Kots*, קוֹץ, a *thorn*, as often; 1 Chron. iv, 8; Sept. Κωέ, Vulg. *Cos*, Auth. Vers. "Coz;" elsewhere with the art. הַקּוֹץ, *hak-Kots*, 1 Chron. xxiv, 10, Sept. Ἀκκώς, v. r. Κώς, Vulg. *Accos*, Auth. Vers. "Hakkoz;" Ezra ii, 61, Sept. Ἀκκούς, Vulg. *Accos;* Neh. iii, 4, 21, Sept. Ἀκκώς, Vulg. *Accus, Haccus;* Neh. vii, 63, Sept. Ἀκκώς, v. r. Ἀκώς, Vulg. *Accos*), the name of two or more men.

1. A descendant of Judah, concerning whose genealogy we have only the confused statement that he "begat Anub and Zobebah, and the families of Aharhel, the son of Harum" (1 Chron. iv, 8). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

2. The head of the seventh division of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 10). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same whose descendants are mentioned as returning with Zerubbabel from Babylon, but as being excluded by Nehemiah from the priesthood on account of their defective pedigree (Ezra ii, 61; Neh. vii, 63). To this family appears to have belonged Urijah, whose son Meremoth is named as having repaired two portions of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 4, 21).

Krafft, Adam, a celebrated German sculptor and architect, born at Nuremberg about 1430, and supposed to have died about 1507, deserves our notice for his prominent connection with ecclesiology. One of the most remarkable performances of his still extant is the tabernacle in stone, fixed against one of the columns of the choir of the church of St. Lawrence (Lorenzkirche), Nuremberg. It is in the form of a square open Gothic spire, and is 64 feet high; the pinnacle being turned downwards like the crook of the crosier or an episcopal staff, to avoid the arch of the church. The ciborium is placed immediately upon a low platform, which is supported partly by the kneeling figures of Adam Krafft and his two assistants; the rail or baluster of the platform is richly carved, and is ornamented with the figures of eight saints. The whole tabernacle is also profusely ornamented with small figures in the round and bassi-relievi: immediately above the ciborium, on three sides, are representations in bassorelievo of "Christ taking leave of his Mother," the "Last Supper," and "Christ on the Mount of Olives;" high above these are "Christ before Caiaphas," the "Crowning with Thorns," and the "Scourging;" above these is the "Crucifixion;" and lastly, above that, is the "Resurrection," all in the round. This elaborate work was executed by Krafft for a citizen of the name of Hans Imhof, and for the small sum of 770 florins. There is a print of this tabernacle in Doppelmayr's *Historische Nachricht von den Nürnbergischen Künstlern.* Recent writers have indulged in various conjectures regarding the time and works of Krafft, but the circumstances of both are still involved in their former uncertainty. See Füssli, *Allgemeines Künstler-Lexikon*, s. v.; Nagler, *Allgemeines Künstler-Lexikon*, s. v.

Krafft, Johann Christian Gottlob Ludwig, the modern reformer of the Protestant Church in Bavaria, was born at Duisburg Dec. 12, 1784. He studied first at Duisburg, where he fell temporarily under the influence of infidelity. He then spent five years as private tutor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and this period was of great spiritual regeneration to him, though he did not succeed in allaying all his doubts. In October, 1808, he became pastor of the Reformed congregation at Weeze, near Cleve. He still felt dissatisfied, however, and continued to search the Scriptures. In 1817 he became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Erlangen, and professor in the university in 1818. By this time his convictions had become settled, and he a firm Biblical supernaturalist. The last period of his spiritual development, his conversion, took place, according to his own account, in the spring of 1821. He died May 15, 1845. Without being gifted with very brilliant talents or especial eloquence, Krafft, by his earnest practical faith, and his uncommon energy, can be said to have awakened the Protestant Church of Bavaria from the lethargic sleep into which it had fallen under the influence of ultra rationalism. He took great part in the progress of home missions, and was the founder of an institution for the daughters of the poor. He wrote *De servo et libero arbitrio* (Nuremb. 1818):—*Seven Sermons on Isaiah liii, and four on* 1 *Cor. i*, 30; *Jahrgang: Predigten ü. freie Texte* (Erlang. 1828, 1832, 1845). After his death Dr. Burger published his *Chronologie u. Harmonie d. vier Evangelien* (Erlangen, 1848). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. viii, s. v. (J. N. P.)

Kraft, Friedrich Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Krautheim, in the duchy of Weimar, Aug. 9, 1712, and was educated at Jena and Leipzig from 1729 to 1732. In 1739 he became pastor at Frankendorf, and in 1747 university preacher at Göttingen, holding also after this an adjunct professorship of theology in this high-school. In 1750 he removed to Dantzic as senior preacher to Mary's Church, and died there November 19, 1758. His most important works are, *Schriftmässiger Beweis v. d. Ankunft d. Messias* (Leipz. 1734, 8vo):—*Epistola de honore Dei per honores ministrorum ecclesiæ promovendo* (Erf. 1739, 4to):—*Commentatio de pietate obstetricum Ægyptiacarum* (ibid, 1744, 4to). He also published many of his sermons, some of them under the title *Geistliche Reden* (Jena, 1746, 8vo), and *Neue theologische Bibliothek* (Lpz. 1746-1758; continued by Ernesti, and later by Döderlein), which last named work evinces Kraft's extended researches in theological literature. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 176 sq.

Kraft, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born at Baiersdorf, in the duchy of Baireuth, June 8, 1740, and was educated at the university in Erlangen. He entered the ministry at first, but in 1764 obtained the privilege of lecturing at the university, and in 1766 became extraordinary professor of philosophy, and in 1768 ordinary professor of theology and university preacher. He died July 2, 1772. He furnished many articles to theological periodicals, and published, besides a host of dissertations and several sermons, an edition of Huth's *Gesammelte Sonn- u. Festtagspredigten* (Schwabach, 1768–1771, 3 vols. 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 179 sq.

Kraft, Johann Melchior, a German theologian, was born at Wetzlar June 11, 1673. He pursued his theological studies at Wittenberg University, where he obtained the master's degree in 1693. In 1695 he began lectures at the University of Kiel, and in 1698 he became pastor at Süderstapel; in 1705 pastor at Sandesneben; in 1709 archdeacon at Husum, and shortly after counsellor of the Danish Consistory. He died July 22, 1751. His most important works are *Emendanda et Corrigenda quædam in historia versionis Germanicæ Bibliorum* (Dr. J. F. Mayero edita, Schleswig, 1705, 4to):—*Podroma historiæ versionis Bibliorum Germanicæ* (ibid, 1714, 4to):—*Ausführliche Historie vom Exorcismo* (Hamburg, 1750, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 182 sq.

Kraft, Johann Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Allendorf March 11, 1696. He went to Marburg University in 1712, and in 1723 became pastor of the Reformed Church at Marburg; later (in 1738) he removed to Hanau, but returned to Marburg in 1747, to assume the duties of a professorship in theology at his alma mater. He died Nov. 25, 1767. His most important works are *Fasciculi observationum sacrarum ix, quibus varia Scripturæ loca atque argumenta theologica illustrantur* (Marb. 1758–1766, 8vo):—*Sciagraphia theologiæ moralis ex resipiscentia et fide tanquam ex genuino geminoque omnium virtutum Christianarum fonte liquido derivatæ* (Rintel and Hersf. 1760, 8vo).—Döring *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 185.

Kraft, Justus Christoph, a German divine, son of the preceding, was born at Marburg Jan. 2, 1732, and was educated at the university of his native place and at Göttingen. In 1757 he became pastor at Weimar, and in 1762 at Cassel, whence he moved to Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1769. He died there Jan. 22, 1795. For a list of his sermons as published, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 187.

Kragh, Peter, a Danish missionary, born at Grimming, near Randers, Nov. 20, 1794, was sent as missionary to Greenland about 1820, and returned to his native country in 1828. The date of his death is not known to us. Kragh wrote extensively, and translated into the vernacular of the people among whom he preached the Gospel of Christ, parts of the O. T., sermons, works on practical religion, etc. He also published in Danish and Greenlandish, *Hans Egedes Aftensamtaler med sine disciples* (Copenhagen, 1837, 8vo).—Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, s. v.

Krakewitz, Albert Joachim von, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Gevezin, near Stargard, in Mecklenburg, May 28, 1674, and was educated for the ministry at the universities of Rostock, Copenhagen, Leipzig, and other German high-schools of note. He became professor of Hebrew at Rostock in 1698; in 1708 also professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1713 was promoted to the full professorship. In 1721 he removed to the university at Greifswald, and there held a prominent position as a theologian. His works, mainly of a controversial nature, are limited to pamphlet form. See *Allgemeines Hist. Lexikon*, Addenda, s. v.

Kraliz, Bible of, the most celebrated Bohemian version of the Holy Scriptures, issued, in the 16th century, by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. It was translated, in fifteen years, by a committee of their bishops and ministers, among whom the most prominent were John Æneas, John Nemczansky, Zacharias Ariston, and Isaiah Cepolla, aided by two Hebrew scholars of Jewish extraction. The work of translating and printing was carried on in the castle of Kraliz— hence the name of this Bible—near Willimowitz, in the west of Moravia, at the expense of Baron von Zierotin, the proprietor of the domain, and a member of the Brethren's Church. He set up for this purpose a special and costly printing-press, which was superintended by Zacharias Solin, an ordained minister of the Brethren. The first edition appeared in six folio volumes, as follows: Part i, the Five Books of Moses, in 1579; Part ii, Joshua to Esther, in 1580; Part iii, the Poetical Books, in 1582; Part iv, the Prophetical Books, in 1587; Part v, the Apocrypha, and Part vi, the New Testament, in 1593. The sixth part was a reprint of the Bohemian N. T. translated from the Greek by John Blahoslaw, a very learned bishop of the Church, who was no longer living. In 1601 a second edition appeared, and in 1613 a third. The last was in one volume quarto. The Kraliz Bible was the first Bohemian version made from the original, six other translations having preceded it, all based on the Vulgate. It was, moreover, the first divided into chapters and verses, and the first which separated the apocryphal from the canonical books. To each single verse, throughout the entire work, was appended a very brief commentary. The correctness of the translation is generally conceded, and the purity of the style universally admired. This Bible is still the classic standard for the Bohemian tongue. At the present day, however, it exists as an antiquarian work only, a copy costing about 300 florins. This is owing to the destruction to which it was doomed in the Bohemian anti-Reformation, when it was everywhere confiscated and committed to the flames by the Jesuits and soldiers who passed through the country in search of Protestant books. A compendium of it was republished at Prague, by J. L. Koher, in 1861 to 1865. It constitutes, moreover, the text, word for word, of the Bohemian Bible issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Gindely, *Geschichte d. Böhmischen Brüder*, ii, 309, 310; Czerwenka, *Geschichte d. Evang. Kirche in Böhmen*, ii, 500, etc.; Cröger, *Gesch. d. alten Brüderkirche*, ii, 157, etc. (E. de S.)

Krama or **Krasis**, the practice of mixing water with the sacramental wine (the *mixture* bearing the name κρᾶμα, and the *act of mixing* κράσις), was adopted very early in the Church, on the assumption that the wine used at the Passover was mixed with water; but Lightfoot shows that this was not necessarily the case. In the Western Church, the mixture of cold water with the wine takes place only once before the consecration; wine being first poured into the cup, and the water added. In the Oriental Church a twofold mixing takes place. There is the first mixture of cold water with the wine in the cup before consecration, and then a second mixture with warm water after consecration, and immediately before distribution. This is said to have been designed to represent at once the water which flowed from our Saviour's side and the fire of the Holy Spirit.

Krain, Andreas, archbishop of. See Andreas of Crain.

Krantz, Albert, a German theologian and eminent historian, was born at Hamburg towards the middle of the 15th century. He studied at Hamburg, Cologne, etc., and became doctor in theology and canon law. After traveling through most of Europe, he was, on his return, appointed professor at Rostock, and rector of that university in 1482. In 1492 he settled at Hamburg, after having been employed in important diplomatic missions. In 1499 he was sent as envoy to England and France, and was often chosen to decide difficulties: thus he acted as arbiter between king John of Denmark and

duke Frederick of Holstein in 1500, etc. In 1508 he was appointed dean of Hamburg, and died there December 7, 1517. Though not an ultramontane, he did not show himself practically much in favor of reformation in the Church, yet as a historian he exhibits great impartiality and much sound criticism. Krantz wrote *Vandalia* (1519; Frankf. 1575, 1588, 1601; German by St. Macropus, Lüb. 1600):—*Saxonia* (1520; Frankfort, 1575, 1580, 1621; Cologne, 1574, 1595; German by Faber, Leipzig, 1593 and 1582; continued by Chytræus, Wittenb. 1585):—*Chronicon regnorum aquilonarium, Daniæ, Sueciæ et Norwagiæ* (1545; Lat. 1546; Frankf. 1574, 1595; German by Eppendorf, Strasb. 1545):—*Metropolis s. Hist. eccles. in Saxonia* (1548; Basel, 1568; Cologne, 1574, 1596; Wittenb. 1576; Frankf. 1576, 1590, 1627):—*Institutiones logicæ* (Lpz. 1517):—*Defensorium eccl.; Spirantissimum opusculum in officium misse* (1506, etc.). Under Clement VIII the writings of Krantz were, on account of some damaging confessions for Romanism therein contained, put in the *Index*. See Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, vol. viii, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. ix, s. v.

Krantz (or CRANZ), **David**, a Moravian historian, was born at Neugarten, Pomerania, in 1723. In his youth he was master of a school at Herrnhut; he became secretary to count Zinzendorf in 1747, was afterwards sent on a literary mission to Greenland, where he was eminently successful in collecting historical information. He returned in 1762, and became pastor of the church at Rixdorf, near Berlin, in 1766. He died at Gnadenburg, in Silesia, in 1777. His principal works are *The History of Greenland*, and of the mission of *the United Brethren* (transl. Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The ancient and modern History of the Brethren* (Lond. 1780, 8vo).—Darling, *Cycl. Bibl.* s. v.

Krasicki, IGNAZ, a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Dubiecko, Poland, Feb. 3, 1734, and early entered the priestly office. His remarkable talents secured for him, when only twenty-nine years old, the honorable appointment as prince-bishop. He died March 14, 1801, as prince-bishop of Gnesen, where he had lived since 1795. See *Kathol. Real-Encyklop.* vi, 396.

Krasinski, count VALERIAN, the Protestant Church historian of Poland, was a native of the ancient Polish province of White Russia, and was descended from a noble family, which embraced at an early period the Protestant faith. He was born about 1780, and received a superior classical education; while yet a young man he was appointed chief of that department of the ministry of public instruction in the kingdom of Poland which was charged with the superintendence of the various classes of dissenters. He was zealous in his endeavors to promote instruction among them, and especially exerted himself in the establishment of a college at Warsaw for the education of Jewish rabbis. In order to lessen the expense of valuable works, especially those on scientific subjects, he was the first to introduce stereotype printing into Poland, and this was not accomplished without a considerable diminution of his own income. When the Polish Revolution of 1830 had proclaimed the throne of Poland vacant, and organized a national government, with prince Adam Czartoryski as president, a diplomatic mission was sent to England, of which count Valerian Krasinski was a member. When the Russian armies in 1831 had overpowered the revolutionary movement of his countrymen, he was still in England, where he then became, with many others of his countrymen, a penniless exile. After having acquired the English language, he devoted himself to literature as a means of support, and became the author of several valuable works. He resided in London during the first twenty years of his exile, and during the last five in Edinburgh, where he died Dec. 22, 1855. Count Krasinski was a man of varied learning, and possessed extensive information, especially on all matters connected with the Slavonic races. His most important works are the following: *The Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1838–40, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Lectures on the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations* (London, 1849, 8vo):—*Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonian Nations* (Edinb. 1851, 8vo):—*Treatise on Relics*, by J. Calvin, newly translated from the French original, with an Introductory Dissertation on the Miraculous Images of the Roman Catholic and Russo-Greek Churches (1854, 8vo). He published also some works and pamphlets on secular and recent political subjects, especially on those connected with the restoration of Poland. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; *British and For. Ev. Rev.* 1845, p. 502; Jenkins, *Life of Cardinal Julian* (Preface).

Kraus, Christian Jacob, a German philosopher, was born at Osterode July 28, 1753, entered the University of Königsberg in 1771, studied first theology and later mainly metaphysics; in 1779 went to Göttingen; was appointed professor of philosophy at the University in Königsberg in 1781, and died there Aug. 25, 1807. His writings were published under the title *Vermischte Schriften* (Königsb. 1808–12, 7 vols. 8vo); etc. —*Katholische Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 397.

Kraus, Johann Baptist, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Regensburg Jan. 12, 1700, entered the Benedictine order in 1715, and in 1721 was sent by his superior to Paris to study in the convent St. Germain under Montfaucon and Guarin; returned to Germany in 1724, and was ordained priest. In 1725 he was appointed to St. Emmeran Convent, and remained there until his death, June 14, 1762. Kraus was a decided Roman Catholic, rather ultramontane in his views, and hardly suited for the liberal German associations which surrounded him. He battled earnestly in behalf of his sect, and opposed vigorously the liberal tendency of the Benedictine Rothfischer, who had frankly confessed the failings of some of the institutions of the Romish Church. For a list of the works of Kraus, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 189 sq.

Krause, Friedrich August Wilhelm, a German doctor in philosophy, was born at Dobrilugk in 1767, and flourished at Vienna, where he died March 24, 1827. He published *Pauli ad Corinthios epistolæ Gr., perpetua annotatione illustratæ*, vol. i (Franc. ad Mœn. 1792); intended as a continuation of Koppe's New Testament, but never carried further. He had previously published *Die Briefe an die Philipp. und Thessal. übersetzt und mit Anmerk. begleitit* (Frankfort, 1790).—Kitto, *Biblical Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Krause, Johann Christian Heinrich, a German divine, was born at Quedlinburg April 29, 1757, and entered the University of Jena in 1775. Four years later he began lectures at the University of Göttingen, but in 1783, on account of straitened circumstances, went to Jever as rector, and in 1792 was called to a like position at Hanover. He died Jan. 12, 1828. For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 193 sq.

Krause, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Reichenbach Oct. 26, 1770, and was educated at Wittenberg University, where, after securing the master's degree, he lectured a short time. In 1793 he was called to his native place as diaconus, and in 1802 the city of Naumburg called him as preacher to the cathedral. In 1810 he went to the University of Königsberg to fill a professorship in theology, which position he held until 1819, when he accepted a call as preacher to Weimar, and there he died, May 31, 1820. Krause's writings consist of several academical programmes, two on the Epistle to the Philippians, one on the first Epistle of Peter, and four on the second Epistle to the Corinthians, and of some discussions pertaining to philosophy and theology. They were collected by him, and issued together under the title *Opuscula Theologica, sparsim edita collegit, ineditisque auxit*, etc. (Regiom. 1818). His sermons he published under the title *Predigten über die gewöhnlichen Sonn- u. Festtagsevangelien des ganzen Jahres* (Lpzg. 1803, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. iii,

ibid, 1805, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Krause, Karl Christian Friedrich, a German philosopher, born in Eisenberg May 6, 1781, was educated at the University of Jena, where he attended the lectures of Reinhold, Fichte, and Schelling, and then lectured as "privat docent" from 1802 to 1804. In order to devote himself to the wide range of studies which he deemed necessary to give completeness to his philosophical system, more especially to studies in art, he quitted Jena, and resided successively in Rudolfstadt, Dresden, and Berlin. He made several journeys through Germany, France, and Italy, and lectured at Göttingen from 1824 to 1831, when he retired to Munich. "The aim of his speculations was to represent the collective life of man as an organic and harmonious unity; and he conceived the scheme of a public and formal union of mankind, which, embracing the Church, State, and all other partial unions, should occupy itself only with the interests of abstract humanity, and should labor for a uniform and universal development and culture. The germ of such a union he thought he found in freemasonry, to which he rendered great service by his works." He died in Munich Sept. 27, 1832. Among his works are *Vorlesungen über das System der Philosophie* (Göttingen, 1828, 8vo):—*Abriss der Religionsphilosophie* (1828):—and *Vorlesungen über die Grundwahrheiten der Wissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1829). See Krug, *Philosophisches Lexikon*, ii, 642; *Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 398, 399; Appleton's *New Amer. Cyclopædia*, x, 217. (J. H. W.)

Krauth, Charles Philip, D.D., an eminent divine in the Lutheran Church, born in Montgomery Co., Pa., May 7, 1797. Originally designed for the medical profession, he commenced its study under the direction of Dr. Selden, of Norfolk, Va., and subsequently attended a course of lectures in the University of Maryland. By a Providential interposition, as he always regarded it, his attention was directed to the ministry as a field of usefulness. Brought under the influence of saving truth, and having consecrated himself unreservedly to the Master, he felt that "woe would be unto him if he preached not the Gospel." He very soon commenced his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Schæffer, of Frederick, Md., and concluded them with Rev. A. Reck, of Winchester, Va., whom he also aided in the pastoral work. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1819. His first pastoral charge was the united churches of Martinsburg and Shepardstown, Va., where he labored for several years most efficiently and successfully. He removed to Philadelphia in 1827; advanced rapidly as a scholar, a theologian, and preacher, and in 1833 was unanimously elected professor of Biblical and Oriental literature in the theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., with the understanding that a portion of his time should be devoted to instruction in Pennsylvania College, in the same place. In 1834 he was chosen president of the college, which office he filled with distinguished success for seventeen years, a model of Christian propriety, purity, and honor. The history of the college during his connection with it furnishes an unerring proof of his abilities and faithfulness. During his administration the institution enjoyed several precious seasons of revival, when large numbers of the young men joined themselves to the people of God. In 1850 Dr. Krauth resigned the presidency of the college, to devote his entire time to the quiet and congenial duties of theological instruction, and continued these labors until the close of life, delivering his last lecture to the senior class within ten days of his death. He died May 30, 1867. Dr. Krauth was a man of rare endowments of intellect. His mind was distinguished for the harmonious blendings of all its powers. His attainments in every department of literature and science were very extensive. In the pulpit he was pre-eminent. His sermons were always impressive, often thrilling, and sometimes accompanied with the most powerful results. The following is a list of his publications: *Oration on the Study of the German Language* (1832):—*Address delivered at his Inauguration as President of Pennsylvania College* (1834):—*Sermon on Missions* (1837):—*Address on the Anniversary of Washington's Birthday* (1846):—*Discourse at the Opening of the General Synod* (1850):—*Baccalaureate Discourse* (1850):—*Discourse on the Life and Character of Henry Clay* (1852). He edited the *General Synod's Hymn-book; Lutheran Sunday-school Hymn-book; Lutheran Intelligencer* (of 1826); *Evangelical Quarterly Review* (from 1850–61). (M. L. S.)

Krautwald, Valentin. See Schwenkfeld.

Krebs, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Baireuth March 5, 1651; studied at Jena; became rector of the gymnasium at Heilsbrunn in 1675, where he afterwards filled the posts of professor of theology and Hebrew, and inspector; and died Aug. 16, 1721. Krebs was a copious writer, the list of his works filling five closely-printed columns in Adelung. They embrace natural and moral philosophy, historical and political science, and theology, mostly in the form of dissertations. Among the most valuable is a work on the first five chapters of Genesis, illustrated from the Syriac, Chaldee, Persic, Æthiopic, and other Oriental languages. See Adelung, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, vol. ii, s. v.; Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.

Krebs, Johann Tobias, a German theologian, was born at Buttelstadt (Thuringia) in 1718, and was educated at Leipzig University, where, after attaining to the master's degree, he lectured on N. T. exegesis. Later he was conrector at Chemnitz, and finally rector at the gymnasium in Grimma, where he died in 1782. Krebs edited Schottgen's *Lexicon in Nov. Testament* (Lips. 1765), and wrote himself two works of considerable value for the illustration of the facts and language of the N. T., *De usu et præstantiu Romanæ Historiæ in N. T. interpretatione* (Lips. 1745):—*Observationes in N. T. e Flavio Joseph.* (Lips. 1755). "The latter contains a rich collection of examples of the peculiarities of N.-T. phraseology."—Pierer, *Univ. Lexikon*, vol. ix, s. v.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Krebs, John Michael, D.D., a noted Presbyterian minister, was born in Hagerstown, Md., May 6, 1804, and was converted at the age of nineteen. He entered Dickinson College in 1825, and after graduation in 1827 with the highest honors of his class, studied theology, and was licensed by Carlisle (Pa.) Presbytery in 1829. Shortly after he became the pastor of Rutgers Street Church, New York City, which he served until his death, Sept. 30, 1867. Though one of the ablest and most prominent ministers of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Krebs published only a few occasional sermons, besides several contributions to the periodicals of his Church (for which see Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1016), and to Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*. "He was a man of rare gifts, and of still more rare and varied acquirements, being learned not only in theology, but in the whole range of the sciences; and his learning was all made to bear upon the work to which he had devoted his life, that of the Gospel ministry. He was eminent as a preacher of the Gospel, and still more eminent in the councils of the Church, having no equal in the knowledge of ecclesiastical law, and in his acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of the denomination to which he belonged." He was honored with the appointment of chairman of the Committee on the Reunion of the Presbyterian Church, and had previously held other offices of distinction in the councils of his denomination. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 100 sq.

Krebs, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Baltimore, Md., Sept. 2, 1819; joined the Church in 1841, and was immediately licensed to exhort; and the year following joined the Baltimore Conference as pastor of Wesley Chapel, Baltimore. He died Sept.

26, 1870. "Brother Krebs was a perspicuous preacher, logical in method, earnest in manner, although not vehement, and eminently diligent in preparation. He was also a notably faithful pastor. Five years of his ministry were spent in Washington, five in Baltimore, and one in Chicago, and everywhere the Lord owned his labors."—*Conference Minutes*, 1871, p. 19.

Krechling. See ANABAPTISTS.

Krell. See CRELL.

Krey, JOHANN BERNHARD, a German theologian, was born at Rostock Dec. 6, 1771, and was educated at the university in that city and at Jena. In 1806 he was appointed assistant pastor at St. Peter's Church in Rostock, and in 1814 became the principal pastor. He died Oct. 6, 1826. He published *Beiträge zur Mecklenburgischen Kirchen- u. gelehrten Geschichte* (Rost. 1818–1823, 3 vols. royal 8vo). For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 207 sq.

Krider, BARNABAS SCOTT, a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1825, in Rowan County, North Carolina; received his education in Davidson College, N. C., where he graduated in 1850; and completed his theological studies in Columbia, S. C., and Princeton, N. J., seminaries in 1855. In 1856 he was ordained and installed as pastor of Bethany and Tabor churches, and in 1858 took charge of Unity and Franklin churches, N. C. The year succeeding he became pastor at Thyatira, where he died Oct. 19, 1865. Krider "was popular in address, judicious and practical, and won the affection of his people."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1866.

Krinon. See LILY.

Kripner, SAMUEL, a German divine of some note, was born at Schwabelwald, in the duchy of Baireuth, March 31, 1695; entered Jena University in 1716, and in 1727 was appointed professor of Greek and the Oriental languages at the gymnasium in Baireuth. He died Oct. 15, 1742. For a list of his writings, mainly dissertations, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 210 sq.

Krishna was the eighth and most celebrated of the ten chief incarnations of the god Vishnu, who, together with Brahma and Siva, constituted the divine triad of the Hindu mythology. See TRIMURTI. The term Krishna is a Sanscrit word signifying *black*, and was given to the incarnation either because the body assumed was of a black complexion, or, more properly, because of the relation of the avatar to a deity whose distinguishing color was black, as that of Brahma was red, and Siva was white; or for a reason implied in the citation from Porphyry (Eusebius, *De Præpar. Evang.*), that the ancients represented the Deity by a black stone because his nature is obscure and impenetrable by man. See further, Maurice, *Indian Antiquities*, ii, 364–368; Prichard's *Egypt. Mythol.* p. 285; Maurice, *History of Hindostan*, ii, 351.

Krishna is the most renowned demigod of the Indian mythology, and most famous hero of Indian history. It is probable that when the story of his life is stripped of its mythological accidents it will be found that he was a historical personage belonging to the Aryan race when they were making their gradual inroads south and east in the peninsula of India. It is presumable that the enemies whom he attacked and subdued were the Turanian races who constituted the aborigines of the country [see KHONDS], and who, fighting fiercely and mercilessly in their primeval forests, were soon magnified into gods and demigods. See MYTHOLOGY.

I. *Theory of the Incarnation.*—Krishnaism, with all its imperfections, may be accounted as a necessary and the extreme revolt of the human heart against the unsatisfying vagaries of the godless philosophy into which Brahmanism and Buddhism had alike degenerated. The speculations of the six schools of philosophy, as enumerated by native writers, served only to bewilder the mind until the word *maya*, "illusion," was evolved as the exponent of all that belongs to the present life, while the awful mysteriousness of *Nirvana* overshadowed the life to come. Man's nature asks for light upon the perplexed questions of mortal existence, but at the same time demands that which is of more moment, an anchorage for the soul in the near and tangible. The ages had been preparing the Hindu mind for the dogma of Krishna—an upheaving of something more substantial from the great deep of human hope and fear than the unstable elements of a life transitory and void. Consult Max Müller's *Chips*, i, 242; *Biblioth. Sacra*, xviii, 543–568.

The avatars preceding that of Krishna were mere emanations of the god Vishnu, but this embodied the deity in the entirety of his nature. In those he brought only an *ansa*, or portion of his divinity, "a part of a part;" in this he descended in all the fulness of the godhead, so much so that Vishnu is sometimes confounded with Brahma, the latter becoming incarnate in Krishna as "the very supreme Brahma." See Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 280, 291, note; also Sir Wm. Jones, in Maurice's *Hindostan*, ii, 256. In the Bhagavat Gita, that wonderful episode of the Mahabharata, Arjuna asks of Krishna that he may be favored with the view of the divine countenance. As, in response, the deity bestows upon him a heavenly eye that he may contemplate the divine glory, he indulges in a rhapsody which describes the incarnate god as comprising the entire godhead in all its functions. Again, Krishna says of himself, "I am the cause of the production and dissolution of the whole universe," etc. (Thomson's edition, p. 51).

One object of this incarnation was "the destruction of Kansa, an oppressive monarch, and, in fact, an incarnate Daitya or Titan, the natural enemy of the gods" (H. H. Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, ii, 66). A more satisfactory object is disclosed by Krishna in the Bhaghavat Gita: "Even though I am unborn, of changeless essence, and the lord of all which exist, yet in presiding over nature (*prakriti*), which is mine, I am born by my own mystic power (*maya*). For, whenever there is a relaxation of duty, O son of Bharata! and an increase of impiety, I then reproduce myself for the protection of the good and the destruction of evil-doers. I am produced in every age for the purpose of establishing duty" (Thomson's ed. p. 30). The incarnations of Vishnu, which were multiplied to infinitude, assuming diversified forms of man, fish, and beast, because physical life has in it nothing real, nothing individual, nothing of lasting worth, we may believe contemplated even yet a more ennobling end, an antidote to the essential evil of nature as declared in one of the Puranas: "The uncreated being abandons the body that he used in order to disencumber the earth of the burden that overwhelmed it, as we use one thorn to draw out another" (Burnouf, quoted by Pressensé, *Religions before Christ*, p. 63). "The thorn is material life, which Vishnu apparently takes on himself that he may the more effectually destroy it" (Pressensé, *ibidem*). "Crude matter and the five elements are also made to issue from Krishna, and then all the divine beings. Narayana or Vishnu proceeds from his right side, Mahadeva from his left, Brahma from his hand, Dharma from his breath, Saraswati from his mouth, Lakshmi from his mind, Durga from his understanding, Radha from his left side. Three hundred millions of gopis, or female companions of Radha, exude from the pores of her skin, and a like number of gopas, or companions of Krishna, from the pores of his skin; the very cows and their calves, properly the tenants of Goloka, but destined to inhabit the groves of Brindavan, are produced from the same exalted source" (H. H. Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, i, 123).

On the other hand, the Puranas disclose with regard to Krishna a human life, when considered from the most favorable stand-point, discreditable to the name and nature of man. It is a tissue of puerilities and licentiousness. The miraculous deeds of Krishna were rarely for an object commensurate with the idea of a divine inter-

position. His associations as a cowherd (gopala) with the gopis—in which capacity he is most popular as an object of adoration—are no better than the amours of classic mythology. The splendid creation of the Gita, not unlike the human head in the *Ars Poetica*, finds in the Puranas an unsightly complement. In his infancy he is represented as destroying in a wonderful manner the false nurse Putana; playing his tricks upon the cowherds—spilling their milk, stealing their cream, and always making cunning escapes; and rooting up trees the fall of which made the three worlds to resound. In his childhood swallowed by an alligator, he burns his way out from the entrails of the monster, and on another occasion contends with and overcomes the dragon, one of whose jaws touched the ground while the other stretched up to the clouds; checkmates Brahma, whose mind had been led by evil suggestions to steal away the cattle and the attendant boys, by creating others which were perfect fac-similes of those that had been stolen. Still a child, he dances in triumph on the great black serpent Kali-naja, and then, in compassion, assigns him to the abyss; hides and restores the clothes of the gopis while bathing; lifts the mountain Govarddhana on his little finger with as much ease as if it had been a lotus, that its inhabitants might be protected from the storm; and plays blind-man's buff, assuming the form of a wolf, that he might find and restore the boys who had been abducted by another wolf. In his more mature manhood we behold him promoting his love intrigues by miraculously corrupting the hearts of the gopis, or accomplishing that most astounding miracle with respect to his 16,000 wives, "quas omnes una nocte invisebat et replebat" (Paulinus, *Systema Brahmanicum*, p. 150), in order that Nared might be convinced of his divine nature. Now he careers in triumph over battle-fields, with a blade of grass or with a single arrow shot from the all-conquering bow discomfiting entire armies; and now he yields himself to scenes of sumptuous revelry in the gardens of golden earth, through which flowed "the river whose banks were all gold and jewels, the water of which, from the reflection of rubies, appeared red, though perfectly white"—in all the license of joy sporting with his 16,000 wives, by whom he was surrounded "*as lightning with a cloud*"—they and he pelting each other with flowers, thousands of lotuses floating on the surface of the river—whose water was the water of life—among which innumerable bees were humming and seeking their food (Bhagavat Purana, in Maurice, *Hist. of Hindostan*, ii, 327–458). Sir Wm. Jones, however, with enlarged charity, takes a modified and more pleasing view of the darker phases of a life the worst scenes of which are not fit to be told, "that he was pure and chaste in reality, but exhibited an appearance of excessive libertinism, and had wives or mistresses too numerous to be counted; he was benevolent and tender, yet fomented and conducted a terrible war." See farther Maurice, *Hindostan*, ii, 258.

II. *Life of Krishna.* — "The king of the Daityas or aborigines, Ahuka, had two sons, Devaka and Ugrasena. The former had a daughter named Devaki, the latter a son called Kansa. Devaki (*the divine*) was married to a nobleman of the Aryan race named Vasudeva, the son of Sura, a descendant of Yadu, and by him had eight sons. Vasudeva had also another wife named Rohini. Kansa, the cousin of Devaki, was informed by the saint and prophet Narada that his cousin would bear a son who would kill him and overthrow his kingdom. Kansa was king of Mathura, and he captured Vasudeva and his wife Devaki, imprisoned them in his own palace, set guards over them, and slew the six children whom Devaki had already borne. She was about to give birth to the seventh, who was Balarama, the playfellow of Krishna, and, like him, supposed to be an incarnation of Vishnu; but, by divine agency, the child was transferred before birth to the womb of Vasudeva's other wife, Rohini, who was still at liberty, and was thus saved" (Thomson's summary in Bhagavad Gita, p. 134). Her eighth child was Krishna, who was produced from one of the hairs of Vishnu (Muir's *Sanscrit Texts*, ch. ii, sec. 5), and was born at midnight in Mathura, "the celestial phenomenon." The moment Vasudeva saw the infant he recognised it to be the Almighty, and at once presented his adoration. The room was brilliantly illuminated, and the faces of both parents emitted rays of glory. The child was of the hue of a cloud with four arms, dressed in a yellow garb, and bearing the weapons, the jewels, and the diadem of Vishnu (H. H. Wilson, *ut sup.* i, 122). The clouds breathed forth pleasing sounds, and poured down a rain of flowers; the strong winds were hushed, the rivers glided tranquilly, and the virtuous experienced new delight. The infant, however, soon encountered the most formidable dangers, for Kansa left no means unemployed to compass the child's destruction. The gods interposed for his deliverance; lulled the guards of the palace to a supernatural slumber; its seven doors opened of their own accord, and the father escaped with his child. As they came to the Yamuna, the child gave command to the river, and a way was opened that they might pass over, a serpent meanwhile holding her head over the child in place of an umbrella. The child was surreptitiously exchanged for another, of which the wife of an Aryan cowherd, Nanda by name, had been delivered. Krishna was left with the cowherd, while Vasudeva returned with the other to the palace. Not long after, Kansa discovered the imposture, and in anger gave command for the indiscriminate slaughter of all male children. To escape the impending danger, Krishna was removed by Nanda to the village Gokula. Here his youth was passed in the care of the flocks and herds. The young gopas and gopis, cowherds and milkmaids, flocked to his side from the surrounding country, won by his matchless beauty and the display of his miraculous powers. He selected from the fascinated gopis a bevy of beauties, of whom he married several, Radha enjoying the honor of being his favorite mistress, and subsequently of being associated with him as a joint object of worship. He beguiled the hours with them in the gay revelries of dance and song. A second Apollo, he wielded the power of music, and at the sweet sounds of flute or vîna the waters stood still to listen, and the birds lost the power of flight. The Puranas dwell upon his repeated exploits with serpents, dæmons, and other monsters, each one of whom was eventually crushed or conquered, for the unequal contest was waged with one who embodied "the strength of the world." An impostor arose, pretending to be the true son of Vasudeva or Krishna himself, but he also was defeated and slain (Johnson's *Selections from the Mahabharata*, third section, note). Krishna participated in the family feud between the Kurus, or hundred sons of Dhritarasthra, and their cousins, the five sons of Pandu. One of the battles is fabled to have lasted eighteen days, and to have been attended with incredible slaughter. The varied fortunes of this protracted strife, interspersed with a vast number of legends and traditions, constitute the subject of the great epic the Mahabharata. For the protection of the people of Yadu against the invasion of a foreign king, Krishna built and fortified the town of Dvaraka, in Guzerat, all the walls of which were so studded with jewels that there was no need of lamps by night. To Rukmini is accorded the pre-eminence as his wife, though his harem numbered 16,000 others, each one of whom bore him ten sons (comp. *The Dabistan*, ii, 31, 183, and Bhagavat Purana, *ibid*, ii, 408). Many were his notable deeds, some of them embracing the regions of the dead, and others India's heaven, from which he stole the famous Parijata-tree, produced at the churning of the ocean, and at that time thriving in the gardens of Indra. The mighty tyrant Kansa, and the mightier dæmons Chanura and Mushtika, fell beneath his prowess, and even his own tribe, the Yadavas, was exterminated through his agency (H. H. Wilson, *Vishnu Purâna*, v, passim). His death at last took place in a wonderful manner, and is sup-

posed by some to illustrate the prophecy of the Garden. Durvasa had once warned him, "Oh, Krishna, take care of the *sole of thy foot;* for if any evil come upon thee it will happen in that place" (as is related in the Mahabharata in Maurice, *ibid*, ii, 472). As he sat one day in the forest meditating upon the fearful destruction of Kuru and Yadava alike, he inadvertently exposed his foot. A hunter, Jara (old age), mistook him for a beast, and with his arrow pierced the sole of his foot. In his death so great a light proceeded from Krishna that it enveloped the whole compass of the earth, and illuminated the entire expanse of heaven. He abandoned his mortal body and "the condition of the threefold qualities." According to the Purana, "he united himself with his own pure, spiritual, inexhaustible, inconceivable, unborn, undecaying, imperishable, and universal spirit." He returned to his own heaven, denominated Goloka—the sphere or heaven of cows—a region far above the three worlds, and indestructible, while all else is subject to annihilation. "There, in the centre of it, abides Krishna, of the color of a dark cloud, in the bloom of youth, clad in yellow raiment, splendidly adorned with celestial gems, and holding a flute" (Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, i, 123).

In this entire life we find no high moral purpose to elicit our admiration or command our faith. Now and then there appear in the Puranas suggestions of relief from individual burdens of oppression and woe, but they are as void and dissevered as flashes of lightning, which serve but to intensify the gloom. Like Buddha, our divinity bewails the evils of existence. Whatever may be the recognition of human need, the idea of succor is most limited, and only proves that the religion feels itself inadequate to the emergency of man's mortal estate (comp. the opening of the Bhagavat Purana). Its sublimest thought is a method of escape from the necessity of repeated births, but even this it fails to elaborate. With our eye upon the balance in which Krishnaism is weighed, the confession of Porphyry still presses painfully upon us that "there was wanting some universal method of delivering men's souls which no sect of philosophy had ever yet found out" (Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. x, ch. xxxii). See INCARNATION, vol. iv, p. 530.

III. *The Worship of Krishna.*—The worship of this divinity is so blended with that of Vishnu and Rama, another of the incarnations of Vishnu, that it is difficult to treat of the one without trenching on that of the others. These are all generally considered under the denomination *Vaishnavas*, or worshippers of Vishnu, who are usually distinguished into four *Sampradáyas*, or sects, designated in the Padma Purana as Sri, Madhwi, Rudra, and Sanaka (comp. Wilson, *Relig. of Hindus*, i, 34). The worshippers of Krishna have been subdivided into, 1. those who worship him alone; 2. those who worship his mistress Radha alone; and, 3. those who worship both conjointly (see Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 1093). According to H. H. Wilson, throughout India the opulent and luxurious among the men, and by far the greater portion of the women, attach themselves to the worship of Krishna and Radha either singly or together. In Bengal the worshippers of Krishna constitute from one fifth to one third of the entire population (Ward, *On the Hindus*, ii, 175, 448). The temples and establishments devoted to this divinity are numerous all over India, particularly at Mathura and Brindavan, the latter of which is said to contain many hundreds, among them three of great opulence (Wilson, *ut supra*, i, 135). For the controversy on the extent of Krishna worship, see Wilson's *Vishnu Purâna*, vol. v, Appendix.

We shall have to content ourselves with glancing at some of the more notable sects or Sampradayas. The Rudra Sampradayis or Vallabhacharis adore Krishna as an infant. This form of worship is widely diffused among all ranks of Hindu society. In their temples and houses are images, not unfrequently of gold, in the form of a chubby boy of a dark hue, and with a mischievous face, in some cases holding butter in both hands, by which is perpetuated one of his boyish pranks (Paullinus, *Systema Brahmanicum*, p. 146, and plate 15). This image eight times a day receives the homage of its votaries with most punctilious ceremony. At the first ceremony, being washed and dressed, it is taken from its couch, where it has slept for the night, and placed upon a seat, about half an hour after sunrise. Lamps are kept burning, while refreshments are presented, with betel and *Pan* (see Wilson, *Relig. of Hindus*, i, 126–128). The Sanakadi, who are scattered throughout the whole of Upper India, the Sakhi Bhavas, the Raddha Vallabhis, and the Charan Dasis differ in minor particulars of creed and ritualism, but all worship Radha in union with Krishna. The Chaitanyas are schismatics. They believe in the incarnation of Krishna in Chaitanya their teacher, who on this account is elevated to joint adoration. With them the momentary repetition of the name of their divinity is a guarantee of salvation.

Festivals in commemoration of Krishna are annually observed throughout India, and still maintain a most powerful hold of the popular heart. The third day of the Uttarayana, a festival held about the middle of January, is sacred to Krishna as gopala or cowherd. In the afternoon the cows and bulls are washed and fed with sacred food, then decorated with chaplets of flowers. Thereupon the Hindus, with joined hands, walk around the herds as well as around the Brahmans, and prostrate themselves before them (Wilson, *ibid*, ii, 171). The Holi festival is observed about the middle of March. It may be not improperly described as an older and more crazy sister of our April Fools' Day, and is mostly devoted to Krishna. His image enjoys a swing several times during the day, is besmeared with red powder, and dashed with water colored red. In the mean time unbounded license reigns through the streets. "It would be impossible to describe the depths of wickedness resorted to in celebration of the licentious intrigues of this popular god" (Trevor's *India*, p. 97). The festival of Jaggernaut ("Lord of the world"), in whose magnificent temple a bone of Krishna is most sacredly preserved, commemorates the departure of Krishna from his native land. See JAGGERNAUT. This also takes place in the month of March. Those who are so highly favored as to assist in the drawing of his car are sure of going to the heaven of Krishna when they die (see Gangooly, in Clark's *Ten Great Religions*, p. 134; Dubois, *Manners and Customs of India*, p. 418). The nativity of Krishna is celebrated on the eighth day of August. This is the most popular of all the festivals at Benares. The Rasa Yatra falls on the full moon in October, and perpetuates the dance of the frolicsome deity with the 16,000 gopis. Though it is universally observed in Hindostan, the details are such that it will not be seemly to treat either of the occasion or the observance of this festival (see Holwell's *Indian Festivals*, pt. ii, p. 132; Maurice, *Indian Antiquities*, v, 159).

The Hindu sects are distinguished from each other by various fantastical streaks, in different colors, upon their faces, breasts, and arms. The followers of Krishna bear upon their forehead two white marks perpendicular to the eyebrows, between which a red spot is perceptible, in token, says Vollmer, that Krishna bore a sun upon his brow (*Wörterb. d. Mythol.* p. 1093; also Wilson's *Rel. of Hind.* i, 41; Dubois, *Manners of India*, ch. viii, and p. 214; Trevor's *India*, p. 101).

Unquestionably the influence of the worship of this divinity upon the morals of the people is evil. On the one hand, it embraces the hideous barbarity of Jaggernaut; and, on the other, excepting a festival of Siva, it is responsible for the most licentious of all the annual feasts (comp. *Dabistan*, i, 183). Entire dependence upon Krishna, or any other form of this heathen deity, says H. H. Wilson, not only obviates the necessity of virtue, but sanctifies vice. Conduct is wholly immaterial. It matters not how atrocious a sinner a man may be if he paints his face, his breast, his arms with certain secta-

rial marks; or, what is better, if he brands them permanently upon his skin with a hot iron stamp; if he is constantly chanting hymns in honor of Vishnu; or, what is equally efficacious, if he spends hours in the simple reiteration of his name or names; if he die with the word Hari, Rama, or Krishna on his lips, and one thought of him in his mind, he may have lived a monster of iniquity, but he is certain of heaven (Wilson, *Relig. of Hindus*, ii, 75; see also i, 161). On the subject of the sects and worship of Krishna, consult *Asiatic Researches*, xvi, 1, and xvii, 169; *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ix, 60–110; H. H. Wilson, *Select Works*, vol. i, ii, passim; *Penny Cyclop.* xxvi, 389.

IV. *Resemblances between Krishnaism and Revealed Religion.* — Efforts have been made in the interest of scepticism to establish a philological similarity between the words Krishna and Christ. Such speculations belong to a past rather than to the present age, as it is now conceded by philologists that the two words have nothing in common. The curious are referred to Hickson's *Time and Faith*, ii, 377; Volney's *Ruins*, p. 165 (Am. ed. 1828); and for refutation to Maurice, *Hindostan*, ii, 268–271. The readiness with which the sceptical mind of our own age seizes upon and magnifies even fancied resemblances is evinced by Inman, who in his first volume (*Ancient Faith*, p. 402) gives an engraving of Krishna strikingly like those attributed to Christ, but which in the second volume, on farther acquaintance with the subject, he admits to be "of European and not of Indian origin, and consequently that it is worthless as illustrating the life of Krishna" (p. xxxii).

There are correspondences, however, some of which have already appeared in the summary of the life of Krishna, that deserve more than a passing notice. It is sufficient to adduce the more striking ones, without their correlatives in the Bible, as these will readily occur to the reader. These are as follows: that he was miraculously born at midnight of a human mother, and saluted by a chorus of Dévatas; that he was cradled among cowherds, during which period of life he was persecuted by the giant Kansa, and saved by his mother's flight; the miracles with which his life abounds, among which were the raising of the dead and the cleansing of the leprous, perhaps the only ones which particularly resembled those of Christ, for the rest were either puerile or monstrous; his contests with serpents, which he crushed with his foot; his descent to the regions of the dead, and his final ascent to the paradise Goloka (comp. Kleuker, *Abhandlung d. Kalk. Gesellsch.* i, 235; Stirm, *Apologie des Christenthums*, p. 181, 2d ed.)

1. The consideration of the interesting questions involved in these correspondences will be facilitated by bearing in mind that India, from the earliest recorded period, had sustained intimate mercantile relations with Shemitic races. "Before merchants sailed from India to Egypt, and from Egypt to India" (that is, as the context shows, *before* the period of the Ptolemies), "Arabia Felix was the staple (mart) both for Egyptian and Indian goods, much as Alexandria is now for the commodities of Egypt and foreign merchandise" (Arrian, *Peripl. Mar. Erythr.* in Heeren's *African Researches*, p. 228). "If," says Heeren, "the explicit testimony here brought forward proves a commercial intercourse between India and Arabia, it proves at the same time its high antiquity, and that it must have been in active operation for many centuries" (*ibid*, p. 229). A caravan trade also extended from India to Meroë, in Ethiopia, which was its grand emporium (*ibid*, p. 211). Taking its rise beyond the horizon of history, it was yet in its zenith during the times of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel (see also Vincent's *Periplus*, p. 57, etc.). It could not be otherwise than that there should have been an interchange of religious knowledge as well as an exchange of wares; for commerce was promoted by religion, and, to a great extent, controlled by the priesthood; even its temples were stations and marts for caravans (see further, Heeren, *ibid*, p. 219, 225, 232). The striking resemblance existing between the Egyptian and Hindu mythologies, which has been unfolded by many writers, illustrates the fact of an interchange of religious light; and that these extremes of the known world should thus have met remarkably confirms the views of Heeren just adduced (see further, Prichard, *Egyptian Mythology*, p. 227–301; Maurice, *Indian Antiquities*, iii, 56–124; Bunsen, *God in History*, bk. iii, ch. ii). The annexed figures

Krishna trampling upon the Serpent.

were copied by Sonnerat from sculptures in one of the oldest of the Hindu pagodas. No Vishnuite of distinction, Sonnerat tells us, is without these images in his house, either of gold, silver, or copper (see also Prichard's *Egypt. Myth.* p. 261). For a glowing description of Krishna's person, see the Purána in Maurice, *Hindost.* ii, 363.

2. On the supposition of the oneness of our race there is no reason to exclude the Hindu from an original participation in the patriarchal knowledge of the promised Redeemer, as transmitted by Noah and his family. Suetonius (*Vespas.* iv) and Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 4, 13) unite in the thought of "an ancient and permanent belief having spread itself over the whole East" to this effect. (See farther Gray's *Connection*, i, chap. xxv; Hengstenberg, *Christology*, iv, Appendix ii; Tholuck, *Lehre v. d. Sünde*, p. 220–229; Stolberg's *Religions Geschichte* i, Beilage iv; Faber's *Proph. Diss.* i, 57–114; Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ*, i, ch. iii.) All Hindu traditions connected with the origin of their religion and their people point but one way, and that to the recognised birthplace of our race — the lofty watershed from which in every direction human faiths and mythologies have flowed forth. (See Max Müller on the relations of the Veda and Zend-Avesta, *Chips*, i, 81–86.) Though these traditions in themselves may be as inconsequential as falling stars, still they reflect a light kindred with that which shines forth from fixed stars in the firmament of true faith. Krishna, as seen in the monuments of the Hindu, stands a striking exponent of primeval traditions, that, having sprung from the promise of the Garden, have more or less modified most distant and varied mythologies. He is a crude though not inartistic painting of a hope preserved to us in the Word of God, but otherwise hopelessly lost. He is one of a brotherhood that embraces an Apollo triumphant over the python; a Hercules, burying the immortal and burning out the mortal heads

of the hydra; a Sigurd, a descendant of Odin, slaying the serpent Fáfnir, and rescuing priceless treasure; a Thor, styled "the eldest of the sons of God," who, in his contest with the serpent, though brought upon his knee, yet bruised his enemy's head with the mace and finally slew him; an Oshanderbeghâ, predicted by Zoroaster, who contends twenty long years with a malignant dæmon, whom he eventually conquers; and even the less renowned Algonquin conqueror Michabo, destroying with his dart the shining prince of serpents who flooded the earth with the waters of a lake. For other instances, consult the authorities referred to immediately above, and Brinton's *Myths of the New World*, p. 116, with his

Serpent biting Krishna's heel.

interpretations. On the other hand, Major Moor states that among a numerous collection of pictures and images of Krishna he had not one original in which the serpent is represented as biting Krishna's foot (*Hindu Pantheon*). For an account of this, see above.

3. It is not to be questioned that India was a field of evangelical effort not long after the death of Christ, which, taken in connection with the generally accepted view that Krishnaism is of comparatively recent origin, suggests that its more palpable features of resemblance have been more or less directly derived from the Scriptures themselves. If doubt be cast upon the extent of country comprehended under the term India in this connection, it is to be borne in mind that those parts of the world which are supposed by some to be confounded with India proper maintained by trade thus early a lively intercourse with India, and could thus furnish a channel for the propagation of Christianity throughout the field where Krishnaism subsequently prevailed.

According to Eusebius, "Pantaenus was constituted a herald of the Gospel of Christ to the nations of the East, and advanced even as far as India." He found himself anticipated by some who were acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew, to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, had preached, leaving with them the same Gospel in Hebrew which was preserved until his time (*Eccles. Hist.* bk. v, ch. x; see Jerome, *Catal. Script.* cap. xxxvi; and for comparison of their views consult Mosheim, *Commentaries*, cent. ii, sec. ii, note 1; see also Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Clark's ed., i, 112). Tradition tells us that St. Thomas preached to the Indians, which is confirmed by Gregory of Nazianzum. Jerome, however, makes the field of labor to have been Ethiopia. There seems to be little doubt that copies both of the apocryphal and of the genuine Gospels circulated early through portions of Southern India. Silly miracles, resembling those of the former almost to the letter, have been incorporated into the sacred writings of Krishnaism. Theophilus, surnamed Indicus, visited India as a missionary in the time of Constantine, and found Christianity already planted and flourishing, though isolated from Christianity at large. Both Bardesanes and Mani, heresiarchs of the early Church, in their travels came into close and prolonged contact with Buddhism, from which they drew much of the virus that they strove to infuse into Christian belief. The former of them certainly visited India as early as the latter part of the 2d century (see Kurtz, *Hist. of Ch.* p. 109, sec. 50; Neander, ii, 198). Weber and Lassen agree in this respect in their interpretation of a passage of the Mahabharata, that at an early period in the history of the Church three Brahmans visited some community of Christians either in Alexandria, Asia Minor, or Parthia, and that on their return they "were enabled to introduce improvements into the hereditary creed, and more especially to make the worship of Krishna the most prominent feature of their system." See farther Hardwick, *Christ*, i, 246–258, 284–293; Carwithen, *Brahminical Religion*, p. 98–104, 320–322; Faber's *Prophetical Dissertation*, i, 64; *Origin of Pagan Idol.* bk. vi, chap. vi; *Treatise on three Dispensations*, bk. i, chap. vi; Wuttke, *Geschichte des Heidenthums*, ii, 339; also authorities referred to by Hardwick, *l. c.* See India, Modern.

4. It was the fashion early in the present century to search out astronomical allusions in Krishna, and resemblances to Apollo, the mythological counterpart to the sun, but these have given place to sounder criticism. Recent researches favor the view that no great antiquity is to be attributed to Krishna as an object of religious regard. That some one bearing that name may have figured as a local hero in the early history of India, and even as far back as the period preceding the war of the Mahabharata, is not improbable (comp. Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, ii, 65, 66). The allusions on classical pages serve to justify such a conclusion.

5. But it is important to remember that Krishnaism nowhere appears in the Vedas, the most ancient scriptures of the Hindu. "Krishna worship is the most modern of all the philosophical and religious systems which have divided India into rival sects. Founded upon the theory of successive incarnations which neither the Vedas nor the legislators of the first Brahmanical epoch admitted, Krishnaism differs in so many points from the faiths peculiar to India that we are tempted to regard it as borrowed from foreign philosophies and religions" (M. Pavie, *Bhagavat Dasan Askund*, Pref. p. xi; in like manner Lassen, *Indische Alterthumsk.* i, 488; ii, 1107; Prichard, *Egypt. Mythology*, p. 259, with citations from Colebrooke; Max Müller, *Chips*, ii, 75, Amer. edit.; *Asiatic Researches*, viii, 494). "It is believed," says H. H. Wilson cautiously, that Rama and Krishna "are unnoticed in authentic passages of the Sanhita or collected prayers, and there is no mention of the latter as Govinda or Gopala, the infant cowherd, or as the uncouth and anomalous Jaggernaut. They are mentioned in some of the Upanishads, supplementary treatises of the Vedas, but these compositions are evidently, from their style, of later date than the Vedas, and some of them, especially those referring to Rama and Krishna, are of very questionable authenticity" (*ibid*, ii, 65). Compare Wilson's *Transl. of the Rig Veda Sanhita*, i, 260, 313, 315; ii, 35, note b; iii, 148, note 7.

At the time of its first translation into English by Wilkins, an immense antiquity was claimed for the Bhagavat Gita (see above, sec. i), but this is now generally admitted to be an interpolation in the Mahabharata, and

to have been produced subsequently to the rise not only of Christianity, but of Krishnaism itself. Lassen accords it a place in the later history of Hindu religions, when "the Vishnuites broke up into sects and sought to bring their religious dogmas into harmony with the theories of philosophy" (*Indische Alt.* ii, 494; Hardwick, i, 241).

As to the Puránas, which are almost the sole authorities for those events in the life of Krishna (exclusive of his victorious contest with the serpent) that most resemble the life of Christ, they are, in their present form, unquestionably of modern origin. They abound in legends that may properly be regarded as *purana* (ancient), but bear upon their face sectarian marks, which betray both their animus and their age. They are eighteen in number, and some of them are voluminous. The Puránas themselves in many cases ascribe their authorship to others than Vyása, "and they offer many internal proofs that they are the work of various hands and of different dates, none of which are of very high antiquity. I believe the oldest of them not to be anterior to the 8th or 9th century, and the most recent to be not above three or four centuries old. . . . The determination of their modern and unauthenticated composition deprives them of the sacred character which they have usurped, destroys their credit, impairs their influence, and strikes away the main prop on which at present the great mass of Hindu idolatry and superstition relies" (H. H. Wilson, *Relig. of the Hindus*, ii, 68). There is but little doubt that the Brahmans are right in referring the authorship of the Bhagavata, the most popular of the Puránas (from which we have quoted so freely in the summary of Krishna's life), to Vopadeva, who flourished in the 12th century (*ibid*, p. 69; see also preface to Wilson's *Vishnu Purana*). Bentley (*View of Ancient Astronomy*, i, bk. ii, chap. ii) informs us that he obtained access to the Janampatra, or horoscope of Krishna, and was enabled to discover from it that he is reputed to have been born on the 23d of the moon of Sravana, in the lunar mansion Rohini, at midnight, the positions of the sun, and moon, and five planets being at the same time assigned; from which he deduced the date of the pretended nativity to be Aug. 7, A.D. 600. In Mr. Bentley's opinion, perhaps a fanciful one, Krishna himself was one of the Hindu personifications of time, which view he supports by Krishna's own declaration, "I am time, the destroyer of mankind matured, come hither to seize at once on all these who stand before us." See farther, on the astronomical view, Greswell's *Fasti Catholici*, iv, 88; Cardinal Wiseman's *Lect.* ii, 1–28; Tomkins's *Hulsean Prize Lectures*, p. 35–41; W. A. Butler's *Ancient Philos.* i, 247.

From considerations like these, not to speak of others that might be urged, we are led to conclude that Krishnaism proper was post-Christian, an outcropping of human and possibly of diabolic nature, that was illustrated at the foot of Sinai, but which no more resembled its divine original than the *lifeless* golden calf resembled the living Apis of Egypt. As in the pitiable blur of a palimpsest, Krishnaism has replaced or obscured that which was more precious—the religion of Christ, founded no less in impregnable truth than in the undying necessities of men. For at the rise of this false religion it is plain to us that the light of Christianity was reflected already on the sky of India—light that was sadly perverted to set forth a feeble caricature of the incarnation and life of Christ.

6. As the tenor of our argument has indicated, the criticism of the present age is disposed to assign a recent origin to Krishnaism, though, at the same time, it does not ignore the existence of a hero bearing the name of Krishna conspicuous in the early and fabulous history of India. It may be of interest to the reader to have presented somewhat more in detail the views of some of the scholars of the present century, conflicting and confused though they be, upon the general subject of the relations of Krishnaism to Christianity as well as profane religions. Archdeacon Hardwick thinks that the resemblances are no greater than the outward and fortuitous resemblances between other heathen deities, or between some of them and Christ. He illustrates by the incident of the persecution of Hercules in his infancy by Juno; the dancing of the milkmaids and satyrs of Bacchus, which compares with that of Krishna; the concealing of Apollo in the household of Admetus. He says further, "If Krishna is to be regarded as a purely human and historical hero, doomed to death in childhood from forebodings that his life would prove the ruin of another, we can find his parallel in the elder Cyrus, who had also been intrusted to the care of herdsmen to preserve him from the vengeance of his royal grandfather, whose death it was foretold he should ultimately accomplish" (i, 285, 286). Colonel Wilford supposes Krishna to have lived about B.C. 1300. Sir William Jones says the story of his birth is long anterior to the birth of Christ, and traces it probably to the time of Homer. He thinks it likely that the spurious gospels of the early age of Christianity were brought to India, and the wildest parts of them repeated to the Hindus, who ingrafted them on the old fable of Kesava, the Apollo of India (*Asiatic Researches*, i, 274). Mr. Bentley (*Hindu Astronomy*), in contradiction to Mr. H. Colebrooke, Sir William Jones, major Moor, and others, boldly charges the whole history of the incarnation of Krishna as a "modern invention" and "fabrication" of the Brahmans, who, alarmed at the progress of Christianity, invented a story not unlike that of Christ, and affixed a name somewhat similar to the hero of it; all of which they threw back to a very remote age, that it might be impossible successfully to contradict it, and then represented that Christ and Krishna were the same person, of whose history the Christians had an incorrect version. Mr. J. C. Thompson thinks that Krishna antedates the Brahmanical triad—Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva—and that his great exploits occasioned him later in Aryan history to be identified with Vishnu (p. 134). Lassen, an eminent Oriental scholar, refers the origin of the system of avatars, as disclosed in Vishnu, to a period of time at least three centuries before Christ; while Weber, equally distinguished as a critic, controverts his views, and argues that Krishna, the hero or demigod, was no incarnation, and differed vastly from the Krishna of later times. (See farther Hardwick, *ibid*, i, 288, note.)

V. *Literature.*—The "*Mahabharata*," translated into French by Fauche (Paris, 1863), book x, which is appropriated to the life of Krishna; the "*Bhagavad Gita*," episode of the preceding (Wilkins's, 1785, and Thomson's, 1855, transl. into English, and Wm. Schlegel's translation into Latin, 1823); the "*Vishnu Purána*" (translated by H. H. Wilson, 1842 and 1866, 6 vols.); the "*Bhagavata Purána*" (translated into French by Burnouf, Paris, 1840); the "*Hari Vansa*" (transl. into French by Langlois, Paris, 1842); "Analysis of the Agni Purana," in the *Journ. of As. Soc. of Bengal*, i, 81; "Analysis of the Brahma Vaivartha Purána," *ibid*, p. 217; also *Asiatic Researches*, passim, especially vol. xv and xvi; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 246–258, 277–293—a valuable and easily accessible resumé of the whole subject; H. H. Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, vol. ii, passim; Hoefer, *Biographie Générale*, art. Crichnie; J. D. Guigniaut, *Religions de l'Antiquité*, vol. i, bk. i, ch. iii; P. F. Stuhr, *Religions systeme der heidnischen Völker des Orients* (Berlin, 1836–38, 2 vols. 8vo); M. Pavie, *Bhagavat Dasam Askand* (Paris, 1852); W. von Humboldt, *Ueber die unter dem Namen Bhagavad Gita bekannte Episode des Mahabharata* (Berlin, 1826); A. Remusat, *Mélanges Asiatiques* (Paris, 1825–1829, 4 vols.); P. von Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien* (2 vols., 1830–31); Christ. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde* (4 vols., 1844–46, chiefly vol. ii); A. F. Weber, *Indischen Studien* (10 vols., 1849–67, especially the two first vols.); *Indische Skitzzen* (Berlin, 1857), particularly the essay *Die Verbindungen Indiens mit den Ländern im Westen;* Coleman, *Mythol-*

ogy of the Hindus (1832), art. Krishna; Edward Moor, *Hindu Pantheon* (1810); H. T. Colebrooke, *Religion of the Hindus* (London, 1858); Wm. Ward, *Account of the Writings, Religion, etc., of the Hindus* (4 vols., 1817–20); G. Haslam, *The Cross and the Serpent* (London, 1849); G. W. F. Hegel, in the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* (Berlin, 1827); J. A. Dorner, *Lehre von d. Person Christi* (Stuttgardt, 1845), i, 7 sq.; Theo. Benfey, *Indien*, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyklop.*, sec. ii, vol. 17 (Leipsic, 1840); *Biographie Universelle* (*Partie Mythologique*, supplement, ii, 545–550); K. F. Stäudlin, *Magazin*, iii, 2, 99 sq.; Muir, *Original Sanscrit Extracts* (5 vols., 1858–1870), vols. i and iv. See Vishnu. (J. K. B.)

Krochmal, Nachman ben-Shalmon, one of the most celebrated Jewish scholars of modern date, was born in Brody Feb. 18, 1780. An erudite critic and eminent Hebraist, he was the first among the Jews who, with a rare sagacity and independence of mind, investigated the Hebrew Scriptures, in order to ascertain the origin, unity, and date of each book, as well as to characterize its peculiarity of style and language, irrespective of the fixed traditional opinions held alike by the synagogue and the Church about the authors and ages of the respective canonical volumes (comp. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, iii, 343). Krochmal, however, on account of feeble health and other infirmities of the flesh, published but little in his lifetime. In many respects he may be likened to the great Jewish philosopher of the 19th century (Mendelsohn), for, like him, he suffered from impaired health, and, like him, he struggled for an education after he had entered the mercantile profession. He also gave much of his time and attention to philosophy, and, as the fruits of his investigations, left in MS. a work entitled *More Neboche Ha-Seman*, a treasury of criticisms on Jewish philosophy, Biblical literature, and sacred antiquities, which the learned Dr. Leopold Zunz edited and published at Lemburg in 1851. Compare also Zunz on Krochmal, in *Jahrb. für Israeliten* (1845). Krochmal was an intimate associate of the late Jewish savant Rapoport (q. v.), and is said to have exerted considerable influence over the latter. He died at Tarnopol July 31, 1840. His works, which appeared in the Hebrew annual called *Kerem Chemed* (vol. v, Prag. 1841, p. 51 sq.), are, on *The Sacred Antiquities and their Import* (קדמוניות קדש והבניתך): 1. On the age of the comforting promises in the second part of Isaiah, chap. xl–xlvi, in which he tries to demonstrate the late date of this part of the volume, and to show that Aben-Ezra was of the same opinion, only that he veiled it in enigmatical language. See Aben-Ezra. 2. On the date and composition of Ezra and Chronicles, with an investigation of the ancient statement on this subject contained in the Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, 14, *b*, which is very important. He tries to trace and analyze the different parts of which these books are composed, and to show that they extend to the destruction of the Persian empire. 3. On the date and composition of Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, Daniel, and Esther, with an examination of the ancient statement on this subject contained in the same passage of the Talmud, which is still more important, inasmuch as Krochmal shows here what is meant by *the Great Synagogue*, and tries to demonstrate that some portions of the Minor Prophets belong to the period of the Greek empire. 4. On the origin and date of Ecclesiastes, in which he insists that it is the latest composition in the canon. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* ii, s. v.

Kromayer, Jerome, a German Protestant divine, nephew of the succeeding, was born at Zeitz in 1610, and was educated at Leipzic, Wittenberg, and Jena. He was appointed professor at Leipzig in 1643, and in 1657 regular or ordinary professsor of divinity. In 1660 he became minister at Zeitz, and in 1661 at Meissen. He died in 1670. He wrote largely; the most important of his works are: *Commentaria in Epist. ad Galatas*:—*Comment. in Apocalypsin*:—*Historiæ Eccles. Centuriæ XVI*:—*Theologia Positivo-Polemica*:—*Loci Antisyncretistici*:—*Polymathia Theologica*:—some controversial tracts, dissertations, etc.—Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* vi, 501.

Kromayer, John, a German theologian, was born at Dobelen, in Misnia, in 1576, and was educated at the University of Leipzic. In 1600 he was made deacon, and some time after was appointed pastor at Eisleben, and later pastor at Weimar. He died in 1643, after having a short time previously been honored with the general superintendency of the churches of the duchy of Weimar. John Kromayer wrote *Harmonia Evangelistarum*:—*Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Compendium*:—*Specimen fontium Scripturæ Sacræ apertorum*, etc.:—*Examen Libri Christianæ Concordiæ*:—a *Paraphrase on the Prophecy and Lamentations of Jeremiah*: this is held in high estimation, and is in the Bible of Weimar:—*Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the Year* (4to); and *Sermons*.—Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* vi, 502.

Krotos (κρότος), a word used to signify approbation of a public speaker. It means literally a *beating, striking, knocking*, as of the hands, together; and hence it was used to signify consent and approbation, either by words or actions. Public applauses and acclamations appear to have been common in the early Church.—Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* See Acclamations.

Krüdener, Barbara Juliana von, a religious visionary and enthusiast, was a granddaughter of the Russian field-marshal Von Münich, and daughter of the states councillor baron Von Wietinghoff, and was born at Riga in 1764 according to some authorities, or in 1766 according to others. In 1782 she married baron Von Krüdener, the Russian ambassador at Venice, and a great admirer of the French philosopher Rousseau. But, unfortunately, the baron, who had been twice married before, succeeded much better in making his wife an ardent disciple of the philosophical principles which he himself espoused than in winning her affections for himself, and after the birth of a son and a daughter the husband and wife separated, the latter to take up her residence at Paris. Here, in the vortex of dissipation, her better feelings would sometimes assert themselves, but they were smothered by the adulations of all the brilliant personages who surrounded her, among whom figured conspicuously Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël. In imitation of the latter she gave the world her biography, in the shape of a sickly sentimental novel entitled *Valérie*, describing an immoral relation concealed beneath the fragrant veil of romance, and redolent with a religious Romish and fanatical sentimentalism. The work is said to have been written with the assistance of St. Martin, and created quite a sensation, meeting with great success, especially in the higher circles of society. After many adventures, Madame von Krüdener came to reside at Berlin, where she enjoyed the close intimacy of that noble woman queen Louisa, of whose projects she was the confidante and sharer in the stormy period of Prussia's warfare with France. In 1808 she became acquainted with Jung Stilling and Oberlin, and thereafter we find her devoted to religious mysticism in its most aggravated forms. She bought a place for the mystics at Börmingheim, in Würtemberg, and did all in her power to promote their interests. Unfortunately, however, the disorders occasioned by the seeress Kumrin, and by pastor Fantaine, whom she protected, were visited upon her head, and she was exiled by king Frederick. She now retired to Baden, and then went to Strasburg, and finally to Switzerland. Wherever she went she attracted attention, both by her political predictions and by the preaching of her peculiar doctrines, heralding a new religious æra, that of unity in the Church—"the period when there should be *one* flock and *one* shepherd." At Geneva especially she created quite a stir in religious circles, and among the clergy of distinction whom she won to her views may be

mentioned pastor Empaytaz, the eventual head of the *Momiers* (q. v.). With the assistance of men of talent and education of Empaytaz's stamp she formed "prayer unions," and urged the community to a more vital Christian living, and the liberal use of property for the good of the poor. The fulfilment of her predictions of the fall of Napoleon, his return from Elba, and the final crisis at Waterloo, aided her cause, and emboldened her to the assertion that she enjoyed the favor of God in a special degree. Among her most ardent followers at this time she counted no less a personage than the Russian emperor Alexander, who, with the Bible in his hand, was her frequent guest; and it is known that her influence over Alexander brought about the Holy Alliance. Her love of humanity, however, and her gigantic schemes for its moral and social elevation, often led her to overstep the bounds of prudence and propriety, and made her appear a dangerous character in the eyes of persons of authority, so that she gradually lost the favor of men of political prominence. She was obliged to quit France and other countries successively, and even lost the friendship of the emperor Alexander, as is evinced by the treatment she received in Russia when she was called thither in consequence of the sickness of her daughter. She was not only refused admittance to the emperor, but when afterwards she advocated the cause of the independence of Greece, and pointed to the Russian emperor as the instrument selected by God for the accomplishment of this great work, she was requested to refrain and to leave St. Petersburg. Under the influence of the Moravians her life and habits had been changed after she quitted Paris, and she had often dreamed of founding a great correctional establishment for the reformation of criminals and persons of evil life. Now driven from St. Petersburg, and the attack of a cutaneous disease necessitating her residence in the south, she started in 1824 with the design of founding such an institution, and of establishing a German and Swiss colony on the other side of the Volga. On the way, however, death overtook her at Kara-su-bazar, Dec. 13, 1824. The life thus suddenly brought to a close has been variously commented upon. In her day "passion oscillated in the public judgment beween favor and hostility to her," but now, when nearly half a century has passed, and it is easy in deliberation to pass judgment upon her life and acts, she is generally spoken of favorably, and her endeavors to inspire the people with religious zeal, and a feeling of love for each other as a common brotherhood, are recognised. Says Hagenbach (*Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries* [transl. by Dr. J. F. Hurst], ii, 413 sq.), "It is a remarkable phenomenon, that a woman trained in the dwellings of vanity, and humbled by her sins and errors, had such a spirit of self-denial as to minister on a wooden bench to the poor and suffering, to seek out criminals in prison, and to present to them the consolations of the Cross; to open the eyes of the wise men of this world to the deepest mysteries of divine love, and to say to the kings of the world that everything avails nothing without the King of kings, who, as the Crucified, was a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. She was derided, defamed, persecuted, driven from one country to another, and yet never grew weary of preaching repentance in the deserts of civilization, and of proclaiming the salvation of believers and the misery of unbelievers. . . . Wherever she set her foot, great multitudes of people physically and spiritually hungry, of sufferers of every class, and persons without regard to confession, surrounded her, and received from her food—yea, wonderful food. The woes which she pronounced on the impenitent awakened in many an oppressed and troubled spirit, a feeling of joy at misfortune, while many a genial word of love fell into good ground." Besides the novel already mentioned, she wrote *Le Camp des Vertus* (Paris, 1815). Many curious details of her conversations and opinions are preserved in Krug's *Conversationen mit Frau v. Krüdener* (Leipz. 1818). See also C. Maurer, *Bilder aus d. Leben eines Predigers* (Schaffhausen, 1843); *Berl. Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben* (1857, No. 5); *Zeitgenossen* (Leipz. 1838), iii; Adèle du Thou, *Notice sur Mme. Julienne de Krüdener* (Geneva, 1827, 8vo); Mahul, *Annuaire Nécrologique*, anno 1825; Eynard, *Vie de Mme. de Krüdener* (Paris, 1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Ziethe, *Jul. v. Krüdener* (1864); Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht* (1869), iv, 537; Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits de Femmes; Derniers Portraits Littéraires*, etc.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 112; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 234. (J. H. W.)

Krug, John Andrew, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers who immigrated to this country, was born March 19, 1732. He was highly educated, and was for a time preceptor in the Orphan House at Halle. He came to the United States in 1763, commissioned by Dr. Francke, who considered him well fitted for missionary work. He labored first at Reading, Penn., and among the people of the surrounding country, wholly devoted to his duties, and greatly beloved by the community. In 1771, in accordance with the wishes of his brethren, he relinquished this field of labor, and assumed the pastoral care of the Lutheran Church in Frederick, Md. Here he continued till his death, which occurred March 30, 1796. (M. L. S.)

Krug, Wilhelm Traugott, a distinguished German philosopher and writer, was born at Radis, near Gräfenhainchen, Prussia, June 22, 1770. He studied at the school of Pforta and the University of Wittenberg, where he was appointed adjunct professor in 1794. In the year following he published *Ueber die Perfectibilität der geoffenbarten Religion* (Jena and Lpz. 1795, 8vo), a work which was so rationalistic in character that it barred his way for further promotion. In 1801 he became professor of philosophy in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and here he wrote his principal work, *Fundamentalphilosophie* (Züllichau and Freistadt, 1803; 3d ed. Lpz. 1827), which became very popular throughout Germany. Guided by Kant's criticism, Krug professed a system which, under the name of "transcendental synthetism," aimed to reconcile idealism and realism. "According to Krug, the act of philosophizing is thought entering into itself, to know and understand itself, and by this means to be at peace with itself. The following are his principal points: 1. In relation with the starting-point, or first principle of knowledge: the *Ego* is the real principle, inasmuch as it takes itself as the object of its knowledge (the philosophizing subject). It is from it that proceed, as from an active principle, the *ideal principles*, which are essentially different from the real principles, or, in other words, the material and formal principles of philosophical knowledge. The material principles are the facts of consciousness grasped in conceptions, which are all comprehended in the proposition, *I am an agent*. The formal principles (determining the form of knowledge) are the laws of my activity; they are as multifarious as activity itself: the first of these laws is, *Seek for harmony in thy activity*. 2. How far ought these researches to be carried (the absolute limit of philosophy)? The consciousness is a synthesis of being, or *Esse*, and knowing, or *Science* (*das Seyn und das Wissen*), in the *Ego*. Every consciousness is thus circumstanced, which implies that being and knowing are united in us *à priori*. This transcendental synthesis is therefore the original and inappreciable fact which forms the absolute limit of philosophizing. Since being and knowing (*Seyn und Wissen*), united together in the consciousness, cannot be deduced the one from the other, their union is completely primitive. 3. What are the different forms of activity? The primitive activity of the *Ego* is either immanent (speculative) or transitory (practical). Sensibility, intelligence, and reason are its different potencies. Philosophy, regarded as the science of the primitive legislation of the human mind in all its activity, is therefore divided into a speculative part and a practical part. The first part is subdivided into formal doctrine (logic) and material

doctrine (metaphysics and æsthetics), inasmuch as the one regards the matter of thought *per se*, and the other (æsthetics) considers it in relation with sentiment. The latter part is likewise subdivided into formal doctrine (the science of right and law) and material doctrine (morals and religion). Each of these considers the legislation of the human mind under a different aspect" (Tenneman, *Manual of Philos.* § 421). After the death of Kant, Krug was called to Königsberg to succeed his great master as professor of logic and metaphysics. He subsequently filled also Kraus's place as professor of practical philosophy. In 1809 he became professor of philosophy at Leipzic, a position which he retained until 1831, when he was pensioned. He died at Leipzic Jan. 13, 1842. Krug's other works are *Versuch einer systematischen Encyklopädie d. Wissenschaften* (Wittenb. 1796–97, 2 vols.; 3d vol. Lpz. 1804):—*Ueber d. Verhältniss d. kritischen Philosophie z. moralischen, politischen, u. religiösen Cultur d. Menschen* (Jena, 1798):—*Versuch einer systematischen Encyklopädie d. schönen Künste* (Lpzc. 1802):—*Philosophie d. Ehe* (Lpzc. 1800):—*Briefe über d. neusten Idealismus* (Lpzc. 1801):—*Entwurf eines neuen Organon d. Philosophie* (Meiss. and Lübben, 1801):—*System d. theoretischen Philosophie* (Königsb. 1806–10; four eds. since):—*Gesch. d. Philosophie alter Zeit* (Lpz. 1815, 1826):—*System d. praktischen Philosophie* (Königsb. 1817–19, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1830–38):—*Handbuch d. Philosophie u. philosophischen Literatur* (Lpzc. 1820–21, 2 vols.; 3d ed. 1829):—*Versuch einer neuen Theorie d. Gefühle u. d. sogenannten Gefühlsvermögens* (Königsberg, 1823):—*Pisteologie oder Glaube, Aberglaube u. Unglaube* (Lpzc. 1825):—*Das Kirchenrecht nach Grundsätzen d. Vernunft*, etc. (Lpzc. 1826):—*Allg. Handwörterbuch d. philosophischen Wissenschaften* (Lpzc. 1827–28, 4 vols.; 2d ed. 1832–34, 5 vols. 8vo):—*Universalphilosophische Vorlesungen* (Neustadt, 1831); etc. His works have been collected and published under the title *Gesammelte Schriften* (Braunschweig, 1830–34, 6 vols. 8vo). See Krug, *Meine Lebensreise in sechs Stationen* (Lpzc. 1826 and 1842); same, *Leipziger Freuden u. Leiden*, etc. (Lpz. 1831); Morell, *Hist. Mod. Philosophy*; Saintes, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 138; Tennemann's *Manual of Philosophy* (by Morell), p. 465 sq.; Krug, *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*, v (1), p. 617 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 240. (J. H. W.)

Krüger, Oswald, a German Jesuit, was born in 1598 in Prussia, and made for himself a name by his thorough study of Hebrew, which he taught in the schools of the Jesuits; later he devoted himself to mathematics, and became professor at the University in Wilna. He died May 16, 1665.—*Allgem. Hist. Lex.* iii, 65.

Krummacher, Friedrich Adolf, a German theologian and poet, was born at Tecklenburg, in Westphalia, July 13, 1767, and was educated at the universities of Lingen and Halle. At the latter school he enjoyed the instruction of "the elder Knapp," the so justly celebrated "pious" professor of the university at that time. In 1800, after having filled various positions of trust, he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Duisburg, where he remained until 1806. He then became successively pastor of Krefeld, Kettwich, Bernburg, and Bremen. His talents as preacher and administrator caused him to be appointed court preacher and Church superintendent. He died at Bremen April 14, 1845. Friedrich Adolph Krummacher deserves special commendation in this work for his piety and the noble Christian example he furnished to his sons, and which became manifest in their lives (comp. Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm). He is especially known for his parables in verse, which have become classic in Germany, and, though he has had many imitators in this line, he has never been surpassed. His works are, *Die Liebe*, a hymn (Wesel, 1801; 2d ed. 1809):—*Parabeln* (Duisburg, 1805; 8th ed. Essen, 1850; French, Par. 1821; English, Lond. 1844, 8vo, and often):—*Apologien und Paramythien* (Duisburg, 1810):—*Festbüchlein, eine Schrift für's Volk* (Duisb. 1810, 2 vols.; 3d edit. Duisb. 1819–21, 3 vols.):—*Die Kinderwelt* (Duisb. 1806, 1813), a series of sacred poems for children:—*Johannes*, a drama (Lpz. 1815):—*Ueber d. Geist u. d. Form d. evangelischen Gesch. in histor. u. æsthetisch. Hinsicht* (Lpz. 1805), by far his most important theological work:—*Bibelkatechismus* (Essen, 1844, 12th edit.):—*Katechismus d. christl. Lehre* (Essen, 1821; 6th ed. 1841):—*Die christl. Volksschule im Bunde m. d. Kirche* (Essen, 1823; 2d edit. 1825):—*St. Ansgar, d. alte und d. neue Zeit* (Bremen, 1828):—*Der Hauptmann Cornelius* (Bremen, 1829; English, London, 1838, 12mo; 1839, 12mo, with notes by Fergusson; 1840, 12mo):—*Das Leben des heiligen Johannes* (Essen, 1833; Engl., Lond. 1849, 8vo):—*Das Täubchen* (Essen, 1840, 3d ed.). See Möller, *F. A. Krummacher u. s. Freunde* (Brem. 1849, 2 vols.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 118 sq.; *Brit. and For. Evangel. Rev.* lxix, 627. (J. H. W.)

Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm, one of Germany's most eloquent preachers in this century, and the most distinguished of a distinguished family, was the son of Friedrich Adolph Krummacher (q. v.), and was born at Mörs, on the Rhine, January 28, 1796. After preparation partly at the Gymnasium and partly under his own father, he entered Halle University in the winter semester of 1815-16, and there enjoyed the instructions of Niemeyer, Wegscheider, Gesenius, Marx, De Wette, and "the elder Knapp," for whom young Krummacher early cherished great affection. Two years later he removed to Jena, drawn thither by the celebrated philosopher Fries, and the theologian Schott, the well-known editor of a revised edition of the text of the New Testament. To an American student of theology this period of F. W. Krummacher's life presents many points of special interest. He had left Halle for Jena determined to sit at the feet of Schott and other celebrated theologians, but so disappointed was he that he is led to exclaim (in his *Autobiography*, p. 77), "Nothing remained for me but to seek refuge from this spiritual famine in reading," and, instead of attending faithfully the lectures of his professors, he found it more to his soul's interest to devote his time to the reading of Herder's *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, his father's *Spirit and Form of the Gospels*, Kleuker's apologetical writings, and other books of this class. His first appointment as preacher he found, in the beginning of 1819, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, as assistant to a German Reformed congregation. In 1823 he removed to the village of Ruhrort, on the Rhine, near Dusseldorf, and two years later to Gemarke, a parish in the town of Barmen; and in 1834 he accepted a repeated call to the city of Elberfeldt. During his residence there a call came to him from the Pennsylvania Synod of the Reformed German Church to come to the United States and fill a professor's chair in their theological school at Mercersburg, Penn., a position which he declined in favor of the celebrated Church historian Philip Schaff, D.D., now professor in the Union Theological Seminary at New York city. In 1847 he was promoted by the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV, to the pastorate of Trinity Church, Berlin, as successor of the renowned pulpit orator Marheinecke, who had died in 1846, and he promptly accepted the place. About two years later he became court preacher at Potsdam, the usual summer residence of the Prussian kings, and he died there Dec. 19, 1868. Krummacher was honored with the doctorate of divinity by the University of Berlin. He was an active worker in behalf of the Evangelical Alliance, and attended all its meetings as long as he lived. Dr. Krummacher acquired a world-wide celebrity by his devotional writings, of which the most important are *Elias der Thisbiter* (Elberf. 1828; 5th edit. 1860; transl. into English and extensively circulated both in England and in this country):—*Salomo und Sulamith* (ibid. 3d ed. 1830; 7th ed. 1855):—*Die Sabbath Glocke*, a series of sermons (Berl. 1848 sq., 12 vols. 8vo):—*Der leidende Christus* (Bielef. 1854, and often; transl. into Engl. in Clark's Library):—and last, but hardly least, *David, der König von Israel*

(Berl. 1866, 8vo; transl. into English and published by Clark of Edinb. and Harpers of N. Y. 1870, 12mo).

Like his father and uncle, Dr. Krummacher was one of the few bold and uncompromising witnesses of evangelical truth of which Germany can boast. Dr. Schaff, who of all men this side the Atlantic is perhaps best entitled to a comment on the life and labors of this celebrated German preacher, speaks of him as follows: "Krummacher was endowed with every gift that constitutes an orator, a most fertile and brilliant imagination, a vigorous and original mind, a glowing heart, an extraordinary facility and felicity of diction, perfect familiarity with the Scriptures, an athletic and commanding presence, and a powerful and melodious voice, which, however, in latter years underwent a great change, and sounded like the rolling of the distant thunder or like the trumpet of the last judgment. This splendid outfit of nature, which attracted even theatrical actors and mere worshippers of genius to his sermons, was sanctified by divine grace, and always uncompromisingly devoted to the defence of scriptural truth. He was full of the fire of faith and the Holy Ghost. In the pulpit he was as bold and fearless as a lion, at home as gentle and amiable as a lamb. Like all truly great men, he had a childlike disposition. . . . He was a millionaire in images and illustrations. There is an *embarras de richesse* in his sermons, even more than those in Jeremy Taylor. The imaginative is too predominant for simple and severe taste; but with all their defects they will live as long as sermons are read for private devotion and as models for cultivating a higher style of pulpit eloquence. The name of their author will always shine as one of the brightest stars in the galaxy of those great and good men who, in the present century, have fought the good fight of the evangelical faith against prevailing Rationalism and infidelity, and have entitled themselves to the gratitude of the present and future generations" (*The Observer*, N. Y. Feb. 4, 1869). His *Autobiography*, left in MS. form, was published after his death by his family, and has been translated into English by the Rev. M. G. Easton (Edinb. and N. Y. 1869, 8vo). See a very pleasant short sketch by professor C. W. Bennett, in the *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, Feb. 11, 1869; and *Meth. Quar. Review*, 1869, p. 142, 441; 1870, p. 161 sq.; *British and For. Ev. Rev.* lxix, 628; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 1869, p. 776; *Evang. Quar. Rev.* 1870, p. 149; *Princeton Rev.* 1870, p. 156. (J. H. W.)

Krummacher, Gottfried Daniel, a German theologian, younger brother of F. A. Krummacher (q. v.), was born at Tecklenburg April 1, 1774. He studied at Duisburg, and became successively pastor of Bärth and Wolfrath, and finally of Elberfeld, where he died Jan. 30, 1837. He was thoroughly Calvinistic, not only in his tone of mind, but even in his outward aspect, and as the head of the Pietists in his district he carried their principles to their full length, even showing much unfriendliness to those who did not coincide with him. He wrote *Die Wanderung Israels durch d. Wüste* (3d ed. Elberfeld, 1850–51, 2 vols.; Engl., Lond. 1837–38, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Hauspostille* (Menns, 1835):—*Tägliches Manna* (Elberfeld, 1838; 4th ed. 1851; Engl., Lond. 1839, 12mo):—*Jakob's Kampf u. Sieg* (1829; Engl., Lond. 1838, 12mo); etc. See A. W. Möller, *F. A. Krummacher's Leben* (Bremen, 1849), i, 169; ii, 84; F. V. Krug, *Krit. Gesch. d. protest.-relig. Schwärmerei*, etc., *im Herzogthum Berg* (Elberfeld, 1851); Krummacher (Emil Wilhelm), *Leben v. Gottfried Daniel Krummacher* (Elberf. 1838, 8vo); *Autobiography of F. W. Krummacher* (translated by Easton), p. 155; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 118 sq.

Krummendyk, Albert, a learned German theologian, flourished about the middle of the 15th century as bishop of Holstein and Lubeck, and died in 1489. He left in MS. form *Chronicon Episcoporum Oldenburgiensium et Lubecensium* (printed in Meibomius's *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, tom. ii).

Krusius, L. A. See Millennium.

Kryptæ (*κρύπται, crypts*). For the purpose of concealment from their persecutors, the early Christians occasionally prepared for themselves churches and oratories under ground, which served both as places of devotion and as sepulchres for their dead. These were called *cryptæ*, from *κρύπτω, to conceal*.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* See Crypt.

Kryptics, a name sometimes given to those theologians who hold to the *κρύψις*, or *concealment* theory of our Lord's divine attributes during his earthly career. See Kenosis.

Ktistolatræ (*worshippers of a created thing*), a branch of the Monophysites, who maintained that the body of Christ before his resurrection was corruptible, in contradistinction from the *Actistetæ*, who held that it was not created.

Kübel, Mathäus, a German theologian, was born at Herbstein, in the duchy of Fulda, Nov. 14, 1742, and when twenty-two years old entered the order of the Jesuits, under whom he received his subsequent education. In 1783 he became professor of mathematics at Heidelberg University, and in 1785 was appointed to the chair of canon law. He died Jan. 3, 1809. Kübel was quite liberal in tendency, and had many warm friends among Protestant theologians. He wrote *Ratio fidei reddita* (Heidelb. 1776, 4to):—*Exercitium canonicum de matrimonio* (1786, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theolog. Deutschlands des 18ten und 19ten Jahrh.* ii, 212.

Küchlein, Johann, a German Protestant theologian, was born at Wetterau, in Hesse, in 1546. He studied at Heidelberg, entered the Church, and became pastor at Tackenheim. When, in 1576, elector Louis expelled the Calvinistic preachers, Küchlein went to Holland, and for eighteen years held a professorship in theology at Amsterdam. In 1595 he became director of the College of Leyden, and died July 2, 1606. Guy Patin calls him one of the most learned men of his time. His collected works were published at Geneva (1613, 4to). See H. Witte, *Diarium Biographicum;* Meursius, *Athen. Batav.;* Moréri, *Dict. Hist.;* Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 256. (J. N. P.)

Kuen, Michael, a German savant, was born at Weissenborn, Austria, Feb. 9, 1709, entered in 1728 the Augustine order, and was elected in 1754 abbot of their monastery at Ulm. He died Jan. 10, 1765. His principal works of interest to us are *Collectio scriptorum rerum historico-monastico-ecclesiasticarum variorum religiosorum ordinum* (Ulm, 1756–66, 6 vols. fol.):—*Joannes de Canabaco ex comitibus de Canabac, qui vulgo venditur pro autore quatuor librorum de Imitatione Christi, recenter detectus a quodam canonico-regulari* (ibid, 1760, 8vo), written against those attributing the authorship of *De Imitatione* to Gersen instead of Kempis.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 258.

Kufic Writing, an ancient form of Arabic characters, which came into use shortly before Mohammed, and was chiefly current among the inhabitants of Northern Arabia, while those of the south-western parts employed the Himyaritic or Mosnad (*clipped*) character. The Kufic is taken from the old Syriac character (*Estrangelo*), and is said to have been first introduced by Moramer or Morar ben-Morra of Anbar. The first copies of the Koran were written in it, and Kufa, a city in Irak-Arabi (pashalic of Bagdad), being the one which contained the most expert and numerous copyists, the writing itself was called after it. The alphabet was arranged like the Hebrew and Syriac (whence its designation, *ABGaD HeVeS*), and this order, although now superseded by another, is still used for numerical purposes. The Kufic character, of a somewhat clumsy and ungainly shape, began to fall into disuse after about A. D. 1000; Ebn-Morla of Bagdad (died A.D. 938) having invented the current or so-called Neshki (*nashak*, to copy) character, which was still further improved by

Ebn-Bawab (died 1031), and which now — deservedly, as one of the prettiest and easiest—reigns supreme in East and West. It is only in MSS. of the Koran, and in title-pages, that the Kufic is still employed. A peculiar kind of the Kufic is the so-called Karmatian—of a somewhat more slender shape—in which several inscriptions have been met with both in Arabia, and in Dauphiny, Sicily, etc., and which is also found on a coronation mantle preserved in Nuremberg. The Kufic is written with a style, while for the Neshki slit reeds are employed. Different kinds of the latter character (in which the alphabet is arranged according to the outward similarity of the letters) are the Moresque or Maghreb (Western), the Diváni (Royal—only employed for decrees, etc.), the Tàlík (chiefly used in Persian), the Thsoletki (threefold, or very large character), Jakuthi, Rihàni, etc. See Alphabet.

Kuhlmann, Quirinus, a German visionary and religious enthusiast, was born at Breslau Feb. 25, 1651. He began to attract public attention at the age of eighteen, when, rising from a sick-bed, he claimed to have been, during his illness, in direct communication both with God and the devil, and asserted that the duty had fallen upon him of revealing to all nations the inspirations which he had received from the Holy Ghost. He quitted the University of Breslau, where he had been studying jurisprudence, and went at once to Holland, in 1673, to become a follower of the mystic Jacob Böhme (q. v.), as is shown by his *Neubegesterter Böhme* (Leyden, 1674, 8vo). He found a congenial spirit in Johann Rothe, of Amsterdam, who claimed to be John the Baptist because his father's name had been Zacharias, and to this fanatic Kuhlmann dedicated his *Prodromus quinquennii mirabilis* (Leyden, 1674, 8vo). He also sought to enter into relations with Antoinette Bourignon, but does not appear to have succeeded. A letter of his, entitled *De sapientia infusa Adamea Salomoneaque*, dated Lubeck, Feb. 1675, shows that he was at that time a resident of that city. Another, addressed to sultan Mohammed IV, proves that he was in Constantinople in 1678. On Nov. 1, 1681, he published at Paris his *Arcanum microcosmicum*, curious and scarce, like all his works. After wandering through Switzerland, England, and Germany, he went, about 1689, to Russia, for the purpose of establishing there the "*real kingdom of God*." At first he succeeded in gaining a large number of partisans, and he may perhaps be considered as the founder of the yet existing sect of Duchobortzi (q. v.), or spiritual wrestlers. But the momentary religious freedom enjoyed by Russia under Basil Galitzin soon came to an end on the downfall of Sophia and the accession of Peter I to the throne. One of the first acts of the latter was the expulsion of the Jesuits, and his sentence of death on Kuhlmann and his disciple, Conrad Nordermann, supposed to have been occasioned mainly by the efforts of the Lutheran pastor Meinecke. They were both burned alive at Moscow, Oct. 4, 1689. Besides the above-named works, Adelung (*Hist. de la folie humaine*, v, 9) considers Kuhlmann as the author of forty-two other works, the principal of which are *Epistolæ theosophicæ Leidenses* (Leyden, 1674, 8vo): — *Epistolarum Londinensium Catholica ad Wicklefio-Waldenses, Hussitas, Zwinglianos, Lutheranos, Calvinianos* (Rotterd. 1674, 12mo):—four pamphlets concerning his correspondence with Athanase Kircher were published under the style *Kircheriana de arte magna sciendi*, etc. (London, 1681, 8vo). See B. G. Wernsdorf, *De Fanaticis Silesiorum et spectatim de Quir. Kuhlmanno* (Wittemberg, 1698, 1718); *Museum Bremense*, vol. ii; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.*; *Encyclop. Catholique de Fribourg*; J. Gagarin, *Un Document inédit sur l'expulsion des Jesuites de Moscou en* 1689, p. 27; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 263; Rotmund, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, vol. iii, s. v.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 688 sq.; Hagenbach, *Vorlesungen über Gesch. d. evangel. Protestantismus*, p. 316 sq.

Kuhn, Jean Gaspard, a French Protestant preacher, was born at Saarbruck in the latter part of the 17th century, and flourished as professor of history and eloquence at the University of Strasburg, and as canon of the Church of St. Thomas, in that city. He died in 1720. He wrote *De Sociabilitate secundum Stoicorum disciplinam*.—Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v.

Kuinoel, Christianus Theophilus (*Christian Gottlieb Kühnöl* in German), a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Leipzic Jan. 2, 1768. He studied the classics at the school of St. Thomas, and theology in the university of his native city. In 1788 he began, by the advice of the celebrated German savant Wolf, a course of lectures at his alma mater on the classics and on the books of the O. and N. T. In 1790 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy, and in 1796 preacher of the university. In 1799 he declined an invitation to a professor's chair at Copenhagen, but in 1801 went to Giessen, as professor of belles-lettres. Subsequently, however, he devoted himself entirely to the exegesis of the N. T., and in 1809 was transferred to the chair of theology as ordinary professor. He died there Oct. 15, 1841. He wrote *Messianische Weissagungen d. alt. Testaments übersetst u. erläutert* (Lpz. 1792, 8vo, Anon.):—*Hoseæ Oracula Hebr. et Lat. perpetua annotatione illustrata* (Lpz. 1792, 8vo). He had published in 1789 a German translation of the same book, with notes:—*Observationes ad Novum Testamentum, ex libris apocryphis Veteris Testamenti* (Lpz. 1794, 8vo):—*Pericopæ evangelicæ* (Lpz. 1796, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Die Psalmen metrisch übersetst, mit Anmerkungen* (Lpz. 1799, 8vo):—*Spicilegium observationum in Epistolam Jacobi* (Lipsiæ, 1807, 8vo):—*Commentarius in libros Novi Testamenti historicos* (Lpz. 1807–18, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. Lpz. 1837; reprinted, with the Gr. text added, Lond. 1835, 3 vols. 8vo)—a very able and successful work; one of the best of the modern exegetical works on the N. T. ever issued from the German press, but unfortunately wanting in spiritual insight. It belongs to the range of higher criticism, while Rosenmüller is occupied with the lower. Kuinoel is undecided between orthodoxy and neology, but seems to have so strong an under-current of conviction in favor of the truth as to lead him to admit, with a good share of favor, evangelical interpretations into his pages. As to theological sentiments, he distinctly avows himself a high Arian, and is evidently sceptical concerning the miracles of Christ. His commentary is of the historico-critical kind:—*Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos* (Lpzc. 1831, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 268; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 758; Kitto, *Cyclopædia*, ii, 763. (J. H. W.)

Kulkzynski, Ignatius, a Russian monastic, was born at Wladimir in 1707; early entered the order of St. Basil; resided several years at Rome as general of his order; and died as abbot of Grodno in 1747. He is noted as the author of *Specimen Ecclesiæ Ruthenicæ* (Rome, 1733, 8vo), a work which was dedicated to pope Clement XII, and is now hardly accessible. He wrote also *Il diaspro prodigioso di tre colori, ovvero narrazione istorica di tre immagini miracolose della Beata Vergine Maria* (Rome, 1732, 12mo):—*De Vitis Sanctorum diri Basilii magni* (2 vols. folio, left in MS. form).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 270.

Kulon, the name of a city found only in the Sept. version (Κουλών) of Josh. xv, 59, as lying in the tract around Bethlehem (see Kiel's *Comment.* ad loc.); probably corresponding to the modern village of *Kulonieh*, an hour and a half west of Jerusalem (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 146), with many old walls built of hewn stones (Scholz, *Reise*, p. 161). See Judah, Tribe of.

Kumârasambhava is the name of one of the most celebrated poems of the Hindus, and its author is believed to have been Kâlidâsa (q. v.). Its subject is the legendary history connected with the birth of Kumâra, or *Kartikeya* (q. v.), the Hindu god of war. It consists of twenty-two cantos, but only eight have hitherto been published in the original Sanscrit. The first

seven have been elegantly rendered into English verse by Mr. R. T. H. Griffith, at present principal of the Benares Government College.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Kunadus, Andreas, a Lutheran divine, born at Döblen, in Misnia, in 1602, was professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg, and died in 1662. He wrote a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxviii, 276.

Kunibert, a bishop of Cologne, who flourished in the 7th century (supposed to have held the see from 613–661), is generally regarded as one of the most influential prelates of the Frankish realm in the 7th century. Not only in ecclesiastical, but also in the civil history of that period, Kunibert fills a not unimportant place. He was a favorite adviser of king Dagobert I, and was the educator of Sigbert III. He died Nov. 12, 661 or 663. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates the day of his decease. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* p. 942 sq.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands,* i, 536.

Kunigunde, St. See Cunigunda.

Künneth, Johann Theodor, a German theologian, was born at Creusen, in Bayreuth, Sept. 22, 1735; in 1753 he went to the University of Erlangen, and in 1759 became assistant preacher in his native place. He died Aug. 28, 1800, as superintendent of Bayreuth. Künneth was a very popular preacher, and published several of his sermons; he also wrote largely for the theological journals of Germany. A list of his writings is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands,* ii, 214 sq.

Kunwald, Mathias von, a bishop of the Bohemian Brethren, flourished in the 15th century. He was especially prominent at the Synod of Reichenau in 1494.

Kunze, John Christopher, D.D., one of the most learned men in the Lutheran Church of this country, was born in Saxony about the middle of the 18th century. He was educated in the Gymnasia of Rossleben and Merseburg and the University of Leipzic, and for several years was engaged in the work of teaching in his native land. When application from the corporation of St. Michael's and Zion's Church was made to the theological faculty at Halle for a minister, their attention was immediately turned to young Kunze. He reached the United States in 1770, and at once commenced his duties as associate pastor of the German churches in Philadelphia. This field of labor he occupied for fourteen years, universally beloved, and exercising a wide influence for good. For several years he was professor in the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he received the doctorate in 1783. He accepted a call to the city of New York in 1784, where he labored for twenty-three years, till his death, July 24, 1807. He was devoted to his work, and indefatigable in his efforts to do good. For a long time he filled with signal ability the professorship of Oriental literature in Columbia College. So high a reputation did he enjoy as a Hebrew scholar that young men who were pursuing their studies with ministers of other denominations frequently resorted to him for instruction. The rabbins connected with the Jewish synagogues also consulted him in their interpretations of the Hebrew. "The various acquirements of this gentleman, and particularly his Oriental learning, long rendered him an ornament of the American republic of letters. He probably did more than any individual of his day to promote a taste for Hebrew literature among those intended for the clerical profession in the United States" (Dr. Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*). Dr. Kunze published a number of works: *History of the Lutheran Church:—Something for the Understanding and the Heart* (1781, 8vo):—*New Method for Calculating the great Eclipse of June* 16, 1806:—*Hymn-book for the Use of the Church* (1795):—*Catechism and Liturgy.* See Hazelius, *Hist. Am. Luth. Church,* 1685–1842. (M. L. S.)

Kurdistan or **Koordistan,** an extensive tract of land in the eastern portion of Asiatic Turkey and in Western Persia. It is chiefly occupied by the Kurds, after whom it is called, but its boundary-line is not definitely established, and the estimates of its area and population greatly differ. The population, according to Russegger (*Reisen in Europa, Asien, und Afrika,* 1835–41), amounted to about 3,000,000; according to Carl Ritter, to only 800,000; according to Chambers, 100,000; according to Appleton, 40,000. The extent of Turkish Kurdisan is estimated at about 13,000 square miles. It was formerly divided into three governments: namely, 1. *Kurdistan,* consisting of the Livas Mardin, Sard, and Diarbekir, and containing 265,000 inhabitants, of whom 198,000 were Mohammedans, 51,000 Armenians, 72 Jacobites, 4 Yezides, and 1100 Gipsies; 2. *Harpût,* consisting of the Livas Meadin, Harpût, Behsni, and Densem; 3. *Wan,* consisting of the Livas Hakkiyari. Later it was divided into the pachalics Wan, Mosul, Diarbekir, and Urfa (Rakka); the beylics Hakkiyari, Bahdinan, Bûtan (Bogden), and Ssindshar; and the district of Mardin. The most important towns are Diarbekir, Bitlis, Wan, and Mardin. Persian Kurdistan comprises the south-western portion of the province of Aserbeijan and the western portion of Ardilan, as far as the Kercha river. The most important town is Kirmanshan, with about 30,000 inhabitants. The Kurds are an agricultural people, who, during the summer months, pitch their black tents upon the Alpine pastures. Asia Minor and Syria, and even Constantinople, are receiving from them large supplies of cattle. The country is made up of isolated villages, without a national bond of union, and their intercourse with each other consists chiefly in plundering expeditions. Old castles on inaccessible peaks serve the beys as places of refuge in cases of emergency. These beys often rule over several villages. The Kurds were known to Greek writers as Carduchians (Καρδοῦχοι, *Carduchi,* see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.) or Kyrtians. In the highlands of Kurdistan they are divided into two different tribes, the Assireta and the Guranians. The Assiretas are the caste of warriors, and rarely or never agriculturists, but are devoted to cattle-breeding. The Guranians can never become warriors, are agriculturists, and kept in subjection by the Assireta. As the language of the two tribes likewise differs, it may be assumed that the Guranians are the descendants of the primitive inhabitants, who subsequently were subdued by a more warlike tribe. In Southern Kurdistan the Assireta call themselves Sîpah (warriors) and the peasants Rayah (subjects). The language of the Kurds is nearly kindred to the New Persian, but is to a large extent mixed with Arabic, Syrian, Greek, and Russian words, and is divided into numerous dialects. They have no written alphabet, and therefore no literature, but a number of their popular poems and songs have been written down in Arabic.

The majority of the inhabitants are fanatical Sunnite Mohammedans, who hate the Shiites even more than they do the Christians. But the number of Armenian, Jacobite, and Nestorian Christians is also considerable. The Armenians chiefly live in the northern part of the country. One section of the Jacobites has its centre near Mardin, under a patriarch, who resides in the convent of Safarani. Western Kurdistan is the seat of the Nestorians. See Nestorians. The Kurds show little disposition to embrace Christianity. Among the Armenians and Nestorians the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have met with a great success. The mission at Harpût for the Armenians commenced in 1853. In 1859 a theological seminary was established for the training of men for the pastoral office, and in 1861 a female seminary for the training of their wives. In 1889 one hundred and fourteen out-stations were connected with 5 principal stations, chief of which is Harpût, where the Euphrates College is located. This field is occupied by 42 American missionaries with 279 native laborers, of whom 78 are ordained or licensed preachers. The membership is 2686. At Mardin the buildings for a

theological school and other purposes are completed. The flourishing missions among the Nestorians, embracing more than sixty congregations, are chiefly in Persia, and are now under the charge of the Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. Of the Jacobites and Nestorians a considerable portion have recognised the supremacy of the pope. The former are called the United Syrians, the latter the Chaldæans. The United Syrians have a patriarch in Diarbekir, and the Chaldæans a patriarch at El-Kush, near Mosul, in the convent of St. Hormisdas. The sect of the Yezides, or Shemsieh, who are descended from the Parsees, though they follow at the same time some Mohammedan and Christian practices adopted from their neighbors, are fire-worshippers, live south of Mardin. See Shiel, *Notes on a Journey from Tabris to Koordistan* (1836), in the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* (London, vol. viii); Rich, *Narrative of a Journey through Koordistan* (London, 1836, 2 vols.); Wagner, *Reise nach Persien und dem Lande d. Kurden* (Lpz. 1852, 2 vols.); Somdreczkh, *Reise nach Persien und durch Kurdistan nach Urumiah* (Stuttgard, 1857, 4 vols.); Layard, *Nineveh*, etc., *with an Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Koordistan*, etc. (London, 1850); Grundemann, *Missionsatlas*, Asien, p. 39; Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals, with Narrative of a Mission to Mesopotamia and Coordistan* (London, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). (A. J. S.)

Kuria or **Kyria**. See ELECTA.

Kurma (called also *Kûrmavatâra*, i. e. the "avatar of the tortoise") is the name by which the second incarnation of Vishnu is designated. It is related in Hindu mythology that Kurma took the form of a tortoise so as to furnish a support to Mount Mandara while the gods and Asurs churned the ocean. The mountain being the churn-stick, the great serpent Sêsha was made use of for the string. It may be proper to observe that in India churning is usually performed by causing a body termed the churn-stick to revolve rapidly in the cream or milk by means of a string, in the same manner as a drill is made to revolve. In some of the Hindu pictures of the churning of the ocean the gods are represented as standing on one side of Mount Mandara and the Asurs on the other, both grasping in their hands the serpent Sêsha, which is wound round the mountain. This rests upon the back of the tortoise (Vishnu). At the same time, the preserving deity, in consequence of his ubiquitous character, is seen standing among the gods and grasping Sêsha, and also as dancing on the top of Mandara (see Plate 49 in Moor's *Hindu Pantheon*). The churning of the ocean is one of the most famous and popular fables related in the mythology of the Hindus. It resulted in the production of the fourteen gems, as they are called, namely, 1. Chandra (the moon), 2. Lakshîni, the incomparable consort of Vishnu; 3. Surâdevî, or the goddess of wine; 4. Uchisrava, a wonderful eight-headed horse; 5. Kustubha, a jewel of inestimable value; 6. Pârijâta, a tree that yielded whatever one might desire; 7. Surabhi or Kâmadhênu, a cow similarly bountiful; 8. Dhanwantara, a wondrous physician; 9. Irâvata or Irâvat, the elephant of India; 10. Shank, a shell which conferred victory on whosoever sounded it; 11. Danusha, an unerring bow; 12. Vish, a remarkable drug or poison; 13. Rembha (or Rambhâ), an Apsarâ possessed of surpassing charms; 14. Amrita, or Amrit, the beverage of immortality. See Moor, *Hindu Pantheon*.

Kurschner, CONRAD. See PELLICAN.

Kurtz, Benjamin, D.D., LL.D, a prominent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born at Harrisburg, Penn., Feb. 28, 1795. He was a lineal descendant of one of the Halle patriarchs, the grandson of Rev. John Nicholas Kurtz, who came to this country in 1745 as an associate of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg. When quite young Benjamin exhibited remarkable fitness for study, and great quickness in the acquisition of knowledge. At the age of fifteen he was employed as an assistant in the Harrisburg Academy, and subsequently gave private instruction in Latin, Greek, and German. Early trained to industry and self-reliance, he formed those habits of mental discipline which gave so much strength to his future character. He studied theology under the direction of Rev. Dr. Geo. Lochman, and was licensed to preach in 1815 by the Synod of Pennsylvania. He immediately received a call to Baltimore as assistant minister to his uncle, Rev. Dr. J. D. Kurtz. He remained in this position for a brief period, and then accepted the invitation to become pastor of the Hagerstown charge. During this period of his ministry his labors were crowned with the most abundant success. On a single occasion he added to the Church one hundred and fifteen members. Very reluctantly he resigned the position, and in 1831 took charge of the Lutheran Church in Chambersburg. But in the midst of his usefulness, with the brightest prospects of success, his labors here were abruptly terminated by the failure of his health. He removed to Baltimore Aug. 24, 1833, and commenced his career as editor of the *Lutheran Observer*. The paper became an engine of great influence in the Church, and, although physically disqualified to perform regular pulpit labor, in his editorial capacity he was permitted every week to preach the Gospel and to advance the interests of the Church. He died Dec. 29, 1865. Dr. Kurtz possessed an intellect of no common order, a resolute will, and remarkable personal power. He was an active, vigorous thinker. He had acquired habits of close application, of careful and keen observation, a fondness for analytical research, and the investigation of intricate questions. His mind was clear and logical, and in controversy he had scarcely a superior. He readily comprehended a subject, and knew how to grapple with any truth that claimed his attention. Had he entered the legal profession, for which he was originally intended, or political life, to which he was so well adapted, he would, no doubt, have risen to the highest position, to a rank equal to his most distinguished contemporaries. As a preacher he was very much gifted. In his earlier years, and in the maturity of his strength, he was regarded by many as the most eloquent speaker in the State of Maryland. He was plain, thoughtful, argumentative, and forcible. He gave utterance to the great truths of the Gospel with an energy and an unction that carried conviction home to the hearer. He was a clear, prolific writer, skilful in repartee, pungent in rebuke; a man of independent spirit, fond of excitement, and worked best when under its influence. He was, in the full sense of the term, a public man, and few men in the Lutheran Church of this country have wielded a greater power than he. His name was a tower of strength in connection with any enterprise that engaged his attention. His public career, extending over half a century, was identified with the most important events in the history of the Lutheran Church during that period. The recognised leader of a central school in the Church, the public representative of a party whose views he adopted, his sentiments on all subjects were regarded with favor. His words were received as oracular. His life was one of ceaseless activity. Laborious, self-sacrificing, a man of great industry and unwearied perseverance, he never yielded to any obstacle that was not absolutely insuperable. Notwithstanding his daily routine of duty, and the multiplicity of his engagements, he found some time for authorship. His books were generally well received by the public; some of them passed through several editions. The following embraces a list of his publications: *First Principles of Religion for Children* (1821): —*Sermons on Sabbath-schools* (1822):—*Faith, Hope, and Charity* (1823):—*Address on Temperance* (1824):—*Pastoral Address* during his absence in Europe (1827):—*Ministerial Appeal*, Valedictory Sermon, Hagerstown (1831):—*A Door opened of the Lord*, Introductory Sermon, Chambersburg (1831):—*Infant Baptism and Affusion, with Essays on Related Subjects* (Baltimore, 1840):

—*Theological Sketch-book, or Skeletons of Sermons*, carefully arranged in systematic order, so as to constitute a complete Body of Divinity, partly original, partly selected (1844, 2 vols.):—*Why are you a Lutheran?* (1847):—*Prayer in all its Forms, and Training of Children* (1856):—*Lutheran Prayer-book*, for the use of Families and Individuals (1856):—*The Serial Catechism, or Progressive Instruction for Children* (1848):—*Design, Necessity, and Adaptation of the Missionary Institute at Selinsgrove, Pa.* (Inaugural Address) (1859):—*The Choice of a Wife*—Lecture to the Graduating Class of Theological Students in the Missionary Institute (1863):—*The Condemned Sermon—Experimental, not Ritual Religion, the one thing needful;* preached before the West Pennsylvania Synod (1863):—*Believers belong to Christ:* Sacramental Discourse delivered before the Maryland Synod (1865). He was also co-editor of the *Year-book of the Reformation* (1844). See *Evang. Rev.* 1866, p. 25 sq.; *Lutheran Observer*, Jan. 5 and 12, 1866. (M. L. S.)

Kurtz, John Daniel, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Lutheran Church, the son of the Rev. J. N. Kurtz, was born at Germantown, Penn., in 1763. Very early in life he had a strong desire to prepare for the ministry of reconciliation. After leaving school he pursued his studies under the direction of his father, and subsequently with Rev. Dr. H. E. Mühlenberg, of Lancaster. In 1784 he was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania. He commenced his ministerial labors by assisting his father in preaching, catechising, and visiting the sick. Afterwards he took charge of congregations in the vicinity of York. He removed in 1786 to Baltimore, where he labored with great diligence and fidelity for nearly half a century. In 1832, in consequence of advancing physical infirmities, he resigned his position, although he occasionally preached, and endeavored to make himself useful whenever an opportunity offered. He died June 30, 1856, in the 93d year of his age, loved and honored by all who knew him. During his ministry he baptized 5156 persons, buried 2521, and solemnized 2386 marriages. Being once told that the Methodists were gathering in German Lutheran emigrants and organizing churches among them, his reply was, "And is it not better that they should go to heaven as Methodists than be neglected and overlooked as Lutherans?" He was one of the founders of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, a director of the Theological Seminary, and closely identified with all the benevolent institutions of the Church. He aided in the formation of the Maryland Bible Society, and for many years was president of the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum. (M. L. S.)

Kurtz, John Nicholas, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born at Lutzelinden, in the principality of Nassau-Weilburg, and came to this country in 1745. He pursued his studies at Giessen and Halle, and was regarded by Dr. Francke as peculiarly fitted for missionary labor among his countrymen in America. He was the first Lutheran minister ordained in this country. He labored successively at New Hanover, Tulpehocken, Germantown, and York, Pa., although he frequently spent whole months in visiting the destitute places of the Church, preaching, catechising, and administering the sacraments. During his residence at Tulpehocken the services of the sanctuary were often conducted at imminent risk of life, as the ruthless Indian lay in wait for victims, and whole families were sometimes massacred. The officers of the church stood at the doors armed with defensive weapons, to prevent a surprise and to protect minister and people. In travelling to his preaching stations and visiting among his members he was often exposed to danger from the attack of the tomahawk and scalping-knife. He was pastor at York when Congress, during the Revolution, held its session there, and bishop White, the chaplain, was his guest. As an evidence of his interest in the American struggle, it is mentioned that, after preaching on the Lord's day, he invited his hearers to collect all the articles of apparel they could spare, and send them to his residence for distribution among the suffering, destitute soldiers. When he reached his threescore years and ten he felt that it was his duty to retire from the active duties of the ministry. He removed to Baltimore, where he spent the remainder of his days in the family of his son, John Daniel Kurtz (q. v.), until 1794, when he peacefully passed away to his rest. He was held in high estimation by his contemporaries as a man of great learning and earnest piety. (M. L. S.)

Kushai'ah (Heb. only with ה paragogic, *Kushaya'hu*, קוּשָׁיָהוּ, *bow of Jehovah*, i. e. rainbow; Sept. Κισαίας), a Levite of the family of Merari, and father of Ethan, which latter was appointed chief assistant of Heman in the Temple music under David (1 Chron. xv, 17); elsewhere (1 Chron. vi, 44) called Kishi. B.C. 1014.

Kussemeth. See Rye.

Küster, Karl Daniel, a German theologian, was born at Bernburg May 6, 1727. In 1745 he entered the University of Halle, and studied theology until 1749, when he became teacher in the German-French orphan asylum in Magdeburg. In 1754 he entered the army as chaplain, and in this capacity served the Prussians during the Seven Years' War. On his return he became preacher at Magdeburg, and was made the first pastor of the city in 1768. He died Sept. 21, 1804. Küster was a truly pious man, and greatly served the cause of Christianity, especially among the soldiers of Frederick the Great. For his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 218 sq.

Küster, Ludolf, a learned German Greek scholar, who was born at Blomberg, Westphalia, in Feb. 1670, held first a professorship at the Joachimsthal Gymnasium in Berlin, and later enjoyed the favor of Louis XIV, and a pension with membership in the French Academy, and who died Oct. 12, 1716, deserves a place here for his edition of Mill's Greek Testament, published at Rotterdam in 1710, and entitled *Collectio Milliana*, etc. Küster's additions consist of the various readings of twelve MSS., of which the most important is the *Codex Boernerianus*, afterwards admirably edited by Matthæi. The edition also contains a preface by Küster, and a letter of Le Clerc's discussing a number of various readings, of some historical interest. According to Tregelles, it is usually considered inferior in accuracy to Mill's original edition.—Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, ii, 764.

Kutassy, Johannes, a very prominent Hungarian prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, flourished towards the close of the 16th century as archbishop of Grau. He was in great favor at the court of the emperor Rudolph II, and was employed on several important diplomatic missions. He died about 1601.—*Allgemeines Hist. Lexikon*, iii, 69.

Kuvera, the Hindu Plutus, or god of wealth. He owes his name—which literally means "having a wretched (*ku*) body (*vera*)"—to the deformities with which he is invested by Hindu mythology. He is represented as having three heads, three legs, and but eight teeth; his eyes are green, and in the place of one he has a yellow mark; he wears an earring, but only in one ear; and, though he is properly of a black color, his belly is whitened by a leprous taint. He is seated in a car (*pushpaka*), which is drawn by hobgoblins. His residence, Alakâ, is situated in the mines of Mount Kailâsa, and he is attended by the Yakshas, Mâyus, Kinnaras, and other imps, anxiously guarding the entrance to his garden, Chaitraratha, the abode of all riches. Nine treasures—apparently precious gems—are especially intrusted to his care. His wife is a hobgoblin, Yakshî, or Yakshinî, and their children are two sons and a daughter. As one of the divinities that preside over the regions, he is considered also to be the protector of the north.

Kuypers, GERARDUS ARENTSE, D.D., an eminent minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born of Hollandish parentage in the island of Curaçoa, W. I., Dec. 16, 1766. His father, Rev. Warmoldus Kuypers, was a clergyman, educated at the University of Groningen, and removed to this country, where he settled as pastor of the churches at Rhinebeck, N. Y., and Hackensack, N. J. He died in 1799. His son Gerardus was educated by the celebrated Dr. Peter Wilson, who was then the most popular and able classical teacher in New Jersey. His theological course was pursued under the care of his father and Drs. Hermanus Mayer and Dirck Romeyn. He was licensed to preach in 1787, ordained in 1788 as co-pastor at Paramus, N. J., and in 1789 became one of the ministers of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in New York, where he remained until his decease in 1833. Dr. Kuypers was a Christian gentleman, and a theologian of the old school, remarkably conversant with the Bible, and possessed of high pastoral qualifications. He is described as an evangelical, practical, lucid, and superior preacher, a man of peace and prudence, and a living chronicle of past events, whose decisions on matters of usage and precedent were for many years received as final. His death was triumphant. He left unfinished a volume of *Discourses on the Heidelberg Catechism.*— Dr. Knox's *Memorial Discourse* (1833); Sprague's *Annals;* Corwin's *Manual Ref. Ch.* p. 130; *Life of Dr. J. H. Livingston.* (W. J. R. T.)

Kvasir is the name of a mythic personage mentioned in the Norse legends. "He was so wise and knowing that no one could ask him a question which he could not answer. He was, however, entrapped and slain by two dwarfs who had invited him to a feast. With his blood they mingled honey, and thus composed a mead which makes every one who drinks of it a skald, or wise man." See Thorpe, *Northern Mythology,* vol. i.

Kyderminster (or KIDDERMINSTER), RICHARD, an English monk, greatly celebrated both as a preacher and scholar, born in Worcestershire, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Winchcombe, Gloucestershire, and died in 1531. He wrote *Tractatus contra Doctrinum Lutheri* (1521); also a history of his monastery. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.;* Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors,* ii, 1046.

Kypke, GEORGE DAVID, a distinguished German Orientalist, was born at Neukirk, Pomerania, Oct. 23, 1724. He studied at the universities of Königsberg and Halle, took his degree in the department of philosophy in 1744, in 1746 was appointed professor extraordinary of Oriental languages at Königsberg, and was promoted to the full professorship in 1775. He died May 28, 1779. Kypke wrote *Observationes sacræ in Novi Fœderis libros, ex auctoribus Græcis et antiquitatibus* (Breslau, 1755, 2 vols. 8vo); a successful attempt to illustrate many passages of the New Testament by examples drawn from Greek classic authors. "Of all the expositions of the New Testament conducted on principles like these, I know of none that are superior, or, indeed, equal to that of Kypke" (Michaelis). See Rotermund, *Suppl. zu Jöcher;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxviii, 312.

Kyrie (Κύριε), "O Lord" (in Church music), the vocative of the Greek word signifying *Lord,* with which word all the musical masses in the Church of Rome commence. Hence it has come to be used substantively for the whole piece, as one may say, *a beautiful Kyrie, a Kyrie well executed,* etc.

KYRIE ELEËISON (Κύριε ἐλέησον, *Lord have mercy [upon us]*), the well-known form of earnest and pathetic penitential appeal of the Scriptures, of frequent occurrence in the services of the early Church, and in the liturgical formulæ of the Eastern and Western churches, and since the Reformation retained even in many Protestant churches.

Eastern Church.—Most frequently it was used in the opening portions of the ancient liturgies. In that of St. Mark we find three long prayers, each preceded by the threefold repetition of the Kyrie. In St. Chrysostom's the deacon offers ten petitions, and each is followed by the answering Kyrie of the choir. In the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. viii, can. 6), when the catechumens are about to pray, all the faithful add for them this supplication (comp. Neale, *Primitive Lit.* p. 88).

Western Church.—In the West the Kyrie Eleëison and Christe Eleëison, termed by St. Benedict "lesser" or "minor litany," it is generally supposed were introduced by pope Sylvester I (314-335), and formed a part of the *Preces Feriales* of the "Salisbury Portiforium," as they do now of the daily offices of prayer of the Church of Rome, England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the Lutheran and many other evangelical liturgies the Kyrie Eleeison is retained. See Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* i, 122; Siegel, *Christlich-Kirchliche Alterthümer,* iii, 237; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* p. 381; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s. v.; Proctor, *Common Prayer* (see Index); Blunt, *Dict. Doct. and Hist. Theol.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Kyrle, JOHN, an English philanthropist, whom Pope has immortalized under the name of "The Man of Ross," was born at Dymock (County of Gloucester) in 1637. With a small income of £500 he managed to do much good to the population of Hereford County. He encouraged agriculture, opened ways of communication between the different places, and founded asylums for orphans and disabled persons. The passage in which Pope commemorates him is too well known and too long to be quoted here. We will only say that it is substantially based on facts. Kyrle died in 1754. See Warton, *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope;* Pope, *Epistle II;* Fuller, *Worthies of England,* i, 582.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxviii, 312. (J. N. P.)

L.

La'ädah (Heb. *Ladah',* לָעָדָה, *order;* Sept. Λααδά v. r. Μαδάθ), the second named of the two sons of Shelah (son of Judah), and founder ("father") of Mareshah, in the lowlands of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 21). B.C. cir. 1873.

La'ädan (Heb. *Ladan',* לָעְדָן, *arranger*), the name of two men.

1. (In 1 Chron. xxiii, 7–9, Sept. Λεαδάν v. r. Ἐδάν, Vulg. *Leedan;* in 1 Chron. xxvi, 21, Λεδάν v. r. Λαδάν, Λααδάν, *Ledan.*) The first named of the two sons of Gershom, the son of Levi; elsewhere called LIBNI (1 Chron. vi, 17).

2. (Sept. Γαλααδάς v. r. Λαάδαν, Λαδάν, Vulg. *Laadan.*) Apparently the son of Tahan and father of Ammihud, of the posterity of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 26). B.C. post 1612.

Laanah. See WORMWOOD.

Labadie, JEAN DE, a French enthusiast, and the founder of the religious sect known as *Labadists,* was born at Bourg, in Guienne, Feb. 13, 1610. Educated in the Jesuits' school at Bordeaux, he entered their order, began the study of theology in 1626, and soon distinguished himself as a preacher. Struck with the abuses existing in the Romish Church, he clamored for reform, but, meeting with no encouragement in his order, he left it to join the Fathers of the Oratory in 1639, and very shortly afterwards the Jansenists. In 1640 he was appointed canon of Amiens, and at once inaugurated various reforms. He held conventicles for the purpose of Bible reading, and administered the Lord's Supper in both kinds to the people. To prevent his progress, he was removed in 1646, and sent as preacher and inspector to the convents of the third order of St.

Francis in Guienne. Still persecuted by the Jesuits, he joined the Reformed Church at Montauban in 1650, and entered the Protestant ministry under very auspicious circumstances. In 1657 he became pastor in Orange, and in 1659 in Geneva. In both situations he exerted himself to the utmost for the restoration of apostolic religion on Pietistic principles, and gained many partisans, especially in Geneva. In 1666 he became pastor of a Walloon church in Middelburg, but, by the machinations of his enemies, was obliged to leave it, and in 1669 went to Amsterdam, where his followers soon formed a distinct religious sect, known as LABADISTS. Peter Yvon was one of their preachers. Having been expelled from the country as a separatist, Labadie went in 1670 to Hereford, where, through the influence of his disciple, the learned Anna Marie von Schurmann (who appears to have become his wife afterwards), he was protected by the princess Elizabeth. But, again driven away (in 1674) by the authorities as an Anabaptist, he went successively to Bremen and Altona. Here he managed, with the assistance of Peter Yvon and De Lignon, to hold private meetings and to disseminate his doctrines. He died at Altona Feb. 13, 1674. His principal works are, *Le hérault du grand roi Jésus* (Amst. 1667, 12mo):—*Le véritable exorcisme, ou l'unique moyen de chasser le Diable du monde Chrétien* (Amsterd. 1667, 12mo):—*Le chant royal du roi Jésus-Christ* (Amsterd. 1670, 12mo):—*Les saintes Décades* (Amst. 1671, 8vo):—*L'empire du St. Esprit* (Amst. 1671, 12mo):—*La réformation de l'église; La jeune religieuse; L'arrivée apostolique; Abrégé du Christianisme* (transl. into German, Frankf. 1742); etc.

According to their confession of faith (*Declaration d. reinen Lehre u. d. gesunden Glaubens d. Joh. de L.*, etc., Heref. 1671), the Labadists did not entirely differ from the Reformed Church, whose symbolic books they accepted. They supported themselves by manual labor, and, after the example of the primitive Church, possessed everything in common; they insisted that great stress is to be laid on the internal light, and that it alone can make the outer revelation intelligible. They, however, declared against infant baptism; also against the second baptism of the Anabaptists; and rejected the observance of the Sabbath on the plea that for them life was a perpetual Sabbath, etc. The reproach of immorality which some Roman Catholic writers have preferred against them is unfounded; they recognised and honored the institution of matrimony. After Labadie's death his followers removed to Wiewert, in the duchy of Cleves, but gained few adherents, and the sect gradually disappeared about the middle of the 18th century. At the opening of the 18th century they attempted to establish themselves in the United States of America; a few of their number settled on the banks of the Hudson River as missionaries, but they do not seem to have taken a special hold. See A. Pauli and J. Hund, *Antilabadie* (Hamm, 1671, 4to); L. G. Engelschall, *Richtige Vorurtheile d. heutigen Welt* (1716), p. 652–682; Dr. Schotel, *A. M. v. Schurmann* (Hertogenb. 1853); Arnold, *Kirchen u. Ketzergesch*, ii, 680; Hagenbach, *Gesch. der Reformation*, iv, 307 sq.; Göbel, *Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. Rheinisch-Westphälischen evangel. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), vol. ii; *Zeitschr. d. histor. theol.* 1853, 1854.

Labadists. See LABADIE.

Labagh, PETER, D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in 1773 in New York city, of French and Hollandish descent. After receiving his classical education from Dr. Peter Wilson, of Hackensack, N. J., his theological studies were pursued under Drs. Froeligh and Livingston, professors of theology in the Reformed Dutch Church. He was licensed in 1796, and immediately went to Western New York on a tour of missionary exploration, and afterwards proceeded on horseback to Kentucky, where he organized a Church in Mercer County. Returning to New York, he settled as a pastor in Greenbush, Rensselaer County, where he remained until 1809, and then removed to the united churches of Shannock and Harlingen. He retained the pastorate of the latter Church until 1844. He died among his own people in 1858, revered and beloved by all. Dr. Labagh possessed an active, acute, and powerful mind, rapid in its movements, sound in its conclusions, and distinguished by great accuracy of judgment. In ecclesiastical assemblies he was always a leading debater and counsellor. In the endowment of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, and in all the great movements of his denomination, he was a vigorous and successful worker. He was a clear, strong, and experimental preacher. During the great revival of 1831 his Church experienced a work of grace which "shook the whole community for miles around." This was the crowning glory of his long ministry. His latter years were spent in patriarchal retirement. He was cheerful, happy, overflowing with good-humor, mother-wit, and strong common sense, and, above all, with a deep piety which illumined his ministry and consecrates his memory. A Memoir of him was published in 1860 by Rev. John A. Todd, D.D. (12mo). (W. J. R. T.)

La'ban (Hebrew *Laban'*, לָבָן, *white*, as frequently; comp. Simonis, *Onom. V. T.* p. 100; Septuag. Λάβαν, but Λοβόν in Deut. i, 1; Josephus Λάβανος, *Ant.* i, 16, 2), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. An Aramæan herd-owner in Mesopotamia, son of Bethuel (Gen. xxviii, 5), and kinsman of Abraham (Gen. xxiv, 15, 29), being a grandson (בֵּן, not simply "son," as usual; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 216) of Nahor (Gen. xxix, 5). During the lifetime of his father, and by his own consent, his sister Rebekah was married to Isaac in Palestine (Gen. xxiv, 50 sq.). B.C. 2024. See REBEKAH. Jacob, one of the sons by this marriage, on leaving home through fear of Esau, complied with his parents' wishes by contracting a still closer affinity with the family of his uncle Laban, and while seeking the hand of his daughter Rachel at the price of seven years' toil, was eventually compelled by Laban's artifice to marry first his oldest daughter, Leah (Gen. xxix). B.C. 1927–1920. See JACOB. When Jacob, having fulfilled the additional seven years' service thus imposed upon him, and six years more under a contract to take care of his cattle (in which time he managed to repay his overreaching uncle by a less culpable stratagem), was returning by stealth across the Euphrates, Laban pursued him with intentions that were only diverted by a preternatural dream, and, overtaking him at Mt. Gilead, charged him with the abduction of his daughters and the theft of his household gods, which Rachel had clandestinely carried off, and now concealed by a trick characteristic of her family, but was at length pacified, and formed a solemn treaty of amity with Jacob that should mutually bind their posterity (Gen. xxx, xxxi). B.C. 1907. Niemeyer (*Charakt.* ii, 246) has represented Laban in a very odious light, but his conduct appears to have been in keeping with the customs of the times, and, indeed, of nomades in all ages, and compares not unfavorably with that of Jacob himself. (See Kitto, *Daily Illustra.* vol. i; Abulfeda, *Anteislam*, ed. Fleischer, p. 25; Hitzig, *Geschichte Israel* [Lpz. 1869], p. 40, 49 sq.; Ewald, *History of Israel* [transl. London, 1869], i, 346 sq.)—Winer, ii, 1 sq. "The mere possession of teraphim, which the Jews at no time consistently condemned (comp. Judg. xvii, xviii; 1 Sam. xix, 13; Hos. iii, 4), does not prove Laban to have been an idolater; but that he must have been so appears with some probability from xxxi, 53 ('the gods of Nahor'), and from the expression נִחַשְׁתִּי, in xxx, 27; A. V., '*I have learnt by experience*,' but properly 'I have divined' or 'learnt by an augury' (comp. xliv, 15; 1 Kings xx, 33), showing that he was addicted to pagan superstitions."

2. A city in the Arabian desert, on the route of the Israelites (Deut. i, 1); probably identical with their twenty-first station, LIBNAH (Numb. xxxiii, 20). Knobel's objections (*Erklär.* ad loc.) to this identification, that no discourses of Moses at Libnah are recorded, and that the

Israelites did not return to that place after reaching Kadesh, are neither of them relevant. He prefers the *Hauara* of ancient notice (*Notit. Dignit.* i, 78 sq.; *Hauarra* of the *Peutinger Table*, ix, e; Ἄυαρα of Ptolemy, v, 17, 5), between Petra and Æla, as having the signification *white* in Arabic (Steph. Byz. s. v.).

Lab'ana (Λαβανά), one of the chief Temple-servants whose "sons" returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v, 28); evidently the LEBANA (q. v.) of the Hebrew list (Neh. vii, 48).

Labărum is the name given to the old standard or flag of Christian nations. Its derivation is uncertain, but it has variously been considered as coming from λαβεῖν, λαῖφη, λάφυρον, *laboro*, etc. Some, with Prudentius, pronounced both *a*'s short; others (Althelm, *De laud. Virg.*) considered the first as long. Sozomen has it Λάβωρον; Chrysostom, Λάβουρον. (Comp., on the etymology, Gretser, *De Cruce*, lib. iii.) We find this name already applied to the Roman standard in coins of the republic and of the first emperors, especially on those connected with the wars against the Germans, Sarmatians, and Armenians. The labarum obtained its Christian signification under the emperor Constantine the Great, who, after his conversion, placed the image of the cross on his standards, and caused it to be received at Rome as the σωτήριον τροπαῖον. Henceforth it was considered as σημεῖον πολεμικὸν τῶν ἄλλων τιμιώτερον· it was carried in advance of the other standards, looked upon as an object of adoration by the Christian soldiery, and was surrounded by a guard of fifty picked men. Eusebius, who describes it with great particularity (in *Vita Constantin.* li, cap. 30, 31; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiast.* A.D. 312, No. 26), relates that Constantine was induced to place the Christian symbol on the Roman standard by having in vision seen a shining cross in the heavens. (This vision may be denied or variously explained from subjective causes; compare the article CONSTANTINE, and Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, § 2.) The Roman labarum consisted of a long gilt spear, crossed at the upper end, and a crown towards the top, made either of gold or of precious stones, and bearing the monogram of Christ (thus $\overset{P}{\times}$ or $\overset{P}{+}$), which the emperor afterwards wore also on his helmet. From the spear was suspended a square piece of silken veil, on which the likeness of Constantine and of his sons was embroidered with gold. According to Prudentius (in Symmachus, i, 486), the image of Christ was embroidered on it. During the reign of Julian the labarum was made in its original shape, and bore the image of the emperor, along with those of Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury, but the standard of Constantine was restored under Valentine and Gratian. The labarum remained the standard of Rome until the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, under the names of *labarum, crux*, and *vexillum ecclesiasticum*. The standards at present in use in some ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church still consist of a spear, with a cross-piece, to which is attached a cloth covered with embroidery or painting. The most renowned masterpiece of Christian art, Raphael's *Madonna del Sisto*, was originally made and used for this purpose. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. viii, s. v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii, 261 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités*, s. v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.; Voisin, *Diss. crit. sur la Vision de Constantin* (Paris, 1774). (J. H. W.)

The *Labarum*.


Monogram of Christ on the Labarum.

Labat, JEAN BAPTISTE, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Paris in 1663. He joined the Dominicans in April, 1685, went as professor of philosophy to Nancy in 1687, and afterwards devoted himself exclusively to preaching. He landed at La Martinique Jan. 29, 1694, and was immediately put in charge of the mission at Macouba. While attending to his ecclesiastical duties, he made himself very useful in the colony as engineer, agriculturist, and even as diplomatic agent, and rendered great service against the English when they attempted taking the island in 1703. Most of his colleagues having died of yellow fever and other diseases brought on by the climate, he returned to Europe to seek for others, and arrived at Cadiz Oct. 9, 1705. He intended returning soon to the West Indies, but was sent to Rome by his superiors, and was retained there until 1709; he afterwards remained at Civita Vecchia until 1716, and finally returned to Paris, where he died, Jan. 6, 1738. He wrote *Nouveau Voyage aux Iles de l'Amérique* (Paris, 1722, 6 vols. 12mo; La Haye, 1724, 6 vols. 12mo; 1738, 2 vols. 4to; 2d ed. Paris, 1742, 8 vols. 12mo; transl. into Dutch, Amsterd. 1725, 4 vols. 12mo; German, Nuremb. 1783–87, 6 vols. 8vo), and some other historical and miscellaneous works. See *Journal des Savants*, Oct., Nov., and Dec. 1730; Echard, *Script. ord. S. Domin.* ii, 806; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 393.

Labbé, PHILIPPE, a celebrated French Jesuit, was born at Bourges July 10, 1607. He joined the order in 1623, and became professor of ethics, philosophy, and moral theology, first at the College of Bourges, where he had been educated, and afterwards at Paris, where he settled in 1643 or 1644. After teaching theology for two years in that city, he turned himself exclusively to literary labors. He died at Paris Mar. 25, 1667. Labbé was a man of extensive learning, uncommon memory, and great activity. Sotwel, Nicéron, and Moréri consider him as the author of seventy-five different works, some of them quite insignificant, however. His chief claim to renown rests on his Manual of Councils, which was completed by Gabriel Cossart, and published at Paris in 1671 (16 vols. in 17, folio; to some copies an 18th vol. is added, containing Jacobatius *de Conciliis*). The most complete edition was published under the title *SS. Concilia, ad regiam editionem exacta, quæ olim quarta parte prodiit auctior. Studio Philip. Labbei, et Gabr. Cossartii. Nunc verò integre, insertis Stephani Baluzii et Joannis Harduini additamentis, plurimis præterea undicunque conquisitis monumentis, notis insuper ac observationibus, firmiori fundamento conciliorum epochas præcipue fulcientibus, longè locupletior et emendatior exhibetur. Curante Nicolao Coleti* (Venet. 1728, 23 vols. fol.). *Et supplementum J. D. Mansi* (Lucæ, 1748–52, 6 vols.; in all, 29 vols. fol.). This is the most complete collection extant of the Councils of the Church. It was reprinted, with the supplement incorporated, and edited by Mansi, at Florence (1757–98, 31 vols. folio)—a much esteemed and accurate edition; but it only reaches to the year 1509, while the edition by Coletus brings the councils down to 1727. Among his other works the most important are, *SS. Patrum theologorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum utriusque Testamenti Bibliotheca chronologica. Cum pinacotheca scriptorum Soc. Jesu* (Par. 1659, 16mo): —*L'étymologie de plusieurs mots François, contre les abus de la secte des Hellénistes du Port-Royal* (Paris, 1661, 12mo):—*Bibliotheca bibliothecarum* (3d edit. Roth. 1678, 8vo):—*De Byzantinæ historiæ scriptoribus* (Byzantine Histories, i):—*Nova Bibliotheca MSS. Librorum* (1657, 2 vols. fol.):—*De Scriptoribus Eccles. Dissertatio* (2 vols. 8vo); etc. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 338; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1751; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 944. (J. N. P.)

Labben. See MUTH-LABBEN.

Labis (λαβίς, or λαβίδιον, *a spoon*), an implement used in the Greek Church for the purpose of administering the elements in the Lord's Supper. Difficulties in the administration of the wine were fancied to arise in the Middle Ages, in order to meet which the *fistulæ eucharisticæ* were introduced; and subsequently the prac-

tice of dipping the bread in the wine, so that both might be administered together. The Latin Church at length withdrew the wine altogether; and the Greek Church, mingling both elements, administered them at once with a λαβίς, or *spoon*. See FISTULÆ.

Labor (properly עָבַד, *abad'*, to *work*, Gr. ἐργάζομαι; also עָמַל, *amal'*, to *toil*, Gr. κοπιάω; and other terms). From Gen. ii, 15 (where the same word עָבַד is used, A. V. "till"), we learn that man, even in a state of innocence, and surrounded by all the external sources of happiness, was not to pass his time in indolent repose. By the very constitution of his animal frame, exercise of some kind was absolutely essential to him (comp. Eccles. v, 12). In Gen. iii, 19, labor, in its more rigorous and exhausting forms, is set forth as a part of the primeval curse, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread;" and doubtless there is a view of labor which exhibits it in reality as a heavy, sometimes a crushing burden (compare Gen. xxxv, 16). But labor is by no means exclusively an evil, nor is its prosecution a dishonor (comp. Psa. ciii, 23, 24). It is the prostration of strength, wherewith is also connected the temporary incapacity of sharing in the enjoyments of life, and not labor itself, which constitutes the curse pronounced on the fallen man. Hence we find that, in primitive times, manual labor was neither regarded as degrading nor confined to a certain class of society, but was more or less prosecuted by all. By the institution of the Sabbath, moreover, one seventh of man's brief life was rescued from labor, and appropriated to rest of body and to that improvement of the mind which tends to strengthen, invigorate, and sustain the entire man. See SABBATH.

Labor was enjoined on all Israelites as a sacred duty in the fourth commandment (Exod. xx, 9; Deut. v, 13); and the Bible entertains so high a respect for the diligent and skilful laborer, that we are told in Prov. xxii, 29, "Seest thou a man skilled in his work, he shall stand before kings" (comp. also ibid. x, 4; xii, 24, 27). Among the beautiful features which grace an excellent housewife, it is prominently set forth that "she worketh willingly with her own hands" (Prov. xxxi, 13). With such an honorable regard for labor, it is not to be wondered at that when Nebuchadnezzar carried the Jews away into captivity, he found among them a thousand craftsmen and smiths (2 Kings xxiv, 14–16; Jer. xxix, 2). The ancient rabbins, too, regarded manual labor as most honorable, and urged it upon every one as a duty, as may be seen from the following sayings in the Talmud: "He who does not teach his son a craft is, as it were, bringing him up to robbery" (*Cholin*, 105); "Labor is greatly to be prized, for it elevates the laborer, and maintains him" (*Chagiga*, 5; *Nedarim*, 49, b; *Baba Bathra*, 110, a). See HANDICRAFT.

The Hebrews, like other primitive nations, appear to have been herdsmen before they were agriculturists (Gen. iv, 2, 12, 17, 22); and the practice of keeping flocks and herds continued in high esteem and constant observance as a regular employment and a social condition (Judg. i, 16; iv, 11; Amos vii, 14; Luke ii, 8). The culture of the soil came in course of time, introducing the discovery and exercise of the practical arts of life, which eventually led to those refinements, both as to processes and to applications, which precede, if they do not create, the fine arts (Gen. iv; xxvi, 12; xxxiii, 19). Agriculture, indeed, became the chief employment of the Hebrew race after their settlement in Canaan; it lay at the very basis of the constitution, both civil and religious, which Moses gave them, was held in great honor, and was carried on by the high as well as the humble in position (Judg. vi, 11; 1 Sam. xi, 5; 1 Kings xix, 19). No small care was bestowed on the culture of the vine, which grew luxuriously on the hills of Palestine (Isa. v, 2, 5; Matt. xxi, 33; Numb. xiii, 24). The vintage was a season of jubilee (Judg. ix, 27; Jer. xxv, 30; Isa. xvi, 10). The hills of Palestine were also adorned with well-cultured olive-gardens, which produced fruit useful for food, for anointing, and for medicine (Isa. xvii, 6; xxiv, 13; Deut. xxiv, 20; Ezek. xxvii, 17; 1 Kings iv, 25; Hos. xiv, 6, 7). Attention was also given to the culture of the fig-tree (2 Kings xxi, 7; 1 Chron. xxvii, 28), as well as of the date-palm (Lev. xxiii, 40; Judg. i, 16; iv, 5; xx, 33; Deut. xxxiv, 3), and also of balsam (Gen. xliii, 11; Ezek. xxvii, 17; xxxvii, 25; Jer. viii, 22). See AGRICULTURE.

Laborantès (*laborers*), a name sometimes given to the *copiatæ* or *fossarii*, on the assumption that the Greek word κοπιάται is taken from κόπος, *labor*.—Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s. v. See COPIATÆ; FOSSARII.

Laborde, VIVIEN, a French priest, born at Toulouse, Nov. 1, 1680, flourished at Paris under the patronage of cardinal De Noailles. He died March 5, 1748. His works are, *A Treatise on the Essence:—Distinction and Limits of the Spiritual and Temporal Powers:—Familiar Conferences;* and other religious works of value.

Labouderie, JEAN, a celebrated French theological writer, was born at Chalinargues, Auvergne, Feb. 13, 1776. He became vicar of Notre Dame, Paris, in 1815, and early distinguished himself more as a writer than a preacher. He was particularly conversant with the Hebrew language. He died as honorary grand vicar of Avignon at Paris, May 2, 1849. Among his works are *Pensées théologiques* (Clermont, 1801, 8vo):—*Considérations addressées aux aspirants au ministère de l'église de Genève, faisant suite à celles de M. Empeytaz sur la divinité de Jesus-Christ, avec une réponse à quelques questions de M. Delloc*, etc. (Paris, 1817, 8vo):—*Précis historique du Méthodisme* (1818, 8vo):—*Le Christianisme de Montaigne* (1819, 8vo):—*Vies des Saints* (1820, 3 vols. 24mo):—*La Religion Chrétienne* (1826, 8vo):—*Notice historique sur Zwingle* (1828, 8vo); etc. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 395.

Laboureur, LE JEAN, a French priest, born at Montmorency in 1623, became one of the almoners of the king, and died in 1675. He wrote several valuable works on the history of France.

Labrador, a peninsula of north-eastern America, is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by the Dominion of Canada and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, on the west by the Hudson Bay and James Bay, on the north by the Hudson Strait. Area about 500,000 sq. miles. The peninsula formerly was a part of the territory belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, and with the remainder of this territory was in 1869 sold to the government of the Dominion of Canada. The interior of the country is almost entirely unknown. The population, comprising Indians, Esquimaux, and a few Europeans, amounts to about 4000. It is believed that Labrador is identical with the *Helluland* (stone-land) which about the year 1000 was discovered by Leif, the son of Eric the Red. On June 24, 1497, it was again discovered by John and Sebastian Cabot. It was visited in 1500 by the Portuguese G. Cortereal, who called it *Tierra del Labrador* (land for labor), and in 1576 by the Englishman M. Frobisher. In 1618 Hudson explored a part of the coast. The country, which has a rugged coast, and is surrounded with many small islands, does not allow an extensive cultivation; for, although the vegetation is only in the northern part so limited as it is throughout Greenland, the winters are even more severe, and during the short summers the musquitoes are even more troublesome than in Greenland. The population of the interior, which consists of Red Indians, is very small; the Esquimaux, who inhabit the north-eastern and the western coast, are a little more numerous, and support themselves by fishing seals, etc. If these animals fail them a famine is brought on, or they are forced to penetrate farther into the interior, where they are apt to encounter the Red Indians, their irreconcilable enemies for centuries.

The first attempt to establish a mission on the coast of Labrador was made by the Moravians in 1752, when

J. C. Erhardt was killed by the Esquimaux. In 1771 the Moravians succeeded in establishing the station of Nain, to which in the course of the following ten years the stations of Okak and Hoffenthal (Hopedale) were added. The mission met here with the same difficulties as in Greenland. Thirty-four years after the establishment of the first mission an extensive revival took place, in consequence of which the Esquimaux connected with these stations were gained to Christianity. For the Esquimaux living more to the north, Hebron was founded in 1830. In 1864 the station of Zoar was established for the tract of land lying between Nain and Hoffenthal. All the Esquimaux in this part of Labrador are now Christians. Only north of Hebron a few pagans are still living, for the conversion of whom in 1871 the station of Rama, situated on the Bay of Nullatorusek (a little north of lat. 59° N.) was founded. Famine and epidemics have greatly reduced the number of the Esquimaux in Labrador. In 1870 the station of Nain numbered 239, Okak 339, Hoffenthal 250, Hebron 219, and Zoar 109 souls, while the number of missionaries and attendants was 45. The acquaintance of the natives with European necessities forced the missionaries to charge themselves with the importation of some of these articles. Subsequently this trade was transferred to special agents. In the mean while, commercial interests have caused a number of Europeans to settle on the coast of Labrador, and a number of trading-posts to be established. Besides the Moravians, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has begun missionary efforts on the southern coast, and the Roman Catholic Church has endeavored to gain an influence upon the Red Indians of the interior. See Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions;* Grundeman, *Missionsatlas;* Römer, *Geschichte der Labrador-Mission* (Gnadau, 1871). (A. J. S.)

Labrousse, Clotilde Suzan Courcelles de, a French religious enthusiast, was born at Vauxain, Perigord, May 8, 1747. While quite young she adopted exaggerated mystical notions, thought herself called to become a saint, and was so anxious to leave this world for a better one that she made an attempt at suicide when but nine years old. Her ascetic practices were very severe, and became still more so as she grew up, yet did not seem to have any injurious effect on her health. At the age of nineteen she became a nun of the third order of St. Francis, and soon after declared that she had received a mission to travel through the world to convert sinners, but was detained in the convent by her superior. She then wrote a history of her life, which she addressed to M. de Flamarens, bishop of Perigueux, without effect. The MS., however, attracted the attention of Dom Gerle, prior of the Chartreuse of Vauclaire, who entered into correspondence with the authoress in 1769, and she afterwards declared, when he was elected a member of the National Assembly, that she had predicted it to him. When the Revolution broke out, M. Pontard, constitutional bishop of Dordogne, attracted her to Paris, where she prophesied against the court of Rome, and in favor of the civil constitution of the clergy. She subsequently returned to Perigord, and left there to go to Rome, thinking to convert the pope, cardinals, etc., to her views, and to induce them to renounce temporal power. On her way she addressed the people wherever an opportunity offered. In August, 1792, she arrived at Bologna, whence she was driven by the legate. At Viterbo she was arrested and taken to the castle of San Angelo. In 1796 the French Directory interfered to obtain her liberation, but she preferred remaining, as she had been very kindly treated; but when the French took Rome in 1798 she left the prison and returned to Paris, where she died in 1821. She persisted to the last in believing herself inspired, and actually succeeded in gathering a small circle of adherents. Labrousse wrote *Propheties concernant la Révolution Française, suivies d'une Prédiction qui annonce la fin du monde* (for 1899) (Paris, 1790, 8vo):—*Lettre de Mlle. de Labrousse* (Paris, 1790, 8vo). Pontard published a *Recueil des Ouvrages de la célèbre Mlle. Labrousse* (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo). See Mahul, *Annuaire nécrolog.* 1822; Arnault, Jay, Jouy et Norvins, *Biog. nouv. des Contemp.;* Quérard, *La France Littéraire.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 418.

La Brune, François de. See La Brune, Jean de.

La Brune, Jean de, a French Protestant minister, flourished in the second half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. After the revocation of the edict of Nantes he went as pastor to Basle; later he became minister at Schoonoven, in Holland. He is particularly celebrated as a writer, but many of the works which have generally been attributed to him are now believed to be the production of François de la Brune, also a Protestant French pastor, who flourished about the same time; went to Amsterdam in 1685, and, on account of heterodox opinions, was suspended from the ministry in 1691. We have under the name of La Brune, among other works, *Morale de Confucius* (Amst. 1688, 8vo):—Calvin's *Traité de la Justification* (ibid, 1693, 8vo; 1705, 12mo):—*Hist. du Vieux et du Nouveau Test. en vers* (1731, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 423.

Lacarry, Giles, a French Jesuit, who was born at Castres in 1605, and died in 1684, is noted as the author of several works on the history of his country. See *General Biographical Dictionary*, s. v.

Lace (פְּתִיל, *pathil'*, from being *twisted*), the blue *cord* with which the high-priest's breastplate was attached to the ephod (Exod. xxviii, 28, 37; xxxix, 21, 31; rendered "riband" Numb. xv, 38); spoken of gold "*wire*" (Exod. xxxix, 3), the *chain* for attaching a cover to its vessel ("bound," Numb. xix, 15); a strong "*thread*" of tow (Judg. xvi, 9), or measuring-"*line*" of flax (Ezek. xl, 3); also of the *string* by which the signet-ring was suspended in the bosom ("bracelet," Gen. xxxviii, 18, 35); finally (κλῶσμα, a *spun* thread, like *pathil* above, for which it stands in Numb. xv, 36), a *cord* (Ecclus. vi, 30).

Lacedæmo'nian (Λακεδαιμόνιος, 2 Macc. v, 9; elsewhere Σπαρτιάτης), an inhabitant of Lacedæmon or Sparta, in Greece, with whom the Jews at one time claimed kindred (1 Macc. xii, 2, 5, 6, 20, 21; xiv, 20, 23; xv, 23). See Sparta.

Lacey, William B., D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1781. He entered the ministry in 1813 as missionary of Chenango County, N. Y.; in 1818 he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany. He labored there upwards of twenty years, his ministration being crowned with great success. Subsequently he became professor in the University of Pennsylvania, and president of a college at Laceyville, Pa. He died October 31, 1866. Dr. Lacey wrote a number of text-books for schools and colleges which were deservedly popular in their day, particularly his *Rhetoric* and *Moral Philosophy.* During the last ten years of his life he employed his leisure hours in revising a *History of the English Church prior to the Time of the Monk Augustin,* and some of his choicest sermons and other MSS. See *Am. Ch. Rev.* 1867, p. 647.

La Chaise or **La Chaize d'Aix,** François de, *Père*, a celebrated French Jesuit and noted confessor of Louis XIV, was born of a noble family at the castle of Aix Aug. 25, 1624. He was educated at the College of Roaune, became a Jesuit, and afterwards went to complete his studies at Lyons, where he subsequently taught philosophy with great success. Having been appointed professor of theology, he was soon called away from Lyons to direct the establishment of his order at Grenoble, but almost immediately returned with the office of provincial. Finally, on the death of father Ferrier, he succeeded him as confessor of the king in 1675. Madame de Montespan was then at the height of her favor, and all the efforts of father Ferrier, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, and

Mascaron had proved ineffective against her. La Chaise proceeded more cautiously than his predecessors, and proved more successful. Never directly contradicting his royal penitent, he knew how to gain him to his views by slow but steady advances. Whenever he saw the king disposed to throw off his easy yoke, he would feign sickness and send some priest of strict and uncompromising principles to the king, who, being positively refused absolution once by father Deschamps, would, after such experiments, submit the more readily to the wily Jesuit. The latter, moreover, was an agreeable companion as well as an easy confessor. Madame de Montespan, weary of the contest with La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon, retired finally into a convent. The queen dying a few years afterwards, La Chaise is said to have given the king the idea of a morganatic marriage, and even to have performed the ceremony. Yet, in spite of all he had done for her, Madame de Maintenon (q. v.) does not appear to have ever been very friendly towards the Jesuit; perhaps because he prevented a public recognition of her marriage; perhaps also because she knew that in helping her he had worked only for himself. When Madame de Maintenon founded the institution of St. Cyr, La Chaise, Racine, and Boileau were commissioned to revise its rules. The former opposed the rule that teachers should be required to take anything more than the simple vows, and carried his point, though subsequently this was changed, and they became subject to the rule of St. Augustine. After the death of the queen and of Colbert, the actions of the king were entirely governed by La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon. Both agreed against the Protestants, and their joint efforts brought on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Jesuit, indeed, tried to conciliate the king and the pope when the difficulties arose about the declaration of the clergy in 1682, and the famous four propositions, and even appeared more inclined to side with the temporal than with the spiritual monarch; but he again balanced the account by advocating the dragonnades as a sure means of reclaiming erring consciences. He died Jan. 20, 1709. In the famous quarrel between Fénelon and Bossuet, La Chaise sided with the former, as far, at least, as he dared without offending the king. He even affected great regard for Quesnel, though, when it is remembered that he caused the works of that writer to be condemned, the sincerity of his regard may be doubted; but it was his principle to attack individuals, not parties, and he therefore found it convenient, as a true Jesuit, to praise men whom, on account of their very principles, he secretly sought to destroy. See JANSENISM; JESUITS. He was a shrewd, persevering politician, and did much good to his order, but père La Chaise cannot be lauded either as a great man or as a good priest. The kindest comment ever made on his character is that by Voltaire, who speaks of him as "a mild person, with whom the ways of conciliation were always open." He obtained the king's protection for the College of Clermont, since called Collége Louis-le-Grand, and received for his order a fine estate to which his name was given, and which is now the cemetery of "*Père la Chaise*" at Paris. He wrote *Peripateticæ quadruplicis philosophiæ Placita rationalis*, etc. (Lyons, 1661, 2 vols. fol.):—*Humanæ sapientiæ Propositiones propugnatæ Lugduni in collegio Soc. Jesu* (Lyons, 1662, fol.):—*Réponse à quelques difficultés proposées à un théologien*, etc. (Lyons, 1666, 4to); etc. See Saint-Simon, *Mémoires;* Madame de Maintenon, *Correspondance;* Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV;* Benoist, *Hist. de l'Edit de Nantes;* Jurieu, *Politique du Clergé de France;* Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, vol. xxv, xxvi, and xxvii; Régis de Chantelauze, *Le Père de la Chaise* (Lyons, 1859, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxviii, 483. See LOUIS XIV.

La Chapelle, ARMAND BOISBELEAU DE, a French Protestant writer, was born at Ozillac (Saintonge) in 1676. He was a student at the college of Bordeaux when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes obliged him to retire to England, where he was received by his grandfather, pastor of the Walloon Church at London. In 1694 he was ordained, and soon afterwards sent to Ireland. Subsequently he became successively pastor of Wandsworth, in the neighborhood of London, in 1696; of the chapel of the French artillery in that town in 1711; and finally pastor of the Walloon Church of the Hague in 1725. He died August 6, 1746. La Chapelle wrote *Réflexions au sujet d'un système prétendu nouveau sur le mystère de la Trinité* (Amst. 1729, 8vo):—*Examen de la manière de prêcher des Protestants Français*, etc. (Amsterd. 1730, 8vo):—*Réponse à Mr. Mainard, ancien chanoine de St. Sernin de Toulouse, au sujet d'une conférence sur la religion*, etc. (La Haye, 1730, 4to):—*Entretien au sujet de la Lettre d'un Théologien sur le mystère de la Trinité* (La Haye, 1730, 8vo):—*Lettre d'un théologien Réformé à un gentilhomme Luthérien* (Amst. 1736, 2 vols. 12mo); it is also known under the title *Lettres sur l'ouvrage de controverse du P. Schaffmacher:—Mémoires de Pologne*, etc. (Lond. 1739, 12mo):—*Description des cérémonies observées à Rome depuis la mort de Clément XII jusqu'au couronnement de Benoit XIV, son successeur*, etc. (Paris, 1741, 12mo):—*De la Nécessité du culte public parmi les Chrétiens* (La Haye, 1746, 8vo; Frankfort, 1747, 2 vols. 12mo; transl. into Dutch, Amst. 1748, 8vo; into German, Breslau, 1749, 8vo; Lpz. 1769, 8vo). It is a defence of the course of the French Protestants in holding their assemblies *du désert* in spite of the edicts of the king:—*Vie de Beausobre* (in Beausobre's *Remarques sur le Nouveau Testament*, vol. ii). He wrote also in *La Bibliothèque Anglaise, ou histoire littéraire de la Grande-Bretagne* (Amst. 1717–27, 15 vols. 12mo):—*Bibliothèque raisonnée des Ouvrages des Savants de l'Europe* (Amst. 1728–53, 52 vols. 12mo):—*Nouvelle Bibliothèque, ou histoire littéraire des principaux ecrits qui se publient* (La Haye, 1738 sq., 19 vols. 12mo). He also translated into French some works of Dition, Steele, Bentley, and Burnet. See Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxviii, 507. (J. N. P.)

La'chish (Heb. *Lakish'*, לָכִישׁ, prob. *impregnable*, otherwise *smitten;* Sept. in Josh. and Kings Λαχίς; in Chron., Neh., and Jer. Λαχείς v. r. Λαχίς; in Isa. Λαχεῖς v. r. Λαχίς or Λαχήϛ; in Mic. Λαχεῖς; Josephus Λαχίς, *Ant.* viii, 10, 1; also Λάχεισα, *Ant.* ix, 9, 3), a Canaanitish royal city (Josh. xii, 11) in the southern part of Palestine, whose king Japhia joined the Amoritish confederacy against Joshua (Josh. x, 3, 5); but he was taken (Josh. xv, 25), and his city destroyed by the victorious Israelites, in spite of the re-enforcement of the king of Gezer (Josh. xv, 31–35, where its great strength is denoted by the *two* days' assault). See JOSHUA. From these last passages it appears to have been situated between Libnah and Eglon; but it is mentioned between Joktheel and Bozkath, among the cities of the Philistine valley or plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 39). It is mentioned in connection with Adoraim and Azekah as having been rebuilt, or rather fortified, by Rehoboam against the Philistines (2 Chron. xi, 9), and seems after that time to have been regarded as one of the strongest fortresses of the kingdom of Judah (for hither Amaziah was pursued and slain, 2 Kings xiv, 19; 2 Chron. xxv, 27), having for a time braved the assaults of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib on his way to Egypt (2 Kings xviii, 14, 17; xix, 8; 2 Chron. xxxii, 9; Isa. xxxvi, 2; xxxvii, 8); but was at length taken by Nebuchadnezzar, at the downfall of the kingdom of Judah (Jer. xxxiv, 7). It was reoccupied after the exile (Neh. xi, 30). The affright occasioned by these sudden attacks was predicted by the prophet Micah (i, 13), where this city, lying not very far from the frontiers of the kingdom of Israel, appears to have been the first to introduce the idolatry of that commonwealth into Judaism. A detailed representation of the siege of some large Jewish city by Sennacherib has been discovered on the recently disinterred monuments of Assyria, which is there called *Lakhisha*, and presumed to be Lachish (Layard's

Nineveh and Babylon, p. 152), although it does not appear from the Biblical account that this city yielded to his arms; indeed, some expressions would almost seem to imply the reverse (see "thought to win them," 2 Chron. xxxii, 1; "departed from Lachish," 2 Kings xix, 8; and especially Jer. xxxiv, 7). Col. Rawlinson even reads the name of the city in question on the monuments as *Lubana*, i. e. Libnah (Layard, *ut sup.* p. 153, note). Rawlinson also thinks that on the first attack at least Sennacherib did not sack the city (*Herodotus*, i, 481, note 6). At all events, it would seem that, after the submission of Hezekiah, Sennacherib in some way reduced Lachish, and marched in force against the Egyptians (Joseph. *Ant.* x, 1, 1; comp. Isa. xx, 1–4). Rawlinson maintains (*Herodotus*, i, 477) that Sennacherib attacked Lachish a second time, but whether on his return from his Egyptian campaign, or after he had paid a visit to Nineveh, cannot now be determined. See Hezekiah. It is specially mentioned that he laid siege to it "with all his power" (2 Chron. xxxii, 9), and here "the great king" himself remained, while his officers only were dispatched to Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxii, 9; 2 Kings xviii, 17). See Sennacherib. This siege is considered by Layard and Hincks to be depicted on the slabs found by the former in one of the chambers of the palace at Kouyunjik, which bear the inscription "Sennacherib, the mighty king, king of the country of Assyria, sitting on the throne of judgment before (or at the entrance of) the city of Lachish (Lakhisha). I give permission for its slaughter" (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 149–52, and 153, note). These slabs contain a view of a city which, if the inscription is correctly interpreted,



Attack of Lachish by the Assyrians. From the Monuments.

must be Lachish itself. The bas-reliefs depict the capture of an extensive city defended by double walls, with battlements and towers, and by fortified outworks. The country around is represented as hilly and wooded, producing the fig and the vine. Immense preparations had evidently been made for the siege, and in no other

Ground-plan of Lachish as taken by the Assyrians. From the Monuments.

sculptures were so many armed warriors drawn up in array against a besieged city, which was defended with equal determination. The process of the assault and sack are given in the most minute and lively manner. The spoil and captives are exhibited in full, the latter distinguished by their Jewish physiognomy, and by the pillaged condition of their garments. On a throne in front of the city is represented the Assyrian king giving orders for the disposal of the prisoners, several of whom are depicted as already in the hands of the executioners, some being stretched naked on the ground in order to be flayed alive, while others were slain by the sword. (See Layard's *Monuments of Nineveh*, 2d series, plates 20–24.) See Captive.

Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) state that in their time Lachish was a village seven miles south

Jewish Captives from Lachish. From the Assyrian Sculptures at Kouyunjik.

("towards Darom") of Eleutheropolis. The only place that has been found by travellers at all answering to the scriptural notices is *Um-Lakis*, on the left of the road between Gaza and Hebron, situated "upon a low round knoll, now covered confusedly with heaps of small round stones, with intervals between, among which are seen two or three fragments of marble columns, wholly overgrown with thistles; a well to the south-east, below the hill, now almost filled up, having also several columns around it" (Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ii, 388). This locality, notwithstanding it is somewhat more distant from Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) than the *Onomasticon* calls for, and likewise to the south-*west*, and notwithstanding the imperfect agreement in name (several of the letters being different in the Heb. and Arabic, in addition to the prefix *Um* [which, however, may only denote its importance as a *mother*-city]), Raumer and Grosse (in the *Studien u. Krit.* 1845, i, 243 sq.) incline to identify with that of Lachish, on the ground of its proximity (see Josh. x, 31–36) to Eglon (Raumer, *Beitrage zur biblischen Geographie*, 1843, p. 23). With this conclusion Schwarz concurs (*Palestine*, p. 85), as also Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 329), and Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 356); but Ritter is undecided (*Erdkunde*, xvi, 131). By "Daroma," also, Eusebius may have intended a place of that name, mentioned in the Talmud, and placed by hap-Parchi two hours south of Gaza (Zunz in *Benj. of Tudela*, by Asher, ii, 442). On account of the weakness of Um-Lakis (see, however, Porter, *Handbook*, p. 261), Mr. Petrie prefers the adjacent site of *Tell Hesy*, where ancient remains have been found (*Pal. Explor. Quarterly Statement*, 1890, p. 159 sq.).

Lachmann, KARL, a distinguished German philologist, was born at Brunswick March 4, 1793. He studied at the universities of Leipzig and Göttingen, and in 1811 founded, together with Bunsen, Dissen, and Ern. Schulze, the Philological Society. In 1813 he entered the army as a volunteer, but, having left it at the conclusion of the war, he became professor at the University of Berlin in 1827, and member of the Academy of that city in 1830. He died at Berlin March 13, 1851. His philological works are distinguished for profound learning and able criticism. He confined himself mainly to editions of classical authors, but he also published an edition of the Greek New Testament (Berlin, 1831; 3d ed. 1846; in a larger form, 1846-50). In this edition of the New-Testament Scriptures in the original, "he aimed," says Dr. W. L. Alexander (Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 769), "at presenting, as far as possible, the text as it was in the authorized copies of the 4th century, his design being, not to compare various readings with the received text, but to supply a text derived from ancient authorities directly and exclusively. Relinquishing the possibility of ascertaining what was the exact text of the original as it appeared in the autographs of the authors, he set himself to determine the oldest attainable text by means of extant codices. For this purpose he made use of only a very few MSS., viz. A, B, C, P, Q, T, Z, for the Gospels; D, G, H, for the Epistles; the ante-Hieronymian Latin versions, and the readings of Origen, Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer; and for the Apocalypse, Primarius. Under the Greek text the editor cites his authorities, and at the bottom of the page he gives the Vulgate version edited from two codices of the 6th century, the Fuldensis and the Amiantinus, preserved in the Laurentian Library at Florence. . . . On its first appearance, his work and the principles on which it was based were subjected to much hostility, but his great services to the cause of N.-T. criticism are now universally admitted. That he narrowed unreasonably the sphere of legitimate authority for the sacred text, that he was sometimes capricious in his selection of authorities, and that, while he did not always follow his authorities, he at other times followed them even in their manifest errors and blunders, may be admitted. But, after every deduction from the merits of his work is made which justice demands, there will still remain to Lachmann the high praise of having been the first to apply to the editing of the Greek N. T. those sound principles of textual criticism which can alone secure a correct and trustworthy text. In this he followed, to a considerable extent, the counsel of the illustrious Bentley, uttered more than a century before (whence some, who sought to discredit his efforts, unworthily mocked him as 'Simia Bentleii'); but he owed nothing to Bentley beyond the suggestion of the principles he has followed; and he possessed and has ably used materials which in Bentley's time were not to be had." (Comp. Lachmann's exposition of his principles in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, p. 817–845; also a review of Scrivener's [*Collation of the Gospels*, Cambr. 1853, 8vo] strictures on Lachmann's edition of the N.-T. writings in Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1853, July, p. 365 sq.) See Hertz, *Lachmann; eine Biographie* (Berlin, 1851, 8vo); Tregelles, *Printed Text of the Greek N. T.* p. 97 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 532; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 954. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Lacombe, PÈRE, a celebrated Roman Catholic monastic, a native of Savoy, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, first as the spiritual adviser and confessor of Madame Guyon, and afterwards as a zealous follower of the eminent French female Mystic. In 1687, when the Quietism of Molinos, which Lacombe ardently espoused, was condemned, père Lacombe was imprisoned, and he died in prison in 1699. During his imprisonment he became very much depressed in mind, and finally lost his reason. This gave rise to the statement made in our vol. iii, p. 1039, that "he died in a madhouse." His relation with Madame Guyon had been very intimate, and this was quite natural when we consider that the former confessor became an ardent follower of Madame, and no doubt the scandal to which their associations had given rise, as well as the imprisonment, made Lacombe a great sufferer in his last days. He wrote *Analyse de l'oraison mentale*, which in 1688 was forbidden. See GUYON. (J. H. W.)

Lacombe, Dominique, a French prelate of note, was born at Montrejean (Haute Garonne) July 25, 1749,

and was educated in the college at Tarbes, which he entered in 1766. In 1788 he became rector of a college at Bordeaux, but energetically embracing the principles of the Revolution in 1789, he solemnly declared in favor of separation of Church and State, and was elected in consequence curate of St. Paul at Bordeaux. Sent to the Assembly, he took quite a prominent part in politics until the decretal prohibiting all ecclesiastical dress was published (April 7, 1792), when he forthwith ceased his service to the state, and returned to Bordeaux to assume the duties of his ecclesiastical functions. In 1797 he was elected metropolitan of Bordeaux, and in 1802 was one of the twelve bishops nominated by the emperor Napoleon, as whose zealous partisan Lacombe is known after his elevation to the episcopacy of Angoulême. He died April 7, 1823. See *Annales de la Religion*, xv, 134; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 541.

Lacordaire, Jean Baptiste Henri, a noted Roman Catholic theologian of this century, the reviver of the Dominican order, and a most distinguished pulpit orator of modern France, was born at Recey-sur-Ource, in the department Côte-d'Or, March 12, 1802. He was educated for the legal profession, first at Dijon, where he obtained the highest honors, and afterwards (1822) at Paris, and in 1824 he began practice as an advocate, and rose rapidly to distinction. Lacordaire was at this time, like most of the youth of France, a Deist of the Voltaire school, but Lamennais' *Essai sur l'indifférence*, which fell into his hands, decided the youthful lawyer to devote himself thereafter to the cause of the Christian religion, which he felt satisfied must form the basis of all social life. He immediately abandoned his profession, and entered the College of St. Sulpice, and in 1827 received holy orders. Montalembert, Lacordaire's biographer, however, would have us believe that this sudden change from atheism to orthodox Christianity "was due to no man and to no book, but solely to a sudden impulse of grace, which opened his eyes to the sin and folly of irreligion." Shortly after his ordination he was offered the position of auditor of the rota at the court of Rome, an office which at once confers the title of monsignore, and is always a step to the episcopate, and often to a cardinal's hat; but he declined it peremptorily. His first appointment was that of almoner in the College of Juilly, also known as the College of Henry IV. Here he became personally acquainted with the abbé Lamennais, and speedily the youthful priest and the learned theologian formed a close and intimate alliance, which was interrupted only by the departure of Lamennais from the Church in 1833. One of the first, and perhaps most important, results of the friendly alliance of these three men was the establishment, after the July revolution of 1830, of the *Journal L'Avenir*, "an organ at once of the highest Church principles and of the most extreme radicalism." See Lamennais. Count Montalembert has furnished us a life-like portrait of Lacordaire at this time; and, although much allowance must be made for the passionate exclamations of a friend, it deserves at least our notice. "It was in November, 1830, that I saw him for the first time in the cabinet of the abbé Lamennais, four months after a revolution which had appeared for a moment to confound in a common ruin the throne and the altar, and one month after the establishment of the *Journal L'Avenir*. That journal had for its motto '*God and Liberty!*' It was the intention of the founders that it should regenerate Catholic opinion in France, and seal its union with liberal progress. . . . . He was twenty-eight years of age; he was dressed as a layman, the state of Paris not then permitting priests to wear their clerical costume. His slender figure, his delicate and regular features, his chiselled forehead, the sovereign carriage of his head, his black and sparkling eye, an indescribable union of high spirit, elegance, and modesty in his whole appearance, were only the outward tokens of a soul which seemed ready to overflow, not merely in the free conflicts of public speaking, but in the effusions of intimate friendship. The brightness of his glance revealed at once treasures of indignation and of tenderness; it sought not merely enemies to combat and overthrow, but also hearts to win over and subdue. His voice, so vigorous and vibrating, took often accents of infinite sweetness. Born to combat and to love, he already bore the stamp of the double royalty of soul and of talent. He appeared to me charming and terrible, as the type of enthusiasm for good, of virtue armed in defence of the truth. I saw in him one of the elect, predestinated to all that youth most desires and adores — genius and glory." The articles published in the *Avenir* speedily provoked the displeasure of the episcopate, and an early opportunity was sought to bring the transgressors to grief. This was found in an intemperate attack written by Lacordaire against Louis Philippe. Both Lacordaire and Lamennais were cited before a jury for trial in January, 1831; the former, however, pleaded the cause of the journal with so much eloquence and ability that both the accused were acquitted. Thus encouraged, they adopted more vigorous measures to secure liberty of education, in the face of an energetic opposition from the university. They announced that they would open a free school in the French capital, and actually began teaching in May, 1831. The police, however, soon put an end to this bold movement, and, as one of their number was a count (Montalembert), they were accused before a court of peers, and fined 100 francs. A short time after the papal see openly declared its opposition to them by an encyclical censure which Gregory XVI issued Sept. 18, 1832. Rejecting all their dogmas, it declared "the whole idea of the regeneration of the Church absurd, liberty of conscience a delirium, freedom of the press fatal, and inviolable submission to the prince a maxim of faith." Even before this papal censure had been publicly proclaimed the three chief editors of *L'Avenir* had gone to Rome, to prevent, if possible, any severe measures on the part of the pope. It was at this time that Lamennais first decided to turn from the corruptions of Rome—from the corpse which he saw clearly it was in vain to attempt to resuscitate. Not so, however, was Lacordaire affected. His imagination had been vividly impressed by the imposing ceremonies and glorious traditions of the Romish Church, and he was prepared at once to submit to it "sicut cadaver." "The miseries, the infirmities," says Montalembert, in his biography of Lacordaire, "inseparable from the mingling of everything human with that which is divine, did not escape his notice, but they seemed to him as if lost in the mysterious splendor of tradition and authority. He the journalist, the citizen of 1830, he the democratic liberal, had comprehended at the first glance not only the inviolable majesty of the supreme pontificate, but its difficulties, its long and patient designs, its indispensable regard for men and things here below. The faith and the duty of the Catholic priest had at once elevated that noble heart above all the mists of pride, above all the seductions, all the temptations of talent, above all the intoxication of strife. With the penetration which faith and humility confer, he passed beforehand upon our pretensions the judgment which has been ratified by time, that great auxiliary of the Church and of truth. It was then, I venture to believe, that God marked him forever with the seal of his grace, and that he gave him the assurance of the reward due to the invincible fidelity of a truly priestly soul." Hereafter the man Lacordaire is lost in the churchman, the active and inquiring intellect confined, if not extinguished, by the official religion. His *bonâ fide* retractation of course drew upon him not only estrangement from his master, whose intellectual philosophy he had never really adopted, and whose retractation was never more than formal, but the reproach of worldliness. It was due in reality, however, to a precisely opposite cause. His heart was identified with the cause of the Church, and only his intellect with the Free-Church theory. "Do not let us

chain our *hearts* to our ideas," he said quite earnestly: and he evidently felt the delight in submission which always accompanies a sacrifice of self for something one thinks higher and better than self. He thought he had detected a pride of systematic philosophy in the views of his master, Lamennais, and this had, he said, often galled and fretted him. He believed that the Church, in condemning Lamennais and his school, had delivered him (Lacordaire) "from the most terrible of all oppressions, that of the human intellect;" and henceforth, though tender and respectful to his master in the adversity of papal disfavor, he really loved the Church the better for having humbled himself before her decision, just as he would have loved God better for having bowed his own self-will to the divine volition. The Church, he held, was higher than his intellect. His spirit, he fancied, had gained in vital power by humbling his own intellect before the mind of the Church. And so he embraced the first opportunity that presented itself to convince the papal see of his sincerity. Lamennais had just appeared before the public in his *Paroles d'un croyant*, and the book was selling extensively, and finding a very large circle of readers. Here was an opportunity to break a lance in defence of Rome; and, though the attack in this instance had to be directed even against his own former master, he hesitated not to enter the lists. He replied to Lamennais' book by his *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. Lamennais*, a work which proved a total failure, and which Montalembert, the associate of Lacordaire—his bosom apostate from Lamennais—is obliged to admit as having been anything but successful. New honors, notwithstanding, soon sought out the devoted adherent to the cause of the Ultramontanes, first (in 1833 and 1835) in the offer of the editorship of the journal *L'Univers*, then lately established to further the Ultramontane principles, and later in the proffer of a professor's chair at the University of Louvain. He desired none of these—the pulpit and the convent cell he had decided should be his future place of resort, "to speak and to write, to live a solitary and studious life;" he says in a letter of 1833, "such is the wish of my whole soul."

In the spring of 1833 he preached for the first time in public. It was in the great church of St. Roch, in Paris. "I was there," says M. Montalembert, "with MM. de Courcelles, Ampère, and some others, who must remember it as I do. He failed completely, and, coming out, every one said, 'This is a man of talent, but he never will be a preacher.' Lacordaire himself thought the same." His failure was very much like that of Sheridan, D'Israeli, Robert Hall, and many other orators—an incentive to become great. In the beginning of 1834 he delivered his famous *Conférences* in the Collége Stanislas, the humblest of the colleges of Paris, where he had been appointed as lecturer to the students, and where his failure at St. Roch was now recompensed by a great success, his audience oftentimes amounting to from 500 to 600 persons. In the year following (1835) we find him installed preacher at Notre Dame, and for once it was acknowledged that "France had a living preacher who knew how to fascinate the intellect, kindle the imagination, and touch the heart of the most cultivated and of the most illiterate. Whenever Lacordaire was announced to preach in Notre Dame the cathedral was surrounded, long before the doors were open, by an immense and heterogeneous crowd. Before he appeared in the pulpit, the vast nave, the aisles, and the side chapels were thronged with statesmen and journalists, members of the Academy and tradesmen, working-men and high-born women, sceptics, socialists, devout Catholics, and resolute Protestants, who were all compelled to surrender themselves for the time to the irresistible torrent of his eloquence" (R. W. Dale, in *Contemporary Review*, May, 1868, p. 2).

Only two years after his appointment to Notre Dame, Lacordaire suddenly fixed the wonder of the multitude again upon him by relinquishing the career of distinction which had so lately opened to him, and by journeying to Rome, "with the principal design," as he himself tells us in one of his letters, "of entering the Dominican order, with the accessory design of re-establishing it in France." This opens a new phase in the life of Lacordaire. "It was always the mark of Lacordaire's character," says a writer in the *Spectator* (Lond. Dec. 7, 1867), "that all his deepest feelings, like moral caustic, burnt inward, so that he complained from the beginning of life to the end that even the deepest friendship he knew led him not into society, but into solitude," and it is in solitude that his days are mainly spent after his sudden retreat from Notre Dame in 1837. Henceforth his "inner life" is a story of the inward progress of self-humiliations—self-crucifixions, as he called them, measuring them by the standard of Christ's sufferings. In the complete self-sacrifice of the monk, in the absolute life in God to which he now resigned himself, he believed he could alone find the true source of a new life for human society. If Christ's self-sacrifice was the source of human redemption, the orders which set forth that self-sacrifice most perfectly to the world contained the true life-blood of the world; and henceforth his life and that of his followers became one long passion of self-immolation, in which the spirit was trained by the sharpest voluntary penances to regulate every inward movement by the ideal of Christian humility or humiliation. What Lacordaire's biographer reverently calls "holy follies" were of daily occurrence. "Will you," he said one day on the Campagna to his disciple, père Besson, "suffer something for the sake of him who has suffered so much for us?" and, showing him a thorn-bush, they both at once precipitated themselves into it, and came out covered with blood. How this was "suffering for Christ's sake" Lacordaire does not explain; but he seems to have thought that all suffering, needless or needful, voluntary or involuntary, was a lesson in love for Christ. "All his mysticism," says his biographer, "reduced itself to this one principle, to suffer; to suffer in order to expiate justice, and in order to prove love." And henceforth his life as a monk was a burning fire of religious passion and penance, all intended to teach him, as he thought, to enter more deeply into crucified love: "His thanksgiving after mass was generally short; in making it he most often experienced very ardent emotions of love to God, which he went to appease in the cell of one of his religious. He would enter with his countenance still radiant with the holy joy kindled at the altar; then, humbly kneeling before the religious, and kissing his feet, he would beg him to do him the charity of chastising him for the love of God. Then he would uncover his shoulders, and, whether willing or unwilling, the brother was obliged to give him a severe discipline. He would rise all bruised from his knees, and, remaining for a long time with his lips pressed to the feet of him who had scourged him, would give utterance to his gratitude in the most lively terms, and then withdraw with joy on his brow and in his heart. At other times, after receiving the discipline, he would beg the religious to sit down again at his table, and prostrating himself on the ground under his feet, he would remain there for a quarter of an hour, finishing his prayer in silence, and delighting himself in God, as he felt his head under the foot that humbled him. These penances were very often renewed, and those who were chosen to execute them did not resign themselves to the office without difficulty. It was a real penance to them, especially at first; they would willingly have changed places with him. But gradually they became used to it, and the father took occasion of this to require more, and to make them treat him according to his wishes. Then they were obliged to strike him, to spit in his face, to speak to him as a slave. 'Go and clean my shoes; bring me such a thing; away with you, wretch!' and they had to drive him from them like a dog. The religious whom he selected to render him these services were those who were most at their ease with him; and

he returned by preference to such as spared him least. His thirst for penances of this description appears the more extraordinary from the fact that his exceedingly delicate and sensitive temperament rendered them insupportably painful to him." To Protestants this sounds like the rehearsal of an unreal moral tragedy, a rehearsal which must have done far more to bewilder the minds of those who were guilty of these artificial, cruel, and unmeaning insults to one they loved and revered than to deepen his own love for his Lord. Yet in scenes like these were fostered the roots of his life as a Dominican friar—the spirit less of a modern Catholic thinker than of a mediæval monk. But if his change to a monastic seclusion from the turmoils of Paris life must appear strange to a Protestant reader, greater still will ever be the task to explain how this advocate of liberty of conscience and the impropriety of the interference of the civil power for the punishment of heretics could find it in his heart to resuscitate an order which has more crimes and cruelties to answer for than even the infamous sect of the Assassins—an order whose founder was the very incarnation of persecution. Just here also it may not be out of place to allude to the uncritical manner in which Lacordaire composed a life of St. Dominic —the founder of the Inquisition—entirely ignoring all those historians who have detailed and *proved* the atrocious cruelties perpetrated by that saint and his followers (*Vie de Saint Dominique*, Paris, 1840–4, 8vo).

In 1840, after a three-years' novitiate in the convent of Quercia, Lacordaire took the vows of the order of St. Dominic, and in 1841, with shaved head and clad in the white robe of his order, which had not been seen in France for half a century, he once more ascended the pulpit of Notre Dame. From this time his voice was frequently heard within the walls of that great cathedral of the capital of the French, as well as in many other parts of France. Thus, in 1847, he preached in the cathedral church of Nancy the funeral sermon of general Drouot, by many (e. g. Ste.-Beuve) pronounced a masterpiece of pulpit oratory. In the first election which succeeded the Revolution of 1848 he was chosen one of the representatives of Marseilles, and took part in some of the debates in the Assembly; but he resigned in the following May, and withdrew entirely from political life. In 1849, and again in 1850 and 1851, he resumed his courses at Notre Dame. To immense audiences, such as no orator in France had ever been able to call together before, he delivered in these eventful years a series of discourses on the communion of man with God, on the fall and the restoration of man, and on the providential economy of the restoration, which, together with earlier discourses, have been collected in three volumes, under the title of *Conférences de Notre Dame de Paris* (1835–50; a selection was published in English dress by Henry Langdon, N. York, 1871, 8vo). His last public discourse at Paris he delivered at St. Roch in February, 1853. To some of his remarks the imperial government took exception; and Lacordaire, finding himself restricted in that freedom of speech of which he had been throughout life a steady and powerful defender, never again preached in Paris; but at Toulouse—the birthplace of St. Dominic and the burial-place of St. Aquinas—he delivered in 1854 six discourses on life—the life of the passions, the moral life, the supernatural life, and the influence of the supernatural life on the public and private life of man—which his biographer (Montalembert) pronounces "the most eloquent, the most irreproachable of all." Offered the direction of the school and convent of Sorèze, he withdrew to that noted retreat of the Dominicans, and there died, Nov. 21, 1861. Besides the works alluded to—the *Conférences* and *Considérations philosophiques* — Lacordaire wrote a *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (1840). His correspondence with Madame Swetchine (by Falloux, 1864), with Montalembert (1863), and with a young friend (by l'abbé Perreire, 1863), as well as all his other writings, were published as *Œuvres complètes* in 1851, 1858, and 1861, in 6 vols. 8vo and 12mo. He was elected a member of the Academy in 1860 as successor to M. de Tocqueville, upon whom he pronounced a eulogy—the customary inaugural address—which was his last public address.

Of the ability Lacordaire displayed in his works a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (Oct. 1863), p. 726 sq., thus comments: "As a writer, Lacordaire has not the slightest pretensions to compete with Lamennais, one of the greatest writers of French prose. His loose, declamatory, theatrical style is in every respect far inferior to the simple, grand, nervous eloquence of Lamennais. We also venture to affirm that, in too many of his discourses, instead of explaining the Word of God simply and familiarly to the people, he goes out of his way to attack what he terms the prevailing doubt and scepticism of the age, and attempts to guide his hearers to a positive divine faith by the utter annihilation of the natural reason. In many of his discourses, too, he falsifies history for the purpose of making it coincide with his Romanist prejudices. He absolutely refuses to recognise any good whatever in former systems of religion and philosophy. Without the pale of the Romish Church all is evil, within it everything is good. As to human reason, he cannot endure it. 'That which at present ruins everything,' he says, 'that which causes the world to ride insecurely at anchor, is the reason.' 'Our intelligence appears to me like a ship without sails or masts on an unknown sea.' 'Societies are tottering when the thinkers take them in hand, and the precise moment of their downfall is that wherein they announced to them that the intellect is emancipated.' And while human reason is thus summarily condemned, the infallibility of the Church is asserted and defended in the most absolute manner. 'The Catholic doctrine,' he says, 'resolves all questions, and takes from them even the quality of questions. We have no longer to reason, which is a great blessing, for we are not here to reason, but to act, and to build up in time a work for eternity.'"

See Montalembert, *Le Père Lacordaire* (Paris, 1862, 8vo); Loménie, *Le Père Lacordaire* (1844); Lorrain, *Biographie historique de Lacordaire* (1847); Chocarne, *Inner Life of Père Lacordaire* (transl. by Father Aylward; Lond. and New York, 1867, 8vo); Villard, *Correspondence inédite et biographie* (Par. 1870, 8vo); Kirwan, *Modern France* (1863); and the *Revue des deux Mondes*, May 1, 1861; Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, i, 208 sq.; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1863, art. iii; *Contemporary Rev.* May, 1868, art. i. M. Edmond Scherer, in the *Littérature Contemporaine*, also treated of père Lacordaire, but with special regard to his ability as a writer. His estimate of the noted Dominican is rather unfavorable, perhaps even unjust. Of the discourses of Lacordaire, he maintains that they are "unreadable" (p. 166). See also *Blackwood's Magazine*, Feb. 1863; *Lond. Quart. Review*, July, 1864. (J. H. W.)

Lacroix, Claudius, a noted Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at the village of St. André, province of Limburg, in 1652. He became master of philosophy in 1673, and immediately after joined the Order of Jesuits. He taught moral theology first at Cologne, then at Münster; became doctor of theology in 1698, and died June 1, 1714. He wrote a commentary on Busenbaum's *Moral Theologie* (Cologne, 1719, 2 vols. folio). See Busenbaum.

Lacroze, Mathurin Veyssière de, a distinguished French Orientalist, was in turn a merchant, a medical student, and a Benedictine monk. Finally, having abjured Romanism, he retired to Prussia, where, in 1697, he became librarian to the king. He died at Berlin in 1739. His principal works are *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes* (La Haye, 1724, sm. 8vo): — *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie et d'Arménie* (La Haye, 1739, sm. 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.

Lactantius. Lucius Cœlius (or Cæcilius) Fir-

MIANUS, one of the early Latin fathers, called by Jerome (*Catal.* c. 80) the most learned man of his time, and, on account of the fine and rhetorical culture which his writings evince, not unfrequently named the Christian Cicero (or, as Jerome has it, "Fluvius eloquentiæ Tullianæ"), was formerly supposed to have been by birth an African, but is now generally believed to have been of Italian birth, a native of Firmum (Fermo), on the Adriatic, Italy. He was born probably near the middle of the 3d century; his parents, according to his own account, were heathens, and he only became a Christian at a somewhat mature age (comp. *De Ira Dei*, c. 2; *Institt. Div.* vii, 2), certainly before the Diocletian persecution. Lactantius pursued his rhetorical studies in the school of the celebrated rhetorician and apologist Arnobius of Sicca, in proconsular Africa, and it is thus, in all probability, that arose the notion that Lactantius was of African birth. While yet a youth Lactantius gained celebrity by the publication of a poetical work called *Symposion*, a collection of a hundred riddles in hexameters for table amusement. But it was his eloquence that secured him really great renown, and he was heard of by Diocletian, and by him called to Nicomedia as professor of Latin eloquence. This city was, however, inhabited and visited mainly by Greeks, and Lactantius found but few pupils to instruct. This afforded him plenty of leisure, and he welcomed it as an opportunity to devote himself largely to authorship. Thus he continued at Nicomedia ten years, while the Christians were not only persecuted by the emperors with fire and sword, but also assailed by the heathen philosophers with the weapons of science, wit, and ridicule. Against so many outrages Lactantius felt impelled to undertake the defence of the hated and despised religion, and the more as he thought he had observed that they proceeded, at least in part, from ignorance and gross misunderstandings. It was during this defence of Christianity, in all probability, that he became himself a convert to the true faith, and thus may it be accounted for that Constantine called him to his court in Gaul as preceptor (after 312 says Dr. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 956) of his son Crispus, whom Constantine afterwards (326) caused to be put to death. Eusebius tells us that even in this exalted position he remained so poor as often to want for the necessaries of life. He must have been quite old when he arrived in Gaul, for he is then already spoken of as a gray-haired old man, and he is supposed to have died at the imperial residence in Treves shortly after his pupil Crispus, about 330. It has often been a matter of great perplexity to antiquarians to account for the fact that Lactantius escaped personal injury during the Diocletian persecution. Some think, and this seems to be reasonable, that Lactantius escaped suffering for his faith because he was generally regarded as a philosopher, and not as a Christian writer; and, indeed, to judge from his *De Opificio Dei*, he appears to have been more attracted by the moral and philosophical aspects of Christianity than by the supernatural and the dogmatic. In fact, in all the theological works of Lactantius is manifest the influence of his early studies of all the masterpieces of ancient rhetoric and philosophy, and he may be defined as a Christian pupil of Cicero and of Seneca. (Comp., on the inclination of the early Christian teachers in the Roman empire to style themselves "philosophers," *Brit. Quart. Rev.* July, 1871, p. 9, col. 1.) Jerome even says of him (*Epist.* 83, *ad Paulinum* [alias 84 *ad Magnum*]), "Lactantius wrote seven books against the Gentiles, and two volumes on the work and the anger of God. If you wish to read these treatises, you will find in them a compendium of Cicero's Dialogues." He had entered more deeply into Christian morals than into Christian metaphysics, and his works offer none of those learned and profound expositions of the dogmas which we find in Clement of Alexandria or in Origen. Lactantius, however, has been called, as we already hinted, the Christian Cicero, on account of his resemblance to this celebrated classical writer in the elegance and finish of his style, but still more on account of having made himself the advocate and propagator of the great moral truth of Christianity, while carefully avoiding all dogmatic speculation; thus also did Cicero advocate all the great practical truths of the best philosophical systems of antiquity, but set little store by whatever was purely metaphysical.

In learning and culture Lactantius excelled all the men of his time; in the words of Jerome, he was "omnium suo tempore eruditissimus." His writings betray a noble unconsciousness which forgets itself in striving to reach its lofty aim. The modesty of his claims and of his estimate of himself is exhibited and embodied in the facts of his life. Although at the court of the greatest prince on earth, and by his position invited to luxurious indulgence, he voluntarily preferred a poverty which not only excluded superfluities, but also often dispensed with the necessaries of life. Some have represented that he pushed his austerities even to an unauthorized extreme. "I shall think that I have sufficiently lived," he writes, "and that I have sufficiently fulfilled the office of a man, if my labor shall have freed any from their errors, and directed them in the way to heaven."

Lactantius was a layman and a rhetorician, and yet he displays in his writings in general—and they were not few—such a depth and extent of theological knowledge as could scarcely have been expected. It is surprising with what penetration and precision he handles many intricate subjects. Warmth of feeling, richness of thought, and clearness of apprehension are impressed upon all his literary productions. His expressions are always lucid, considerate, and well arranged. Nowhere does the reader feel an unpleasant tone of pedantry or affectation; everywhere he is attracted by the impress of genuine learning and eloquence. In harmony and purity of style, in beauty and elegance of expression, he excels all the fathers of Christian antiquity, if we except Ambrose in some of his letters, and Sulpicius Severus. His reputation in this respect was so celebrated in the earliest times that men loved to call him the Christian Cicero. So much for form and diction. The case is quite otherwise with the exposition of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity in detail. In the midst of admirable philosophical developments, as with other writers of this class, we meet with many mistakes, many erroneous views and half-truths, for which Gelasius classed his writings with the Apocrypha. If the judgment above expressed is thus, in some measure, modified, yet is his merit not much diminished. That is to say, there are at bottom almost entirely such anomalies as he met in the older writers before him, and which the Church had not yet distinctly excluded by a more precise definition of the doctrines in question. What strikes us more unpleasantly is that we miss the establishment of Christianity by proof from its own dogmas, which he himself had promised to give; we sympathize with Jerome in the wish, "Utinam tam nostra confirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena distinxit."

Dr. Schaff gives the following summary of the doctrinal views of Lactantius (*Church Hist.* iii, 957): "His mistakes and errors in the exposition of points of Christian doctrine do not amount to heresies, but are mostly due to the crude and unsettled state of the Church doctrine at the time. In the doctrine of sin he borders upon Manichæism. In anthropology and soteriology he follows the synergism which, until Augustine, was almost universal. In the doctrine of the Trinity he was, like most of the ante-Nicene fathers, a subordinationist. He taught a *duplex nativitas* of Christ, one at the creation, and one at the incarnation. Christ went forth from God at the creation as a word from the mouth, yet hypostatically."

Works.—We will briefly notice his works in order: 1. *Divinarum Institutionum*, libri vii (Divine Institutes, seven books), a comprehensive apology for the Christian religion, which, on account of the elegant style in which

it is written, has been favorite reading, and is said to have appeared in more than a hundred editions. His motive for writing this work he thus assigns himself: Since men, by their own fault bewildered, can no longer find the way back to truth, his object is to point it out to them, and, at the same time, to confirm in it those who have already reached it. He feels himself the more impelled to this because his predecessors in this field—and he names particularly Tertullian and Cyprian—had not, in his opinion, satisfied the requirements of the case on all sides, and had performed their task neither with the requisite learning and thoroughness, nor with the suitable adornment of art and scientific depth. To this unfortunate circumstance he ascribes it that the Christian religion was held in such contempt, and with the educated classes was as good as totally unknown. When, with all the power of language and genius which he eminently possessed, Lactantius promises to make a defence of the faith, the precedence in this respect must by all means be conceded to him; in beauty of form and splendor of diction he surpasses all; but Jerome justly refuses to admit the same in respect to the weight of the contents and the solidity of the proofs. The work is dedicated to Constantine the Great—if the passage is not an interpolation—whom he extols with the highest reverence, and praises as the first Christian prince, and the restorer of righteousness. Consequently, it was written at the time when he, advanced in years, was already at court; but the Church was still sighing under a severe persecution, evidently that of Licinius, since the author refers to that of Diocletian as having long since died out. This brings us to the year 320, although he had, as elsewhere appears from his own words, formed the purpose and the plan at a much earlier period. Some suppose that the work was commenced in Bithynia and completed in Gaul after a lapse of twenty years. Others, from an allusion which it contains to the Diocletian persecution—"Spectatæ sunt enim spectanturque adhuc per orbem pœnæ cultorum Dei," etc. (v, 17, § 5), suppose it to have been written before Lactantius went to Gaul.

The seven books into which this work is divided form seven separate treatises. The first book is inscribed *De falsa religione*. He designedly leaves untouched the principal question in regard to the *existence* of a supreme Providence, and takes his departure from the proposition that there is *one God*, and that, according to our idea of his essence, of his relation to the world under him, and of that to him, there *can be but one*. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a petitio principii), by the utterances of the poets, the philosophers, and the sibyls—all of whom consent in one and the same truth; and this, at least, is good as an *argumentum ad hominem*, though he seems to allege it as having a higher and proper force of proof. The last half of the book consists in the ludicrous exposure and sarcastic confutation of the mythological system of deities in general and in detail, as recognised by its advocates.

The second book, *De origine erroris*, demonstrates the manifold absurdity with which mankind, while all nature impels them to the knowledge of the one God, and a law of necessity teaches every one instinctively to seek him, are nevertheless so blinded as to wander away to the worship of idols. He confutes the spurious grounds by which particularly the educated class among the heathen sought to excuse or justify idolatry, and shows how this whole pagan religion, more closely considered, is only a reflex of their thoroughly materialized and secularized habit of mind. But since the heathen used especially to appeal to the antiquity of their cultus and to venerable tradition, the author meets them in this wise: In matters of religion every one must see for himself; error, though ever so full of years, has, by its old age, acquired no right, and must give way to the truth so soon as she establishes against it her primitive and indefeasible claims. He proceeds, with constant reference to the diverging opinions of the philosophers, to develop from the holy Scriptures the history of the creation and of the origin of idolatry. According to him, this originated in its first germ from Ham, who lay under his father's curse. Among his posterity the loss of the knowledge of the true God first prevailed; this passed over into Sabaism or Parseeism (worship of the heavenly bodies); spread itself in this form first in Egypt, and thence among the neighboring people. In its further progress it included the deification of men, an externally pompous worship, and finally developed itself into idolatry proper, which, cherished and promoted by the influence of dæmons, and strengthened by means of other arts, by oracles, magic, etc., leavened the whole life of the pagan nations. The truth of this intimate connection of the dæmon realm with the heathen polytheistic worship, and with the phenomena pertaining thereto, lies visibly before us, says Lactantius, in the Christian power of exorcism; and with this he concludes.

The third book, *De falsa sapientia*, exposes the heathen philosophy as nugatory and false. The etymology of the word philosophy indicates, says he, not the possession of wisdom, but a striving after it; and in its ultimate result it leaves us nothing but mere opinions, upon whose grounds or groundlessness it can give us no trustworthy criterium, and consequently no certainty. The result of all philosophy, therefore, when brought into relation to our highest end, is unsatisfying and useless. Our heart thirsts after happiness, and this eager, fervent impulse no human wisdom can satiate. The reason why it cannot is this: because, torn away from its union with religion, the fundamental condition of happiness, it must necessarily become external, one-sided, and abstract. He finally points out in detail this result of all philosophy in the history of the different schools, none of which has found the truth, or could find it, because their formal principle had already misplaced the way to the desired goal. Therefore—and this is the natural conclusion—to still his thirst for knowledge, man must not turn himself to these, but to God's own revelation.

The fourth book, *De vera sapientia*, proposes to prepare the way to this goal. Starting with the principle already enunciated, but here set forth more in detail, that (genuine) wisdom and religion are, in the last analysis, one, they may, only in our conception, be held asunder as distinct, abstract elements, but in reality and in life ought never to be separated. The heathen philosophy and religion, in which this unnatural antithesis and separation occurred, were therefore, for this simple reason, false. The true unity of the two is found only in Christianity. In order to exhibit this principle as a fact, he reviews the history of our religion. After having briefly, but as much as he deemed requisite for his purpose, spoken of the prophets, he proceeds to develop the doctrine, after his fashion, of the person of Jesus Christ, from the first, the eternal birth of the Logos from the Father, and from the second, his incarnation in time; he establishes the truth of these, together with his Deity and his Messianic office, from his life, his miracles, and the prophets, with reference almost always to the Jews only; but finally he shows to the heathen how the very idea of true ethical wisdom in some sort includes in itself the incarnation of the lawgiver, that so a perfect example may be given of the possibility of keeping the law. The necessities of man required this in order to a mediation between God and man; and the lowly life of Christ, his sufferings, and even his death on the cross, are in perfect harmony with this design.

The fifth book, *De justitia*, unfolds first the author's motives and object. Then, entering upon the subject itself, he teaches how, anciently, in the times called by the heathen the Golden Age, the one God was honored, and with his worship justice bore sway; and how, in the sequel, in connection with polytheism, all sorts of vice

came trooping in, but with Christ a kind of golden age has again appeared through the propagation of righteousness. He further shows how near this lies to all, and that only through wilfulness it can fail to be known; and how the heathen, in open contradiction to the idea of religion, to reason, and to every sentiment of right, hate the Christians, and persecute and torment them even to the death. Were the Christians fools, one should spare them; if wise, imitate them. That they are the latter is made clear by their virtuous behavior and their unflinching constancy. It is true the wisdom and righteousness of God condescend to clothe themselves in the appearance of folly, partly that thus the wisdom of the world may be convinced of its nothingness, and partly that the righteous man may be helped forward on the narrow way to his reward. The pretexts offered by the heathen in justification of their treatment of the Christians, as that they sought to bring them to a sober mind, etc., were, he maintains, utterly empty, because, in the first place, this treatment was in itself unsuitable, and, in respect to the Christians, who knew very well how to defend their cause with all soberness, it was contemptuous and destructive of its own object; but, in the second place, these pretexts were contradicted and falsified by the Romans' contrary practice of toleration towards other and extremely despicable and senseless religions. Rather it was abundantly clear that nothing but a fierce hatred against the truth impelled to those bloody deeds of violence and cruelty.

The sixth book, *De vero cultu*, treats of the practical side of true religion. A merely external worship, like that of the heathen, is absolutely worthless, and only that is true in which the human soul offers itself to God. As all the philosophers agree in saying there are two ways for man, one of virtue, the other of vice; the former narrow and toilsome, leading to immortality; the latter easy and pleasant, leading to destruction: the Christians call them the way to heaven and to hell, and eagerly prefer the former, that at the last they may attain the enjoyment of the blessedness in which it ends. The philosophers could not find the way of virtue, because at the outset they had formed to themselves an utterly different idea of good and evil, and therefore always sought it where it is never to be found—on earth instead of in heaven. The Christians, who walk in the light of revelation, have the clew of the truth, the eternal, unchangeable law of God, adapted to the nature of man, which unfolds our duties both towards God (officia pietatis) and towards man (officia humanitatis). Lactantius then proceeds to treat of the virtues which are embraced in the fundamental principle of genuine humanity—pity, liberality, care for the widow, the orphan, the sick, the dead, etc.; finally, of self-government and the moderation of the desires and appetites, particularly of chastity in wedlock and out of it; and, last of all, of penitence or penance (pœnitentia), and the true service of God. The former he treats as a *satisfaction*, and in the latter he does not rise above the merely ethical, Rationalistic position, although, through his whole exposition, he makes references, by way of contrast, to the divergent views of the philosophers.

The seventh and last book, *De vita beata*, has for its subject the chief end of man. He gives us briefly his own conception of the great end of our existence, thus: "The world was made that we might be born; we are born that we might know the Creator of the world and of ourselves; we know him that we may honor him; we honor him that we may receive immortality as the reward of our effort, because the honoring of God demands the highest effort; we are rewarded with immortality, that we, like the angels, may forever serve the supreme Father and Lord, and may form unto God an ever-during kingdom: that is the sum and substance of all things, the secret of God, the mystery of the world." After this follows the proof of the immortality of the soul, pursued through ten distinct arguments, with the refutation of objections. He then proceeds with an attempt to show under what condition the natural immortality of the soul becomes at the same time a blessed immortality. With this he connects his views in regard to the time and the signs of the end of the present world to the last judgment, to the millennial reign, to the general resurrection and the transformation of this world. On the superabounding delights and glories of the millennium he enlarges with special satisfaction and copious eloquence. In conclusion, he congratulates the Church upon the peace which Constantine has given her, and calls upon all to forsake the worship of idols and to do homage to the one true God.

2. *An Epitome of the Institutes*, dedicated to Pentadius, is appended to the larger work, and is attributed to Lactantius by Jerome, who describes it as being even in his time ἀκέφαλος. All the early editions of this abridgment begin at the sixteenth chapter of the fifth book of the original. But in the 18th century a MS. containing nearly the entire work was discovered in the royal library at Turin, and was published by C. M. Pfaff, chancellor of the University of Tübingen (Paris, 1712). Walchius and others have doubted the genuineness of this *Epitome*, but Jerome's assertion appears to us conclusive.

3. *De Ira Dei* (On the Anger of God). It has often been observed how the Greek philosophy, and, following its lead, the heretical Gnosis, could not reconcile justice and goodness. This had also struck Lactantius, and awakened in him the thought of proving in this treatise that the abhorrence of evil and primitive justice are necessary and fundamental attributes of the divine Being. In the judgment of Jerome, this work is composed with equal learning and eloquence. Its date is probably somewhat later than that of the Institutes.

The system both of the Epicureans and of the Stoics excluded all reaction of God against the wicked. The former, in order not to disturb God's indolent repose; the latter, in order not to transfer to the idea of God human characteristics, would know nothing of any vital or essential manifestation of the Deity in the course of the world or towards mankind. Lactantius showed how, on the contrary, in the worthy idea of God's essence and operation, the conception of providence cannot be wanting; and how, moreover, complacency towards the good has, as its natural counterpart, the detestation of its opposite, the evil. Besides, religion is incontestably founded in the nature of man; but, if we assume that God is not angry with the wicked, or does not avenge the transgressions of his commands, from religion are withdrawn, by consequence, its rational motive and all its foundations. If there is a moral distinction among actions, it is impossible that God should stand affected in the same manner towards the one as towards the other, and that without its being necessary, in consequence, to ascribe to God likewise passions or affections which consist in a weakness, as, for example, fear. When Epicurus objects that God could punish—if punish he must—without any emotion within himself, Lactantius replies: the view of the evil must of itself provoke the will of any being who is good to a counter emotion, and it cannot be indifferent to the lawgiver how his precepts shall be observed. The disproportion of the external fortunes of the good and the bad in the present life proves nothing to the contrary when we consider the proper attitude and essence of virtue, etc. The whole he confirms by declarations of the prophets, and especially of the sibyls.

4. *De Opificio Dei, vel formatione hominis* (On Creation).—This is thought to be the first-fruits of the Christian genius of Lactantius, since, judging from the introduction, the persecution was still in progress. The book is dedicated to a certain Demetrianus, who, having been his disciple, was now an officer of state: it is especially directed against the prevailing philosophy, and therefore the presentation of the subject is kept, in form and spirit, upon this basis. The subject of the treatise is the organization of human nature, which Cicero, he says, has more than once superficially touched upon in

his philosophical writings, but never thoroughly investigated. He first draws a general parallel between the organism of the beasts and that of man; to the latter God, in connection with an apparently scantier outfit, has given, in his reason, a pre-eminence far outweighing all the superiority of the beasts in physical force. When philosophy, particularly the Epicurean, reminds us of the helplessness of human infancy, of man's weakness and early dissolution, the author shows, on the other hand, that these objections rest upon a one-sided mode of regarding, partly the phenomena in question considered absolutely, and partly the essence and the end of man and of his nature (c. 1–4). Having thus, in a preliminary way, disposed of these possible objections against his subsequent exhibition of the subject, he proceeds to his proper business, the consideration of the human body as the habitation and organ of the soul. He indulges in a detailed investigation and analysis of its wonderful structure; shows the beauty and symmetry of its several limbs, their adaptation to their corresponding functions, and their admirable connection with the totality of the organism. Hence he establishes, what the Epicureans denied, that a divine creation, and an ordering and guiding providence, are active throughout the universe (c. 5–17). In conclusion, he dilates upon the essence of our soul, upon its distinction from spirit (animus), and, finally, upon its propagation. He here reviews the opposing philosophical theories, and declares himself thoroughly opposed to generationism or traducianism (c. 17–20). In this treatise he has caught the grand idea, and furnished the leading materials of Paley's famous teleological argument; and, what is more surprising, has anticipated some of the most striking and comprehensive ideas of modern scientific and zoölogical classification.

5. *De mortibus persecutorum* (On Martyrdom).—Le Nourry was of opinion that this treatise does not belong to Lactantius. In the only codex which we have of it, it bears, not the inscription Firmiani Lactantii, but Lucii Cæcilii, which is never given to our author by the *ancient* writers. We must confess that, without being aware of this judgment of Le Nourry, we had already, upon a careful reading of the treatise, come to the same conclusion from internal evidence. Möhler, on the other hand, maintains its genuineness; in confirmation of which he refers to the facts: (1) that Jerome refers to a work of Lactantius under the name *De Persecutione*, which, says he, indicates a similar subject matter with the work in question; (2) that it is dedicated to a certain Donatus, like that *De Ira Dei*, and the writer shows himself to have been an eyewitness of the transactions in Nicomedia under Diocletian. These reasons certainly are not very strong; but, meanwhile, it is a curious question whether the Donatus addressed in this treatise as a professor may not have been the first Donatus of heretical notoriety. Möhler further adds that the style is the same as that of Lactantius's other works. From this we must strongly dissent. The style is harsher, more rugged, and broken and irregular—often obscure. It frequently reminds one of Tacitus; whereas the genuine Lactantius rarely departs from an imitation of the clear, smooth, flowing, and copious style of Cicero, whom he had chosen for his special model of eloquence.

In the early editions of Lactantius *De mortibus persecutorum* is altogether wanting. It was first printed by Stephen Baluze in his *Miscellanea*, vol. ii (Paris, 1679), from a very ancient MS. in the Bibliotheca Colbertina. Its authenticity as the *De Persecutione Liber Unus* of Lactantius, mentioned by Jerome, is maintained by Baluze, Heumann, and others. Among the latest authorities in favor of accepting the production as a genuine work of Lactantius we count Möhler (see below) and Dr. Philip Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* iii, 958, note 2). Against accrediting this treatise to Lactantius are prominent, besides Nourry (in the Append. to ii, 839 sq. of Migne's edition of Lactantius), Pfaff, Walch, Le Clerc, Lardner, Gibbon, Burckhardt, and others.

The object of this work is to show the truth of the Christian religion historically, from the tragical fate of all those who have persecuted the Church of Christ. It gives a very detailed description of several scenes in the persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and Valerian, but especially dwells upon the later times, those of Diocletian and his imperial colleagues Galerius and Maximin, and shows how avenging justice overtook them all. This work, if genuine, furnishes highly important contributions to ecclesiastical history. Among other things, its author, whoever he may be, declares that Peter and Paul preached the Gospel at Rome, and established a *temple of God* there, where they both suffered martyrdom.

6. *Lost Writings.*—The *Symposium* of Lactantius has probably perished, though some have surmised that the *Ænigmata*, published under the name of *Symposius*, is really the youthful composition of Lactantius. Jerome mentions besides an *Itinerarium* in hexameters, two books to *Asclepiades*, eight books of letters to Probus, Severus, and Domitian, all of which are lost. It appears from his own words (*Instit.* vii, 1, sub fin.) that he had formed the design of drawing up a work against the Jews, but we cannot tell whether he ever accomplished his purpose.

Several other pieces still extant, but which have been erroneously ascribed to Lactantius, are, *De Phœnice*, in elegiacs, a compilation of tales and legends on the far-famed Arabian bird; it is probably of a later date (see Wernsdorff, *Poetæ Lat. Minores*, iii, 283):—*Symposium*, a collection of one hundred riddles, more likely the work of a certain Cælius Firmianus:—*De Pascha ad Felicem Episcopum*, now generally considered as the work of Venantius Honorianus Clementianus Fortunatus, in the 6th century:—*De Passione Domini* (printed in G. Fabricius's *Poet. Vet. Eccles. Op. Christiana*, Basle, 1564; and in *Bibl. Patr.* Lugdun. 1677), in hexameters, worthy of Lactantius, but bearing in its language the impress of a much later age.

The *Editio Princeps* of Lactantius was printed at the monastery of Subiaco, by Sweynheym and Pannartz, in 1465, and is one of the earliest specimens of typographical art; the same printers published two other editions (Rome, 1468, 1470), the latter under the direction of Andrew, bishop of Aleria. A number of editions have been published since; the most important are by Gallæus (Lugd. Bat. 1660, in a series of Variorum Classics, 8vo), C. Cellarius (Lpz. 1698, 8vo), Walchius (Lpz. 1715, 8vo), Heumann (Götting. 1736, 8vo), Bünemann (Lpzg. 1739, 8vo), Le Brun and Lenglet du Fresnoy (Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to), F. Ea St. Xaverio (Rome, 1754–9), and Migne (Paris, 1844, 2 vols. royal 8vo). A convenient manual edition was prepared by O. F. Fritzsche for Gersdorf's *Bibliotheca Patrum eccles. selecta* (Lips. 1842), vols. x, xi. See Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* p. 79, 80; Chronic. Euseb. ad ann. cccxviii, *Comment. in Eccles.* c. 10; *Comment. in Ephes.* c. 4, *Ad Paulin. Epist.*; Lactant. *Divin. Instit.* i, 1, § 8; v, 2, § 2; iii, 13, § 12; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* v, 232; Schönemann, *Bibl. Patr. Lat.* vol. i, § 2; Bähr, *Gesch. d. Römisch. Litterat.* Suppl. Band, 1e Abtheil. § 9; 2e Abtheil. § 38–46; Bähr, *Die christlich-röm. Theologie*, p. 72 sq.; Franciscus Floridus, *Subcesivarum. Lect.* liber ii, ch. iv; Lenain de Tillemont, *Histoire Eccles.* vol. vi; Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs eccles.* i, 295; Brooke Mountain, *A Summary of the Writings of Lactantius* (Lond. 1839); Möhler, *Patrologie*, i, 917–933; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. sacrés*, ii, 494 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii, § 173; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 160–163; *Christian Review*, 1845, p. 415 sq.; Woodham, *Tertullian*, p. liii; Leckey, *Hist. Europ. Morals*, i, 493 sq. Excellent articles may also be found, especially on the writings of Lactantius, in Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 701; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 158. On the Christology of Lactantius, consult Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. ii, p. 192 sq.; Lamson, *The Church in the first three Centuries*, p. 183 sq.; Bull, *On the Trinity* (ii, Index); Neander, *Chr. Dogmas; Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol.* 1871, vol. iv, art. xiii.

Lacticinia, a term used in the Church law of fasts to denote whatever is obtained as an article of food from the mammalia, viz. milk, butter, grease, cheese. Eggs are usually included with these articles. Abstinence from such food was required in the Western Church during Lent, while the more stringent customs of the Greek Church extended the prohibition to all other fasts. Thomas Aquinas uses the following language: "In jejunio quadragesimali interdicunter universaliter etiam *ova et lacticinia*, circa quorum abstinentiam in aliis jejuniis diversæ consuetudines existunt apud diversos." The Laodicean and Trullan (A.D. 691) councils made stringent requirements on the subject. Certain papal dispensations, granted as late as A.D. 1344 and A.D. 1485, show that even in certain parts of the Western Church this abstinence was practiced in many fasts besides Lent. In some Catholic countries general dispensations on this point have become permanent by long custom and positive decree, especially on the ground of health and necessity.

In the English Church the only abstinence that was ever enforced was from flesh-meat, in the reign of queen Elizabeth; but its object was rather the promotion of state interests, "to promote fisheries, to maintain mariners, and set men a fishing;" and was dispensed with by virtue of licenses, which were sold, according to the rank of the applicants, by the curates, under an act of Parliament passed in the fifth year of her [Elizabeth's] reign (Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 273, Fasts; comp. Hook, *Ch. Dictionary*, article Abstinence). "With us," says Wheatly (Hook, *Church Dict.* p. 9), "neither Church nor State makes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as the former determines in the matter, she seems to recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring in her [Ch. of Engl.] homilies that fasting is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v. See also Abstinence; Fasts.

Lacunary Roofs. The ceiling of churches in early times was often composed of lacunary work, i. e. it was divided into several panels called *laquearia* or *lacunaria*, and these were richly gilded and otherwise ornamented. Jerome often speaks in his writings of the lacunary golden roofs. See Farrar. *Eccl. Dict.* s. v.

Lacu'nus (rather Laccunus, Λακκοῦνος, Vulg. *Caleus*), one "of the sons of Addi," who had married a foreign wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 31); doubtless the Chelal (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x, 30).

Lacy, John, an English mystical writer, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. He joined the French prophets upon their appearance in London, and professed to have supernatural revelations. His principal works are, *Warnings of the Eternal Spirit by the Mouth of his Servant John, surnamed Lacy* (London, 1707, sm. 8vo):—*A Relation of the Dealings of God to his unworthy Servant since the Time of his believing and professing himself inspired* (London, 1708, small 8vo). He is also supposed to be the author of *The general Delusion of Christians touching the Ways of God revealing himself to and by the Prophets* (1713, 8vo); reprinted a few years since. See Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lad (נַעַר, *na'ar*, often rendered "young man," etc.; N. T. παιδάριον, a *little child*, the last occurring only John vi, 9, and "child" in Matt. xi, 16; both terms being originally without respect to sex). The Heb. word occasionally thus rendered in the Auth. Vers., although occasionally standing for a *girl* or maiden (Gen. xxiv, 14, 16, 28, 55; xxxiv, 3, 12; Deut. xxii, 15 sq.), for which the fem. noun (נַעֲרָה, *naarah'*) is usually employed, properly denotes a *boy*, being prob. a primitive word. It is spoken of an infant just born (Exod. ii, 6; Judg. xiii, 5, 7; 1 Sam. iv, 21), of a boy not yet full grown (Gen. xxi, 16 sq.; xxii, 12; Isa. vii, 16; viii, 4), and of a youth nearly twenty years old (Gen. xxxiv, 19; xli, 12; 1 Kings iii, 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 5, 29). See Child, etc.

La'dan (Γαδάν v. r. Λαλάν, and even Ἀσάν, Vulg. *Dalarus*), one of the Temple servants whose descendants had lost their pedigree after the exile (1 Esdr. v, 37); evidently the Delaiah (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra ii, 60).

Ladd, Francis Dudley, a Presbyterian minister,

Ancient Egyptians assailing a Fortress with the Testudo and Ladders.

1, 2, 3, 4, besiegers protecting by the *testudo* armed warriors, *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, at the base of the fort, *e*; 5, driving a spike between the joints of the stones along the upper courses of the foundation walls, *f*, to support the foot of the scaling-ladder; 6, 7, 8, warriors contending with the defenders of the first line of battlements, *h*; 9, archer attacking those above; 10, mounting to the second line of defences, *g*; 11, 12 seem to be let down to parry the assault; *i*, *k*, *l*, *m*, the garrison defending the citadel, on which is mounted the standard, *n*.

was born in 1820. When only eight years of age he showed marked indications of piety, but it was not until his fifteenth year that he joined the Church, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. George Shephard, now professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. With a view to prepare for the ministry, he entered Bowdoin College at the age of seventeen, and graduated with honor in 1841; then studied theology at Bangor Seminary, and was ordained at Farmington in 1846. In Nov., 1851, he received and accepted a call from the Penn Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. During the war he labored incessantly for the good of the soldiers, but fell a prey to disease contracted in the camps, whither he had gone several times, and died July 7, 1862. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 184.

Ladd, William, an American philanthropist, born at Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1778, was one of the originators of the American Peace Society, of which he became president. He died in 1841. Ladd was editor of the *Friend of Peace* and the *Harbinger of Peace*, and wrote several essays on that subject.

Ladder (סֻלָּם, *sullam'*, a *staircase*, perh. from סָלַל, to *raise* up; Sept. κλῖμαξ; the Arab. *sullamun* has the same signification) occurs only once, in the account of Jacob's vision in his dream at Bethel (Gen. xxviii, 12), where the "ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it," represented the Gospel dispensation, the blessings of which the patriarch's posterity were to inherit; the Redeemer himself being this mystic channel of intercourse between heaven and earth (John i, 51). (See Lang, *Visio Scalæ Jacob*, Alt. 1699; Schramm, *De Scala Jacobæa*, F. ad O. 17—.) Scaling-ladders for war (κλίμακες) are mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. v, 30). That this was a contrivance known from the earliest times, we have abundant evidence on the monuments of Thebes, where attacks on fortified places are represented as being made by soldiers provided with scaling-ladders (Wilkinson, i, 390). (For illustration, see opposite page.) Similar scenes are frequently depicted on the Assyrian monuments (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 284). See FORTIFICATION.

LADDER OF TYRUS, THE (ἡ κλῖμαξ Τύρου; Vulg. *a terminis Tyri*, possibly reading κλίμα), one of the extremities (the northern) of the district over which Simon Maccabæus was made captain (στρατηγός) by Antiochus VI (or Theos) very shortly after his coming to the throne; the other being "the borders of Egypt" (1 Macc. xi, 59). The Ladder of Tyre (סולמא של צור, see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 343), or of the Tyrians (ἡ κλῖμαξ τῶν Τυρίων), was the local name for a high mountain, the highest in that neighborhood, a hundred stadia north of Ptolemais, the modern Akka or Acra (Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2). The rich plain of Ptolemais is bounded on the north by a rugged mountain ridge which shoots out from Lebanon and dips perpendicularly into the sea, forming a bold promontory about 300 feet in height (Russegger, p. 3, 143, 262; Ritter, *Palest. und Syr.* iii, 727, 814 sq.). The waves beat against the base of the cliff, leaving no passage below. In ancient times a road was carried, by a series of zigzags and *staircases*, over the summit, to connect the plain of Ptolemais with Tyre—hence the origin of the name *Scala Tyriorum*, "Ladder of Tyre." It was the southern pass into Phœnicia proper, and formed the boundary between that country and Palestine (Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 20; Reland, p. 544). The road still remains, and is the only one along the coast. A short distance from it is a little village called Nakûrah, and the pass is now called *Râs en-Nakûrah* ("the excavated promontory"), doubtless from the road which has been "hewn in the rock" (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 389; see also Pococke, i, 79; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 89; Stanley, p. 260, 262). The location of the Ras en-Nakhurah agrees very nearly with the above position defined by Josephus, as it lies 10 miles, or about 120 stadia, from Akka, and is characterized by travellers as very high and steep. Both the Ras en-Nakhurah and the *Ras el-Abyad*, i. e. the White Cape, sometimes called Cape Blanco, a headland six miles still farther north, are surmounted by a path

Ancient Assyrians assaulting a City with Ladders.

cut in zigzags; that over the latter is attributed to Alexander the Great. It is possibly from this circumstance that the latter is by some travellers (Irby, Oct. 21; Wilson, ii, 232; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 346; etc.) treated as the ladder of the Tyrians. But by the early and accurate Jewish traveller, hap-Parchi (Zunz, in *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 402), and in our own times by Robinson (iii, 82), Mislin (*Les Saints Lieux*, ii, 9), Schwarz (p. 76), Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 264), the Ras en-Nakhurah is identified with the ladder; the last-named traveller pointing out well that the reason for the name is the fact of its "differing from Carmel in that it leaves no beach between itself and the sea, and thus, by cutting off all communication round its base, acts as the natural barrier between the Bay of Acre and the maritime plain to the north—in other words, between Palestine and Phœnicia" (comp. p. 266).

Ladislas (*Vladislas, Vladislaf, Uladislas*) **II**, king of Poland (1386–1434), known also under the name of *Jagiello* or *Jagello*, deserves a place in our work on account of his introduction of Christianity into the Polish dominions. He was born in Lithuania in 1348, the son of Olgerd and grandson of Gedimin, great princes of Lithuania. He succeeded his father in 1386, and, by the noble influence of his pious Christian wife Hedvig, was influenced to embrace Christianity; a short time after all Lithuania became Christian, and when Poland came under his sway Christianity became the dominant religion there. He died in Grodek, near Lemberg, Galicia, May 31, 1434. See LITHUANIA; POLAND.

Ladislaus, king of Naples (A.D. 1386–1414), succeeded to the throne on the violent death of his father, Charles III. Born in 1376, he was ten years old at the time of his accession to the disputed crown. Louis of Anjou, to whom queen Joanna, the predecessor of Charles III, had bequeathed the kingdom, was his competitor. Ladislaus and Louis were of nearly the same age. Each was left under the guardianship of a widowed mother, and each had on his side the authority of one of the two rival popes, between whom Christendom was divided, and whose mutual excommunications, extending to their respective adherents, were the scandal of the age.

The reign of Ladislaus is historically important from its intimate connection with the great events of the time in Church and State. At an early age he developed that restless energy and that unscrupulous ambition which made him a model for Machiavelli's "Prince." When but sixteen years old, his mother Margaret committed him to the barons of her party to make his first essay in arms. His marriage with the richest heiress of Sicily put into his hands an immense dowry, which he employed to prosecute his designs, securing, when it was expended, from the venal pontiff a divorce from his wife, whom he bestowed upon one of his favorites.

By means of the papal sanction and his own energy he recovered Naples from the Angevin party (1400). The faction opposed to him felt the full weight of his vengeance. His security was increased by a second marriage, which the pontiff, Boniface IX, proposed. His ambition was excited by the tempting offer of the Hungarian crown, made by those who, dissatisfied with Sigismund (subsequently emperor), had seized and imprisoned him. His expedition proved unsuccessful, and his absence from Naples inspired anew the hopes and efforts of the Angevin party. His prompt return (1403) defeated their attempts. The most powerful of the disaffected nobility felt the weight of his vengeance. Many were thrust into prison. Numbers were strangled. Others fled. Wholesale confiscation enriched the royal treasury. A reign of terror prevailed throughout the kingdom.

Jealous of his powerful ally, Boniface IX showed himself no longer disposed to co-operate with the tyrant; but at this juncture he died. In spite of letters from the king of France deprecating a new election, that Christendom might be united under one pontiff (the French prelates supported as rival pope Benedict XIII, q. v.), the cardinals chose Innocent VII (q. v.) as his successor. Ladislaus, whose policy was opposed to the reunion of Christendom, hastened to Rome to congratulate him upon his accession. He had designs, moreover, upon Rome itself, torn by Guelph and Ghibelline factions. Dissembling his purpose, he proposed himself as mediator, and secured a strong hold upon the government of the city, while his royal title was solemnly confirmed.

Turning from Rome, he led his army to Southern Italy (1406), but was repelled by the valor of the Ursini. The new pope already regarded him with mistrust. At his instigation the Roman factions were brought into collision. Alarmed for his safety, the pope fled. Ladislaus ordered his generals to take possession of the city, but they were repulsed. The citizens, inclining to favor the exiled pontiff, recalled him to Rome. Ladislaus, whose attention had again been diverted to Southern Italy, where a marriage with the widow of Raymond de Ursini had accomplished more than arms, now advanced in open hostility, resolved to regain his control of the city. He was embittered against the pontiff, who resented his unscrupulous spoliation of churches and monasteries, as well as other revenues of the Church, and who complained, moreover, of his conspiracy and treason against himself. The charges against the king were drawn up in sixteen articles, and on the ground of these he was declared to have forfeited his kingdom, as well as the fiefs which he held of the Church, and was excommunicated by the Church. Ladislaus, however, succeeded in calming the papal resentment, and a treaty was effected which restored him to his former power and privileges; but as he evaded all the provisions which conflicted with his ambition, the excommunication would have been renewed had not Innocent died suddenly (Nov. 6, 1406).

Gregory XII, successor of Innocent VII, pledged himself on his election to promote the unity of the Church. His disinclination to meet his rival in conference was encouraged by Ladislaus, who assured him of protection. The unscrupulous proceedings of the king stood in need of the papal sanction, and he was willing to make some efforts to secure a pope for himself. Gregory XII disappointed the expectations of his cardinals. Alarmed by the sedition at Rome, he fled to Viterbo (August 3, 1407), and afterwards to Sienna and Lucca. Ladislaus seized the occasion to make inroads upon the States of the Church. Gregory complained of his conduct, and menaced him with the thunders of the Church. He found himself forced, however, to accept the plausible excuses of the king, whose support he needed. Ladislaus now resolved to prosecute his long-cherished desire of possessing himself of Rome. By means of force and treachery he succeeded in his project. On the 25th of April, 1408, Rome opened its gates to him, and the tyrant of Naples was welcomed by the shouts of the people.

Gregory exulted in the king's success. He hoped himself to be able now to return to Rome. He was encouraged to refuse his assent to the appointment of the council proposed to be held at Pisa, which he justly feared might prove fatal to his claims. Meanwhile Ladislaus prosecuted his ambitious plans. He hoped to secure possession of Sienna and Florence. For several months he prosecuted his plans by diplomacy and threats; but the cautious resistance of the republics, and the hostile attitude of the Pisan Council, which was now (March, 1409) in session, disconcerted him. The new pontiff, Alexander V, elected by the council, favored the pretensions of Louis of Anjou, the rival pretender to the throne of Naples. The latter, followed by an army, and surrounded by his partisans, entered Italy and secured a lodgment in Rome. Ladislaus, in the height of his passion, swore to annihilate the authors of his calamity. He provided for the security of Gregory, who had been holding a council in Aquileia, rival to that of Pisa, and ordained his recognition as pontiff

throughout the kingdom. He then proceeded in force to Rome, of which he quickly regained possession.

Alexander V, indignant at the king's course, made up a catalogue of his crimes, and ordered Ladislaus before him to hear the sentence which pronounced his forfeiture of his throne. Regardless of the summons, Ladislaus prosecuted his measures of violent rapacity, amassing the means to continue the war. But at this juncture he lost possession of Rome. With treachery within and the forces of Balthasar Cossa without, the city yielded to the allies, and the papal authority was re-established within its walls.

The sudden death of Alexander V (May 3, 1410) opened the way to the election of Balthasar Cossa himself, the sworn foe of Ladislaus, under the title of John XXIII. Leaving Bologna, which he had ruled as a despot under the title of legate, he advanced in triumph to Rome. Ladislaus was now confronted by an Italian pope and a French army under Louis. The sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, but, reckless of spiritual terrors, he marshalled his forces and prepared for the conflict. The battle took place May 19, 1411, near Ponte-Corvo, and, after a desperate contest, the forces of Ladislaus were defeated. Instead of being disheartened by reverse, however, he exerted himself successfully to bring into the field a new army largely composed of the fragments of the old. In a short time, by a liberal use of money, he had greatly profited by the respite which his enemies, too sluggish to pursue their advantage, allowed him. Retracing his disasters, he said that on the first day his crown and personal liberty were endangered; on the second, he feared only for his kingdom; on the third, his foe could only waste himself.

John XXIII had exulted in the defeat of his foe. The joy at Rome was expressed by pageants and processions; but the pope soon discovered that he had been too precipitate in his demonstrations. He encouraged the hopes of Louis, but declined to aid him by arms. He contented himself with sending Ladislaus (August 11, 1411) a summons to appear before him as a heretic and favorer of schism, and with publishing a crusade against him. But the withdrawal of Louis from Italy left Ladislaus without a competitor, and of a sudden the pope saw himself almost helpless in the hands of Ladislaus, and in constant fear of his ravages and assaults. Anxious for peace, he proposed a compromise with Ladislaus. The latter was to abandon the anti-pope, Gregory XII, and drive him from the kingdom. The pope was to confirm the king in possession of his dominions, to which other possessions were to be added, and was to be appointed gonfalionere of the Church, and to be paid specified sums of money. Thus John XXIII sacrificed his ally to his foe, and Ladislaus did the same. The double ingratitude and treachery were endorsed by the public recognition of the legitimacy of the pontiff on the part of Ladislaus, who ascribed his new and more correct apprehensions to the instruction of the Father of light. Gregory was forced to flee to Rimini, and at an interview between Ladislaus and the pope, the latter received from the former marks of profound homage.

To this hollow compromise mutual distrust succeeded. The pope sought to recover his old allies. He exculpated himself to Louis, and again denounced the king of Naples. The latter responded by hostile demonstrations. The council which the pope had meanwhile convoked at Rome was considered by him as depending on the appointment and authority of that of Pisa, and, as hostile to his interests, he hoped to disperse it. The prospect of gaining some advantage over his old foe, Sigismund of Hungary, now elected emperor, was also kept in view. Gathering his forces, he approached Rome. The faithlessness and feebleness of the papal forces facilitated its capture. The pope and cardinals fled. From place to place they wandered, yet even Florence dared not entertain them from fear of the vengeance of Ladislaus. John XXIII besought help of Sigismund, which was finally granted on the stipulation that the pope should immediately convoke a General Council. See JOHN XXIII.

Ladislaus meanwhile gave full scope to his vengeance. Rome trembled with terror. Some of her most distinguished citizens were sacrificed to his revenge. The States of the Church came into his hands. Sienna and Florence felt themselves threatened. John XXIII fortified himself at Boulogne, and gathered forces about him. Even here he did not feel himself safe. His cardinals prepared for flight, and some deserted him. The citizens sought to hide their treasures, and fled, some to Venice, or other places not yet threatened.

There appeared no longer hope of effectual resistance to the advance of Ladislaus. All Italy seemed about to be forced to submit to his sway. But at this juncture, while lingering at Perusia, he was smitten by a mortal disease. A slow fever wasted his strength, but did not subdue his thirst for vengeance. He had destined the Ursini, who had obstructed his capture of Rome, and whom he had promised to spare, as victims. They visited him in his sickness, and were thrust into prison by his orders. This gross violation of faith excited general indignation. The murmurs of the soldiers constrained him to pause in his purpose of vengeance. As his disease progressed his passions became more fierce. Returning by way of Ostia to Naples, the officers who accompanied him were on the watch to prevent him from ordering the Ursini to be cast overboard into the sea. When he reached his capital he was no longer master of himself. Every word that escaped him was an order for some fatal arrest. He charged his sister, the princess Joanna, to see that Paul de Ursini be put to death. For the last three days of his life his mind was occupied only with thoughts of vengeance. With fearful cries he was heard to ask, "Is Paul dead?" sometimes calling for his dagger that he might stab himself. He could only be calmed for the moment by his sister's treacherous assurance that his orders should be executed.

In the midst of his paroxysms Ladislaus died, Aug. 6 or 8, 1414. Naples was relieved of a tyrant and Italy of a terror that had disquieted her for years. History may account Ladislaus a modern Herod. All that was unscrupulous, cruel, and depraved seemed to be incarnate in him. He alternated between private lust and public violence. In his own age he was the most notorious representative of the vigor and craft of the Italian "prince." See NAPLES.

See, for notices more or less extended of the deeds or career of Ladislaus, Van der Hardt, *Monstrelet's Chronicles;* Niern, *Life of John XXIII;* Poggi, *Bracciolini's Writings.* Also the works of the earlier as well as the later Italian historians, including Sismondi and Proctor. The most extended and connected account of his life, perhaps, is that given by M. d'Egly, *Histoire des Rois des Deux Siciles.* He seems to have carefully sifted his authorities, and he devotes over 200 pages of his second volume almost exclusively to Ladislaus. (E. H. G.)

Ladvocat, JEAN BAPTIST, a noted French theologian and author, was born at Vancouleurs in the early part of the 17th century, and was educated first at Pont-a-Mouson, afterwards in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he subsequently became a professor. In 1751 he was appointed to the chair, founded at his suggestion in the Sorbonne by the duke of Orleans, for the interpretation of the Old-Testament Scriptures according to the Hebrew text. He died in 1765. Ladvocat wrote *Dictionnaire Geographique portatif:—Dictionn. Historique portatif des grands hommes* (2 vols. 8vo: this is an abridgment of Moreri, and is full of errors). He also wrote a Hebrew Grammar for the use of his pupils; *Tractatus de Conciliis in Genere;* and *Lettre dans laquelle il examine si les Textes originaux de l'Ecriture sont corrumpus et si la Vulgate leur est preferable.* Ladvocat was, as an expositor of Scripture, a zealous disciple of Houbigant. He was also a correspondent of Dr. Kennicott,

whose great work he zealously promoted, and he collated many MSS. for him in the Royal Library at Paris.—Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 506.

Lady is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: גְּבִרֶת (*gebe'reth*, fem. of גְּבִיר, a *mighty man*), applied to Babylon as the mistress of nations (Isa. xlvii, 5, 7; elsewhere a "mistress," as opposed to a maid-servant, Gen. xvi, 4, 8, 9; 2 Kings v, 3; Prov. xxx, 23; Psa. cxxiii, 2, Isa. xxiv, 2); שָׂרָה (*sarah'*, fem. of שַׂר, *noble;* the same as the name given to Sarai), a noble female (Judg. v, 29; Esth. i, 18; elsewhere a "princess," spec. the king's wives of noble birth, 1 Kings xi, 13, different from concubines, comp. Cant. vi, 8; "queen," Isa. xlix, 23; "princess" among provinces, Lam. i, 1); κυρία (fem. of κύριος, *lord* or master), mistress, occurs only as an epithet of a Christian female (2 John i, 1, 5), either as an honorable title of regard, or as a fem. proper name CYRIA (q. v.).

Lady Chapel, a chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary ("Our Lady"), and usually, but not always, placed eastwards from the altar when attached to cathedrals. Henry VII's chapel at Westminster is the lady chapel of that cathedral.

Lady Day. See ANNUNCIATION, FEAST OF.

Lady Fast, a species of penance, voluntary or enjoined, in which the penitent had the choice of fasting once a week for seven years on that day of the week on which *Lady Day* (q. v.) happened to fall, beginning his course from that day, or of finishing his penance sooner by taking as many fasting-days together as would fall to his lot in one year.

Lady of Mercy, OUR, a Spanish order of knighthood, instituted in 1218 by James I of Aragon, in fulfilment of a vow made to the Virgin, during his captivity in France, for the redemption of Christian captives from among the Moors; and to this end each knight, at his inauguration, was obliged to take the vow that, if necessary for their ransom, he would remain himself a captive in their stead. Within the first six years of the existence of the order no fewer than 400 captives are said to have been ransomed by its efforts. On the expulsion of the Moors from Spain the labors of the knights were transferred to Africa. Their badge is a shield party per fess gules and or, in chief a cross pattée argent, in base four pallets gules for Aragon, the shield crowned with a ducal coronet. The order was extended to ladies in 1261.

Lady of Montesa, OUR, an order of knighthood, founded in 1317 by king James II of Aragon, after the abrogation of the Order of the Templars, for the protection of the Christians against the Moors. By permission of pope John XXII, James of Aragon used all the estates of the ex-Templars and of the Knights of St. John situated in Valencia for this new order, which king James named after the town and castle of Montesa, its head-quarters. The order is now conferred merely as a mark of royal favor, though the provisions of its statutes are still nominally observed on new creations. The badge is a red cross edged with gold, the costume a long white woolen mantle, decorated with a cross on the left breast, and tied with very long white cords.

Lady Psalter. See ROSARY.

La'ël (Heb. *Laël'*, לָאֵל, *for* or *of God*, i. e. created by him; otherwise *to God*, i. e. devoted to him; occurs also in Job xxxiii, 6, where the Auth. Vers. has "in God's stead;" Septuag. Λαήλ), father of Eliasaph, which latter was chief of the family of the Gershonites at the Exode (Numb. iii, 24). B.C. ante 1657.

Lætare Sunday, called also MID-LENT, is the fourth Sunday of Lent. It is named *Lætare* (*to rejoice*) from the first word of the Introit of the mass, which is from Isa. liv, 1. The characteristic of the services of the day is joyousness, and the music of the organ, which throughout the rest of Lent is suspended, is on this day resumed. Lætare Sunday is also called *dominica de rosa*, because it is the day selected by the pope for the blessing of the Golden Rose. See Siegel, *Handbuch d. christl.-Kirchlichen Alterthümer*, iv, 366, 367.

Lævinus, TORRENTINUS, commonly called TORRENTIN, a Dutch theologian, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was a native of Ghent, and was educated in the University of Louvain in law and philosophy. After an extended tour in Italy, he became successively canon of Liege, vicar-general to the bishop of Liege, and finally bishop of Antwerp, from which he was transferred to the see of Mechlin, where he died in 1595. At Louvain Torrentin founded a Jesuitical college, to which he bequeathed his library and a large collection of curiosities.

Lafaye (also known by the Latin name *Fayus*), ANTOINE, a French Protestant minister, was born at Châteaudun about the middle of the 16th century. He became professor of philosophy at Geneva in 1570, and rector in 1580. He was transferred to the chair of theology in 1584, and died in 1615. In 1587 he took part in the composition of the Preface to the French translation of the Bible. His works are, *De vernaculis Bibliorum interpretationibus et sacris vernacula lingua peragendis* (Gen. 1572, 4to):—*De Verbo Dei* (Gen. 1591, 4to):—*De Traditionibus, adversus pontificios* (Gen. 1592, 4to):—*De Christo mediatore* (Gen. 1597, 4to):—*De Bonis Operibus* (Gen. 1601, 4to):—*Geneva liberata, seu narratio liberationis illius quæ divinitus immissa est Genevæ* (Geneva, 1603, 12mo):—*Enchiridion Disputationum theologicarum* (Gen. 1605, 8vo):—*De Vita et Obitu Bezæ Hypomnemata* (Geneva, 1606, 4to):—*Commentarii in Ecclesiasten* (Gen. 1609, 8vo):—*Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos* (Gen. 1608, 8vo):—*Comment. in Psalmos xlix et lxxxvii* (Gen. 1609, 8vo):—*Comment. in priorem Epistol. ad Timotheum* (Geneva, 1609, 8vo):—*Emblemata et Epigrammata selecta ex stromatis peripateticis* (Gen. 1610, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxviii, 686.

Lafitau, JOSEPH FRANÇOIS, a French Roman Catholic missionary of the Order of the Jesuits, born at Bordeaux in 1670, labored for many years among the Iroquois tribe of American Indians. He died in 1740. Lafitau is especially noted for his archæological researches, among which is *Mœurs des sauvages Américains comparées aux mœurs des premiers temps* (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 4to). He wrote also *Histoire des découvertes et des conquêtes des Portugais dans le nouveau monde.*

La'had (Heb. *id.* לָהַד, in pause לָהָד, prob. *oppressor*, otherwise *flame;* Sept. Λάδ v. r. Λααδ, Vulg. *Laad*), the second named of the two sons of Jahath, of the family of Zerah, grandson of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 2). B.C. post 1612.

Lahai-roi. See BEER-LAHAI-ROI.

Lah'mam (Heb. *Lachmas'*, לַחְמָס, prob. an erroneous reading for *Lachmam'*, לַחְמָם, *their bread*, which is read in some MSS., and which the Vulg. and Auth. Vers. follow, Septuag. Λαμάς, Vulg. *Lehemam*), a city in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Cabbon and Kithlish (Josh. xv, 40), probably situated among the Philistines west of the Highlands of Judæa. A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary*, s. v., by a series of arguments resting essentially upon the insecure foundation of the mere *order* of the names in Joshua, seeks to identify Lahmam with the *el-Humam* mentioned by Smith in the list in Robinson's *Researches* (iii, Append. p. 119); but of this place there is no other trace save perhaps the name *Tell-Imam* on Zimmerman's *Map*, some six miles to the S.E. of the vicinity of the other associated names, and apparently out of the bounds of the group, if not of the tribe itself. Lahmam is possibly the present *Beit-Lehia*, a short distance N.E. of Gaza (Robinson, iii, Append. p. 118; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 115).

Lah'mi (Heb. *Lachmi'*, לַחְמִי, *my bread;* Septuag.

Λεεμεί v. r. Λοομί, Λαχμί, etc.; Vulg. *Bethlehemites*), a person named (1 Chron. xx, 5) as being the brother of Goliath, and slain by Elhanan, one of David's heroes; but prob. a corrupt reading for BETH-LEHEMITE, as in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxi, 19). See ELHANAN. It would seem that both these passages should be restored so as to read thus: "Elhanan, the son of Jair (or Dodo) of Bethlehem, slew the brother of Goliath of Gath, whose spear-handle was like a weaver's beam." See JAIR.

Laidlie, ARCHIBALD, D.D., a noted minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Kelso, Scotland, Dec. 4, 1727. After graduating at the University of Edinburgh he was ordained to the Gospel ministry in 1759, and became pastor of the Scotch Church in Flushing, Holland, where he officiated four years, and as a member of the ecclesiastical courts of that country was held in high repute. He there became acquainted with the Dutch Church and language, and was providentially prepared for his ministry in America. The bitter controversy concerning the use of the Dutch language in preaching in the Reformed Church of this country was practically settled by the call and acceptance of Dr. Laidlie as pastor of the Collegiate Church of New York. He was the first minister called to preach in the English tongue in this denomination. His first sermon was delivered April 15, 1764, from 2 Cor. v, 11. It was two hours long, most carefully prepared, and delivered to an immense audience with great effect in the Middle Dutch Church, which was set apart for his use on a part of each Sabbath day. This event marks a new era in the history of the Reformed Dutch Church, and which Dr. Livingston declared "should have begun a hundred years before." It would have saved the Church a civil lawsuit, a weary ecclesiastical strife, and a century of growth. Trained in the Scotch theology, and warmly devoted to the Dutch Church, Dr. Laidlie's evangelical and powerful ministry resulted in great spiritual blessings. He was a winner of souls. A great revival crowned his ministry. Crowds waited upon his preaching. His pastoral tact and success were remarkable. His brief ministry was interrupted during the Revolutionary War, when he retired to Red Hook, and died there in 1778, at the age of fifty-one, a victim of consumption. His memory is held in great esteem. He was prudent, wise, devout, a peacemaker, and a dauntless herald of the truth. The circumstances of his call, the critical period of his advent, the learning, wisdom, grace, and success of his ministry, have made his name historical in his Church. He left no printed books, but his "works do follow him." It is related that one of his aged parishioners once said to him, soon after he came to New York, "Ah! dominie, we offered up many an earnest prayer in *Dutch* for your coming among us, and the Lord has heard us in *English*, and has sent you to us." But his coming illustrated another phase of contradictory human nature in those who had most strenuously insisted upon the retention of the language of the mother country. Some of these very people, offended and baffled by their more sensible co-worshippers, actually left the Dutch Church and joined the Episcopal, saying as they departed, "If we must have English, we will have all English." Among them were the Stuyvesants, Livingstons, and other eminent families of the city, who have ever since been connected with the latter denomination.—Dr. Thos. De Witt, *Historical Discourse* (1856); Dr. Gunn, *Life of Dr. Livingston;* Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. ix. (W. J. R. T.)

Lainez (or LAYNES), **Francisco,** a Portuguese Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Lisbon in 1656. His true name was *Francisco Troyano.* He joined the Jesuits in 1672, and was sent to the coast of Malabar in 1681. He landed at Goa, and settled at Catur, in Madura. It is claimed by his order that he baptized there 13,600 inhabitants. After a residence of twenty-two years in India he returned to Rome in 1703, and was appointed bishop of Meliapur. In 1708 he started again for India, and arrived at Goa September 25, 1709. Here he now had many difficulties with the civil authorities, and finally retired to the Jesuits' establishment at Chandernagore, where he died, June 11, 1715. He wrote, *Defensio Indicarum Missionum Madurensis et Carnotensis*, etc. (Rome, 1707, 4to):—*Carta esorita de Madure aos padres da companhia missionarios acerca do V. P. João de Brito*, translated into French in the *Lettres edifiantes et curieuses*, ii, 1–56; and in the *Mercure*, under the title *Lettre du P. François de Laynes, jésuite*, etc. (March, 1695). See Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana;* P. Prat, *Vie de Jean de Brito* (2 vols. 8vo); Franco, *Imagem da virtude uro noviciado de Coimbra* (2 vols. fol.); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 41.

Lainez, Iago, a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Almancario, near Siguenca, in Castile, in 1512, and was educated at the high-school of Alcala. In his nineteenth year he was attracted to Paris by the renown of Ignatius, and at once became one of his most ardent followers. He accompanied Loyola on his journey to Rome, and there obtained from pope Paul III the appointment to a professor's chair in the "Collegium della Sapienza." On the death of the great leader of the Jesuitical order (in 1556) Lainez was elected his successor, and became general of the order (June 19, 1557). A cardinal's hat and other high positions he refused, determined to devote all his time and energy to the interests of the new order. In the Council of Trent, where, with Salmeron, he represented his order, he took an active part, and opposed the doctrine of Seripando on justification. Lainez appeared on the field of controversy more with a work on the subject than with a speech. He had the greatest number of the divines on his side. He also took a leading part in that council in the discussion concerning the divine right of bishops and the infallibility of the pope. The historians have preserved a very full report of his speech on this point. It contains the most extravagant assertions of pontifical power and authority. Lainez maintained that Jesus Christ is sole ruler of his Church; that when he left the world he constituted Peter and his successors his vicars; that, in consequence, the pope is absolute lord and master, supreme and infallible; that bishops derive from him their power and jurisdiction; and that, in fact, there is no power whatever in the Church excepting that which emanates from him, so that even general councils have no authority, are not infallible, do not enjoy the influence of the Holy Spirit, unless they are summoned and controlled by papal authority (compare Pallav. lib. xviii, s. 15; Sarpi, lib. vii, s. 20; Le Plat, v, 524). Lainez also took an active part (in 1561) in the Conference of Poissy (q. v.), where he aimed to conciliate the Huguenots (q. v., especially p. 392). At Venice he afterwards expounded the Gospel of St. John for the express edification of the nobility; and, aided by Lippomano, he succeeded in laying the foundation of a college of Jesuits. He devoted great attention to the schools, and directed the thoughts of his order towards education, well aware that man is most influenced during his whole life by his early impressions. In some parts of Germany—at Ingolstadt for instance—the Jesuits soon acquired the reputation of most successful teachers. This new direction given to the order by Lainez came near, however, involving them in serious difficulties: the Jesuits had at first attached themselves to the doctrinal views of the Thomists; but, desiring to be independent in doctrine as well as life, the Inquisition soon found reasons to criticise the freedom with which they pursued their speculations on this point, and Lainez himself was suspected by the Spanish Inquisition (see Llorente, iii, 83). He died at Rome Jan. 19, 1565. It was under the guidance of Lainez that the spirit of intrigue entered freely into the society. He possessed a peculiar craftiness and dexterity in managing affairs, and was frequently led by it into low and unworthy tricks. His ruling passion was ambition, which he

knew well how to conceal under a veil of humility and piety. By his artful policy he transformed the character of the Jesuitical order into a terrible army, that, for the sake of advancing its own interests, shrunk from no attempt to gain its ends; an order which has become a reproach to the Church that gave it birth. The Jesuits in the 19th century are recognised as a bold band — an order which dares to undermine states, to rend the Church, and even to menace the pope. See JESUITS. Lainez wrote several theological works, but none of them had been completed, and nothing from his pen, except some speeches, has ever been printed. See Michel d'Esne, *Vie de Lainez* (Douai, 1597); Nicolini, *Hist. Jesuits*, p. 506 sq.; *Versuch einer neuen Gesch. des Jesuiterordens*, vol. ii; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, 90, n. 20; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 16*th and* 17*th Centuries*, i, 145, 153, 163, 399, 585; Hardwick, *Hist. Ref.* ch. viii; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 31; and for the Roman Catholic version, Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 316. (J. H. W.)

Laing, JAMES, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Berry Holes of Blain, Perth County, Scotland, in 1785, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, where he graduated with distinction in 1816. After teaching for some time, he determined to devote himself to the ministry, and in 1825 was licensed by the Glasgow Relief Presbytery. May 8, 1830, he emigrated to the United States; was ordained by Washington Classis in 1832, and was installed pastor of the Church in Argyle, N. Y. In 1834 he removed to Andes, where he died Nov. 15, 1858. "Mr. Laing was a man to be esteemed, loved, and trusted—a laborious pastor and 'Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile.'"—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 359.

La'ïsh (Heb. *La'yish*, לַיִשׁ, Judg. xviii, 14, 27, 29; 1 Sam. xxv, 44, a *lion*, as in Isa. xxx, 6, etc., in pause לָיִשׁ, text לָיְשׁ, 2 Sam. iii, 15, with ה local לַיְשָׁה; Judg. xviii, 7; Isa. x, 30; Sept. Λάις in Sam., Λαισά in Judg., Λαϊσά in Isa.; Vulg. *Lais*, but *Laisa* in Isa.), the name of at least one place and perhaps also of a man.

1. A city in the extreme northern border of Palestine (Judg. xviii, 7, 14, 27, 29), also called LESHEM (Josh. xix, 47), and subsequently, after being occupied by a colony of Danites (Josh. xix, 47; Judg. xviii, 27 sq.), also DAN (Judg. xviii, 29; Jer. viii, 16), a name sometimes given to it in anticipation (Gen. xiv, 14; Deut. xxxiv, 1; comp. Jahn, *Einleit.* II, i, 66; Hug, in the *Freiburg. Zeitschr.* v, 137 sq.). It lay in a fruitful district, near the sources of the upper Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 8, 4), four miles from Paneas towards Tyre (Eusebius, *Onomast.*). Saadias and the Samaritan version falsely give, instead of Dan (in Gen. xiv, 14), "Paneas" (see Winer, *Diss. de vers. Sam.* p. 54), which also Jerome (at Ezek. xxvii, 15, and Amos viii, 14) gives as an equivalent. Laish was long the seat of a corrupt worship of Jehovah (Judg. xviii, 14 sq.), and as it fell within the kingdom of Israel, Jeroboam established there the idolatry of the golden calf (1 Kings xii, 28 sq.).

The occupation of this place by the Sidonians is easily accounted for. Sidon was a commercial city. Situated on the coast, with only a narrow strip of plain beside it, and the bare and rocky side of Lebanon impending over it, a large and constant supply of food had to be brought from a distance. The plain around Laish is one of the richest in Syria, and the enterprising Phœnicians took possession of it, built a town, and placed in it a large colony of laborers, expecting to draw from it an unfailing supply of corn and fruit. Josephus calls this plain "the great plain of the city of Sidon" (*Ant.* v, 3, 1). A road was made across the mountains to it at an immense cost, and still forms one of the main roads from the seacoast to the interior. Strong castles were built to protect the road and the colony. Kulat esh-Shukif, one of the strongest fortresses in Syria, stands on a commanding hill over the place where the ancient road crosses the river Leontes, and it is manifestly of Phœnician origin. So also the great castles of Banias, four miles east of Laish, and Hunin, about six miles west of it, were founded by the Phœnicians, as is evident from the character of their architecture (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 444, 447; Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 50, 52, 371, 403). It is most interesting to discover, after the lapse of more than three thousand years, distinct traces of the wealth and enterprise of the Phœnicians around the site and fertile plain of Laish. See DAN.

2. A place mentioned in Isa. x, 30, where the prophet, in describing the advance of the Assyrian host upon Jerusalem, enumerates Laish with a number of other towns on the north of the city. It is not quite certain whether the writer is here relating a real event, or detailing a prophetic vision, or giving a solemn warning under a striking allegory; but, however this may be, the description is singularly graphic, and the line of march is pointed out with remarkable minuteness and precision. Aiath, Migron, and Michmash are passed; the deep ravine which separates the latter from Geba is then crossed; Ramah sees and is afraid—"Gibeah of Saul is fled." The writer now, with great dramatic effect, changes his mode of description. To terror and flight he appends an exclamation of alarm, representing one place as crying, another as listening, and a third as responding — "Lift up thy voice, daughter of Gallim! *Hearken, Laishah!* Alas, poor Anathoth!" The words הַקְשִׁיבִי לַיְשָׁה are rendered in the A. V., "Cause it (thy voice) to be heard unto Laish"—that is, apparently, to the northern border-city of Palestine; following the version of Junius and Tremellius, and the comment of Grotius, because the last syllable of the name which appears here as Laishah is taken to be the Hebrew particle of motion, "to Laish" (agreeably to the Hebrew accent), as is undoubtedly the case in Judg. xviii, 7. But such a rendering is found neither in any of the ancient versions, nor in those of modern scholars, as Gesenius, Ewald, Zunz, etc.; nor is the Hebrew word here rendered "cause it to be heard" found elsewhere in that voice, but always absolute — "hearken" or "attend." There is a certain violence in the sudden introduction amongst these little Benjamite villages of the frontier town so very far remote, and not less in the use of its ancient name, elsewhere so constantly superseded by Dan (see Jer. viii, 16). Laishah was doubtless a small town on the line of march near Anathoth (see Lowth, Umbreit, Alexander, Gesenius, ad loc.).

Many, therefore, understanding a different place from Dan (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* III, ii, 191; Hitzig and Knobel, *Comment.* ad loc.), regard it as the *Laisa* (Ελαισά, Cod. Alex. Αλασά) mentioned in 1 Macc. ix, 5; but Reland has shown that the city of Judah there referred to is Adasa, and the form of the word in Isa. does not warrant this interpretation (see Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.). This Adasa has been discovered by Eli Smith in the modern ruined village *Adasa*, immediately north of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 121).

A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* plausibly suggests that the Laishah in question may be found in the present little village *El-Isawiyeh*, in a valley about a mile N.E. of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 108), beautifully situated, and unquestionably occupying an ancient site (Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem*, ii, § 719).

3. A native of Gallim, and father of Phalti or Phaltiel, to which latter Saul gave David's wife Michal (1 Sam. xxv, 44; 2 Sam. iii, 15, in which latter passage the text appears to have read לוּשׁ, *Lush*). B.C. ante 1062. "It is very remarkable that the names of Laish (Laishah) and Gallim should be found in conjunction at a much later date (Isa. x, 30)" (Smith). "This association of names makes it more than probable that Laishah was founded by Michal's father-in-law, who, according to the custom of those times, gave it his own name. The allusion to the *lion* which it involves is interesting, for this neighborhood was another of the favorite haunts of that animal. It was by such ravines as wadys Fârah

and Selâm that it was wont to 'come up from the swelling of Jordan' (Jer. xlix, 19); in the opposite direction we have a further trace of it in the Chephirah ('young lion,' now Kefîr) of western Benjamin (Josh. ix, 17; xviii, 26); northward, we find it encountering the disobedient prophet on his return from Bethel (1 Kings xiii, 24); while in the pastures of Bethlehem to the south we see it vanquished by the superior prowess of the youthful David (1 Sam. xvii, 14–17)."

Laishah (Heb. *La'yeshah*, לַיְשָׁה, i.e. *Laish*, with ה paragogic, Isa. x, 30). See Laish, 2.

Laity, the people as distinguished from the clergy. The Greek word λαϊκός, derived from λαός (Latin synonyme *plebs*), *people*, and signifying *one of the people*, is retained in the Latin *laicus*, from which *laity* is derived. In the Sept. λαός is used as the synonyme of the Hebrew עַם, *people*. As synonymes of these Scripture terms we may also cite the words "faithful," "saints," and "idiotæ" (q. v.). Comp. Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 188 sq., 274, 275; Vinet, *Pastoral Theology* (N. Y. 1854), p. 345. In the O.-T. Scriptures we find allusions to the *laity* in Deut. xviii, 3, where upon them is laid the obligation to pay a tithe to the priest when offering sacrifice; and in Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple, where "the ministers of the house" (οἱ λειτουργοῦντες) are to boil the sacrifices of the laity (Ezek. xlvi, 24). So also in 1 Chron. xvi, 36, "all the laity said Amen, and praised the Lord," when Asaph and his brethren had finished the psalm given to them by David; see likewise 2 Kings xxiii, 2, 3; Neh. viii, 11; Isa. xxiv, 2; Hos. iv, 9. In the N.-T. Scriptures this distinction seems to have been ignored by Christ and his apostles, for, although there are passages in which the laity are spoken of as a class, it is nowhere intimated that they were not allowed to exercise the prerogatives of the clergy in a great measure. Coleman (*The Apostolical and Primitive Church* [Phila. 1869, 12mo], p. 230; compare p. 226 [6]), one of the best authorities on Christian antiquities, holds that in the early stages of Christianity "all were accustomed to teach and to baptize," a practice to which Tertullian (born about A.D. 160) soon objected (*De Præscript.* ch. xli). From the writings of the early fathers, it is evident, moreover, that only in the 2d and 3d centuries, after the general establishment of the churches, a stricter distinction was inaugurated. The introduction of the episcopal office, however, first definitely settled the position of the layman in the Church. As early as A.D. 182, or thereabouts, we find Clement of Rome pointing to the laity as a distinct class. In a letter of his to the Corinthians respecting the order of the Church, after defining the positions of the bishops, priests, and deacons respectively, he adds, ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται, "the layman is bound by the laws which belong to laymen" (*Ad Corinth.* i, 40). A little later, Cyprian (born about the beginning of the 3d century) uses the words "clerus" and "plebs" as of the two bodies which make up the Christian Church (*Ep.* lx). But the idea that the priesthood formed an intermediate class between God (Christ) and the Christian community first became prevalent during the corruptions that ensued upon the establishment of the prelacy. Gradually, as the power of the hierarchy increased, the influence which the laity had exercised in the government of the Church was taken from them, and in 502 a synod held at Rome under Symmachus finally deprived the layman of all activity in the management of any of the affairs of the Church (compare Coleman, *Apostolic and Primitive Church*, p. 118).

In the Church of the Reformers a very different spirit prevailed. All Christians were looked upon as constituting a common and equal priesthood. Still the desire of making a visible distinction often led even the Protestant Church astray, and to this day the question remains unsettled in some churches how far the laity ought to share in the government of the Church; and hence the depth of the distinction implied in the use of the word "clergy" and "laity" varies with the "Church" views of those employing them. Some very strict Protestants prefer the words "minister" and "people" instead of clergy and laity.

Farrar (in his *Eccles. Dict.* p. 349 sq.) thus draws the line of distinction between the clergy and laity of the Protestant Church: "It is for the sake of the people that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy as the dispensers of them, exist; they are called to bear the burdens of the Church, as they receive its benefits. It is, however, questioned by some how far the professional distinctions between clergy and laity are desirable. As religious *teachers*, the clergy may be expected to be more especially occupied in fitting themselves for that office in qualifying themselves to explain, and to enforce on others, the evidences, the doctrines, and the obligations; but they are not to be expected to understand more of things surpassing human reason than God has made known by revelation, or to be the *depositories* of certain mysterious speculative doctrines; but '*stewards* of the mysteries of God,' rightly dividing (or dispensing, ὀρθοτομοῦντες) the word of the truth. The laity are in danger of perverting Christianity, and making it, in fact, two religions, one for the initiated few, and one for the mass of the people, who are to follow implicitly the guidance of the others, trusting to their vicarious wisdom, and piety, and learning. They are to beware of the lurking tendency which is in the hearts of all men to that very error which has been openly sanctioned and established in the Romish and Greek churches—the error of thinking to serve God by a deputy and representative; of regarding the learning and faith, the prayers and piety, and the scrupulous sanctity of the 'priest' as being in some way or other transferred from him to the people. The laity are also to be constantly warned that the source of these errors lies in the very fact of thus regarding the clergyman as a *priest* (in the sacerdotal sense of that term), as holding a kind of mediatorial position, one which makes him something distinct from, and therefore no rule for themselves; a view which, while it unduly exalts the clergy, tends most mischievously to degrade the tone of religion and morals among the people, by making them contented with a less measure of strictness of life and seriousness of demeanor than they require in their ministers. Laymen need also to be reminded that they constitute, though not exclusively, yet principally, 'the Church;' the clergy being the *ministers* of 'the Church' (1 Cor. iii, 5); that it is for the people's sakes that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy, as dispensers of the same, exist; that they are the 'body of Christ;' that on them rests the duty of bearing the burdens, as they receive the benefits of the Church; and, finally, that there is no difference between them and the clergy in Church standing, except that the clergy are the officers of each particular church, to minister the Word and sacraments to that portion of its members over whom they are placed." See Clergy; Lay Representation; Lay Preaching; Mediator; Ministry; Pastoral Office; Priest. (J. H. W.)

Lake (λίμνη, a *pool*), a term used in the N. T. only of the Lake of Gennesareth (Luke v, 1, 2; viii, 22, 23, 33), and of the burning sulphurous pool of Hades (Rev. xix, 20; xx, 10, 14, 15; xxi, 8). The more usual word is *sea* (q. v.). The principal lakes of Palestine, besides the above Sea of Tiberias, are the Dead Sea and the Waters of Merom. See each in its place.

Lake, Arthur, a distinguished English prelate, was born at Southampton about 1550, and was educated at Winchester School, and at New College, Oxford, of which latter he was chosen fellow in 1589. He became successively archdeacon of Surrey in 1605, dean of Worcester in 1608, and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1616. He died May 4, 1626. Lake made important donations to the library of New College, and founded a chair for Hebrew and for mathematics in that institution. He was a very learned man, especially versed in the ancient

fathers, and very successful as a preacher. After his death there were published several volumes of his sermons: *Exposition of the First Psalm; Exposition of the Fifty-first Psalm;* and *Meditations*—all of which were collected and published in one volume, under the title *Ninety-nine Sermons, with some Religious and Divine Meditations* (Lond. 1629, fol.).—*Theses de Sabbato* (at the end of Twisse on the Sabbath):—*On Love to God* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, 4, 39). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses;* Chalmers, *General Biogr. Dictionary;* Walton, *Life of Bp. Sanderson;* Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, vi, 509; Darling, *Cyclopœdia Bibliographica*, ii, 1755; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1048.

Lake, John, D.D., a noted English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was bishop of Sodor and Man in 1682; was transferred to Bristol in 1684, and in 1685 to Chichester. In 1689 he was ejected for nonconformity. He died about the close of the 17th century. Lake published only a few sermons (1670, 4to; 1671, 4to, etc.). See *Defence of Bp. Lake's Profession*, etc. (1690, 4to).—Allibone, *Dict. English and American Authors*, ii, 1048.

Lakemacher, Johann Gottfried, a German theologian and Orientalist, was born at Osterwyck, near Halberstadt, Nov. 17, 1695, and was educated at the universities of Helmstädt and Halle. In 1724 he was appointed professor of Greek, and in 1727 of Oriental literature at Halle. He died March 16, 1736. His works are, *Elementa linguæ Arabicæ* (Helmst. 1718, 4to), a work which has been highly commended for its intrinsic value as an introduction to the study of the Arabic language:—*Observationes philologicæ, quibus varia præcipue S. Codicis loca ex antiquitatibus illustrantur* (pars i–x, ibid, 1725–33, 8vo, and often):—*Antiquitates Græcorum Sacræ* (ibid, 1734, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 223.

Lakin, Benjamin, a Methodist minister, was born in Montgomery Co., Md., Aug. 23, 1767; was converted in 1791, and shortly after entered the ministry. His first station was Hinkston Circuit (Nov. 6, 1794); he joined Holston Conference in 1795, and was appointed to Green Circuit. "Diligently and successfully Mr. Lakin labored in the Lord's vineyard until 1818, when his health and strength so far failed him that he was obliged to retire from the active ranks of the ministry. . . . He was at first placed on the list of supernumerary preachers, but soon after on the superannuate roll. This relation to his Conference he sustained until his death," Feb. 5, 1849. See Prof. Sam. Williams, in Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 267 sq.

Lakshmi is the name of a female Hindu deity, the consort of the god Vishnu (q. v.). According to the mystical doctrine of the worshippers of Vishnu, this god produced the three goddesses Brahmi, Lakshmi, and Chandika, the first representing his creating, the second his preserving, and the third his destroying energy. This view, however, founded on the superiority of Vishnu over the two other gods of the Hindu triad—Brahmi or Saraswati being generally looked upon as the energy of Brahma, and Chandika, another name of Durga, as the energy of Siva—is later than the myth, relating to Lakshmi, of the epic period; for, according to the latter, she is the goddess of Fortune and of Beauty, and arose from the Ocean of Milk when it was churned by the gods to procure the beverage of Immortality, and it was only after this wonderful occurrence that she became the wife of Vishnu. When she emerged from the agitated milk-sea, one text of the Ramayana relates, "she was reposing on a lotus-flower, endowed with transcendent beauty, in the first bloom of youth, her body covered with all kinds of ornaments, and marked with every auspicious sign. . . . Thus originated, and adored by the world, the goddess, who is also called *Padma* and *Sri*, betook herself to the bosom of Hari—i. e. Vishnu."

A curious festival is celebrated in honor of Lakshmi on the fifth lunar day of the light half of the month Magha (February), when she is identified with Saraswati, the consort of Brahma, and the goddess of learning. In his treatise on festivals, Raghunandana, a great modern authority, mentions, on the faith of a work called *Samwatsara-sandipa*, that this divinity is to be worshipped in the forenoon of that day with flowers, perfumes, rice, and water; that due honor is to be paid to inkstand and writing-reed, and no writing to be done. Wilson, in his essay on the *Religious Festivals of the Hindus* (*Works*, ii, 188 sq.), thus describes the celebration: "On the morning of the 2d of February the whole of the pens and inkstands, and the books, if not too numerous and bulky, are collected, the pens or reeds cleaned, the inkstands scoured, and the books, wrapped up in new cloth, are arranged upon a platform or a sheet, and strewn over with flowers and blades of young barley, and that no flowers except white are to be offered. After performing the necessary rites . . . all the members of the family assemble and make their prostrations—the books, the pens and ink, having an entire holiday; and, should any emergency require a written communication on the day dedicated to the divinity of scholarship, it is done with chalk or charcoal upon a black or white board." There are parts of India where this festival is celebrated at different seasons, according to the double aspect under which Lakshmi is viewed by her worshippers. The festival in February seems originally to have been a vernal feast, marking the commencement of the season of spring.

La'kum (Heb. *Lakkum'*, לַקּוּם, according to Gesenius, *way-stopper*, i. e. fortified place; Sept. Λακούμ v. r. Δωδάμ and Ἄκρον, Vulg. *Lecum*), a place on the northeastern border of Naphtali, mentioned after Jabneel in the direction of the Jordan (Josh. xix, 33), and therefore probably situated not far south of Lake Merom. The Talmud (*Megilloth*, Ixx, 1) speaks of a *Lukim* (לוּקִים), perhaps the same place (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 875). The site of Lakkum is possibly indicated by the ruins marked on Van de Velde's *Map* adjoining a small pool east of *Tell-Akbarah* and south-east of Safed.

Lalita-Vistaria is the name of one of the most celebrated works of Buddhistic literature. It contains a narrative of the life and doctrine of Buddha Sâkyamuni [see Buddha], and is considered by the Buddhists as one of their nine chief works treating of Dharma, or religious law. It is one of the developed sûtras of the Mahâyâna system. An edition of the Sanscrit text, and an English translation of this work by Bâbu Râjendralal Mitra, is publishing under the auspices of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. A French translation from the Thibetan has been made by Ph. Ed. Foucaux. In Chinese there are two translations of it. See E. Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien* (Par. 1844); and W. Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1860).

Lallemant, Jacques Philippe, a French Jesuit, was born near Abbeville about 1660, and died in 1748. He published a remarkable work entitled *The true Spirit of the new Disciples of Saint Augustine* (1706 sq., 4 vols.). He also wrote *Moral Reflections, with Notes, on the New Testament* (1714, 11 vols.).

Lallemant, Pierre, a mystical French writer, was born at Rheims in 1622, and died in 1673. He published *The Spiritual Testament* (1672), and other works of a like character.

La Luzerne, César Guillaume de, a distinguished French prelate, was born at Paris July 7, 1738. Intended for the Church by his family, he studied at the seminary of St. Magloire, and while yet quite young had several benefits bestowed upon him through family influence. In 1754 he was made canon *in minoribus* of the cathedral of Paris, and in 1756 abbot of Mortemer. In 1762 he graduated with distinction, and was immediately appointed grand vicar to the archbishop of Nar-

bonne, and in 1770 (June 24) was finally raised to the bishopric of Langres. This position securing him a seat in the States with the nobility, he took an active part in political events, and tried to conciliate the claims of the third estate with those of the nobility and clergy. He subsequently opposed the declaration of rights placed at the head of the new constitution, and spoke in favor of making the right of veto granted to the king more decisive. At the close of August, 1789, he became president of the Assemblée Constituante, but, after witnessing the excesses of the 5th and 6th of October, he retired to his diocese. Here he strenuously opposed the civil constitution of the clergy, and was obliged in 1791 to leave France. He went successively to Switzerland and Austria, and finally settled at Venice in 1799, and remained there until the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France. He was made cardinal July 28, 1817, and minister of state. The see of Langres having been restored, La Luzerne was reappointed to it, but legal difficulties prevented his assuming its direction. In 1818 he was the only bishop called to the council of ministers to contrive the ratification of the concordat of the preceding year. Although strongly attached to the liberties of the Gallican Church, La Luzerne earnestly advocated a strict compliance with the letter of the Concordat. He died June 21, 1821. Besides the *Oraison funèbre de Charles Emmanuel III, roi de Sardaigne* (1773, 4to and 12mo), and the *Oraison funèbre de Louis XV, roi de France* (1774, 4to and 12mo), he wrote a number of pastoral instructions, etc., and political pamphlets. Most of his writings were collected and published under the style *Œuvres de M. de La Luzerne* (Lyons and Paris, 1842, 10 vols. 8vo). See *Le Moniteur*, July 26, 1821; *Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, xxviii, 225–233; Mahul, *Annuaire Nécrologique*, 1821, p. 239; Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 38. (J. N. P.)

La'ma (λαμά, Matt. xxvii, 46, which is also read in the best MSS. at Mark xv, 34, where the received text has λάμμα; the Heb. has both forms, לָמָּה, *lamah'*, and לְמָה, *lam'mah, for what;* the Syriac version has *lemono*), a term signifying *why* (as the context explains it, *ivari*, by which also the Sept. interprets), quoted by our Saviour on the cross from Psa. xxii, 1 [2 in the Hebrew].

Lamaism (from the Thibetan *b-Lama* [pronounced *Lama*], *spiritual teacher* or lord) is the Thibetan form of *Buddhism* (q. v.), blended with and modified by the religions which preceded it in that portion of China. Among these was the belief in the "Mystic Cross," which originated in the circumstance that an Indian prince of the Litsabyi or Lichhavyi race, being conquered in war, sought refuge in Thibet, where he became king. The Lichhavyis of Vaisili professed belief in "Swasti." Swasti is a monogrammatic sign formed of the letters *Su* and *Ti*, and "Suti" is the Pali form of the Sanskrit "Swasti," a compound of *su* (well) and *asti* (it is); so that "swasti" implies complete resignation under all circumstances, which was the chief dogma of the fatalists who called themselves *Swastikas*, or followers of the Mystic Cross. These people were also annihilationists; hence their Thibetan name of Mu-stegs-pa or Finitimists. They were grossly atheistical and indecent in dress, but called themselves "Pure-doers," and the synonymous title Punya, "the pure," was carried with them into Thibet, and became modified into *Pon* or the "Bons." This form of faith continued for nine centuries, until Buddhism was generally introduced about the middle of the 7th century. Even then the followers of the Mystic Cross were still powerful.

History.—Buddhism was probably introduced into Thibet during the reign of Asoka, who propagated that religion with ardor upwards of two thousand years ago. In B.C. 240, at the close of the third synod, numerous missionaries were dispatched to all surrounding countries to spread the doctrines of Sakyamuni. But the more formal history of Buddhism in Thibet begins with king Srongtsan Gampo (born A.D. 617, died 698), who sent to India his prime minister Thumi Sambhota, with sixteen companions, to study letters and religion. He had the sacred books translated into Thibetan, and issued laws abolishing all other religions, and directing the establishment of this one. His wives, the one a Nepaulese, the other a Chinese, greatly assisted him in these enterprises. He met, however, with only tolerable success, and the religion did not greatly flourish. Under king Thisrong-de-tsan (A.D. 728–786) Buddhism was more successful in Thibet, overcoming the efforts of the chiefs to crush the "new religion." This prince induced great teachers from Bengal and Kafiristan to reside in Thibet. They superseded the Chinese priests, who were the earliest Buddhist missionaries. A public disputation on religions, which was ordered by the king, greatly increased the influence of the Indian priests. Large monasteries were erected, and a temple at Samyé, and the translation of sacred books into the vernacular was more energetically conducted. King Langdar or Langdharma tried to abolish Buddhism, and in his efforts to do so commanded the destruction of all temples, monasteries, images, and sacred books pertaining to that religion. The indignation against these efforts was so intense that it resulted in the murder of the king in A.D. 900. His son and successor was also unfavorably disposed towards Buddhism, and gradually the new religion lost many adherents, and those still remaining faithful even suffered persecution.

From A.D. 971 dates the revival of Buddhism, or the second general effort to propagate this religion in Thibet, under Bilamgur Tsan, who rebuilt eight temples, and under whom the priests who had fled the country returned, and fresh accessions were made from the priesthood of India. Among those from India came in A.D. 1041 the celebrated priest Atisha. In the 12th or 13th century the modification of Buddhism known as the Tantrika mysticism was introduced. Considerably later a great impetus was given to Buddhism by the celebrated reformer Tsonkhapa (born A.D. 1357), who endeavored, about the opening of the 15th century, to unite the dialectical and mystical schools, and to put an end to the tricks, pretended miracles, and other corruptions of the priesthood. He published new works on religion; but, so far as regards the marked similarity between the ceremonial of the Chinese Buddhists and some Christian sects, Schlagintweit says that "we are not yet able to decide the question as to how far Buddhism may have borrowed from Christianity. but the rites of the Buddhists enumerated by the French missionary (Huc) can for the most part either be traced back to institutions peculiar to Buddhism, or they have sprung up in periods posterior to Tsonkhapa" (q. v.).

Sects.—According to Schlagintweit, there was no division of Lamaism into sects previous to the 11th century. Subsequently, however, there arose numerous subdivisions of the people, nine of which still exist, which are reputed orthodox, though there is not much known about them. In distinction from the other sects which Tsonkhapa labored energetically to supersede, he ordered his disciples to wear a yellow dress instead of red, the color of the older religionists, and, to make the distinction still greater, he provided a peculiar pattern for a cap, also to be made of yellow cloth.

1. The eldest of the primitive sects is the *Nyigmapa*. The lamas of Bhutan and Ladak belong to this sect, and they adhere to ancient rites, ceremonies, and usages such as obtained among the earliest Chinese priests. They acknowledge some sacred books not included in the Kanjur or Tanjur hereinafter mentioned. 2. Another ancient sect is the *Urgyenpa*, or the disciples of Urgyen, who differ from the first in their worship of Amitabha as Padma Sambhava. 3. A sect founded by Bromston (born A.D. 1002) observe only "precepts" and not "transcendental wisdom." This sect wear a red dress. 4. The *Sakyapa*, whose particular tenets are not known,

but who wear a red dress also. 5. The *Gelukpa* (Galdanpa or Geldampa) adhere to the doctrines of Tsonkhapa, and this sect is now the most numerous in Thibet. 6. The *Kargyutpa*, leave Prājna Pārimita, resting in their observance of the Aphorisms (Sutras) and in the "succession of precepts." 7. The *Karmapa*, and, 8. *Brikungpa*, are not much known. 9. The *Brugpa* (Dugp or Dad Dugpa) have a particular worship of the thunderbolt (Dorge) which fell from heaven in Eastern Thibet. This sect observe the Tantrika mysticism.

In addition to the above there is the "*Bon*" religion, the followers of which are called *Bonpas*. They own many wealthy monasteries. They are probably the descendants of those who did not originally accept Buddhism, but preserved the ancient rites and superstitions of the country.

Sacred Books.—Lamaism has a voluminous sacred literature. Originally it consisted almost wholly of translations, but after this it developed rapidly an indigenous element, especially after the 14th century, under the impulse given to it by Tsonkhapa. The commentaries on the sacred text are frequently in the vernacular. But the great works are a compilation of Sanskrit translators, containing sacred and profane publications of different periods. These are respectively translations of "the commandments" and of the doctrines of Sakyamuni, in which are embraced philosophy, logic, rhetoric, and Sanskrit grammar. The principal of these translations date from about the 9th century. Minor ones are probably of later origin, but the modern arrangement of the works is probably not older than the present century. These collections were printed in 1728–46, by order of the regent of Lhassa, and are now printed at many of the monasteries. They are entitled "*Kanjur* and *Tanjur*;" according to Müller, the proper spelling is *Bkah-hgyur* and *Bstan-hgyur*.

"The *Kanjur* consists of the following sections: 1. *Dulva* (Sanscrit, *Vinaya*), or discipline; 2. *Sher-phjin* (Sans. *Prajnâpâramitâ*), or philosophy and metaphyics; 3. *Phalchhen* (Sans. *Buddhavata Sangha*), or the doctrine of the Buddhas, their incarnations, etc.; 4. *dKon brTsegss* (Sans. *Ratnakûta*), or the collection of precious things; 5. *mDo ssDe* (Sans. *Sûtrantra*), or the collection of Sûtras; 6. *Mjang dass* (Sans. *Nirvâna*), or the liberation from wordlly pains; 7. *rGjud* (Sans. *Tantras*), or incantations, etc." (Chambers). There are many editions of the *Kanjur*, varying from 100 to 108 volumes folio. It embraces 1083 distinct works. Massive as this code is, editions of it have been printed at Pekin, Lhassa, and other places. These have been sold for sums ranging as high as £600, or, when men deal in kine, for 7000 oxen. A most valuable analysis of this immense Bible is given in the *Asiatic Researches*, vol. xx, by Alexander Csömä de Körös, a Hungarian who made his way to Thibet on foot for other purposes, but became an enthusiastic student of the Thibetan Scriptures.

The *Tanjur* is "a collection of treatises in 225 volumes, elegantly printed at Pekin, containing translations from Sanskrit and Prakrit, on dogmas, philosophy, grammar, medicine, and ethics, with Amara's Rosha or vocabulary, and fragments of the Mahabharata and of other epic poems. The work of the great reformer, the history of Buddhism, lives of saints, and all sorts of works on theology and magic, fill the libraries. But the Thibetans also possess annals, genealogies, and laws, as, for instance, the 'Mirror of Kings' (translated into Mongolic by Ssanang Ssetsen, and into German by Schmidt), or Bodhimör ('Way to Wisdom'), and works on astronomy and chronology" (Appleton).

Among the native sacred literature of Thibet is the historical book called *Mani Kambum*, containing the legendary tales of Padmapani's propagation of Buddhism in Thibet, and the origin and application of the sacred formula "*Om Mani Padma Hum*." It contains a description of the wonderful region Sukhavati, where Amitabha sits enthroned, and where those are who most merit blissful existence; a history of creation; prayers to Padmapani, and the advantages of frequent repetition of Om Mani; the meaning of that sacred sentence; an account of the figurative representations of Padmapani, and of his images, which represent him with faces varying from three to one thousand. It contains, moreover, the ethics and religious ordinances of Buddhism; biography; a description of the irresistible power of "Om Mani," etc., and tells how it secures deliverance from being reborn; legends, translations of sacred books, etc. This has been translated into Mongolian.

Grades of Initiation.—The Buddhist community is divided into three classes. The first or highest is known in Thibet as True Intelligence, or *Chang Chhub*, meaning "the perfect" or "accomplished;" and *Chang Chhub Sempali*, or "Perfect Strength of Mind," because the graduate has accomplished the grand object of life, which is the perfect suppression of all bodily desire and complete abstraction of mind. These are the Bodhisatwas of Sanskrit (or, in Chinese, *Pusas*), who are incipient Buddhas, rising by self-sacrifice and their good influence over their fellow-men to the highest goal. Every age produces a number of these Bodhisatwas. The second class comprises those having "individual intelligence" or self-intelligence, the *Pratyeka*, who turn not out of the way. The third is the *Sravaka* or auditor (listener).

Orders of Beings.—The self-existent Adi Buddha, by five spontaneous acts of divine wisdom, and by five exertions of mental reflection (*dhyan*), projected from his own essence five intelligences of the first order, known as the *Pancha Dhyâni-Buddha*, or "Five celestial Buddhas," whose names are *Vairochana*, *Akshobya*, *Ratna Sambhava*, *Amitabha*, and *Amogha Siddha*. These five intelligences of the first order created "five intelligences" of a second order, or *Bodhisatwas*, who "become creative agents in the hands of God, or serve as links uniting him with all the lower grades of creaturely existence." The *Lokeswaras* (Jigten Baugchuk), or "Lords of the World," are also acknowledged in Thibetan Buddhism. All these are celestial beings, the spontaneous emanations from the Deity, who have never been subject to the pains of transmigration.

Inferior to these are the created or mortal beings, divided into six classes, named *Droba Rikdruk*, or "Six advances or progressors," because their souls advance by transmigration from one state to a better one, until they finally attain absorption, and are no longer subject to transmigration. These six are: 1. *Lhâ*, or gods; 2. *Lha ma yin*, Titans; 3. *Mi*, which equals man; 4. *Dudro*, brutes; 5. *Yidok*, goblins; 6. *Myalba*, the damned.

The hells are eight cold and sixteen hot, and are favorite subjects of Chinese and Thibetan painters. The punishment is not everlasting, but after expiation the person may be born again.

Objects of Worship.—In early periods Lamaism confined its worship to the triad Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha; and pious reverence was shown to the relics of former Buddhas, as well as to those of Sakya himself and his principal disciples; but there is no mention of the elaborate system of Dhyani Buddhas, Padmapani, etc., earlier than about A.D. 400. Primitive Buddhism is now stated to have been undoubtedly atheistic, but was in later ages greatly modified.

Sakyamuni is worshipped in Ladak as "Shakya Thubba," yet there is a legend to the effect that at the end of twenty-five centuries from the present time he is to be superseded by a more benign Buddha, called *Maitreya*, or *Mi-le*. The people, however, worship others equally with Sakya, though there is reason to believe that the worship is of later date, as Fa Hian is the first who makes mention of it. He speaks of it as extant at the time of his visit in A.D. 400. These other deities are Padmapani, Jamya, and Chanrazik (or Padmapani, Manju Sri, and Ava Lokiteswara); and though the people still confirm an oath by appealing to the three supremacies of the Buddhist triad, yet, when they undertake any enterprise or begin a journey, their prayers for

success are almost invariably addressed to Padmapani. The mystic sentence "*Om Mani Padma Hum*" is repeated in worship, and is constantly heard as one moves through the country. It has been variously translated as "Oh, the jewel in the lotus!" and "Hail to him of the jewel and the lotus!" and "Glory to the lotus-bearer Hum!"

Padmapani is a "Dhyani Bodhisattna," and of all the gods is most frequently worshipped, because he is a representative of Sakyamuni, and guardian and propagator of his faith until the appearance of the Buddha Maitreya. He is the patron deity of Thibet, and manifests himself from age to age in human shape, becoming Dalai Lama (see below) by the emission of a beam of light, and ultimately is to be born as the most perfect Buddha —not in India, where his predecessors became such, but in Thibet. He has a great many names, and is represented in various figures, sometimes having eleven faces and eight hands, the faces forming a pyramid ranged in four rows, each series being of a different complexion, as white, yellow, blue, red; sometimes he is represented as having one head and four arms.

Co-regent with Padmapani is Manju Sri, who diffuses religious truth, bearing a naked sword as symbolic of power and acumen; he is lord of the intellect, and the author of the joy of the family circle, and is deputy governor of the whole earth. The representations of him in Thibet, as in Mongolia, make him to have innumerable eyes and hands, and even ten heads, crowned, and rising in the form of a cone, one above another; he is often represented as incarnate in the person of some Dalai Lama as Padmapani.

It must not be supposed, however, that these are the only objects of worship in Thibet. The earliest worship of that country was a species of nature or element worship; and, as Lamaism ingrafted the ancient gods and spirits of the former inhabitants on itself, the poorer people still make offerings to their old divinities, the gods of the hills, the woods, the dales, the mountains, the rivers, and have field, family, and house divinities. Lamaism was, besides this, greatly affected by its contact with the *Shamanism* (q. v.) of the Mongolians.

These gods are particles of the Supreme Intelligence, and, though they are many, they are all a multiplication of the one God. The Thibetan name for deity is *Sha*, the equivalent of the Sanskrit *Deva*. They assist man, each having his own sphere, within which he reigns supreme. These gods are both male and female.

There are, besides these, malignant gods, called "Da," or *enemy*, and "Geg," *devil*. The most malignant of them are, 1. Lhamayin, to whom many ill-natured spirits are subject. They cause untimely death. 2. The Dudpos, or judges of the dead. These try to prevent the depopulation of the world by prompting evil desire, by becoming beautiful women. They disturb devout assemblies. They are, of course, antagonized by the more benevolent deities, among whom some become specially famous, as the *Drag-sheds*, "the cruel hangmen," who are subdivided into eight classes. Legends concerning them abound.

Doctrines.—According to Csömä (in the *Bengal Society Journal*, vii, 145), the higher philosophies are not popularly understood, yet the people of Thibet are in general tolerably familiar with the doctrine of the Three Vehicles (Triyana), a dogma of the Mahayani school, explained in the Thibetan Compendium called *Lamrim*, or "The gradual Way to Perfection." The argument of the book is to the effect that the Buddha dogmas are intended for the lowest, middle, and highest people, and they are graded accordingly. In the matter of creeds, for instance, there is the following order. The lowest people must believe in God, future life, and that the fruit of works is to be earned in this life, while the middle class are to know (1) that every compound is perishable; (2) that all imperfection is pain, and that deliverance from bodily existence is the only real happiness. A person of the highest class, in addition to all the foregoing, must know that from the body to the Supreme Soul nothing is existent but himself; that he will not always be, nor ever cease absolutely from being.

In moral duties there is a like gradation. The vulgar are to practice ten virtues, to which the middle class are to add meditation, wisdom, etc.; while the superior class must, in addition to the foregoing, practice the six transcendental virtues. In their ultimate destiny this gradation pursues these classes, the lowest being admitted to become men, gods, etc., the next having hope of rebirth in Sukhavati, without pain or bodily existence, and the best expecting to reach themselves Nirvana, and to lead others thereunto also. The priests who take the vows called Dom can alone hope for this.

A more popular code, however, is necessary for simpler people, and hence the following eight precepts commonly obtain: 1. To seek to take refuge only with Buddha. 2. To form in one's mind the resolution to strive to attain the highest degree of perfection, in order to be united with the Supreme Intelligence. 3. To prostrate one's self before the image of Buddha to adore him. 4. To bring offerings before him, such as are pleasing to any of the six senses, as lights, flowers, garlands, incense, perfumes, all kinds of edibles and drinkables, stuffs, cloth, etc., for garments, and hanging ornaments. 5. To make music, sing hymns, and utter the praises of Buddha, respecting his person and doctrines, love or mercy, perfections or attributes, and his acts or performances for the benefit of all animal beings. 6. To confess one's sins with a contrite heart, to ask forgiveness for them, and to resolve sincerely not to commit the like hereafter. 7. To rejoice in the moral merits of all animal beings, and to wish that they may thereby obtain final emancipation or beatitude. 8. To pray and entreat all Buddhas that are now in the world to turn the wheel of religion (or to teach their doctrines), and not to leave the world too soon, but to remain here for many ages or *kalpas*.

Buddhism in Thibet, as elsewhere, accepts the doctrine of *metempsychosis*. The forms under which any living beings may be reborn are sixfold, enumerated previously as among the inferior objects of worship. Good works involve rebirth, just as bad ones do. Shinje, "the Lord of the Dead," determines the end of life and the form of the rebirth. He has a wonderful mirror, which reflects the good and bad actions of men, and a balance in which to weigh them. When being in any one form must cease, he sends his servants to bring the soul before him for the announcement of the form it shall next assume. If the servant bring the wrong person the mirror shows it, and the soul is dismissed.

The object of rebirth being the expiation of sins, atonement for them may lessen these if made in this life, as will also the subduing of evil desires, the practice of virtue, and confession. The Mahayana school says that confession confers entire absolution from sins. So also Thibetan Buddhism now considers it. Confession, however, includes repentance and promises of amendment. Various ceremonies accompany the avowal. Consecrated water must be used, which, however, can only be rendered fit by the priests by a ceremony called *Tvisol*, or "Entreaties for ablution." Abstinence from food and recitation of prayers are also observed, but the commonest form is that of a simple address to the gods. The confessors who deliver from sins are generally Buddhas who preceded Sakyamuni, or holy spirits equal in power to Buddhas. There are thirty-five of these eminent in this work, known as the "thirty-five Buddhas of Confession," beautifully colored images of whom are found in the monasteries, and to whom prayers are made in the Thibetan liturgy.

Regarding the future abode of the blessed, Lamaism differs from other Buddhism. Nirvāna (annihilation) is not carefully pointed out, and the sacred books say it is impossible to define its attributes and properties. But to those failing to obtain Nirvāna, or unconscious existence, the next best state that can be offered is *Suk-*

havati, entrance upon which exempts from rebirth, but not from absolute existence. Thibetans do not now generally distinguish between the two, the great stress being laid on the deliverance from rebirth. This region is located towards the west, in a large lake, the surface of which is covered with lotus-flowers of rare perfume, and of red and white color. Devotion is kindled by birds of Paradise, food and clothing being had for the wishing. Human forms may be assumed and laid aside at pleasure. These are on their way to be Buddhas.

Priesthood.—The first organization of the Thibetan clergy dates from A.D. 726–786, and the present hierarchical system from about the 15th century. In A.D. 1417 the Lama Tsonkhapa founded the Golden Monastery, but the Dalai Lama at Lhassa and the Panchen Rinpoche, both credited with divine origin, gained greater influence than that of Golden. The *Dalai Lama* (Grand Lama) is an incarnation of the "Dhyani Bodhisattwa" Chenrisi, who becomes reincorporated by a beam of light which leaves him and enters the person selected for the descent. The "Panchen," on the other hand, are incorporations of the father of Chenrisi, who was named Amitabha. The first to assume the title of "His precious Majesty," and the first Dalai Lama, was Gedun Grub (1389–1473). With the fifth Dalai Lama the *temporal* government was extended over all Thibet. These Dalai Lamas are elected by the priests, but since A.D. 1792 these elections have been greatly influenced

Figure of the *Dalai Lama.*

by the Chinese government at Pekin. Next below the Dalai Lamas are the superiors of monasteries, called *Khanpos*. They are appointed by the Dalai Lamas for a term of three or six years, and some of them are considered to be incarnations. The third in grade are the superintendents of choral songs and the music of the divine services, and are termed *Budzad*. Next succeeding are the *Gebkoi*, who are elected by the monks to maintain order; below the Gebkoi are the *abbots*. The sixth in order is the *Lama*, a title which literally pertains only to "superior" priests, but, by courtesy, is now applied to all Buddhist priests. The *Tsikhan* are astrologers, who marry, are fortune-tellers, conjure evil spirits, etc. Their instruments are an arrow and triangle.

In the organization of the orders there is a code of some two hundred and fifty rulers. Celibacy and poverty have had much to do in the formation of the character of the priesthood. The vow to lead a life of celibacy is rarely revoked. While the priests personally must continue poor, the monasteries may be wealthy, and they actually have great revenues. Living on alms, most is collected about harvest time. Fees from funerals, marriages, illness, etc., are among their resources. The property of the monasteries is free from taxation.

The elder son generally becomes a lama. In 1855 the total number of lamas, as estimated in the *Bengal Society Journal*, was 18,500, in twelve monasteries of Eastern Thibet. In Western Thibet Cunningham estimates one to every thirteen laymen, while in Spiti they number one to seven of the population.

These priests till the gardens attached to the monasteries, revolve prayer cylinders, carve blocks, and paint. They are often illiterate, and, though most of them know how to read and write, they do not care to acquire knowledge. Their dress and caps are of double felt, with charms between the folds, or they wear large straw hats. The head lama's cap is generally low and conical, though some are hexagonal, and others like a mitre. They wear also a gown, which reaches to the calves of their legs; this has a slender girdle and an upright collar. They wear also trowsers, and boots of stiff felt. They carry rosaries containing 108 beads, made of wood, pebbles, or bones. Their amulet boxes contain images of deities, relics, and objects dreaded by evil spirits.

Buildings and Monuments.—The priests live in monasteries, each of which receives a religious name. The architecture is similar to that of the houses of the wealthy. The entrance faces either the south or east. They are always decorated with flags. They sometimes consist of one large house, several stories high, and in other cases of several buildings with temples attached. In their exterior appearance they are much inferior to those of other countries.

The temples have nothing imposing about them. The roofs are flat or sloping, with square holes for windows and skylights. The walls are towards the quarters of the heavens. The north side should be colored green, the south side yellow, the east side white, the west red. They are not always, however, in this order. The interior of the building is generally one large room, with side halls decorated with paintings, images, etc. The side halls contain the library, the volumes of which are on shelves, and sometimes wrapped in silk. In the corners are statues of deities, the religious dresses of the priests, musical instruments, and other articles of sacred appointment. "The Lamaic temples are of Indo-Chinese form, square, fronting the east in Thibet and the south in Mongolia. They are often cruciform. There are three gates, and three interior divisions, viz., the entrance-hall, the body of the edifice with two parallel rows of columns, and the sanctuary with the throne of the high lama" (Appleton). For a description of two of the largest lama temples in China, see Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese*, ii, 457 sq.

The *Chodtens* are monuments from eight to fifteen feet, or even sometimes forty feet high. They are receptacles for the offerings of the people, and repositories of relics, and are very much revered by the lamas. They are set up in the temples, and are moulded from metals, or even of clay and straw.

The *Man* is a wall six feet long and four or five feet broad, of sacred use. Derchoks and lapchas are sacred flags and heaps of stones. Prayers are inscribed on the flags, and the people seem ever eager to make new lapchas.

Images, etc.—The representations of deities and other sacred personages are copied everywhere. From the earliest period relics and images of Buddha have been honored and worshipped with simple ceremonies, as prostrations, presentation of flowers, perfumes, prayers, and hymns. At the present day, Buddhas preceding Sakyamuni, as well as the Dhyani Buddhas, a host of gods, spirits deified, priests of local reputation, are all represented in images or pictures. The "Gallery of Portraits" has drawings of over three hundred saints.

The lamas have a monopoly of the manufacture of these, as they are efficacious only after the performance of certain ceremonies at many junctures in their preparation, and these the lamas alone know how to perform. Pictures must be commenced on prescribed days; on certain other days the eyes must be painted, etc. Draw-

ings and paintings are traced with pinholes, through which powder is sifted; they are bordered by several strips of silk, of blue, yellow, red, and other colors. Statues and bass-reliefs of clay, papier-maché, bread-dough, or metals, or even of butter run in a mould, are made. The best executed contain relics, as ashes, bones, hair, rags, and grain; these are sometimes contained in a hole in the bottom of the image.

The images and statues of the Buddha, Bodhisattwas, and the Dragsheds differ greatly from each other. *Sakyamuni* is represented in many attitudes, with one hand uplifted or holding an alms-bowl, as sitting, or as recumbent. *Padmapani* has sometimes eleven faces and a thousand hands. "*Melha*, the god of fire, when driving away evil spirits, rides a red ram, and has a horrible countenance;" but he is represented in many other attitudes. The Bodhisattwas have a shining countenance, and are seated on a lotus-flower. The Dragsheds who protect against evil spirits are fierce-looking, of dark complexion, and sometimes have a third eye in the forehead, to represent their wisdom. They are almost naked, but wear a necklace of human skulls, and have rings on their arms and ankles. They have in their hands various instruments symbolic of their power. The *Dorje*, or thunderbolt, "may best be represented by four or eight metallic hoops joined together so as to form two balls," which are on a staff, with points projecting. The *Phurbu*, or "nail," the *Bechon*, "club," and *Zagpa*, or "snare" to catch evil spirits, and the *Kapāla*, or drinking-vessel, which is a human skull, are among these sacred instruments.

Forms of Worship.—The religious services consist of singing, accompanied with instrumental music, offerings, prayers, etc. The offerings are of clarified butter, flour, tamarind-wood, flowers, grain, peacock feathers, etc. There are no blood-offerings, as any sacrifices entailing injury to life are strictly forbidden in the Buddhistic faith. Drums, trumpets made of the human thigh-bone, cymbals, and flageolets, are among the sacred musical instruments.

The *Prayer cylinder* is an instrument peculiar to the Buddhists. It is called "knorben" (Hardy says *hGorlas* or *Tchukor*, according to Huc=*turning-prayer*). It is generally of brass, enveloped in wood or leather. A wooden handle passes through the cylinder, forming its axis, around which is rolled the long strip of cloth or paper on which is the prayer of printed sacred sentences. A small pebble or piece of metal, at the end of a short chain, facilitates the rotation of the cylinder in the hand. Large cylinders near the monasteries are kept in motion by persons employed for the purpose, or by being attached to streams of running water like a mill-wheel. Each revolution, if made slowly, and from right to left, is equivalent to the repetition of the sentences inclosed. Generally the inscription is only a repetition of the sentence "Om mani padma hum." There is also a sacred drama.

Sacred Days and Festivals.—The monthly festivals are four, and are connected with the phases of the moon. No animal food must be eaten, but ordinary avocations need not be discontinued. There are particular festivals for each month, and three great annual festivals. "The *Log gSsar*, or the festival of the new year, in February, marks the commencement of the season of spring, or the victory of light and warmth over darkness and cold. The Lamaists, like the Buddhists, celebrate it in commemoration of the victory obtained by the Buddha Sakyamuni over the six heretic teachers. It lasts fifteen days, and consists of a series of feasts, dances, illuminations, and other manifestations of joy; it is, in short, the Thibetan Carnival. The second festival, probably the oldest festival of the Buddhistic Church, is held in commemoration of the conception or incarnation of the Buddha, and marks the commencement of summer. The third is the *water-feast*, in August and September, marking the commencement of autumn" (Chambers).

Ceremonies.—*Tvisol*, or prayer for ablution, is among the most sacred of Buddhist rites. The "ceremony of continued abstinence" is performed once or twice a year, and occupies four days, prayers being read in praise of Padmapani.

Rites are also observed for the attainment of supernatural faculties called *Siddhi*, of which eight classes are distinguished: the power to conjure; longevity; water of life; discovery of hidden treasures; entering into Indra's cave; the art of making gold; the transformation of earth into gold; the acquiring of the inappreciable jewel.

This siddhi, however, cannot be obtained without certain austerities, observances, and incantations. The latter must be repeated a fixed number of times, as, for instance, 100,000 times a day. Meditation is always necessary.

Peculiar ceremonies are observed for securing the assistance of the gods: these are the rite *Dubjed*, or making ready a burnt-offering, which has various names and is differently observed, as the "sacrifice for peace," the "rich sacrifice," to secure good harvests; the sacrifice for power, to obtain influence or success; the "fierce sacrifice," to secure protection from untimely death, etc. Incantation of Lungta, or "the horse of the wind," is powerful for good, as is also the talisman Changpo, which protects from evil spirits. The evil spirits are limited in their mischief by the magical figure Phurbu, a triangle drawn on paper covered with charms. Among the multitudinous ceremonies are those performed in cases of illness. Each malignant spirit causes some particular disease: Rahu inflicts palsy, others cause children to fall sick, etc. Charms, noisy music, and prayers accompany what rude medicine is administered.

"Baptism and confirmation are the two principal sacraments of Lamaism. The former is administered on the third or tenth day after birth; the latter, generally when the child can walk or speak. The marriage ceremony is to Thibetans not a religious, but a civil act; nevertheless, the lamas know how to turn it to the best advantage, as it is from them that the bridegroom and bride have to learn the auspicious day when it should be performed; nor do they fail to complete the act with prayers and rites, which must be responded to with handsome presents" (Chambers).

"The bodies of rich laymen are buried, and their ashes preserved, while those of the common people are either exposed to be devoured by birds or eaten by sacred dogs, which are kept for the purpose, and the bones are pounded in mortars, and given to the animals in the shape of balls. Rich persons about to die are assisted by lamas, who let out the soul by pulling the skin from the skull and making a hole in it. Religious services for departed souls are said in the ratio of payment received. The mode of the funeral is determined by astrology" (Appleton).

Great importance is attached to astronomy, and tables of divination are in high esteem, as are soothsayers' formulas.

Holy Places.—"The principal holy place in Thibet is Lassa, with the monasteries Lha-brang, the cathedral; Ra-mo-tshhe (great circuit), wherein is the Chinese idol of Fo; and Moru (pure), having a celebrated printing-office. Near the city is Gar-ma-khian (mother cloister), wherein bad spirits are personated, and about a mile distant a three-pointed hill, with the chief of all monasteries and palaces, called Potala (Buddha's Mount), occupied by about 10,000 lamas in various dwellings. Several fine parks and gardens adorn the environs of the holy city. Among the thirty great lamaseries in the neighborhood are Sse-ra (golden), on the road to Mongolia, with Buddha's sceptre floating in the air, and 15,000 lamas; 'Brass ssPungss (branch-heap), founded by the reformer, with a Mongolic school, 300 sorcerers, and 15,000 lamas; and dGal Dan (Joy of heaven), also built by the reformer, whose body sometimes converses with the 8000 lamas. On the road to Ssu-tchuan is

Lha-ri (god mountain), with a fine temple; there is another sacred place in the metropolis of Kham; others at Issha-mDo (two ways), Djaya, etc., with printing-offices; many others on the roads to Pekin, besides the northern monastery; all containing an incredible number of monks, under Khutukhtus and lower lamas; so that father Huc counts 3000 monasteries in U alone; others 84,000 monks in U, Tsang, and Kham, of the yellow sect, hermits, beggars, and vagabonds not included. About 120 miles south-west from Lassa, near the confluence of the Painom with the great g'Tsang-po-tshhu (Sanpu), is the second metropolis of Lamaism, viz. bKra-Shiss-Lhun-po (mount of grace), also called bLabrang, with five great cenobies, many temples, palaces, mausoleums, pyramids, and the like. In the neighboring city there is a Chinese garrison. About midway between the two bLa-brangs there are three rocky islands in a lake, called gYang-brog (happy desert; Yambro on English maps), which contain temples, a magnificent palace, and thousands of monks and nuns, subject to the rDo-rDje-Phag-mo (saint, or adamantine sow), a female Khutukhtu, who becomes incarnated with a figure of a sow's snout on her neck, in consequence of her having escaped from Lassa during the troubles of the regency in the shape of that animal. The Chinese believe her to be the incarnate Ursa Major. On the road to Nepaul there are the sNar-thang monastery, where the Kanjûr was printed; and Ssaskya, mentioned above, now the see of the red-capped Gong-rDogss (high lord) Rin-po-tshhe, who is hereditary. On the road to Bhotan are the monasteries Kisu and Gantum Gumba of Turner, and many others, swarming with lamas, some filled with Annîs (nuns). Bhotan is subject to the Dalai, but there are also three red-capped Rin-po-tshhe. The metropolis is bKra-Shiss Tshoss rDsong (gloria salutis fideique arx, Turner's Tassisudon), under an incarnate great lama and a secular Dharma-raja, who rules over six districts, with about 10,000 lamas and 45,000 families. In Sikkim the aboriginal Leptchas have many mendicant lamas who practice magic, the other tribes being pure Buddhists. Buddhism flourished in Nepaul as early as the 7th century of our æra. It now exists there with Brahminism and Mohammedanism, so that Nepaul has also a double literature. In Kunawar, and elsewhere on the Upper Sutlej, there are many great monasteries of both the yellow and the red caps, living in peace with each other. At Sungnam there is a great library, a printing establishment, and a gigantic statue of Buddha. Ladakh became Buddhist before our æra; its history is even less known than that of Thibet. Although invaded by Moslems (about 1650), it has many lamas, both male and female. In China there are two Buddhistic sects, viz. that of Fo, since A.D. 65, fostered by the government, very numerous, but without hierarchy, each monastery being under an abbot, who is a citizen of the 12th class; and the Lamaists, organized, as in Thibet, under the ministry of foreign affairs, with three Khutukhtus at Pekin, one of whom is attached to the court, while another's diocese is in South Mongolia, and the third governs the central one of their great monasteries. The most celebrated temples in the eighteen provinces are one on the U-tai-shan (five-topped mountain), in Shan-si, and one in Yunnan. In Si-fan, or Tangut, about the Koko-Nor, Lamaism flourished under the Hia at the close of the 9th century. The great reformer was incarnated in Amdo. The great cenoby of ssKubum was visited and endowed by Khanghi, and has a celebrated university. Mongolia is the paradise of lamas, they forming about one eighth of its population. Its patriarch, the Gegen-Khutukhtu, a Bodhisattwa of Maitreya, is equal in rank to both Thibetan popes, resides at Urga, on the road between Pekin and Kiachta, lat. 48° 20′, with about 20,000 monks, and has attained the highest Khubilghanism by sixteen incarnations, having been first the son of Altan Khakhan of the Khalkas, and having once died (1839), after a visit to Pekin, either by poison or from licentiousness. The Urgan cenoby owns about 30,000 families of slaves. The cathedral at Kuku Khotun, among the Tumed, is under an incarnate patriarch, now second to the preceding. Most cenobies and temples now extant in Mongolia were built or restored after the second conversion. A Khutukhtu rules over the celebrated establishment of the 'five towers.' Dyo Naiman Ssuma, the summer residence of the second Pekin Khutukhtu, contains 108 temples and a famous manufactory of idols. Many other abodes of lamas are scarcely inferior to those we have mentioned. The desert of Gobi contains many such establishments. Sungaria contains numerous ruins of Lamaism, on the Irtish and elsewhere, among which those of Ablai-Küt, near Usk-Kamenogorsk, are most renowned, because the first fragments of the holy canon were brought thence to Europe about 1750. The Torguts have built many sacred places since their return from the west. A few lamas were found among the Buryäts (in Russia), near Lake Baikal, about 160 years ago, as missionaries from Urga. Now almost all of them south of the lake are Lamao-Shamanites, and have wooden temples. The Calmucks between the Don, Volga, and Ural are forbidden to maintain intercourse with the Delai, although they keep up a Lamaic worship in Shitüni-urgas (church tents)."

Government.—"Since the restoration of the power of the Dalai by the emperor Khian-lung, all the decrees of government are issued in the name of each of the two high lamas, in their respective dioceses; but the real power is in the hands of the emperor, whose two Tatchin (great mandarins) reside at Lassa, with Chinese garrisons in the neighborhood, to watch both the ocean of holiness and the Tsang-vang, who, as vicar of the emperor, administers the affairs of the country. The lower offices only are hereditary. The annual tribute of the two high lamas is carried every third year to Pekin by caravans."

Literature.—See, besides the sacred books mentioned above, and the works cited under Buddhism, A. Cunningham, *Ladak, Physical, Statistical, and Historical* (London, 1854); Csömä de Körös, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Bengal, i, 121–269; ii, 57, 201, 388; iii, 57; iv, 142; v, 264, 384; vii (pt. i), 142; xx, 553–585; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 88 sq.; Huc et Gabet, *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et la Chine* (Paris, 1852); Hodgson, *Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists* (Serampore, 1841); Köppen (Fr.), *Die Lamaische Hierarchie*, etc. (Berlin, 1859); Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in Tibet* (Lpzg. and London, 1863). See Thibet. (J. T. G.)

La Marck, Evrard de, cardinal bishop and lord of Liege, was born about 1475. His personal qualities, as well as the services rendered to the Church of Liege by his ancestors, caused him to be chosen bishop of that city in 1506. He at once applied to Rome for approbation, and, on the reception of the papal bull of installation by pope Julius II, repaired to Liege, where he was received with great enthusiasm. He confirmed the privileges of the city, which he governed with such wisdom that, while war was raging outside, his diocese continued to enjoy undisturbed peace. He restored the old discipline of St. Hubert, first bishop of Liege, and devoted himself to the spiritual and temporal improvement of his charge. In acknowledgment of services he had rendered to Louis XII in the affairs of Italy, he was made bishop of Chartres. Francis I even promised to procure him a cardinal's hat, but a protégé of the duchess of Angoulême obtaining it in his stead, he entered in 1518 into the league of Austria against France, and even warred against his own brother, Robert de la Marck, who had made peace with Francis I. In the Diet of Frankfort he advocated the nomination of Charles V as emperor of Germany, and was rewarded with the archbishopric of Valencia. In 1521 he was created cardinal, and thereafter became a zealous opponent of the Reformation. According to Abraham Bzovius, he appointed in each district men on whom he could rely to

ferret out and punish all heretics. A great many were found and punished by exile or death, while their possessions were sequestered. He is said to have cruelly tortured Protestant theologians. He had at first welcomed Erasmus, who dedicated to him his paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans, but turned about and called him a heathen and a publican when he saw him incline towards the new doctrines. In 1529 he was called to Cambrai, where the *Ladies' Peace* was concluded. In 1532 he equipped at his own expense a body of troops to war against the Turks. Appointed legate *a latere* in 1533, he labored with new zeal to uproot all heresy. For this object he assembled a synod at Liege in 1538, but the priests, dissatisfied with his austerity, declared against him. He hoped to subdue their opposition, but suddenly died, Feb. 16, 1538. See Chapeauville, *Hist. des Cardinaux*, vol. iii, ch. v and vi; Auber, *Histoire des Cardinaux*, iii, 331, Louis Doni d'Attichy, *Flores Cardinalium*, vol. iii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 52. (J. N. P.)

La Marck, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, Chevalier de, a very distinguished French naturalist, deserves a place here on account of his connection with the celebrated theory of the "Variation of Species," lately so generally made known by the English naturalist Darwin. See Man, Origin of. La Marck was born at Barenton, in Picardy, Aug. 1, 1744, and was intended for the Church; he entered, however, the army, but accidental injury led him to adopt the mercantile profession. During his leisure hours he studied the natural sciences, and in 1778 finally came before the public with a work on botany, which secured him the position of botanist to the king. In 1793 he was made a professor of natural history in the "Jardin des Plantes." He died Dec. 20, 1829. His greatest work is his *Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres* (Paris, 1815–22, 7 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. Paris, 1835, etc.). In *Philosophie Zoologique* (Paris, 1809, 2 vols. 8vo), and some other of his productions, he advanced extremely speculative views, which, since Darwin's rise, have become the consideration of scientific scholars. So much is certain, that La Marck was the first (if we except a few obscure words of Buffon towards the close of his life) to advocate "Variation of Species." For a more detailed account and a complete list of his works, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 55–62). (J. H. W.)

Lamb is the representative of several Hebrew and Greek words in the A. V., some of which have wide and others distinctive meanings. See Ewe.

1. The most usual term, כֶּבֶשׂ, *ke'bes* (with its transposed form שֶׂכֶב, *ke'seb*, and the feminines כִּבְשָׂה, *kibsâh'*, or כַּבְשָׂה, *kabsâh'*, and כִּשְׂבָה, *kisbâh'*), denotes a male lamb from the first to the third year. The former, perhaps, more nearly coincide with the provincial term *hog* or *hogget*, which is applied to a young ram before he is shorn. The corresponding word in Arabic, according to Gesenius, denotes a ram at that period when he has lost his first two teeth and four others make their appearance, which happens in the second or third year. Young rams of this age formed an important part of almost every sacrifice. They were offered at the daily morning and evening sacrifice (Exod. xxix, 38–41), on the Sabbath day (Numb. xxviii, 9), at the feasts of the new moon (Numb. xxviii, 11), of trumpets (Numb. xxix, 2), of tabernacles (Numb. xxix, 13–40), of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii, 18–20), and of the Passover (Exod. xii, 5). They were brought by the princes of the congregation as burnt-offerings at the dedication of the tabernacle (Numb. vii), and were offered on solemn occasions like the consecration of Aaron (Lev. ix, 3), the coronation of Solomon (1 Chron. xxix, 21), the purification of the Temple under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 21), and the great Passover held in the reign of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 7). They formed part of the sacrifice offered at the purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xii, 6), and at the cleansing of a leper (Lev. xiv, 10–25). They accompanied the presentation of first-fruits (Lev. xxiii, 12). When the Nazarites commenced their period of separation they offered a he-lamb for a trespass-offering (Numb. vi, 12), and at its conclusion a he-lamb was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and a ewe-lamb as a sin-offering (v, 14). A ewe-lamb was also the offering for the sin of ignorance (Lev. iv, 32). See Sacrifice.

2. The corresponding Chaldee term to the above is אִמַּר, *immar'* (Ezra vi, 9, 17; vii, 17). In the Targum it assumes the form אִימְרָא.

3. A special term is טָלֶה, *taleh'* (1 Sam. vii, 9; Isa. lxv, 25), a young sucking lamb; originally the young of any animal. The noun from the same root in Arabic signifies "a fawn," in Ethiopic "a kid," in Samaritan "a boy," while in Syriac it denotes "a boy," and in the feminine "a girl." Hence "*Talitha* kumi," "Damsel, arise!" (Mark v, 41). The plural of a cognate form occurs (טְלִי, *teli'*) in Isa. xl, 11.

4. Less exact is כַּר, *car*, a fat *ram*, or, more probably, "wether," as the word is generally employed in opposition to *ayil*, which strictly denotes a "ram" (Deut. xxxii, 14; 2 Kings iii, 4; Isa. xxxiv, 6). Mesha, king of Moab, sent tribute to the king of Israel 100,000 fat wethers; and this circumstance is made use of by R. Joseph Kimchi to explain Isa. xvi, 1, which he regards as an exhortation to the Moabites to renew their tribute. The Tyrians obtained their supply from Arabia and Kedar (Ezek. xxvii, 21), and the pastures of Bashan were famous as grazing-grounds (Ezek. xxxix, 18). See Ram.

5. Still more general is צֹאן, *tsôn*, rendered "lamb" in Exod. xii, 21, properly a collective term denoting a "flock" of small cattle, sheep and goats, in distinction from herds of the larger animals (Eccles. ii, 7; Ezek. xlv, 15). See Flock.

6. In opposition to this collective term the word שֶׂה, *seh*, is applied to denote the individuals of a flock, whether sheep or goats; and hence, though "lamb" is in many passages the rendering of the A. V., the marginal reading gives "kid" (Gen. xxii, 7, 8; Exod. xii, 3; xxii, 1, etc.).—Smith, s. v. See Kid.

7. In the N. T. we find *ἀρνίον* (strictly the diminutive of *ἀρήν*, which latter once occurs, Luke x, 1), a *lambkin*, the almost exclusive word, *ἀμνός* being only employed in a few passages, directly referring to Christ, as noticed below.

It appears that originally the paschal victim might be indifferently of the goats or of the sheep (Exod. xii, 3–5). In later times, however, the offspring of sheep appears to have been almost uniformly taken, and in sacrifices generally, with the exception of the sin-offering on the great day of atonement. Sundry peculiar enactments are contained in the same law respecting the qualities of the animal (Exod. xxii, 30; xxxiii, 19; Lev. xxii, 27). See Passover.

In the symbolical language of Scripture the lamb is the type of meekness and innocence (Isa. xi, 6; lxv, 25; Luke x, 3; John xxi, 15). See Sheep.

The hypocritical assumption of this meekness, and the carrying on of persecution under a show of charity to the souls of men, and bestowing absolutions and indulgences on those who conform to its rules, appears to have given rise to the application of this otherwise sacred title to Antichrist (Rev. xiii, 11): "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns *like a lamb*, and he spake as a dragon." This evidently has reference to the ostensibly mild and tolerant character of the pagan forms of religion, which nevertheless, in the end, were found co-operating with the relentless secular power. It finds a fit counterpart in the Jesuitical pretensions of Romanism. See Antichrist.

Lamb (*as a Christian emblem*), the symbol of Christ (Gen. iv, 4; Exod. xii, 3; xxix, 38; Isa. xvi, 1; Jer. liii, 7; John i, 36; 1 Pet. i, 19; Rev. xiii, 8), who was typified by the paschal lamb, the blood of which was sprink-

led on the door-posts and lintel of the doors like a Tau-cross, to preserve the Hebrews from destruction. In very old sepulchres the lamb stands on a hill amid the four rivers of Paradise, or in the Baptist's hand. It sometimes carries a milk-pail and crook, to represent the Good Shepherd. In the 5th century it is encircled with a nimbus. In the 4th century its head is crowned with the cross and monogram. In the 6th century it bears a spear, the emblem of wisdom, ending in a cross; or appears, bleeding from five wounds, in a chalice. At last it is girdled with a golden zone of power and justice (Isa. xi, 5), bears the banner-cross of the resurrection, or treads upon a serpent (Rev. xviii, 14). At length, in the 8th and 9th centuries, it lies on a throne amid angels and saints, as in the apocalyptic vision. When fixed to a cross it formed the crucifix of the primitive Church, and therefore was afterwards added on the reverse of an actual crucifix, as on the stational cross of Velletri. In 692 the council in Trullo ordered the image of the Saviour to be substituted for the lamb. Jesus is the Shepherd to watch over his flock, as he was the Lamb, the victim from the sheep. Walafrid Strabo condemns the practice of placing near or under the altar on Good Friday lamb's flesh, which received benediction and was eaten on Easter day. Probably to this custom the Greeks alluded when they accused the Latins of offering a lamb on the altar at mass in the 9th century. In ancient times the pope and cardinals ate lamb on Easter day.

LAMB OF GOD (*ἀμνὸς Θεοῦ*, John i, 29, 36; so of the Messiah, *Test. xii Patr.* p. 724, 725, 730), a title of the Redeemer (compare Acts viii, 32; 1 Pet. i, 19, where alone the term *ἀμνός* is elsewhere employed, and with a like reference). This symbolical appellation applied to Jesus Christ, in John i, 29, 36, does not refer merely to the character or disposition of the Saviour, inasmuch as he is also called "the *Lion* of the tribe of Judah" (Rev. v, 5). Neither can the appellation signify the *most excellent* lamb, as a sort of Hebrew superlative. The term lamb is simply used, in this case, to signify *the sacrifice*, i. e. *the sacrificial victim*, of which the former sacrifices were typical (Numb. vi, 12; Lev. iv, 32; v, 6, 18; xiv, 12–17). So the prophet understood it: "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter" (Isa. liii, 7); and Paul: "For even Christ, our Passover," i. e. our *Passover lamb*, "is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v, 7; comp. Pet. i, 18, 19). As the *lamb* was the symbol of sacrifice, the Redeemer is called "the Sacrifice of God," or the divine Sacrifice (John i, 14; comp. 1 John xx, 28; Acts xx, 28; Rom. ix, 5, 1 Tim. iii, 16; Tit. ii, 13). As the Baptist pointed to the divinity of the Redeemer's sacrifice, he knew that in this consisted its efficacy to remove the sin of the world. The dignity of the Sacrifice, whose blood alone has an atoning efficacy for the sin of the world, is acknowledged in heaven. In the symbolic scenery, John beheld "a LAMB, as it had been *slain*, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God," i. e. invested with the attributes of God, omnipotence and omniscience, raised to the throne of universal empire, and receiving the homage of the universe (1 Cor. xv, 25; Phil. ii, 9–11; 1 John iii, 8; Heb. x, 5–17; Rev. v, 8–14). See the monographs on this subject cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 52.

Agnus Dei.

In the Romish Church the expression is blasphemously applied in its Latin form to a consecrated wax or dough image bearing a cross, used as a charm by the superstitious. See AGNUS DEI.

Lamb, John, D.D., an English divine and antiquary, was born about 1790. He was made master of Corpus Christi College in 1822, and in 1837 was honored with the deanery of Bristol. He died in 1850. Lamb published *Hist. Account of the XXXIX Articles*, 1553–1571 (Cambridge, 1829, 4to; 2d ed. 1835, 4to); etc. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* 1848, pt. ii, p. 55; 1850, pt. i, p. 667; *Christian Remembrancer*, June, 1829.

Lamb, Thomas, an English Baptist minister and strict Calvinist, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He died about 1672. He is noted as the opponent of John Goodwin, the bold defender of Arminianism, whose *Redemption Redeemed* (London, 1651, fol.) Lamb answered in a work entitled *Absolute Freedom from Sin by Christ's Death for the World*, etc. (London, 1656, 4to).

Lambdin, WILLIAM, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Talbot Co., Md., June 4, 1784; was converted at sixteen; removed to Pittsburg in 1805; joined the Baltimore Conference in 1808; was on various circuits and stations until 1815; then local till 1822, then in Pittsburg Conference until 1830; then local at Wheeling until 1842; then in Memphis Conference, Tennessee, where he labored until he was superannuated in 1848. He died in Henry County, Tenn., May 22, 1854. Lambdin was an able and faithful minister of the Word, and served the Church long and successfully.—*Annals of the Methodist Episcopal Church South*, 1855, p. 348.

Lambert VON HERSFELD, or ASCHAFFENBURG, an eminent German historian of the 11th century, was born, it is supposed by some, at Aschaffenburg, about 1034. In 1058 he entered the convent of Hersfeld, the school of which was at that time one of the most celebrated in Germany, and in the same year, 1058, was ordained priest. Shortly after he went on a journey to Jerusalem, without the consent or knowledge of the abbot of his convent. After his return in the following year, Lambert devoted himself to literary pursuits, yet as an inmate of the convent which he had entered before his departure for the Holy Land. He was in great favor among his superiors, as is evinced by the fact that he was sent to visit the convents of Sigeberg and Saalfeld, newly-established institutions. The precise date of his death is not ascertained—probably about 1080. His works, which are numerous, are especially valuable as giving a clear perception of the state of letters in his times. His first work was a heroic poem, which is now lost. He then wrote a history of the Convent of Hersfeld, which contains valuable information for the history of the 11th century, but unfortunately we possess only fragments of this work. These were published by Mader from a Wolfenbüttel Codex: comp. *Vetustas, sanctimonia, potentia atque maiestas ducum Brunsvicensium ac Lyneburgensium domus* (Helmstadt, 1661–4), p. 150; and again in *Antiqq. Brunsvic.* p. 150. This same codex was also published by M. G. Waitz, vii, 138–141. His third work is a history of Germany in two parts. The second part is the most complete, as well as the most interesting: it begins with the reign of Henry IV, and extends to the election of king Rudolf. It is believed by some that this work, treating contemporary events, was written at different periods, whenever anything occurred which seemed to the author important enough to be mentioned. It appears, however, to have been concluded about 1084. Lambert's works are remarkable for purity of style and elegance of diction, as well as for learning and accuracy. Milman (*Lat. Christianity*, viii, 333) says that he occupies as a historian, "if not the first, nearly the first place in mediæval history." Hase (*Ch. History*, p. 182), however, thinks that Lambert was too little acquainted with the ways of the world to make a proper

chronicler. Speaking of his German history, Hase says that it is "just such a picture of society as might be expected from a pious monk who had made a pilgrimage to the holy sepulchre, and looked out upon the world and his nation from the small stained window of his cell." In his allusions to the difficulties which occurred between the temporal and ecclesiastical powers, Lambert shows a rare degree of impartiality, although necessarily yielding to some extent to the effects of his position as a monk, as well as of the troubles of the times. Some of his writings were translated into German by Hegewisch, and his whole works by F. B. v. Bucholz (Frankf. 1819); also, more recently, by Hesse, in the *Geschichtschreiber deutscher Vorzeit. d. XI Jahrh.* (Berl. 1855, 6 vols.). See Frisch, *Comparatio critica de Lamberti Sch. annal., etc., Diss. inaug. Monachii* (1830, 8vo); Stenzel, *Fränkische Kaiser*, i, 495, ii, 101 sq.; Piderit, *Comment. de Lamb. Schafnab.* (Hersf. 1828, 4to); Hesse, *Recension. Jen. Lit. Zeitg.* 1830, No. 130; Wilman, *Otto III Exkurs*, vi, p. 214; Hirsch and Waitz, *Chr. Corbej.* p. 36; Giesebrecht, *Annales Altahenses* (Berlin, 1841); Floto, *Kaiser Heinrich IV;* Grünhagen, *Adolbert v. Bremen*, 1854; Ranke, *Abhh. d. Berlin. Akad.* von 1854, p. 436 sq.; Witt, *Ueber Benzo* (Marburg, 1856); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 166 sq.

Lambert OF MAESTRICHT, a martyr and a saint of the Romish Church, commemorated on Sept. 17, was born at Maestricht, Holland, towards the middle of the 7th century; was educated by Theodard, bishop of that see, whom he succeeded in office when that prelate died a martyr in 668. The major domus Ebroin was then in war with the Merovingian dynasty, and persecuted all its supporters. Upon Lambert also fell his displeasure, and he deprived him of his bishopric, and appointed Faramund in his place. Lambert remained for seven years (674–81) in the Convent of Stablo, where he led a life of penitence and humiliation. When Pepin d'Heristal, after killing Ebroin, became the head of the kingdom, Lambert was restored to his bishopric. The ancient historians relate that he was killed by a Frankish chieftain named Dodo, out of revenge. Two relatives of Dodo attempted to seize on the goods of the Church, and were killed by Lambert's nephew; Dodo, in return, caused Lambert himself to be murdered at Liege. Subsequent writers attempted to render this history more interesting. They say that he was murdered by Dodo on account of the freedom with which he reproved Pepin d'Heristal for his improper intimacy with Alpaïs, a sister of Dodo. Siegbert of Gemblours and others say that on one occasion he refused at the king's table to bless Alpaïs's cup with the sign of the cross, and, seeing that he would be killed for this, he forbade his followers defending him, and said to them, "If you truly love me, love Jesus, and confess your sins to him; as for me, it is time that I should go to live in communion with him." After saying which, he knelt down, and, while praying for his enemies, was killed with a spear. It was on the 17th of September, 708 (709 according to the Bollandists; others say 697 or 698). So great was the veneration in which Lambert was held by his contemporaries, that in 714 a church was built in commemoration of him at Liege. His successor in the bishopric was Hubert. Biographies of Lambert were written by Godeschalk, deacon of the Church of Liege in the middle of the 8th century; Stephan, bishop of Liege in 903, a canon called Nicholas, about 1120, and a monk named Reiner. See A. Butler, *Lives of the Saints;* F. W. Rettberg, *K. Gesch. Deutschlands*, i, 558 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 165; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 323, 324.

Lambert, Chandley, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Alford, Berkshire County, Mass., in 1781, and converted at Lansingburg, N. York, March 27, 1804. He entered the Black River Conference in 1807, labored with great zeal and success for twenty years, was superannuated in 1827, and died at Lowville, N. Y., March 16, 1845. Lambert was a man of great integrity and usefulness. His mind was superior and well stored with information, and his preaching eminently practical and full of the Holy Ghost. Many souls were converted through his labors.—*Black River Conference Memorial*, p. 128. (G. L. T.)

Lambert, Francis (generally known as *Lambert of Avignon*, the name of his native place), also called JOHN SERRANUS, a French theologian, and one of the early apostles of the Reformation, was born in 1487. At the age of sixteen he became a Gray Friar, was then ordained priest, and preached for a while with great success. He soon, however, tired of the world, and, thinking to find peace of mind in stricter seclusion, he asked permission to join the Carthusians. Refused by his superiors, he left his order in 1522, and embraced the doctrines of Luther, whose writings he had secured and carefully studied. On a visit to Switzerland he was received by Sebastian de Monte Falcone, prince-bishop of Lausanne, and went to Berne and Zürich, where he had a public conference with Zwingle. He thereupon cast aside the dress of his order, took the name of John Serranus, and began preaching the reformed principles in the several cities of Switzerland and Germany. In 1522 he held public conferences at Eisenach, and was greatly instrumental in propagating the Reformation in Thuringia and Hesse. In January, 1523, he joined Luther at Wittenberg, where he wrote his commentaries on Hosea and other books. In 1524 he went to Metz, and afterwards to Strasburg, where he remained until called to Hombourg by the landgrave, Philip of Hesse, in 1526. Here, in a synod held in October of the same year, he argued in Latin, and Adam Craton, or Crafft, in German, against the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church as defended by Nicholas Herborn and John Sperber. The latter were declared vanquished and driven out of Hesse. The convents were closed up, and their revenues employed to establish four hospitals and a Protestant academy at Marburg. Lambert became its first professor of theology. In 1529 he took part in the Conference of Marburg between the theologians of Switzerland, Saxony, Suabia, and other southern German provinces. He died April 18, 1530. All the writers of his time agree in calling him a learned, industrious, and upright man. His numerous works are now very scarce; among the most important are *Commentarius in Evangelium Lucæ* (Wittemberg, 1523, 8vo; Nuremberg and Strasburg, 1525, 8vo; Frankfort, 1693, 8vo):—*In Cantica canticorum Salomonis libellus*, etc. (Strasburg, 1524, 8vo):—*De fidelium vocatione in regnum Christi, id est Ecclesiam*, etc. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo):—*Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum* (1525?), consisting of 385 propositions arranged into thirteen chapters, and which contain the whole theological system of the author:—*In Johelem prophetam*, etc. (Strasb. 1525, 8vo):—*In Amos, Abdiam, et Jonam, et Allegoriæ in Jonam* (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo):—*In Micheam, Naum et Abacuc* (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo):—*Theses theologicæ in synodo Homburgensi disputatæ* (Erfurt, 1527, 4to and 8vo):—*Exegeseos in Apocalipsim libri vii* (Marburg, 1528, 8vo):—*De Symbolo fœderis numquam rumpendi quam communionem vocant; Fr. Lamberti Confessio*, etc. (1530, 8vo; translated into German, 1557, 8vo):—*Commentarii in quatuor libros Regum et in Acta Apostolorum* (Strasb. 1526; Frankft. 1539):—*De Regno, Civitate et Domo Dei ac Domini nostri J.-C.*, etc. (Worms, 1538, 8vo). See J. G. Schelhorn, *Amœnitates Litterariæ*, iv, 307, 312, 324, 328, x, 1235; Seckendorf, *Commentarius de Lutheranismo*, lib. ii, sect. viii; Freher, *Theatrum Virorum Doctorum*, i, 104; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 708 sq.; J. Tilemann, *Vitæ Professorum theologiæ Marpurgensium;* Abraham Scultet, *Annales Evangelii*, ann. 1526; Le Long, *Biblioth. Sacra;* J. F. Hekelius, *Epistolæ Singular.* manip. primus; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xxxix, 234 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 132; Baum (Johann W.), *Lambert v. Avignon nach seinem Leben*, etc. (1840); Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref.* i, 380, 434; ii, 219.

Lambert, George, a Presbyterian minister, was

born Jan. 31, 1742, at Chelsea, England. In 1767 he became a student at the theological school under the charge of Rev. James Scott, at Heckmondwicke, England. He pursued his studies there for five years, and then accepted the charge of a church at Hull, April 9, 1769, where he continued his ministrations until his death, March 17, 1816. Mr. Lambert was a minister of more than ordinary power and success, attaching to himself, by his intellectual vigor, moral worth, and Christian excellence, not only his own people, but also numerous members and ministers of other denominations. He published two volumes of his sermons, *On various useful and important Subjects, adapted to the Family and the Closet.* Lambert was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society, and preached its first anniversary sermon in May, 1796. See Morison, *Missionary Fathers*, p. 375 sq.

Lambert, Johann Heinrich, a noted German philosopher and mathematician, was born Aug. 29, 1728, at Mühlhausen, Alsace, of a French Protestant family. His talents and application to study having gained him friends, he obtained a good education, making remarkable progress in mathematics, philosophy, and Oriental languages. In 1756–58 he visited Holland, France, and Italy, and while residing in the first-named country appeared in print with his *Sur les propriétés remarquables de la route de la lumière*, etc. In 1764 Frederick the Great summoned him to Berlin, and made him a member both of the Council of Architecture and of the Academy of Sciences. He died in that city Sept. 25, 1777, leaving behind him the renown of having been the greatest analyst in mathematics, logic, and metaphysics that the 18th century had produced. Lambert was the first to lay a scientific basis for the measurement of the intensity of light in his *Pyrometrie* (Augsburg, 1760), and he discovered the theory of the speaking-tube. In philosophy, and particularly in analytical logic, he sought to establish an accurate system by bringing mathematics to bear upon these subjects, in his *Neues Organon, oder Gedanken über die Erforschung und Beziehung des Wahren* (Lpzg. 1764, 2 vols.). Of his other works, we may mention his profound *Kosmologische Briefe über die Einrichtung des Weltbaus* (Augsb. 1761), and his correspondence with Kant. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 151 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Graf, *Lambert's Leben* (1829); Huber, *Lambert nach s. Leben u. Wirken* (1829).

Lambert, John, an English reformer, lived in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and was for a time minister of an English company at Antwerp. After his return to England he was charged with heresy because he rejected the dogma of transubstantiation. He was tried before the king and bishops, and, upon refusing to recant, was burned at Smithfield, Nov. 20, 1538. Lambert was distinguished for his learning. He wrote a *Treatise on the Lord's Supper* (edited by John Ball, London, 1538, 16mo):—*Treatise on Predestination and Election* (Canterbury, 1550, 8vo). See Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, i, 406; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1051.

Lambert, Joseph, a French ecclesiastic and moralist, was born in Paris in 1654. He took sacred orders when thirty years old, and flourished afterwards as prior of Saint-Martin-de-Palaiseau. He died January 31, 1722. Among his best works are *L'Année évangélique, ou homilies sur les Évangiles* (Paris, 1693–1697, 7 vols. 12mo, and often):—*Instruction sur le symbole* (Par. 1728, 2 vols. 12mo, and often). See, for a full list of his writings, Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 150.

Lambert, Ralph, D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, lived in the latter part of the 18th century. He was successively dean of Down, and bishop of Dromore and of Meath. He is noted especially for his plea in favor of depriving Presbyterian ministers of all power to celebrate marriage. Some of his *Sermons* were published in 1693, 1702, and 1703. The date of his death, or other particulars of his life, are not at hand.—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1052; Reid, *Hist. Irish Presb. Church*, iii, 38.

Lambert, St., de, Charles François, marquis, a noted French infidel and poet, a contemporary and colaborer of Voltaire on the French *Encyclopædia* (q. v.), was born at Vézelise, in Lorraine, in 1716 or 1717. About 1750 he went to Paris, and soon found associates in Rousseau, Voltaire, Grimm, and other celebrated French infidels of Voltaire's day. He became especially celebrated as a poet, his productions were greatly lauded by Voltaire, and, finally, he was made a member of the French Academy. As a philosopher, however, he did not really appear before the public until 1797, when he published *Les Principes des Mœurs chez toutes les nations, ou Catechisme universel* (1797–1800). He died Feb. 9, 1803. St. Lambert's personal history fully coincides with the doctrines he espoused. Ignoring all need of religion, his morals were truly Epicurean, and we need not wonder to find that his celebrity was first gained by the publication of his criminal intercourse with a woman, and the birth of an illegitimate child.

As to a more detailed description of St. Lambert's philosophical system, it may suffice to say here that it very much resembles that of Helvetius, whom St. Lambert slavishly followed. Thus he teaches, in treating of man's *nature*, and his *duties* with regard to human nature, that "man, when he first enters upon the stage of life, is simply an organized and sentient mass, and that, whatever feelings or thoughts he may afterwards acquire, still they are simply different manifestations of the sensational faculty, occasioned by the pressure of his various wants and necessities. With regard to ethics, he maintains that, as man possesses only sensations, his sole good must be personal enjoyment, his only duty the attainment of it; and that, as we may be mistaken as to what objects are really adapted to promote our pleasure, the safest rule by which we can judge of duty in particular cases is public opinion." In his *Catechisme Universel* he divides the whole mass of man's duty into three classes—his duty to himself, to his own family, and to society at large; while the duties of religion are never mentioned, and the very name of God is altogether excluded. Condorcet's fundamental doctrine of ethics—the present perfectibility of mankind, both individually and socially, by means of education—St. Lambert proposed to substitute in place of the sanctions both of morality and religion, as the great regenerating principle of human nature (compare Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 111). See Puymaigre, *Saint-Lambert* (1840); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Lambeth Articles. See Articles, Lambeth.

Lambruschini, Louis, an eminent Italian prelate and statesman, was born at Genoa May 16, 1776. Having entered the Order of Barnabites, he became bishop of Sabine, then archbishop of Genoa; was sent to France as papal nuncio during the reign of Charles X, and finally created cardinal Sept. 30, 1831. Pope Gregory XVI appointed him abbot of Santa Maria di Farfa, secretary of state for foreign affairs, librarian of the Church, grand prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, grand chancellor of the order of St. Gregory, and prefect of the congregation of studies. Opposed to all innovations, Lambruschini took an active part in all the religious and political persecutions which marked the pontifical career of Gregory XVI, and became consequently very unpopular. In 1845 he surrendered the direction of public instruction to cardinal Mezzofante. On the death of Gregory XVI in 1846, Lambruschini came very near being elected pope. Pius IX appointed him member of the states council, and restored him to the secretaryship and librarianship of the Vatican. In 1847 he was also made bishop of Porto de San Rufina and of Civita Vecchia, chancellor of the pontifical orders, and subdean of the sacred college. When the revolution broke out in Ita-

ly Lambruschini was in danger, and fled to Civita Vecchia, but, not finding more security there, he returned to Rome. In 1848 he fled first to Naples, and afterwards joined Pius IX at Gaeta. He re-entered Rome with the pope in 1850, and was appointed cardinal of the papal household. He is said to have then advised measures of moderation, which were rejected by cardinal Antonelli. He died May 12, 1854. His principal works were translated into French, under the title *Méditations sur les Vertus de Sainte Thérese, précédées d'un abrégé de sa vie* (Paris, 1827, 18mo):—*Sur l'Immaculée Conception de Marie, dissertation polémique* (Paris and Besançon, 1843, 8vo):—*Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, etc. (Par. 1857, 18mo). See *Dict. de la Conversation;* Bourquelot et Maury, *La Littérature Française Contemp.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 175. (J. N. P.)

La'mech (Heb. *Le'mek*, לֶמֶךְ, *taster*, otherwise a *vigorous* youth, in pause *La'mek*, לָמֶךְ; Septuag. and N. T. Λάμεχ; Josephus Λάμεχος, *Ant.* i, 2, 2), the name of two antediluvian patriarchs.

1. The fifth in descent from Cain, being the son of Methusael, and father of Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-cain, and Naamah (Gen. iv, 18–24). B.C. cir. 3776. He is recorded to have taken two wives, Adah and Zillah; and there appears no reason why the fact should have been mentioned, unless to point him out as the author of the evil practice of polygamy. The manner in which the sons of Lamech distinguished themselves as the inventors of useful arts is mentioned under their several names (q. v.). The Targum of Jonathan (ad loc.) adds, that his daughter was "the mistress of sounds and songs," i. e. the first poetess; which Jewish tradition embellishes by saying that all the world wondered after her, even the sons of God, and that evil spirits were born of her (*Midrash* on Ruth, and *Zohar*). Josephus (*Ant.* i, 2, 2) relates that the number of Lamech's sons was seventy-seven, and Jerome records the same tradition, adding that they were all cut off by the Deluge, and that this was the seventy-and-sevenfold vengeance which Lamech imprecated.

The most remarkable circumstance in connection with Lamech is the poetical address which he is very abruptly introduced as making to his wives, being, indeed, the only example of antediluvian poetry extant (Gen. iv, 23, 24):

> Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;
> Wives of Lamech, listen to my say!
> For a man I slew for my wound,
> Even a youth for my bruise:
> If sevenfold Cain was to be avenged,
> Then Lamech seventy and seven.

It has all the appearance of an extract from an old poem, which we may suppose to have been handed down by tradition to the time of Moses. It is very difficult to discover to what it refers, and the best explanation can be nothing more than a conjecture. It is the subject of a dissertation by Hilliger in *Thesaurus Theologico-Philol.* i, 141, and is discussed at length by the various commentators on Genesis. See also Hase, *De Oraculo Lamechi* (Brem. 1712); Schröder, *De Lamecho homicida* (Marb. 1721). The following is a synopsis of ancient and modern views. "Chrysostom (*Hom.* xx *in Gen.*) regards Lamech as a murderer stung by remorse, driven to make public confession of his guilt solely to ease his conscience, and afterwards (*Hom. in Psa.* vi) obtaining mercy. Theodoret (*Quæst. in Gen.* xliv) sets him down as a murderer. Basil (*Ep.* 260 [317], § 5) interprets Lamech's words to mean that he had committed two murders, and that he deserved a much severer punishment than Cain, as having sinned after plainer warning; Basil adds, that some persons interpret the last lines of the poem as meaning that, whereas Cain's sin increased, and was followed after seven generations by the punishment of the Deluge washing out the foulness of the world, so Lamech's sin shall be followed in the seventy-seventh (see Luke iii, 23–38) generation by the coming of him who taketh away the sin of the world. Jerome (*Ep.* xxxvi, *ad Damasum*, t. i, p. 161) relates as a tradition of his predecessors and of the Jews that Cain was accidentally slain by Lamech in the seventh generation from Adam. This legend is told with fuller details by Jarchi. (See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.) According to him, the occasion of the poem was the refusal of Lamech's wives to associate with him in consequence of his having killed Cain and Tubal-cain; Lamech, it is said, was blind, and was led about by Tubal-cain; when the latter saw in the thicket what he supposed to be a wild beast, Lamech, by his son's direction, shot an arrow at it, and thus slew Cain; in alarm and indignation at the deed, he killed his son; hence his wives refused to associate with him; and he excuses himself as having acted without a vengeful or murderous purpose. Onkelos, followed by Pseudo-Jonathan, paraphrases it, 'I have not slain a man that I should bear sin on his account.' The Arab. Ver. (Saadias) puts it in an interrogative form, 'Have I slain a man?' etc. These two versions, which are substantially the same, are adopted by De Dieu and bishop Patrick. Aben-Ezra, Calvin, Drusius, and Cartwright interpret it in the future tense as a threat, 'I will slay any man who wounds me.' Luther considers the occasion of the poem to be the deliberate murder of Cain by Lamech. Lightfoot (*Decas Chorogr. Marc. præm.* § iv) considers Lamech as expressing remorse for having, as the first polygamist, introduced more destruction and murder than Cain was the author of into the world" (Smith). Shuckford, in his *Connection*, supposes that the descendants of Cain had lived for a long time in fear of vengeance for the death of Abel from the family of Adam; and that Lamech, in order to persuade his wives of the groundlessness of such fears, used the argument in the text, i. e. if any one who might slay Cain, the murderer of his brother, was threatened with sevenfold vengeance, surely they must expect a far sorer punishment who should presume to kill any of us on the same account. Others regard Lamech's speech as a heaven-daring avowal of murder, in which he had himself received a slight wound. Some have even sought to identify Lamech with the Asiatic deity *Lemus* or *Lames* (see Movers, *Phön.* 477; Nork, *Bibl. Mythol.* i, 235). Herder, in his *Hebrew Poetry*, supposes that the haughty and revengeful Lamech, overjoyed by the invention of metallic weapons by his son Tubal-cain, breaks out in this triumphal song, boasting that if Cain, by the providence of God, was to be avenged sevenfold, he, by means of the newly-invented weapons, so much superior to anything of the kind known at that time, would be able to take a much heavier vengeance on those who injured him. This hypothesis as to the occasion of the poem was partly anticipated by Hess, and has been received by Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Delitzsch. Pfeiffer (*Diff. Scrip. Loc.* p. 25) collects different opinions up to his time with his usual diligence, and concludes that the poem is Lamech's vindication of himself to his wives, who were in terror for the possible consequences of his having slain two of the posterity of Seth. This judicious view is substantially that of Lowth (*De S. Poesi Heb.* iv, 91) and Michaelis, who think that Lamech is excusing himself for some murder which he had committed in self-defence ("for a wound inflicted on me"), and he opposes a homicide of this nature to the wilful and inexcusable fratricide of Cain. Under this view Lamech would appear to have intended to comfort his wives by the assurance that he was really exposed to no danger from this act, and that any attempt upon his life on the part of the friends of the deceased would not fail to bring down upon them the severest vengeance (compare Dathe and Rosenmüller, ad loc.; see also Turner's *Companion to Genesis*, p. 209). "That he had slain a man, a *young* man (for the youth of one clause is undoubtedly but a more specific indication of the man in the other), and this not in cool blood, but in consequence of a wound or bruise he had himself received, is, if not the only possible, certainly the natural and obvious meaning of the

words; and on the ground apparently of a difference between his case and that of Cain's—namely, that he had done *under* provocation what Cain had done *without* it—he assures himself of an interest in the divine guardianship and protection immeasurably greater than that granted to Cain. This seems as plainly the import of Lamech's speech as language could well make it. But if it seems to imply, as it certainly does, that Lamech was not an offender after the type and measure of Cain, it at the same time shows how that branch of the human family were becoming familiar with strife and bloodshed, and, instead of mourning over it, were rather presuming on the divine mercy and forbearance to brace themselves for its encounters, that they might repel force with force. The prelude already appears here of the terrible scenes which, after the lapse of a few generations, disclosed themselves far and wide—when the earth was filled with violence, and deeds were every day done which cried in the ear of heaven for vengeance. Such was the miserable result of the human art and the earthly resources brought into play by the Cainite race, and on which they proudly leaned for their ascendency; nor is it too much to say that here also, even in respect to the poetic gift of nature, the beginning was prophetic of the end." See ANTEDILUVIANS.

2. The seventh in descent from Seth, being the son of Methuselah, and father of several sons, of whom apparently the oldest was Noah (Gen. v, 25–31; 1 Chron. i, 3; Luke iii, 36). B.C. 3297–2520. He was 182 years old at the birth of Noah, and survived that event 595 years, making his total age 777. His character appears to have been different from that of his Cainite namesake (see Dettinger, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1835, i, 11 sq.). "Chrysostom (*Serm.* ix *in Gen.*, and *Hom.* xxi *in Gen.*), perhaps thinking of the character of the other Lamech, speaks of this as an unrighteous man, though moved by a divine impulse to give a prophetic name to his son. Buttman and others, observing that the names of Lamech and Enoch are found in the list of Seth's, as well as of Cain's family, infer that the two lists are merely different versions or recensions of one original list—traces of two conflicting histories of the first human family. This theory is deservedly repudiated by Delitzsch *on Gen.* v."

Lamennais, Félicité Robert, *Abbé de*, a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, occupies a distinguished place in the ecclesiastical, political, and literary history of France of the 19th century. He was born of a noble family at St. Malo, in Bretagne, June 6, 1782. In his boyhood, his clerical tutor having fled to England on the outbreak of the Revolution, he and his brother continued their studies together with singular independence. It is said that when only twelve years old he was able to read Livy and Plutarch with ease. "In 1794, having been sent to live with an uncle, this relation, not knowing what to do with a wilful boy, used to shut him up for whole days in a library consisting of two compartments, one of which, called 'Hell,' contained a large number of prohibited books, which little Robert was enjoined not to read. But the lad already cared for none but books of reflection, and finding some of these on the prohibited shelves, that division became his favorite. Long hours were thus spent in reading the ardent pages of Rousseau, the thoughtful volumes of Malebranche, and other writers of sentiment and philosophy. Such a course of reading, far from producing its usual effects of precocious vainglory and unbelief on so young a mind, served rather to ripen his judgment, and to develop that religious fervor which was a part of his nature" (*English Cyclopædia*). He soon took a decidedly religious course, and, though offered a mercantile career by his father, chose the clerical profession. Before, however, entering upon the studies of the sacred office, he accepted in 1807 the position as teacher of mathematics in the college of his native place.

To promote practical piety, he published in 1808 a translation of the ascetic *Guide Spirituel* of Louis de Blois. In reference to the Concordat of Napoleon, he wrote *Réflexions sur l'état de l'église en France pendant le dix-huitième siècle et sur la situation actuelle* (1808). He here denounces the materialism propagated by the philosophers of the 18th century, bitterly deplores the apathy thence induced to religion, and expresses much hope from the beneficent influence of the Concordat, and declares the laws of religion and morality to be the supreme laws of life. The imperial censorship, however, detected a dangerous independent tendency in this work, especially in the demand for ecclesiastical synods and conferences, and the issue of the first edition was suppressed. After having received the clerical tonsure (in 1811), he published, in defence of the papal authority and against Napoleon, *Tradition de l'église sur l'institution des évêques* (Paris, 1814). From retirement in England, whither he had been obliged to flee during the Hundred Days, Lamennais returned to France (in 1816) in full sympathy with the Restoration, and entered more ardently than ever upon the work of disseminating his earlier opinions. He was ordained priest in 1817, and in this year began the publication of his *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (Paris, 1817–1820, 4 vols.). This work, of which Lacordaire said that it caused its author to rise, in a single day, like a new Bossuet above the horizon, thoroughly aroused public attention to the author and his principles, attracted many readers by the eloquence of its style, and has passed through many editions. The work belongs to the Catholic reactionary school of philosophy, to which Joseph de Maistre had given the leading impulse. The author first points out certain perilous tendencies of the age which seem to threaten another revolution, and notices the various systems of religious indifference. He next asserts the absolute importance of religion to the individual and the state. The inquiry concerning the ground of certainty in matters of religion is then met by postulating *authority* — that is, the *consenting testimony* of mankind as the only ground. This testimony finds its interpretation by divine appointment in the Catholic Church, and finally in the pope. This whole scheme proceeds upon the basis of sceptical philosophy, which denies to the individual reason the possession of certainty concerning any truth, whether scientific, philosophic, or religious, and which takes refuge for the attainment of religious certainty in a *common consent* divinely guided. It thus becomes the duty of the state, for the security of its own welfare and that of the individual, to enforce by every moral and physical means the decisions of this authoritative Church. Here was an attempt to win back both prince and people to the absolute submission demanded by Gregory VII and Innocent III. The French Church was alarmed at so extreme a position, and disavowed its own champion. A *Défense de l'Essai sur l'indifférence* was issued by the author. In 1818 Lamennais joined hands for a brief period with certain Royalists in founding the "Conservateur;" but afterwards, in sympathy with another coterie called the *drapeau blanc*, his severity in writing against the management of the university invited the attention of the police authorities. In 1824 he visited Rome, and was received with distinction by pope Leo XII; he is said to have declined a cardinalship, as he had previously declined a bishopric which had been urged upon him by the ministry at Paris. In *La Religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre civil et politique* (Paris, 1825–26, 2 vols.) he first began to exhibit that freedom of thought, reaching to the last boundary of revolution (but which, however, independent of Church interests, abandons nothing in spiritual faith). It contained an attack upon Gallican principles, and upon some measures of the king, which brought him again before the courts. Defended by the legal skill of Berryer, he was let off with a fine of thirty francs. There is a manifest prognostication of the coming disturbance, of the breach between the hierarchical authority and the spirit of the times in his *Progrès de la révolution et de la guerre contre l'église* (1829).

The July revolution completed, the Church must now be saved by bringing it into harmony with the demands of civil liberty, and to serve such an end Lamennais enters upon the second period of his career. With the co-operation of Lacordaire (q. v.) and Montalembert (q. v.) he founded the journal *L'Avenir*, which had for its motto "God and Freedom," and for its guiding thought concerning the Church that the latter can save itself from the ruin which waits on political absolutism only by freeing itself from all relations with the state, and from the corruptions of hierarchical luxury, while it is to flourish only through the voluntary devotion of its adherents, and in harmony with laws which secure for the people freedom of education and worship. He preached such a doctrine enthusiastically, and believed that Rome would receive it. He was present at Rome in 1831 with Lacordaire and Montalembert, and sought to win the representatives of the French, Russian, Austrian, and Prussian courts to his views. An audience was granted by the pope only on condition of silence concerning the matters agitated. When, however, Lacordaire had presented a scheme of these views in writing, the French bishops, on April 22, 1832, presented an outspoken opposition to them. A few extracts from an encyclical letter condemnatory of such principles which was issued by Gregory XVI on Aug. 15, 1832, best explains the peculiar position assumed by the writers of *L'Avenir:* "From this infectious source of indifferentism," says the encyclical, "flows that absurd and erroneous maxim, or, rather, that madness, which would insure and guarantee to all liberty of conscience. The way is prepared for this pernicious error by the free and unlimited liberty of opinion which is spreading abroad, to the misfortune of civil and religious society, some asserting with extreme imprudence that it may be productive of certain advantages to religion." And afterwards it adds: "With this is connected that lamentable liberty which we cannot regard with too much horror, the liberty of the press to publish all sorts of writings, a liberty which some persons dare to demand and extol with so much noise and ardor." A copy of it was sent with special explanations to Lamennais by cardinal Pacca, who urged him to render submission to the authority he had himself so highly extolled, and, as if to make even more explicit the meaning of the encyclical of which he was the transmittent, added, "The doctrines of the *L'Avenir* upon the liberty of worship and the liberty of the press are very reprehensible, and in opposition to the teaching, the maxims, and *the policy of the Church* [the italics are ours]. They have exceedingly astonished and afflicted the holy father; for if, under certain circumstances, prudence compels us to tolerate them as lesser evils, such doctrines can never be held up by a Roman Catholic as good in themselves, or as things desirable." Strangely enough, as it must appear to Protestant ideas, the three editors of *L'Avenir* — Lamennais and his two younger coadjutors, Lacordaire and Montalembert — submitted to the papal see, and, of course, to evince their sincerity, discontinued the publication of *L'Avenir*. But Lamennais having afterwards, in certain smaller articles, expressed himself in a spirit contrary to the views of the encyclical, he received a letter from the pope on the subject, and thereupon, in a formal way, subscribed a submission, Dec. 11, 1833, at the palace of the archbishop of Paris. In the *Affaires de Rome* (see below), however, he declared that this submission on his part had been made only for the sake of peace, and that, in truth, the welfare of the people must be considered before that of the Church. In 1834 *Paroles d'un croyant* appeared, which passed in a few years through 100 editions, and was translated into many languages. In this work a new spirit is manifest. In earnest language the former and existing evils of society are deplored, while in a style of prophetic ardor the future is anticipated. A new Christianity, based on the principles of the New Testament, in a revolutionized democratic state is sought. A certain ideal external form was still Lamennais' hope. He had idealized the Church, and would now seek a like panacea in a social reorganization (see *Brit. and For. Evangel. Review*, Oct. 1863, p. 731). This work was severely condemned by a special decree of Gregory XVI, Aug. 7, 1834.

In the *Affaires de Rome* (Paris, 1836) Lamennais enters fully upon the final period of his life. He here breaks completely and irrevocably with the Church; declares the Roman hierarchy, of which he had long been the champion, to be incompatible with a true Christianity and a true humanism, and hereafter Lamennais was regarded by the Church authorities as an apostate. Like Luther, Ulrich von Hutten, and many other great men, Lamennais had been completely disenchanted by the sight of the corruptions of Rome in her very stronghold. "His strong and clear vision saw in her but a corpse which it was vain to attempt to resuscitate; a conglomerate religion made up of Christianity perverted by Jewish symbolism, and degraded and sensualized by Oriental and classical mythology and philosophy. Yet he hesitated long before he could make up his mind to deny his whole previous life, to forsake and repudiate what he had formerly defended, to become an antagonist of the Church of which he had formerly been the bulwark and the champion; and it required a year's meditation and self-examination, amid the woods of his paternal domain of La Chesnaye, before he resolved finally and forever to break with the Church of Rome. In a worldly point of view, he had everything to lose and nothing to gain by the course which he pursued, and it required no ordinary courage, no small portion of the martyr-spirit to act as he acted" (*For. and Brit. Evang. Review*, Oct. 1863, p. 730). In 1837 he began to edit a daily journal, *Le livre du Peuple*. His work, *Le Pays et le Gouvernement* (1840), was obnoxious to the authorities, and caused the author two years' imprisonment and a fine of 2000 francs. The most important and elaborate work of the latter days of Lamennais is his *Esquisse d'une Philosophie*, in 4 volumes (Paris, 1840-46); a work eloquent and religious in tone, and exhibiting the author's general philosophical conceptions in this later period of his life. Here the authoritative ground of certainty is found, not in the common testimony of mankind, but in the *common reason*. Philosophy is understood in a broad sense, having for its range the facts of general being; it is not merely a matter of psychology or metaphysics. The *method* of this philosophy is the assumption of certain foundation truths which all mankind admit. Absolute existence is not capable of proof, and in like manner God and the world are two fundamental assumptions. *God* has in his own essence necessity and variety. He is an eternal conscious Ego. He has the triune attributes of power, intelligence, and love, which in Scripture language are expressed as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God has society within himself, is the type of all society, and the three attributes produce and explain the laws of whatever is outside of God. These attributes are recognised as controlling elements through every development of this philosophical system. Creation is not emanation, but the original divine *ideas* are made real by God's *free power*. This is not Pantheism or Dualism. Matter arises under the mysterious power of God in the *limitation* of individuals. Properly speaking, matter is not a distinct entity; it is but a limitation of that which exists. Time and space, the modes of *our* existence, are the limitations of eternity and immensity, which are the modes of God's existence. The nature of the universe is to be determined by the aid of the disclosures of science, but the laws of its existence and operation in the forms of inorganic, organic, and intellectual being are determined by the application of the principles inherent in the three divine attributes. Man is the most elevated of the beings known to us. The great problem concerning man is the origin of moral evil. This is to be explained as a *limitation* of the free moral agent in his communion with God. Thus, although hurtful to the subject, the actuality of moral evil

does not introduce any positive disorder into the universe regarded as a realization of the divine ideas. The true purpose of man's life is to free himself from this state of isolation, of negation in *self*, and come into entire harmony with the divine will. The application of this system to the several faculties and pursuits of man is developed at large. Hope for the world thus lies in the development of the people. Religion and nature will issue in one when fully disclosed. Everything in the work seems to proceed from a religious, but no longer churchly stand-point.

Lamennais' *Discussions Critiques et pensées diverses sur la Religion et la Philosophie* (Paris, 1841) gives the author's views on social questions. In place of the Church authority whose claims he formerly advocated, he would now have the democratic theocracy honored. This is in great measure a retraction of his work *Sur l'indifférence en matière de Religion.* Of similar import is *La Religion du passé et de l'avenir du Peuple* (1842). It is no longer the future of the Church of which he speaks, but of the people. His Church is now the religion of brotherly love, and he will have it rise upon the ruins of both Romanism and Protestantism. *Amschaspands et Darvans* (1843), and *Les evangiles, traduction nouvelle avec des notes et des reflexions* (1846), were issued professedly as a defence for the people against a mythological and superstitious credulity. Lamennais was greatly interested in the February Revolution, and exerted his influence to prevent acts of violence against the Church and religious interests. Gratitude for his services in this regard led to his election to the Assembly from the department of the Seine, and in his seat he always sided with the Left. He is said to have spoken but once, and that in opposition to the dictatorship of Cavaignac. He undertook the editorship, conjointly with Pascal Duprat, of the journal *Le Peuple Constituant.* He was grieved by the violence of the Red Republicans, though still steadfast in his hope of the democracy; and was forced into retirement by the coup d'état, meeting with disappointment in this direction likewise. Nothing, however, availed to change the views he had in later years adopted, and the Church sought in vain, through the influence of relatives, to recall him to her faith on his dying bed. He died at Paris, in the Rue du Grand Chartres, Feb. 27, 1854. He had refused to see a minister, and his will ordered that no formal ceremony should attend his burial. He wished his body to be placed in the corbillard des pauvres, or pauper's hearse, and this direction was complied with. His remains were followed by a few friends, as Béranger and Garnier Pages, and also, notwithstanding the police prohibition, by a large number of the people, who gathered at the cemetery Père la Chaise. No prayer was uttered, nor last word said, and the remains were placed in the common grave, without cross or stone to mark their resting-place. Lamennais was small of stature, though of attractive physiognomy; somewhat slow and hesitating in speech, with something of the Brétagne dialect; less able with his tongue than with his pen. His family had lost most of their property in the first Revolution, and he himself a large part of his own through misplaced confidence. In later years he resided mostly on a small estate in Lachesnaye, near Dinan, in Brétagne.

As a literary character, Lamennais occupied a prominent place in the revival of style under the Restoration. His era succeeds that of Chateaubriand, and corresponds with that of Madame de Staël and Joseph de Maistre. He was an earnest if not profound thinker, but especially brilliant as a writer. He had the culture of art combined with the vehemence of passion, though the latter element perhaps too often expressed itself in the manner of declamation. As a theorist in social philosophy he had a counterpart in Benjamin Constant, who took his stand-point in individual liberty, while Lamennais set out from the assumption of a consenting unity in society and religion. It has been claimed that his steadfastness to this primary principle explains the variation of position which changed political circumstances seemed to necessitate, causing him to be at one time all for the Church, at another all for the people. There were, at all events, three distinct periods in his career, in the first of which he was Ultramontane; in the second he sought to mediate between the Church and democratic ideas; while at the last he cast off all churchly control, and became a chiliastic prophet of the democracy.

M. Guizot, in the second series of his *Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity*, thus portraitures Lamennais: "This apostle of universal reason was at the same time the proudest worshipper of his own reason. Under the pressure of events without, and of an ardent controversy, a transformation took place in him, marked at once by its logical deductions and its moral inconsistency; he changed his camp without changing his principles; in the attempt to lead the supreme authority of his Church to admit his principles he had failed; and from that instant the very spirit of revolt that he had so severely rebuked broke loose in his soul and in his writings, finding expression at one time in an indignation full of hatred levelled at the powerful, the rich, and the fortunate ones of the world; at another time in a tender sympathy for the miseries of humanity. The *Words of a Believer* are the eloquent outburst of this tumult in his soul. Plunged in the chaos of sentiments the most contradictory, and yet claiming to be always consistent with himself, the champion of authority became in the state the most baited of democrats, and in the Church the haughtiest of rebels. It is not without sorrow that I thus express my unreserved opinion of a man of superior talent—mind lofty, soul intense; a man in the sequel profoundly sad himself, although haughty in his very fall. One cannot read in their stormy succession the numerous writings of the abbé de Lamennais without recognising in them traces, I will not say of his intellectual perplexities—his pride did not feel them—but of the sufferings of his soul, whether for good or for evil. His was a noble nature, but full of exaggeration in his opinions, of fanatical arrogance, and of angry asperity in his polemics. One title to our gratitude remains to the abbé de Lamennais—he thundered to purpose against the gross and vulgar forgetfulness of the great moral interests of humanity. His essay on indifference in religious questions inflicted a rude blow upon that vice of the time, and recalled men's souls to regions above. And thus it was, too, that he rendered service to the great movement and awakening of Christians in the 19th century, and that he merits his place in that movement, although he deserted it."

One of Lamennais' last and most earnest injunctions was that certain papers, which contained his latest sentiments, should be published without alteration or suppression; but the religious advisers of his niece (who was also his housekeeper) so far wrought on her susceptibility as to cause her to refuse to give up the papers to the persons whom Lamennais had authorized to superintend their publication. The matter was in consequence brought before the proper legal tribunal, when the judges directed (August, 1856) that the papers should be handed over for publication in their integrity.

The first edition of Lamennais' collected works was published under the title *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1836–37, 12 vols. 8vo). Several editions have appeared since. See Paganel, *Examen critique des Opinions de l'Abbé de Lamennais* (2d edit. 1825, 2 vols. 8vo); H. Lacordaire, *Considérations sur le Système Philosophique de M. de Lamennais* (1834, 8vo); E. Lerminier, *Les Adversaires de Lamennais* (in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1834); Robinet, *Études sur l'abbé de Lamennais* (1835); Madrolle, *Histoire secrète du Partié et de l'Apostasie de M. de Lamennais* (1843); Loménie, *M. de Lamennais* (1840); Sainte-Beuve, *Critique et Portraits Littéraires*, v (Paris, 1846); and, by the same author, *Portraits Contemporains* (1846), i, 134–191; E. Rénan, *Lamennais et ses écrits* (in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, August, 1857); Morell, *Hist.*

Modern Philosophy, p. 527–37; Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au 19ème siècle* (1828), p. 105–197; Haag, *Les Dogmes Chrétiens*, i, 449 sq.; *Foreign Quar. Rev.* April, 1838; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1843, p. 382 sq.; *Westminster Review*, April, 1859; 1866, p. 174; *Revue Chrétienne*, vol. xiv, No. 3, p. 173. See also the excellent articles in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 178–184; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 182 sq.

Lamennais, Jean Marie Robert de, a French theologian, brother of the preceding, born at St. Malo about 1775, flourished as canon of the diocese of Rennes, and was the founder of the order known as *Les frères de Lamennais de Ploërmel* (compare Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 509). He wrote several works on religious subjects, but they are of no particular value. In the preparation of *Tradition de l'église sur l'institution des évêques* he greatly assisted his brother. He died in 1860.—Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1362.

Lament (represented by numerous Heb. and several Gr. words, of which the principal are אָבַל, *abal'*, to *mourn*; אָנָה, *anah'*, to *sigh*; נָהָה, *nahah'*, to *wail*; סָפַד, *saphad'*, to *smite* the breast in token of violent grief; קוֹן, *kun*, to *strike* a mournful tune; בָּכָה, *bakah'*, to *weep*; θρηνέω, to *wail* aloud; κόπτω, to *cut*, i. e. beat the bosom, etc., in violent bursts of grief; with their derivatives). The Orientals are accustomed to bewail the dead in the most passionate manner, and even hire professional mourners, usually women, to perform this ceremony more effectually at funerals. See Burial; Grief, etc.

The קִינָה, *kinah'*, *elegy*, or *dirge*, is not mentioned in the earliest Hebrew writings. The first example of it which we meet with, and also one of the most beautiful and pathetic, is the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 17–27). Notwithstanding, it is natural to suppose that, from an early period, and not on rare occasions, the Hebrew poetic spirit found utterance in this class of compositions. The *kinah* is mentioned as a frequent accompaniment of mourning in Amos viii, 10: "I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation" (קִינָה). Jeremiah wrote a lament on the death of Josiah, which, as we are informed, was added to the collection of *kinoth* or *dirges* existing at that time (2 Chron. xxxv, 25; compare also Jer. vii, 29; ix, 9, 16, 19). In 2 Sam. iii, 33, 34, is preserved the brief but touching lament of David over Abner (q. v.).

The *kinah* was of two sorts, *historical* and *prophetical*. The laments of David and Jeremiah already mentioned are of the former sort. In the prophetic writings, and especially in Ezekiel, we meet with the prophetic lament, which had reference to some calamity yet future, but vividly anticipated and realized. Thus Ezek. xxvii, 2, "Son of man, take up a *lamentation* for Tyrus," etc. In this case the prophet himself is told to raise his lament, as if the city had already been overthrown. In others he gives to his prophecy the form of a lament, to be used when the predicted calamity has actually taken place. The calamity is so inevitable that the preparations for bewailing it may be now begun. (Comp. Ezek. xix, 1, 14; xxvi, 17; xxvii, 32; xxviii, 12; xxxii, 2, 16. So Amos v, 1.)

The only other passage in which קִינָה, or its cognate verb קוֹנֵן (*kônen*), is found, is Ezek. ii, 10, where we read of a "roll of a book," מְגִלַּת סֵפֶר (*megillath sêpher*), being spread out before the prophet; "and there was written therein lamentations, קִינִים (*kinîm*), and mourning, and woe." It is a remarkable coincidence, but probably nothing more, that immediately before the book of Ezekiel there stands in most of the versions of the Hebrew Scriptures a מְגִלָּה, or *roll*, which answers quite to this description. Those who regard the book of Lamentations as belonging to the class of prophetic laments might probably find in this coincidence a confirmation of their views.

The opinion just mentioned, that the book of Lamentations was written *proleptically* in view of the destruction of Jerusalem, and belongs to the class of prophetic *kinoth*, as intended to describe that event prophetically, is an ancient opinion, held and defended by critics of no mean reputation, is not now so generally entertained as formerly. The prophetic laments are usually very brief; or, if they include more than a few verses, always tend to pass into distinct prophecy, and rarely keep up to the close their character as *laments* (Ezek. xxvii, 27, etc.). Perhaps the most perfect example is the lament in Ezek. xxviii, 12–19; but even there we meet with a "Thus saith the Lord" (ver. 12). It is therefore, *prima facie*, improbable that an elegiac composition so lengthened and elaborate as the book of Lamentations should bear a distinctively prophetic character; though, on the other hand, its assumed prophetical character might be said to justify this extended wail. Moreover, in the book itself there is not the slightest indication that it does bear such a character; and the most ancient tradition—that contained in the Sept.—gives to it a historical foundation. It is, indeed, an old conjecture, that the book of Lamentations is identical with the lament which Jeremiah composed on the death of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 25); but this, if its main or only purpose, is quite inconsistent with the fact that throughout the entire book there is not a single allusion to the death of Josiah. Only once is mention made of the king, "the anointed of the Lord" (iv, 20), and the reference is evidently not to Josiah. See Lamentations, Book of.

LAMENTATIONS, Book of, one of the books of the O. T. commonly assigned to Jeremiah, and consisting of a remarkable series of threnodies. In many respects it is peculiar and almost unique in the sacred canon. See Bible.

I. *Title.*—The Hebrew name of this book, אֵיכָה, *Eykah'*, "How," is taken, like those of the five books of Moses, from the Hebrew word with which it opens, and which appears to have been almost a received formula for the commencement of a song of wailing (compare 2 Sam. i, 19–27). The Rabbins remark upon this title, "Three prophets have used the word אֵיכָה with reference to Israel: Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. To what are they to be likened? To three bridesmen (שׁוּשְׁבִינִין = Μυρηφόροι) who have seen the afterwards widowed wife in three different stages. The first has seen her in her opulence and her pride, and he said, "Oh, how shall I bear alone your overbearing and your strife?' (Deut. i, 2). The second has seen her in her dissipation and dissoluteness, and he said, 'Oh, how has she become a harlot!' (Isa. i, 21). And the third has seen her in her utter desolation, and he said, 'Oh, how does she sit solitary!' (Lam. i, 1)" (Introduction to *Echa Rabathi*).

Later Jewish writers usually designate the book by the more descriptive title קִינוֹת, *Kinoth'*, "lamentations" = dirge, a term which they found in Jer. vii, 29; ix, 10, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 25, and which already had probably been applied familiarly to the book itself. See Lament.

The Septuagint translators found themselves obliged, as in the other cases referred to, to substitute some title more significant, and adopted Θρῆνοι Ἱερεμίου as the equivalent of the latter Hebrew term. The Vulgate gives the Greek word, and explains it (*Threni, id est, Lamentationes Jeremiæ Prophetæ*). Luther and the A. V. have given the translation only, in "*Klagelieder*" and "*Lamentations*" respectively.

II. *Position.*—In the present Hebrew Bible the book of Lamentations stands in the Hagiographa (*Kethubim*) between Ruth and Ecclesiastes. The Jews believe that it was not written by the gift of prophecy, but by the Spirit of God (between which they make a distinction), and give this as a reason for not placing it among the prophets. In the arrangement adopted for synagogue use, and reproduced in some editions, as in the Bomberg Bible of 1521, it stands among the five *Megilloth* after

the books of Moses, or books of Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. This position of the book probably had a liturgical origin, as it is read in their synagogues on the ninth of the month Ab, which is a fast for the destruction of the holy city. In the ancient Hebrew copies, however, this book is supposed to have occupied the place which is now assigned to it in most versions, namely, after Jeremiah. Indeed, from the manner in which Josephus reckons up the books of the Old Testament (*Contra Apion*, i, 8), it has been supposed that Jeremiah and it originally formed but one book (Prideaux, *Connection*, i, 332). The Septuagint groups the writings connected with the name of Jeremiah together, but the book of Baruch comes between the prophecy and the Lamentation. On the hypothesis of some writers that Jer. lii was originally the introduction to the poem, and not the conclusion of the prophecy, and that the preface of the Sept. (which is not found either in the Hebrew or in the Targum of Jonathan) was inserted to diminish the abruptness occasioned by this separation of the book from that with which it had been originally connected, it would follow that the arrangement of the Vulg. and the A. V. corresponds more closely than any other to that which we must look upon as the original one.

III. *Form.*—The structure of this book is peculiarly artificial, being strictly poetic, and in many portions acrostic.

(1.) Ch. i, ii, and iv contain 22 verses each, arranged in alphabetic order, each verse falling into three nearly balanced clauses (Ewald, *Poet. Büch.* p. 147); ii, 19 forms an exception, as having a fourth clause, the result of an interpolation, as if the writer had shaken off for a moment the restraint of his self-imposed law. Possibly the inversion of the usual order of ע and פ in ch. ii, iii, iv, may have arisen from a like forgetfulness. Grotius (ad loc.) explains it on the assumption that here Jeremiah followed the order of the Chaldæan alphabet. Similar anomalies occur in Psa. xxxvii, and have received a like explanation (De Wette, *Psa.* p. 57). It is, however, a mere hypothesis that the Chaldæan alphabet differed in this respect from the Hebrew; nor is it easy to see why Jeremiah should have chosen the Hebrew order for one poem, and the Chaldæan for the other three.

(2.) Ch. iii contains three short verses under each letter of the alphabet, the initial letter being three times repeated.

(3.) Ch. v contains the same number of verses as ch. i, ii, iv, but without the alphabetic order. The thought suggests itself that the earnestness of the prayer with which the book closes may have carried the writer beyond the limits within which he had previously confined himself; but the conjecture (of Ewald) that we have here, as in Psa. ix and x, the rough draught of what was intended to have been finished afterwards in the same manner as the others, is at least a probable one.

IV. *Author.*—The poems included in this collection appear in the Hebrew canon with no name attached to them, and there is no direct external evidence that they were written by the prophet Jeremiah earlier than the date given in the prefatory verse which appears in the Septuagint, which is as follows: "And it came to pass, after Israel had been carried away captive, and Jerusalem had become desolate, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said." This has been copied into the Arabic and Vulgate versions; but as it does not exist in the Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac, it was regarded by Jerome as spurious, and is not admitted into his version. This represents, however, the established belief of the Jews after the completion of the canon. The Talmud, embodying the earliest traditions, has: "Jeremiah wrote his book, the book of Kings, and the Lamentations" (*Baba Bathra*, 15, a). Later Jewish writers are equally explicit (*Echa Rabb.* introd.). Josephus (*Ant.* x, 5, 1) follows, as far as the question of authorship is concerned, in the same track, and the absence of any tradition or probable conjecture to the contrary leaves the concensus of critics and commentators almost undisturbed. (See below.) An agreement so striking rests, as might be expected, on strong internal evidence. The poems belong unmistakably to the last days of the kingdom or the commencement of the exile. They are written by one who speaks, with the vividness and intensity of an eye-witness, of the misery which he bewails. It might almost be enough to ask who else then living could have written with that union of strong passionate feeling and entire submission to Jehovah which characterizes both the Lamentations and the Prophecy of Jeremiah. The evidences of identity are, however, stronger and more minute. In both we meet, once and again, with the picture of the "Virgin-daughter of Zion" sitting down in her shame and misery (Lam. i, 15; ii, 13; Jer. xiv, 17). In both there is the same vehement outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eyes flow down with tears (Lam. i, 16; ii, 11; iii, 48, 49; Jer. ix, 1; xiii, 17; xiv, 17). There is the same haunting feeling of being *surrounded* with fears and terrors on every side (Lam. ii, 22; Jer. vi, 25; xlvi, 5). In both the worst of all the evils is the iniquity of the prophets and the priests (Lam. ii, 14; iv, 13; Jer. v, 30, 31; xiv, 13, 14). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Judge (Lam. iii, 64-66; Jer. xi, 20). He bids the rival nation that exulted in the fall of Jerusalem prepare for a like desolation (Lam. iv, 21; Jer. xlix, 12). The personal references to Jeremiah's own fate, such as we know it from his book of Prophecies and Kings, are not wanting (comp. Lam. ii, 11, and iii, with Jer. xv, 15 sq.; xvii, 13 sq.; xx, 7; Lam. iii, 14 with Jer. xx, 7; iii, 64-66 with Jer. xvii, 18; v with iv, 17-20). As in the Prophecies, so here, the iniquities of the people are given as the cause of the exile and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (compare i, 5, 8, 14, 22; iii, 39, 42; iv, 6, 22; v, 16 with Jer. xiii, 22-26; xiv, 7; xvi, 10 sq.; xvii, 1 sq.), their sinful trust in false prophets and iniquitous priests, their relying on the safety of Jerusalem, and on the aid of powerless and treacherous allies, etc. What is more, his poetical and prophetical individuality pervades the whole so unmistakably that it seems hardly necessary to refer to the numerous parallel passages adduced by Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Keil, De Wette, Jahn, Bleek, and others. If contents, spirit, manner, individuality, are any guarantee at all, then Jeremiah is the author, and sole author of the book before us. He even seems to refer to his other book (comp. ii, 14; Jer. xiv, 13). But were any further proof needed, we would certainly find it in the very diction and phraseology common to both works, and peculiar to them alone (comp. דַּוָּי, Lam. i, 22, and Jer. viii, 18; פחד ופחת, Lam. iii, 47, and Jer. xxiv, 17; xlviii, 43; שבר בת עמי, Lam. ii, 11, and Jer. vi, 14, and viii, 11; מגור מסביב, Lam. ii, 22, and Jer. vi, 25, and frequently the very frequent use of חוֹרֵד שֶׁבֶר, מַיִם, הָמְיָה, in both; phrases like "I became a mockery all day long," Lam. iii, 14, and Jer. xx, 7, etc.: the use of the ו parag., and other grammatical peculiarities. See Keil, *Einleit. in das A. T.* § 129).

The only exceptions to this unanimity of opinion as to the authorship of Lamentations are Hardt, who, for reasons of his own, ascribed the five different elegies to Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and king Jehonja respectively, and, in our own time, Conz and Thenius. The last holds that only Lam. ii and iv belong to Jeremiah (the former written in Palestine, the latter in Egypt), the three others, however, having been written by Jeremiah's contemporaries and disciples. His reasons for this assumption are, that Jeremiah *could* not have treated the same subject five times; that ii and iv are different from i, iii, v, which are less worthy of Jeremiah's pen; that the three latter do not quite fit Jeremiah's own circumstances; and, finally, because there is

a difference in the alphabetical structure (see above) of i and of ii–iv. These objections to Jeremiah's exclusive authorship seem about as tenable as Hardt's Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and consorts. The first two points are not worth consideration; the third is answered by the simple proposition that they are poems, and not a historical narrative which we have before us, and that therefore a certain license must be given to the poet in the use of broad similes in his generalizings, and in his putting himself sometimes in the place of the whole people as its spokesman and chief mourner. And if, finally, the structure differs in i from ii and iv, then it may as well be asked why iii, which is not supposed to be written by Jeremiah, is like ii and iv, which are allowed to be written by him? If somebody has imitated the structure in iii, why has it not been also imitated in i and v? A further refutation of this attempt to take away two fifths of Jeremiah's authorship—supported by no investigator as we said—has been given by Ewald, and we have indeed only mentioned it for the sake of completeness. Bunsen, it is true (*Gott in der Gesch.* i, 426), indicates Baruch as probably the author, in part at least, of Lamentations; but this is evidently a mere conjecture.

V. *Occasion.*—The earliest statement on this point is that of Josephus (*Ant.* x, 5, 1). He finds among the books which were extant in his own time the lamentations on the death of Josiah, which are mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxv, 25. As there are no traces of any other poem of this kind in the later Jewish literature, it has been inferred, naturally enough, that he speaks of this. This opinion was maintained also by Jerome, and has been defended by some modern writers (Usher, Dathe, Michaelis, *Notes to Lowth*, Præl. xxii [Michaelis and Dathe, however, afterwards abandoned this hypothesis, and adopted that of the later date]; Calovius, *Prolegom. ad Thren.*; De Wette, *Einl. in das A. Test.*, Klagl.). It does not appear, however, to rest on any better grounds than a hasty conjecture, arising from the reluctance of men to admit that any work by an inspired writer can have perished, or the arbitrary assumption (De Wette, *l. c.*) that the same man could not, twice in his life, have been the spokesman of a great national sorrow. (The argument that iii, 27 implies the youth of the writer hardly needs to be confuted.) Against it we have to set (1) the tradition on the other side embodied in the preface of the Septuagint; (2) the contents of the book itself. Admitting that some of the calamities described in it may have been common to the invasions of Necho and Nebuchadnezzar, we yet look in vain for a single word distinctive of a funeral dirge over a devout and zealous reformer like Josiah, while we find, step by step, the closest possible likeness between the pictures of misery in the Lamentations and the events of the closing years of the reign of Zedekiah. The long siege had brought on the famine in which the young children fainted for hunger (Lam. ii, 11, 12, 20; iv, 4, 9; 2 Kings xxv, 3). The city was taken by storm (Lam. ii, 7; iv, 12; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 17). The Temple itself was polluted with the massacre of the priests who defended it (Lam. ii, 20, 21; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 17), and then destroyed (Lam. ii, 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 19). The fortresses and strongholds of Judah were thrown down. The anointed of the Lord, under whose shadow the remnant of the people might have hoped to live in safety, was taken prisoner (Lam. iv, 20; Jer. xxxix, 5). The chief of the people were carried into exile (Lam. i, 5; ii, 9; 2 Kings xxv, 11). The bitterest grief was found in the malignant exultation of the Edomites (Lam. iv, 21; Psa. cxxxvii, 7). Under the rule of the stranger the Sabbaths and solemn feasts were forgotten (Lam. i, 4; ii, 6), as they could hardly have been during the short period in which Jerusalem was in the hands of the Egyptians. Unless we adopt the strained hypothesis that the whole poem is prophetic in the sense of being predictive, the writer seeing the future as if it were actually present, or the still wilder conjecture of Jarchi that this was the roll which Jehoiachin destroyed, and which was rewritten by Baruch or Jeremiah (Carpzov, *Introd. ad lib. V. T.* iii, c. iv), we are compelled to come to the conclusion that the coincidence is not accidental, and to adopt the later, not the earlier of the dates. At what period after the capture of the city the prophet gave this utterance to his sorrow we can only conjecture, and the materials for doing so with any probability are but scanty. The local tradition which pointed out a cavern in the neighborhood of Jerusalem as the refuge to which Jeremiah withdrew that he might write this book (Del Rio, *Proleg. in Thren.*, quoted by Carpzov, *Introd.* l. c.), is as trustworthy as most of the other legends of the time of Helena. He may have written it immediately after the attack was over, or when he was with Gedaliah at Mizpeh, or when he was with his countrymen at Tahpanhes. Pareau refers ch. i to Jer. xxxvii, 5 sq.; ch. iii to Jer. xxxviii, 2 sq.; ch. iv to Jer. xxxix, 1 sq., and 2 Kings xxv, 1 sq.; ch. ii to the destruction of the city and Temple; ch. v is admitted to be the latest in order, and to refer to the time after that event. Ewald says that the situation is the same throughout, and only the time different. "In chaps. i and ii we find sorrow without consolation; in ch. iii consolation for the poet himself; in chapter iv the lamentation is renewed with greater violence; but soon the whole people, as if urged by their own spontaneous impulse, fall to weeping and hoping" (*Die Poetischen Bücher*). De Wette describes the Lamentations somewhat curtly, as "five songs relating to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and its Temple (ch. i, ii, iv, v), and to the unhappy lot of the poet himself (chap. iii). The historical relation of the whole cannot be doubted; but yet there seems a gradual ascent in describing the condition of the city" (*Einleitung*, § 273).

There can hardly be any doubt, however, as to the time to which these threnodies refer. A brief glance at the corresponding portions in the books of Kings and Chronicles affords decisive evidence that they speak, one and all, of the whole period from the beginning of the last siege by Nebuchadnezzar to its terrible end. This has also, from the Sept. and the Midrash downwards, been the almost unanimous opinion of investigators (Carpzov, Eichhorn, Jahn, Bertholdt, Börmelius, Horrer, Riegler, Pareau, etc.). It would seem to be equally clear that these poems belong, broadly speaking, to no particular phase of the great epoch of terrors, but that, written probably within a very brief space of time (more especially does this appear to be the case with the first four), they portray indiscriminately some woeful scene that presented itself "at the head of every street," or give way to a wild, passionate outcry of terror, misery, despair, hope, prayer, revenge, as these in vehement succession swept over the poet's soul.

Yet it has been suggested (and the text has been strained to the utmost to prove it) that the successive elegies are the pictures of successive events portrayed in song; that, in fact, the Lamentations are a *descriptive* threnody—a drama in which, scene after scene, the onward march of dread fate is described, intermixed with plaints, reflections, prayers, consolations, such as the chorus would utter in grave and measured rhythms, accompanied by the sighs and tears to which the spectators would be moved by the irredeemably doomed heroes and actors. Thus, for instance, it has been maintained that the first chapter speaks of Jehoiachin's capture and exile (Horrer, Jahn, Riegler, etc.), upon which there is this to be observed, that a mere glance at 1 Kings xxiv shows that such scenes as are described in this first elegy (famine, slaughter of youths, etc.) do not in the least agree with the time and circumstances of Jehoiachin, while they do exactly correspond with the following chapter of Kings, in which the reign under Zedekiah, with all its accompanying horrors, to the downfall of the city and empire, are related with the severe calmness of the historian, or rather the dry minuteness of the annalist. Neither can we, for our own part,

see that "gradual change in the state of the city" which De Wette sees in the consecutive chapters; nor can we trace the gradual progress in the mind of the people—that is, in the first two chapters, heaviest, forever inconsolable grief; in the third, the turning-point (the classical *peripety*); in the fourth and fifth, the mind that gradually collects itself, and finally finds comfort in fervent prayer—which is Ewald's ingenious suggestion, to which Keil assents, as far as "a general inner progress of the poems" goes. To our, and, we take it, to every unbiassed view, each of the elegies is complete, as far as it goes, in itself, all treating the same, or almost the same, scenes and thoughts in ever new modes. In this respect they might, to a certain degree, be likened to the "*In Memoriam*" and the second movement of the "*Eroica*"—the highest things to which we can at all compare them in the varied realms of song. The general state of the nation, as well as of the poet, seem not much different from the first to the last, or, at all events, the fourth poem. It would certainly appear, moreover, as if, so far from forming a consistent and progressive whole, consciously leading onward to harmony and supreme peace, they had not even been composed in the order in which they are before us now. Thus, e. g., the fourth chapter is certainly more akin to the second than to the third. Accident, more than a settled plan, must have placed them in their present order. But the history of this collection and redaction is one so obscure that we will not even venture on a new speculation concerning it.

VI. *Contents.*—The book is a collection of five elegies sung on the ruins of Zion; and the fall of Judæa, the destruction of the sanctuary, the exile of the people, and all the terrors of sword, fire, and famine in the city of Jerusalem, are the principal themes upon which they turn in many varied strains. We may regard the first two chapters as occupied chiefly with the circumstances of the siege, and those immediately following that event; in the third the prophet deplores the calamities and persecutions to which he was himself exposed; the fourth refers to the ruin and desolation of the city, and the unhappy lot of Zedekiah; and the fifth and last seems to be a sort of prayer in the name, or on behalf, of the Jews in their dispersion and captivity. More particularly,

1. Chap. i. The opening verse strikes the key-note of the whole poem. That which haunts the prophet's mind is the solitude in which he finds himself. She that was "princess among the nations" (1) sits (like the JUDÆA CAPTA of the Roman medals), "solitary," "as a widow." Her "lovers" (the nations with whom she had been allied) hold aloof from her (2). The heathen have entered into the sanctuary, and mock at her Sabbaths (7, 10). After the manner so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the personality of the writer now recedes and now advances, and blends by hardly perceptible transitions with that of the city which he personifies, and with which he, as it were, identifies himself. At one time it is the daughter of Zion that asks, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" (12). At another, it is the prophet who looks on her, and portrays her as "spreading forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her" (17). Mingling with this outburst of sorrow there are two thoughts characteristic both of the man and the time. The calamities which the nation suffers are the consequences of its sins. There must be the confession of those sins: "The Lord is righteous, for I have rebelled against his commandment" (18). There is, however, this gleam of consolation that Judah is not alone in her sufferings. Those who have exulted in her destruction shall drink of the same cup. They shall be like unto her in the day that the Lord shall call (21).

2. Chap. ii. As the solitude of the city was the subject of the first lamentation, so the destruction that had laid it waste is that which is most conspicuous in the second. Jehovah had thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah (2). The rampart and the wall lament together (8). The walls of the palace are given up into the hand of the enemy (7). The breach is great, as if made by the inrushing of the sea (13). With this there had been united all the horrors of the famine and the assault—young children fainting for hunger in the top of every street (19); women eating their own children, and so fulfilling the curse of Deut. xxviii, 53 (20); the priest and the prophet slain in the sanctuary of the Lord (ibid.). Added to all this, there was the remembrance of that which had been all along the great trial of Jeremiah's life, against which he had to wage continual war. The prophets of Jerusalem had seen vain and foolish things, false burdens, and causes of banishment (14). A righteous judgment had fallen on them. The prophets found no vision of Jehovah (9). The king and the princes who had listened to them were captive among the Gentiles.

3. Chap. iii. The difference in the structure of this poem, which has already been noticed, indicates a corresponding difference in its substance. In the two preceding poems Jeremiah had spoken of the misery and destruction of Jerusalem. In the third he speaks chiefly, though not exclusively, of his own. He himself is the man that has seen affliction (1), who has been brought into darkness and not into light (2). He looks back upon the long life of suffering which he has been called on to endure, the scorn and derision of the people, the bitterness as of one drunken with wormwood (14, 15). But that experience was not one which had ended in darkness and despair. Here, as in the prophecies, we find a Gospel for the weary and heavy-laden, a trust, not to be shaken, in the mercy and righteousness of Jehovah. The mercies of the Lord are new every morning (22, 23). He is good to them that wait for him (25). The retrospect of that sharp experience showed him that it all formed part of the discipline which was intended to lead him on to a higher blessedness. It was good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth, good that he should both hope and quietly wait (26, 27). With this, equally characteristic of the prophet's individuality, there is the protest against the wrong which had been or might hereafter be committed by rulers and princes (34–36), the confession that all that had come on him and his people was but a righteous retribution, to be accepted humbly, with searchings of heart, and repentance (39–42). The closing verses may refer to that special epoch in the prophet's life when his own sufferings had been sharpest (53–56), and the cruelties of his enemies most triumphant. If so, we can enter more fully, remembering this, into the thanksgiving with which he acknowledges the help, deliverance, redemption, which he had received from God (57, 58). Feeling sure that, at some time or other, there would be for him a yet higher lesson, we can enter with some measure of sympathy even into the terrible earnestness of his appeal from the unjust judgment of earth to the righteous Judge, into his cry for a retribution without which it seemed to him that the Eternal Righteousness would fail (64–66).

4. Chap. iv. It might seem, at first, as if the fourth poem did but reproduce the pictures and the thoughts of the first and second. There come before us once again the famine, the misery, the desolation that had fallen on the holy city, making all faces gather blackness. One new element in the picture is found in the contrast between the past glory of the consecrated families of kingly and priestly stock (A. Vers. "Nazarites"), and their later misery and shame. Some changes there are, however, not without interest in their relation to the poet's own life and to the history of his time. All the facts gain a new significance by being seen in the light of the personal experience of the third poem. The declaration that all this had come "for the sins of the prophets and the iniquities of the priests" is clearer and sharper than before (ver. 13). There is the giving up of the last hope which Jeremiah had cherished when he urged on Zedekiah the wisdom of submission to the

Chaldæans (verse 20). The closing words indicate the strength of that feeling against the Edomites which lasted all through the captivity (ver. 21, 22). She, the daughter of Edom, had rejoiced in the fall of her rival, and had pressed on the work of destruction. But for her, too, there was the doom of being drunken with the cup of the Lord's wrath. For the daughter of Zion there was hope of pardon when discipline should have done its work, and the punishment of her iniquity should be accomplished.

5. Chap. v. One great difference in the fifth and last section of the poem has already been pointed out. It obviously indicates either a deliberate abandonment of the alphabetic structure, or the unfinished character of the concluding elegy. The title prefixed in the Vulgate, "*Oratio Jeremiæ Prophetæ*," points to one marked characteristic which may have occasioned this difference. There are signs also of a later date than that of the preceding poems. Though the horrors of the famine are ineffaceable, yet that which he has before him is rather the continued, protracted suffering of the rule of the Chaldæans. The mountain of Zion is desolate, and the foxes walk on it (ver. 18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (ver. 8). Women have been subjected to intolerable outrages (verse 11). The young men have been taken to grind, and the children have fallen under the wood (ver. 13). But in this also, deep as might be the humiliation, there was hope, even as there had been in the dark hours of the prophet's own life. He and his people are sustained by the old thought which had been so fruitful of comfort to other prophets and psalmists. The periods of suffering and struggle which seemed so long were but as moments in the lifetime of the Eternal (verse 19), and the thought of that eternity brought with it the hope that the purposes of love which had been declared so clearly should one day be fulfilled. The last words of this lamentation are those which have risen so often from broken and contrite hearts: "Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned. Renew our days as of old" (ver. 21). That which had begun with wailing and weeping ends (following Ewald's and Michaelis's translation) with the question of hope: "Wilt thou utterly reject us? Wilt thou be very wroth against us?"

VII. *General Character.*—1. It is well to be reminded by the above survey that we have before us, not a book in five chapters, but five separate poems, each complete in itself, each having a distinct subject, yet brought at the same time under a plan which includes them all. It is clear, before entering on any other characteristics, that we find, in full predominance, that strong personal emotion which mingled itself, in greater or less measure, with the whole prophetic work of Jeremiah. There is here no "word of Jehovah," no direct message to a sinful people. The man speaks out of the fulness of his heart, and, though a higher Spirit than his own helps him to give utterance to his sorrows, it is yet the language of a sufferer rather than of a teacher. There is this measure of truth in the technical classification which placed the Lamentations among the Hagiographa of the Hebrew Canon, in the feeling which led the Rabbinic writers (Kimchi, *Præf. in Psalm.*) to say that they and the other books of that group were written indeed by the help of the Holy Spirit, but not with the special gift of prophecy.

2. Other differences between the two books that bear the prophet's name grew out of this. Here there is more attention to form, more elaboration. The rhythm is more uniform than in the prophecies. A complicated alphabetic structure pervades nearly the whole book. It will be remembered that this acrostic form of writing was not peculiar to Jeremiah. Whatever its origin, whether it had been adopted as a help to the memory, and so fitted especially for didactic poems, or for such as were to be sung by great bodies of people (Lowth, Præl. xxii), it had been a received, and it would seem popular, framework for poems of very different characters, and extending probably over a considerable period of time. The 119th Psalm is the great monument which forces itself upon our notice; but it is found also in the 25th, 34th, 37th, 111th, 112th, 145th—and in the singularly beautiful fragment appended to the book of Proverbs (Prov. xxxi, 10-31). Traces of it, as if the work had been left half finished (De Wette, *Psalmen*, ad loc.), appear in the 9th and 10th. In the Lamentations (confining ourselves for the present to the structure) we meet with some remarkable peculiarities.

It has to be remembered, too, that in thus speaking the writer was doing what many must have looked for from him, and so meeting at once their expectations and their wants. Other prophets and poets had made themselves the spokesmen of the nation's feelings on the death of kings and heroes. The party that continued faithful to the policy and principles of Josiah remembered how the prophet had lamented over his death. The lamentations of that period (though they are lost to us) had been accepted as a great national dirge. Was he to be silent now that a more terrible calamity had fallen upon the people? Did not the exiles in Babylon need this form of consolation? Does not the appearance of this book in their canon of sacred writings, after their return from exile, indicate that during their captivity they had found this consolation in it?

The choice of a structure so artificial as that which has been described above may at first sight appear inconsistent with the deep, intense sorrow of which it claims to be the utterance. Some wilder, less measured rhythm would seem to us to have been a fitter form of expression. It would belong, however, to a very shallow and hasty criticism to pass this judgment. A man true to the gift he has received will welcome the discipline of self-imposed rules for deep sorrow as well as for other strong emotions. In proportion as he is afraid of being carried away by the strong current of feeling will he be anxious to make the laws more difficult, the discipline more effectual. Something of this kind is traceable in the fact that so many of the master-minds of European literature have chosen—as the fit vehicle for their deepest, tenderest, most impassioned thoughts—the complicated structure of the sonnet; in Dante's selection of the *terza rima* for his vision of the unseen world. What the sonnet was to Petrarch and Milton, that the alphabetic verse-system was to the writers of Jeremiah's time, the most difficult among the recognised forms of poetry, and yet one in which (assuming the earlier date of some of the Psalms above referred to) some of the noblest thoughts of that poetry had been uttered. We need not wonder that he should have employed it as fitter than any other for the purpose for which he used it. If these Lamentations were intended to assuage the bitterness of the Babylonian exile, there was, besides this, the subsidiary advantage that it supplied the memory with an artificial help. Hymns and poems of this kind, once learned, are not easily forgotten, and the circumstances of the captives made it then, more than ever, necessary that they should have this help afforded them.

De Wette maintains (*Comment. über die Psalm.* p. 56) that this acrostic form of writing was the outgrowth of a feeble and degenerate age dwelling on the outer structure of poetry when the soul had departed. His judgment as to the origin and character of the alphabetic form is shared by Ewald (*Poet. Büch.* i, 140). That this is often the case cannot be doubted; the 119th Psalm is a case in point. It is hard, however, to reconcile this sweeping estimate with the impression made on us by such Psalms as the 25th and 34th; and Ewald himself, in his translation of the Alphabetic Psalms and the Lamentations, has shown how compatible such a structure is with the highest energy and beauty. With some of these, too, it must be added, the assignment of a later date than the time of David rests on the foregone conclusion that the acrostic structure is itself a proof of it

(comp. Delitzsch, *Commentar über den Psalter*, on Psa. ix, x). De Wette, however, allows, condescendingly, that the Lamentations, in spite of their degenerate taste, "have some merit in their way." Other critics have been more enthusiastic in their admiration of this book. Dr. Blayney remarks, "We cannot too much admire the flow of that full and graceful pathetic eloquence in which the author pours out the effusions of a patriotic heart, and piously weeps over the ruins of his venerable country" (*Jeremiah*, p. 376). "Never," says an unquestionable judge of these matters, "was there a more rich and elegant variety of beautiful images and adjuncts arranged together within so small a compass, nor more happily chosen and applied" (Lowth, *De Sacra Poesi Hebr.* Prælect. xxii). The poet seizes with wonderful tact those circumstances which point out the objects of his pity as the subjects of sympathy, and founds his expostulations on the miseries which are thus exhibited. His book of Lamentations is an astonishing exhibition of his power to accumulate images of sorrow. The whole series of elegies has but one object—the expression of sorrow for the forlorn condition of his country; and yet he presents this to us in so many lights, alludes to it by so many figures, that not only are his mournful strains not felt to be tedious reiterations, but the reader is captivated by the plaintive melancholy which pervades the whole.

3. The power of entering into the spirit and meaning of poems such as these depends on two distinct conditions. We must seek to see, as with our own eyes, the desolation, misery, confusion, which came before those of the prophet. We must endeavor also to feel as he felt when he looked on them. The last is the more difficult of the two. Jeremiah was not merely a patriot-poet, weeping over the ruin of his country. He was a prophet who had seen all this coming, and had foretold it as inevitable. He had urged submission to the Chaldæans as the only mode of diminishing the terrors of that "day of the Lord." And now the Chaldæans had come, irritated by the perfidy and rebellion of the king and princes of Judah; and the actual horrors that he saw, surpassed, though he had predicted them, all that he had been able to imagine. All feeling of exultation in which, as a mere prophet of evil, he might have indulged at the fulfilment of his forebodings, was swallowed up in deep, overwhelming sorrow. Yet sorrow, not less than other emotions, works on men according to their characters, and a man with Jeremiah's gifts of utterance could not sit down in the mere silence and stupor of a hopeless grief. He was compelled to give expression to that which was devouring his heart and the heart of his people. The act itself was a relief to him. It led him on (as has been seen above) to a calmer and serener state. It revived the faith and hope which had been nearly crushed out.

4. There are, perhaps, few portions of the O. T. which appear to have done the work they were meant to do more effectually than this. It has presented but scanty materials for the systems and controversies of theology. It has supplied thousands with the fullest utterance for their sorrows in the critical periods of national or individual suffering. We may well believe that it soothed the weary years of the Babylonian exile (comp. Zech. i, 6 with Lam. ii, 17). When the Jews returned to their own land, and the desolation of Jerusalem was remembered as belonging only to the past, this was the book of remembrance. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July), the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read, year by year, with fasting and weeping, to commemorate the misery out of which the people had been delivered. It has come to be connected with the thoughts of a later devastation, and its words enter, sometimes at least, into the prayers of the pilgrim Jews who meet at the "place of wailing" to mourn over the departed glory of their city. It enters largely into the nobly-constructed order of the Latin Church for the services of Passion-week (*Breviar. Rom.* Feria Quinta. "In Cœna Domini"). If it has been comparatively in the background in times when the study of Scripture had passed into casuistry and speculation, it has come forward, once and again, in times of danger and suffering, as a messenger of peace, comforting men, not after the fashion of the friends of Job, with formal moralizings, but by enabling them to express themselves, leading them to feel that they might give utterance to the deepest and saddest feelings by which they were overwhelmed. It is striking, as we cast our eye over the list of writers who have treated specially this book, to notice how many must have passed through scenes of trial not unlike in kind to that of which the Lamentations speak. The book remains to do its work for any future generation that may be exposed to analogous calamities.

VIII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Lamentations exclusively, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Origen, *Scholia* (Greek, in *Opp.* iii, 320); Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (Syr., in *Opp.* v, 165); Jerome, *In Lam.* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*] xiv, 227); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (Greek, in *Opp.* ii, 1); Paschalius Ratbertus, *In Threnos* (in *Opp.* p. 1307); Hugo à St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* i, 103); Aquinas, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* ii); Bonaventura, *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* i, 428); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* viii); Œcolampadius, *Enarrationes* [including Jer.] (Argent. 1533, 4to); Clenard, *Meditationes* (Paris, 1536, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Vitemb. 1546, 4to); Quinquaboreus, *Adnotationes* (Paris, 1556, 4to); Palladius, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1560, 8vo); Pintus, *Commentarius* [including Isa. and Jer.] (Lugd. 1561, etc., fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* (Lips. et Brem. 1564, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1565, 4to); Calvin, *Prælectiones* [includ. Jer.] (Frankft. 1581, 8vo; in French, Spires, 1584, 8vo; in English, London, 1587, 12mo, etc.); Taillepied, *Commentarii* (Paris, 1582, 8vo); Panigarola, *Adnotationes* (Verona, 1583; Rome, 1586, 8vo); Agellus, *Catena* (Rom. 1589, 4to); J. Ibn-Shoeib, קוֹל בּוֹכִים (Ven. 1589, 4to); Sam. de Vidas, פְּרוּשׁ (Thessalon. 1596, 8vo); Figuero, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1596, 8vo); Makshan, יָגוֹן לֵב (Cracow, s. a. [about 1600], 4to); Alscheich, דְּבָרִים נֶחוּמִים (Venice, 1601, 4to); Navarrette, *Commentaria* (Cordub. 1602, 4to); Bachmeister, *Explicatio* (Rost. 1603, 8vo); Broughton, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Genev. 1606, 4to; also in *Works*, p. 314); A Jesu Maria, *Interpretatio* (Neap. 1608, Col. Agrip. 1611, 8vo); Delrio, *Commentarius* (Lugdun. 1608, 4to); Polan, *Commentarius* [including Jer.] (Basil. 1608, 8vo); A Costa de Andrada, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1609, 8vo); De Castro, *Commentarii* [including Jer. and Bar.] (Par. 1609, fol.); Topsell, *Commentarius* (London, 1613, 4to); Sanctius, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Lugd. 1618, fol.); Hull, *Exposition* (Lond. 1618, 4to); Ghisler, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Lugd. 1623, fol.); *Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rostock, 1627, 1642; Hamb. 1707, 4to); Peter Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1629, 4to); Udall, *Commentarie* (Lond. 1637, 4to); De Lemos, *Commentarius* (Madrit. 1649, fol.); Tayler, *Commentarii* [Rabbinical] (London, 1651, 4to); Fowler, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Vitemb. 1672, 1699, 4to); Hulsemann, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Rudolph. 1696, 4to); Benjamin Allessandro, אֲלוֹן בָּכוּת (Venice, 1713, 4to); C. B. Michaelis, *Notæ* (in *Adnot. phil. exeg.* Halle, 1720, 3 vols. 4to); Riedel, *Uebersetz.* (Wien, 1761, 8vo); Lessing, *Observationes* (Lipsiæ, 1770, 8vo); Börmel, *Anmerkungen* (Weimar, 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, *Curæ* (in Eichhorn's *Repert.* pt. xii, Lips. 1783); Horver, *Bearbeitung* (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Blayney, *Notes* [including Jer.] (Oxf. 1784, 8vo, etc.); Löwe and Wolfssohn, *Anmerkungen* (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); Hämon, *Commentaire* (Par. 1790, 8vo); *Pareau, *Illustratio* (L. Bat. 1790, 8vo); Libowitzer בְּכִית צִיּוֹן (Korez, 1791, 8vo); Schnurrer, *Observationes* (Tüb. 1793, 4to); J. H. Michaelis, *Observationes* [includ. Jer.] (Götting. 1793, 8vo); Gaab, *Beiträge* [includ. Cant. and Eccles.] (Tübing. 1795, 8vo); Volborth, *Uebersetz.* (Celle,

1795, 8vo); Otto, *Dissertatio* (Tüb. 1795, 4to); Wetzler, אֶבֶל צִיּוֹן (Sklon, 1797, 8vo); Lundmark, *Dissertatio* (Upsal. 1799, 4to); Hasselhuhn, *Dissertationes* (Upsal. 1804, 4to); Deresir, *Erklärung* [including Jer. and Bar.] (Frkft. a. M. 1809, 8vo); Hartmann, *Uebersetz.* (in Justi's *Blumen*, etc., Giess. 1809, ii, 517 sq.); Welcker, *Uebers.* [metrical] (Giess. 1810, 8vo); Björn, *Threni* [including Nah.] (Havn. 1814, 8vo); *Riegler, *Anmerkungen* (Erlangen, 1814, 8vo); Jacob-Lissa, אִמְרֵי יֶשֶׁר [including Cant.] (Dyrhenf. 1815–19, 4to); Erdmann, *Specimen*, etc. (Rost. 1818, 8vo); Conz, *Klaglieder* (in Bengel's *Archiv*, iv [Tüb. 1821], p. 146 sq.), Fritz, *Exegesis* [on chap. i] (Argent. 1825, 4to); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lpz. 1827, 8vo), Goldwitzer, *Anmerk.* (Sulzb. 1828, 8vo), Wiedenfeld, *Erläut.* (Elberf. 1830, 8vo); Koch, *Anmerk.* (Menz, 1835, 8vo); Kalkar, *Illustratio* (Havn. 1836, 8vo); Löwenstein, *Erklärung* [metrical] (Frkft. 1838, 8vo); Cureton, ed. Tanchum Jerus. תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Pappenheim, *Uebersetz.* (Bresl. 1844, 8vo); Hetzel, *Anmerk.* (Lpz. 1854, 8vo); *Neumann, *Auslegung* [includ. Jer.] (Lpz. 1858, 8vo); *Engelhardt, *Auslegung* (Lpzc. 1867, 8vo); *Von Gerlach, *Erklärung* (Berl. 1868, 8vo); *Henderson, *Commentary* [includ. Jer.] (London, 1851; Andov. 1868, 8vo). See POETRY, HEBREW; COMMENTARY.

Lamfridus. See LANTFREDUS.

Lami. See LAMY.

Lami, GIOVANNI, an Italian writer of note, was born at Santa Croce, Tuscany, in 1697. He studied law at the University of Pisa, and for a time practiced his profession at Florence. But his fondness for literature, and especially classical and ecclesiastical erudition, interfered with his professional pursuits, and he became an author. He first wrote in defence of the Nicene Creed concerning the Trinity, and against Leclerc and other Socinian writers. He contended that the Nicene dogma concerning the Trinity was the same as that held by the early promulgators of Christianity in the apostolic times. His work is entitled *De recta patrum Nicenorum fide* (Venice, 1730). In 1732 he was made librarian of the Riccardi Library, and professor of ecclesiastical history in the Florence Lyceum, and while in this position he published *De Eruditione Apostolorum* (1738), a sort of continuation of his former work. In 1740 Lami began to publish a literary journal, entitled *Novelle Letterarie*, which he carried on till 1760, at first with the assistance of Targioni, Gori, and other learned Tuscans of his time, with whom he afterwards quarrelled, and he then continued the work alone. During his position as librarian he made a selection of inedited works, or fragments of works, from the manuscripts of the Riccardi Library, which he published in a series entitled *Deliciæ Eruditorum* (Florence, 1736–69, 18 vols. 8vo). He also edited the works of the learned John Meursius, in 12 vols. folio. He wrote short biographies of many illustrious Italians of his age, under the title of *Memorabilia Italorum eruditione præstantium quibus præsens sæculum gloriatur* (Florence, 1742–48, 2 vols. 8vo), and published in Greek the letters of Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, in Asia Minor, and of other prelates of the Greek Church: *Gabrielis Severi et aliorum Græcorum recentiorum Epistolæ* (Flor. 1754, 8vo). A *History of the Eastern Church, from the Council of Florence to* 1439, he left unfinished. Lami died in 1770. He was a great hater of the Jesuits, and wrote many satires against them. Memoirs of his life were published by Fabroni (*Vitæ Italorum*, vol. xvi) and Fontanini (Flor. 1789, 4to). See *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 216 sq.; Sax, *Onomasticon*, vi, 490.

Lamiletière, THÉOPHILE BRACHET DE, a noted French theologian, was born about the year 1596. He studied at the University of Heidelberg, and afterwards practiced law at Paris. He soon, however, tired of the bar, and devoted himself to theology. Having become elder of the Protestant Church at Charenton, he took an active part in all the religious controversies of the times, and was one of the most prominent members of the political assembly of La Rochelle in 1690, whither he had been sent by the Consistory of Paris. He subsequently went with La Chapellière to Holland, to ask aid of the states-general for the Protestants of France. We next find him at the Assembly of Milhau in 1625, and in 1627 at Paris, where he was arrested as an agent of the duke of Rohan. He was condemned to death, but his life was spared on account of the threatening attitude which the inhabitants of La Rochelle assumed, in retaliative, towards the person of one of their prisoners, a relation of P. Joseph (the confessor and secret agent of Richelieu). He was finally released, and even received a pension from Richelieu on the condition of using every exertion to reunite the different Protestant churches. He now became the pliant tool of Richelieu, and was excommunicated by the Church of Charenton in 1644 for not having partaken of the Lord's Supper in twelve years. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church, April 2, 1645. The remainder of his life was employed in writing against Protestantism. He died in 1665, despised alike by Protestants and Romanists. His principal works are, *Discours des vrayes raisons pour lesquelles ceux de la religion en France peuvent et doivent resister par armes à la persécution ouverte* (1622, 8vo); very scarce, as it was condemned to be burned by the public executioner:—*Lettre à M. Rambours pour la réunion des évangéliques aux catholiques* (Paris, 1628, 12mo):—*De universi orbis Christiani pace et concordia per cardinalem ducem Richelium constituenda* (Par. 1634, 8vo; transl. into French, 1635, 4to):—*Le Moyen de la paix Chrétienne* (Par. 1637, 8vo):—*La Necessité de la Puissance du Pape en l'Église* (Paris, 1640, 8vo):—*Le Catholique réformé* (Paris, 1642, 8vo):—*Le Pacifique véritable* (Paris, 1644, 8vo)—condemned by the Sorbonne; etc. See Benoît, *Histoire de l'Édit de Nantes*, ii; De Marolles, *Mémoires;* Grotius, *Epistolæ;* Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique;* Tallemant, *Historiettes;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 222. (J. N. P.)

Lammas-day is the name of a festival observed by Roman Catholics on the 1st of August, in memory of the imprisonment of St. Peter, and otherwise called *St. Peter's chains.* The word is of doubtful meaning: some refer it to a Saxon term signifying contribution. Brande, in his "Antiquities," says, "Some suppose it is called Lammas-day, *quasi Lamb-masse*, because on that day the tenants that held lands of the cathedral church at York were bound by their tenure to bring a live *lamb* into the church at high *mass* on that day." More probably, however, is its derivation from "loaf-mass," it having been the custom of the Saxons to offer on this day (August 1) an oblation of loaves made of new wheat. Like many other Church festivals, it seems to have been observed already in pagan times, and, like the 1st of May, was a festive day with the Druids. Vallancey, in his *Collectanea De Rebus Hibernicis*, says the Druids celebrated the 1st of August as the day of the oblation of grain. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, Gen. Suppl. p. 92, Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Lammermann. See LAMORMAIN.

Lammists, a sect of Remonstrant Baptists. See MENNONITES.

Lamont, DAVID, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian divine, flourished as minister of Kirkpatrick, Durham. He died in 1837. This is all we know of his personal history. His *Sermons* were published at London from 1760–87, in 2 vols. 8vo (new edit. 1810, 3 vols. 8vo).

Lamormain, Guillaume Germeau de, a noted Belgian Roman Catholic theologian of the Order of the Jesuits, was born in the duchy of Luxemburg about 1570; entered the Jesuitical order in 1590, and then became professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Gratz. In 1624 he was appointed confessor of the emperor of Austria, Ferdinand II, and over this thoroughly monkish ruler Lamormain is said

to have exercised perfect sway. He and John Weingärtner, another Jesuit confessor, Vehse (see below) tells us, "constantly kept near him, and never let him (Ferdinand) out of their sight;" and it is due to this Jesuitic influence, no doubt, that Ferdinand became such a fanatical adherent of the Church of Rome, and a most cruel persecutor of Protestantism. See AUSTRIA. Of Lamormain himself, it is said that he was so devoted to the Romish cause that he made upwards of 100,000 converts to the Church of Rome. He died Feb. 22, 1648. He wrote a life of Ferdinand II, which abounds in flattering terms to the emperor, who had been a pliant tool in the hands of the crafty Jesuit. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 245; Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire littéraire des Pays-Bas*, v, 98–100; Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court, Aristocracy, and Diplomacy of Austria* (transl. by F. Demmler, Lond. 1856, 2 vols. sm. 8vo), i, 287 sq., 319. (J. H. W.)

Lamormain, Henri de, a Belgian Jesuit, brother of the preceding, and, like him, a native of Luxemburg, entered the Order of the Jesuits in 1596, but exerted little influence on account of feeble health. He died Nov. 26, 1647. He translated and wrote several works; among them are, *Tractatus amoris divini constans*, libri xii (from the French of Francisco de Sales, Vienna, 1643, 4to; 2d edit., with life of the author [Sales], Col. 1657, 8vo):—*De Virtute Pœnitentiæ*, etc. (Vienna, 1644, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 245.

Lamothe, PIERRE LAMBERT DE, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Bucherie, in the diocese of Lisieux, Jan. 18, 1624. After being for some time connected with the chancellery of the Parliament at Rouen, he entered the Church. His talents caused him to be distinguished among a number of priests who had formed in 1652 the plan of Christianizing China and neighboring countries. In 1660 he was consecrated bishop of Berythe. He embarked at Marseilles for China November 27, 1660, and, passing through Malta, Antioch, Aleppo, Bassora, Chalzeran, Shiraz, Ispahan, Lara, Surate, Masulipatam, Tenasserim, Yalinga, Pram, and Pikfri, arrived at Jutlica, the capital of Siam, April 22, 1662. Here he found some 1500 Christians of different nations and two churches, the one administered by the Dominicans, the other by the Jesuits. He was at first well received, but had subsequently to submit to many annoyances from the archbishop of Goa, who claimed the primacy of the whole East Indies, and Lamothe finally sailed for Canton in July, 1663, with two other missionaries. A severe tempest obliged them, however, to return to Siam. Here they were exposed to all sorts of ill treatment at the hands of the Portuguese, and owed their safety only to the aid of the Cochin Chinese. Lamothe sent to the pope and to Paris for more missionaries and other assistance. Alexander VII, in consequence, extended the jurisdiction of apostolic vicars over the kingdom of Siam, Japan, and other neighboring countries, which action freed Lamothe from the control of the archbishop of Goa. He was now joined by Pallu du Parc, bishop of Heliopolis, who reached Siam January 27, 1664, with other missionaries. The two apostolic vicars held a synod, and Lamothe received permission from the king to establish a Church at Siam, which he intended should become the centre of communication between the extreme Eastern missions. He also established a seminary for the education of native priests and instructors, a college, and a hospital. Lamothe died June 15, 1679.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 250 sq.

Lamourette, ADRIEN, *abbé*, a noted French ecclesiastic, was born in Picardy in 1742. During the Revolution in France he became an auxiliary of Mirabeau in 1789, and wrote the address on the civil constitution of the clergy which that orator pronounced. In 1791 he was chosen, under the new Church regime enacted by the Assembly in opposition to the Roman see, bishop of Rhone-et-Loire, and deputed to the National Assembly. Having resisted the extreme measures of the dominant party, he was guillotined Jan. 10, 1794. He published *Pensées sur la philosophie et l'incrédulité* (1786, 8vo):—*Pensées sur la philosophie de la foi* (1789, 8vo):—*Les Délices de la Religion* (1789, 12mo):—*Considérations sur l'esprit et les devoirs de la vie religieuse* (1795, 12mo); etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Lamp (properly לַפִּיד, *lappid'*, a *flame*, Gen. xv, 17; Exod. xx, 18, Job xli, 11; Nah. ii, 5, Dan. x, 6; Isa. lxii, 1; Ezek. i, 13; *lamp-torch*, Judg. vii, 16, 20; xv, 4, 5, Job xii, 5; Zech. xii, 6; in some of which passages it is rendered "lightning," "brand," "torch," etc.: Gr. λαμπάς, a torch-"*light*" or lantern, Acts xx, 8; Rev. iv, 5; "*torch*," John xviii, 3; Rev. viii, 10, oil-*lamp*, Matt. xxv, 1–8; also נֵר, *neyr*, or נִיר, *nir*, a *light*, in various senses, especially for domestic purposes, the Gr. λύχνος) is a term of frequent occurrence in a literal sense in the Scriptures, such a utensil being often really meant where the A. V. gives the rendering "candle" (q. v.). The primary sense of light (Gen. xv, 17) also gives rise to frequent metaphorical usages, indicating life, welfare, guidance, as, e. g. 2 Sam. xxi, 17; Psa. cxix, 105; Prov. vi, 23; xiii, 9. See LIGHT. The following are the cases in which the use of lamps is referred to in the Bible. In their illustration we freely avail ourselves of the materials brought to light from the ancient remains.

1. That part of the golden candlestick belonging to the tabernacle which bore the light; also of each of the ten candlesticks placed by Solomon in the Temple before the Holy of Holies (Exod. xxv, 37; 1 Kings vii, 49; 2 Chron. iv, 20, xiii, 11, Zech. iv, 2). The lamps were lighted every evening, and cleansed every morning (Exod. xxx, 7, 8; Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* i, v, 9, and vii, 8). It is somewhat remarkable, that while the golden candlestick, or rather candelabrum, is so minutely described, not a word is said of the shape of the lamps (Exod. xxv, 37). This was probably because the socket in which it was to be inserted necessarily gave it a somewhat cylindrical form adapted to the purpose; for it is hardly to be presumed that the insecure cup-form usually represented in engravings would have been adopted. This shape is aptly illustrated by an instance occurring on the Egyptian monuments. Wilkinson gives (*Ancient Egyptians*, v, 376) what he takes to be the representation of a lamp made of glass, with a hand holding separately an erect wick, as if the bearer were about to place it in the vase previous to its being lighted.



Ancient Egyptian Cylindrical Lamp.

The lines, he thinks, may represent the twisted nature of the cotton wick, as they do the watering of the glass vase.

Almost the only other fact we can gather in this connection is, that vegetable oils were burnt in them, and especially, if not exclusively, olive-oil. This, of the finest quality, was the oil used in the seven lamps of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii, 20). Although the lamp-oils of the Hebrews were exclusively vegetable, it is probable that animal fat was used, as it is at present by the Western Asiatics, by being placed in a kind of lamp, and burnt by means of a wick inserted in it. See OIL. Cotton wicks are now used throughout Asia, but the Hebrews, like the Egyptians, probably employed the outer and coarser fibre of flax (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xix, 1), and perhaps linen yarn, if the rabbins are correct in alleging that the linen dresses of the priests were unravelled when old, to furnish wicks for the sacred lamps.

As to the material, the burners were in this instance doubtless of gold, although metal is scarcely the best substance for a lamp. The golden candlestick may also suggest that lamps in ordinary use were placed on stands, and, where more than one was required, on stands with two or more branches. The modern Orientals, who

are satisfied with very little light in their rooms, use stands of brass or wood, on which to raise the lamps to a sufficient height above the floor on which they sit. Such stands are shaped not unlike a tall candlestick, spreading out at the top. Sometimes the lamps are placed on brackets against the wall, made for the purpose, and often upon stools. Doubtless similar contrivances were employed by the Hebrews. The Romans are known to have employed them. See CANDLESTICK.

Bronze Lamp and Stand. From Pompeii.

2. A torch or flambeau, such as was carried by the soldiers of Gideon (Judg. vii, 16, 20; comp. xv, 4). From the fact that these were at first enclosed in pitchers, from which, at the end of the march, they were taken out and borne in the hand, we may with certainty infer that they were not ordinary lamps, open at top, from which the oil could easily be spilled. See TORCH.

3. It seems that the Hebrews, like the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the modern Orientals, were accustomed to burn lamps overnight in their chambers; and this practice may appear to give point to the expression of "*outer* darkness," which repeatedly occurs in the New Testament (Matt. viii, 12, xxii, 13); the force is greater, however, when the contrast implied in the term "outer" is viewed with reference to the effect produced by sudden expulsion into the darkness of night from a chamber highly illuminated for an entertainment. This custom of burning lamps at night, with the effect produced by their going out or being extinguished, supplies various figures to the sacred writers (2 Sam. xxi, 17, Prov. xiii, 9, xx, 20). On the other hand, the keeping up of a lamp's light is used as a symbol of enduring and unbroken succession (1 Kings xi, 36, xv, 4, Psa. cxxxii, 17). (See Wemyss's *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.)

The usual form of these domestic utensils may probably be inferred from the prevailing shape of antique specimens from neighboring nations that have come down to us. In the British Museum there are various forms of ancient Egyptian lamps, which were employed for lighting the interior of apartments, some of terra-cotta and others of bronze, with various ornaments in bas-relief.





Common Forms of Ancient Egyptian Lamps.



Ancient Assyrian Lamps in the British Museum.
1, Bronze from north-west palace, Nimroud. 2, Bronze from Kouyunjik. 3, 4, Terra-cotta from Warka. 5, Terra-cotta from Kouyunjik.



Ancient Classical Hand-lamps.



Common Form of Classical hanging Lamp.

4. It appears from Matt. xxv, 1, that the Jews used lamps and torches in their marriage ceremonies, or rather when the bridegroom came to conduct home the bride by night. This is still the custom in those parts of the East where, on account of the heat of the day, the bridal procession takes place in the night-time. The connection of lamps and torches with marriage ceremonies often appears also in the classical poets (Homer, *Iliad*, vi, 492; Eurip. *Phœniss.* 346; *Medea*, 1027; Virgil, *Eclog.* viii, 29), and, indeed, Hymen, the god of marriage, was figured as bearing a torch. The same connection, it may be observed, is still preserved in Western Asia, even

where it is no longer usual to bring home the bride by night. During two, or three, or more nights preceding the wedding, the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns, or with lanterns and small lamps suspended from cords drawn across from the bridegroom's and several other houses on each side to the houses opposite; and several small silk flags, each of two colors, generally red and



Modern Oriental Wedding Lantern.

green, are attached to other cords (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* i, 201; Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, iii, 131). A modern lantern much used on these occasions, with lamps hung about it and suspended from it, is represented in the preceding cut. The lamps used separately on such occasions are represented in the following cut. Figs. 1, 3, and 5 show very distinctly the conical receptacle of



Small Oriental hanging Lamps.

wood which serves to protect the flame from the wind. Lamps of this kind are sometimes hung over doors. The shape in figure 3 is also that of a much-used indoor lamp, called *kandil* (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, chap. v, p. 151). It is a small vessel of glass, having a small tube at the bottom, in which is stuck a wick formed of cotton twisted round a piece of straw: some water is poured in first, and then the oil. Lamps very nearly of this shape appear on the Egyptian monuments, and they seem, also, to be of glass (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, iii, 101; v, 376).



Enlarged View of the *Kandil* and its receptacle for oil.

If the Egyptians had lamps of glass, there is no reason why the Jews also might not have had them, especially as this material is more proper for lamps intended to be hung up, and therefore to cast their light down from above.

The Jews used lamps in other festivals besides those of marriage. The Roman satirist (Persius, *Sat.* v, 179) expressly describes them as making illuminations at their festivals by lamps hung up and arranged in an orderly manner; and the scriptural intimations, so far as they go, agree with this description. If this custom had not been so general in the ancient and modern East, it might have been supposed that the Jews adopted it from the Egyptians, who, according to Herodotus (ii, 62), had a "Feast of Lamps," which was celebrated at Sais, and, indeed, throughout the country at a certain season of the year. The description which the historian gives of the lamps employed on this occasion strictly applies to those in modern use already described, and the concurrence of both these sources of illustration strengthens the probable analogy of Jewish usage. He speaks of them as "small vases filled with salt and olive-oil, in which the wick floated, and burnt during the whole night." It does not, indeed, appear of what materials these vases were made, but we may reasonably suppose them to have been of glass. The later Jews had even something like this feast among themselves. A "Feast of Lamps" was held every year on the twenty-fifth of the month Kisleu. See DEDICATION. It was founded by Judas Maccabæus, in celebration of the restoration of the Temple worship (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 7), and has ever since been observed by the lighting up of lamps or candles on that day in all the countries of their dispersion (Maimonides, *Rosh. Hashanah*, fol. 8). Other Orientals have at this day a similar feast, of which the "Feast of Lanterns" among the Chinese is perhaps the best known (Davis, *Chinese*, p. 138). See LANTERN.

LAMP, a strange ceremony of the Maronite Church. A wafer of some size, having seven pieces of cotton stuck into it, is put into a flask or basin of oil; a religious service is then read, the cotton is set fire to, and the sick person for whose recovery the rite is intended is anointed with the oil, and prayer is repeated over him.

LAMPS (their use in the Christian Church). Among the Jews *lamps* were freely used in the synagogue for various purposes. In fact, all the ancient nations had them in their temples; but how soon they were made use of by Christians, and what significance they had in symbolism, remains a matter of dispute between the Romish and Protestant churches. The Protestants generally hold that there is no evidence that lamps were used in the early Church for any other purpose than to light up the dark places where they were obliged to congregate for worship, while Romanists claim that they were used as symbols. (Compare, on the Roman Catholic view, Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, p. 151, s. v. Cierges; see also the art. LIGHTS.) Several of the fathers, among them Chrysostom, condemn in strong terms the custom of setting up lamps on days of festival—as the relic of some pagan rite. In the days of Jerome, it is true, lights were freely used in churches, but Romish theologians forget to tell that the propriety of the custom was much questioned even then. In graves of the Catacombs "lamps were often placed," says Walcott (*Sacred Archæology*, s. v.), "as a symbol of the eternal light which the departed, it is hoped, enjoy—as memorials of their shining lights before men, and their future glory" (Matt. xiii, 43). But it is evident that even this custom was early disapproved of, for the Council of Elibaris forbade the faithful, on pain of excommunication, lighting wax candles in the daytime in cemeteries or other burial-places of the martyrs (compare Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 367). In our day it is the custom in the Roman Catholic churches to keep a lamp (eternal light) constantly burning before or by the side of the tabernacle. (J. H. W.)

Lampadary is the name of an officer in the Eastern Church whose duty it is to carry before the patriarchs in all processions a lighted candelabrum, called λαμπαδοῦχον, as a badge of distinction among bishops. It is the business of the lampadary also to see that the lamps of the church are lighted, and to carry a taper on days of great processions.

Lampe, Friedrich Adolf, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Detmold (Lippe-Detmold) Feb. 19, 1683. He entered the University of Franeker, and later that of Utrecht, to study theology. He was successively pastor at Wees, Duisburg, and Bremen. In 1720 he became professor of theology at Utrecht, and in 1727 removed to the University of Bremen in the same capacity. He died December 8, 1729. Lampe is one of the most prominent German theologians of the Reformed Church, who introduced into the German Church the Coccejanian doctrines, and measurably also the principles of Labadism. Lampe's principal works are, *Commentarius analytico-exegeticus Evangelii secundum Johannem* (Amsterd. 1724–25, 3 vols. 4to); this work Orme commends as "both extensive and valuable." Walch ranks it among the best expositions of the apostle's Gospel:—*De Cymbalis veterum* Libri tres (Utrecht, 1703, 12mo):—*Exercitationum sacrarium Dodecas, quibus Psalmus xlv perpetuo commentario explanatur* (Bremen, 1715, 4to):—*Geheimniss des Gnadenbundes* (Bremen, 1723, 12mo; translat. into Dutch, Amst. 1727, 8vo); this work is nothing more nor less than his system of theology:—*Delineatio Thelogiæ activæ* (Utrecht, 1727, 4to):—*Rudimenta Theologiæ elenchticæ* (Bremen, 1729, 8vo). Lampe published also a large number of sermons and devotional treatises in German, which were nearly all translated into Dutch; he rearranged and edited an edition of the *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria et Transylvania*, attributed to Paul of Debrezin (Utrecht, 1728, 4to). Together with Hase, he published the first three volumes of the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, for which he wrote a number of theological articles. Other treatises which he published in various papers were collected and published by D. Gerdes, together with his discourses and programmes (Amsterd. 1737, 2 vols. 4to). See Schumacher, *Memoria Lampii*, in *Miscellanea Duisburgensia*, vol. ii; *Acta Eruditorum*, ann. 1722; Klifker, *Bibl. Eruditor. Præcocium;* Burmann, *Trajectum eruditum;* Jöcher, *Allgem. Gel. Lexikon;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 284; Göbel (Maximilian), *Gesch. d. Christlichen Lebens*, vol. ii (see Index).

Lampetians is the name of one of the heretical sects which, on pretence of promoting sanctity by an ascetic life, made the Christian Sabbath a fast-day.

There was also another sect of this name in the 17th century, the followers of Lampetius, a Syrian monk, who pretended that, as a man is born free, a Christian, in order to please God, ought to do nothing by necessity; and that, therefore, it is unlawful to make vows, even those of obedience. To this doctrine he added the views of the Arians, Carpocratians, and other sects. The Lampetians formed a branch of the Messalians (q. v.).

Lampillas, Francis Xavier, a Spanish Jesuit, was born in Catalonia in 1731. After the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain in 1767 he went to Genoa, where he died in 1810. His principal work is a defence of Spanish literature against Bettinelli and Tiraboschi, *Saggio storico-apologetico della Leteratura Spagnuola.* See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 285.

Lamplugh, Thomas, D.D., an English prelate of note in the days of king James II, was born in Yorkshire in 1615. But little is known of his early personal history. He was dean of Rochester in 1676, when he was promoted to the episcopate as bishop of Exeter. In this position he became one of the most conspicuous divines of the day, securing, in particular, the favor of the king by his partisanship, especially in 1688. In this year, just before the exit of king James from the English throne, Lamplugh called on the king, was graciously received, praised for his loyalty, and awarded with the archbishopric of York, which had been vacant for more than two years and a half. William III, whom Lamplugh, strangely enough, recognised as the rightful sovereign of England, after the flight of James, confirmed the appointment, hence some writers' statement that William of Orange appointed Lamplugh to the archbishopric. The archbishop died in 1691. See Debary, *History of the Church of England*, p. 167; Macaulay, *History of England*, ii, 382. (J. H. W.)

Lampronti, Isaac, a Jewish Rabbi of some note as an author, flourished in Ferrara in the first half of the 18th century. He died about 1756. He commenced the preparation of a large encyclopædia of Rabbinism, of which he himself completed twelve volumes, bringing the work, excellent in its character, down to the letter *Mem.* It was published at Venice between 1750 and 1813. See Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, iii, 230.

Lamson, Alvan, D.D., a Unitarian minister, was born in 1792 at Weston, Mass.; was educated first at Phillips Academy, Andover, and then at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1814. He was immediately appointed tutor in Bowdoin College, but left in 1816, and entered the Divinity School at Cambridge. In 1818 he became pastor of the First Church in Dedham, Mass., where he officiated for over forty years. He died July 18, 1864. He wrote much for the *Christian Examiner*, and in 1857 published a volume of sermons (Bost. 12mo). The *Christian Register* says of him: "Dr. Lamson has succeeded in uniting the acutest moral wisdom with the most unpretending and childlike modes of exhibiting it. His style is clear as crystal, sometimes almost quaint in its simplicity, and not without touches of poetic feeling as well as fancy, though a calm, shrewd judgment characterizes all his opinions."—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, vol. ii; *American Annual Cyclopædia*, 1864, p. 612.

Lamy (or Lami), **Bernard,** an eminent priest of the French Oratory, was born at Mans in June, 1640; studied under the Oratorians, joined their order in 1658, and completed his studies at Paris and at Saumur. He next taught belles-lettres at Vendôme and Juilly, and philosophy at Saumur and at Angers. In 1676 he was deprived of his professorship for his zealous advocacy of the Cartesian philosophy. His enemies, the Thomists, even obtained a *lettre de cachet* against him under the accusation that he opposed the principle of royal authority. He was banished to Grenoble, where cardinal Le Camus, who had established a seminary for the education of ecclesiastics, and who held Lamy in high estimation, appointed him professor of divinity. In 1686, his sentence having been revoked in its most essential charges, he was recalled to Paris, and remained for a while in the Seminary of St. Magloire, but, having violated the rules of the establishment by publishing without the knowledge of the superior a work (*Lettre au P. Fourré, de l'Oratoire*), which, besides, was considered to contain objectionable teachings (viz. as that Christ did not celebrate the Jewish Passover with his disciples [a view adopted by some of the soundest scholars]; that John the Baptist was imprisoned twice, by the Sanhedrim and by Herod; and that the three Marys mentioned in the Gospels are identical), he was again exiled, this time to Rouen. He died in the latter city Jan. 29, 1715. Lamy was a very prolific writer, and his works are generally distinguished for clearness of thought and expression. The most important are, *Apparatus Biblicus ad intelligenda Sacra Biblia* (originally [Grenoble, 1687] no more than tables of the chief facts of Scripture, with rules for its study, and compiled simply for his pupils, he subsequently enlarged and published it at Lyons, 1696, sm. 8vo, and it was in its day considered the best "introduction" to the Bible extant; an English edition was prepared by R. Bundy, Lond. 1723, 4to):—*Entretiens sur les Sciences* (1684), a work which was highly esteemed by J. J. Rousseau:—*Introduction*

à l'Ecriture Sainte, où l'on traite de tout ce qui concerne les Juifs, etc. (Lyons, 1709, 4to):—*Harmonia, sive concordia quatuor Evangelistarum*, editio novissima (Paris, 1701, 12mo):—*Commentarius in harmoniam, sive concordiam quatuor Evangelistarum* (Paris, 1699, 4to):—*Dissertatio de Levitis cantoribus* (Ugol. 32, 571):—*De tabernaculo fœderis, de sancta civitate Jerusalem, et de templo ejus* (Paris, 1720, fol.). To this last-named work Lamy is said to have devoted the last thirty years of his life It was published (after his death) under the editorship of père Desmoulins. See Ellies Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs ecclés.* vol. xix, 4to ed.; *Journal de tout ce qui s'est passé en l'Université d'Angers*, 1679, 4to; F. Bouillier, *Hist. du Cartésianisme*, vol. ii; B. Haurèau, *Hist. Littér. du Maine*, ii, 117–165, Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 515; Kitto, *Biblical Cyclopædia*, ii, 779, 780. (J. H. W.)

Lamy, Dom. **François**, a French Roman Catholic priest. was born at Montereau, in the diocese of Chartres, in 1636. He entered the congregation of St. Maur, of the Order of St. Benoist, in 1685, and was in relation with some of the most important men of the time, Fénelon among others. He died in 1711. Lamy wrote largely in defence of Christianity, and against Spinoza; the most important of his works are, *Traité de la vérité évidente de la religion Chrétienne* (1694, 12mo):—*De la connaissance de soi-même* (Paris, 1694–98, 6 vols. 8vo, augmented, Paris, 1700), the ablest and most celebrated work of François Lamy (comp. the art. MALEBRANCHE):—*Le Nouvel Athéisme renversé, ou réfutation du système de Spinosa*, etc. (Anon., Paris, 1696, 12mo):—*Sentiments de piété sur la profession religieuse* (Paris, 1697, 12mo), which gave rise to much controversy:—*Leçons de la Sagesse et de l'engagement au service de Dieu* (Par. 1703, 12mo):—*L'incrédule amené à la religion par la raison* (Paris, 1710, 12mo):—*Traité de la connaissance et de l'amour de Dieu* (Paris, 1712, 12mo); this work, published after his death, is very scarce. Some of his letters are contained in the *Correspondance de Fénelon* (Paris, 1827–29, 11 vols. 8vo). See Le Cerf, *Biblioth. des Auteurs de la Congrég. de St. Maur*; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. x; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 298 sq.

Lancaster, Joseph, an English Quaker, was born in London, Nov. 25, 1775, and died about Oct. 4, 1838. He was the promulgator of the mutual system of education first introduced by Dr. Bell at Madras, but afterwards known both in England and America as the *Lancasterian System*, and gave an impulse, by his writings and lectures, to the cause of popular education in many countries. He first opened a school for poor children in St. George's Field, and soon rendered his method very popular. For the characteristics of his system, see Watts, *Bibl. Brit.*, and his works (London, 1854); *Lond. Quart. Rev.* vi, 24; *North Amer. Rev.* xviii, 184; *Living Age*, April, 1845; Allibone, *Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1052; Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* p. 1365.

Lancaster, Lydia, a female Quaker minister, daughter of Thomas Rawlinson, was born at Graithwaite, Lancashire, England, in 1684. In the course of her ministry she visited several times the greater part of England, Ireland, and Scotland, building up her society with great zeal and efficacy. In 1718 she came to the United States, and was here especially instrumental in the extension of the Quaker cause. She retained her zeal and activity to extreme old age, laboring almost to the close of her days, May 30, 1761. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 296.

Lancaster, Nathaniel, D.D., a minister of the Church of England, was born in England in 1698. During a portion of his ministry he was rector of Stamford Rivers, but he is better known as a literary man than as a pastor. He died in 1775. His published works are, *Sermons* (1746):—*Essay on Delicacy* (1748, 8vo):—*The Old Serpent*, or *Methodism Triumphant—a Poem* (1770, 4to).—Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1052.

Lance (כִּידוֹן, *kidon'*, so called from its *destructive* use, Jer. l, 42; elsewhere usually "spear"), a *javelin* or smaller kind of missile weapon, in distinction from the long-handled spear (חֲנִית, *chanith'*), and the simple dart (שֶׁלַח, *she'lach*). See ARMOR.

Lance, The Holy (1), is the name of a knife very much in the form of a lance, used in the Greek Church to imitate the spear by which Christ was pierced. With this "holy lance" the priest, at communion, cuts the bread, while reading the corresponding passages of the N. T. Scriptures. See Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités*, p. 353.

Lance, The Holy (2), was given by king Rudolph of Burgundy to king Henry I of Germany, as a present, through the influence of Luitprand, bishop of Cremona. It came to be considered as one of the chief insignia of the empire, and a powerful talisman. The earlier tradition represents the lance as having been chiefly made of the nails with which Christ was crucified; later accounts assume that it was the identical lance with which the Roman soldier pierced the Saviour's side. Under the emperor Charles IV this lance was brought to Prague, and in 1354 pope Innocent VI, at the emperor's request, instituted a special festival, *De lancea*, which was celebrated in Germany and Bohemia on the first octave after Easter. Another holy lance was discovered by the empress Helena, and kept first in the portico of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and afterwards at Antioch, where it was found in 1093 by a French priest, Peter Bartholomew; its appearance cheered the discouraged Crusaders, who gained a brilliant victory over the Saracens. It was subsequently brought to Constantinople, then to Venice, and afterwards came into the possession of St. Louis, king of France. It was, however, afterwards taken back again to Constantinople, and it is said that the iron of it was brought to Rome as a present to pope Innocent VIII, and is preserved at the Vatican. The genuineness of both lances has, however, been doubted even in the Roman Catholic Church, and their authenticity was never officially proclaimed.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 197. (J. N. P.)

Lanceæ et Clavōrum Festum. See LANCE, THE HOLY (2).

Lancellot(t)i (LANCELOTUS), **Giovanni Paoli** (1), a noted Italian writer on canon law, was born in Perugia in 1511, was professor of canon law in the university of his native place, and died there in 1591. He is particularly known as the author of *Institutiones juris canonici*, which are generally published with the *Corpus juris canonici;* yet it was not adopted in the "editio Romana," and therefore Richter omitted it in his edition. Lancellotti appears to have for a long time contemplated writing an elementary text-book for the study of canon law, after the model of Justinian's Institutes [see CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS], for we find already in 1555 pope Paul IV encouraging him in his plans. Two years after Lancellotti presented his work to the papal censure, and it was examined by a committee composed of Fabianus Atorombonus, Julius Oradinus, and Antonius Massa, all officers of the court Della Rota. They approved strongly of it, and their recommendation was printed in several editions of the *Commentarii Institutionum* subsequently added by Lancellotti himself to his *liber i.* The book was afterwards published, and immediately adopted as a text-book in the University of Cologne. On the other hand, the pope steadily refused his approval, and some other censors raised objections against it on the ground that it contained principles opposed to the then recent decisions of the Council of Trent. The author, however, was disinclined to alter the obnoxious passages, and resolved to continue to publish the work as a private enterprise, which he did towards the close of the Council of Trent, in August, 1563, at Perugia, dedicating it to Pius IV. In the following years it was repeatedly reprinted and commended, Petrus Matthäus even appended it to his edition of the *Corpus juris canonici* (Frankf. ad M. 1591). Soon after it was included

in the edition of the *Corpus juris canon.* published at Lyons, and continued to be printed in that manner, it having finally obtained the approval of pope Paul V (1605–21) by the intercession of cardinal Scipio Cobellutius and others. Still the *Institutiones* were never considered as an official work. Their value consists chiefly in the insight it affords into what was considered as law before the Council of Trent, and the common practice of that time. Subsequent editions carefully indicate the differences between it and the new laws. (See Caspar Ziegler, *Notæ ex ipsis antiquitatum ecclesiasticarum fontibus deductæ*, Wittemb. 1699, 4to; reproduced in Thomasius's edition, Halæ, 1716, 1717, 4to; also that of Doujat, Venetiis, 1750, 2 vols. 8vo). A French translation, with a comparison of the Romish and Gallican practice, was published by Durand de Maillane (Lyons, 1710, 10 vols. 12mo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 187.

Lancellotti (or LANCELOTTI), **Giovanni Paoli** (2), an Italian author and priest, was born at Perugia in 1575, and died in Paris in 1640. He is noted as the author of a successful work entitled *To-day* ("L'Hoggidi"), intended to prove that the world was not morally or physically worse than it had been in ancient times. He wrote also other learned works.

Lancelot, Dom. CLAUDE, a noted French theologian and writer of the Romish Church, was born at Paris in 1615. In 1640 he was appointed presiding officer of the noted school of Port Royal, and, after its discontinuance in 1660, he became instructor of prince Conti; then lived in the convent St. Cyran until its destruction in 1679. He died at Quimperlé April 15, 1695. His works are mainly on the grammar of the classical and Roman languages. He also published historical annotations on the Bible of Vitre, and left in MS. form memoirs of the life of Duverger de Hauranne, of the St. Cyran convent. See Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal;* Vigneul Marville, *Mélanges*, i, 132; Niceron, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire des Hommes Ill.* xxxv; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxix, 322 sq.

Lancet (רֹמַח, *ro'mach*, from its *piercing*, 1 Kings xviii, 28, elsewhere usually "spear"), the iron *point* or head of a lance. See ARMOR. The incisive implements of the most ancient Hebrews, as of other peoples, were of stone (Exod. iv, 25; Josh. v, 2; compare Abicht, *De cultis saxeis*, Lipsiæ, 1712; and generally Creuzer, *Comment. Herod.* i, 22. The *testa samia* with which the priests of Cybele emasculated themselves [Pliny, xxxv, 46], and the stone knives of the Egyptian embalmers [Herod. ii, 86], are parallel cases). The Hebrews used no knives at table (although one term for knife, מַאֲכֶלֶת, is so named from *eating*), since the meat was brought on ready cut into pieces, and the bread was so thin as to be easily broken with the fingers. See EATING. The same is the case at present in the East, even in princely feasts. See MEAL. Knives were regularly employed by mechanics (q. v.), and in slaughtering animals (Gen. xxii, 6, 10; comp. Judg. xix, 29; see Philo, *Opp.* ii, 570), and for preparing food (Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 7; *Ant.* xvii, 71, etc.). The sacrificial knife, in particular, was called מַחֲלָה (Ezra i, 9), and a room in the (second) Temple was appropriated to such cutlery (בֵּית מַחֲלִיפוֹת, Mishna, *Middoth*, vi, 7). A penknife was called תַּעַר (Jer. xxvi, 23; Ezek. v, 1), originally in Aramæan בְּסַפַּר, which in the Talmud (*Chelim*, xiii, 1) likewise denotes a razor. The pruning-knife was called מַזְמֵרָה (Isa. ii, 4; xviii, 5, etc.). See KNIFE.



Egyptian Knives and Lancets. Collected from various Sculptures.

Lancet Style. See ENGLISH STYLE.

LANCET-WINDOW is an architectural term for a narrow window with acutely-pointed arch head. This form was much used in England and Scotland during the early pointed period of Gothic architecture. Several lancet-windows are frequently grouped together, so as to produce a pleasing effect. In Scotland, the lancet-window was, like many other features of Scotch Gothic, retained to a much later period than in England.—Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Lancet-window. From Glasgow Cathedral.

Land (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words: properly אֶרֶץ, *e'rets*, usually rendered "*earth*," Gr. γῆ; and אֲדָמָה, *adamah'*, usually the "*ground*;" sometimes שָׂדֶה, *sadeh'*, elsewhere a "*field*," Gr. ἀγρός; also χώρα, a *tract* of land; etc.). This word in the Old Testament often denotes emphatically the country of the Israelites, at other times some particular country or district, as the land of Canaan, the land of Egypt, the land of Ashur, the land of Moab. In several places of our Authorized Version the phrase "all the earth" is used, when the more restricted phrase "the land," or "all the land," would be more proper. See AGRICULTURE; FARM; LANDED ESTATE.

Landau, JECHESKEL, a German Rabbi of note, was born about 1720. He flourished first as Rabbi of Jampol, Podolia, and later as chief Rabbi of Prague. He died in 1793. While yet a young man Landau gave promise of great ability as a polemic, and he displayed this quality to great advantage in the Sabbatarian controversy which raged between Eibeschütz [see JONATHAN EIBESCHÜTZ] and Emden. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. x, ch. xi, especially p. 409, 415, 438, Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 216 sq.

Landed Estate. It has been the custom to regard the Hebrews as a pastoral people until they were settled in Palestine. In a great degree they doubtless were so, and when they entered agricultural Egypt, the land of Goshen was assigned to them expressly because that locality was suited to their pastoral habits (Gen. xlvii, 4–6). These habits were substantially maintained; but it is certain that they became acquainted with the Egyptian processes of culture, and it is more than

probable that they raised for themselves such products of the soil as they required for their own use. We may, indeed, collect that the portion of their territory which lay in the immediate vicinity of the Nile was placed by them under culture (Deut. xi, 10), while the interior, with the free pastures of the desert beyond their immediate territory, sufficed abundantly for their cattle (1 Chron. vii, 21). This partial attention to agriculture was in some degree a preparation for the condition of cultivators, into which they were destined eventually to pass. While the Israelites remained in a state of subjection in Egypt, the maintenance of their condition as shepherds was highly instrumental in keeping them distinct and separate from the Egyptians, who were agriculturists, and had a strong dislike to pastoral habits (Gen. xlvi, 34). But when they became an independent and sovereign people, their separation from other nations was to be promoted by inducing them to devote their chief attention to the culture of the soil. A large number of the institutions given to them had this object of separation in view. Among these, those relating to agriculture—forming the agrarian law of the Hebrew people—were of the first importance. They might not alone have been sufficient to secure the end in view, but no others could have been effectual without them; for, without such attention to agriculture as would render them a self-subsisting people, a greater degree of intercourse with the neighboring and idolatrous nations must have been maintained than was consistent with the primary object of the Mosaic institutions. The commonest observation suffices to show how much less than others agricultural communities are open to external influences, and how much less disposed to cultivate intercourse with strangers. See HUSBANDRY.

It was, doubtless, in subservience to this object, and to facilitate the change, that the Israelites were put in possession of a country already in a high state of cultivation (Deut. vi, 11), and it was in order to retain them in this condition, to give them a vital interest in it, and to make it a source of happiness to them, that a very peculiar agrarian law was given to them. In stating this law, and in declaring it to have been in the highest degree wise and salutary, regard must be had to its peculiar object with reference to the segregation of the Hebrew people; for there are points in which this and other Mosaic laws were unsuited to general use, some by the very circumstances which adapted them so admirably to their special object. When the Israelites were numbered just before their entrance into the land of Canaan, and were found (exclusive of the Levites) to exceed 600,000 men, the Lord said to Moses, "Unto these the land shall be divided for an inheritance, according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to the few thou shalt give the less inheritance; to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers shall they inherit" (Numb. xxvi, 33–54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the agrarian law. By it provision was made for the support of 600,000 yeomen, with (according to different calculations) from sixteen to twenty-five acres of land to each. This land they held independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their sovereign, by whose power they were to acquire the territory, and under whose protection they were to enjoy and retain it. "The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine, saith the Lord: ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. xxv, 23). Thus the basis of the constitution was an equal agrarian law. But this law was guarded by other provisions equally wise and salutary. The accumulation of debt was prevented, first, by prohibiting every Hebrew from accepting interest from any of his fellow-citizens (Lev. xxv, 35, 36); next, by establishing a regular discharge of debts every seventh year; and, finally, by ordering that no lands could be alienated forever, but must, on each year of Jubilee, or every seventh Sabbatic year, revert to the families which originally possessed them. Thus, without absolutely depriving individuals of all temporary dominion over their landed property, it re-established, every fiftieth year, that original and equal distribution of it which was the foundation of the national polity; and as the period of this reversion was fixed and regular, all parties had due notice of the terms on which they negotiated, so that there was no ground for public commotion or private complaint. See JUBILEE.

This law, by which landed property was released in the year of Jubilee from all existing obligations, did not extend to houses in towns, which, if not redeemed within one year after being sold, were alienated forever (Lev. xv, 29, 30). This must have given to property in the country a decided advantage over property in cities, and must have greatly contributed to the essential object of all these regulations, by affording an inducement to every Hebrew to reside on and cultivate his land. Further, the original distribution of the land was to the several tribes according to their families, so that each tribe was, so to speak, settled in the same county, and each family in the same barony or hundred. Nor was the estate of any family in one tribe permitted to pass into another, even by the marriage of an heiress (Numb. xxvii); so that not only was the original balance of property preserved, but the closest and dearest connections of affinity attached to each other the inhabitants of every vicinage. See INHERITANCE.

It often happens that laws in appearance similar have in view entirely different objects. In Europe the entailment of estates in the direct line is designed to encourage the formation of large properties. In Israel the effect was entirely different, as the entail extended to all the small estates into which the land was originally divided, so that they could not legally be united to form a large property, and then entailed upon the descendants of him by whom the property was formed. This division of the land in small estates among the people, who were to retain them in perpetuity, was eminently suited to the leading objects of the Hebrew institutions. It is allowed on all hands that such a condition of landed property is in the highest degree favorable to high cultivation and to increase of population, while it is less favorable to pasturage. The first two were objects which the law had in view, and it did not intend to afford undue encouragement to the pastoral life, while the large pastures of the adjacent deserts and of the commons secured the country against such a scarcity of cattle as the division of the land into small heritages has already produced in France.

For this land a kind of quit-rent was payable to the sovereign Proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithe of the produce, which was assigned to the priesthood. See TITHES. The condition of military service was also attached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder (Deut. xx, 5) was obliged to attend at the general muster of the national army, and to serve in it, at his own expense (often more than repaid by the plunder), as long as the occasion required. In this direction, therefore, the agrarian law operated in securing a body of 600,000 men, inured to labor and industry, always assumed to be ready, as they were bound, to come forward at their country's call. This great body of national yeomanry, every one of whom had an important stake in the national independence, was officered by its own hereditary chiefs, heads of tribes and families (comp. Exod. xviii and Numb. xxxi, 14), and must have presented an insuperable obstacle to treacherous ambition and political intrigue, and to every attempt to overthrow the Hebrew commonwealth and establish despotic power. Nor were these institutions less wisely adapted to secure the state against foreign violence, and at the same time prevent offensive wars and remote conquests. For while this vast body of hardy yeomanry were always ready to defend their country, when assailed by foreign foes, yet,

as they were constantly employed in agriculture, attached to domestic life, and enjoyed at home the society of the numerous relatives who peopled their neighborhood, war must have been in a high degree alien to their tastes and habits. Religion also took part in preventing them from being captivated by the splendor of military glory. On returning from battle, even if victorious, in order to bring them back to more peaceful feelings after the rage of war, the law required them to consider themselves as polluted by the slaughter, and unworthy of appearing in the camp of Jehovah until they had employed an entire day in the rites of purification (Numb. xix, 13–16; xxxi, 19). Besides, the force was entirely infantry; the law forbidding even the kings to multiply horses in their train (Deut. xvii, 16); and this, with the ordinance requiring the attendance of all the males three times every year at Jerusalem, proved the intention of the legislator to confine the natives within the limits of the Promised Land, and rendered long and distant wars and conquests impossible without the virtual renunciation of that religion which was incorporated with their whole civil polity, and which was, in fact, the charter by which they held their property and enjoyed all their rights (Graves, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, lect. iv; Lowman, *Civil Gov. of the Heb.* ch. iii, iv; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, i, 240 sq.).

Landelin and **Landoald**, two saints of the Roman Catholic Church, are said to have flourished as preachers of the Gospel in Belgium in the 7th century. We have no trustworthy information as to their lives and proceedings. Among the aids which St. Amandus procured from Rome in 651 to help him in his missionary labors is mentioned the presbyter Landoald, probably an Anglo-Saxon. According to the history of Landoald, written in the 10th century by abbot Heriger von Lobbes, Landoald was especially supported in his missions by king Childeric II, who furnished him with all the necessary means. He is also said to have had Lambert of Maestricht for a pupil, and to have been nine years bishop as successor of St. Amandus. This latter assertion, however, is contradicted by the fact that Remaclus was the successor of Amandus; and it appears also a matter of doubt whether Lambert of Maestricht was indeed a pupil of Landoald.

Concerning Landelin, the Bollandists give, under date of June 15, an old biography, according to which he had been a pupil of Andebert, bishop of Cambray and Arras, had fled from his tutor, and supported himself for a while by highway robbery. The sudden death of one of his band, and a dream, in which he saw his former companion carried to hell by the devil, caused his conversion, and he subjected himself to strict penance in a convent, and made a pilgrimage to Rome. Subsequently consecrated deacon and presbyter, he made two more journeys to Rome, the last time accompanied by his pupils Adelenus and Domitianus. He is said to have founded the two convents of Lobbes and Crepin. According to the same account, Landelin died in 686, continuing his penances to the last.—Dörle, *Landelin, Apostel d. Deutschen* (Augsb. 1838); Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 335; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 187. (J. N. P.)

Land-mark (גְּבוּל, *gebul'*, or גְּבוּלָה, *gebulah'*, usually rendered "border" or "coast"), a *boundary-line* as indicated by a stake, stone, or other monument (Deut. xix, 14; xxvii, 17; Prov. xxii, 28; xxiii, 10; Job xxiv, 2). It was the manifest intention of Jehovah, in bringing the Hebrews into Canaan, to make them a nation of agriculturists. For this purpose the land was divided by lot and measurement among the tribes, families, and individuals of the nation. Thus every citizen had allotted to him a piece of ground, which he was to cultivate and leave to his descendants. The importance of preserving accurately the boundaries of individual or family possessions is very obvious; and, to prevent mistakes and litigation, the fields were marked off by stones set up on the limits, which could not be removed without incurring the wrath of heaven. The custom had doubtless prevailed long before (Job xxiv, 2), it was thus confirmed by express statute (Deut. xix, 14; xxvii, 17), and it appears to have been strictly perpetuated in later times (Prov. xxii, 28; xxiii, 10). Similar precautions were in use among the Romans, who had images or posts, called *Hermæ* or *termini*, set up on the line between different owners, which were under the patronage of a deity especially designated for that care (see Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* s. v. Terminus). Landmarks were used in Greece even before the age of Homer (*Iliad*, xxi, 405); and they are still used in Persia, and in various parts of the East. Even to this day fields in the East have no fences or hedges, but a ridge, a stone, or a post occasionally marks the boundary; consequently, it is not very difficult to encroach on the property of another (see Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 167). See Hedge.

Lando or **Landon**, a Roman pontiff, was a native of Sabina, but the date of his birth is not known. Indeed, but little is accessible as to his personal history until he came to the pontifical chair in 913. He held the pontificate only about six months, for he died about April 27, 914. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, v, 89 sq.

Landoald. See Landelin.

Landon, Whittington, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of England, was for some time provost of Worcester College, Oxford. In 1813 he was appointed dean of Exeter, and in 1821 prebendary of Salisbury. He died in 1839. Some of his sermons were published in London (1812, 8vo, and in 1835, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, ii, 1053.

Landsborough, David, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born at Dalvy, Galloway, Scotland, in 1782. He was pastor of the parish of Stevenson from 1811 to 1843, and of a Free-Church congregation at Saltcoats from 1843 until his death in 1854. Mr. Landsborough was very eminent as a naturalist, and wrote several treatises on botany and zoology. He also contributed frequently to Dr. Harvey's *Psychologia Britannica*, and published papers in the *Annals* and *Magazine of Natural History*.—Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, ii, 1056.

Landsperger, Johann, a Carthusian monk, who obtained distinction by his voluminous ascetic writings, was born in Landsperg, Bavaria, in the latter part of the 15th century; studied in Cologne, was made prior of his order near Julich, and died about 1534. On account of his marked and severe piety, he was called *the Just*. Among his works, which were published in many editions at Cologne, are, *Sermones capitulares in præcipuis anni festivitatibus*:—*Vita Servatoris N.I.X.*:—*Paraphrases in dominicales Epistolas et Evangelia*:—*Alloquia Jesu Christi ad fidelem animam*:—*Enchiridion vitæ spiritualis ad perfectionem*:—*Pharetra divini amoris*. Landsperger was the first to publish the *Revelations of the Holy Gertrude*.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 342.

Landulph. See Patarians.

Lane (ῥύμη, so rendered in Luke xiv, 21; elsewhere "street"), a narrow passage or *alley* in a city, in distinction from a principal thoroughfare (πλατεῖα). See Street.

Lane, George, a Methodist minister of considerable note, was born in the State of New York April 13, 1784. He was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1805, and located in 1810; was readmitted in 1819, and again located in 1825; but was readmitted once more in 1834. In 1836 he was elected assistant agent of the Methodist Book-Concern at New York. In this capacity first, and later in that of principal agent, he served until 1852, when he retired from all active duties in the Church. He died May 6, 1859. Under his prudent management, the publishing house, then at 200 Mulberry Street, assumed almost gigantic proportions,

his industrious and economical business habits having gained him the confidence both of the Church and of the general public. For about twelve years he was also treasurer of the Missionary Society of the M. E. Church. By his energy and business tact this society was relieved of a debt of about sixty thousand dollars, which had long crippled its powers of usefulness. Such was his earnestness in the missionary cause that he was frequently entitled the "father of the Missionary Society." "As a preacher, Mr. Lane was thoroughly orthodox, systematic, and earnest, and often overwhelmingly eloquent; his language unstudied, but chaste, correct, simple, and forcible."—Peck, *Early Methodism*, p. 492 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii.

Lane, John, an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia about 1789. His early life was spent in Georgia, and he was some time a student of Franklin College. In 1814 he entered the South Carolina Conference; in 1815 was sent to the "Natchez Circuit," and was thrown much in contact with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, where his heroism and success were alike conspicuous; in 1816 he assisted in organizing the Mississippi Conference, then a vast and almost trackless region, now constituting four Conferences and part of a fifth. In 1820 he was delegate to the General Conference at Baltimore, and presiding elder on the Mississippi District. During this year his father-in-law, Rev. Newit Vick, died, and Mr. Lane was obliged to locate, to care for his large estate and numerous family. He remained located for eleven years, during which he successfully founded the city of Vicksburg on his father-in-law's estate, and so saved it, and educated the orphan children. He was also an extensive merchant, probate judge of the county, and director of the Railroad Bank, and one of the most competent and influential business men of the state, while at the same time he preached continually, and filled Vicksburg station one year. In 1831 he re-entered the Conference, and spent most of his subsequent career in the presiding eldership. For many years he was president of the Board of Trustees of Centenary College, and was still longer president of the Conference Missionary Society. He died in 1855. He was a man of large capacities and indomitable vigor. His piety was genial and earnest, and his great delight was in preaching the Word of Life. He will long be remembered as one of the founders of Methodism in the South-west.—Summer, *Biog. Sketches*, p. 229, Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii. (G. L. T.)

Laney, Benjamin, D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, was bishop of Peterborough from 1650 to 1663; was then transferred to Lincoln, where he remained until 1667, when he was transferred to the bishopric of Ely. He died about 1675. Some of his sermons were published in 1662 and 1675. He was considered a very learned divine, and of great acumen.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, ii, 1056.

Lanfranc, the most noted foreign churchman who rose to distinction in the English Church of the Middle Ages, was born of a senatorial family in Pavia, Italy, about 1005; studied law in Bologna, but not without attention to other subjects; returned to Pavia, where he taught jurisprudence, and also the liberal arts, with great success. He soon gave his attention exclusively to the latter, the *liberales disciplinæ*, and especially to dialectics, and, leaving his own country, he travelled over a large part of France, until, induced perhaps by the fame of William, duke of Normandy, he settled in Avranches with some of his old pupils. He there won great distinction as a teacher, but in 1042, having determined upon a more private and contemplative life, he betook himself to Rouen, where, in fulfillment of such a purpose, according to his biographer Crispinus, he proposed to reside. On his way thither he was fallen upon by robbers, bound to a tree, and there, stricken in conscience for what he deemed a too selfish fear, and for his unfitness to find consoling communion with God in the hour of peril, he made a vow, should he escape with his life, to enter a monastery. Delivered from the hands of the robbers by some passing travellers, he entered the cloister of Bec, of the Benedictine Order. After three years of quiet, he began again, at the instance of Herluin, the abbot of Bec, to give instruction, and Bec became the resort of students from every class, both clergy and laity, and from many lands. Made prior of the monastery in 1046, he established a more extensive and systematic course of study, sacred as well as secular, unusual attention being given to grammar and dialectics. In respect to the former, Lanfranc's influence contributed greatly to revive the general study of Latin, and in dialectics he is a forerunner of the schoolmen. Exegesis, and patristic, but especially speculative theology, were pursued. Anselm was among his pupils at Bec, and also the future pope Alexander II. During this period, about 1049, occurred Lanfranc's first dispute with his former friend Berengar, then archdeacon at Angers, on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The latter, while defending the opinions of Scotus Erigena, sought in a letter to persuade Lanfranc; but the letter, falling into the hands of others, gave rise to such charges of heretical fellowship against Lanfranc that he was provoked, in defending himself at Rome and Vercelli in 1050, to a violent attack upon Berengar. The learning which he displayed in this controversy greatly increased Lanfranc's fame for scholarship, and he was now invited to the position of abbot in various cloisters, and was treated with special favor by William of Normandy. It is related that, on occasion of some false charges, the duke fell out with him, and banished him from his dominions. A lame horse was given him for the journey, and, seated on it, he happened to meet the duke, who could not help noticing the laughable hobbling of the animal, when Lanfranc took occasion to say to him, "You must give me a better horse if you wish me out of the country, for with this one I shall never get over the border." The jest won the duke's attention, and an explanation followed, which established Lanfranc in a position of permanent favor. He was employed by William in 1060 to secure from the pope Nicholas II liberty to marry a near relative, a princess of Flanders. This allowance was obtained on the condition that William should found two cloisters, one for monks and another for nuns. Over the monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, which was thereupon established, Lanfranc was installed in 1063 as abbot, Anselm succeeding him in that capacity at Bec. The dispute with Berengar meanwhile continued. The latter, though constrained at Rome in 1059, through fear, to recognise the doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus, nevertheless afterwards sought to spread his former sentiments, and was bitterly opposed by Lanfranc in his work, *De corpore et sanguine Dom. Jesu Christi, adv. Berengar Turonensem*, published between the years 1064 and 1069. In this work the doctrine of transubstantiation is clearly contained. Berengar issued a reply, *De sacra cœna adv. Lanfrancum* (an edition of which was published by Vischer in Berlin in 1834). The ability with which this controversy was conducted on both sides has been confessed. Severe personal charges are mingled with argument, and, whatever fault may have been established against Berengar, his opponent was not without blame nor without prejudice in dealing with patristic authorities. While at Caen, Lanfranc steadfastly refused the archbishopric of Rouen, but, upon the advice of his old abbot Herluin, he accepted in 1070, with much reluctance, the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was urged upon him by William of Normandy, at this time on the throne of England. His task in the archbishopric was by no means light, inasmuch as he was obliged not only to control and amend the rudeness and ignorance of his own clergy, but to defend also the authority of his primacy against the other prelates, especially Thomas of York and Odo of Bayeux and Kent. The self-will of the king also gave him much trouble,

and he was frequently tempted to retrace his steps to the cloister, but was urged by pope Alexander II to continue his public labors. The violent disposition of William Rufus, who ascended the throne in 1087, was a further annoyance. Notwithstanding all these difficulties, he labored perseveringly in the erection of churches and cloisters, in multiplying correct copies of the fathers and of the holy Scriptures, in the extension of learning and improvement of manners in clergy and people, and in care for the sick and the poor. "Under his spiritual rule," says a noted Church historian, "the Church of England received as strong an infusion of the Norman element as was forced upon the political system of England by the iron hand of the Conqueror." His active and prudent influence was also often employed in state affairs.

Lanfranc's relation, while archbishop of Canterbury, to the papal chair forms an important feature of his life. He was on a friendly footing with Alexander II, his former pupil, and went to receive at his hands the pallium of his office, though he had at first desired, in accordance with the king's wishes, that it should be sent to him to England. Gregory VII, greatly displeased with William's independent conduct, and his inclination to restrain the bishops from visiting Rome, sharply complained to Lanfranc that he had also lost his former spirit of obedience to papal authority. Lanfranc protested his continued affection for the Church, and declared that he had sought to win the king to conformity in certain particulars (as specially in the matter of Peter's pence), but said little concerning his general relation to the king, or that of the latter to the pope. He seems to have known that a certain degree of consideration, more than he liked definitely to express, must be allowed to the royal wishes. The pope's command to Lanfranc to appear in Rome within four months under threat of suspension he openly and without answer disobeyed. A letter of Lanfranc to an unknown correspondent (*Ep.* 59), who sought to gain his adhesion to the rival pope, Clement II, places him in a neutral position as between the two popes, and as awaiting, with the government of England, further light on the subject. Something of Lanfranc's coldness towards Gregory may perhaps be explained by the fact that he saw in this pope (as is apparent in a letter cited by Gieseler) a protector of his enemy Berengar. Lanfranc died May 28, 1089, two years after the death of William the Conqueror.

Besides his work against Berengar may be mentioned his *Decreta pro ordine Sancti Benedicti:—Epistolarum Liber*, containing 60 letters, 44 written by him and 16 addressed to him:—*De celanda confessione*, a fragment of an address in defence of his primatical authority; and *Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles*. His biography of William the Conqueror has been lost. The first complete edition of Lanfranc's writings was published by D'Achery, a Benedictine (Paris, 1648, fol.); the earliest edition is entitled *B. Lanfranci Opera* (Paris, 1568, fol.); the latest edition is by Giles (Ox. 1844–45, 2 vols. 8vo).

See Milo Crispinus, *Vita B. Lanfranci*; Cadmer, *Vita Anselmi; Chronicon Biccense;* Malmesbury, *Gesta Anglorum*, book iii; *Acta Sanctorum*, Maii, tom. vi; Möhler, *Gesamelte Schriften*, vol. i; Hasse, *Anselm*, vol. i; Sudendorf, *Berengarius Turonensis* (Hamburg and Gotha, 1850); Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 102; Churton, *Early English Church*, p. 266, 291 sq., 302; Palmer, *Ch. Hist.* p. 106 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii, 438–440; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ii (1861); Hill, *Monasticism in England*, p. 337 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Lang, Georg Heinrich, a distinguished German theologian, was born Nov. 28, 1740, at Oettingen. He received a scientific education in his native town, and pursued theology at the University of Jena. In 1765 he assumed a pastorate at Bühl, and in 1770 accepted a call to Hohen-und-Nieder-Altheim. From 1774 to 1779 he filled the position of superintendent and pastor at Trochtelsingen, and in the latter year returned to his late pastorate. In 1789 he became court preacher and ecclesiastical counsellor to the reigning princess at Ratisbon. He died March 15, 1806. Lang exerted no little influence in the progress and culture of religious learning. His Dictionary of the N. T. (*Wörterbuch des neuen Testamentes*), which appeared in 1778, placed him in the front rank of writers on the theory and history of the Christian religion. His intense zeal for the practical in later life directed his literary activity to the popular treatment of religious truth; hence appeared *Katechetisches Magazin; Neues Magazin; Ascetische Bibliothek*, and numerous sermons and liturgical writings. In his homiletical writings he developed many new and happy ideas, peculiarly adapted to the exigencies of the times. Many estimable traits of character both adorned his private life and enhanced his merits as a teacher of religious truth. For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 229.

Lang, Joseph, a German Jesuit, was born in 1746 at Brünn, in Bohemia, and was educated at his native city. The Jesuits then sent him to Olmütz to pursue philosophy, and finally to the University of Prague, where he completed a course of theology. He was ordained in 1773. In 1780 he accepted a call to a Catholic Church in Leipzic, and in 1783 was chosen court preacher at Dresden. In 1802 he received the office of superintendent of the Catholic infirmary at the latter place. He died Dec. 28, 1806. Lang acquired the reputation of a popular and eloquent pulpit orator. Besides frequent contributions to journals, he published several sermons. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 233.

Lang, Lorenz Johann Jakob, a German theologian, born in Selb, in the principality of Baireuth, on May 10, 1731, was the son of a stocking-maker, and being destined by his father to follow the same trade, he contended in his desire for study, which he early manifested, with many difficulties. By the assistance of his pastor, however, he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Latin and Greek, and entered in 1743 the lyceum at Culmbach. Indefatigable in his industry, he became thoroughly versed in philosophy and theology, as is evinced in the disputations *De præstantia philosophiæ Wolfianæ*, and *De pontifice cœlesti Novi Testamenti*, after the defence of which he entered the University of Erlangen in 1751. After quitting Erlangen, he went to Baireuth in 1756 as tutor. A few months later he became subrector in Baireuth. In 1758 he was appointed professor of the Oriental languages and of the fine arts at the Gymnasium of Baireuth. In 1767 he was appointed court librarian, and in 1789 the first professor and inspector of the alumni, and in 1795 the first counsellor. He died Sept. 18, 1801. Lang wrote extensively, but most of his writings are in the form of dissertations. A complete list is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. .i, s. v.

Lang (OF WELLENBURG), **Matthäus**, a noted German prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, an acknowledged natural brother of the emperor Maximilian I, was born in Augsburg in 1469, and educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He was secretary first to Frederick III and later to Maximilian I. At the same time he held positions in the Church. He was successively priest at Augsburg and Constance until 1505, when he was appointed bishop of Gurk. Inclined towards the schismatics of the Council of Pisa, and feared on account of his influence over the emperor, who was following the lead of Lang, the youthful bishop received the cardinal's hat from pope Julius II in 1511. Of course the conferred honor made the trusted adviser of Maximilian an obedient servant of the pontiff. Lang rested not until peace was restored between emperor and pope, so long at variance. See LATERAN, COUNCIL OF, 1513; PISA, COUNCIL OF; JULIUS II. In 1514 he was made coadjutor of the archbishop of Salzburg, and in 1519 sole incumbent

of that archiepiscopal see. In 1518 he attended the diet at Augsburg, and was active both for the election of Charles V as king of Rome, and the submission of Luther. First inclined to liberal action towards those who clamored for reform, threatening to quit the Church unless their wishes were heeded, he changed front suddenly after he had gained over Johann Staupitz (q. v.); crushed the revolutionary movements of the Salzburgers in 1523; in the year following joined the Romish *League* (q. v.); and in 1525, assisted by Bavaria, suppressed the peasant insurrections. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 he openly declared himself a bitter opponent of Luther. He died in March, 1540. A narrative of cardinal Lang's travels in Austria, Hungary, and the Tyrol was published by his chaplain Bartholinus, under the title *Odeporicon de Matthæi cardinalis* (Vienna, 1511, 4to). This work is now very rare (comp. Götz, *Dresdener Bibliothek*, iii, 37). Vehse (*Memoirs of the Court, Aristocracy and Diplomacy of Austria* [transl. by Demmler, Lond. 1856, 2 vols. sm. 8vo], i, 31) thus comments on his character: "Lang was an exceedingly eloquent and adroit man, yet he was just as famous for his elasticity of conscience as for cleverness. He surpassed in splendor all the cardinals and archbishops of his time, and in this respect certainly did not belie his Cæsarean descent." See also Hansitz, *Germania Sacra*, vol. ii; Dücker, *Chronik v. Salzburg;* Braun, *Gesch. d. B. B. V. Augsburg*, vol. iii; Veith, *Bibliotheca Augustana*, Alphabet v, p. 25–116; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 348. See also the article MAXIMILIAN. (J. H. W.)

Langbaine, GERARD, D.D., an English divine and philologist, was born at Bartonkirke, in Westmoreland, about 1608. He studied at Blencow, Cumberland, then became successively a servitor, scholar, and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and held the places of keeper of archives to the university and provost of his college for a good many years before his death, which happened in 1658. He was a studious and timid man, who contrived to steer through the political storms of his time without giving serious offence to any party. He edited Longinus, and published several works of his own, chiefly on Church questions. The most important of them are, *Episcopal Inheritance*, etc. (Oxford, 1641, 4to):—*A Review of the Covenant* (Oxford, 1644; Lond. 1661, 4to):—*Quæstiones pro more solemni in Vesperiis propositæ ann.* 1651 (Oxf. 1658, 4to). He also worked on Usher's *Chronologia Sacra*, transl. from the French into English an account of the Council of Trent (Oxford, 1638, fol.), and is considered the author of *A View of the New Directory, and a Vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1645, 4to). He left also some unprinted collections, including several catalogues of MSS., which have often been referred to by Warton and others. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. ii; Chaufepié, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique; English Cyclopædia;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxix, 384. (J. N. P.)

Langdon, SAMUEL, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1722 in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1740, and was ordained colleague pastor in Portsmouth, N. H., Feb. 4, 1747. In 1774 he was elected president of Harvard College, which position he resigned Aug. 30, 1780, and was ordained, Jan. 18, 1781, pastor at Hampton Falls. He died in the last-named place Nov. 29, 1797. Langdon published *An impartial Examination of Mr. Robert Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspasio* (1765):—*A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, drawn up principally in Scripture language* (1768):—*Dudleian Lecture in Harvard College* (1775):—*Observations on the Revelations of Jesus Christ to St. John* (1791, 8vo):—*Corrections of some grand Mistakes committed by Rev. John Cozens Ogden* (1792):—*Remarks on the leading Sentiments of Rev. Dr. Hopkins's System of Doctrines in a Letter to a Friend* (1794); and several occasional sermons. He also published, in company with Col. J. Blanchard, a map of New Hampshire (1761).—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 455.

Lange, Joachim, a noted German Lutheran theologian, one of the heads of the so-called Pietistic school, was born at Gardelegen, in Saxony, Oct. 26, 1670. He entered the University of Leipzic in 1689 to study theology. Here he became intimate with H. A. Franke, and, besides other subjects, applied himself especially to the study of the Eastern languages. In 1690 he accompanied Franke to Erfurt, and in 1691 to Halle. In 1696 he was made corector of Köslin, rector of the Gymnasium of Friedrichswerder, at Berlin, in 1697, and finally professor of theology at Halle, May 7, 1744. His controversies against the philosopher Christian Wolff, in whose banishment from Halle he was greatly instrumental, and against all philosophical systems, whether atheistical, Jewish, or Mohammedan, prove him to have been fond of controversy, more learned than profound, and greatly wanting in method. The part he played in the Pietistic controversies was not very brilliant. It is not certain, but appears probable, that he was the author of the *Orthodoxia vapulans* (1701) against the theologians of Wittenberg (see G. Walch, *Lehrstreitt. innerhalb d. evang. luth. Kirche*, i, 844 sq.). His *Antibarbarus orthodoxiæ* (1709–11), written in answer to Schelwig's *Synopsis Controversiarum sub pietatis prætextu motarum*, is a good specimen of his system, which generally attached itself to particular points of a subject instead of the whole. G. Walch (see above) gives an extensive list of his other works on this topic. His controversy with Christian Wolff, the distinguished pupil of Leibnitz, is the most important. The school of the latter had produced the Bible of Wertheim, which Lange attacked in his *Der philos. Religionsspötter im ersten Theile d. Werthheimischen Bibelwerkes verkoppt* (1735; 2d edit. 1736). In that work he advanced his favorite theory, which he further developed in his later writings against Wolff and others, that their philosophical system was purely mechanical. This was followed by his *Darstellung d. Grundsätze d. Wolffischen Philosophie* (Lpz. 1736, 4to), and the 150 *Fragen aus der neuen mechanischen Philosophie* (Halle, 1734). He had already given some inklings of his views of this system in his *Caussa Dei adversus Atheismum et Pseudophilosophiam, præsertim Stoicam, Spinoz. ad Wolfianam* (2d ed. Halle, 1727, 8vo) (see H. Wuttke, *Christian Wolff's eigene Lebensbeschreibung*, Lpz. 1841, Preface). Some of Lange's exegetical works are yet in use; such are *Comm. hist.-herm. de vita et epistolis Pauli* (Halle, 1718, 4to):—*Mosaisches Licht u. Recht* (Halle, 1732, fol.), a sort of commentary on all the books of the O. T. Also commentaries on various other books of Scripture, published at different times, and collectively under title *Biblia parenthetica* (Leipzic, 1743, 2 vols. fol.). Also *Exegesis epp. Petri* (Halle, 1712):—*Joannis* (1713, 4to). Among his historical works we notice *Gestalt d. Kreuzreichs Christi in seiner Unschuld.* (Halle, 1713, 8vo):—*Erläuterung d. neuesten Historie d. evang. Kirche* v. 1689 bis 1719 (Halle, 1719, 8vo). Among his doctrinal works the most important is his *Œconomia salutis evangelicæ* (2d edition, Halle, 1730, 8vo; German translation 1738, often reprinted), against predestination; which met with great success. Finally he published also a Latin Grammar, which was for a long time very popular, and went through a great many editions; and an *Autobiographie*, to which is appended a list of his works (Halle and Lpz. 1744). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 194; Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 251 sq.; Rotermund, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s. v.; Dorner, *Doctrine and Person of Christ*, II, ii, 369, 376. (J. H. W.)

Lange, Johann Michael, a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Etzelwangen, near Sulzbach, March 9, 1664. He became successively pastor of Hohenstrauss, Halle, Altdorf, and Prenziow, where he died Jan. 10, 1731. He wrote fifty-six different works (see the list in Rotermund, *Lex.* iii, 1227), of which the principal are *Aphorismi Theologici* (Altdorf, 1687):—*De Fabulis Mohamedicis* (Altdorf, 1697, 4to):—*Exercitatio Philologica de differentia linguæ Græcorum veteris et novæ seu barbaro-Græcæ* (2d edit. Altd. 1702):

—Decas I disputatt. theolog. exegeticarum cum positivo polemicarum numero sacro (Altd. 1703, 4to):—*De Alcorani prima inter Europæos editione Arabica per Paganinum Brixiensem, sed jussu Pontif. Rom. abolita* (Altdorf, 1703):—*De Alcorano Arabico et variis speciminibus atque novissimis successibus doctorum quorumdam virorum in edendo Alcorano Arabico* (Altdorf, 1704):—*De Alcorani versionibus variis, tam oriental. quam occidental, impressis et ἀνεκδόσεις* (Altdorf, 1705):—*Octo Dissertationes de Versione N. T. barbaro-Græca* (Altd. 1705):—*Institutiones Pastorales* (Nuremb. 1707):—*Philologia barbaro-Græca*, etc. (Nuremb. 1707–8, 2 parts, 4to). See Zeltner, *Vitæ Theolog.* (Altd.), p. 468–488; Will, *Lexicon*, ii, 394–405; Rotermund, *Suppl. z. Jöcher;* Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 391. (J. N. P.)

Langeais, Raoul de, a French prelate, was born in the beginning of the 11th century. He was brother of Fulchredus, abbot of Charroux. Raoul became successively dean of the Church of Tours and bishop of that diocese in 1072. His election, however, caused great disturbances. His enemies having accused him of incest before Alexander II, the latter deposed and excommunicated him. Raoul immediately set out for Rome, justified himself, and was restored to his bishopric. When Gregory VII succeeded Alexander II the accusation was taken up again, but with like result. Still the whole Church of France was at the time in a state of complete anarchy, and the bishop of Tours was treated with the utmost disrespect by his clergy, and especially by the monks, in spite of the evident favor of the pope. In 1078 he was accused of simony before the Council of Poitiers, and unable, it is said, to clear himself otherwise, he broke up the council by main force (compare Labbe, *Concil.* x, 366; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 497). Still Gregory VII merely appointed a committee to inquire into the case. How this committee decided is not known, but all trouble was at an end in 1079, for we then find Gregory writing to Raoul inviting him to recognise Gebuin, archbishop of Lyons, whom he had appointed primate of Gaul, and about the same time Raoul was invited to the Council of Badeaux by the legate Amat, who calls him "religionis ecclesiasticæ caput honorabilius." Shortly afterwards he excommunicated Foulques Rechin, count of Anjou, and Gebuin approved his proceedings; but king Philip, angered at Langeais for siding with Gregory VII on the question of investiture, took the part of the count. Langeais was driven from his see, and excommunicated by the canons of St. Martin; the pope, in return, excommunicated the count of Anjou and all his partisans, while Hughes and Amat, legates of the council of Poitiers, excommunicated the canons of St. Martin. It is difficult to form a correct judgment of these events. It is likely, however, that all the trouble resulted from the fact that Langeais had entered zealously into the plans of reformation of Gregory VII, and therefore, while praised by this pope and his adherents, became necessarily, as a leader of his party in France, an object of hatred to the opposite faction. Documents show that he was governing his diocese again in 1084 and 1086. The exact time of his death is not ascertained, but he must have died previous to the year 1093. See J. Maan, *Sacr. et Metr. eccl. Turon.; Gallia Christ.* vol. xiv, col. 63; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxix, 394 sq.

Langeland (Langland or Longland), John, a distinguished prelate of the Church of England, was born at Henley, England, in 1473, and was fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and principal of Magdalen Hall in 1507. In 1520 he became bishop of Lincoln, and confessor to Henry VIII, whom he counseled to divorce queen Catharine. He died in 1547. He published a number of sermons and theological treatises from 1517 to 1540.—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1057; Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1452.

Langham, Simon of, an English prelate, was born about 1310, probably at Langham, in Rutlandshire. In 1335 he entered the convent of St. Peter, Westminster, of which he became abbot in 1349, and showed great zeal in the reformation of monastic abuses. As a reward for his talents Edward III appointed him lord treasurer in 1360, and chancellor in 1364. In the mean time (1361) he had been appointed bishop of Ely. In 1366 he was transferred to the see of Canterbury. The principal act of his administration was the deposing of the celebrated Wycliffe (whom his predecessor had appointed head of Canterbury Hall, Oxford) on the plea that a secular priest was not suitable for the position. This injustice perhaps first suggested to Wycliffe an inquiry into papal abuses. His proceedings on that occasion gave great offence to Edward III, and when the pope, as a reward, created Langham cardinal of St. Sixtus, the king seized on his temporalities, as, by the law, the see of Canterbury had become vacant by the promotion. Langham now went to join the pope, who loaded him with favors. He continued to take a part in the political affairs of England, vainly trying to reconcile that country to France. During the last years of his life Gregory XI intrusted him with the care of the papal affairs at Avignon, where he died July 22, 1376. His body was taken back to England, and buried at Westminster. See Wharton, *Anglia Sacra;* Moser, *Life of Simon of Langham*, in the *European Magazine*, 1797; Th. Tanner, *Biblioth. Britannica;* Baluze, *Vitæ Pap. Aven.* vol. i; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 409; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. viii); Neander, *Church Hist.* v, 136.

Langhorne, John, a minister of the Church of England, was born in Westmoreland, England, in 1735; obtained a curacy in London in 1764; in 1767 he was appointed to the living of Blagden, Somersetshire, in 1777 became prebendary of Wells, and died in 1779. Langhorne published several works both in prose and poetry; also a volume of his *Sermons, preached before the honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn* (3d ed. Lond. 1773, 2 vols. small 8vo). "His sermons are short, florid, and superficial." His most famous work was his translation of *Plutarch's Lives*, on which his brother assisted. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1765; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, ii, 1057.

Langhorne, William, M.A., an English divine, was born in 1721. He was presented to the rectory of Hakinge, and received the perpetual curacy of Folkestone in 1754. He died in 1772. He assisted his brother, John Langhorne, D.D., in the translation of a popular version of *Plutarch's Lives*, and wrote himself *Sermons on practical Subjects, and the most useful Points of Divinity* (2d edition, Lond. 1778, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Job*, a poem; and a paraphrase in verse of a part of *Isaiah*. See Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), p. 1368.

Lanigan, John, D.D., an eminent Irish Roman Catholic priest, was born at Cashel, Ireland, in 1758, and received his scientific and theological education at the Irish College in Rome, where he also took his orders. Soon after he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew, divinity, and the Scriptures in the University of Pavia. In 1796 he was elected to a similar position at Maynooth, Ireland, but declined it, and accepted an appointment in Dublin Castle, in connection with which he assumed in 1799 the duties of editor, librarian, and translator for the Dublin Society. In 1821, becoming insane, he was placed in an asylum at Finglas, near Dublin, where he died, July 7, 1828. Among his works are the following important ones: *Institutionum Biblicarum pars prima* (Paviæ, 1794, 8vo):—*Protestant's Apology for the Roman Catholic Church* (1809, 8vo):—*Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century* (Dublin, 1822, 4 vols. 8vo; 1829, 4 vols. 8vo), a work much valued for its extensive learning, deep research, and critical acumen. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* x, 304; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, ii, 1058.

Langle, Jean Maximilian de, a French Protestant writer, was born at Evreux in 1590, and was made

pastor at Rouen in 1615. He died there in 1674. Besides a dissertation in defence of Charles I of England, he wrote *Les joyes inénarrables et glorieuses de l'âme fidèle, représentées en quinze Sermons sur le huitième chap. de l'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains* (Saumur, 1669, 8vo); and *Sermons sur divers textes de l'écriture.* —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 414.

Langres, Synod of. From the acts of the Concilium Tullense of June, 859, it appears that another (*Concilium Lingonense*) had a short time before been held at Langres by the bishops of Charles the Young, king of Provence, nephew of Charles the Bald, and son of Lothair I, to whom Langres belonged as part of Burgundy. We find sixteen *canones* adopted at Langres still extant. These were read again in the Synod of Toul (Savonnières), and incorporated in the acts of that synod's session held in the early part of June, 859. The *canones* refer partly to political and canonical points, partly to dogmas. The assembled clergy availed themselves of the opportunity afforded them by the synod to obtain from the princes Charles the Bald, Lothair II, and Charles the Young the convocation of yearly provincial synods, and two yearly general synods (can. 7). An attempt was also made to take the election of bishops out of the hands of the laity, wherever these still retained this right, and to leave it exclusively with the clergy, under the plea that the metropolitan and bishops of the diocese were alone able to judge of the qualifications of candidates (can. 8). Great opposition was also manifested against the independence of convents from the episcopacy, the interest of discipline requiring that such institutions should be visited by the bishops (can. 9). They only maintained the right of the convents to appoint their superiors themselves (can. 9 and 12). Much was also done in regard to the building of churches, the administration of Church property, etc. (can. 13); the establishing of schools (can. 10), and the restoration of *hospitalia, peregrinorum videlicet, et aliorum pro remedio animarum receptacula* (can. 14). The intervention of the temporal power was invoked against *raptores, adulteri vel rapaces*, which latter were to be also punished by the Church with the full severity of her discipline. But the most important of the decrees adopted by this synod are those which refer to the dogma of predestination. It is in this Synod of Langres that the bishops of Provence appear to have prepared the whole matter, so as to have it ready to be submitted to the Synod of Toul for the three Carolinian kingdoms (Neustria, Lorraine, and Provence). King Charles was himself present, with a view to prevent the proceedings becoming a basis for the decrees of the future Synod of Toul. In the kingdom of Charles the Bald the semi-Pelagian views of Hincmar on that dogma were most generally held, whilst in the ancient provinces of Lothair I the Augustinian views were still officially retained. As the coming Synod of Toul was intended to settle all disputes between the two kingdoms in regard to political and religious questions, the preparatory Synod of Langres had either to recall the Augustinian resolutions of the Synod of Valence, or to alter them in such a manner that they might no longer give offence. They could not agree to do the former, and the six *canones* of Valence were endorsed; but the expressions against the Synod of Kiersy, which offended Hincmar and his followers (capitula quatuor quæ a concilio fratrum nostrorum minus prospecte suscepta sunt propter inutilitatem vel etiam noxietatem et errorem contrarium veritati [a pio auditu fidelium penitus explodimus]) were omitted from the fourth canon. That this was but a half-way and inefficient measure had already been sufficiently established by Hincmar himself in his work on predestination, cap. 30: if the canons of Valence were retained, it should be done openly, and they should be courageously defended, and then the protestation against the four principles of Kiersy could not be considered omitted; but if these were omitted, then it would be consistent to drop the resolutions of the Council of Valence (comp. Hincmari *Opp.* ed. Sirm. i, 231). Its inefficiency was subsequently made evident in the proceedings of the *Concilium Tullense I apud Saponarias.* See Mansi, xv, 537; Hardouin, v, 481; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 4th edit. ii, 1, 137; Gfrörer, *K.-G.* iii, 2, 881; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 196. (J. N. P.)

Langton, Stephen, one of the greatest prelates of the early English Church, celebrated alike in ecclesiastical and secular history, was born in the earlier half of the 12th century, according to one account in Lincolnshire, according to another in Devonshire, and was educated at the University of Paris, where he was the fellow-student and associate of Innocent III. Immediately after the completion of his studies he was appointed teacher in the university, and, by successive advances, finally rose to the office of its chancellor. On his visit to Rome about the year 1206, pope Innocent III honored him with the purple by the title of *Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus;* and when, by the rejection for the archbishopric of Canterbury of the claims both of Reginald, the subprior of Christchurch, whom his brother monks, without consultation of the king, had in the first instance appointed to succeed the last archbishop, Hubert, and of John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, whom they had afterwards substituted in deference to the commands of king John, another choice had to be made, Innocent III favored his old school-associate rather than the appointment of John de Gray, and Langton was consequently elected by the English monks who were then at Rome, and was consecrated by Innocent at Viterbo June 27, 1207. John's determined resistance to this nomination gave rise to the contest between him and the pontiff which had such important results. See Innocent III; John, king of England. The consequence, in so far as Langton was concerned, was, that he was kept out of his see for about six years; till at last, after the negotiation concluded by the legate Pandulf, John and the cardinal met at Winchester in July, 1213, and the latter was fully acknowledged as archbishop. In the close union, however, that now followed between John and Innocent, Langton, finding his own interests and those of the clergy in general, in so far as they were opposed to those of the king, disregarded by the pope, joined the cause of the English barons, among whom the eminence of his station and the ascendency of his talents soon gave him a high influence, and in whose councils he at once took a prominent part. At the meeting of the heads of the revolters and the king at Runnymede he was present, and it was through his efforts that the charter of Henry I was renewed. Among the subscribing witnesses to the *Magna Charta* his name stands first; and from henceforth we find him devoted to the cause of the national liberties, which he had just joined, without swerving throughout the rest of the contest, a course by which he greatly offended the pope. Indeed, so sincerely devoted to the interests of his native country was Stephen Langton that he hesitated not to act not only in direct opposition to the wishes of his friend, the Roman pontiff, but he even refused to comply with his demand to publish the document containing the announcement of excommunication of the barons who had rebelled against the king, a punishment which Innocent sought to inflict in order to please John, whose warm partisan he had become after 1213. Langton did not waver even when threatened with expulsion from the archiepiscopal see; he was suspended in 1215, but was restored in the year following (in February), and was in his place in 1218 on the accession of Henry III. From this time forward Langton busied himself chiefly with the affairs of the Church, instituted many reforms, caused the translation of Becket's relics into a magnificent shrine of gold, set with precious stones, and introduced into England the mendicant orders. He attended the Lateran Council convened at Rome in 1215. He died July 9, 1228.

Langton is generally considered one of the most illustrious men of the age in which he lived. Both as

an ecclesiastic and a writer he has exerted great influence. Unfortunately, however, his writings, which displayed great learning and ability, are hardly accessible. They have hitherto found no editor, nor has any one, as far as we are aware, ever taken the trouble to ascertain how much the commentaries of Langton differ from the works of that class by mediæval Church writers. A few of his theological tracts have been printed, and lists of all the productions known as his are given by Cave and by Tanner. The principal are, *De Benedictionibus:—De Maledictionibus:—Summa Theologiæ:—Summa de diversis:—Repetitiones lectionum:—Documenta Clericorum:—De sacerdotibus Deum nescientibus:—De vera Pœnitentia:—De Similitudinibus:—Adam ubi es;* and more particularly his *Commentary* (on a large portion of the O. Test.). Dean Hook (in his *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ii [1861], ch. xii) gives references to libraries where some of Langton's writings are still preserved; and we may add that the library of Canterbury Cathedral contains his *Morals* on Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Tobit, Esther, Ezra, Maccabees, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the lesser prophets (comp. Todd [H. J.], *Catalogue* [Lond. 1802], p. 111 sq.). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Med. Ævi;* Tanner, *Biblioth. Britannico-Hibern.;* Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccles.* vol. ii; Cave, *Script. eccles. Hist. Litterar.* vol. ii; Ciaconius, *Vitæ Pontific. et Cardin.* vol. ii; Godwin, *De Præsulibus Angliæ Commentarius; English Cyclop.;* Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 538 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, v, 25 sq.; Inett, *Hist. of English Church*, vol. iii (see Index); Churton, *Early Engl. Ch.* p. 355; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* (see Index in vol. viii); Hume, *Hist. of England*, vol. i, ch. xi; and the authorities already cited in the articles INNOCENT III, and JOHN, king of England. (J. H. W.)

Language (לָשׁוֹן [Chald. לִשָׁן], *tongue;* שָׂפָה, *lip*). An indication of the manner in which man may have been led to the formation of a vocabulary is thought to be given in Gen. ii, 19. But it is evident from the whole scriptural account of creation that speech was coeval with the formation of our first parents. At a later date the origin of the various languages on the earth (see Van den Honert, *De lingua primæva*, L. B. 1738) is apparently given in connection with the building of the tower of Babel (comp. Römer, *De linguar. in extruenda turri Babyl. ortu*, Viteb. 1782) and the dispersion of men (Gen. xi); but it is probable that the diversities of human speech have rather resulted from than caused the gradual divergence of mankind from a common centre (Diod. Siculus, i, 8; comp. Jerusalem, *Fortges. Betracht.* Brschw. 1773, p. 263 sq.; Eichhorn, *Diversitatis linguar. ex tradit. Semit. origines*, Götting. 1788; Abbt, *Vermisch. Schrift.* vi, 96 sq.). See TONGUES, CONFUSION OF. The later Jews inferred from Gen. x that there were generally on earth seventy (nations and) languages (compare Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 699; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 754, 1031, 1089: see a list in the Jerusalem Talmud, *Megill.* fol. 71, ch. ii). Individual tongues are only mentioned incidentally in the Bible, as follows: the *Canaanitish* (שְׂפַת כְּנַעַן, Isa. xix, 18), the *Chaldæan* (לְשׁוֹן כַּשְׂדִּים, Dan. i, 4), the *Aramæan* (אֲרָמִית, familiar to the Assyrians [2 Kings xviii, 26], the Magians [Dan. ii, 4], and the Persian officials [Ezra iv, 7]), the *Jewish* (יְהוּדִית, i. e. Hebrew; 2 Kings xviii, 26; Neh. xiii, 24; compare Esther viii, 9; Josephus, *Apion*, ii, 2), the *Ashdodite* (אַשְׁדּוֹדִית, Neh. xiii, 24); in the N. T. the Hebrew, i. e. *Syro-Chaldee* (Ἑβραΐς, Ἑβραϊστί, Acts xxii, 2, etc.), the *Greek* (ἡ Ἑλληνική, Ἑλληνιστί, John xix, 20; Acts xxi, 37; Rev. ix, 11), the *Latin* (Ῥωμαϊστί, John xix, 20; Luke xxiii, 38), and the *Lycaonian* (Λυκαονιστί, Acts xiv, 11). It is remarkable that, in all the intercourse of the Hebrews with foreign nations, mention is very rarely made of an interpreter (Gen. xlii, 23); but the passages in 2 Kings xviii, 26; Isa. xxxvi, 11, prove that the common Jews of the interior at least did not understand the Aramæan dialect. That the Jews of later times, especially the bigoted citizens of Palestine, despised heathen languages, is notorious (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 11, 2); that they made use of the Greek, however, is evident from the Talmud (*Sota*, ix, 14; comp. *Jadaim*, iv, 6, where Homer is mentioned), to say nothing of the N. T.—Winer, ii, 498. See HELLENIST. The question as to the common language of Palestine in the time of our Lord and his apostles has been keenly discussed by learned writers with very opposite conclusions. On the one hand, Du Pin (*Dissert.* ii), Mill (*N. T.* p. 8), Michaelis (*Introd.* iii), Marsh (*ibid.* notes), Weber (*Untersuch. üb. d. Ev. der Hebraer*, Tüb. 1806), Kuinöl (*Comment.* i, 18), Olshausen (*Echtheit der Evang.* Königsberg, 1823, p. 21 sq.), and especially De Rossi (*Della lingua propria di Cristo*, Parma, 1772), and Pfannkuche (in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibliothek*, viii, 365 sq.) contend for the *exclusive* prevalence of the Aramæan or Syro-Chaldee at the time and in the region in question. On the other hand, Cappell (*Observatt. in N. T.* p. 110), Basnage (*Annal.* ad an. 64), Masch (*Von der Grundsprache Matthei*), Lardner (Supplement to *Credibility*, etc., i. c. 5), Walæus (*Commentarius*, p. 1), and more particularly Vossius (*De Oraculis Sibyll.* Oxon. 1860, p. 88 sq.), and Diodati (*De Christo Græce loquente*, Neap. 1767, London, 1843), insist that the Greek *alone* was then and there spoken. Between these extremes Simon (*Hist. Crit. du N. T.* Rotterd. 1689, c. 6, p. 56), Fabricy (*Titres primitifs de la Revelation*, Rome, 1773, i, 116), Ernesti (*Neuste theol. Bibliothek*, i [1771], 269 sq.), Hug (*Einleit. in d. N. T.* Tüb. 1826, ii, 30 sq.), Binterim (*De ling. originali N. T. non Latina*, Dusseld. 1820, p. 146 sq.), Wiseman (*Horæ Syriacæ*, Rom. 1828, i, 69 sq.), and the mass of later writers, as Credner (*Einleit. in d. N. Test.* Halle, 1836), Bleek (*id.* Berl. 1862), and (though with more reserve) Roberts (*Language of Palestine*, London, 1859) hold the more reasonable view that *both* languages were concurrently used, the Aramæan probably as the vernacular at home and among natives, and the Greek in promiscuous and public circles. For additional literature on this question, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, iv, 760; *Biblical Repository*, 1831, p. 317 sq., 530 sq.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 18. On the Greek of the N. T., see NEW TESTAMENT. On the tongues cognate with the Hebrew, see SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Languet de Gergy, JEAN JOSEPH, a distinguished French prelate, noted for his opposition to the Jansenists, was born at Dijon August 25, 1677. A compatriot and friend of Bossuet, he was influenced to dedicate himself early to the service of the Church. After having filled various minor positions, he became bishop of Soissons in 1715; later (in 1730) he was promoted to the archbishopric of Sens, where, by his zeal and ultramontane opinions, he brought upon himself several controversies with the Jansenists, and by his extreme course made himself very unpopular. In 1721 the French Academy honored him with membership. He died May 3, 1753. Languet wrote very extensively. A complete list of his works is given by Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 441. The most important of his writings are *Mémoire pour l'évêque de Soissons contre les religieuses du Val de Grâce et les bénédictines de Saint-Corneille de Compiègne* (Paris, 1726, fol.):—*Opera omnia pro defensione Constitutionis Unigenitus et adversus ab ea appelantes successive edita; in Latinam linguam conversa a variis doctoribus et ab auctore recognita et emendata* (Sens, 1752, 2 vols. folio).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 441 sq.

Laniado (or LAÑADO), **Abraham** BEN-ISAAC, an Italian rabbi and commentator, flourished in the latter half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. He wrote a work on the mysteries of the Mosaic law, entitled מגן אברהם, *The Shield of Abraham*, which consists of seventeen treatises and discourses on circumcision, marriage, almsgiving, confession of sins, repentance, and mourning for the dead. It was printed in Venice in 1603, and is very highly esteemed by the

Jews:—A commentary on the Song of Songs, entitled נקדות הכסף, *Studs of Silver*, which was edited by Moses Laniado, with the Hebrew text, the Commentary of Rashi, the Chaldee Paraphrase, with a Spanish translation by the editor, printed in Hebrew characters (Venice, 1619). He also wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, and a commentary on Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, which have not as yet been published.

Laniado, Samuel BEN-ABRAHAM, another Italian rabbi of note, flourished at Aleppo about 1580. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled כלי חמדה, *Delightful Vessel*, which was first published in Venice in 1594–1595. He explains the Pentateuch according to the Sabbatic Lessons [see HAPHTARAH] in the Midrashic manner:—A commentary on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, entitled כלי יקר, *Precious Vessel*, which was first published in Venice in 1603, and excerpts of it are printed in Frankfurter's *Rabbinic Bible* (q. v.). It consists chiefly of extracts from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc.:—A commentary on Isaiah, called כלי פז, *A Vessel of Pure Gold* (Venice, 1657). It is a very lengthy commentary, and, like the former, is chiefly made up from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc. See Fürst, *Biblioth. Hebraica*, ii, 222; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 2433; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Lankâ, the ancient name of the capital of Ceylon, is celebrated in Hindu mythology as the chief city of the giant Râvana (q. v.), who, by carrying off Sîta, the wife of Râma, caused the conquest of Ceylon by the latter personage, who is considered as an incarnation of the god Vishnu.

Lanneau, Bazile E., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, March 22, 1830, and was educated at Charleston College, where he graduated in 1848. He completed a course of theology at Columbia Seminary, S. C., in 1851, and was immediately appointed tutor of Hebrew in the same institution. In 1854 he was ordained, and made pastor of a Church at Lake City, Florida; from 1856 to 1858 he was editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*, at Charleston, and then returned to Lake City. In October, 1859, he was elected to the chair of ancient languages in Oakland College, Miss., which position he held until his death, July 12, 1860. Lanneau's linguistic acquirements were very extensive. "He was not only a scholar, but an accurate and well-read divine. His style as a writer was chaste and clear."—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 95.

Lanneau, John Francis, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, August 14, 1809; was educated at Yale College, class of 1829, and studied theology at the theological seminaries of Princeton, N. J., and Columbia, S. C. He was ordained in 1833, and labored three years for the cause of foreign missions; then went as a missionary to Jerusalem. In 1846 he returned to America, and was called to Marietta, Ga. In 1855 he became pastor at Salem, Va., and in 1861 returned to Marietta, where he died, Oct. 7, 1867. Mr. Lanneau is represented as an able minister, and always eminently influential and acceptable both as a preacher and a citizen.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 340.

Lannis, JACOB W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Baltimore Co., Maryland, July 8, 1826; received a collegiate education at Muskingum College, Ohio, and at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1852. He studied theology at Alleghany City Theological Seminary, and afterwards with Dr. Edwards, of Fort Wayne, Ind. In 1856 he was ordained and installed as pastor of a Church at Waveland, Ind. In 1858 he removed to Nashville, Tennessee, and died there Aug. 9, 1859. Mr. Lannis was very successful in his brief ministry.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 95.

Lansing, NICHOLAS, a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born at Albany in 1748. He studied theology under Dr. Westerlo, of that city, and was licensed to preach by a general meeting of ministers and elders in 1780. Among the Dutch clergymen of the last two generations, this venerable man held a reputation for piety and individuality of character that reminds us of Rowland Hill, James Patterson, of Philadelphia, and a few others of similar mould. Many curious and interesting stories are told of his unique and godly life, and of his holy ministry. He was, while young, captain of a small sailing vessel that ran between Albany and New York, and was converted to Christ while in this calling. Immediately he consecrated himself to the ministry, although his health was so feeble that his physician said he would not live to enter the pulpit. But God spared him to serve in his sanctuary fifty-five years. He preached regularly until the second Sabbath before his death, at the great age of eighty-seven. "He spent much time day and night in his study, fasting much and being much in prayer. He usually spent much of the night, and sometimes the whole night, in praying. His clothing always gave way first upon the knees." His preaching, which was in the Dutch language, was remarkable for its scriptural character, spirituality, and utter fearlessness. Striking anecdotes are told, and many of his peculiar expressions are yet current, illustrative of these features of his ministry. On one occasion, in a meeting of classis, when called upon a second time by the president to make a brief statement of the condition of his Church, the old man rose suddenly and said, "Mr. President, Tappan! Tappan! all Tappan is dead, and I'm dead too." He sat down and said no more until he was asked to pray, and then poured out his soul in such strains of "power with God" that all who heard him felt that whatever might be the state of his people, he, at least, was *not* "*dead*" yet. He observed family worship three times daily during a part of his life. A great revival of religion followed one of his most bold and characteristic sermons in a neighboring place, where people were given up to worldliness and sin. During his last service he sat in the pulpit, as his feebleness obliged him to do frequently in his later years. Like Baxter, he could have said

> "I preached as if I ne'er should preach again,
> And as a dying man to dying men."

Referring to the strain of his ministry among them, he said to his people, "I have never preached to you 'Do and live,' but 'Live and do.'" That week he was seized with his last illness, during which he was constantly engaged in prayer, and in speaking for Christ to those who were with him. His last end was peace. Mr. Lansing was settled first in the united churches of what are now Greenbush, Linlithgo, and Taghkanic, near Albany, during 1781–4, and afterwards at Tappan and Clarkstown, in Rockland County, N. Y., 1784–1830, and Tappan alone 1830–35. His home and church in the latter place were near the spot on which major André was hung in the Revolutionary War. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 134 sq. (W. J. R. T.)

Lantern (*φανός*, so called for its *shining*) occurs only in John xviii, 3, where the party of men which went out of Jerusalem to apprehend Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane is described as being provided "with *lanterns* and torches:" it there probably denotes any kind of covered light, in distinction from a simple taper or common house-light, as well as from a flambeau (comp. Athenæus, xv, 58; Philosen. *Gloss.*). Lanterns were much employed by the Romans in military operations; two of bronze have been found among the ruins of Herculaneum and Pompeii. They are cylindrical, with translucent horn sides, the lamp within being furnished with an extinguisher (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* p. 568). In the article LAMP it has been shown that the Jewish lantern, or, if we may so call it, lamp-frame, was similar to that now in use among the Orientals. As the streets of Eastern towns are not lighted at night, and never



Ancient Roman Lantern. (On the left is a separate view of one of the corner-pieces; on the right is the extinguisher.)

Modern Oriental Lantern.

were so, lanterns are used to an extent not known among us. Such, doubtless, was also formerly the case; and it is therefore remarkable that in but a single instance the



Ancient Egyptian Lantern.

Egyptian monuments offer any trace of the use of a lantern. In this case it seems to be borne by the night-watch, or civic guard, and is shaped like those in common use among ourselves (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii. 72). A similar lantern is at this day used in Persia, and perhaps does not materially differ from those mentioned in Scripture. More common at present in Western Asia is a large folding lantern of waxed cloth strained over rings of wire, with a top and bottom of tinned copper. It is usually about two feet long by nine inches in diameter, and is carried by servants before their masters, who often pay visits to their friends at or after supper-time. In many Eastern towns the municipal law forbids any one to be in the streets after nightfall without a lantern.

Ordinary Eastern Lanterns.

Lantern, in Italian or modern architecture, a small structure on the top of a dome, or in other similar situations, for the purpose of admitting light, promoting ventilation, or for ornament. In Gothic architecture the term is sometimes applied to *louvres* on the roofs of halls, etc., but it usually signifies a tower which has the whole height, or a considerable portion of the interior, open to view from the ground, and is lighted by an upper tier of windows; lantern-towers of this kind are common over the centre of cross churches. The same name is also given to the light open erections often placed on the tops of towers; these sometimes have spires rising from them, but in such cases they are less perforated with windows. *Lanternes des Morts* occur only in the church-yards on the Continent, they were simply pillars, with a place for a light on the top similar to small light-houses, and it is not improbable that something of the kind was adopted in the early Roman cemeteries, and so has given origin to some of the Irish round towers, which may well have been used, at least in some instances, for this purpose.

St. Helen's, York.

Lanterns, Feast of, is a Chinese festival, observed in the evening of the 15th day of January by every Chinese of respectability, who illuminates, with a great number of wax candles, a large lantern, displaying more or less splendor, according to the circumstances of the owner. Some of them are valued at several thousand dollars, on account of the decorations bestowed on them, and are from twenty to thirty feet in diameter. The Chinese ascribe the rise of this festival to a sad accident which happened in the family of a certain mandarin, whose daughter, as she was walking one evening on the bank of a river, fell in and was drowned. Her father, in order to find her, embarked on board a vessel, carrying with him a great number of lanterns. The whole night was spent in search of her, but to no purpose. However, this ceremony is annually kept up in memory of the mandarin's daughter. In some respects this festival resembles that observed by the ancients in

honor of Ceres, when her votaries ran up and down the streets with lighted torches in their hands, in imitation of the hurry and confusion of the goddess when in quest of her daughter Proserpine. Others ascribe the rise of this Chinese festival to an extravagant project of one of their emperors, who shut himself up with his concubines in a magnificent palace, which he illuminated with a great number of splendid lanterns. The Chinese, scandalized at his behavior, demolished his palace, and hung the lanterns all over the city. But, however uncertain its origin, it seems pretty definitely established that the lantern-festival was observed as early as A.D. 700 (comp. Williams, *Middle Kingdom*, ii, 82).

One peculiar custom of this feast is the grant of greater license to married women, who on other evenings, by Chinese custom, are obliged to confine themselves to their homes. The goddess called *Mother* (q. v.) is worshipped by them at this time, particularly by married but childless women, "expecting or desiring, as a consequence of such devotional acts to 'Mother,' to have male offspring." See Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra*, ii, 4; Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (New York, 1867, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 34 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lantfredus or **Lamfridus**, a disciple of bishop Ethelnold of Winchester, flourished in the latter part of the 10th century. He is known only by his life of St. Swithun, which is very interesting, as it affords fine facilities for studying the manners and history of his time. "His style is very inflated, and it is rendered obscure by the adoption of numerous words formed from the Greek language." The editions of Lantfredus are those of Henry Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i (Lond. 1691, folio), 322:—*Lantfredi epistola præmissa Historiæ de Miraculis Swithini*, *Acta Sanctorum Julii*, i (Antwerp, 1719, fol.), 328–337:—*Swithuni Vita et Miracula, per Lamfridum Monachum Winton.* See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* ii, 1767.

Laödice'a [strictly LAODICI'A] (Λαοδίκεια, *justice of* the *people*), the name of several cities in Syria and Asia Minor, but one of which, usually called *Laodicea ad Lycum* (from its proximity to the river Lycus), is named in Scripture. It lay on the confines of Phrygia and Lydia, about forty miles east of Ephesus, and is that one of the "seven churches in Asia" to which John was commissioned to deliver the awful warning contained in Rev. iii, 14–19. The fulfilment of this warning is to be sought in the history of the Christian Church which existed in that city, and not in the stone and mortar of the city itself; for it is not the city, but "the Church of the Laodiceans," which is denounced. It is true, however, that the eventual fate of that Church must have been involved in that of the city. (See an account of the synod at Laodicea, in Phrygia, A.D. 350–389, in Von Drey's *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1824, p. 3 sq.)

Laodicea was the capital of Greater Phrygia (Strabo, xii, p. 576; Pliny, v, 29; or Phrygia Pacatiana, according to the subscription of 1 Tim.), and a very considerable city (Strabo, p. 578) at the time it was named in the New Testament; but the violence of earthquakes, to which this district has always been liable, demolished, some ages after, a great part of the city, destroyed many of the inhabitants, and eventually obliged the remainder to abandon the spot altogether. The town was originally called *Diospolis*, and afterwards *Rhoas* (Pliny, v, 29); but Laodicea, the building of which is ascribed to Antiochus Theos, in honor of his wife Laodice, was probably founded on the old site. It was not far west from Colossæ, and only six miles to the west of Hierapolis (*Itin. Ant.* p. 337; *Tab. Peut.*; Strabo, xiii, p. 629). At first Laodicea was not a place of much importance, but it soon acquired a high degree of prosperity. It suffered greatly during the Mithridatic war (Appian, *Bell. Mith.* 20; Strabo, xii, p. 578), but quickly recovered under the dominion of Rome; and towards the end of the republic and under the first emperors, Laodicea became one of the most important and flourishing commercial cities of Asia Minor, in which large money transactions and an extensive trade in wood were carried on (Cicero, *ad Fam.* ii, 17; iii, 5; Strabo, xii, p. 577; compare Vitruv. viii, 3). The place often suffered from earthquakes, especially from the great shock in the reign of Tiberius, in which it was completely destroyed; but the inhabitants restored it from their own means (Tacit. *Ann.* xiv, 27). The wealth of the citizens created among them a taste for the arts of the Greeks, as is manifest from the ruins; and that it did not remain behind-hand in science and literature is attested by the names of the sceptics Antiochus and Theiodas, the successors of Ænesidemus (Diog. Laërt. ix, 11, § 106; 12, § 116), as well as by the existence of a great medical school (Strabo, xii, p. 580). During the Roman period Laodicea was the chief city of a Roman conventus (Cicero, *ad Fam.* iii, 7; ix, 25; xiii, 54, 67; xv, 4; *ad Att.* v, 15, 16, 20, 21; vi, 1, 2, 3, 7; *in Verr.* i, 30). Many of its inhabitants were Jews, and it was probably owing to this circumstance that at a very early period it became one of the chief seats of Christianity [we have good reason for believing that when, in writing from Rome to the Christians of Colossæ, Paul sent a greeting to those of Laodicea, he had not personally visited either place. But the preaching of the Gospel at Ephesus (Acts xviii, 19–xix, 41) must inevitably have resulted in the formation of churches in the neighboring cities, especially where Jews were settled. See LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE], and the see of a bishop (Coloss. ii, 1; iv, 15 sq.; Rev. i, 11; iii, 14 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 10, 20; Hierocl. p. 665). The Byzantine writers often mention it, especially in the time of the Comneni; and it was fortified by the emperor Manuel (Nicet. Chon. *Ann.* p. 9, 81). During the invasion of the Turks and Mongols the city was much exposed to ravages, and fell into decay; but the existing remains still attest its former greatness (see Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* s. v. Laodiceia). Smith, in his *Journey to the Seven Churches* (1671), was the first to describe the site of Laodicea. He was followed by Chandler, Cockerell, and Pococke; and the locality has, within the present century, been visited by Mr. Hartley, Mr. Arundell, Col. Leake, and Mr. Hamilton.

Laodicea is now a deserted place, called by the Turks *Eski-hissar* ("Old Castle"), a Turkish word equivalent to *Paleó-kastro*, which the Greeks so frequently apply to ancient sites. From its ruins, Laodicea seems to have been situated upon six or seven hills, taking up a large extent of ground. To the north and north-east runs the river Lycus, about a mile and a half distant; but nearer it is watered by two small streams, the Asopus and Caprus, the one to the west, and the other to the south-east, both passing into the Lycus, which last flows into the Mæander (Smith, p. 85). Laodicea preserves great remains of its importance as the residence of the Roman governors of Asia under the emperors, namely, a stadium, in uncommon preservation, three theatres, one of which is 450 feet in diameter, and the ruins of several other buildings (*Antiq. of Ionia*, pt. ii, p. 32; Chandler's *Asia Minor*, c. 67). Col. Leake says, "There are few ancient sites more likely than Laodicea to preserve many curious remains of antiquity beneath the surface of the soil; its opulence, and the earthquakes to which it was subject, rendering it probable that valuable works of art were often there buried beneath the ruins of the public and private edifices (Cicero, *Epist. ad Amic.* ii, 17; iii, 5; v, 20; Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv, 27). A similar remark, though in a lesser degree, perhaps, will apply to the other cities of the vale of the Mæander, as well as to some of those situated to the north of Mount Tmolus; for Strabo (p. 579, 628, 630) informs us that Philadelphia, Sardis, and Magnesia of Sipylus, were, not less than Laodicea and the cities of the Mæander as far as Apameia at the sources of that river, subject to the same dreadful calamity (*Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 253)." "Nothing," says Mr. Hamilton (*Researches in Asia Minor*, i, 515), "can exceed the desolation and melancholy appearance of the site of Laodicea;

Copper Coin ("medallion") of Laodicea in Phrygia, with Head of Commodus, Triumphal Figure, and name of Asiarch.

no picturesque features in the nature of the ground on which it stands relieve the dull uniformity of its undulating and barren hills; and, with few exceptions, its gray and widely-scattered ruins possess no architectural merit to attract the attention of the traveller. Yet it is impossible to view them without interest when we consider what Laodicea once was, and how it is connected with the early history of Christianity." See also Fellows, *Journal written in Asia Minor*, p. 251 sq.; Arundell, *Seven Churches*, p. 85 sq.; Schubert, *Reisen*, i, 282; S. Stosch, *Syntagma dissert. 7 de sept. urbibus Asiæ in Apoc.* p. 165 sq.; also in Van Hoven, *Otium literar.* iii, p. 52; Mannert, VI, iii, 129 sq.; Schultess, in the *N. theol. Annal.* 1818, ii, 177 sq. See ASIA, SEVEN CHURCHES OF.

LAODICEA, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Laodicenum*), an important council held at Laodicea, in Phyrgia, in the 4th century. The year in which this council convened is disputed. Baronius and Binius assign the year 314; Pagi, 363; Hardouin places it as late as 372, and others even in 399. Hefele thinks that it must have had its session between 343 (the Council of Antioch) and 381, rather in the second than in the first half of the 4th century. Beveridge adduces some probable reasons for supposing it to have been held in 365. Thirty-two bishops were present, from different provinces of Asia, and sixty canons were published, which were accepted by the other churches. 1. Permits the administration of communion to persons who have married a second time, after their remaining a while in retreat, fasting and praying. 2. Directs holy communion to be given to those who have completed their penance. 3. Forbids to raise neophytes to the sacerdotal order. 4. Forbids usury among the clergy. 5. Ordination not to be administered in the presence of those who are in the rank of hearers. 6. No heretics to enter within the church. 7. Any Novatians, Photinians, or Quartodecimani who are to be received into the Church must first abjure every heresy, be instructed in the true faith, and anointed with the holy chrism. 8. All Cataphrygians or Montanists to be instructed and baptized before being received into the Church. 9. Excommunicates the faithful who go to the places of worship or burial-grounds of heretics. 10. Forbids the faithful to give their children in marriage to heretics. 11. Forbids the ordination of priestesses (*πρεσβύτιδες*) (see below). 12. Bishops to be appointed by the metropolitan and his provincials. 13. Priests not to be elected by the people. 14. Consecrated elements not to be sent into other parishes at Easter by way of eulogiæ. 15. Only those chanters named in the Church roll shall ascend the pulpit and chant. 16. The Gospels to be read, as well as the other books of Scripture, on Saturday. 17. A lesson shall be read between each psalm. 18. The same prayer to be repeated at nones as at vespers. 19. After the bishop's sermon the prayers for the catechumens shall be said separately, then those for the penitents, and, lastly, those of the faithful; after which the kiss of peace shall be given, and after the priests have given it to the bishop, the lay persons present shall give it to each other; and that ended, the administration of the holy eucharist shall proceed. None except the priests shall be permitted to approach the altar in order to communicate. 20. A deacon not to sit in the presence of a priest without permission of the latter. The same conduct is enjoined on subdeacons and all inferior clergy towards the deacon. 21, 22. The subdeacon not to undertake any of the functions of the deacon, nor touch the sacred vessels, nor wear a stole. 23. Forbids the same to chanters and readers. 24. No one of the clergy, or of the order of ascetics, to enter a tavern. 25. Forbids the subdeacon to give the consecrated bread and to bless the cup. 62. Prohibits persons not appointed thereto by a bishop from meddling with exorcisms. 27. Forbids the carrying away of any portion of the agapæ. 28. Forbids the celebration of the agapæ, or love-feasts, in churches. 29. Forbids Christians observing the Jewish Sabbath. 30. Forbids Christian men, especially the clergy, from bathing with women. 31. Forbids giving daughters in marriage to heretics. 32. Forbids receiving the eulogiæ of heretics. 33. Forbids all Catholics praying with heretics and schismatics. 34. Anathematizes those who go after the false martyrs of heretics. 35. Forbids Christian persons leaving their church in order to attend private conventicles in which angels were invoked, and anathematizes those who are guilty of this idolatry. 36. Forbids the clergy dealing in magic, and directs that all who wear phylacteries be cast out of the Church. 37. Forbids fasting with Jews or heretics. 38. Forbids receiving unleavened bread from Jews. 39. Forbids feasting with heathen persons. 40. Orders all bishops to attend the synods to which they are summoned, unless prevented by illness. 41, 42. Forbids clergymen leaving the diocese to travel abroad without the bishop's permission and the canonical letters. 43. Forbids the porter of the church leaving the gate for a moment, even in order to pray. 44. Forbids women entering into the altar. 45. Forbids receiving those who do not present themselves for the Easter baptism before the second week in Lent. 46. Orders that all catechumens to be baptized shall know the Creed by heart, and shall repeat it before the bishop or priest on the fifth day of the week. 47. Those who have been baptized in sickness, if they recover, must learn the Creed. 48. Orders that those who have been baptized shall be anointed with the holy chrism, and partake of the kingdom of God. 49. Forbids celebrating the holy eucharist during Lent on any days but Saturdays and Sundays. 50. Forbids eating anything on the Thursday in the last week of Lent, or during the whole of Lent anything except dry food. 51. Forbids celebrating the festivals of the martyrs during Lent; orders remembrance of them on Saturdays and Sundays. 52. Forbids celebrating marriages and birthday feasts during Lent. 53. Enjoins proper behavior at marriage festivals, and forbids all dancing. 54. Forbids the clergy attending the shows and dances given at weddings. 55. None of the clergy or laity to club together for drinking-parties. 56. Forbids the priests taking their seats in the sanctuary before the bishop enters, except he be ill or absent. 57. Directs that bishops shall not be placed in small towns or villages, but simply visitors, who shall act under the direction of the bishop in the city. 58. Forbids both bishops and priests celebrating the holy eucharist in private houses. 59. Forbids singing uninspired hymns, etc., in church, and reading the uncanonical books. 60. Declares which are the canonical books of Scripture. In this list the Apocrypha and the book of Revelation are omitted. See CANON OF SCRIPTURE. Of particular interest among

the decisions of this council is canon 11, forbidding the employment of women as preachers. Hefele holds that the canon has hardly been properly translated, and that the desire of the council was simply to forbid *superior diaconesses* in the Church. But for a detailed discussion we must refer to Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i, 731 sq. The difficulty as to the meaning arises from the fact that the canons were written in Greek, and the question hinges on the *meaning* intended for πρεσβύτιδες and προκαθήμεναι.

Laodice'an (Λαοδικεύς), an inhabitant of the city of Laodicea, in Phrygia (Coloss. iv, 16; Rev. iii, 14), from which passages it appears that a Christian Church was established there by the apostles. See below.

LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE. "In the conclusion of the Epistle to the Colossians (Colos. iv, 16), the apostle, after sending to the Colossians the salutations of himself and others who were with him, enjoins the Colossians to send this epistle to the Laodiceans, and that they likewise should read *the one from Laodicea* (*τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*). It is disputed whether by these concluding words Paul intends an epistle from him to the Laodiceans or one from the Laodiccans to him. The use of the preposition *ἐκ* favors the latter conclusion, and this has been strongly urged by Theodoret, Chrysostom, Jerome, Philastrius, Œcumenius, Calvin, Beza, Storr, and a multitude of other interpreters. Winer, however, clearly shows that the preposition here may be under the law of attraction, and that the full force of the passage may be thus given: 'that written *to* the Laodiceans, and to be brought *from* Laodicea to you' (*Grammatik d. Neutestamentl. Sprachidioms*, p. 434, Lpz. 1830). It must be allowed that such an interpretation of the apostle's words is in itself more probable than the other; for, supposing him to refer to a letter from the Laodiceans to him, the questions arise, How were the Colossians to procure this unless he himself sent it to them? And of what use would such a document be to them? To this latter question it has been replied that probably the letter from the Laodiceans contained some statements which influenced the apostle in writing to the Colossians, and which required to be known before his letter in reply could be perfectly understood. But this is said without the slightest shadow of reason from the epistle before us; and it is opposed by the fact that the Laodicean epistle was to be used by the Colossians *after* they had read that to themselves (*ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ, κ. τ. λ.*). It seems, upon the whole, most likely that the apostle in this passage refers to an epistle sent by him to the Church in Laodicea some time before that to the Church at Colossæ." The suggestion of Grotius (after Marcion) that it is identical with the canonical Epistle to the Ephesians has substantially been adopted by Mill and Wetstein, and many modern critics: see, especially, Holzhausen, *Der Brief an die Ephesen* (Hannover, 1834); Baur, *Paulus* (2d ed. Lpz. 1866-7), ii, 47 sq.; Räbiger, *De Christologia Paulina* (Breslau, 1852), p. 48; Bleek, *Einleitung in das N. T.* (2d ed. Berlin, 1866), p. 454 sq.; Hausrath, *Der Apostel Paulus* (Heidelb. 1865), p. 2; Volkmar, *Commentar zur Offenb. Joh.* (Zürich, 1862), p. 66; Kiene, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1869, p. 323 sq.; Klostermann, in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1870, p. 160 sq.; Hitzig, *Zur Kritik Paulinischen Briefe* (Lpz. 1870), p. 27. The only supposition that seems to meet all the circumstances of the case is that the Epistle to the Ephesians, although not exactly encyclical, was designed (as indeed its character evinces) for general circulation; and that Paul, after having dispatched this, addressed a special epistle to the Colossians on occasion of writing to Philemon, and recommends the perusal of that to the Ephesians, which would by that time reach them by way of Laodicea. This explains the doubtful reading *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, and the absence of personal salutation in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and at the same time the allusion to a letter from Laodicea; while it obviates the objectionable hypothesis of the loss of an inspired epistle, to which particular attention had thus been called, and which was therefore the more likely to have been preserved. See EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO. Wieseler's theory (*Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 450) is that the Epistle to Philemon is meant; and the tradition in the *Apostolical Constitutions* that he was bishop of this see is adduced in confirmation. But this is utterly at variance with the evidently personal nature of the epistle. See PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO. Others think that the apostle refers to an epistle now lost, as Jerome and Theodoret seem to mention such a letter, and it was also referred to at the second general Council of Nicæa. But these allusions are too vague to warrant such a conclusion. The apocryphal epistle, now extant, and claiming to be that referred to by Paul, entitled *Epistola ad Laodicenses*, is admitted on all hands to be a late and clumsy forgery. It exists only in Latin MSS., from which a Greek version was made by Hutten (in Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* i, 873 sq.). It is evidently a cento from the Galatians and Ephesians. A full account of it may be found in Jones (*On the Canon*, ii, 31-49). The Latin text is given by Auger (*ut inf.*), and an English version by Eadie (*Comment. on Colos.*). We may remark in this connection that the subscription at the end of the First Epistle to Timothy (*ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, ἥτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς*) is of no authority; but it is worth mentioning, as showing the importance of Laodicea. On the general subject of the Laodicean epistle, see Michaelis, *Introd.* iv, 124; Hug, *Introd.* ii, 436; Steiger, *Colosserbr.* ad loc.; Heinrichs, ad loc.; Raphel. ad loc.; and especially Credner, *Geschichte d. N. T. Kanon* (ed. Volkmar, Berlin, 1860), p. 300, 313; Auger, *Ueb. d. Laodicenerbrief* (Lpz. 1843); Sartori, *Ueb. d. Laodicenerbrief* (Lübeck, 1853); Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ii, 395 sq.; Huth, *Ep. ex Laodicea in Encyclica ad Ephesios adservata* (Erlangen, 1751); and other monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 85. See PAUL.

Laos, the name of the mountain tribes in Farther India who inhabit the country between China, Assam, Burmah, Siam, and Tonquin, and are dependent upon Siam. Like the Shaus of Burmah, they belong to the race of the Thai, which extends through the Ahom as far as Assam. The Laos and their descendants, scattered through the northern provinces of Siam and their own country, are estimated at two to three millions. The Laos are divided into two subdivisions. The western tribes tattoo themselves like the Burmese and the Shaus, and are on that account called *Lao-pung-dam*, or black-bellied Laos; the eastern tribes, which do not tattoo themselves, are called *Lao-pung-khao*, or white-bellied Laos. The western Laos form the principalities of Labong (founded in 574 after Christ), Lamphun, Lagong, Myang Preh, Myang Nan, Chiengrai, and Chiengmai or Zimmay. The last-named was formerly an independent kingdom, which frequently carried on wars with Pegu. Of the principalities of the eastern or white Laos, Viengkhan has been almost wholly (1828), and Myang Phuen for the greater part, destroyed by the Siamese; Myang Lomb pays a tribute to Siam, and Myang Luang Phrabang, which was formerly governed by three kings, is dependent not only upon Siam, but upon Cochin China. As the Laos have no maritime coast, they have for a long time remained unknown to the Europeans. Chiengmai was for the first time visited by the London merchant, Ralph Fitch, who arrived there in 1586 from Pegu. After the occupation of Maulmain in 1826 by Great Britain, new expeditions were sent out, and the meeting with Chinese caravans suggested the first idea of an overland road to Yunnan. The first European who visited the eastern Laos was Wusthof, an agent of a Dutch establishment in Cambodia, who in 1641, amid the greatest difficulties, sailed up the Mekhong. The Laos possess several alphabets which are derived from the Cambodian form of the Pali. The name of *Free Laos* is usually given to the mountain tribes of the Radeh. Between the language of the

Laos and that of the Siamese there is only a dialectic difference, which has chiefly been caused by the fact that the savage mountaineers neglect or misapply the rules of accentuation. On the other hand, the Laos surpass the Siamese in musical taste. The religion of the Laos is Buddhism, which, however, they do not hold so strictly as the Siamese. The first Christian mission among the Laos was commenced in 1867 at Chiengmai (on the river Quee Ping, 500 miles north of Bankok), by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The first missionary, Mr. M'Gillivray, was welcomed on his arrival at Chiengmai both by the people and by the princes, who had provided a native house for him until he was able to build one more suitable to his wants and tastes. In 1869 the missionaries were even presented by the king with a beautiful lot, but subsequently a spirit of opposition and persecution manifested itself. According to the report of the Board of Foreign Missions of May, 1871, no congregation had yet been organized. (A. J. S.)

Lao-tzu (formerly written LAO-TSE), one of the most remarkable men of the Chinese Empire, the author of the *Tao-te-king*, and founder of the religious sect known as Taoists (or Tauists), was born in the kingdom of Tsu B.C. 604. His family name was *Le*, or Plum; in his youth he himself was called *Urh*, or Ear, a name given him on account of the size of his ears. When he came to be known as a philosopher he was honorably called *Pe-yang*, and was surnamed *Lao-tzu* (old boy), or *Lao-kun-tzu* (old prince). Tradition asserts that his father was a poor peasant, who remained a bachelor until he was seventy years old, and then married a woman of forty. Lao-tzu was probably a great student in early life, and when yet a youth was promoted to an office connected with the treasury or the museum under the Chow dynasty. While in the service at the court of Chow he visited the western parts of China, and there probably became acquainted with the rites and religion of Fuh, or Buddha. The duration of Lao-tzu's service at the court is entirely uncertain. When the Chow dynasty was hastening to its fall, and the whole country torn up into petty states warring with each other, and anarchy every where prevailing, Lao-tzu retired into obscurity. For this course he has been often and severely censured; but when we consider that the corruption of the government was too great for him to overcome, it does not appear that he was to blame for retiring with pure hands from his connection with it. There is no trustworthy account of the time or manner of his death, but some writers have assigned the date of B.C. 523 to that event. Szu Ma-chien, in relating his retirement from the government, simply says, "He then went away, and no one knows his end." His life seems to have been that of a contemplative philosopher—far more occupied with thoughts of the invisible and the mysterious than with sublunary things. He became so celebrated as a philosopher that Confucius went to see him, and left him deeply impressed with his extraordinary character, and evidently regarded Lao-tzu as something wonderful—divine; yet, while all agree that Confucius was almost carried away by his admiration of Lao-tzu, the latter has been accused of jealousy and spite against Confucius. His writings, however, give no color to the charge; nor is it likely that Confucius himself would have always spoken of Lao-tzu in such high terms of esteem and admiration, and even quoted the opinions of his rival as sufficient answers to the queries of his disciples, had he not received kind treatment and attentions at the hands of Lao-tzu, the advocate of a doctrine that "man is to be rendered immortal through the contemplation of God, the repression of the passions, and the perfect tranquillity of the soul," the author of "a moral code inculcating all the great principles found in other religions: charity, benevolence, virtue, and the free-will, moral agency, and responsibility of man."

Lao-tzu has at different periods enjoyed the patronage of the Chinese government, there being, indeed, a constant struggle for ascendency between his supporters and those of Confucius during several centuries at the beginning of our era. Emperors have paid homage to him in his temple, and one of them wrote a commentary on his book. When we turn aside from definite history and give our attention to legends, there is no end to the mysteries thrown around his birth and being. His followers have transferred him from the ranks of ordinary mortals into an incarnation of deity, and have clothed his philosophic treatise with the authority of a sacred book, being probably moved to this course by a desire to make their founder equal to Sakyamuni (see GAUTAMA), and to give enhanced importance to his works. He is represented as an eternal and self-existing being, incarnated at various times upon the earth. One account represents him as having been conceived by the influence of a meteor, and after being carried in the womb for seventy-two (another author says eighty-one) years, at last delivering himself by bursting a passage under his mother's left arm. From having gray hairs at birth, and looking generally like an old man, he was called Lao-tzu—i. e. *the old boy*. He is reported to have had the gift of speech at birth. It is also said that, as soon as he was born, he mounted nine paces in the air, each step producing a lotus-flower, and, while poised there, pointed with his left hand to heaven and with his right hand to earth, saying, "Heaven above—earth beneath—only Tao is honorable." The eighty-one chapters of the *Tao-te-king* are said to have been obtained from him by Yin-hsi, the keeper of the Han-ku Pass, through which he was leaving the country on his retirement from office.

The *Tao-te-king* seems to have received its present name about B.C. 160. Before that, it was known as the teachings of Hwang and Lao—i. e. the emperor Hwang (B.C. 2600) and Lao-tzu; also as the Book of Lao-tzu. There is much uncertainty and confusion in regard to the text. Some editors, having in view the tradition that Lao-tzu wrote a book of 5000 characters, have cut down those in excess of that number without much regard for the sense of the author. Others have added characters to explain the meaning, thus incorporating their commentary into the text. The occasional suppression of a negative particle, by some editors, gives an exactly opposite meaning to a sentence from that of other editions. To ascertain the true text is in many instances impossible. The style is exceedingly terse and concise, without any pretension to grace or elegance. The work is full of short sentences, often enigmatical or paradoxical, and without apparent connection. Quite probably the book is composed of notes for philosophical discourses, which were expanded and explained by Lao-tzu while orally instructing his disciples. As contributing to the obscurity of the style, we must consider that the topics discussed are exceedingly abstruse, and that Lao-tzu labored under the disadvantage of writing in the infancy of literary language in China, and was compelled to use a very imperfect medium for communicating his thoughts.

There has been much discussion and much difference of opinion as to what Lao-tzu really intended by *Tao*. The word means a path, a road; the way or means of doing a thing; a course; reason, doctrine, principle, etc. Lao-tzu sometimes uses it in its ordinary senses, but it is evident that in general he uses it in a transcendental sense, which can only be ascertained by a careful study of his writings. *Tao* is something which existed before heaven and earth, and even before deity. It has no name, and never had one. It can not be apprehended by the bodily senses; it is profound and mysterious; it is calm, void, solitary, and unchanging; yet, in operation, it revolves through the universe, acting everywhere, but acting mysteriously, spontaneously, and without effort. It contains matter, and has an inherent power of production; and although itself formless, yet comprehends all possible forms. It is the ultimate cause of the universe, and is the model or rule for all creatures,

but chiefly for man. It represents also that ideal state of perfection in which all things acted harmoniously and spontaneously, good and evil being then unknown, and the return to which constitutes the *summum bonum* of existence. French and English writers generally have translated *Tao* by "Reason," some adding "or Logos." There are some striking similarities between *Tao* and *Logos;* and in all the translations of the Scriptures into Chinese the *Logos* of John is rendered by *Tao*. Julien, decidedly dissenting from the common translation of *Tao*, adopts "Voie" or "Way"—giving just cause for his dissent in the fact that Lao-tzu represents *Tao* as devoid of thought, judgment, and intelligence. Julien's "Way," however, is also objected to, as implying a way-maker antecedent to it, while *Tao* was before all other existences. The "Nature" of modern speculators probably answers more nearly than anything else to *Tao*, although it will by no means answer all the conditions of the use of *Tao* by Lao-tzu.

Doctrines.—(1.) The teachings of Lao-tzu on speculative physics may be summarized as follows: All existing creatures and things have sprung from an eternal, all-producing, self-sustaining unity called Tao, which, although regarded as a potential existence, is also distinctly denominated non-existence, Lao-tzu considering it equivalent to the primeval Nothing or Chaos. Mr. Watters (see below) thus combines these apparently contradictory views: "Though void, shapeless, and immaterial, it yet contains the potentiality of all substance and shape, and from itself produces the universe, diffusing itself over all space. It is said to have generated the world, and is frequently spoken of as its mother—'the dark primeval mother, teeming with dreamy beings.' All things that exist submit to it as their chief, but it *shows* no lordship over them. All the operations of Nature (*Tao*) occur without any show of effort or violence—spontaneously and unerringly. Though there is nothing done in the universe which Nature does not do, though all things depend upon it for their origin and subsistence, yet in no case is Nature *visibly* acting. It is in its own deep self a unit—the smallest possible quantity, yet it prevails over the wide expanse of the universe, operating unspent but unseen." Lao-tzu's account of the origin of the universe is, "*Tao* begot 1, 1 begot 2, 2 begot 3, and 3 begot the material universe;" which has been explained by commentators that *Tao* generated the Passive Element in the composition of things, this produced the Active Element, and this the harmonious agreement of the two elements, which brought about the production of all things. The next thing to *Tao* is heaven—i. e. the material heaven above us. This is pure and clear, and if it should lose its purity would be in danger of destruction. The earth is at rest, the heavens always revolving over it, producing the various seasons, vivifying, nourishing, killing all things. Then come the "myriad things"—all animate and inanimate existences, that spring from *Tao*—which, although in itself impalpable, bodies itself forth in these objects, and thus becomes subject to human observation. This manifestation of *Tao* in each object constitutes its *Te*. *Te* is generally translated "Virtue," but this rendering is inadequate. It seems frequently to refer to the *specific* nature of the object spoken of, which is derived from Universal Nature (*Tao*). Following the popular ideas of his country, Lao-tzu speaks of five colors, five sounds, and five tastes, and regards all things as arranged in a system of dualism—e. g. a wooden vessel, in the case of which solidity gives the object, and hollowness the utility. In representing pure existence as identical with non-existence, he anticipated Hegel, of our own century, who says, "Seyn und Nichts ist dasselbe"—Being and Non-being are the same. He agrees with those modern philosophers who maintain that God made all things out of himself, but differs from them in never introducing personality into his conception, and consequently excluding will and design from the primordial existence.

(2.) In politics he assigns the original choice of a sovereign to the people, and holds that he whom the people elect is the elect of heaven. He conceives of the sovereign as rather the model and instructor than the judge and ruler of the people. He compares the ruling of a kingdom to the cooking of a small fish, which is easily spoiled by too much cooking. The first duty of the ruler is to rectify himself. This done, it will be easy for him to regulate his kingdom. He speaks in strong terms against military oppression, and has a poor opinion of fire-arms. He opposes capital punishment and excessive taxation. He thinks the people should be kept ignorant—the ruler should empty their minds and fill their stomachs; weaken their wills and strengthen their bones. The intercourse of different states with each other should be regulated by courtesy and forbearance.

(3.) In ethics, Lao-tzu held that in the beginning virtue and vice were unknown terms. Man, without effort, constantly lived according to *Tao*. In the next stage, man—though in the main virtuous—was occasionally sliding into vice, and was unable to retain the stability of unconscious goodness. Then came a period of filial piety and integrity; and, finally, the days of craft, and cunning, and insincerity. He makes no express statement as to the moral condition of human beings at birth, but it may be inferred from some expressions that he regards the spirit as coming pure and perfect from the great Mother, but susceptible of bad influences, which lead it astray. With him, *Tao* is the standard of virtue, the guide and model of the universe. To meet the desire of men for something more tangible, he refers to heaven, earth, and the sages of olden times, but nowhere to a personal god, and there is no clear evidence of his belief in such a being. The virtues which distinguish the perfect man are freedom from ostentation, humility, continence, moderation, gravity, and kindness. Much and fine talking are to be avoided. He assigns a low place to learning, which, he says, adds to the evil of existence; and, if we were to put away learning, we would be exempt from anxiety. There is one passage that seems to refer to a future life, but it is very obscure; and the only future Lao-tzu appears to anticipate is absorption into *Tao*. Most minds will see little difference between absorption into non-existence and annihilation. At chap. xvi of his *Tao-te-king*, where he refers to this subject, he says, "When things have luxuriated for a while, each returns home to its origin. Going home to the origin is called stillness. It is said to be a reversion to destiny. This reversion to destiny is called eternity. He who knows (this) eternity is called bright. He who does not know this eternity wildly works his own misery. He who knows eternity is magnanimous. Being magnanimous, he is catholic. Being catholic, he is a king. Being a king, he is heaven. Being heaven, he is Tau. Being Tau, he is enduring. Though his body perish, he is in no danger." And again, at chap. xxviii, "He who knows the light, and at the same time keeps the shade, will be the whole world's model. Being the whole world's model, eternal virtue will not miss him, and he will return home to the absolute." The attainment, then, of this state of absolute vacuity he looks upon as the chief good, and warns such as have attained to it to keep themselves perfecty still, and to avoid ambition. And, in alluding to the fact that emptiness or non-existence is superior to existence, he says that the former may be said to correspond to use, the latter to gain. "Tau is empty." "The space between heaven and earth may be compared to a bellows; though empty, it never collapses, and the more it is exercised the more it brings forth." To enforce this theory he draws an illustration from common life, and says, "Thirty spokes unite in one nave, and by that part which is non-existent (i. e. the hole in the centre of it) it is useful for a carriage-wheel. Earth is moulded into vessels, and by their hollowness they are useful as vessels. Doors and windows are cut out in

order to make a house, and by its hollowness it is useful as a house."

Since the 2d century A.D. the Taoists have greatly spread in China, Japan, Cochin-China, Tonquin, and among the Indo-Chinese nations. In our day they are especially popular with the common people, and in some parts of China their influence rivals that of the Buddhists. They have, however, greatly corrupted the teachings of their founder; the worship of original Taoism has been degraded into the lowest idolatry, while its priests are jugglers and necromancers, among whom scarcely a trace of the pure spirit of Lao-tzu can be found. See J. P. A. Rémusat, *Memoire sur la Vie et les Opinions de Lao-tseu* (1829); John Chalmers, *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality of the old Philosopher Lau-tsze*, with an Introduction (Lond. 1869, 8vo); the valuable articles of T. Watters in the *Chinese Recorder*, vol. i (1868); Pauthier, *La Chine* (Paris, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo), p. 110–120; Stanislas Julien, *Le Livre des Recompenses* (Paris, 1848, 8vo); Neumann, *Lehrsaal des Mittelreichs* (Munich, 1856, 8vo); Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius* (Lond. 1867, 8vo), ch. v; Loomis, *Confucius and the Chinese Classics*, p. 278 sq.; *Pall Mall Gazette* (London), Sept. 3, 1869, p. 11 sq. See also articles on Lao-tzu in Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.*; and Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex.* (S. L. B.)

Lap (בֶּגֶד, 2 Kings iv, 39, a *garment*, as elsewhere; חֵיק, Prov. xvi, 33, the *bosom*, as elsewhere; חֹצֶן, Neh. v, 13, the *armful*, as in Isa. xlix, 22), the fold of the raiment in which Orientals are accustomed to carry articles in lieu of pockets. Instead of the *fibula* or clasp that was used by the Romans, the Arabs join together with thread, or with a wooden bodkin, the two top corners of their upper garment; and, after having placed them first over one of their shoulders, they then fold the rest of it about their bodies. The outer fold serves them frequently instead of an apron, in which they carry herbs, loaves, corn, and other articles, and may illustrate several allusions made to it in Scripture: thus one of the sons of the prophets went out into the field to gather herbs, and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds his lap full (2 Kings iv, 39). The Psalmist offers up his prayers that Jehovah would "render unto his neighbors sevenfold into their bosom their reproach" (Psa. xix, 12). The same allusion occurs in our Lord's direction, "Give, and it shall be given unto you, good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom" (Luke vi, 38). See Bosom; Dress.

Lapide. See Steen.

Lapĭthæ (Λαπίθαι), in mythical geography, a people of Thessaly, chiefly known to us from their fabled contests with the Centaurs. The battle between the Centaurs and the Lapithæ has been minutely described by Hesiod and Ovid.—Brande and Cox, ii, 317.

Laphria (Λαφρία), a surname of Artemis or Diana among the Calydonians, from which the worship of the goddess was introduced at Naupactus and Patræ, in Achaia. At the latter place it was not established till the time of Augustus, but it became the occasion of a great annual festival (Pausanias, iv, 31, § 6; vii, 18, § 6, etc.; Schol. *ad Eurip. Orest.* 1087). The name Laphria was traced back to a hero, Laphrius, son of Castalius, who was said to have instituted her worship at Calydon. Laphria was also a surname of Athene or Minerva (Lycophron, 356).—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lapĭdes Judaĭci (*Jewish Stones*). In the chalky beds which surround in some parts the summit of Mount Carmel are found numerous hollow stones, lined in the inside with a variety of sparry matter, which, from some distant resemblance, are supposed by the natives to be petrified olives, melons, peaches, and other fruit. These are considered not only as curiosities, but as antidotes against several diseases. Those which bear some resemblance to the olive have been designated *Lapides Judaici*, otherwise "Elijah's Melons," and are superstitiously regarded as an infallible remedy for stone and gravel when dissolved in the juice of lemons. Those supposed petrified fruits are, however, as Dr. Shaw states, only so many different-sized flint-stones, beautified within by sparry and stalagmitical knobs, which are fancifully taken for seeds and kernels. See Carmel.

Lap'idoth (Hebrew *Lappidoth'*, לַפִּידוֹת, *torches*; Sept. Λαφιδώθ), the husband of Deborah the prophetess (Judg. iv, 4). He may have resided with her at the time of her public services as female judge (ver. 5), or more probably he was deceased, and she is named as his widow. B.C. ante 1409. From the fact that the name is in the form of a fem. plur., some have taken it to mean her place of residence (אֵשֶׁת, *woman of*, being understood before it), but without probability (Bertheau, ad loc.). By others the term *lappidoth* has been understood to denote merely her character (q. d. "woman of splendors," i. e. noble, brilliant), or even her occupation merely (q. d. *lamp-trimmer*); but all these are equally nugatory suppositions. See Deborah.

La Pilonnière, François de, an eminent French writer, was born in the second half of the 17th century. After remaining for some time a member of the Order of the Jesuits, he was converted to Protestantism, and on this account was obliged to flee the country. He took refuge first in Holland, then in England, where he was welcomed by bishop Hoadly. The precise time of his death is not ascertained. He wrote *L'Athéisme découvert par le P. Hardouin, Jésuite, dans les écrits de tous les Peres de l'Eglise et des philosophes modernes* (1715, 8vo; and in St. Hyacinthe, *Mémoires Littéraires*, 1716): —*L'Abus des Confessions de Foi* (1716, 8vo):—*An Answer to the R. D. Snape's Accusation, containing an account of his behavior and suffering amongst the Jesuits* (Lond. 1717, 8vo; transl. into Latin in 1718): it is a sort of autobiography:—*Défense des Principes de la Tolérance* (London, 1718, 8vo):—*Further Account of himself* (Lond. 1729, 8vo). He translated also into French Pope's *Essay on Criticism* (1717); Plato's *Republic* (1725, 8vo); Burnet's *Histoire des dernières Révolutions d'Angleterre* (La Haye, 1725, 2 vols. 4to; London, 3 vols. 12mo; latest edit. La Haye, 1735); and some works of bishop Bauger and of Steele. See Adelung, *Suppl. z. Jocher*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 527. (J. N. P.)

Lapis (*the stone*), a surname of Jupiter at Rome, as is evident from the expression "Jovem Lapidem" (Cicero, *ad Fam.* vii, 12; Gellius, i, 21; Polybius, iii, 26). It was formerly believed that Jupiter Lapis was a stone statue of the god, or originally a rude stone serving as a symbol, around which people assembled for the purpose of worshipping Jupiter. But it is now generally acknowledged that the pebble or flint-stone was regarded as a symbol of lightning, and that therefore, in some representations of Jupiter, he held a stone in his hand instead of the thunderbolt (Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* iv, 25). Such a stone ("lapis Capitolinus," August. *De Civ. Dei*, ii, 29) was even set up as a symbolic representation of the god himself (Serv. *ad Æn.* viii, 641). When a treaty was to be concluded, the sacred symbols of Jupiter were taken from his temple, viz. his sceptre, the pebble and grass from the district of the temple, for the purpose of swearing by them ("per Jovem Lapidem jurare," Livy, i, 24; xxx, 43). A pebble or flint-stone was also used by the Romans in killing the animal when an oath was to be accompanied by a sacrifice, and this custom was probably a remnant of very early times, when metal instruments were not yet used for such purposes.—Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Laplace (Placæus), **Josué de,** a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1605. After completing his studies in the University of Saumur, he taught philosophy for a

while, and in 1625 was appointed pastor of the Church at Nantes. He left this situation in 1633, to become professor of theology in the University of Saumur. Here, with L. Cappel and Moses Amyraut, he gave a new impulse to theological studies. Laplace, attacking the Calvinistic dogma of the imputation of original sin to all the descendants of Adam, endeavored to show its incompatibility with the divine mercy and justice. According to him, original sin is only indirectly imputed to man, and he has to answer only for his own individual sins. The orthodox party in the Calvinistic Church strongly opposed this doctrine, and, on the motion of Garissoles, the national Synod of Charenton (in 1644) formally condemned it, without, however, naming the author. The schools of Sedan, Geneva, and Holland denounced it also as impious and heretical. On the other hand, it obtained the approbation of all moderate people. A large number of provincial synods thought the national synod had been too hasty in condemning a doctrine before taking time to thoroughly investigate and discuss it; they refused to submit to the verdict until another national synod should decide. Laplace, for fear of increasing the difficulties, patiently submitted to the repeated attacks of Desmarets, Rivet, and other orthodox theologians. He only answered them after waiting vainly for ten years for the convocation of the synod which was to decide. He died at Saumur Aug. 17, 1665. His works are, *Discours en forme de dialogue entre un père et son fils*, etc. (Quevilly, 1629, 8vo); often reprinted, also under title *Entretiens d'un père et de son fils sur le changement de religion* (Saumur, 1682, 12mo; translat. into German, Basle, 1665, 8vo):—*Examen des Raisons pour et contre le sacrifice de la Messe* (Saumur, 1639, 8vo):—*Suite de l'Examen*, etc. (Saumur, 1643, 8vo):—*De locis Zachariæ xi*, 13; *xii*, 10; *Malachia iii*, 1 (Saumur, 1650, 4to):—*Exposition et Paraphrase du Cantique des Cantiques* (Saumur, 1656, 8vo):—*Explication typique de l'histoire de Joseph* (transl. from the Latin of Laplace by Rosel, Saumur, 1658, 8vo):—*De argumentis quibus efficitur Christum prius fuisse quam in utero beatæ Virginis secundum carnem conciperetur* (Saumur, 1649, 4to):—*De Testimoniis et Argumentis ex Veteri Testamento petitis, quibus probatur Dominum nostrum Jesum-Christum esse Deum, præditum essentia divina* (Saumur, 1651, 4to):—*Catechesis pro conversione Judæorum* (Saumur, 4to):—*Theses Theologicæ de statu hominis lapsi ante gratium* (Saumur, 1640, 4to): this is the work whose doctrines were condemned by the Synod of Charenton in 1644:—*De Imputatione primi peccati Adami* (Saumur, 1655, 4to): a defence of his opinions:—*Opuscula nonnulla* (Saumur, 1656, 8vo):—*Syntagma Thesium theologicarum* (Saumur, 1660, 3 pts. 4to; 4th part, 1664). A complete collection of Laplace's works was published under the style *Opera Omnia* (Franeker, 1699, and Aubincit, 1702, 2 vols. 4to). See Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii, 404; Aymon, *Synodes des Eglises Réformées de France*, ii, 680; Weismann, *Historia Eccles.* sæc. xvii, p. 919; Haag, *La France Protestante;* T. Colani, *Revue de Théologie*, Oct. 1855; Bartholmess, *Discours sur la vie et le caractère de J. de La Place*, in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* (1853); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, viii, 97; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 529; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xi, 755 sq. (J. N. P.)

Laplace, Pierre Simon de, a noted French philosopher, one of the greatest astronomers and mathematicians of any age or country, born at Beaumont-en-Auge (Calvados), in France, March 23, 1749, of humble parentage, and appointed professor of mathematics in the military school at Paris in 1768, and membre-adjoint of the Academy of Sciences in 1773, first made a reputation for himself by his *Exposition du Système du Monde*, which he published in 1796, and which was simply an outline for popular use of his greater treatise, *La Mecanique céleste*, of which the first two volumes were sent forth in 1798, the third in 1802, the fourth in 1805, and the fifth in 1825, and still later (1827) a posthumous supplement (for a full synopsis of the contents of this great work on mathematical astronomy, see *Penny Cyclop.* xiii, 326 sq.), a book which will doubtless preserve his memory to the latest posterity. He also wrote *Théorie Analytique sur les Probabilités* (1812), and *Essai Philosophique sur les Probabilités* (1814). He died May 5, 1827. His last words were, "Ce que nous connaissons est peu de chose; ce que nous ignorons, est immense." "The author of the *Mecanique Céleste*, to use a common synonyme for Laplace, must be an object of the admiration of posterity as long as any record of the 18th century exists. For many years he was the head, though not the hand of European astronomy; and most of the labors of observation were made in directions pointed out by him, or for the furtherance of his discoveries in the consequences of the law of gravitation. It is sometimes stated by English writers that Laplace was an atheist. We have attentively examined every passage which has been brought in proof of this assertion, and we can find nothing which makes either for or against such a supposition. . . . . An attempt to explain how the solar system might possibly have arisen from the cooling of a mass of fluid or vapor is called atheistical because it attempts to ascend one step in the chain of causes; the *Principia* of Newton was designated by the same term, and for a similar reason. What Laplace's opinions were we do not know; and it is not fair that a writer who, at a time of perfect license on such matters, has studiously avoided entering on the subject, should be stated as of one opinion or the other upon the authority of a few passages of which it can only be said (as it could equally be said of most mathematical works) that they might have been written by a person of any religious or political sentiments whatever" (*Penny Cyclop.* xiii, 325–328). See Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1372; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 531 sq.

La Placette, Jean, a distinguished French Protestant theologian and moralist, was born at Pontac, in Bearn, Jan. 19, 1639, and studied theology at the Protestant Academy of Montauban. Appointed pastor of Orthez in 1660, he removed in the same capacity to Naï in 1664, and remained there until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, refusing several pressing invitations from the important congregation of Charenton. At the revocation he obtained leave to go to Holland, from whence he afterwards went to Prussia. In 1686 he finally accepted the office of pastor to the French Church at Copenhagen, which he held until 1711. He then resigned and retired to Utrecht, where he died April 25, 1718. His principal works are, *Traité des Bonnes Œuvres en general* (Amst. 1709, 12mo):—*Traité de la Restitution*, etc. (Amst. 1696, 12mo):—*La mort des justes, ou la manière de bien mourir* (La Haye, 1729, 12mo):—*Traité de l'Aumone* (Amsterd. 1699, 12mo):—*Divers traités sur les matières de Conscience* (Amst. 1697, 12mo):—*The Death of the Righteous*, etc., translated by Thomas Fenton, M.A. (Lond. 1725, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Traité de la foi divine* (Roter. 1716, 3 vols. 12mo):—*La communion dévote, ou la manière de participer saintement et utilement à l'Eucharistie* (Amsterd. 6me edit. 1706, 12mo):—*La morale Chrétienne abrégée*, etc. (Amst. 2d ed. 1701, 12mo):—*Essais de morale* (Amst. 1716, 4 vols. 12mo):—*Nouveau essais de morale* (La Haye, 1715, 2 vols. 12mo):—*The incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome* (Gibson's *Preservative*, xvi, 176); etc. See *Vie de La Placette*, by Carrier de St. Philippe, in *Avis sur la manière de prêcher;* Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. ii; *Europe Savante*, vol. xviii; *Nouvelles Littéraires*, July, 1718, Haag, *La France Protestante;* Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Sayons, *Hist. de la littér. Française à l'étranger*, ii, 211–220; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 549; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 1767. (J. N. P.)

Lapland (native *Sameanda*), a territory in the northernmost part of Europe, is bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean, on the south by Finland and the Swedish province of Norrland, on the east by the White Sea, and on the west by Norway. The winter is very long

and severe; the summer lasts only nine weeks, but is, in consequence of the very long days, almost as hot as in Italy, and, owing to the innumerable mosquitoes, most oppressive for both man and beast. Only in the southern part of Swedish Lapland is the soil capable of cultivation; the corn is sown towards the close of May, and reaped in the middle of August, but is frequently spoiled by night-frosts. The territory is but very thinly settled, and only a part of it is now occupied by the people to which it owes its name, the southern and better portions having been gradually encroached upon by Norwegians, Swedes, and Finlanders, till the Laplanders proper have in a great measure been cooped up within the Arctic Circle. The territory is politically divided into three parts: 1. Norwegian Lapland or Finnmark, containing 27,315.70 square miles and 13,668 inhabitants, all Laplanders, or, as they are here called, Finnar. 2. Swedish Lapland, containing 49,035.17 square miles, with a population of 27,443 inhabitants, of whom only 5685 are Laplanders, and all the remainder Swedish colonists, whose number has steadily increased since 1760, when the first two Swedish families settled in the country. 3. Russian Lapland, which partly belongs to Finland and partly to the government of Archangel, and embraces Eastern Lapland, with the peninsula of Kola, also called the Lapland peninsula. The number of Laplanders in Russian Lapland had in 1852 been reduced to 2290. The native inhabitants, Laplanders or Laps, call themselves Sami or Samelads, and consider Lapland and Laplanders as terms of abuse. They are either Fjell-Lappar-Finner, mountain Laplanders, who lead a nomadic life, and pasture large reindeer herds; or Skogs-Lappar, forest Laplanders, chiefly occupied with hunting and fishing, leaving their herds of reindeer in charge of the preceding class; or Soë-Finner, sea or shore Laplanders, who, too poor to possess such herds, have been obliged to fix their residence upon the coast, and subsist chiefly by fishing; or Sockne Lappar, parish Lappars, who hire themselves out as servants, chiefly for tending the reindeer. They are good-natured, honest, superstitious, and patriotic, and, with the exception of an inclination to drunkenness, they show neither great vices nor great virtues. The origin of the Laplanders is not yet fully cleared up, as their physical characteristics point partly to the Mongolian and partly to the Caucasian race. The prevailing opinion, however, is, that they are only a variety of Tchude or Finns. The Christianization of the Laplanders did not begin until, in 1275, a part of their territory was annexed to Sweden. For several centuries, however, no results were obtained except the introduction of Christian baptism and Christian marriage. The Norwegian part of Lapland belonged to the archbishopric of Nidaros (Drontheim): the Swedish to the archbishopric of Upsala. Gustavus I, of Sweden, in the first half of the 16th century, established the first Lappish school in the town of Pikeå. Charles IX and Christina made great efforts for bringing them over to the Lutheran Church, while in Norwegian Finnark king Christian IV, of Denmark (about 1600), extirpated the remnants of paganism by force. The Christianization of this part of Lapland was completed by the zeal of bishop Eric Bredahl, of Drontheim (1643 to 1672), and his successors. At the beginning of the 18th century, Isaac Olsen, a poor man, during fourteen years, labored among the Laplanders for their Christianization, and king Frederick IV, of Denmark, in 1715 and 1717, for the same purpose, established theological seminaries in Copenhagen and Drontheim. In 1730 king Christian VI issued an order that every Laplander, before the nineteenth year of his age, must receive confirmation, from which time the parents began to bestow greater care upon the education of their children. The government appointed travelling teachers, and also several resident clergymen, who at first found their progress greatly delayed by the difficulty of mastering the Lappish language. The kings of Sweden since Frederick I (1748) worked with great zeal, but little success, for the entire conversion of the Laplanders. In the treaty of Friedrichshaven Sweden had to cede its Lappish territory to Russia, but in 1814, in the treaty of Kiel, it received another portion from Norway. The most zealous missionary who has labored among the Laplanders was pastor Stockfleth (born in 1787), who joined them in their nomadic life, and preached to them in their own language, which it cost him great efforts to learn. At present divine service is held in the Lappish, Swedish, and Finnish languages. During the summer months the Laplanders, who during this time are moving with their reindeer further into the mountains, are visited by clergymen of Southern Lapland. The Laplanders show great docility for the reception of the Christian doctrine, but their Christianity is still mixed up with many superstitious views and pagan customs. The Roman Catholic Church established in 1855 the Prefecture Apostolic of the North Pole, which embraces Lapland, the Faroë Islands, Greenland, and the northernmost part of America. The apostolic prefect resides at Tromsoë, the capital of Finnmark; another Laplandish station has been established at Altengard. See Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 421 sq.; Neher, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 406 sq. (A. J. S.)

Lapping (לָקַק, to *lick* up like a dog, 1 Kings xxi, 19, etc.) of water by "putting their hand to their mouth," spoken of as a test in reference to Gideon's men (Judg. vii, 5, 6), is still in the East supposed to distinguish those who evince an alacrity and readiness which fits them in a peculiar manner for any active service in which they are to be engaged. See Gideon. Among the Arabs, lapping with their hands is a common and very expeditious way of taking in liquids. "The dog drinks by shaping the end of his long, thin tongue into the form of a spoon, which it rapidly introduces and withdraws from the water, throwing each time a spoonful of the fluid into his mouth. The tongue of man is not adapted to this use; and it is physically impossible for a man, therefore, to lap literally as a dog laps. The true explanation, probably, is that these men, instead of kneeling down to take a long draught, or successive draughts from the water, employed their hand as the dog employs his tongue—that is, forming it into a hollow spoon, and dipping water with it from the stream. Practice gives a peculiar tact in this mode of drinking; and the interchange of the hand between the water and the mouth is so rapidly managed as to be comparable to that of the dog's tongue in similar circumstances. Besides, the water is not usually sucked out of the hand into the mouth, but by a peculiar knack is jerked into the mouth before the hand is brought close to it, so that the hand is approaching with a fresh supply almost before the preceding has been swallowed: this is another resemblance to the action of a dog's tongue. On coming to water, a person who wishes to drink cannot stop the whole party to wait for him when travelling in caravans, and therefore, if on foot, any delay would oblige him to unusual exertion in order to overtake his party. He therefore drinks in the manner described, and has satisfied his thirst in much less time than one who, having more leisure, or being disposed to more deliberate enjoyment, looks out for a place where he may kneel or lie down to bring his mouth in contact with the water, and imbibe long and slow draughts of it" (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, ad loc.).

Lapse is a term used in English ecclesiastical law to denote the failure to exercise the right of presenting or collating a vacant ecclesiastical benefice within the lawful period. On such occasions, if the bishop be the patron, the right devolves or lapses to the archbishop, and if the archbishop omits to take advantage thereof, to the king. So also if any person, other than the bishop, be patron, on his neglecting to present, the right lapses in the first place to the bishop, on the bishop's neglect to the archbishop, and from him to the king. The patron, the bishop, and the archbishop are severally and successively allowed the full period of six calen-

dar months, exclusive of the day on which the benefice becomes void; and if the bishop be himself the patron, he must collate to the benefice within the period of the first six months after the vacancy, as he is not entitled to six months in his character of patron, and six months more in his character of bishop. When the patron's six months have expired, his right of presentation is not absolutely destroyed by the lapse which then takes place, but the bishop acquires merely a kind of concurrent right with him; for, although the bishop may collate immediately after the lapse, yet, so long as he suffers the benefice to continue vacant, he cannot refuse to institute a person presented by the patron; and, in like manner, when the bishop's six months have expired, the patron may present at any time before the archbishop has filled up the vacancy. By these means provision is made against the improper duration of vacancies in the Church; for when the benefice has continued vacant for six months, the patronage for that turn becomes an object of competition between the original patron and the bishop or archbishop, as the case may be, the nominee of that party which presents first being entitled to the benefice. But when the right to present has passed the bishop and the archbishop, and through their neglect has actually lapsed to the crown, a different rule prevails, arising from an old maxim of English law, that the king's rights shall never be barred or destroyed by delay on his part. *Nullum tempus occurrit regi.* When, therefore, the lapse to the king has actually occurred, the right of presentation for that turn is absolutely vested in him; and if the patron presents while the benefice continues vacant, the king may present at any time afterwards before another vacancy occurs, and may turn out the patron's nominee. But if the patron's nominee is instituted and inducted, and dies incumbent, or if, after his induction, he is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, or resigns *bona fide*, and not with intent to defeat the king's right to present, before the king has exercised that right, it is then held that his right is destroyed; for he was only entitled to the presentation for one turn, and his having permitted the patron to present for that turn will not entitle him to any other. When the vacancy is occasioned by the death of the incumbent, or by his cession, which is his own voluntary act, being the acceptance of a second benefice incompatible with the one which he already holds, the patron is bound to take notice of the vacancy, without its being notified to him by the bishop, and his six months are calculated from the time at which the vacancy actually occurs. But when the incumbent is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, and when he resigns, such resignation being necessarily made into the hands of the bishop, it is held that, as neither his deprivation nor resignation can be complete without the concurrence of the bishop, the bishop ought to notify the vacancy to the patron, and that the patron's six months are to be calculated from the time at which such notice is given. And in like manner, if the patron presents in due time, and the bishop refuses to institute the person so presented on the ground of his insufficiency, the bishop ought, if the patron be a layman, to give notice of his refusal, and until he does so no lapse can take place; but if the patron be a spiritual person, it appears from the old law-books that no notice is necessary, because the spiritual person is presumed to be a competent judge of the morals and abilities of the person whom he has selected for the appointment. If, on account of some such neglect or omission on the part of the bishop, the benefice does not lapse to him, it cannot lapse to the archbishop or to the king; for it is a rule that a lapse cannot take place *per saltum*, that is, by leaping over or leaving out the intermediate steps. This rule protects the patron's right from being ever injured by the improper refusal of the bishop to institute his nominee; for the bishop can take no advantage of that which is occasioned by his own wrongful act, neither can the archbishop or the king, for the reason alleged above. This right of lapse appears to have been first established about the time of the reign of Henry II, and to be coeval with the practice of institution. Previously to that period the incumbent's title was complete, upon his appointment by the patron, without his being instituted by the bishop. But the Church of Rome, always anxious to render the clergy independent of the laity, strongly opposed this custom (*pravam consuetudinem*, as Pope Alexander III, in a letter to Thomas à Becket, designates it), and insisted that the right of appointing to ecclesiastical benefices belonged exclusively to the bishops. This introduced the ceremony of *institution* (q. v.). It is, however, contended by some that institution is as ancient as the establishment of Christianity in England; but Blackstone (ii, 33) maintains that it was introduced at the time stated above. After that period the bishop alone had the power of conferring the legal title to the vacant church, which he did by institution; but he was still bound to institute the person presented to him for that purpose by the patron, provided the patron presented some one. But how long was the bishop to wait to see whether it was the patron's intention to exercise his right of presentation? The law declared that he should wait a reasonable time; and with a due regard to the interest of the patron and the convenience of the public, it has settled that time to be six months. See Jus Devolutum.

Lapsed. See Lapsi.

Lapsi, in the more extended meaning of the word, "*the fallen*," especially those who were excluded from communion with the Church on account of having committed one of the *peccata mortalia*. In a more restricted sense, it was used to denote such as had "fallen away," i. e. committed the *peccatum mortale* of denying their faith. It was natural that these should be first designated by the expression of "lapsi," as heretics were very numerous in the early ages of the Church, and the question of their reintegration into the Church was one of considerable importance. As, after the close of the persecutions, there were no longer any "lapsi" in that sense of the word, it came to be applied as synonymous with *pœnitentes* or *hæretici*, though only occasionally. Compare Henschel, *Glossarium*, s. v.

The "lapsi" were especially numerous when persecution assumed the regular and systematic form it obtained in Roman law under Nerva and Trajan. Persistence in the profession of Christianity was alone considered a crime against the state. Yet Trajan granted full forgiveness to the Christians who consented to offer up incense before his statues and those of the gods. During the Decian persecution the form of abjuration became even more simple. Those who shrank from offering up sacrifices were *supposed* to have done so by the authorities. Indeed, in many instances certificates were given by magistrates that the law had actually been complied with. Such mild measures made it easy for many to recant. Cyprian informs us that large numbers eagerly recanted in Carthage even before the persecution broke out; and Tertullian (*De fuga in persec.* c. 13) relates with righteous indignation that whole congregations, with the clergy at their head, would at times resort to dishonorable bribes in order to avert persecution. But, after the end of the persecution, many tried to unite again with the Church. The question now arose whether the Church could again receive them as members, and on what conditions; and also, who had the power to decide that question? In the first ages such penitents were, upon their confessions, readmitted by imposition of hands. Confessors had the privilege of issuing letters of peace (*libelli pacis*) to the lapsed, which facilitated their early reception to communion. But such penitents were ineligible for holy orders, and, if already ordained, they were deposed, not being allowed to resume their clerical functions, but suffered only to remain in lay communion. By degrees these admissions were made still easier, and therefore became a matter of serious consideration by the Council of Ancyra (q. v.), and

resulted in the revival of the old Montanist controversy as to the purity and holiness of the Church, besides provoking another as to the extent of episcopal powers. On the controversies and schisms which were thus provoked in the African Church, see the articles CYPRIAN; DECIUS; FELICISSIMUS; MARTYRS AND CONFESSORS; NOVATIAN; NOVATUS. (Compare also Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. i, § 114 and 115.) Epiphanius asserts that Meletius revived the struggle against the laxity of Church discipline; yet this assertion is not fully substantiated; the question of authority was already the foremost in these discussions. See MELETIUS. This was still more the case in the controversy with the Donatists (q. v.).

The only other points to be noticed are some decisions of the councils which gradually elaborated each of the principles finally established. Thus seven *canones* (1–8) of the Synod of Ancyra determine the penance to be performed by the *lapsi*. It distinguished between those who cheerfully partook of the repast which followed the sacrifices offered to idols, those who partook of it reluctantly and with tears, and those who ate none of it. These latter were punished with two years of penance, the others more severely. Priests who had sacrificed to idols lost their ecclesiastical character. The Synod of Nicæa was still more lenient. Those against whom it was most severe were persons who had recanted without being threatened in their lives or fortunes; yet even those, while declared to be "unworthy of the pity of the Church," were also readmitted. Naturally, as persecution decreased, the Church became less stringent, as it had no longer to fear desertions. Even before that the practice of the Eastern Church had become very lenient. See Tertullian, *De pudicitiu; De pœnitentia;* Cyprian, *De lapsis; epistolæ; epp. canonicæ Dionysii Alexandrini*, c. 262; Mansi, *Acta Concil.* (Ancyr. 1–8; Nicæn. 10–13; II Carthag. 3; III Carthag. 27; Agath. 15); Jacobi Sirmondi *Historia pœnitentiæ publ.* (1650); Joh. Morini *Comm. histor. de disciplina in administratione sacr. pœnit. 13 primis sæculis* (1651); Klee, *Die Beichte, eine hist. krit. Untersuchung* (1828); Krause, *Diss. de lapsis primæ ecclesiæ;* Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* p. 624 sq.; Siegel, *Christlich-Kirchliche Alterthümer*, i, 290 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv, 215, 282 sq.; v, 59, 313, 382; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 200; Blunt, *Dict. Hist. and Doct. Theology*, p. 395. See APOSTASY. (J. H. W.)

Lapwing, in our version, is used for דּוּכִיפַת (*dukiphath'*, perhaps from דּוּךְ, the Arabic for *cock*, and כִּפָּא, *head*, i. e. topknot), a word which, occurring as the name of an unclean bird only in Lev. xi, 19 and Deut. xiv, 18, affords no internal or collateral evidence to establish the propriety of the translation. It has been surmised to mean "double-crest," which is sufficiently correct when applied to the *hoopoe*, but less so when applied to the lapwing (Targum, *Gallus montanus*), or the cock of the woods, *Tetrao urogallus*, for which bird Bochart produces a more direct etymology; and he might have appealed to the fact that the *Attagan* visits Syria in winter, exclusive of at least two species of *Pterocles*, or sand-grouse, which probably remain all the year. But these names were anciently, as well as in modern times, so often confounded that the Greek writers even used the term Gallinacea to denote the hoopoe; for Hesychius explains ἔποψ in Æschylus by the Greek appellations of "moor-cock" and "mountain-cock" (see Bochart, s. v. Dukiphath); and in modern languages similar mistakes respecting this bird are abundant. Æschylus speaks of the hoopoe by name, and expressly calls it the *bird of the rocks* (*Fragm.* 291, quoted by Aristotle, *H. A.* ix, 49). Ælian (*N. A.* iii, 26) says that these birds build their nests in *lofty rocks*. Aristotle's words are to the same effect, for he writes, "Now some animals are found in the mountains, as the *hoopoe*, for instance" (*H. A.* i, 1). When the two lawsuit-wearied citizens of Athens, Euelpides and Pisthetærus, in the comedy of the *Birds* of Aristophanes (20, 54), are on their search for the home of Epops, king of birds, their *ornithological* conductors lead them through a wild, desert tract *terminated by mountains and rocks*, in which is situated the royal aviary of Epops. The Septuagint and Vulgate agree with the Arabian interpreters in translating the Hebrew term by ἔποψ and *upupa;* and, as the Syrian name is *kikuphah*, and the Egyptian *kukuphah*, both apparently of the same origin as *dukiphath*, the propriety of substituting hoopoe for lapwing in our version appears sufficiently established. The word *hoopoe* is evidently onomatopoetic, being derived from the voice of the bird, which resembles the words "hoop, hoop," softly but rapidly uttered. "It utters at times a sound closely resembling the word *hoop, hoop, hoop*, but breathed out so softly, but rapidly, as to remind the hearer of the note of the dove" (Yarrell, *Brit. Birds*, ii, 176). The Germans call the bird *Ein Houp*, the French, *La Huppe*, which is particularly appropriate, as it refers both to the crest and note of the bird. In Sweden it is known by the name of *Här-Fogel*, the army-bird, because, from its ominous cry, frequently heard in the wilds of the forest, while the bird itself moves off as any one approaches, the common people have supposed that seasons of scarcity and war are impending (Lloyd's *Scand. Advent.* ii, 321).

The hoopoe is not uncommon in Palestine at this day (Forskäl, *Descr. Anim.* pref. p. 7, Russel, *Aleppo.* ii, 81; Höst, *Nachr. v. Marokko*, p. 297; compare Jerome, *ad Zech.* v, 9; Bechstein, *Naturgesch.* ii, 547), and was from remote ages a bird of mystery. Many and strange are the stories which are told of the hoopoe in ancient Oriental fable, and some of these stories are by no means to its credit. It seems to have been always regarded, both by Arabians and Greeks, with a superstitious reverence —a circumstance which it owes, no doubt, partly to its crest (Aristoph. *Birds*, 94; compare Ovid, *Met.* vi, 672), which certainly gives it a most imposing appearance, partly to the length of its beak, and partly, also, to its habits. "If any one anointed himself with its blood, and then fell asleep, he would see dæmons suffocating him"—"if its liver were eaten with rue, the eater's wits would be sharpened, and pleasing memories be excited" —are superstitions held respecting this bird. One more fable narrated of the hoopoe is given, because its origin can be traced to a peculiar habit of the bird. The Arabs say that the hoopoe is a betrayer of secrets; that it is able, moreover, to point out hidden wells and fountains under ground. Now the hoopoe, on settling upon the ground, has a strange and portentous-looking habit of bending the head downwards till the point of the beak touches the ground, raising and depressing its crest at the same time. Hence, with much probability, arose the Arabic fable. These stories, absurd as they are, are here mentioned because it was perhaps in a great measure owing, not only to the uncleanly habits of the bird, but also to the superstitious feeling with which the hoopoe was regarded by the Egyptians and heathen generally, that it was forbidden as food to the Israelites, whose affections Jehovah wished to wean from the land of their bondage, to which, as we know, they fondly clung. The summit of the augural rod is said to have been carved in the form of a hoopoe's head; and one of the kind is still used by Indian gosseins, and even Armenian bishops, attention being no doubt drawn to the bird by its peculiarly arranged bars upon a delicate vinous fawn color, and further embellished with a beautiful fan-shaped crest of the same color. The hoopoe is a bird of the slender-billed tribe, allied to the creepers (*Certhiadæ*), about as large as a pigeon, but rather more slender. The general hue is a delicate reddish buff, but the back, wings, and tail are beautifully marked with broad alternate bands of black and white: the feathers of the crest, which can be raised or dropped at pleasure, are terminated by a white space tipped with black. In Egypt these birds are numerous (Sonnini, *Travels*, i, 204), forming probably two species, the one permanently resident about human habitations, the other migratory, and the same that visits Europe. The lat-

Hoopoe (*Upupa Epops*).

ter wades in the mud when the Nile has subsided, and seeks for worms and insects; and the former is known to rear its young so much immersed in the shards and fragments of beetles, etc., as to cause a disagreeable smell about its nest, which is always in holes or in hollow trees. Though an unclean bird in the Hebrew law, the common migratory hoopoe is eaten in Egypt, and sometimes also in Italy; but the stationary species is considered inedible. See Macgillivray's *British Birds*, iii, 43; Yarrell, *Brit. B.* ii, 178, 2d ed.; Lloyd's *Scandinavian Adventures*, ii, 321. The chief grounds for all the filthy habits which have been ascribed to this much-maligned bird are to be found in the fact that it resorts to dunghills, etc., in search of the worms and insects which it finds there. A writer in *Ibis*, i, 49, says, "We found the hoopoe a very good bird to eat." Tristram says of the hoopoe (*Ibis*, i, 27): "The Arabs have a superstitious reverence for this bird, which they believe to possess marvellous medicinal qualities, and call it 'the Doctor.' Its head is an indispensable ingredient in all charms, and in the practice of witchcraft." See Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 107 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, ii, 326; Oedmann, *Samml.* v, 66 sq.; Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.* i, 254 sq.; *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Upupidæ; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 392.

Dr. Thomson, however, dissents from the common view above that the Hebrew *dukiphath* is the ordinary hed-hood or hoopoe, on the ground that the latter "is a small bird, *good to eat*, comparatively rare, and therefore not likely to have been mentioned at all by Moses, and still less to have been classed with the unclean." He proposes the English *pewit*, called by the natives *now* and *bu-teet*. "The bird appears in Palestine only in the depth of winter. It then disperses over the mountains, and remains until early spring, when it entirely disappears. It roosts on the ground wherever night overtakes it. It utters a loud scream when about to fly, which sounds like the last of the above names. It is regarded as an unclean bird by the Arabs. The upper part of the body and wings are of a dull slate-color, the under parts of both are white. It has a topknot on the hinder part of the head pointing backward like a horn, and when running about on the ground it closely resembles a young hare" (*Land and Book*, i, 104).

The Pewit.

Lardner, Dionysius, LL.D., a distinguished English writer on physical science, was born in Dublin April 3, 1793, and was appointed professor of natural philosophy and astronomy in University College, London, in 1828. In 1830 he projected a sort of Encyclopædia, consisting of original treatises on history, science, economics, etc., by the most eminent authors, and 134 volumes were accordingly published, under the general name of *Lardner's Cyclopædia*, between 1830 and 1844. Some of these volumes were from his own pen. A second issue of this work was begun in 1853. He has published various scientific works, the most important of which are his "hand-books" of various branches of natural philosophy (1854-56). He is also the author of the *Museum of Science and Art*, an excellent popular exposition of the physical sciences, with their applications. He died in Paris April 29, 1859.

Lardner, Nathaniel, D.D., a very noted English theologian and minister of the Presbyterian Church, of Arian tendency, was born in Hawkshurst, in Kent, in 1684. In early life he was a pupil of Dr. Joshua Oldfield, a minister of eminence in that denomination, but, like many of the Dissenters of his time, he preferred to go abroad to prosecute his studies. He spent more than three years at the University of Utrecht, where he studied under Grævius and Burmann, and was then some time at the University of Leyden. He returned to England in 1703, and continued to prosecute his theological studies with a view to the ministry, which he entered at the age of twenty-five. He began preaching at Stoke-Newington in 1709, but, owing to his want of power to modulate his voice, soon became private chaplain and tutor in the family of lady Treby. In 1724 he was appointed lecturer at the Old Jewry, where he delivered in outline his work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (London, 1727-43, 5 vols. 8vo), generally acknowledged as constituting the most unanswerable defence of Christianity to our own day. "The work is unequalled for the extent and accuracy of its investigations. Recent researches supplement it, but it is not likely that they will ever supersede it" (W. J. Cox in Kitto). Sir James Mackintosh, in his remarks on Paley (in the *View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy*), rather discredits its general usefulness as an apologetical work, because it "soon wearies out the greater part of readers," though there are many eminent English critics who think otherwise (compare Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Am. Authors*, ii, 1060). But even sir J. Mackintosh concedes that with the scholar it has power: "The few who are more patient have almost always been gradually won over to feel pleasure in a display of knowledge, probity, charity, and meekness unmatched by an avowed advocate in a case deeply interesting his warmest feelings" (compare also Leland, *Deistical Writers*). In 1729 he was unexpectedly called to the Church in Crutched Friars, which position he accepted and held for about twenty-two years. He died at his native place in 1768, having devoted his long life to the prosecution of theological inquiry, to the exclusion of almost any other subject. As a supplement to *The Credibility*, Lardner wrote *History of the Apostles and Evangelists, writers of the N. Test.* (1756-57, again 1760, 3 vols. 8vo; also in vol. ii of bishop Watson's *Collection of Tracts*). Dr. Lardner likewise wrote many other treatises, in which his store of learning is brought to bear on questions important in Christian the-

ology. The most remarkable of these, his minor publications, are his *Letter on the Logos* (1759), in which it distinctly appears that he was of the Unitarian or Socinian school; and *History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries after Christ* (published after his decease [1780, 4to], with additions by John Hogg). The best edition of Lardner's works is that by Dr. Andrew Kippis (Lond. 1788, 11 vols. 8vo); but it is no mean proof of the estimation in which they are held, that, large as the collection is, they were reprinted entire as late as 1838 (Lond. 10 vols. 8vo, a very handsome edition). His writings, now more than a century old, are still regarded as "a bulwark on the side of truth," so much so that not only ministers and students of theology of our day can ill afford to be without them, but every intelligent layman who seeks to do his duty in the Church, of which he is a part, should possess and study them. "In the applause of Dr. Lardner," says T. H. Horne (*Bibl. Bib.* p. 368), "all parties of Christians are united, regarding him as the champion of their common and holy faith. Secker, Porteus, Watson, Tomline, Jortin, Hay, and Paley, of the Anglican Church; Doddridge, Kippis, and Priestley, among the Dissenters, and all foreign Protestant Biblical critics have rendered public homage to his learning, his fairness, and his great merits as a Christian apologist. The candid of the literati of the Romish communion have extolled his labors; and even Morgan and Gibbon, professed unbelievers, have awarded to him the meed of faithfulness and impartiality. By collecting a mass of scattered evidences in favor of the authenticity of the evangelical history, he established a bulwark on the side of truth which infidelity has never presumed to attack." See Dr. Kippis, *Life of Lardner*, in vol. i of the works of the latter; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, ii, 1060; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 468; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, ii, pt. iii, App. p. 407.

Larès, in connection with the MANÈS and the PENĀTÈS, were tutelary spirits, genii, or deities of the ancient Romans. The derivation of the names is not perhaps quite certain, but the first is generally considered the plural of *lar*, an Etruscan word signifying "lord" or "hero;" the second is supposed to mean "the good or benevolent ones;" and the third is connected with *penus*, "the innermost part of a house or sanctuary." The Lares, Manes, and Penates do not appear to have been regarded as essentially different beings, for the names are frequently used either interchangeably or in such a conjunction as almost implies identity. Yet some have thought that a distinction is discernible, and have looked upon the Lares as earthly, the Manes as infernal, and the Penates as heavenly protectors—a notion which has probably originated in the fact that Manes is a general name for the souls of the departed, those who inhabit the lower world; while among the Penates are included such great deities as Jupiter, Juno, Vesta, etc. Hence we may perhaps infer that the Manes were just the Lares viewed as departed spirits, and that the Penates embraced not only the Lares, but all spirits, whether dæmons or deities, who exercised a "special providence" over families, cities, etc. Of the former, Manes, we know almost nothing distinctively. An annual festival was held in their honor on the 19th of February, called *Feralia* or *Parentalia*, of the latter, Penates, we are in nearly equal ignorance, but of the Lares we have a somewhat detailed account. They were, like the Penates, divided into two classes — *Lares domestici* and *Lares publici*. The former were the souls of virtuous ancestors set free from the realm of shades by the Acherontic rites, and exalted to the rank of protectors of their descendants. They were, in short, household gods, and their worship was really a worship of ancestors. The first of the Lares in point of honor was the *Lar familiaris*, the founder of the house, the family Lar, who accompanied it in all its changes of residence. The *Lares publici* had a wider sphere of influence, and received particular names from the places over which they ruled. Thus we read of *Lares compitales* (the Lares of cross-roads), *Lares vicorum* (the Lares of streets), the *Lares rurales* (the rural Lares), *Lares viales* (the Lares of the highways), *Lares permarini* (the Lares of the sea), and the *Lares cubiculi* (the Lares of the bedchamber). The images of these guardian spirits or deities were placed (at least in large houses) in small shrines or compartments called *ædiculæ* or *lararia*. They were worshipped every day: whenever a Roman family sat down to meals, a portion of the food was presented to them; but particular honors were paid to them on the calends, nones, and ides of the month; and at festive gatherings the lararia were thrown open, and the images of the household gods were adorned with garlands. See Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Biography and Mythology*, s. v.

Larned, Sylvester, an American Presbyterian minister, born in Pittsfield, Mass., Aug. 31, 1796, was educated at Lenox Academy and Middlebury College, studied theology in Princeton Seminary, and was ordained in July, 1817. His earliest efforts at preaching showed rare gifts of eloquence, and his first sermons, delivered in New York city, attracted large crowds, and melted whole audiences to tears. President Davis, of Middlebury College, remarked of him that in his composition and eloquence he was not surpassed by any youth whom he had ever known; and John Quincy Adams declared that he had never heard his equal in the pulpit. To his wonderful gift of oratory Larned added the strength of a dignified and commanding presence, a voice full of melody and pathos, thorough and sympathetic appreciation of his theme, and an unyielding devotion to his calling. He had the unusual power of winning his audience with the utterance of almost his first sentence. His very look was eloquent. Larned was solicited to take the first stations, with the largest salaries; but, desiring to give his energies to build up the Church where it was weak, he went to New Orleans, and soon organized a church, the First Presbyterian, over which he became pastor. He labored there with the greatest success, creating deep impressions upon the popular mind until his death, Aug. 20, 1820. Seldom, if ever, has the death of one so young caused such widespread sorrow. His *Life and Sermons* were published by Rev. R. R. Gurley (New York, 1844, 12mo). — Allibone, *Dict of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1060; Waterbury, *Sketches of Eloquent Preachers*, p. 33 sq.; *New Englander*, v, 70 sq.

Larned, William Augustus, a noted American Congregational theologian and professor, was born in Thompson County, Conn., June 23, 1806. His ancestors had lived in that county for four generations, the first of the family having come over in John Winthrop's colony in 1630. Provided with suitable opportunities for obtaining an education by his father, a lawyer of considerable ability and renown, young Larned was graduated at Yale College with honor when about twenty years of age. Although religiously trained he was somewhat sceptical in his youth, but, under the preaching of Dr. Fitch while in college, he was powerfully impressed, and in the great revival that occurred soon after his graduation he resolved to be a follower of Christ. After teaching five years, first at Salisbury, N. C., and then for three years as tutor in Yale College, he entered upon his theological studies, and was ordained in 1834 pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Millbury, Mass., but was compelled to relinquish this charge in the following year on account of impaired health. From 1835 to 1859 he was associated, at their request, with Rev. N. S. Beman, D.D., and Rev. Mr. Kirk, in instructing theological students in Troy, N. Y. Soon after finishing his labors in Troy he was appointed professor of rhetoric and English literature in Yale College, a position which he filled with honor and usefulness till his death, Feb. 3, 1862. Prof. Larned's literary labors were mostly confined to the *New Englander*, of which he was editor for two years, and to which he contributed twen-

ty-seven different articles on a variety of topics. As the pastor of a church, as the successor of Dr. Goodrich in the professor's chair, and as a literary man, he acquitted himself with fidelity and success. He was a man simple and unpretending in his tastes and habits, of great purity of character, and of strong faith in Christ as his Saviour. See *New Englander*, 1862, April, art. ix; Appleton, *New Am. Cyclop.* vol. x, s. v.; *Congreg. Quart.* 1863; Dr. Theodore Woolsey, *Funeral Discourse commemorative of Rev. W. A. Larned* (New Haven, 1862, 8vo). (H. A. B.)

Laroche, Alain de, also called Alanus de Rupe, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1428. While yet quite young he joined the Dominicans, studied philosophy and theology at Paris, and was sent to the Netherlands in 1459. After lecturing for a while in the convents of Lille and Douai, he became professor of theology at Gand in 1468, and at Rostock in 1470. He died at Zwoll Sept. 8, 1475. Full of zeal, but very deficient in knowledge, Laroche labored ceaselessly to propagate the use of the rosary; he was the first to preach on this practice, introducing in his sermons marvellous stories which he mostly invented himself. His works were published more than a century after his death, under the title *Beatus Alanus de Rupe redivivus, de Psalterio, seu Rosario Christi et Mariæ, tractatus, in V partes distributus* (Friburg, 1619, 4to; Col. 1624; Naples, 1630). See Trithemius, *De Script. Eccles.* c. 850; Choquet, *Script. Belg. Ord. Prædicat.* p. 202–218; Echard, *Script. Ord. Prædicat.*; Paquot, *Mémoires*, etc., iii, 144–150; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 622. See Rosary. (J. N. P.)

Larochefoucauld, François, Duc de, a noted French philosophical writer, the descendant of an old French family of great celebrity, was born in 1613. He early enjoyed the favor and confidence of the court, but involved himself in intrigues against cardinal Richelieu, and in the tumults of the Fronde, and was obliged to retire into private life. Ever attached to literary pursuits, he cultivated the society of the most eminent literary persons of his time, Boileau, Racine, and Molière, and composed his famous *Mémoires* (Cologne, 1662; Amsterdam, 1723, etc.), in which he gives a simple but masterly historic account of the political events of his time. In 1665 he published *Réflexions ou Sentences et Maximes Morales*, a work containing 360 detached thoughts, of which, perhaps, the most widely celebrated is his definition of hypocrisy, as "the homage which vice renders to virtue." The book is regarded as a model of French prose, and exhibits much acuteness of observation, and a clear perception of the prevalent corruption and hypocrisy of his time. Larochefoucauld died March 17, 1680. His *Œuvres Completes* were edited by Depping (Par. 1818), and his writings have been commented on by a host of critics of the most different schools, as Voltaire, Vinet, Sainte-Beuve, and Victor Cousin. See Suard, *Notice sur La Rochefoucauld;* Sainte-Beuve, *Etudes sur La Rochefoucauld*, in his *Portraits des Femmes;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 634 sq.

Laromiguière, Pierre, a distinguished French metaphysician, was born at Livignac-le-Haut, Aveyron, Nov. 3, 1756. He studied at the College of Villefranche, and became successively professor of philosophy at Carcassonne, Tarbes and La Flèche, and Toulouse. In 1790 he went to Paris, where he soon became professor of the normal school. In 1812 he confined himself to his office of librarian of the university, still retaining, however, the title of professor of the faculty of philosophy. He died at Paris Aug. 12, 1837. With the exception of a few miscellaneous pieces, his chief reputation as a philosopher rests on his *Leçons de Philosophie* (3d ed. Paris, 1826, 3 vols. 12mo). He had been educated a zealous pupil of Condillac, but there were, as Cousin expresses it, *two men* in Laromiguière, the ancient and the modern; the disciple and the adversary of Condillac.

Laromiguière's Philosophy.—(1.) *Classification of the Faculties.*—"These powers and capacities he separates into two great classes—those of the *understanding* and those of the *will*. The faculties of the understanding he reduces to these three: 1. Attention; 2. Comparison; 3. Reasoning. Of these three, attention is the fundamental principle from which the other two proceed; and of these two, again, the phenomena usually denoted by the words memory, judgment, imagination, etc., are simply modifications. Since, however, these three generic powers, in their last analysis, are all included in the first, the whole of the phenomena of the understanding may be said to spring from the one great fundamental faculty of *attention*. If we now turn to the *will*, we find, according to M. Laromiguière, a complete parallel existing between its phenomena and those we have just been considering. The foundation of all voluntary action in man is *desire;* and in the same manner as we have already seen the two latter faculties of the understanding spring from the first, so now we see springing from desire, as the basis, the two corresponding phenomena of *preference* and *liberty*. These three powers, then, being established, all the subordinate powers of the will are without difficulty reducible to them, so that, at length, we have the complete man viewed in two different aspects—in the one as an intellectual, in the other as a voluntary being, the chief facts of his intellectual exactly corresponding to those of his voluntary existence. Lastly, to bring the whole system to a state of complete unity, our author shows that desire itself is, strictly speaking, a peculiar form of attention; that the fundamental principle, therefore, of our intellectual and voluntary life is the same; that the power of attention, broadly viewed (being, in fact, but another expression for the natural activity of the human mind), is the point from which the whole originally proceeds. Now the contrast between this psychology and that of Condillac is sufficiently striking, the one being indeed, in a measure, directly opposite to the other. The one lays at the foundation of our whole intellectual and active life a faculty purely *passive* in its nature, and regards all phenomena as simply transformations of it; the other assumes a primitive power, the very essence of which is *activity*, and makes all our other powers more or less share in this essence."

(2.) *Origin of our Ideas.*—"Here, in order to swerve as little as possible in appearance from the philosophy of Condillac, he makes the whole *material* of our knowledge come from our *sensibility*. Condillac had derived all our ideas from sensation in its ordinary and contracted sense; Locke had derived them from sensation and reflection, thus taking in the active as well as the passive element to account for the phenomena of the case; M. Laromiguière, however, explains his meaning of the word sensibility in such a manner as to make the foundation still broader than that of Locke himself. Sensibility, he shows, is of four kinds: 1. That produced by the action of external things upon the mind—this is sensation in the ordinary sense of the word; 2. that produced by the action of our faculties upon each other—this is equivalent to Locke's reflection; 3. that which is produced by the recurrence and comparison of several ideas together, giving us the perception of *relations;* and, 4. that which is produced by the contemplation of human actions, as right or wrong, which is the moral faculty. In this theory it appears at once evident that there is a secret revolt from the doctrines of sensationalism. The activity of the human mind was again vindicated, the majesty of reason restored, and, what was still more important, the moral faculty was again raised from its ruins to sway its sceptre over human actions and purposes. M. Laromiguière, the ideologist, will always be viewed as the day-star of French eclecticism" (Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 631 sq.).

Laromiguière's works were published, in the 7th edition, as *Œuvres de Laromiguiere*, at Paris, in 1862. See Cousin, *Fragments philosophiques* (1838), ii, 468; Damiron, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au*

xix^me siècle (1828); Daunou, *Notice sur la Vie et les Écrits de Laromiguière* (1839); Valette, *Laromiguière et l'Éclectisme* (1842); Saphary, *L'Ecole éclectique et l'École Française* (1844); Perrard, *Logique classique d'après les principes de Laromiguière* (1844); C. Mallet, *Mém. sur Laromiguière*, in the *Compte rendu de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques* (1847), vol. iii; Tissot, *Appréciations des Leçons de Philosophie de Laromiguière* (1855); Mignet, *Notice historique sur la Vie et les Écrits de M. Laromiguière* (1856); Taine, *Les Philosophes Français du xix^me siècle* (1857); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 669.

Laros, John Jacob, a minister of the German Reformed Church, of Huguenot descent, was born in Lehigh Co., Pa., in Feb. 1755. He was three years a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and fought in the battle of Trenton. Afterwards he went to North Carolina, where he taught school. He studied theology privately, and was licensed to preach in 1795. He preached seven years in North Carolina, when he removed to Ohio, and there continued the good work. He was not ordained, however, till 1820. He died Nov. 17, 1844, having accomplished an important work in Ohio as a pioneer of the German Reformed Church. Mr. Laros wrote much. He left behind in MS. treatises on *The Decrees of God and Reprobation*, and *The Evidences of saving Faith*. These are in German—ably conceived, well conducted, and written in a beautiful style. He left also a number of poems of considerable merit. Without much learning, he was decidedly a genius, but, what is better, he left behind him the record of a long, laborious, and useful life.

Larroque, Daniel, a French theologian and writer, was born at Vitré near 1660. He studied theology, and was about to enter the ministry, when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes drove him to London. After preaching in the capital of England for several months, he went to Copenhagen as minister to Huguenot refugees. In 1690 he returned to France, and became a Roman Catholic; but he failed to meet with success among the Romanists, and he devoted himself mainly to study, and kept in close retirement from the world. He died at Paris Sept. 5, 1731. A list of his writings, which are not of particular interest, is given in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 697-699.

Larroque, Matthieu de, a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born at Lairac, near Agen, in 1619. He studied theology at Montauban, and in 1643 became pastor of the Church at Poujoh. The next year he went in the same capacity to Vitré, where he remained twenty-six years. In 1669 he was proposed as minister to the Church of Charenton, but the government opposed his nomination; similar reasons prevented his accepting a call as pastor and professor to Saumur. He shortly after went to Rouen, where he died, Jan. 31, 1684. Larroque was a man of eminent natural talents, extensive learning, and great activity. He wrote a large number of works, mostly polemical, the principal of which are, *Histoire de l'Eucharistie* (Amst. 1669, 4to; 2d ed. 1671, 8vo); a very scholarly work, by far his best, and of itself enough to make his name immortal:—*Dissertatio duplex de Photino hæretico et de Liberio pontifice Romano* (Geneva, 1670, 8vo):—*Observationes in Ignatianas Pearsonii vindicias et in annotationes Beveregii in Canones Apostolorum* (Rouen, 1674, 8vo): a defence of Daillé's work on the epistles of Ignatius against Pearson and Beveridge; *Réponse au livre de M. l'évêque de Meaux, De la Communion sous les deux espèces* (Rotterdam, 1683, 12mo):—*Nouveau Traité de la Régale* (Rotterdam, 1685, 12mo), in defence of the king's right to appoint ministers to the vacant churches in France:—*Adversariorum sacrorum Libri iii* (Leyden, 1688, 8vo), being part of an ecclesiastical history which he left incomplete. See *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, March, 1684, art. 5; Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique;* Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxi; *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants*, April, 1688; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 697. (J. N. P.)

Larue, Charles de, a French Jesuit and celebrated preacher, was born at Paris in 1643; joined the order in 1659, became soon after professor of rhetoric, and at once attracted the attention of Louis XIV by his talents as a preacher and poet. He was for a while sent as a missionary among the Protestants of the Cévennes, but soon returned to Paris, where he was appointed professor of rhetoric in the college Louis-le-Grand. He was also chosen confessor of the dauphiness, and of the duke of Berri. He died at Paris May 27, 1725. Larue wrote *Idyllia* (Rouen, 1669, 12mo), reprinted under the title *Carminum Libri iv* (6th ed. Paris, 1754), which contains, among a number of profane pieces, a Greek ode in honor of the immaculate conception (1670):—*P. Virgilii Maronis Opera, interpretatione et notis, ad usum Delphini* (Paris, 1675, 4to, often reprinted):—*Sermons* (in Migne, *Collection des Orateurs Sacrés*): these are celebrated as models of pathos, as well as for vehemence of style and grace of diction:—*Panégyriques des Saints*, etc. (Paris, 1740, 2 vols. 12mo); and a number of theatrical pieces, etc. See *Mercure de France*, June, 1725; Baillet, *Jugements des Savants; Journal des Savants*, 1695, 1706, 1712, 1738, and 1740; *Dict. des Prédicateurs;* Le Long, *Bibl. Historique;* Moréri, *Dictionnaire Hist.* ix; *Bibl. des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*, p. 658-665; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 700.

Lasæ'a (Λασαία, derivation unknown), a place mentioned only in Acts xxvii, 8, as a city lying near the Fair Havens, in the island of Crete. Other MSS. have *Alassa* (Ἄλασσα), and some (with the Vulgate) *Thalassa* (Θάλασσα), which latter Beza adopted (see Kuinöl, *Comment.* ad loc.), and Cramer mentions coins of a Cretan town by this latter name (*Ancient Greece*, iii, 374); but neither of these readings is to be preferred. It is likely that during the stay at the adjoining port the passengers on Paul's ship visited Lasæa (Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epist. of St. Paul*, ii, 320, n.). It is probably the same as the *Lisia* of the Peutinger Tables, sixteen miles east of Gortyna (see Höck, *Kreta*, i, 412, 439). In the month of January, 1856, a yachting party made inquiries at Fair Havens, and were told that the name Lasæa was still given to some ruins in the neighborhood. It lies about the middle of the southern coast of Crete, some five miles east of Fair Havens, and close to Cape Leonda. Mr. Brown thus describes the ruins: "Inside the cape, to the eastward, the beach is lined with masses of masonry. These were formed of small stones cemented together with mortar so firmly that even where the sea had undermined them huge fragments lay on the sand. This sea-wall extended a quarter of a mile along the beach from one rocky face to another, and was evidently intended for the defence of the city. Above we found the ruins of two temples. The steps which led up to one remain, though in a shattered state. Many shafts, and a few capitals of Grecian pillars, all of marble, lie scattered about, and a gully worn by a torrent lays bare the substructions down to the rock. To the east a conical rocky hill is girdled by a wall, and on a platform between this hill and the sea the pillars of another edifice lie level with the ground" (Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, Append. i, p. 260, 3d edit., where a plan is given). Captain Spratt, R. N., had previously observed some remains which probably represent the harbor of Lasæa (see p. 80, 82, 245). It ought to be noticed that in the *Descrizione dell' Isola di Candia*, a Venetian MS. of the 16th century, as published by Mr. E. Falkener in the *Museum of Classical Antiquities*, Sept. 1852 (p. 287), a place called *Lapsea*, with a "temple in ruins," and "other vestiges near the harbor," is mentioned as being close to Fair Havens.

La Salle, Jean Baptist de, a French priest, founder of the Order of *Brethren of the Christian Schools*, was born at Rheims April 30, 1651. In 1670 he went to Paris to complete his education at the Seminary of St.

Sulpice. He was made canon of Rheims, and was ordained priest in 1671. Struck with the ignorance of the poorer classes with regard to religion, he resolved to establish a congregation whose chief object should be to teach and elevate them. In 1679 he began teaching in two parishes of Rheims, but was subjected to many annoyances from the secular teachers, and even censured by some of the clergy. He nevertheless continued his labors, gave all his means to the poor, and finally succeeded. A house which he had bought at Rouen, Saint-Yon, became the head-quarters of his order, and when he died, April 7, 1719, the Brethren of the Christian Schools were established at Paris, Rouen, Rheims, and other principal cities of France. Its institution was approved by Benedict XIII in 1725. The Brethren of the Christian Schools take the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, but they are not perpetual. La Salle did not wish any priest to be ever received among them. Their dress consists of a black robe resembling a cassock, with a small collar or white bands, black stockings, and coarse shoes, a black cloak of the same material as the dress, with wide hanging sleeves, and a broad-brimmed black felt hat, looped up on three sides. Their order became widely disseminated, and they are now scattered nearly through the whole world. In 1854 they counted over 7000 members, employed in France, Algeria, the United States, Italy, etc. Pope Gregory XVI placed La Salle among the blessed, and he was canonized by Pius IX. La Salle wrote a number of books for the education of children, many of which are still in use; among them we notice *Les Devoirs du Chrétien envers Dieu, et les moyens de pouvoir bien s'en acquitter:—Les Règles de la Bienséance et de la civilité Chrétienne:—Instructions et Prières pour la Sainte Messe:—Conduite des Écoles Chrétiennes:—Les douze Vertus d'un bon Maitre.* He is also considered the author of *Méditations sur les Évangiles de tous les Dimanches et sur les principales Fêtes de l'Année*, of which a new edition was published in 1858 (Versailles, 8vo). See abbé Carron, *Vie de J.-B. de La Salle;* Garreau, *Vie de J.-Bapt. de La Salle; L'Ami de l'Enfance, ou Vie de J.-B. de La Salle; Le véritable Ami de l'Enfance, ou Abrégé de la Vie et des Vertus du vénérable Serviteur de Dieu J.-B. de la Salle;* abbé Tresvaux, *Vie des Saints;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxix, 724. (J. N. P.)

Las Casas. See CASAS.

La'sha (Heb. *Le'sha*, לֶשַׁע, *fissure*, in pause לָשַׁע; Sept. Λασά, Vulg. *Lesa*), a place mentioned last in defining the border of the Canaanites (Gen. x, 19), and apparently situated east of the Dead Sea. According to Jerome (*Quæst. in Gen.*), Jonathan (where קלרחי is doubtless an erroneous transcription for קלרהי), and the Jerus. Targum, it was the spot afterwards known as *Callirrhoë*, famous for its warm springs, just beyond Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 6, 5; *War*, i, 33, 5; compare Ptolemy, v, 16, 9), on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, where Machærus lay (Pliny, v, 15). These springs were visited by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 467 sq.); they lie north of the Arnon (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, i, 218). Schwarz says that ruins as well as the hot springs are still found at the mouth of *wady Zurka* (*Palestine*, p. 228). Bochart (*Geogr. Sacr.* iv, 37) less correctly identifies the name with the Arabic *Lusa* (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 871). Lieut. Lynch visited the outlet of these springs through the wady Zurka, which he describes as a rapid stream twelve feet wide and ten inches deep, with a temperature of 94°, having a slight sulphurous taste. The bed is a chasm 122 feet wide, worn through perpendicular cliffs, and fringed with canes, tamarisks, and the castor-bean (*Narrative of the U. S. Expedition to the Jordan*, p. 370). Irby and Mangles found several warm sulphur springs discharging themselves into the stream at various points, being, no doubt, those visited by Herod in his last sickness. See CALLIRRHOË. The place is apparently also the ZARETH-SHAHAR (q. v.) of Josh. xiii, 19.

Lash'aron [many *Lasha'ron*] (Heb. *Lashsharon'*, לַשָּׁרוֹן, signif. unknown; Sept. Λεσαρών, but almost all copies omit; Vulg. *Saron*, but in the Benedictine text *Lassaron*), one of the Canaanitish towns whose kings were killed by Joshua (Josh. xii, 18). "Some difference of opinion has been expressed as to whether the first syllable is an integral part of the name or the Hebrew preposition with the art. implied (see Keil, *Josua*, ad loc.). But there seems to be no warrant for supposing the existence of a particle before this one name, which certainly does not exist before either of the other thirty names in the list. Such, at least, is the conclusion of Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, ch. 31), Reland (*Palæst.* 871), and others, a conclusion supported by the reading of the Targum, and the Arabic Version, and also by Jerome, if the Benedictine text can be relied on. The opposite conclusion of the Vulgate, given above, is adopted by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 642, b), but not on very clear grounds, his chief argument being apparently that, as the name of a town, Sharon would not require the article affixed, which, as that of a district, it always bears. The name has vanished from both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the Sept., unless a trace exists in the Ὀφεκτησαρώκ of the Vat." (Smith). Masius supposes Lasharon to be the place mentioned in Acts ix, 35, where the reading of some MSS. is Ἀσσάρωνα instead of Σάρωνα; but there is no evidence to support such a view. From the fact that in Joshua it is named between Aphek and Madon, a writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* argues for a position at the modern *Saruneh*, south-east of Tiberias (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* iii, Appendix, p. 131); but the reasoning is wholly inconclusive, and the location utterly out of the question. Lasharon was possibly the same place with the LASHA of Gen. x, 19.

Lashers. See KHLYSTIE.

Lasitius, JOHN, a noted Polish Protestant ecclesiastical writer, often mistaken, formerly, for the celebrated John à Lasco, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was born of a noble family about 1534, and, as was the custom of his day, was early sent abroad to pursue a course of studies at the high-schools of Basle, Berne, Geneva, and Strasburg. After quitting the university he taught for a short time in a private family of one of the most celebrated noble families of Poland, John Krotowsky, an ardent follower of the Moravian Brethren. Of a restless nature, and greatly addicted to study, he soon took up his wandering-staff again, and roamed nearly over all Europe, bringing up, most generally, at some place noted for its university. First we meet him in Paris, next in Basle, next in Geneva, and next in Heidelberg, etc., until, in 1567, he brings up again in Paris, and holds a disputation on the Trinity with the Romish theologian Genebrard (*Chronolog.* lib. iv, a. a. 1582, p. 786). After 1575 Lasitius seems to have settled in his native country, but frequently, even after this date, he went abroad, not for his own gratification, however, but in the interests of the State and the Church. He early became an admirer of the Moravians, and is by many (e. g. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 4. p. 460) supposed to have joined their communion; but, however uncertain his membership, certain it is that Lasitius greatly favored the Moravians, and that he was engaged on a history of them. He was one of the most energetic and indefatigable workers among the Poles for the union of all his Protestant brethren into one common bond, and in 1570 finally saw his efforts crowned with success at the Synod of Sendomir. See POLAND. He died July 12, 1599. His history of the Moravians Lasitius enlarged after the union of the Protestants, but it was never published entire. In 1649 Amos Comenius published an outline of the larger one under the title *Johannis Lasitii, nobilis Poloni, historiæ de origine et rebus gestis Fratrum Bohemicorum liber octavus, qui est de moribus et institutis eorum. Ob præsentem rerum statum seorsim editus. Adduntur tamen reliquorum vii librorum argumenta et particularia quædam*

excerpta (1649, 8vo; Amst. 1660, 8vo). For criticisms of this work, see Gindely, *Gesch. d. böhmischen Brüder*, ii, 90; Wagenmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xix, 776. His other works are, *Clades Dantiscanorum* (Frkf. 1578, 8vo):—*Historia de ingressu Polonorum in Walachiam anno* 1572 (Frankf. 1578, 8vo):—*De Russorum et Moscovitarum et Tartarorum religione*, etc. (Speier, 1582, 8vo):—*De Diis Samogitarum ceterorumque Sarmatarum et falsorum Christianorum, item de religione Armeniorum et de initio regiminis Stephani Bathorii opuscula* (Basle, 1615, 4to):—*Pro Volano et puriore religione defensoribusque ejus adversus Antonium Possevinum S. J. scriptum apologeticum* (Wilna, 1584, 4to). See Lukaszewicz, *Gesch. d. reform. Kirchen in Litthauen*, ii, 182 sq.; Gindely, *Geschichte d. böhmischen Brüder*, ii, 90; and by the same author, *Quellen zur Geschichte d. böhmisch. Brüder*, in *Fontes rerum Austriacarum* (Vienna, 1859), p. 379; Dieckhoff, *Gesch. d. Waldenser im Mittelalter*, p. 172, 357; Regenvolscius (Wengerski), *Hist. eccl. Slavon.* iii, 452; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lex.* ii, 2283; and especially the excellent article by Wagenmann in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 770–777. (J. H. W.)

Lasius, Christophorus, a Protestant theologian, prominent as a preacher of the synergistic school, and opponent of Flacius, was born at Strasburg about the beginning of the 16th century. He was in high favor with Melancthon in 1531, and by the latter recommended to Bucer. The part he took in the synergistic Melancthonian controversy, and his activity against the Flacian, rendered his life comparatively a wandering one. In 1537 he became rector of Görlitz, and in 1543 pastor at Greussen. On account of his Melancthonian proclivities he was deposed in 1545; was then made pastor of Spandau, and when driven away from that place became superintendent of Lauingen, which he was also obliged to leave. After remaining for a time in Augsburg he was appointed superintendent of Cottbus, but was here likewise subject to many annoyances, and finally died at Senftenberg in 1572. His works are especially bitter against the doctrine of the passivity of man in repentance, and do not in the least compliment the Lutherans of his day and generation. The principal are, *Fundament wahrer Bekehrung wider d. flacianische Klotzbusse* (Francf. ad O. 1568):—*Güldenes Kleinod* (Nüremb. 1556):—*Grundfeste d. reinen evangelischen Wahrheit* (Wittemb. 1568).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 203; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 353.

Lasius, Hermann Jacob, a German theologian, was born Nov. 15, 1751, at Greifswald, Prussia. He entered the university of his native place in 1733, and studied theology, philosophy, mathematics, and philology. In 1738 he went to Jena, and in 1740 to Halle, with the intention of lecturing at the universities; at the latter he obtained the degree of M.A. Failing health soon obliged him to leave for his native city, and he reopened his lectures there. In 1745 he became subrector, and in 1749 rector of the public school. In 1764 he accepted a call to Rostock as professor of Greek literature at the university, where he continued laboring until 1793. He died Aug. 4, 1803. Lasius spent a great deal of his time in the study of theology. The few books he wrote are valuable, and generally esteemed. The most noted of his dissertations are *De individuo finito* (Jenæ, 1739, 4to):—*De bonarum malarumque actionum effectibus naturalibus post hanc vitam* (Halæ, 1740, 4to):—*Diss. qua justa divina imputatio actionum nostrarum liberarum vindicatur* (Gryphisw. 1741, 4to):—*De legibus et pœnis conventionalibus, in genere* (Halæ, 1740, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lasius, Lorenz Otto, a German theologian, born Dec. 31, 1675, at Rüden, in Brunswick, was early distinguished for his knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He attended the universities of Heidelberg and Halle, and became successively in 1702 subrector in Salzwedel; in 1705, deacon; and in 1709, pastor at Ziebelle, near Muskau; then assessor of the Consistory; in 1717, doctor of theology; and died Sept. 20, 1750. Among his numerous books are *Die Prüfung seiner selbst* (Lauban, 1710, 8vo, and often):—*Versuch die hebräische, griechische, lateinische, französische und italienische Sprache ohne Grammatik zu erlernen* (Budissin, 1717, 8vo, and often):—*Palingenesia mortalium, oder Betrachtungen der Wiedergeburt* (Crossen, 1736, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Laskary, Andreas, a learned and pious Roman Catholic prelate, was bishop of Posen from 1414–1426. He was a member of the Council of Constance, and often preached to the assembled clergy. On his return home he sought cloister life, but was restrained by the pope, and subsequently by his active influence secured such marked prosperity for an episcopal village in Masowine that it was called after his name, Laskarzewo.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Lasko (Polish *Laski*, Latin *Lascus*), **John à** (1), a very celebrated Roman Catholic prelate of the Church of Poland, was born in the early part of the year 1466. He was at first provost at Skalbimierz, then at Posen, and was afterwards chosen by Andreas Roza, of Boryszewice, archbishop of Gnesen, as his coadjutor. During the reigns of Casimir IV, John Albrecht, and Alexander, he resided at court as archchancellor, and on the death of the archbishop of Gnesen (in 1510) Lasko succeeded him in that eminent position. In 1513 he was sent to the fifth general council of Lateran, together with Stanislaus Ostrorog, and in the presence of pope Leo X implored the Christian princes there present to assist Poland and Hungary against the attacks of the Turks and Tartars. In this council Lasko obtained for himself and all succeeding archbishops of Gnesen the title of *legatus natus sedis apostolicæ*. He died May 19, 1531. He wrote *Relatio de erroribus Moschorum, facta in concilio Lateranensi a Joanne Lasko*. His activity as archbishop is manifest in the number of provincial synods over which he presided: 1. at Gnesen, in 1506; 2. at Petrikau, in 1510; 3. same, 1511; 4. Lenczyc, 1523; 5. same, 1527; 6. Petrikau, 1530. He was a decided opponent of the Reformation and its propagation in Poland, as is evinced by his canons and decretals (comp. *Constitutiones synodorum metropolitanæ ecclesiæ Gnesnensis*, Cracov. 1630). He wrote also *Sanctiones ecclesiasticæ tam ex pontificum decretis quam in constitutionibus synodorum provinciæ inprimis autem statuta in diversis provincialibus synodis a se sancita* (Cracov. 1525, 4to). Lasco gained great reputation by his collection of the laws of the country, made by order of king Alexander of Poland, under the title *Commune Poloniæ regni privilegium constitutionum et indultuum* (Cracov. 1506). See Damalewicz, *Vitæ archiepiscoporum Gnesnensium*, p. 278; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 203; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Lasko, John à (2), one of the most distinguished of the Polish reformers, was born at Warsaw in the early part of 1499, of one of the noblest families of Poland, which, during the 16th century especially, furnished many men illustrious in the Church, in the council, and the camp. We know little of John à Lasko's early education, but it was probably conducted under the supervision of his uncle (see the preceding article), who would naturally intend him for the priesthood. While he was yet a youth, the German Reformation commenced, and evidently attracted a large share of his attention. The archbishop, however, was its strenuous opponent, and young Lasko, at the University of Cracow, where Luther's writings were publicly bought and sold, may have contented himself with accepting the current religious sentiments of his countrymen, which by no means accorded with the highest standards of Roman Catholic orthodoxy. At the age of twenty-five he set forth on his travels. It was his purpose to visit the courts and universities of other lands. Passing by Wittenberg, with its Luther and Melancthon, he directed his course

to Louvain, where he seems to have been repelled by the ignorance and bigotry of the priesthood, and thence passed to Zürich, where he met and conferred with Zwingle, and was by him influenced to take a decided stand for the reformatory movement. From Zürich he went to Paris, where he was honorably received, and entered into a correspondence with the sister of the king, the famous Margaret of Navarre, already favorably disposed to the cause of reform. Thence he directed his course to Basle, attracted thither by the fame of Erasmus, who extended to him a cordial welcome, and did not disdain to accept his hospitable gifts. The veteran scholar admired and praised his young friend, and Lasko seems to have reciprocated his confidence and affection. Both occupied the same dwelling, and for some months the expense of the household was met from Lasko's purse. Perhaps the fact that at this very juncture the break between Luther and Erasmus took place may not have been without its effect in repelling Lasko from too close association with the German reformer. In October, 1525, Lasko was recalled to Poland, doubtless with a view to be engaged in state employ, or as an ambassador to France or Spain. However this may be, he probably passed through Italy previous to his return, and there formed some acquaintanceships, not without influence in later years. Not long after his return he fell in with the writings of Melancthon, with whom he subsequently corresponded, and we may reasonably conclude that by his counsel, or with his sanction, Polish youth were sent abroad to complete their studies at Wittenberg. A marked change by this time is manifest in his views and feelings. Erasmus, in his correspondence, was not slow to note this. It was due partly, no doubt, to a better knowledge of the German reformers, and partly, also, to the ripening of his own Christian experience. We hear him declaring that he owed everything to the mercy of God. No foresight of his own, no world-wisdom, could have saved him from ruin. There was more of Luther than of Erasmus in such soul-humbling confessions. The death of his uncle, the archbishop (1531), who was resolutely opposed to the cause of reform, removed a certain measure of restraint which had checked young Lasko's freedom of action, if not speculation. No outward manifestation of any radical change of sentiment had hitherto been apparent. He was successively nominated canon of Gnesen, custos of Plock, and dean of Gnesen and Lencicz. In accepting these dignities he still cherished the hope inspired by Erasmus that reform might take place within the Church itself, and to this end he was induced, in a cautious manner, to present the Polish monarch with suggestions as to the necessity of measures directed to that object (Krasinski's *Ref. in Poland*, i, 248). In 1536 he received the royal nomination of bishop of Cujavia, and the most inviting prospects of ecclesiastical promotion opened before him. But already his hope that the Church of Rome would reform herself had died out. He opened his heart to the king, and freely confessed the views and convictions which forbade his acceptance of the proffered promotion. With the royal permission, and provided with commendatory letters, he chose temporarily to withdraw from his native land. He directed his course to the Netherlands. At Antwerp he was sought out and his acquaintance cultivated by the most respectable citizens. The royal letters alone would have opened all doors to him. But his final decision to withdraw entirely from the Roman Catholic Church was hastened in or before 1540. In that year he married a woman of humble rank, without dowry, whom he met at Louvain (Krasinski says Mayence), and thus made his breach with Rome irreparable. Instead of returning to his native land, he sought a retired residence at Emden, in Friesland. Count Enno, who was anxious to secure a reformation of the Church in his principality, proposed to Lasko the charge of the matter as superintendent. His death suspended the negotiation, but his sister Anna, who succeeded him, renewed the proposal. After much hesitation, Lasko was induced in 1543 to accept the charge, and in the following year was nominated superintendent of all the churches of Friesland. He had already declined the invitation to return to Poland, where he was assured that his marriage should not stand in the way of the bestowment of a bishopric. He longed, indeed, to return, but only that he might labor as an evangelist, unencumbered with any connection with Rome. He accepted his present post—as he did others to which he was subsequently called—with the express proviso that if duty and the prospect of useful service called him back to his native land he might be free to go. He made it also a condition of his acceptance that no obligation should be imposed upon him in his office inconsistent with the word and will of God. In neighboring lands his proceedings were jealously watched. The duke of East Courland, who had married a daughter of Maximilian, as well as the duke of Brabant, felt that his influence and innovations threatened their states. Lasko pushed on the cause of reform by assailing the monasteries and the pictures in the churches. A formidable opposition was provoked, but he manfully defended himself, and was sustained by the countess. Opposition gradually yielded, and Romish rites and ceremonies disappeared from all the churches. An improved order of Church organization and discipline was introduced and established, substantially Presbyterian. He employed the eldership to enforce discipline. He sought to promote pastoral culture and improvement, as well as confessional unity of doctrine. Preaching himself, he habitually insisted on the sole and supreme authority of the Word of God. In correspondence with Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Pellican, and Hardenberg, he drew up a confession of faith, which yet proved unsatisfactory to the Lutherans, leaning as it did to the views of the Swiss and Anglican reformers, although by no means in full correspondence with those of Calvin.

Lasko's reputation as the founder of the Protestant Church in Friesland now spread rapidly, and he was repeatedly consulted by foreign rulers and divines on questions of Church polity and order. The duke of Prussia invited him to accept the superintendence of the churches of his dominions, but the project was defeated by the condition on which Lasko insisted that the Church should be independent of the state, and that Lutheran rites, kindred to those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be abolished (Krasinski, i, 253). During his residence at Emden Lasko was forced to engage in controversy. Persecuted elsewhere, religious enthusiasts found shelter in the Netherlands, and intruded within his sphere. Menno Simon and David George were his principal antagonists. He sought to convince them by argument, but failed. His constant difficulties and the pressing burden of his duties induced him to listen to an invitation that reached him from England. Archbishop Cranmer, to whom Lasko had been recommended by some of his brother reformers, Peter Martyr and William Turner, pressed him to come and assist in the task of completing the reformation of the Church. Early in Sept. 1548, parting from the countess, who reluctantly consented to his withdrawal, Lasko set out for England. Three days before he left the celebrated interim of the emperor was published, threatening to arrest and put back the cause of Church reform in all his states. Lasko wrote back to his friends in Emden to abide firm, assuring them that it was better to fall into the hands of God than into those of men. His first visit to England was designedly temporary. For six months he resided with Cranmer at Lambeth. The views of the two men were coincident in doctrine, and apparently not greatly divergent in matters of order and discipline. The impression which he made in England was favorable, and in a sermon preached before the king Latimer extolled him with high praise. Returning to Emden, Lasko encouraged his fellow-religionists in their opposition to the interim, and incurred the hostility of those—and among them of the chancellor Ter West—who were disposed to

favor a compromise with the emperor. There was some danger that Lasko himself would be sacrificed to their policy. Leaving Emden, therefore, he resided for a time at Bremen and Hamburg, and at length directed his course back to England, in May, 1550, to which he had been reinvited. Here, under the protection of a Protestant monarch (Henry VI), refugees from persecution on the Continent were collected in considerable numbers. The foreign Protestant congregation in London was composed of French, Germans, and Italians. Of this, in all about 3000 members, Lasko, by the king's nomination (July 24, 1550), was made superintendent. He seems, however, to have had supervisory charge over all the other foreign churches of the city, while their schools were subject to his inspection. The wisdom of his measures is attested by a letter of Melancthon, who speaks (September, 1551) of the purity of doctrine of his churches. He differed with Cranmer on some points, as in reference to sacramental doctrine and the use of priestly habits, but his scruples were respected, and his intervention secured the foreign churches from molestation. In London he introduced the same system of Church order which he had established at Emden. He brought out an edition of his Catechism for the instruction of the people, and to this the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism are said to have been manifestly indebted. The English liturgy he discarded. His views on the sacraments may be inferred from his republication in England of the work of Bullinger, to which he furnished an introduction. This was followed, however, by his *Brevis et dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesia Christi Tractatio* (Lond. 1552, 8vo), in which he approximated to the views of Zwingle and Calvin. On the doctrines peculiar to Calvin Lasko was not disposed to stand. He uses language that would seem to indicate an acceptance of the belief in a general atonement. While insisting on the insufficiency and inability of human effort without the grace of God, he emphasizes the freeness and rich provisions of the Gospel of Christ. It was during his residence in England that Lasko's wife died, and his second marriage took place. The death of the young king suddenly wrought an entire change in the prospects of the exiles, and on the accession of queen Mary they prepared to return to the Continent. On the 17th of September, 1553, the first band of them, more than 170 in number, embarked for Denmark, where they had been assured of a welcome reception from a Protestant monarch. But a bigoted Lutheranism repelled them from the Danish shores. Lasko hastened back to Emden, while his fellow-pilgrims, called by Westphal, a Lutheran divine, "martyrs of the devil," and repulsed at Hamburg, Lubeck, and Rostock, finally found a hospitable reception at Dantzic. At Emden Lasko found his position uncomfortable. His vicinity to Brabant gave occasion for those who feared his influence to intrigue against him. Gustavus Vasa invited him and his friends to Sweden, assuring him of entire religious liberty. But he longed to return to his native land. His views concerning the sacrament, however, were represented to the king as objectionable, and it seemed essential that he should first seek to harmonize them with the Augsburg Confession. His opponents in controversy, Westphal especially, had spoken of him in reproachful terms. He determined to consult with Melancthon, and in April, 1555, he left Emden, and for many months, passing from city to city in Germany, and conferring with leading theologians, he awaited the long-desired opportunity of returning, with the hope of useful service, to his native land. We find him at Frankfort almost at the very time when the English exiles had transferred their altercations with reference to the habits to that city, and involved there to some extent in the Lutheran controversy. He was complained of as a dissenter from the Augsburg Confession, but in reply he asserted that he accepted its very language in regard to Christ's presence in the sacrament. At Stuttgard (May 22, 1556) he entered with Brentz upon a disputation on the sacramentarian controversy, and there renewed his assertion and vindicated his views. With Melancthon he succeeded better. Although he could not effect a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed, as he was exhorted to do by the king of Poland, with a view to its happy effect in his own states, he yet secured the confidence and friendly offices of Melancthon. The latter intrusted him with a letter to the king of Poland, to which a modification of the Augsburg Confession, such as it was hoped all Protestants might unite in, was added. Lasko now prepared for his return to Poland, where the king, Sigismund Augustus, was disposed to welcome him. He first, however, published a new account of the foreign churches which he had superintended in London, dedicating it to the king, the senate, and the states of Poland, urging at the same time the reasons for reformation, and setting forth the grounds of his own action in rejecting the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Such a vindication of himself was called for. The news of his return excited the apprehensions, if not the consternation of his enemies. In Dec. 1556, after an absence of twenty years, he planted his feet on his native soil. His approach had been preceded by alarms addressed especially to the ears of the king. He was called a dangerous person, an outlawed heretic, who returned to his country only to excite troubles and commotions. He was said to be preparing measures of rebellion, and means to destroy the churches. The king was not alarmed. He received the reformer in a friendly manner, and was gratified with Melancthon's letters. Cautious in his policy, however, he was anxious, before taking bold and decisive measures of reform, to secure Protestant union. Lasko was intrusted with the superintendence of all the Reformed churches in Little Poland. Laboring for the desired union, his efforts were counteracted by men who preferred to conceal their real (Socinian) sentiments, and by the grave difficulties which he had to encounter. At successive annual synods he exerted himself to secure a harmony of the Protestant confessions—a result effected after his death in the celebrated Consensus Sendomiriensis. In the translation of the Bible of Brzesc he took an active part, and is said to have published many books, most of which are now irrecoverably lost. In the midst of his efforts, and under the burden of his pressing duties, he closed his life, Jan. 8, 1560. During the last four years of his life the record of his labors is scanty indeed, but his vigor, activity, and practical ability left a deep and abiding impress on the development of the Polish Reformation.

Literature.—The sources of information in regard to Lasko are at present quite ample. His *Life* (*Leben d. Johann v. Lasko*), by Peter Bartels (Elberfeld, 1860) has been concisely and carefully compiled, and gives a satisfactory account of his doctrinal position, as well as some notice of his books, together with an extended list of authorities. Krasinski's *Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo) presents an extended view of his life in connection with the Reformation in his native country. In some respects, however, the most valuable work on the subject of this article is *Johannis a Lasco Opera, tam edita quam inedita, recensuit vitam auctoris enarravit A. Kuyper* (Amsterd. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo). In over 1300 closely printed pages we have nearly, if not quite all the remains of Lasko that can now be identified, including portions of his correspondence, extending from 1526 to 1559. See also Bertram (J. F.), *Gründlicher Bericht von Johann Alasco* (1733, 3 vols. 4to); Göbel, *Gesch. des christlichen Lebens in der rhein-westph. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1849), i, 318-351; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, i, 53 sq.; Hassencamp, *Hessische Kirchengesch.* (Marburg, 1832), i, § 47; Fischer, *Versuch einer Gesch. der Ref. in Polen* (1856); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* ii, 688 sq.; Middleton, *Reformers*, ii (see Index); *Jahrb. deutscher Theologie*, 1860, ii, 536; 1868, iii, 536; and the excellent article by Göbel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 204 sq. (E. H. G.)

Last Day. See JUDGMENT DAY.

Las'thenès (Λασθένης; comp. Λά-μαχος), an officer who stood high in the favor of Demetrius II Nicator. He is described as "cousin" (συγγενης, 1 Macc. xi, 31) and "father" (1 Macc. xi, 32; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 3, 9) of the king. Both words may be taken as titles of high nobility (compare Grimm on 1 Macc. x, 89; Diod. xvii, 59; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s. v. אָב, § 4). It appears from Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 4, 3) that he was a Cretan, to whom Demetrius was indebted for a large body of mercenaries (compare 1 Macc. x, 67), when he asserted his claim to the Syrian throne against Alexander Balas, B.C. 148 or 147. It appears that Lasthenes himself accompanied the young prince; and when Demetrius was established on the throne, he appointed Lasthenes his chief minister, with unlimited power. His arbitrary government, added to his persuading Demetrius to disband the regular troops and only employ Cretans, is supposed to have alienated the subjects from the king, and caused great dissatisfaction to the soldiers. This conduct led to the downfall of Demetrius, for it enabled Tryphon to set up Antiochus, the young son of Alexander Balas (Diodotus, *Reliq.* lib. xxxiii, 4, ed. Didot, ii, 522). What became of Lasthenes is not known. See DEMETRIUS.

He must not be identified with the *Cnidian* instructor of the sons of Demetrius I Soter (Justin, xxxv, 2; comp. Livy, *Epit.* 52). There is a later Lasthenes, also a Cretan, who took a prominent part against the Romans in B.C. 70–68 (Smith, *Dict. of Biogr.* s. v. Lasthenes, No. 3).

Last Time. See ESCHATOLOGY.

Latchet (שְׂרוֹךְ, *serok'*, so called from *lacing* and binding together; Gr. ἱμάς, a *thong*, as it is rendered in Acts xxii, 25), the cord or strap which fastens an Oriental shoe upon the foot (Isa. v, 27; Mark i, 7; Luke iii, 16; John i, 27); proverbial for anything of little value (Gen. xiv, 23). See SANDAL. "Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s. v. חוּט) compares the Lat. *hilum=filum*, and quotes two Arabic proverbs from the Hamasa and the Kamûs, in which a corresponding word is similarly employed. In the poetical figure in Isa. v, 27, the 'latchet' occupies the same position with regard to the shoes as the girdle to the long flowing Oriental dress, and was as essential to the comfort and expedition of the traveller. Another semi-proverbial expression in Luke iii, 16 points to the same easily-removed article of clothing" (Smith). "In Matt. iii, 11 the same sentiment is expressed rather differently, 'Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear;' in both cases the allusion is to slaves, who were employed to loosen and carry their master's shoes, the habits of Orientals requiring this article of dress to be taken off before entering an apartment (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, pt. i, chap. ix). This saying of the Baptist, as reported by Matthew, is repeated by Paul in his address to the Jews at Antioch, in Pisidia (Acts xiii, 25). Chrysostom, on John i, 27, remarks, Τὸ γὰρ ὑπόδημα λῦσαι τῆς ἐσχάτης διακονίας ἐστι" (Kitto). See SHOE.

Lateran, CHURCH OF ST. JOHN, the first in dignity of the Roman churches, and situated in the southern extremity of the city, derives its name from its occupying a portion of the site of the splendid palace of Plantius Lateranus, which having been escheated (A.D. 66) in consequence of Lateranus being implicated in the conspiracy of the Pisos (Tacitus), became imperial property, and was assigned for Christian uses by the emperor Constantine. The palace, once destroyed by fire, and rebuilt by Sixtus V, was the habitual residence of the popes until after the return from Avignon, when they removed to the Vatican. It was once made a hospital for orphans, and is now occupied partly by officials of the chapter, partly for public purposes. The present pope, Pius IX, has converted a portion of it into a museum of Christian archæology. Its ancient magnificence is celebrated by Juvenal. In the time of Constantine the palace was the abode of his second wife, the empress Fausta. It has been the conjecture of some that Fausta was a Christian, and that the Basilica, or Hall of Justice, connected with her palace, was granted by Constantine as a place of Christian assembly. The fact seems, however, well established that Constantine subsequently bestowed the palace upon pope Sylvester, and it has ever since (several times rebuilt, and modified in its final completion, dating from the pontificate of Clement XII) continued a papal patrimony. The emperor is said to have founded at the same time the adjacent church, which was originally dedicated to the Saviour, but after it was rebuilt by Lucius II in the middle of the 12th century, was dedicated to St. John, because of the baptistery which Constantine built near by it. It bears the additional name *Basilica Constantiniana*. The church has thus been naturally regarded as the parish or cathedral church of the popes, and is distinguished as such above any other in Rome. St. Peter's and Sta. Maria Maggiore are not to be compared with it in importance. Each of the three has a *porta santo*. In reference to the Lateran, however, Gregory XI, in his bull June 23, 1372, uses the following language, which has been substantially repeated by many popes: "Sacrosanctam Lateranensem ecclesiam, præcipuam sedem nostram, inter omnes alias Urbis et orbis ecclesias ac basilicas, etiam super ecclesiam seu basilicam principis Apostolorum de Urbe, supremum locum tenere." The ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran Basilica is one of the first observed on the election of a new pope, whose coronation takes place in it. The chapter of the Lateran has precedence of that of St. Peter's. On the throne of the Lateran is written the inscription, "Hæc est Papalis Sedes et Pontificalis." An inscription on each side of the entrance styles it mother and mistress of churches, *Omnium urbis et orbis Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput*. In accordance with its dignity, therefore, all the œcumenical councils assembled in the city of Rome have been held in this church, the late council (1870), held at St. Peter's, being the only exception. See LATERAN COUNCILS. In the piazza of St. John Lateran stands the celebrated relic called the "Scala Santa," or "Holy Staircase," reputed to be the stairs of Pilate's house at Jerusalem, made holy by the feet of Christ as he passed to judgment. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 212; Stanley, *Hist. East. Ch.* p. 304; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s. v.

Lateran Councils, a general name for the ecclesiastical councils that have been convened in the Lateran Church at Rome, but especially five great councils held there, and regarded by the Roman Catholics as œcumenical, viz. those of the years 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, and 1512–17. We have room to notice the most important only of all these councils, and that with reference to their principal enactments and historical connections.

I. The council of 649, under Martin I, condemned the Monothelitic doctrine, or that of *one will* in the person of Christ. This view was developed as a continuation of the Monophysite controversy. The Council of Chalcedon, in 451, had affirmed the existence of *two natures* in Christ in *one person*, against the Antiochians, the Nestorians, and Eutychians. This determination of the council did not obtain final supremacy in the Greek and Latin churches till after the time of Justinian, and the conflict with it was continued under various forms. From the Council of Chalcedon till that of Frankfort, in 793, the Church councils especially sought to maintain the *twofoldness* of the nature of Christ asserted at Chalcedon, with less regard to the *unity*, which was at the same time established. An early source for the rise of Monothelitism appeared in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, which, originating probably in the 4th century, obtained for many centuries thereafter great credit in the Church. A Neo-Platonic mysticism in these writings seeks to mediate between the prevalent Church doctrine and Monophysitism (or the doctrine of one nature in Christ). The Areopagite is not an outspoken Monophysite, and yet, with him, the human in Christ is only a form of the divine, and there is in all

the acts of Christ but one *mode of operation*, the theandric energy (*μια θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*). This expression became a favorite one with all the Monophysite opponents of the Chalcedonian decisions.

The Monothelitic controversy proper extends from 623 to 680, at which latter date the Synod of Constantinople gave the most precise definition of *two wills* in the two natures of Christ. The earlier stage of the controversy, extending to the year 638, concerns rather the question of one or two energies or *modes of working* in the acts of Christ. The emperor Heraclius, on occasion of his reconquering the Eastern provinces from the Persians in the year 622, and there coming in contact with certain Monophysite bishops, conceived the idea of reconciling them to the Church by authorizing the expression in reference to the acts of Christ which was used by Dionysius—the *μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, being consulted, admitted the propriety of the expression as one sanctioned by the fathers, and recommended it to Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, who, being soon made bishop of Alexandria, set up a compromise for the Monophysites with the Council of Chalcedon on nine points. Sophronius, a monk of Alexandria, seriously objected to the course taken by Sergius, and, on being made bishop of Jerusalem, became so strong an opponent that Sergius called to his aid the influence of Honorius, bishop of Rome, who expressed himself in favor of the view rather of one will than of one operation, but advised that controversy be avoided. It is unquestionably the fact that the expressed views of Honorius, though a pope, were subsequently condemned in council. By occasion of the more decided opposition of Sophronius, the emperor Heraclius, under advice of Sergius, issued his edict, the *Ecthesis*, in the year 638, in which he forbade the use of either expression, "one mode of working" or "two modes of working," in a controversial way, but especially prohibited the latter, since it is evident that Christ can have but *one will*, the human being subordinate to the divine. This was distinct Monothelitism. A powerful opponent of this view was the monk Maximus, whose writings had a controlling influence with the Lateran Council. He asserts that for the work of redemption a completeness in the two natures of Christ is necessary; there must be a complete human will. The Logos, indeed, works all through the human working and willing. There is a theandric energy in his own sense. It is rather as a *τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως*, or what was subsequently called the *communicatio idiomatum*. Maximus worked with great zeal against Monothelitism in Rome and Africa, sending out thence tracts on the subject into the East. Sophronius still carried on the controversy, as also, with him, Stephen, bishop of Doria, his pupil. After the death of Honorius in 638, the bishops of Rome were decidedly opposed to Monothelitism, and Martin I, who had zealously contended against the view while representative of the Roman Church at Constantinople, became, when made pope in 649, the chief pillar of the contrary opinion. Advocates of the view enunciated in the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius were Theodore, bishop of Phasan, and Pyrrhus of Constantinople. In 648 the emperor Constans II, under the influence of the patriarch Paul, issued his *Type* (*τύπος πίστεως*), which, though not so decidedly Monothelitic as the *Ecthesis*, condemns, under threat of the severest penalties, any further controversy upon this subject. Without consulting the emperor, Martin I now convoked this first Lateran Council, in which he presided over about 104 bishops from Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa. The pope sought to obtain generally recognition for the council, and it was finally everywhere received with the five œcumenical councils. Five sessions were held; the writings of the prominent Monothelites were examined and condemned; pope Martin explained the proper meaning of Dionysius's term "theandric operation," stating that it was designed to signify *two* operations of one person; the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius and *Type* of Constans were condemned; and the judgment of the council pronounced in twenty canons, which anathematize all who do not confess in our Lord Jesus Christ two wills and two operations.

II. The councils of 1105, 1112, and 1116, under Pascal II, concern the contest about *investitures* between the pope and the emperor, which was brought to a close in the Council of 1123, called and presided over by Calixtus II. This body consisted of 300 bishops and 600 abbots, all of the Latin Church. The investiture (q. v.) contest, which began as early as 1054, when, by mutual decrees of excommunication, the breach between the Eastern and Western churches was made final, arose from the claim made by the German emperors to an inheritance of rights exercised by the Greek emperors concerning the appointment of candidates to ecclesiastical offices, and their investiture with the right to hold Church property as subjects of the empire. Under the new German empire, from Otho the Great to Henry IV, 936–1056, the popes themselves were confirmed in their seat by the emperor. Henry III obtained from the Council of Sutry, which was held near Rome, in the midst of his own army, in 1046, the power of nominating the popes, without intervention of clergy or people. The influence of Hildebrand was now felt—an influence which he had begun to exert from the time of Leo IX, in 1048, and which secured from Nicolas II, 1060, a decree transferring the election of popes to a conclave of cardinals. Hildebrand, as Gregory VII, maintained a celebrated contest with Henry IV, to whom, in 1075, he forbade all power of investiture, excommunicating the emperor the next year, and causing him to do penance at Canossa. With his victorious campaign in Italy, 1080–83, Henry drove the pope into exile at Salerno, where he soon after died. His immediate successors, however, were such as he had designated for the post, and were the inheritors of his doctrines and plans for the supremacy of the Church. Urban II sent forth an encyclical declaring his adhesion to the principles of Gregory—the *Dictatus Gregorii;* and Pascal II (1099–1118), who had been one of Gregory's cardinals, showed more zeal than firmness in the same course. In the Lateran Council under the pope, 1105, an oath of obedience to the pope was taken by the clergy, and a promise rendered to affirm whatever he and the Church in council should affirm. The count De Meulan and his confederates were excommunicated for having encouraged the king of England in his conduct concerning investitures. Henry V, who, in the rebellion against his father, was encouraged by Pascal, would nevertheless yield nothing on becoming emperor, 1105, in the matter of investitures, his example being followed in this respect by England and France. Henry marched into Italy and imprisoned the pope in 1111, forcing from him the concession of rendering back to the emperor the fiefs of the bishops on condition that there should be no imperial interference with the elections. For his weakness in this and in other points the pope was bitterly reproached, and the council of 1112 revoked all these concessions and excommunicated the emperor. Notwithstanding the rebellion of his German subjects, Henry collected an army and invaded Italy anew in 1116. The council convoked the same year thereupon renewed the revocation of the concessions Pascal had formerly made, and anathematized the emperor. At last, the German people, weary of the conflict between State and Church, brought about a peaceful compromise in the concordat at the imperial Diet of Worms, 1122. The principles of this concordat were adopted by the council of 1123. The terms of the compact are as follows: "The emperor surrenders to God, to St. Peter and Paul, and to the Catholic Church, all right of investiture by king and staff. He grants that elections and ordinations in all churches shall take place freely in accordance with ecclesiastical laws. The pope agrees that the election of German prelates shall be had in the presence of the emperor, provided it is without violence or simony. In case any election is disputed,

the emperor shall render assistance to the legal party, with the advice of the archbishop and the bishops. The person elected is invested with the imperial fief by the royal sceptre pledged for the execution of everything required by law. Whoever is consecrated shall also receive in like manner his investiture from other parts of the empire within six months" (Hase, *Church History*, p. 200; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, 181 sq.). The pope here made considerable concessions in form, but actually, through his influence, obtained all power at the elections. The council of 1123 also renewed the grant of indulgences promulgated by Urban II in promotion of the first crusade in 1095, and decreed the celibacy of the clergy. Twenty-two canons of discipline were established.

III. The council of 1139, under Innocent II, condemned the anti-pope Anacletus II, with his adherents, and deposed all who had received office under him. On the same day with the installation of Innocent II, in 1130, Peter of Leon, a cardinal, and grandson of a rich Jewish banker, had been proclaimed pope, as Anacletus II, by a majority of the cardinals. Innocent took refuge in France, where he was supported by the king. His cause was warmly espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux, through whose influence chiefly Innocent recovered his position in Italy, and marched into Rome triumphantly with Lothaire II in 1136. Anacletus died in 1138, and a successor was chosen by his party only with the purpose of making peace. Roger of Sicily had supported Anacletus, and was on this account condemned in the council of 1139, though the origin of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies belongs to the same year, Roger having taken Innocent prisoner, and having compelled the pope to bestow upon him the investiture of this kingdom. At this council Arnold of Brescia was also condemned. This was a young clergyman of the city of Brescia, a disciple of Abelard, who, inspired by the free philosophical spirit of his master, devoted himself to the promotion of practical reform in Church and State. A marked spirit of political independence was manifesting itself about this time in Lombardy, as an inheritance from the old Roman municipalities established there. The popes, from the days of Leo IX, had themselves inspired movements of ecclesiastical reform. Pascal II had admitted that the secular power of the bishops interfered with their spiritual duties. Bernard, though a zealous opponent of Arnold, yet writes as follows in his *Contemplations on the Papacy:* "Who can mention the place where one of the apostles ever held a trial, decided disputes about boundaries, or portioned out lands?" "I read that the apostles stood before judgment seats, not sat on them." Arnold preached with great zeal against the political power and wealth of the clergy. The Church ought rather to rejoice, he said, in an apostolic poverty. He was driven successively from Italy, France, and Switzerland, but in 1139 was recalled to Rome by the populace, who sought to revive the sovereignty of the state, established a senate, limited the pope to the exercise of spiritual power and the possession of voluntary offerings, and invited the German emperor to make Rome his capital. Arnold and his "politicians" at Rome thus gave pope Innocent and his immediate successors—Lucius II, Eugenius III, and Adrian IV—more trouble than any political movements elsewhere. This condemnation at the council did not effectually diminish his power. When, however, Adrian, in 1154, put the city of Rome under ban, and prohibited all public worship, Arnold was abandoned by the senate, sacrificed by Frederick I, and hung at Rome in 1155, his body being burned and thrown into the Tiber. Among the canons of the council, the twenty-third condemns the heresy of the Manichæans, as the followers of Peter de Bruis were called. This heresy was attributed to the early Waldensians in France and elsewhere, arising partly from their ascetic mode of life. About 1000 prelates were present at this council; thirty canons of discipline were published, and among them reaffirmations of former canons against simony, marriage, and concubinage in the clergy.

IV. The council of 1179, under Alexander III, numbering 280, mostly Latin bishops, was called to correct certain abuses which had arisen during the long schism just brought to a close by the peace of Venice, 1177. Until near the end of the 12th century the popes were hard pressed by the Hohenstauffen emperors. It is the contest of Ghibelline and Guelph. Frederick I had taken umbrage at the use of the term "beneficium" in a letter addressed to him by Adrian IV about the rudeness of German knights to pilgrims visiting Rome, as if the pope meant to imply that the imperial authority had been conferred by him. The emperor marched into Italy, and other letters were interchanged between him and the pope, when, upon the death of Adrian in 1159, the two parties—the hierarchic and the moderate among the cardinals — chose two opposing popes, viz. Alexander III and Victor IV. The emperor's council, called at Pavia in 1160, recognised the latter. Pascal III and Calixtus III followed at the imperial dictation, with but little influence. Alexander, from his refuge in France, enjoyed great popularity. He had on his side the Lombard league. The cause of Frederick was defended by the lawyers of Bologna, who ascribed to him unlimited power, to the prejudice of the people. Defeated at Legnano in 1176, the emperor subscribed, at the dictation of Alexander, the peace of Venice, the provisions of which were based on the Concordat of Worms. The first and most important of the twenty-seven canons established by this council, which were mostly disciplinary, provides that henceforth "the election of the popes shall be confined to the college of cardinals, and *two thirds* of the votes shall be required to make a lawful election, instead of a majority only, as heretofore." It was by this council also that the "errors and impieties" of the Waldenses and Albigenses were declared heretical. At the unimportant council of 1167, pope Alexander excommunicated Frederick I.

V. The council of 1215, under Innocent III, was the most important of all the Lateran Councils. It is usually styled the Fourth Lateran. It continued in session from November 11 to November 30, having present 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 800 abbots, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the legates of other patriarchs and crowned heads. The pope opened the assembly with a sermon upon St. Luke xxii, 15, relating to the recovery of the Holy Land and the reformation of the Church. The remarkable power of Innocent III is displayed in his influence over this council, which was submissive to all his wishes, and received the seventy canons proposed by him. The papal prerogatives attained their greatest height in Innocent, whose pontificate extended from 1198 to 1216. The bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, directed against Philip the Fair in 1302, marks the limit from which the power of the popes evidently declined. Innocent III—a man of great personal power, of marked ability as a writer and orator, bold, crafty, and ever watchful of affairs—had his eye on all that transpired through his legates. The chief objects which his pontificate sought were "the strengthening of the States of the Church, separation of the Two Sicilies from all dependence on the German empire, the liberation of Italy from all foreign control, the exercise of guardianship over the confederacy of its states, the liberation of the Oriental Church, the extermination of heretics, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline" (Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 207). Hitherto England, Germany, and France had constituted a balance of power against the pope, but under Innocent the two former, as well as Italy, submitted to the claims of the pseudo-Isidorean decretals. France was early laid under interdict (1200) on account of Philip Augustus's repudiation of Ingeburge and the French bishops' approval of the act, while John of England was deprived of his realm, to receive it back (in 1213) only as a fief of Rome. Deciding at first for Otho IV, the Guelph, against the

Hohenstauffen Philip, in Germany, Innocent subsequently secured from the council the recognition of Frederick II, vainly seeking in this his German policy to free Italy entirely from the power of the emperor. The famous seventy constitutions of Innocent, if not discussed *conciliariter* by the bishops, or passed with every form of enactment, were nevertheless regarded as the canons of the council, so recognised by the Council of Trent and by Church authorities of the intervening age, and they have constituted a fundamental law for many well-known practices of the Romish Church. The *first* of these canons asserts the Catholic faith in the unity of God against all Manichæan sects. It also, for the first time, makes the doctrine of transubstantiation, in the use of this express term, an article of faith. "The body and blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament of the altar are truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being, by the divine omnipotence, *transubstantiated* into his body, and the wine into his blood." The *second* canon condemns the treatise of Joachim, the prophet of Calabria, which he wrote against Peter Lombard on the subject of the Trinity. The *third* canon is of great importance, furnishing the basis for the crusade against the Albigenses, and for all severities of a like character on the part of the Romish Church. It "anathematizes all heretics who hold anything in opposition to the preceding exposition of faith, and enjoins that, after condemnation, they shall be delivered over to the secular arm; also excommunicates all who receive, protect, or maintain heretics, and threatens with deposition all bishops who do not use their utmost endeavors to clear their dioceses of them" (Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 295). The *fourth* canon invites the Greeks to unite with and submit themselves to the Romish Church. The *fifth* canon regulates the order of precedence of the patriarchs: 1. Rome; 2. Constantinople; 3. Alexandria; 4. Antioch; 5. Jerusalem; and permits these several patriarchs to give the pall to the archbishops of their dependencies, exacting from themselves a profession of faith, and of obedience to the Roman see, when they receive the pall from the pope. The *sixth to the twentieth*, inclusive, are of minor importance (see Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 296). The *twenty-first* canon enjoins "all the faithful of both sexes, having arrived at years of discretion, to confess all their sins at least once a year to their proper priest, and to communicate at Easter." This is the first canon known which orders sacramental confession generally, and may have been occasioned by the teachings of the Waldenses, that neither confession nor satisfaction was necessary in order to obtain remission of sin. From the words with which it commences, it is known as the canon "Omnis utriusque sexûs," and was solemnly reaffirmed by the Council of Trent. The canons (given completely by Landon, *Man. of Councils*, p. 293 sq.) in general constitute a body of full and severe disciplinary enactments. This council reaffirmed and extended the Truce of God on plenary indulgence which had been previously proclaimed in behalf of the Eastern Crusades, and fixed the time, June 1, and place, Sicily, as a rendezvous for another crusade.

This council also confirmed Simon de Montfort in possession of lands which the Crusaders had obtained by papal confiscation from the Waldenses, and decreed the entire extirpation of the heresy. The Waldenses or Albigenses in the south of France were the followers of Peter Waldo, a wealthy citizen of Lyons, who, from religious principle, adopted a life of poverty. His followers were also called Leonistæ and "Poor men of Lyons." They were allied in their sentiments to the Vaudois of the Piedmontese valleys, with whom they became united for mutual defence. They protested against these points in the doctrine of the Romish Church: 1. Transubstantiation. 2. The sacraments of confirmation, confession, and marriage. 3. The invocation of saints. 4. The worship of images. 5. The temporal power of the clergy. A crusade had been instituted against them by the papal power in 1178. Innocent sought to win them over and make monks of them by establishing in 1201 the order of "Poor Catholics." Unsuccessful in this, he confiscated their lands to the feudal lords, and established an inquisition among them under the direction of Dominic, which was formally sanctioned by the present council. The warfare against them, incited and directed by the monks of Citeaux, was allowed by Philip Augustus. Count Raymond of Toulouse espoused the cause of his persecuted vassals. The papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, sent to convert the Waldenses, was murdered by Raymond, whose dominions were thereupon assaulted in 1209 by a fiercer crusade of so-called "Christian Pilgrims," led on by Simon de Montfort and Arnold, the abbot of Citeaux. The count of Toulouse submitted, but a bloody warfare was prosecuted against Raymond Roger, viscount of Beziers and Albi, and subsequently 200 towns and castles within the boundaries of the two counts were granted to the successful Simon de Montfort. A rebellion, however, against his power deprived him of all; but Raymond of Toulouse, who appeared at the council of 1215, obtained no favor, and his territory was declared to be alienated from him forever.

VI. The council of 1512–1517, under Julius II and Leo X, was convened for the reformation of abuses, for the condemnation of the Council of Pisa, and attained its most important result in the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. France, under Louis XII, had obtained great military successes in Italy by the League of Cambray, formed in 1509 against Venice. In the interests of France, and by the friendship of some of the cardinals, Louis XII summoned a Church council at Pisa, Nov. 1511, which in 1512 was moved to Milan, but was entirely fruitless of results, being dissolved by the presence of the pope's army. Julius II, though at first jealous of Venice, had nevertheless, aroused by the successes of the French general, formed the Holy Alliance with Venice, Spain, England, and Switzerland, and now, at the head of his army, drove the French beyond the Alps, and himself summoned a council at the Lateran May 10, 1512. This council extended over twelve sessions, until March, 1517. The bishop of Guerk had actively promoted the summoning of the council, and attended as representative of the German emperor. All the acts of the Council of Pisa were at once annulled. Julius having died in Feb. 1513, Leo X presided over the sixth session. At the eighth session, in Dec. 1513, Louis XII, through his ambassador, declared his adhesion to this Council of the Lateran. At the eleventh session, in Dec. 1516, the bull was read which, in place of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), wherein France accepted the decisions of the Basle council in so far as they were consistent with the liberties of the Gallican Church, substituted the Concordat agreed upon this year, 1516, between Leo X and Francis I. Through hope of increasing his power in Italy, Francis largely sacrificed the liberties of the Church. Several of the articles of the Pragmatic were retained, but most of them were altered or abolished. The first article was entirely contrary to the Pragmatic, which had re-established the right of election, while the Concordat declares that the chapters of the cathedrals in France shall no longer proceed to elect the bishop in case of vacancy, but that the king shall name a proper person, whom the pope shall nominate to the vacant see. The Concordat, on account especially of this provision, met with great opposition in the Parliament, universities, and the Church at Paris. It was a great advance of the papacy against the liberties of France (compare Janus, *Pope and Council*, § xxviii and xxix). Neither this council nor the other four, viz. those of 1123, 1139, 1179, and 1215, styled œcumenical by the Romish Church, can be properly regarded as such.

Some writers mention as the sixth Lateran the council convened by pope Benedict XIII on the bull *Unigenitus* [see JANSENIUS], and for the purpose of general reform in the Church (compare Klemm, *Conc. a Bened. XIII*, in *Lat. habiti præbreve examen* (1729); Walch, *De*

concil. Lat. a Bened. XIII (Lips. 1726). For a detailed account of the council at the Lateran opened Dec. 8, 1869, see ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL, and the article INFALLIBILITY in vol. iv, especially p. 573 sq. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 287–303; Mansi, *Concil.* vi, 75; x, 741, 767, 806, 891, 999, 1503; xi, 117; xiv, 1–346; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i, 368; ii, 131, 184, 195, 388; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii, 297, 298 sq., 434; iv, 146, 175 sq., 236; v, 211 sq.; Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* i, 417 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 351; ii, 206.

Latey, GILBERT, an English Quaker, was born in England in 1627. He was one of the most active and efficient members of his society in London. His labors were directed especially to the relief of the more unfortunate of his Church. He died Sept. 15, 1705. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 105.

Lathrop, JOSEPH, D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born October 20, 1731 (O. S.), at Norwich, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1754; entered the ministry January, 1756; was ordained pastor in West Springfield, Mass., August 25, and labored there until his death, December 31, 1820. In 1793 he was elected professor of divinity in Yale College, but declined the position. He published *A Letter to the Rev. the associated Pastors in the County of New Haven concerning the Ordination of the Rev. John Hubbard in Meriden* (1770):—*Miscellaneous Collection of original Pieces, political, moral, and entertaining* (1786); and a number of occasional *Sermons* (Hartford, 1793, 8vo; 1803, 8vo; Worcester, 1807, 8vo). Doctor Lathrop was a popular preacher, and his sermons have long been highly commented upon both in this country and in Europe.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i, 528.

Latimer, Hugh, one of the most distinguished prelates of the Church of England, undoubtedly one of the ablest, if not the ablest ecclesiastic among the English reformers of the 16th century, called by Froude (*Hist. of England*, i, 264; comp. ii, 101) the John Knox of England, the bearer of a name that "now shines over two hemispheres, and will blaze more and more till the last day," was born at Thurcaston, in Leicestershire, about 1490. His father, a farmer of good practical judgment, early discovering in Hugh talents that would fit him for a literary position of note, afforded him all the advantages of his time at school, and at fourteen Hugh was transferred to Cambridge, where he was soon known as a sober, hard-working student. At nineteen he was elected fellow of Clare Hall, took his degree at twenty, and at once entered on the study of theology, having decided to devote himself to the services of the Church. A sincere and devout believer in the doctrines and rites of the Church of Rome, we need not wonder at finding him, at this period of his life, loud and frequent in his denunciation of the would-be reformers, seldom losing an opportunity of inveighing against them. "He even held them," says Middleton (*Memoirs of the Reformers*, iii, 103), "in such horror that he thought they were the supporters of that Antichrist whose appearance was to precede the coming of the Son of Man, and conjectured that the day of judgment was at hand." Nor were the events of his day likely to cool his mistaken zeal. Luther, who was making havoc in the ranks of the papacy, had just been assailed by "the defender of the faith" (king Henry VIII); and as a most fit subject for his dissertation for the divinity degree, Latimer could find no better work than "fleshing his maiden sword" in an attack upon Melancthon—surely no small task for a man not much beyond his teens. But even at this early age Hugh Latimer proved himself quite a formidable polemic, and, what is even more noteworthy, a man not afraid to speak his mind—a trait which distinguishes our subject in all the acts of his life. Immediately after his attack on Melancthon he came under the eye and tongue of Bilney, the famous advocate of the Reformed doctrines in the English Church, and he was led to examine more critically the doctrines and discipline of his Church. The result was, naturally enough, conversion to the cause which Bilney so ably advocated. Latimer was at this time about thirty years of age, and as he was not a man accustomed to do things by halves, he became a zealous advocate for reform, and preached manfully and boldly against the false doctrines and various abuses of Romanism which had crept into and polluted the Church of England. Naturally gifted with great oratorical powers, and inspired by the fitness of the subject with which he was dealing, he soon made himself famous as a preacher at Cambridge. "None, except the stiff-necked and uncircumcised, ever went away from his preaching, it was said, without being affected with high detestation of sin, and moved to all godliness and virtue" (*Jewel of Joy* [Parker Society edition], p. 224 sq.). Such preaching, however, greatly as it was needed by the times in which Latimer lived, could not meet the approval of the servile ecclesiastics. It was too much tinged by theological statements that "had originally sprouted in England, and, after being translated to Germany, had been brought back with improved fibre;" and Latimer soon found himself surrounded by a formidable opposition, daily growing in strength. His "heretical preaching," as it was then called, caused a remonstrance made to the diocesan bishop of Ely by a gray friar named Venetus, but really due to most of the divines of Cambridge, requesting episcopal interference. Dr. West, then the incumbent of the bishopric of Ely, naturally a mild and moderate man, inclined to favor Latimer at first, and only mildly rebuked him. Here the matter might have ended, and it is more than likely that "he would not have been the Latimer of the Reformation, and the Church of England would not, perhaps, have been here to-day" (Froude, ii, 101), had not this bishop, while on a visit to Cambridge (1525), unexpectedly attended one of Latimer's preaching services, and had not his prelatical dignity been sorely touched on the occasion. Latimer was right in the midst of his sermon when the bishop entered; immediately he abandoned his subject, and, as soon as the bishop had been seated, according to Strype, addressed the audience as follows: "It is of congruence meet that a new auditory being more honorable, requireth a new theme, being a new argument to entreat of. Therefore it behoveth me now to deviate from mine intended purpose, and somewhat to entreat of the honorable estate of a bishop. Therefore let this be the theme, '*Christus existens pontifex futurorum bonorum*, etc.'" This text, says a contemporary, he so fruitfully handled, expounding every word, and setting forth the office of Christ so sincerely as the true and perfect pattern unto all other bishops that should succeed him in his Church, that the bishop then present might well think of himself that neither he nor any of his fellows were of that race, but rather of the fellowship of Caiaphas and Annas. It cannot appear strange to any one that "the wise and politic man," as the bishop of Ely was generally called, thereafter also went over to the enemy, and forbade Latimer's preaching within the diocese over which he presided. Latimer, however, overcame this obstacle by gaining the use of a pulpit in a monastery of Austin friars, exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and the prior of which, Dr. Barnes, decidedly favored the reformed doctrines. This daring attitude of the young preacher so provoked Dr. West and the Cambridge clique that the bishop made complaint to cardinal Wolsey. "No eye saw more quickly than the cardinal's the difference between a true man and an impostor," and when he had heard from the lips of Latimer himself the substance of the sermons that had given cause to the complaint, the cardinal, instead of punishing Latimer, replied to the accusations by granting the offender a license to preach in any church in England. "If the bishop of Ely cannot abide such doctrine as you have here repeated," he said, "you shall preach it to his beard, let him say what he will" (Latimer, *Remains*, p. 27 sq., as quoted by Froude, ii, 102). From this time forward the career of Latimer seems

clearly marked out. Hitherto he had been quite orthodox in points of theoretic belief. "His mind," says Froude, "was practical rather than speculative, and he was slow in arriving at conclusions which had no immediate bearing upon action." Now he broke loose altogether from the position of the Cambridge authorities, and probably became defiant of them. But Wolsey († 1530) fell from grace, and there was reason to fear that Latimer would now, at last, also fall a prey to the malice of his formidable adversaries, greatly increased in numbers by his success in gaining followers, who were drawn towards him by his eloquence, his moral conduct, and his kindness of disposition, as well as by the merits of his cause. Unexpectedly, however, and quite to the chagrin of the Cambridge men, he found a fresh protector in the king himself. He had preached before Henry in the Lent of 1530, having been introduced to his royal master by the king's physician, Dr. Butts; and he won the favor of Henry by his honest, straightforward logic and his enthusiasm. In this new position he performed his duty as faithfully as he had in preaching at Cambridge, and he dared to speak the truth in a place where the truth is generally forgotten. A special opportunity to speak in defense of the Protestant cause was afforded him by the persecutions to which the truest men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time on account of their religious faith; and, though he did not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains "to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to speak something, too, for a prince that could respect the nobleness of the poor yeoman's son, who dared in such a cause to write to him as a man to a man. To have written at all in such a strain was as brave a step as was ever deliberately ventured. Like most brave acts, it did not go unrewarded; for Henry remained ever after, however widely divided from him in opinion, yet his unshaken friend" (Froude, ii, 104). Perhaps it may not be out of place here to say that Henry VIII himself, however nobly he may have acted towards Latimer and the Reformers after 1530, was perhaps, in the main, incited to his friendly deeds towards Latimer by the position the latter had taken in 1527. Froude and most of the English historians forget, in their great endeavor to cleanse Henry VIII from all sin, that, however greatly the Church of England has been benefited by his work, his object was not reform in the Church, but the establishment of a second papacy and his own enthronement as pope, and that he was only led to take this step when he found so many pliant tools to carry out his project of separation from his first wife, Catharine of Aragon. Of the commission appointed by the University of Cambridge to investigate the king's rights in this matter, Latimer had been a member, and had taken decided ground in favor of the king. This of itself was sufficient to secure the good offices of his royal master. Latimer's record of course, both before and after this event, clearly proves that he was not a pliant tool in the hands of the king, but actually believed Henry VIII justified in his separation from Catharine.

Most prominent and influential at this time among the king's favorites, or the Anne Boleyn party, as they are sometimes termed, as the advocates of her cause and the justness of king Henry's marriage with her, was lord Thomas Cromwell (q. v.; comp. also Froude, *History of England*, ii, 109 sq.). By Cromwell's exertions, Latimer, in 1531, was presented with the benefice of West Kingston, in Wiltshire, where he preached the reformed doctrines with such plainness and emphasis as to bring upon him a public accusation and citation before the bishop of London, who had only been watching for an opportunity to punish him as a heretic. The citation was issued and served January 10, 1532. Articles were drawn up, mainly extracts from his sermons, in which he was charged with speaking lightly of the worship of the saints, and with affirming that there was no material fire of a purgatorial description, and that, for his own part, he would rather be in purgatory than in the Lollard's tower! He set out for London in the depth of winter, and under a severe fit of the stone, determined to defend the justness of his course. He was submitted by the different bishops to the closest cross-questionings, in the hope that he would commit himself. "They felt," says Froude (ii, 107), "that he was the most dangerous person to them in the kingdom, and they labored with unusual patience to insure his conviction." Latimer, however, baffled his episcopal inquisitors with their own weapons, and when they dared to excommunicate and to imprison him, he dared to appeal to the king in the face of their formidable opposition, and was permitted to escape with a simple submission to the archbishop, instead of an obligation to subscribe to a certain list of articles. These latter were as follows: "That there is a purgatory to purge the souls of the dead after this life; that the souls in purgatory are holpen with the masses, prayers, and alms of the living; that the saints do pray as mediators now for us in heaven; that they are to be honored; that it is profitable for Christians to call upon the saints that they may pray for us unto God; that pilgrimages and oblations done to the sepulchres and relics of saints are meritorious; that they which have vowed perpetual chastity may not marry, nor break their vow, without the dispensation of the pope; that the keys of binding and loosing delivered to Peter do still remain with the bishops of Rome, his successors, although they live wickedly, and are by no means, nor at any time, committed to laymen; that men may merit at God's hand by fasting, prayer, and other works of piety; that they which are forbidden of the bishop to preach, as suspected persons, ought to cease until they have purged themselves; that the fast which is used in Lent, and other fasts prescribed by the canons, are to be observed; that God, in every one of the seven sacraments, giveth grace to a man rightly receiving the same, that consecrations, sanctifyings, and blessings, by custom received into the Church, are profitable; that it is laudable and profitable that the venerable images of the crucifix and other saints should be had in the Church as a remembrance, and to the honor and worship of Jesus Christ and his saints; that it is laudable and profitable to deck and clothe those images, and to set up burning lights before them to the honor of said saints." Historians disagree as to the attitude of Latimer towards the bishops, who demanded that he should sign at least two of the articles, viz. the one respecting the observance of Lent, and that concerning the crucifix and the lawfulness of images in churches. Fox doubts that Latimer signed any; Gilpin, in his memoir of Latimer, denies it outright; Hook (*Eccles. Biogr.* vi, 562) says that the fact of his signing "is put beyond all question by the minutes of the Convocation, where it is recorded that in the month of March, 1532, Latimer appeared, and, kneeling down, craved forgiveness, acknowledging that he had erred in preaching against the aforesaid two articles." Froude, however, holds that Latimer signed "all *except* two—one apparently on the power of the pope; the other I am unable to conjecture." (Comp. Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.* iii, 116, Latimer's *Remains*, p. 466.)

Rescued from these perils by lord Cromwell, he was by the latter now introduced to Anne Boleyn, and by her appointed chaplain; and in 1535 he was honored with the bishopric of Worcester. In this new appointment, which marks an important epoch in the ecclesiastical history of the day, Latimer was remarkably zealous in the discharge of his office; he was active, determined, and vigilant. "In writing, frequent; in ordaining, strict; in preaching, indefatigable; in reproving, severe; in exhorting, persuasive." In 1536, finally, he was brought from the somewhat secluded position he had hitherto occupied to a more public exhibition by a summons to Parliament and Convocation, at the opening of which he preached two very powerful sermons, boldly urging the necessity of reform. Ever since 1534 es-

trangement between the pope and the king had been quite decided. Cranmer's decree of 1533, approving the marriage with Anne Boleyn, had been declared first null and void by the pope, and Henry had been threatened with excommunication; but, as he had ignored the papal threat, a bull to this effect was published in 1534–5. These proceedings on the part of Rome left no other course open to Henry than either to repent, or to establish himself as the supreme head of the English Church. The Convocation of Canterbury, in 1531, had pronounced officially in favor of constitutional reforms, and an act of Parliament in 1533 repudiated papal supremacy by withdrawing first the payment of the bishops' annates or first-fruits, and next by an "act for the restraint of appeals," which forbade appeals to Rome on any pretext, and asserted the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in England competent to decide without any consultation of the papal power, followed by another act conferring on the English monarch the right of episcopal appointment, as well as another forbidding applications to the Roman see for faculties, dispensations, etc. It was therefore no great task to prevail upon the convocations of Canterbury and York, in 1534, to declare formally against the claim of the Roman see to exercise any jurisdiction in England; and, when once the step had been taken by the convocations, both the universities, as well as the whole of the bishops, and an overwhelming majority of the clergy, cheerfully followed in the same wake, "all apparently feeling that there was no sound theological reason for the maintenance of so burdensome and unconstitutional a tyranny" (Blunt [John Henry], *Key to Ch. History* [modern], p. 23). With all these initiatory measures secured, Henry had no reason any longer to hesitate on the decided step of seizing the supreme power over the English Church, which, in 1531, the convocations of Canterbury and York had consented to recognise only with the definite limitation "as far as the law of Christ will allow," and he began the work by an order, in 1534, to omit the pope's name from the service-books, quickly followed by two successive acts, passed by a servile Parliament, confirming the supremacy, and giving to the king unlimited power to repress all heresies, and to punish as high treason the denial of his right to the title of supreme head of the Church. In order further to secure him in the position which he had assumed, the Convocation of 1536, in which Latimer, as we have seen above, figured quite prominently, was urged to settle the questions of doctrine and devotion, which were agitating the English Church, and, as the result of their deliberations, sent forth the following ten articles, the original predecessors of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. See ARTICLES.

I. Enjoined belief in the Holy Bible, the three creeds, and the teaching of the first four general councils.
II. Set forth the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.
III. Defined penance as consisting of repentance, confession, absolution, and amendment of life.
IV. Declared fully the doctrine of the real presence, without asserting that of transubstantiation.
V. Explained justification as attainable by repentance, faith, and charity, through the merits and mission of our blessed Lord.
VI. Declared that images might be profitably used as aids to devotion, but not worshipped nor unduly honored.
VII. Set forth the honor due to saints as God's faithful people who pray for us.
VIII. Showed that, with certain limitations, the prayers of the saints might be asked for.
IX. Spoke of minor rites and ceremonies of the Church, such as the use of holy water, ashes on Ash-Wednesday, palms on Palm-Sunday, etc., and declared that they might be fitly used to excite devotional feelings, but not as if they could obtain remission of sins.
X. Distinguished prayers for the dead from the Romish doctrine of purgatory, repudiating the latter..

In the following year these doctrinal articles were succeeded by the *Institution of a Christian Man* (q. v.), a plain and authoritative exposition of Church doctrine, composed by a commission of forty-six divines, appointed by the king, and including all the bishops as well as some other dignitaries of the Church. In this commission all shades of opinion had been represented, Cranmer and Latimer, as well as Gardiner and Bonner, being of the number; but it was evident throughout that the Reformers were in the majority; and when, to all outward appearances, the reform movement seemed destined to prove a success in England, it suddenly received, from a quarter where it was last looked for, a blow that stunned it almost completely. The separation between the king of England and the pope of Rome having become complete, the Lutherans grew anxious to effect a union with the English Reformers, and to this end three German divines, with Burckhardt at their head, had come to England in 1538, to discuss and amicably settle all minor religious differences of opinion. Unfortunately, however, they not only failed to bring about an agreement on sacramental doctrine, but the discussion even induced the king to cling more tenaciously than ever to the belief of the Romish Church, especially on transubstantiation; and in 1539 the king actually caused the passage of "the bloody act of the Six Articles," or "the whip with six strings," as the Protestants termed it, by which the denial of transubstantiation was made punishable with death, and other mediæval dogmas were enforced by fine and imprisonment (comp. Froude, *Hist. of England*, iii, ch. xvi). From these *six articles* (q. v.) the reformers, of course, totally dissented; many of them preferred to hold their peace, and kept their places. Latimer, however, was not one of these; accustomed to speak his mind, he at once manifested his dissent to this enactment by his resignation of the bishopric. Some historians will have it that he was induced to resign by lord Cromwell; the latter, "either himself deceived or desiring to smooth the storm, told Latimer that the king advised his resignation" (Froude, iii, 370, foot note). The *state papers* (i, 849), however, state "that his majesty afterwards denied this, and pitied Latimer's condition;" and when we consider that Latimer had found a tried friend in Cromwell, we can hardly conclude that either he or the king had anything to do with the resignation, which was an act only to be expected of Latimer, ever independent and bold to speak the truth. Froude (on the authority of Hall) will have it even that Latimer, together with Shaxton (q. v.), were imprisoned immediately after their resignation, but if this be true he can have been confined only a brief period, as by a summary declaration of pardon the bishop's dungeon doors were thrown open and the prisoners were dismissed a very short time after their imprisonment.

Latimer thereafter sought retirement in the country, where he would have continued to reside had not an accident befallen him, the effects of which he thought the skill of London surgeons would alleviate. He arrived in London when the power of Cromwell was nearly at an end, and the mastery in the hands of Gardiner, who no sooner discovered him in his privacy than he procured accusations to be made against him for his objections to the Six Articles, and he was committed to the Tower. Different causes being alleged against him, he remained a prisoner for the remaining six years of king Henry VIII's reign, his enemies evidently designing mainly to prevent his influence for the cause of the Reformers in the capital of the nation. Upon the accession of Edward VI Parliament offered to restore him to his see, but Latimer was firm in his refusal to receive it: his great age, he said, made him desirous of freedom from any and all responsibility. He preached, however, frequently, and gave himself up to all manner of benevolent works. He was a decided opponent of "the bloody Bonner;" occasionally his advice was sought for by the king, and he was continually active as the strenuous reprover of the vices of the age; but the reign was short, and with it expired Latimer's prosperity. In July, 1553, king Edward died; in September, Mary had begun to take vengeance on the Reformers, and, among others, Latimer was committed to the Tower. Though he was at least eighty years old, no consideration was shown for his great age, and he was sent to Oxford, March 8, 1554, together with Cranmer and Ridley, to dis-

pute on the corporal presence. He had never been accounted very learned: he had not used Latin much, he told them, these twenty years, and was not able to dispute; but he would declare his faith, and then they might do as they pleased. He declared that he thought the presence of Christ in the sacrament to be only spiritual; "he enlarged much against the sacrifice of the mass, and lamented that they had changed the communion into a private mass; that they had taken the cup away from the people; and, instead of service in a known tongue, were bringing the nation to a worship that they did not understand" (Burnet, *Reformation*, vol. ii). He was laughed at, and told to answer their arguments; he reminded them that he was old, and that his memory had failed; the laughter, however, continued, and there was great disorder, perpetual shoutings, tauntings, and reproaches. When he was asked whether he would abjure his principles, he only answered, "I thank God most heartily that he hath prolonged my life to this end, that I may in this case glorify God with this kind of death." He was found guilty of heresy and sentenced to death, but the Romanists, to make sure that no claims for the irregularity of the trial should be charged upon them, set aside the sentence which had been passed at the first trial, and, by direction of cardinal Pole, another commission, consisting of Brookes, bishop of Gloucester; Holyman, bishop of Bristol; and White, bishop of Lincoln, was convened on the 7th of September, under the altar of St. Mary's Church at Oxford, and the three "arch heretics" given a second hearing and condemned. Latimer was the last introduced. He was now eighty years old, "dressed in an old threadbare gown of Bristol frieze, a handkerchief on his head with a night-cap over it, and over that again another cap, with two broad flaps buttoned under the chin. A leather belt was round his waist, to which a Testament was attached; his spectacles, without a case, hung from his neck. So stood the greatest man, perhaps, then living in the world, a prisoner on his trial, waiting to be condemned to death by men professing to be ministers of God. . . . Latimer's trial was the counterpart of Ridley's (see Froude, vi, 356 sq.); the charge was the same (on the sacrament), and the result was the same, except that the stronger intellect vexed itself less with nice distinctions. Bread was bread, said Latimer, and wine was wine; there was a change in the sacrament, it was true, but the change was not in the nature, but the dignity" (Froude, vi, 359 sq.). Every effort was made to induce a recantation, but Latimer, like Ridley, remained firm, and sentence was pronounced upon them as heretics obstinate and incurable, and on the 16th of October, 1555, both Latimer and Ridley were led to the stake and burnt, outside the north wall of the town, a short stone's throw from the southward corner of Baliol College, and about the same distance from Brocardo prison, where Cranmer still lingered. The last words of Latimer were addressed to his companion, and are characteristic of our subject: "Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man: we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." Gunpowder had been fastened about his body to hasten his death; it took fire with the first flame, and he died immediately.

Latimer's character, which has been treated most beautifully by the late Rev. E. Thomson, D.D., LL.D., in his *Sketches, Biographical and Incidental* (Cinc. 1856), p. 42 sq., seems to us to present a combination of many noble and disinterested qualities. "He was brave, honest, devoted, and energetic, homely and popular, yet free from all violence; a martyr and hero, yet a plain, simple-hearted, and unpretending man; an earnest, hopeful, and happy man, fearless, open-hearted, hating nothing but baseness, and fearing none but God—not throwing away his life, yet not counting it dear when the great crisis came—calmly yielding it up as the crown of his long sacrifice and struggle. There may be other reformers that more engage our admiration, there is no one that more excites our love" (Tulloch, *Leaders of the Ref.* p. 322-324). Latimer's sermons, characterized by humor and cheerfulness, manly sense and direct evangelical fervor, were first printed collectively in 1549, 8vo, and in 1570, 4to; one of the best editions, with notes and a memoir, was prepared by John Watkins, LL.D. (Lond. 1824, 2 vols. 8vo). A complete edition of his *Works* (the only complete one) was edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. G. E. Corrie (Cambr. 1844-5, 4 vols. 8vo). See Gilpin, *Life of Latimer* (1755, 8vo); Fox, *Book of Martyrs;* Middleton, *Mem. of the Reformers*, iii, 101 sq.; Tulloch, *Leaders of the Reformation*, p. 245 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 551 sq.; Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation* (see Index); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index); Froude, *Hist. of Engl.* vol. i–vi (see Index in vol. xii); *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; *Blackwood's Mag.* lxix, 131 sq.; *Lond. Retr. Rev.* 1822, vi, 272 sq. (J. H. W.)

Latimer, William, an English humanist of the 15th century, became in 1489 a fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. He studied theology in that university, and afterwards Greek at Padua, and subsequently became teacher to Reginald Pole. He was a friend of Erasmus, and even assisted him in preparing his second edition of the N. T. He died about 1545. Erasmus and Leland both speak of Latimer in high terms as a writer and scholar. Unfortunately, however, he never published any of his writings, and there remain in MS. form only a few of his letters to Erasmus. See Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (Lond. 1854), i, 232, 271.

Latin (Ρωμαϊκός, *Roman*, Luke xxiii, 38; Ῥωμαϊστί, *in Roman*, John xix, 20), the vernacular language of the Romans, although most of them in the time of Christ likewise spoke Greek. See the monographs on the subject cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 135. See Latinisms.

LATIN, Use of, in the Administration of the Sacraments. The words of St. Augustine against heathen Rome in *De civitate Dei*, xix, 7, "Opera data est, ut imperiosa civitas non solum jugum sed etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus imponeret," may be justly applied to modern Christian Rome. By imposing its language on all nations acknowledging its sovereignty it has obtained also the mastery over their spiritual life. Benedict XIV, indeed, nobly declared, "Ut omnes catholici sint, non ut omnes Latini fiant, necessarium est." But this principle of true, ancient catholicity resulted only in some useless concessions on unimportant points, for Roman Catholicism early found that it cannot afford to dispense with the use of Latin and adopt the vulgar tongues; that it would thereby endanger the consolidation of the Church's power—yea, its very existence. That the Latin language was originally used in the public worship of the Romish adherents, in countries where Latin was the popular language, cannot be a matter of surprise or condemnation, nor that the clergy should have continued to use it in Christianizing the nations who became subjects to Rome, even after its use had become obsolete in Rome itself. Of course there is every reason to believe that in the earliest stages the ecclesiastical language of the Greek-speaking Roman Church was Greek, and continued such till the transfer of the empire to Byzantium (Forbes, *Explan. XXXIX Art.* ii, 430), and that, indeed, all the early churches followed the practice of the apostles, to whom the use of a foreign language was repugnant (compare 1 Cor. xiv, 19; ibid. 16), and made use of their own vernacular, as in the introduction of the Gospel to India, Parthia, and other regions. But the use of the Latin tongue by the Romish Church was in its early period admissible, when we consider that it was only the Church that had it in its power, at a time when the influence of the infant modern languages was derogatory to the Latin, to maintain the ancient language in comparative purity, and to preserve to us its most noble monuments. Indeed, as Hill (*English Monasticism*, p. 325) has well said, "had it not been adopted by the Church,

then, for some centuries, while the new tongues were gradually developing themselves and settling into a form, the world would have been dark indeed; not a book, not a page, not a syllable would have reached us of the thought, the life, or the events of that period. From the 4th to the 7th century there would have been an impenetrable gap in the annals of humanity—the voice of history would have been hushed into a dead silence, and the light of the past, which beacons the future, would have been extinguished in the darkness of a universal chaos." Not so justifiable, however, was the conduct of the Romish Church after the moderate development of the modern languages; and we see an inclination, even in the papal chair, to revolutionize ecclesiastical usage in this respect in the latter half of the 9th century, when the Slaves became converts to Christianity under the labors of St. Methodius, and introduced the vernacular, with the consent and approval of pope John VIII (comp. Methodius, *Epist.* 247, to Sfentopulcher, count of Moravia). Gregory VIII, on the other hand, quickly undid the liberal work of John VIII, and was loud in his denunciations of the use of any but the Latin language in Christian religious worship. Nevertheless, there have been many exceptions during the Middle Ages. The Bohemian Church early manifested a desire to use the vernacular; and, although Gregory VII had stringently insisted on the use of the Latin, they succeeded at the Council of Basle (1431) in the passage of an act tolerating the vernacular in the churches of Bohemia.

The Reformation of the 16th century first awoke a general desire for the use of the vernacular, France and Germany were particularly determined to secure this privilege. The Council of Trent, which was approached on this subject, however, only so far regarded the demands of Catharine de Medicis and the emperor Ferdinand on this point as to reaffirm the existing rules in the mildest possible terms, so as not to offend them (Sessio xxii, cap. 8: "Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut [missa] vulgari lingua passim celebraretur"). It only anathematizes those who claim that mass is to be exclusively celebrated in the vernacular: "Si quis dixerit, lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, anathema sit" (*l. c.* canon 9). Yet, in order to appear to make some concession to the requirements of the times, the synod decided (*l. c.* cap. 8), "Ne oves Christi esuriant, neve parvuli panem petant, et non sit qui frangat eis, mandat S. synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios ex iis, quæ in missa leguntur, aliquid exponant, atque inter cetera sanctissimi hujus sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus præsertim dominicis et festis," by which they acknowledged, perhaps more than they intended to do, the necessity of making an allowance for the desire of having the Scriptures explained in the vernacular. The reasons given by the Council of Trent for its determination to continue the use of Latin as the language of the Church (given by Göschl in his *Geschichtliche Darstellung d. Conc. v. Trident.* 1840, part ii, p. 135) are as follows: 1. That, in consequence of the changes to which modern languages are liable, the terms of worship might be altered, and also the ideas connected with them, thus giving rise to heresies. 2. If mass were to be said in the vernacular, then the greater number of the priests would be unable to say mass in other than their native countries, as they would be obliged to say mass in a different language in every country. 3. The holy mysteries, of which mass is the most important, should not be presented to the masses in their own language, as, from their inability to understand their mysterious import, occasion might thus arise for modern heretics to profane these mysteries in the vernacular. All the other reasons which have at various times been advanced in defence of the custom by Roman Catholic writers are but variations on the above (comp. Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, ii, 434; Adolphus, *Compendium Theologicum*, p. 420).

Bellarmine (in his *Works*, iii, 119) attempts to complete and comment on these grounds. 1. He says "the Latin Church has always administered the sacraments in Latin, although this language had long since ceased to be the common language of the people." This is admitting that circumstances are changed, but asserting, at the same time, that it is to be retained simply from habit. Bellarmine then attempts to prove its reasonableness. He says: "There is no pressing motive why the sacraments should be administered in the vernacular, while there are many objections to it; for there is no necessity that those who receive the sacraments should understand the words which accompany them; for the words are addressed either to the elements, as in the eucharist, the blessing of holy water, oil, etc., and these understand no language; or else they are addressed to God, and he understands them all; or, again, they are addressed to persons who are to be consecrated or absolved, not instructed or edified, as in the sacraments of baptism and absolution; hence it is at best a matter of indifference to the person concerned whether he understood the words or not; it is further proved that persons deprived of reason can nevertheless receive baptism and the sacrament of *reconciliatio*, which is seen in the baptism of new-born infants and the *reconciliatio* of sick persons when in an unconscious state." Yet Bellarmine himself, perceiving the difficulties of the position he had assumed, adds: "There are, moreover, hardly such grossly ignorant persons in the Latin Church as not to know in general, by the words which accompany it, which of the sacraments is being administered to them." Granting this, we cannot understand, then, in what manner the use of Latin is to prevent the profanation of the sacraments as set forth by the Council of Trent. Among the objections to the use of modern languages, we find that "the free intercourse between the different churches, which they need as members of one body, is rendered by it much more difficult. Moreover, Christians leaving their native country would thus be obliged to deprive themselves from attending the divina officia." This is taking for granted that all Christians understand Latin; for, unless they do, it would become a matter of indifference to them whether they heard mass in that or another foreign language. "2. The sacraments should always be attended by a certain majesty and inspiring solemnity, which can be better preserved by not using their usual language. If it is granted that in public worship we should use special buildings, special costumes, special forms, etc., there cannot be any objection against the propriety of using also a different language; not that Latin is in itself a more sacred language than another, but because it is better calculated to produce a feeling of reverence than the common tongue. 3. It is right that the sacramental words should always be presented to all the people in the same manner and under the same form, to avoid the danger of changes and alterations. This is the more easily accomplished by making all priests use the same language." Yet this does not always avoid the danger, for there have been instances of priests administering baptism "in nomine patria, filia et spiritua sancta." 4. "By administering the sacraments in the vernacular a wide door would be opened to ignorance, for the priests would at last consider themselves fully qualified if they knew how to read. Latin would be totally forgotten, and they would be unable to read the fathers and even the Scriptures." Here we see another instance of the arrogance of the hierarchy, surpassing that of heathen Rome, which, if it compelled subjected nations to adopt its language, did not, at least, prevent them from understanding it. Christian Rome seems, indeed, to be imbued with the idea that mankind praise and value most what they do not understand.

Towards the close of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, efforts were again made, especially in

Germany, to have mass said in the vernacular (see Marheinecke, *System d. Katholicismus*, iii, 397), but in vain. The increase of ultramontanism rendered all efforts unavailing. Hirscher, in his *Missæ genuinam notionem eruere*, etc., *tentavit Hirscher* (Tübing. 1821), thus clearly expressed the general aspiration (p. 69): "Vituperamus igitur hunc exteræ in cultu nostro linguæ usum pro viribus nostris, atque si unquam eucharistiæ celebrationi vitam redire velimus, eliminandum esse atque proscribendum statuimus. Et sane, si liturgia Latina inter nos Germanos non existeret, nemo profecto populum aliquem universum lingua uti vel duci velle, qua Deum adoret, sibi penitus ignota admitteret possibilitatem. Incomprehensibile revera istud omnibus debet videri, qui cuncta ad sanæ rationis normam solent metiri, et nihil nisi quod ædificat ad cultum admittere." Here Hirscher quotes the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv, 1–20, and continues: "Apostolus hoc loco ne de ordinario quidem linguæ exteræ in ecclesia usu sed de extraordinario aliquo loquitur, quem argumentis ex visceribus rei petitis impugnat. Quanto magis igitur principiis suis inhærens ordinarium ab ipsis mysteriorum ministris et universi cultus ducibus debuit corripere?" He then goes on to prove that the use of Latin in the mass is in contradiction with the object of this part of worship, which requires "sacerdotem inter et populum actionem, celebrantis et populi communionem" (p. 70–71). These views, however, he afterwards withdrew, on being admonished by superior authorities. Romanism cannot admit any real communion between the priest and the people in the sacrifice of the mass, and Hirscher had in this respect gone further than his Church would allow him. It is remarkable that all such efforts were always connected with more extended theological views, namely, with the rejection of the atoning character of mass.

As the principles of the Reformation unfolded, so did the necessity of administering the sacraments in the vernacular. Yet Latin was not at once set aside, and there are yet extant a number of Lutheran liturgies of the second half of the 16th century in which that language is extensively used.

In the English Church, one of the first acts of the Reformers was in behalf of the use of the vernacular in religious service, and the twenty-fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles treats "of speaking in the congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth." The article reads thus: "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understanded of the people."

See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 208; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 619 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xx, 153 sq.; xxi, 418 sq. (J. H. W.)

Latinisms. This word, which properly signifies *idioms* or *phraseology peculiar to the Latin tongue*, is extended by Biblical critics so as to include also the *Latin words* occurring in the Greek Testament. It is but reasonable to expect the existence of Latinisms in the language of every country subdued by the Romans. See Rome. The introduction of their civil and military officers, of settlers, and merchants, would naturally be followed by an infusion of Roman terms, etc., into the language of their new subjects. There would be many new things made known to some of them for which they could find no corresponding word in their own tongues. The circumstance that the proceedings in courts of law were, in every part of the Roman empire, conducted in the Latin language, would necessarily cause the introduction of many Roman words into the department of law, as might be amply illustrated from the present state of the juridical language in every country once subject to the Romans, and even in our own. Valerius Maximus (ii, 2, 2), indeed, records the tenacity of the ancient Romans for their language in their intercourse with the Greeks, and their strenuous endeavors to propagate it through all their dominions. The Latinisms in the New Testament are of four kinds.

1. *Latin Words in Greek Characters.*—The following are instances (see Tregelles in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 15): Ἀσσάριον, "farthing," from the Latin *assarius* (Matt. x, 29). This word is used likewise by Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Athenæus, as may be seen in Wetstein, ad loc. See Assarium. Κῆνσος, *census* (Matt. xvii, 25); κεντυρίων, *centurio* (Mark xv, 39), etc.; λεγεών, *legio*, "legion" (Matt. xxvi, 53). Polybius (B.C. 150) has also adopted the Roman military terms (vi, 17) 1616. Σπεκουλάτωρ, *speculator*, "a spy," from *speculor*, "to look about," or, as Wahl and Schleusner think, from *spiculum*, the weapon carried by the speculator. The word describes the emperor's life-guards, who, among other duties, punished the condemned; hence "an executioner" (Mark vi, 27), margin, "one of his guard" (comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* i, 25; Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 7; Seneca, *De Irâ*, i, 16). Μάκελλον, from *macellum*, "a market-place for flesh" (1 Cor. x, 25). As Corinth was now a Roman colony, it is only consistent to find that the inhabitants had adopted this name for their public market, and that Paul, writing to them, should employ it. Μίλιον, "a mile" (Matt. v, 41). This word is also used by Polybius (xxxiv, 11, 8) and Strabo (v, 332).

2. *Latin Senses of Greek Words:* as καρπός (Rom. xv, 28), "fruit," where it seems to be used in the sense of *emolumentum*, "gain upon money lent," etc.; ἔπαινος, "praise," in the juridical sense of *elogium*, a testimonial either of honor or reproach (1 Cor. iv, 5).

3. Those forms of speech which are properly called Latinisms: as βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, "willing to content the people" (Mark xv, 15), which corresponds to the phrase *satisfacere alicui*; λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανὸν παρά, "to take security of," *satis accipere ab* (Acts xvii, 9); δὸς ἐργασίαν, "give diligence," *da operam* (Luke xii, 58)—the phrase *remittere ad alium judicem* is retained in Luke xxiii, 15; σὺ ὄψει, "see thou to that," *tu videris* (Matt. xxvii, 4) (Aricler, *Hermeneut. Biblica*, Viennæ, 1813, p. 99; Michaelis, *Introd. to the New Test.* by Marsh, Camb. 1793, vol. i, pt. i, p. 163 sq.).

4. *Latin Terminations* in Greek, Gentile, and patronymic nouns: e. g. Ἡρωδιανός (Matt. xxii, 16) and Χριστιανός (Acts xi, 26, etc.) (Winer, *New Test. Gram.* ed. Andover, 1869, p. 95).

The importance of the Latinisms in the Greek Testament consists in this, that, as we have partly shown (and the proof might be much extended), they are to be found in the best Greek writers of the *same era*. Their occurrence, therefore, in the New Testament adds one thread more to that complication of probabilities with which the Christian history is attended. Had the Greek Testament been free from them, the objection, though recondite, would have been strong. At the same time, the subject is intricate, and admits of much discussion. Dr. Marsh disputes some of the instances adduced by Michaelis (*ut sup.* p. 431 sq.). Dresigius even contends that there are no Latinisms in the New Testament (*De Latinismis*, Lips. 1726; and see his *Vindiciæ Dissertationis de Latinismis*). Even Aricler allows that some instances adduced by him may have a purely Greek origin. Truth, as usual, lies in the middle, and there are, no doubt, many irrefragable instances of Latinisms, which will amply repay the attention of the student. See Georgii *Hierocrit. de Latinismis Novi Test.* (Wittemberg, 1733); Kypke, *Observat. Sacr.* ii, 219 (Wratisl. 1755); Pritii *Introductio in Lect. Nov. Test.* p. 207 sq. (Leipz. 1722); Wetterburg, *De vocibus Latinis in N. T. obviis* (Lund. 1792); Fougberg, *De Latinismis in N. T.* (Upsal. 1798); Kapp, *De N. T. Latinismis* (Lipsiæ, 1726); Wernsdorf, *De Christo Latine loquente*, p. 19; Jahn, *Archiv.* II, iv; Olearius, *De Stylo Nov. Test.* p. 368 sq.; Inchofer, *Sacræ Latinitatis Historia* (Prag. 1742). See New Testament.

Latin Versions of the Holy Scriptures.—The extensive use of the Latin as a learned language, and the great influence which the translations in it have had upon all subsequent versions, render them highly important. The various recensions or editions, however,

need to be carefully distinguished and critically examined in order to show their real value and bearing.

I. *Ante-Hieronymian Versions.*—The early and extensive diffusion of Christianity among the Latin-speaking people renders it probable that means would be used to supply the Christians who used that language with versions of the Scriptures in their own tongue, especially those resident in countries where the Greek language was less generally known. That from an early period such means were used cannot be doubted; but the information which has reached us is so scanty, that we are not in circumstances to arrive at certainty on many points of interest connected with the subject. It is even matter of debate whether there were several translations, or one translation variously corrupted or emended.

1. The first writer by whom reference is supposed to be made to a Latin version is Tertullian, in the words "Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem," etc. (*De Monogamia*, c. 11). It is possible that Tertullian has in view here a version in use among the African Christians; but it is by no means certain that such is his meaning, for he may refer merely to the manner in which the passage in question had come to be usually cited, without intending to intimate that it was so written in any formal version. The probability that such is really his meaning is greatly heightened when we compare his language here with similar expressions in other parts of his writings. Thus, speaking of the Logos, he says, "Hanc Græci Λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam *sermonem* appellamus. Ideoque in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis, Sermonem, dicere, in primordio apud Deum esse" (*Adv. Prax.* c. 5), where he seems to have in view simply the colloquial usage of his Christian compatriots (comp. also *Adv. Marc.* c. 4 and c. 9). The testimony of Augustine is more precise. He says (*De Doct. Christ.* ii, 11): "Qui Scripturas in Hebræa lingua in Græcam verterunt numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuiquam primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Græcus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ Latine videbatur, ausus est interpretari." A few sentences before he speaks of the "Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas;" and he proceeds to give instances how one of these versions elucidates another, and to speak of the defects attaching to all of them. This testimony not only clearly establishes the fact of the existence of Latin versions in the beginning of the 4th century, but goes to prove that these were numerous; for that Augustine has in view a number of interpreters, and not merely a variety of recensions, is evident from his statement in this same connection, "In ipsis interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ;" and from his speaking elsewhere (*Cont. Faustum*, ii, 2) of "codices aliarum regionum." On the other hand, the testimony of Hilary is in favor of only one Latin version: "Latina translatio dum virtutem dicti ignorat magnam intulit obscuritatem, non discernens ambigui sermonis proprietatem" (*in Psa. clviii*). On the same side is the declaration of Jerome: "Si Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda respondebunt Quibus? tot sunt enim exemplaria pene quot codices." That by "exemplaria" here Jerome refers to what would now be called *editions* or *recensions*, is evident from the nature of his statement, for it cannot be supposed that he intends to say that almost every codex presented a distinct translation; and this is rendered still more so by what follows: "Si autem veritas est quærenda de pluribus, cur non ad Græcam originem revertentes ea quæ vel a vitiosis interpretibus male reddita, vel a præsumptoribus imperitis emendata perversius, vel a librariis dormitantibus addita sunt aut mutata corrigamus" (*Præf. in Evangg. Ad. Damas.*). Elsewhere (*Præf. in Josuam*) he says also: "Apud Latinos tot exemplaria quot codices et unusquisque pro suo arbitrio vel addidit vel subtraxit quod ei visum est;" where there can be no doubt as to his meaning. Jerome frequently uses the expression *communis* or *vulgata editio*, but by this he intends the Sept., or the old Latin translation of the Sept. In reference to the Latin N. T. he uses the expressions *Latinus interpres*, *Latini codices*, or simply *in Latino*.

The statement of Augustine, that of these interpretations the *Itala* was preferred, has been supposed to indicate decidedly the existence of several national Latin versions known to him. For this title can only indicate a translation prepared in Italy, or used by the Italian churches, and presupposes the existence of other versions, which might be known as the *Africana*, the *Hispanica*, etc. On the other hand, however, if there was a version known by this name, it seems strange that it should never be mentioned again by Augustine or by any one else; and further, it is remarkable, that to designate an Italian version he should use the word "*Itala*" and not "*Italica*." This has led to the suspicion that this word is an error, and different conjectural emendations have been proposed. Bentley suggested that for *itala . . . . nam* there should be read *illa . . . . quæ*, a singularly infelicitous emendation, as Hug has shown (*Introd.* E. T. p. 267). As Augustine elsewhere speaks of "codicibus ecclesiasticis interpretationis usitatæ" (*De consensu Evang.* ii, 66), it has been suggested by Potter that for *Itala* should be read *usitata*, the received reading having probably arisen from the omission, in the first instance, of the recurrent syllable *us* between interpretationibus and usitata (thus INTERPRETATIONIBUSITATA), and then the change of the unmeaning *itata* into *itala*. Of this emendation many have approved, and if it be adopted, the testimony of Augustine in this passage, as for a plurality of Latin versions, will be greatly enfeebled, for by the *versio usitata* he would doubtless intend the version in common use as opposed to the unauthorized interpretation of private individuals. As tending to confirm this view of his meaning, it has been observed that it is extremely improbable that if there was an acknowledged *versio Africana*, the Christians in Africa would be found preferring to that a version made for the use of the Italians. A new suggestion relating to this passage has been offered by Reuss (*Gesch. d. Schr. d. N. T.* p. 436), "Is it not possible," he asks, "that Augustine may refer, in this passage (written about the year 397), to a work of Jerome, viz., his version of Origen's Hexapla, which Augustine, in one of his letters (*Ep.* xxviii, tom. ii, p. 61) to Jerome prefers to his making a new translation from the original? At any rate," he adds, "it is remarkable that Isidore of Spain (*Etymol.* vi, 5) characterizes the translation of Jerome (the last) as *verborum tenaciorem et perspicuitate sententiæ clariorem*. May one venture to suggest that he has taken this phrase from Augustine, regarding him as using it of Jerome." To this, however, it may be replied, that whilst it is not improbable that Isidore took the passage from Augustine, he may have done so without regarding Augustine's words as referring to any work of Jerome. That they do so refer seems to us very improbable.

An effort has been made to obtain a decision for this question from a collation of the extant remains of the ancient Latin texts, but without success. Eichhorn (*Einleit. ins. N. T.* iv, 337 sq.) has compared several passages found in the writings of the early Latin fathers with certain extant codices of the early Latin text, and, from the resemblance which these bear to each other, he argues that they have all been taken from one common translation. In this conclusion many scholars have concurred both before and since the time of Eichhorn (Wetstein, Hody, Semler, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf), but others have, on the other side, pointed to serious differences of rendering, which, in their judgment, indicate the existence of distinct translations (Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Bleek, etc.).

As the evidence stands, it seems impossible either to hold to the existence of only one accredited Latin version before the time of Jerome, the corruption of which,

from various causes, is sufficient to account for all the discrepancies to be found in the extant remains, or to maintain with certainty that there were several independent versions, the work of persons in different parts of the Latin Church. There is, however, a third supposition which may be advanced: There may at an early period, and probably in Africa, have been made a translation of the Bible from the Greek into Latin, and this may have formed the groundwork of other translations, intended to be amended versions of the original. In this case a certain fundamental similarity would mark all these translations along with considerable variety; but this variety would be traceable, not to undesigned corruption, but to purposed attempts, more or less skilfully directed, to produce a more adequate version. This supposition meets all the facts of the case, and so far has high probability in its favor. Proceeding upon it, we may further suppose that these different revised or amended translations might have their origin in different parts of the western world; and in this case the meaning of Augustine's statement in the passage (*Cont. Faustum*, ii, 2) where he speaks of "codices aliarum regionum" becomes manifest. In this case, also, if the reading *Itala* be retained (and most critics incline to retain it) in the famous passage above cited, it will indicate the revision prepared in Italy and used by the Italian churches, of which it is natural to suppose that it would be both more exact and more polished than the others, and with which Augustine would become familiar during his residence in Rome and Milan. See ITALIC VERSION.

2. Of this ancient Latin version in its various amended forms, all of which it has become customary to include under the general designation *Itala*, we have remains partly in the citations of the Latin fathers, partly in the Græco-Latin codices, and partly in special MSS. A copious collection from the first of these sources (which yet admits of being augmented) has been supplied by Sabatier, *Bibliorum SS. Latinæ Vers. antiquæ seu Vetus Itala, etc., quæcunque reperiri potuerunt* (Remis, 1743, 3 vols. fol., ed. 2, 1749). For the Apocalypse we depend entirely on this source, namely, the quotations made by Primasius. The Græco-Latin codices are the *Cantabridgian* or *Codex Bezæ*, the *Laudian*, the *Claromontane*, and the *Boernerian*. See MANUSCRIPTS. Of the known special codices containing portions of the N. T., the following have been printed or collated:

1. *Cod. Vercellensis*, written apparently by Eusebius the Martyr in the 4th century: it embraces the four Gospels, though with frequent *lacunæ*. It is mentioned by Montfaucon in his *Diarium Italicum*, p. 445; and it has been edited by Bianchinus (Bianchini), in *Evangeliarium quadruplex Latinæ vers. antiq. seu Vet. Italicæ*, etc. (Rom. 1749, 4 vols. fol.); previously, and still more carefully, by J. A. Irici, *SS. Evangeliorum Cod. S. Eusebii manu exaratus, ex autographo ad unguem exhibitus*, etc. (Mediol. 1748, 2 parts, 4to). In this codex the Gospels are arranged in the order Matthew, John, Luke [Lucanus], Mark. As a specimen of the style of this codex, and the imperfect state in which some parts of it are, we give the following passage (John iv, 48–52) from the edition of Irici:

AIT ERGO AD ILLV̄	ET IBAT JAM - - - -
IH̄S NISI SIG	IPSO DESCEN
NA ET PRODIG	DENTE SERVI
- - VIDERITIS	OCCVRER - -
NON - - - -	ILLI ET NVNT - -
TIS DICIT ILLI	VERVNT EI - -
REG - - - S DM̄E	CENTES QVO
L- - - - - - - - E	NIAM FILIVS
- - - - -	TVVS VIVIT
- - - - -	INTER - - GA
- - - - -	BAT H- - - -
AIT - - IH̄S - ADE	- - - - -
FILIVS TVVS	MELIVS HABVIT
VIVIT ET CRE	ET DIXERVNT
DIDIT HOMO	HERI HORA SEP
VERBO QVOD	TIMA - - LIQVID
DIXIT ILLI IH̄S	ILLVM FEBRIS.

2. *Cod. Veronensis*, a MS. of the 4th or 5th century, in the library at Verona, containing the Gospels, but with many *lacunæ*; printed by Bianchini.

3. *Cod. Brixionus*, of about the 6th century, at Brixen, in the Tyrol, containing the Gospels, with the exception of some parts of Mark; printed by Bianchini.

4. *Cod. Corbeiensis*, a very ancient MS., from which Martianay edited Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle of James, etc. (Par. 1695). The gospel appears also in Bianchini's work, and in the appendix to Calmet's commentary on the Apocalypse. There is another MS. of the old Latin text at Corbey, from which various readings have been collected on Matthew, Mark, and Luke by Bianchini, and on the four Gospels (partially) by Sabatier.

5. *Cod. Colbertinus*, of the 11th century, in the Parisian library; edited entire by Sabatier.

6. *Cod. Palatinus*, of the 5th century, in the library at Vienna, containing about the whole of Luke and John, and the greater part of Matthew and Mark; edited by Tischendorf (Leipz. 1847, 4to).

7. *Cod. Bobbiensis*, of the 5th century, now at Turin, formerly in the monastery of Bobbio, containing portions of Matthew and Mark; fragments of Acts xxiii, xxvii, 28; and of the Epistle of James, i, 1–5; iii, 13–18; iv, 1, 2; v, 19, 20; 1 Pet. i, 1–12; edited by Fleck, in *Anecdota Sacra* (Lips. 1837), and more fully by Tischendorf, in the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1847.

8. *Cod. Clarmontanus*, of the 4th or 5th century, now in the Vatican library, containing the four Gospels, Matthew in an ante-hieronymian version (wanting i, 1–iii, 15; xiv, 33–xviii, 12), the other three according to the Vulgate; collated by Sabatier, edited by Mai, *Scriptorr. Vett. Nova Collectio a Vatican. codd. edita*, iii, 257 sq.

9. Fragments of Mark and Luke, contained in a MS. of about the 5th century, belonging to the imperial library at Vienna, have been printed by Alter, in Paulus, *Repertor. für Bibl. und Morgenländ Litter.* iii, 115–170, and in Paulus, *Memorabilien*, vii, 58–96.

10. A MS. of the 7th century, now at Breslau, containing the synoptic Gospels, with *lacunæ* and part of John's Gospel; described by Dr. D. Schulz, *De Cod. 4 Evangg. Bibl. Rhedigerianæ* (Bresl. 1814).

11. A fragment of Luke (xvii–xxi) from a palimpsest of the 6th century, in Ceriani, *Monumenta Sac. et Prof. præsertim Bibl. Ambrosianæ* (Mil. 1861), I, i, 1–8.

12. Cardinal Mai has given, in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, ix, 61–86, various readings from a very ancient codex of the *Speculum Augustini*, and he has since edited the *Speculum* entire in his *PP. Nov. Bibl.*; comp. Tregelles, p. 239.

13, 14, 15. In the monastery of St. Gall are three codices, the first of the 4th or 5th century, containing fragments of Matthew; the second a Gallic MS. of the 7th century, containing Mark xvi, 14–20; the third an Irish MS. of the 7th or 8th century, containing John xi, 14–44.

16. *Cod. Monacensis*, of the 6th century, containing the four Gospels, with *lacunæ*; transcribed by Tischendorf.

17. A fragment containing Matt. xiii, 13–25, on purple vellum, of the 5th century, in the library at Dublin, printed in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, iii, 374, by Dr. Todd.

18. *Cod. Guelferbytanus*, of the 6th century, containing some fragments of Rom. xi, 15, published by Knittel (q. v.) in 1762, and more correctly by Tischendorf, *Anecdot. Sac. et Prof.* p. 153.

19. Fragments of the Pauline epistles discovered by Schmeller at Munich, and transcribed by Tischendorf, who has described them in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wissenschaft* for 1857, No. 8.

Besides these, there are several MSS. known to exist chiefly in the British libraries. Some of these are noticed in Bentley's *Critica Sacra*, edited by Ellis, 1862, and in Westwood's *Palæographia Sacra Pictoria*. See also Betham, *Antiquarian Researches*; Petrie, *On the Ecclesiastical Antiq. of Ireland*; O'Connor, *Rerum Hibern. Scriptores*.

These codices palæographists and critics profess to be able to allot to different recensions or revisions. Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 17 they pronounce to be African; 3, 6, 12, 16, Italian; and 14, 15, Irish; though Tischendorf expresses doubt as to the African character of No. 9, and the Italian of No. 6.

Of the O. T. only a few fragments have been discovered in special codices. These have been printed by Sabatier (*lib. cit.*), by Vercellone (*Variæ Lectiones Vulg. Lat. Bibliorum*, 2 vols., Rom. 1860-62), by Münter (*Miscell. Hafn.* 1821), by Mone (*Libri Palimpsesti*, Carlsruhe, 1855), by Ranke (*Fragmenta Hos. Am. Mich.* Vien. 1856, 1858), by Fritzsche (*Liber Judicum*, Turici, 1867), and anonymously (*Biblioth. Ashburnham.*, Lond. 1868). The MSS. of the Vulgate preserve the old Latin version of those books of the Apocrypha which were not retranslated by Jerome, and the Psalter. Our principal source of information, however, is in the citations made by the Latin fathers from the version in their hands.

From these various sources we possess, in the old Latin version of the O. T., the Psalter, Esther, and some of the apocryphal books entire, the rest only in fragments; whilst of the N. T. we possess nearly the whole.

3. The value of these remains in regard to the criti-

cism of the sacred text is very considerable. They afford important aid in determining the condition of the Greek text in the early centuries. This, which Bentley was the first to perceive, or at least to announce, has been fully recognised by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, though they have not all followed it out with equal discretion (see Tischendorf's strictures, *Proleg. in ed. Sept. et N. T.* p. ciii, ccxlii).

The general character of the Itala is close, literal adherence to the original, so as often to transgress the genius of the Latin language; its phraseology being marked by solecisms and improprieties which may be due to its having been originally produced either in a region remote from the centre of classical culture, or among the more illiterate of the community. Thus Σωτήρ is rendered by *salutaris*, διαφέρειν by *superponere* (e. g. "quanto ergo superponit homo ab ove," Matt. xii, 12), προελπίζειν by *præsperare*, κοσμοκράτορες by *munditenentes*, etc.; and we have such constructions as "stellam quam viderant in orientem" (Matt. ii, 9); "ut ego veniens adorem ei" (Matt. ii, 8); "qui autem audientes" (ii, 9); "pressuris quibus sustinetis" (2 Thess. i, 4); "habitavit in Capharnaum maritimam" (Matt. iv, 13); "terra Naphthalim viam maris" (iv, 15); "verbum audit et continuo cum gaudio accipit eum" (xiii, 20); "dominantur eorum, principantur eorum" (xx, 25), etc. It must be borne in mind, however, that the current text was exposed to innumerable corruptions, and that we can hardly, from the specimens that have come down to us, form any very accurate judgment of the state in which it was at first. One can hardly suppose that by any Latin-speaking people, the following version, which is that presented by the Colbertine MS. of Col. ii, 18, 19, could have been accepted as idiomatic, or even intelligible: "Nemo vos convincat volens in humilitate et religione angelorum, quæ vidit ambulans, sine causa inflatus sensu carnis suæ, et non tenens caput Christum, ex quo omne corpus connexum et conductione subministratum et provectum crescit in incrementum Dei." If this be (to borrow the remark of Eichhorn, from whose *Einleitung ins N. T.* iv, 354, we have taken these specimens) "verborum tenax," where is the "perspicuitas sententiæ" of which Augustine speaks?

II. *Hieronymian or Vulgate Version.* See VULGATE.

III. *Later Latin Versions.*—Both before and since the invention of printing attempts have been made to present, through the medium of Latin, a more correct version of the original text than that found in the ancient Latin versions. Of these we have space only for a bare catalogue. (See notices of the authors under their names in this work.)

1. Adam Eston, a monk of Norwich, and cardinal (died 1397), seems to have been the first who thought of a new version; he translated the O. T., with the exception of the Psalter, from the Hebrew; his work is lost (Hody, p. 440; Le Long—Masch ii, 3, p. 432).

2. Giannozzo Manetti, who died in 1459, began a translation of the Bible, of which he finished only the Psalms and the N. T.; this is lost (Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* vi, 2, p. 109 sq.).

3. Erasmus translated the N Test., and published the translation along with the Greek text (Basil. 1516, fol.).

4. Th. Beza issued his translation of the N. T. in 1556; it appeared along with the Vulgate version. Four other editions followed during the author's lifetime, and these present the Greek text as well as the Vulgate and Beza's own translation; many other editions have since followed. Beza aimed at presenting a just rendering of the original, without departing more than necessary from the Vulgate. His renderings are sometimes affected by his theological views.

5. Sanctes Pagninus, a learned Dominican from Lucca, produced a translation of the whole Bible (Lugdun. 1528, 4to, and Colon. 1541, fol.). Later editions of this work, with considerable alterations, appeared: one, edited by the famous Mich. Servetus, under the name of Villanovanus (Lugd. 1542); another, revised and edited by R. Stephen (Paris, 1557, 2 vols. folio; with a new title, 1577). This latter has been often reprinted. The version of Arias Montanus, printed in the Antwerp, Paris, and London polyglots, is a revision of this version.

6. Cardinal Cajetan employed two Hebrew scholars, a Jew and a Christian, to supply him with a literal version of the Old Test. This they accomplished, and the work appeared in parts (Lugd. 1639, 5 vols. folio). The N. T., translated on the same principle of strict literality, appeared earlier (Ven. 1530, 1531, 2 vols. folio).

7. Sebastian Münster added to his edition of the Hebrew Scriptures a Latin translation (Basle, 1534–35, and 1546, 2 vols. folio). This translation is faithful without being slavishly literal, and is executed in clear and correct Latin. Portions of it have been published separately.

8. The Zürich version, begun by Leo Judæ, and completed by Bibliander and others (1543, folio, and in 4to and 8vo in 1544). This version is much esteemed for its ease and fluency; it is correct, but somewhat paraphrastic. It has frequently been reprinted, there is one edition by R. Stephen (Paris, 1545).

9. Sebastian Castellio produced, in what he intended to be purely classical Latin, a translation of the O. and N. T. (Basil. 1551, again 1573, and at Leipzic, 1738).

10. The version of Junius and Tremellius appeared at Frankfort in parts between 1575 and 1579, and in a collected form in 1579, 2 vols. folio. Tremellius took the principal part in this work, his son-in-law Junius rather assisting him than sharing the work with him. Tremellius translated the N. Test. from the Syriac, and this, along with Beza's translation, appeared in an edition of Tremellius's Bible, published at London in 1585. The translation of Piscator is only an amended edition of that of Tremellius.

11. Thomas Malvenda, a Spanish Dominican, engaged in a "nova ex Hebræo translatio," which he did not live to finish. What he accomplished was published along with his commentaries (Lugdun. 1650, 5 vols. folio); but the extreme barbarism of his style has caused his labors to pass into oblivion.

12. Cocceius has given a new translation of most of the Biblical books in his commentaries, *Opera Omnia* (tom. i–vi, Amsterdam, 1701).

13. Sebastian Schmid executed a translation of the O. and N. Test., which appeared after his death (Argentor. 1696, 4to); it has been repeatedly reprinted, and is esteemed for its scholarly exactness, though in some cases its adherence to the original is over close.

14. The version of Jean le Clerc (Clericus) is found along with his commentaries; it appeared in portions from 1693 to 1731.

15. Charles Fr. Houbigant issued a translation of the O. T. and the Apocrypha along with his edition of the Hebrew text (Paris, 1753, 4 vols. folio).

16. A new translation of the O. T. was undertaken by J. A. Dathe; it appeared between 1773 and 1789. At one time much admired, this version has of late ceased perhaps to receive the attention to which it is entitled.

17–19. Versions of the Gospels by Ch. Wilh. Thalemann (Berl. 1781); of the Epistles by Godf. Sigismund Jaspis (Lipsiæ, 1793–97, 2 vols.); and of the whole N. T. by H. Godf. Reichard (Lips. 1799), belong to the school of Castellio.

20. H. A. Schott and F. Winzer commenced a translation of the Bible, of which only the first volume has appeared, containing the Pentateuch (Alton. et Lipsiæ, 1816). Schott has also issued a translation of the N. T., appended to his edition of the Greek text (Lips. 1805). This has passed into four editions, of which the last (1839) was superintended by Baumgarten-Crusius.

21. Rosenmüller (in his *Scholia in V. T.* Lips. 1788 sq.).

Translations of the N. T. have also been issued by F. A. Ad. Naebe (Lips. 1831) and Ad. Goeschen (Lips. 1832). See Carpzov, *Crit. Sacr.* p. 707 sq.; Fritzsche, art. Vulgata, in Herzog's *Encyk.*; *Bible of every Land*, p. 210, etc.

IV. *Literature.*—Simon, *Hist. Crit. des Versions du N.*

Test. (1690); Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Græcis et Latina Vulgata, Libri* iv (Oxford, 1705, folio); Martianay, *Hieronymi Opp.* (Paris, 1693); Bianchinus, *Vindiciæ Canonis SS. Vulg. Lat. ed.* (Rome, 1740); Riegler, *Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata* (Sulzb. 1820); L. van Ess, *Pragmatisch-Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata* (Tüb. 1824); Wiseman, *Two Letters* on 1 John v, 7, reprinted in his *Essays*, vol. i; Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Test.* (Jena, 1869); Rörsch, in the *Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theol.* 1867, 1869, 1870. See also the *Introductions* of Eichhorn, Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Hävernick, Bleek, etc.; Davidson, *Biblical Criticism;* Reuss, *Gesch. der Heil. Schr. N. T.* sec. 448–457; Darling, *Cyclopædia*, p. 80. See VERSIONS.

Latitudinarians, a name given to those divines who in the 17th century professed indifference to what they considered the small matters in dispute between Puritans and High-Churchmen, and, looking at theology from a philosophical point of view, laid more stress on classical philosophy than on Christian theology. They attempted to compromise the differences between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents. Their views were a result of the changes then going on in the religious world, and of the influence of philosophy. The doctrinal Puritans had already taken a position midway between the school of Laud and the fanatical Puritans. Abbot, Carlton, Hall, and others were the chief leaders of that party. They attached no importance to externals, and prized practical piety far above all matters of form; and, though themselves attached to the Protestant Episcopal Church, they allowed others to differ from them as to the best form of ecclesiastical government. In their theology they adhered to the milder Calvinism of the Thirty-nine Articles; but, being the most moderate, they were soon overwhelmed by the other parties. As liberal, but differing from them in doctrine, we find among the Eaton scholars Hales, who, although an opponent of Laud's High-Churchism, was in dogmatics an Arminian; and Chillingworth, who desired to reduce Christianity to a few essential practical principles. In the midst of the struggle, and the rapid changes of religious views and systems, the moral conception of Christianity was daily gaining ground; on the other hand, theology was unable to withstand the influence of philosophy. The regeneration which the latter had experienced at the hands of Bacon and Des Cartes obliged theology to review its foundations in the light of philosophy and science as well as of history (compare Professor Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, in the *Encyclop. Metropol.* ii, 656; Stewart, *Essay on Metaphysical Philosophy*, p. 58, 61, notes, and 246, note O). Thus Platonic philosophy and theology were introduced into Cambridge by Cudworth (q. v.) and Henry More (q. v.). Men of these views (among others, also, John Smith, Worthington, bishop Wilkins, and Theophilus Gale), and especially the more moderate among them, were looked down upon with contempt by the more ambitious ones in power, and, as they would not follow the selfish tendencies of the times, were called *Latitude-men.* In the days of the Commonwealth they were reproached with Arminianism and prelatism. But when the High-Church party came again into power with the Restoration, and its old adversaries tried to atone for their former attacks by all means in their power, the moderate party was accused of want of loyalty and of opposition to the Church. Whoever refused to submit to the High-Church, or did not take sides with the strict Puritans against it, were called *Latitudinarian.* "That name," said a contemporary, "is the man of straw who, in order to have something to fight against, has been set up for want of a real adversary—a very convenient name wherewith to defame any one who we may wish to injure." As the name came thus to be applied to a number of persons who had no connection whatever with the party which it designated at first, and even to such as were totally indifferent in matters of religion, the appellation soon came to be regarded as equivalent to Socinian, Deist, and Atheist. As regards the original Latitudinarians, they retained the liturgy, rites, and organization of the English Episcopal Church. They considered a general liturgy as a necessary guard against the often fanatical prayers of the Puritans, and they considered the English liturgy as the best, on account of its solemn earnestness and its character of primitive simplicity. The form of public worship they looked upon as a happy medium between that of the Romish Church and that of the conventicles. Ceremonies they deemed useful for the purpose of edification, and episcopacy they cherished as the most correct and evangelical form of Church government, differing both from what they regarded as the tyrannical authority of Scotch Presbyterianism and from the anarchy of the Independents. In point of doctrine they also retained the confession of the English Church, which they considered as according thoroughly with the Scriptures. The commentaries of the primitive Church were the guides by which they wished reason to be governed, and reason they recognised as the source of our knowledge of revealed and natural religion, which agree on all points. The fundamental principles of true religion are freedom of the will, the universality of the redemption by the death of Christ, the sufficiency of divine grace; and these find entrance into the human heart sometimes by the testimony of Scripture, sometimes by the unvarying testimony of the primitive Church, and again by reason only. In theology, the oldest views are always found to be the most reasonable. Nothing that is false in philosophy is true in theology; but what God has united, let no man put asunder. Natural sciences have made immense progress, and philosophy and theology cannot remain behind. True science cannot be put down any more than the light of the sun or the motion of the ocean. It is the best weapon against atheism and superstition (comp. Smith [John], *Discourses* [ed. 1821], ii, p. 19). Thus the Latitudinarians took at once for their basis science and toleration. They taught respect for the Church by their submission to it, defended it by their learning and activity, and hoped to win over the Dissenters by their moderation, and the Presbyterians by their accommodating spirit, thus preventing them from anarchy. This is the character given to the Latitudinarians by one of their contemporaries in a work entitled *A brief account of the New Sect of Latitudinarians* (1662). It is remarkable how many ideas of the school of Laud this party still retained, in spite of its philosophical views. Its broad platform admitted men of the most different tendencies. While Cudworth, Whichcote, Worthington, and Wilkins inclined to philosophical views, Burnet, Tillotson, Whiston, and Spencer adhered more to the Church doctrines. Bury, in *The Naked Gospel* (1690), declared all Christian doctrines, except those of repentance and faith, non-essential. For this he was attacked by Jurieu in his *La Religion du Latitudinaire*, and vainly attempted to defend the orthodoxy of his views in his *Latitudinarius orthodoxus* (1697). The attempts made by the Latitudinarians in 1689-1699 to reconcile the Episcopalians and Presbyterians failed utterly. Latitudinarianism was subsequently identified still more with indifferentism, and seldom appeared in theological works. It is only in quite modern times, and especially under the influence of human theology, that this tendency has been brought to light again in the *Broad-Church* party, which forms a sort of medium between the High and Low Church. By their opponents the Broad-Churchmen are, however, designated as Latitudinarians or Indifferents. They consider the differences among Christians as unimportant when compared with their essential unity. The watchword of the party is love and toleration. For doctrines, they hold to those of incarnation and atonement, conversion by grace and justification. They coincide with the Low-Church in considering Scripture as the only rule of faith, but taking exceptions here and there to miracles, and with the High-Church in believing that man shall be

judged according to his works. In opposition to the doctrine of the invisible Church of the evangelical Church, they lay great stress on the doctrine of a visible Church. They take what is good anywhere, as well in the Romish as in the evangelical churches. They aim at nothing less than the accomplishment of a religious and moral reformation, and seek to occupy in our day the place held at the beginning of this century by the evangelical party. This end they strive to attain partly by their science and partly by their practice, and thus distinguish among themselves between the theorists and anti-theorists. They derive great power from the high scientific attainments of many of their members, and try to advance the education of the masses. The founders of this school were S. T. Coleridge and Thomas Arnold, and its most eminent followers Hare, Whately, Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, Alford, Conybeare, and Howson. About one seventh of the English clergy and a number of bishops belong to it. See Conybeare, *Church Parties;* Schaff, *Zust. u. Partheien d. engl. Staats-Kirche* in *Deutsch. Zeitschrift.* 1856, No. 17; Edward Churton, *The Latitudinarians* from 1671–1787 (Lond. 1861, 8vo); *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 1861, April, art. vi; *Westminster Rev.* 1854, January; *Bib. Sacra*, 1863, p. 865; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought;* Gass, *Dogmengeschich.* iii (see Index); Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (since the Restoration), ii, 262 sq., 341 sq., 359 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 215; Blunt, *Dict. Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* p. 395 sq., and his *Key to the Knowledge of Ch. Hist.* (Mod.) p. 97 sq. On the present Broad Church of England, see Miss Cobbe, *Broken Lights* (London ed. p. 63), and Hurst's *History of Rationalism*, Eng. edition (greatly enlarged), p. 423–438.

Latomius, Jacobus (*Jaques Masson*), a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Cambron, in Hainault, about the middle of the 15th century, and was educated at the University of Paris. In 1500 he became a resident of Louvain, where he was made a professor of theology. He died in 1544. A zealous disciple of scholasticism, he ardently opposed the Reformation both by his pen and his tongue, and was engaged in an able controversy with Luther, who addressed to him *Rationis Latomianæ confutatio* while a resident of the Wartburg (comp. Köstlin, *Luther's Theologie*, ii, 55, 366). The Roman Catholics, of course, greatly loved Latomius, and he is spoken of as "vir multæ eruditionis, pietatis, modestiæ, trium linguarum peritissimus, hæreticæ pravitatis inquisitor." A collection of his works was made by his nephew, Jacobus Latomius, his successor at Louvain (died in 1596), and was published at Louvain in 1550, in folio, containing, 1. *Articulorum doctrinæ Lutheri per theologos Lovanienses damnatorum ratio* (1519 and 1521):—2. *Responsio ad libellum a Luthero emissum pro iisdem articulis* (1521):—3. *De primatu Pontificis adversus Martinum Lutherum* (1526, also reprinted in Roccaberti *Biblioth. max. pontificia*, Rom. 1689, tom. xiii):—4. *De variis quæstionum generibus quibus certat ecclesia intus et foris:*—5. *De ecclesia et humanæ legis obligatione:*—6. *De confessione secreta* (1525):—7. *Ad hellebòrum J. Œcolampadii responsio:*—8. *Libellus de fide et operibus, de votis atque institutis monasticis:*—9. *De trium linguarum et studii theologici ratione dialogi ii* (1519, 4to):—10. *Apologia pro dialogis:*—11. *Adversus librum Erasmi de sarcienda ecclesiæ concordia:*—12. *Confutationum adversus Guil. Tindalum libri iii:*—13. *De Matrimonio:*—14. *De quibusdam articulis in ecclesia controversis:*—15. *Disputatio quodlibetica tribus quæstionibus absoluta:* (1.) *In libellum de ecclesia, Phil. Melancthoni inscriptum;* (2.) *Contra orationem factiosorum in Comitiis Ratisbonensibus habitam* (1544, 8vo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 777.

Latrīa (λατρεία), the name given in the Roman Catholic Church to the adoration due to God alone on account of his supremacy, as distinguished from *hyperdulia* (q. v.), worship paid to the Virgin, and *dulia* (q. v.), the worship paid to saints.

Latroncinium. See Ephesus, Robber Council of.

Latta, James, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1732; emigrated to America at an early age, and graduated at the College of Philadelphia in 1757. He became college tutor at his alma mater, and pursued the study of divinity. He was licensed in 1758, and ordained as an evangelist in 1759. Two years after he accepted a call from the congregation of Deep Run, in Bucks Co., Pa., which he resigned in 1770 for the charge of Chestnut Level, in Lancaster County, Pa. Here he established a school of long-continued celebrity. During the war he accompanied the American army on their campaign as a soldier, and served as chaplain for a time. He vindicated the introduction of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, and labored faithfully in his ministry till near the close of life. He died Jan. 29, 1801. Latta published a pamphlet showing that the principal subjects of psalmody should be taken from the Gospel, 8vo.—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 199; Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1865.

Latta, Samuel A., a minister of the M. E. Church South, born April 8, 1804, in Muskingum Co., Ohio, early evinced an aptitude for the Christian ministry, and, having practiced medicine from 1824 to 1829, entered the ministry by joining the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to the difficult mission at St. Clair, Michigan. In 1830 he was stationed at Cincinnati, and in 1831 was travelling agent for the American Colonization Society. In 1832 and 1833 he occupied the Union Circuit; in 1834, Lebanon station; in 1835 and 1836, Hamilton and Rossville stations. In 1837 he was agent for Augusta College, Ohio, in behalf of which institution he was very successful. In 1838 and 1839 he preached at Dayton, Ohio. From 1840 till his death, June 28, 1852, he maintained a superannuated relation. Dr. Latta was both an excellent preacher and a good physician, but he earned his highest distinction as a writer. For some years he was editor of the *Methodist Recorder*. He had a mind of uncommon strength, quite versatile, and he had improved it by extensive research and study. "He would sometimes reason with great power, and his descriptions of men and things were often exceedingly striking and beautiful." The work which gained him his greatest fame was *The Chain of Sacred Wonders*, published in 1851 and 1852, 2 vols. 8vo.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 755.

Latter-Day Saints. See Mormons.

Lattice stands in the Auth. Vers. for the following Hebrew words in certain passages: 1. אֶשְׁנָה (*eshnah'*, so called from *darkening* a room), a latticed opening through which the cool breeze passes, and which at the same time screens the inmates, especially females, from exterior sight (Judg. v, 28; "casement," Prov. vii, 6). See Window. 2. חַרַכִּים (*charakkim'*, prop. *nets;* Sept. δίκτυα), the net-work or lattices of a window (Cant. ii, 9). 3. שְׂבָכָה (*sebakah'*, an *interweaving*), the latticed balustrade before a window or balcony (2 Kings i, 2; elsewhere a *net* or "snare," Job xviii, 8; "net-work," etc., around the capitals of columns).



Lattice Window in Cairo.

"The lattice window is much used in warm Eastern countries. It frequently projects from the wall of the building, and is formed of reticulated work, often highly ornamental, portions of which are hinged, so that they may be opened or shut at pleasure. The object of the contrivance is to keep the apartments cool

by intercepting the direct rays of the sun, while, at the same time, the air is permitted to circulate freely through the trellis openings. Through the lattice the mother of Sisera and the mystical bridegroom are represented as looking. Through this Ahaziah fell and injured himself; for there is no reason to adopt an old idea that he fell through a grating in the floor. The words in these three texts, however, are different each time in the original, though it is now impossible to determine whether they were entirely interchangeable, or whether there were certain differences of construction indicated by each of them." See HOUSE.

Lattice-work in Cairo.

Latzembock, HENRY DE, a native of Bohemia, lived in the latter part of the 14th and first part of the 15th centuries. He was a friend of the reformer John Huss, whom, in connection with two other friends, he was appointed to conduct in safety to the Council of Constance. He stood very high in the favor of the emperor Sigismund, and appealed to him in behalf of the reformer. After the condemnation and burning of Huss he was himself suspected of heresy, was summoned before the council, and required to abjure the doctrines of his friend and approve of his condemnation. With this requisition he complied, being more intent on his own safety and advancement at court than anxious for reform. After this period little information concerning him is attainable.—Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, i, 352–354, 386; ii, 28, 260.

Laud, William, the celebrated archbishop under James I and Charles I, was born at Reading, the principal town of Berkshire, October 7, 1573, of humble but respectable parentage. In 1589 he entered St. John's College, Oxford, graduated with distinction in 1594, and proceeded A.M. in 1598, when he was appointed reader in grammar. In January, 1600, he was ordained deacon, and priest in 1601. The Calvinistic and Puritan tendency was strong in Oxford at that time; but Laud's immediate instructors and friends had been on the other side; his natural instincts inclined him to High-Church views and high ritualistic observances; he saw, too, that the court was on that side, and that a powerful reaction against the Calvinistic ascendency was already in progress. Abbot (afterwards primate) and Prideaux had succeeded Drs. Holland and Reynolds as theological professors in the university; but Laud, being appointed in 1602 to read the Maye divinity lecture in St. John's College, did not hesitate to attack Abbot's doctrine in regard to the visibility of the Church. The latter had traced the visible Church down, in the Middle Ages, through the Berengarians, the Albigenses or Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, to Luther and the Reformation; Laud traced it boldly and exclusively through the Church of Rome. They did not see that *exclusiveness* was the error of both parties. In 1603 James succeeded to the throne of England, and, greatly to the disappointment and disgust of the Puritans, but to the unbounded satisfaction of Laud and his friends, he openly took sides with the highest hierarchical party in the English Church, early adopting as his pet motto, "No bishop, no king." Then followed the "Millenary petition" and the famous conference at Hampton Court, which resulted in the king's proclamation of "uniformity in discipline and worship." This year Laud was chosen proctor for the University of Oxford, and in the same year he was appointed chaplain to the earl of Devonshire. In 1604 he took his degree of B.D., and in the thesis which he presented on the occasion he maintained the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, and of diocesan bishops to the existence of a true Church. In the following year Laud committed one of the most unfortunate, though oft-repented faults of his life, in solemnizing the marriage of his patron, the earl of Devonshire, with lady Rich, who, as he and all the world knew, had been divorced from her former husband, lord Rich, on account of adultery already committed with the same earl of Devonshire himself, of whom Laud was meanwhile the chaplain. The consequence of this affair was that the earl was utterly disgraced at court, and soon after died, while Laud, sharing in the public odium, was severely censured by the highest dignitaries both in Church and state.

In 1606 Laud preached a sermon before the university for which he was vehemently attacked by the vice-chancellor as a papist; and though he contrived to escape formal censure from the authorities, he acknowledged afterwards to Heylin that such was the repute in which he was generally held at the university that "it was reckoned a heresy to speak to him, and a suspicion of heresy to salute him as he walked the street." Still, Laud was not without powerful friends, who sympathized with him and his opinions, and especially active among them was Dr. Neile, then bishop of Rochester. In 1607 he was preferred to the vicarage of Stamford, received the advowson of North Kilworth, and took his degree of D.D. In 1608 he was appointed chaplain of bishop Neile, exchanged North Kilworth for West Tilbury, and preached his first sermon before king James at Theobald's. The next year he was presented to the living of Cuckstone, whereupon he resigned his fellowship in St. John's and resided on his benefice. The climate of Cuckstone not agreeing with his health, he soon exchanged this benefice for that of Norton. In the mean time Neile, having been translated to the see of Lichfield, recommended Laud so powerfully to the king that he obtained for him a prebend's stall in the Cathedral of Westminster, the deanery of which Neile, as bishop of Rochester, had held *in commendam*. In 1611, after a violently contested canvass, Laud was elected president of St. John's College, owing his success chiefly to the strenuous efforts of bishop Neile and of Dr. Buckeridge. At the same time he became one of king James's chaplains, while, to his great chagrin, Abbot, upon the death of archbishop Bancroft, was raised to the primacy. Abbot is charged by Laud's friends as having been the inveterate enemy of the latter, and the great retarder of his ecclesiastical promotion. Of the "enmity," it may be said once for all that there seems to be no evidence beyond the constant repetition of the charge. The simple truth of the case seems to be that Laud became the "inveterate enemy" of Abbot because the latter, when he had the power, refused to promote him, and conscientiously discouraged the advancement of a man in whom he had no confidence. Bishop Neile now bestowed upon Laud the prebendary of Bugden, and in 1615 the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. In 1616 James himself bestowed upon him the deanery of Gloucester, and he thus obtained the prospect of reaching the higher prizes he had in view. A second time he got into hot water by a sermon preached before the university. For this he was taken to task by Dr. Robert Abbot, then vice-chancellor, and brother of the archbishop. Abbot now, like bishop Hall before, charged him with trying to keep on both sides at once. In his deanery of Gloucester he proceeded to "reform and set in order" according to his own ecclesiastical notions, ordering the communion-table to the east end of the choir, to stand as the "altar" formerly stood, and enjoining a becoming reverence, i. e., due bowings and genuflexions, upon the clergy and officers on entering the church or chancel, and proceeding withal in a most high-handed manner. Returning to court, Laud procured directions for the "better government" of the university, which contained the first official disapprobation of the tenets of the Calvinists, and which, being evidently levelled against the Puritans, are conceded by one of Laud's most ardent eulogists (Lawson) to have been "not altogether justifiable," inasmuch as they deprived the university of its independence, and subjected it completely to the control of the king. "But," he adds, with char-

acteristic fallacy and one-sidedness, "the state of the times rendered such instructions necessary; and the consternation of the Puritan faction, when they were made known at Oxford, is a proof of the wisdom of the monarch and his advisers in thus placing a timely restraint on the progress of sectarian partisanship and enthusiasm." James had already (1610–12) re-established episcopacy in Scotland, and with a special view to effect a more perfect uniformity in the two churches, he set out in 1617 to visit his northern kingdom for the first time since his accession to the English throne, and ordered Laud to accompany him. The king's favorite object was to substitute in the Scottish Church the Episcopal liturgy instead of the Presbyterian form of worship; and, though the Presbyterians prayed that they might be preserved from the same, Laud and some of the royal chaplains encouraged James to persist in regarding the mass of the nation as a set of "factious enthusiasts," and to obstinately adhere to his purpose of imposing upon these people his own form of religion in the name of "the Church." James and Laud, with a little knot of archbishops and bishops who had been consecrated to their office, not in Scotland, but at Westminster, were "the Church," and the Scottish nation was "the faction"—a mistake big with sad and fearful consequences. James now propounded the famous *Five Articles*, which he subjected first to the assembly called together at St. Andrew's, and later to the assembly at Perth, where, through the indefatigable exertions of the bishops, and the shrewd and cunning management of the king, the Five Articles were confirmed. These articles were rigidly enforced, but without the desired effect. The Scottish "rabble" were too "factious" to submit to a religion manufactured for them and forcibly imposed upon them by others. It was left for James's successor to continue his father's design, but with still worse success; and it was reserved for Laud to take a more dominant part in the business, and from a higher position, at a subsequent period. On his return through Lincolnshire he was inducted into the rectory of Ibstock, which he had taken in exchange for Norton; and, arriving at Oxford, he learned with pleasure that his exertions had effectually restrained the "Puritan enthusiasm" at Gloucester.

In 1620 Laud was at length raised to the episcopate, being made bishop of St. David's, in spite of the strenuous opposition of archbishop Abbot, as his friends assert, and through the earnest solicitations of the duke of Buckingham and of the lord-keeper Williams, then bishop of Lincoln, as is commonly alleged. Before his consecration as bishop, Laud, much to his credit, resigned the presidency of St. John's College, because, though such things were often winked at, he could not hold it without a violation of the statute. In his primary visitation of his diocese, he set things "in order" according to his peculiar views of what constituted the essentials of "the Church's" religion. He also built a chapel for himself, which he proceeded to fit up to his own taste as a model, and consecrated it with sundry extraordinary ceremonies.

In 1622 Laud's dispute with the Jesuit Fisher took place, which was, perhaps, the most creditable performance of his life, evincing extensive learning and no mean ability. Yet, dealing with the controversy from the high Anglican point of view, it fails to cover the whole Protestant position, and is now almost forgotten, being a document of much less breadth and historical interest than some still older defences of the English Church, as, for example, Jewell's *Apology*.

About this time Laud became chaplain to the duke of Buckingham, and between them there grew up an intimate and lasting friendship. While Buckingham was absent with prince Charles in Spain, Laud was in correspondence with him, and seems to have been charged with the care of his interests at court during his absence; for, observing or suspecting some movements of the lord-keeper Williams towards undermining the duke in the royal favor, he immediately informed his patron in Spain of the apprehended danger, who accordingly hastened home to protect himself. Hence arose a determined hostility of the duke towards Williams, and Williams accused Laud of ingratitude, while Laud, on the other hand, charged him with duplicity and selfishness. Evidently the duke's patronage was judged of more value than the bishop's, and the breach ripened into a rooted enmity between the two churchmen. Laud chose to consider himself insulted by Abbot and Williams because his name was not inserted in the High Commission. He complained to Buckingham, who forthwith procured his nomination. In 1624 James died, and Laud lamented him with demonstrations of the utmost sorrow. On the first day of March, the year after the death of James, Laud received his appointment to preach before Charles at Westminster at the opening of the first Parliament; and the king, upon the advice of bishops Laud and Andrews, prohibited, in the Convocation which met at the same time with Parliament, the discussion of the five predestinarian articles of the Synod of Dort, "on account of the number of Calvinists admitted under Abbot's auspices into the Lower House." On the Sunday after the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria, Laud again preached before the king and the House of Lords. The king had summoned this Parliament to procure supplies for the prosecution of his wars; but they chose to look after the righting of their own grievances before attending to the king's wants, and proceeded to cite and condemn a certain Mr. Montague for preaching what they judged heretical and unconstitutional doctrine. Laud immediately flew to Montague's protection, and, at his remonstrance, the king revoked the proceedings of Parliament, and prorogued them to Oxford. Parliament was no more pliant at Oxford than it had been at Westminster, and in a pet Charles suddenly dissolved it.

Meanwhile Laud was continually rising in the king's esteem and confidence, while Williams was removed from his office of lord-keeper and banished the court. Laud was indefatigable in his labors in preaching and purging the Church, refusing to ordain any whom he found to be unqualified for the sacred office, according to his view of the proper qualifications. He was appointed by the king to supply the place of the now disgraced Williams, the dean of Westminster, at the ceremony of the coronation. He here had official charge of the regalia, and is accused of having placed a crucifix upon the "altar," and tampered with the coronation oath; but of this accusation not much was ever made. By the king's appointment Laud again preached the sermon at the opening of Parliament, which assembled immediately after the coronation. This Parliament likewise proceeded at once to appoint a committee on religion. They also impeached the duke of Buckingham, and refused to do any other business until his case was disposed of. The king, finding them resolved on the ruin of his minister—and it is to be observed it was the House of Lords and not the House of Commons before which he was to be tried—to save his favorite, was compelled to dissolve his second Parliament. Unquestionably Laud was deeply and anxiously interested in the cause of his patron, and he is charged, on some show of evidence, with having written the speech of Buckingham in his own defence, and the speech of the king in Buckingham's behalf.

In 1626 Laud was translated to the see of Bath and Wells — a richer bishopric than that of St. David's. Both of Charles's Parliaments had refused to vote the subsidies to supply his pecuniary wants, and he resolved to collect the money without parliamentary authority. With this view he resorted to the expedient of "tuning the pulpits," and Laud was his instrument for this purpose. He was instructed to prepare letters to be issued to the two archbishops and their suffragans, through them to the inferior clergy, and by them to the people, persuading them to pay cheerfully the taxations necessarily imposed on them. "The in-

structions," as Laud informs us, "were partly political and partly ecclesiastical," and were to be published in every parish in the kingdom. Laud engaged in the duty with his wonted alacrity, and almost immediately upon receiving the royal commands he had the instructions prepared. His apologists admit that it is a difficult matter to justify these instructions, "because they afford a dangerous precedent, which, were it followed, would be attended with the worst consequences;" it was no less than undertaking to tax the people without the consent of their representatives. By Laud's prompt and efficient management of this affair he was still further advanced in the king's good opinion, and was rewarded with the appointment of dean of the chapel royal, and the promise of the primacy in the event of Abbot's decease. In enforcing Laud's "instructions," doctors Sibthorpe and Manwaring preached sermons in which they maintained the extreme doctrines of passive obedience, and which, after Laud's revision, were published. Abbot, too, had refused to license Sibthorpe's sermon, for which factious procedure a commission of sequestration was issued against him, and the administration of his metropolitan functions was put into the hands of Laud, in conjunction with four other bishops. In the same year Laud was made a privy counsellor, and, by the redistribution of sundry bishops and bishoprics, arrangements were initiated to make a vacancy in the see of London, that Laud might at once be translated to that rich and powerful bishopric. Meanwhile Charles had been compelled by his necessities to call a third Parliament, although it was well understood that Laud as well as Buckingham would be thereby endangered. But, to propitiate the popular feeling, several commissions were made, and, among other things, Abbot was restored to his functions, and received at court. Again Laud preached the opening sermon, and the king concluded his speech by exhorting Parliament to follow the good advice which Laud had given them. But the Commons determined to proceed to business in their own way. They first drew up and passed the famous Petition of Right. They then presented a remonstrance of grievances against the duke of Buckingham, not omitting to mention Laud in their indictment. They cited Dr. Manwaring to their bar, ordered him to be severely punished, and his sermons to be burnt. The king prorogued Parliament, ignored the complaints against Buckingham and Laud, remitted Manwaring's fine, and, successively giving him various livings, at length promoted him to the deanery of Worcester, and then to the bishopric of St. David's, made Sibthorpe prebendary of Peterborough, and translated Laud to the see of London, July 15, 1629. On the death of Buckingham, which took place before the next meeting of Parliament, the king was pleased to assure Laud that he intended to intrust him with his confidence in Buckingham's room. At the examination of Felton, the assassin of Buckingham, before the privy council, the man admitted the deed, but denied the privity of any other parties. Laud, in his eagerness to improve this presumed opportunity for reaching and crushing his enemies, threatened him with the rack if he would not disclose his accomplices. But, upon the judges being asked whether Felton could be lawfully put to the rack, they returned for answer that by the laws of England he could not. It was in this interval, too, that Laud, "in order to put a stop to the disturbances which arose from the preaching of the abstruse and mystical doctrines of predestination," as his friends aver, "procured a royal declaration to be prefixed to the Articles," prohibiting such preaching. Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards earl of Strafford, was gained over from the popular party to the king's side by largesses of royal favor, and he and Laud immediately commenced a friendship which ever after remained inviolate.

When at length Parliament again assembled, the Commons opened with a remonstrance upon the alleged infractions of the Petition of Right, and then turned their attention to their religious grievances. Excited to great exasperation by the king's declaration which Laud had procured, they passed a solemn vote against it, claiming, protesting, and vowing that the current and general exposition of the articles, "which had been established by act of Parliament," had ever been the same as their own. In the debate, Sir John Eliot denounced some of the bishops as neither "orthodox nor sound in religion. Witness," said he, "the two bishops, Laud and Neile, who were complained of at the last meeting of Parliament. I apprehend much fear that, should we be in their power, we may be in danger to have our religion overthrown. Some of them are masters of ceremonies, and they labor to introduce new ceremonies into the Church." The House resumed the cases of Montague, Manwaring, and Sibthorpe, to all of whom the king had granted pardons and preferments. Laud and Neile were the grand objects of attack, being accused of having procured these pardons. "In Laud and Neile," declared Sir John Eliot, "is centred all the danger we fear," and he proposed to petition the king to leave those bishops to "the justice of the House." Oliver Cromwell, too, distinguished himself in this discussion; the preferment of Manwaring especially "excited his wrath." "If these be the steps to Church preferment," cried the future Protector, "what may *we* expect?" At length the king, exasperated, endeavored to adjourn the House by royal command. This led to a scene of great excitement and confusion, and finally the third Parliament of Charles's reign was abruptly dissolved. Parliaments were now to be abolished, and Laud was prime minister. He must be held to all the responsibility attaching to such a position at such a time. He presided especially over the affairs of England, the duke of Hamilton over those of Scotland, and Wentworth over those of Ireland. In his ecclesiastical administration, Laud's friends commonly claim for him the character of toleration and liberality, in the face of the fact that, having advised with Harsnet, archbishop of York, he drew up certain articles which, under the royal authority, were immediately dispatched to archbishop Abbot, requiring him and his suffragans (in brief) to suppress the preaching of the Puritans, to note all absentees from the prescribed public prayers, and to render an account in the premises on the 2d of January every year.

Early in 1630 Laud was chosen chancellor of the University of Oxford. In the same year he also enjoyed the honor of officiating at the baptism of the infant prince, afterwards Charles II, although this distinction belonged by usage to the archbishop of Canterbury. Laud was now in the full tide of prosperity, and nothing could stand in his way. Did the Puritans undertake to buy up the impropriations of Church livings, that they might have the disposal of them for their lecturers, Laud had them punished for their impertinence, and their purchases confiscated to the king. Did they presume to preach or publish their peculiar tenets at Oxford or in Ireland, Laud had them expelled or silenced. Were any bishoprics or deaneries vacant, Laud saw that they were filled with the right sort of churchmen. He enlarged St. John's College with a new quadrangle. He repaired St. Paul's Cathedral. He took cognizance of the chapels and chaplains of English congregations abroad, and of the congregations or churches of foreigners in England, and reduced them all to conformity, or placed the members of the latter under the strictest surveillance, taking away the children, and burdening the parents with all the disadvantages of alienage. He urged the Scottish bishops, if they made any change in their liturgy, to adopt that of the Church of England without any variation; and the new liturgy which was drawn up by those bishops was submitted to his final revision. On the king's visit to Scotland, Laud attended him, was made a member of the Scotch Privy Council, and preached before the king, in the chapel royal in Holyrood House, on "the utility of conformity."

At length, on the 4th of August, 1633, archbishop Abbot died; on the 6th Laud was promoted by the king to the primacy, and on the 19th of September was formally translated to this, the long-desired goal of his ambition. At the same time he was offered a cardinal's hat by certain emissaries of the pope, which, without betraying either astonishment, or indignation, or disturbance of any kind, he respectfully declined "till Rome should be otherwise than it then was;" and before his enthronement he was elected chancellor of the University of Dublin.

In his metropolitan chair his first act was to issue more stringent rules for candidates for ordination, so as more effectually to shut out Puritan preachers and lecturers. The next was to revive and extend the king's declaration concerning lawful sports on Sundays. The archbishop now proceeded upon his metropolitan visitations, and he made thorough work of it; for all Puritanism he was a perfect "root and branch" man. But one great business and burden with him was to see that the communion-tables were placed altar-wise, railed in, and approached always with the prescribed bows and obeisances, it being assumed that thus, and thus only, could true devotion and godly reverence be preserved in the Church. His old patron, bishop Williams, he suspended for contumacy. He busied himself earnestly in improving the revenues of the poor clergy of London and the poorer clergy of Ireland. He procured a new charter and statutes for the University of Dublin, and the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles, instead of those of Lambeth, by the Irish Church. Indeed, through his intimacy with Wentworth, the lord deputy, and his chancellorship of the Dublin University, he seems, as prime minister and archbishop of Canterbury, to have had much more control of the affairs of the Irish Church than her own primate, Usher, or any or all of her bishops and archbishops. Civil appointments, also, were accumulated upon Laud. He was not only prime minister, privy counsellor in England and in Scotland, member of the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, but he was also appointed a member of the committee of trade, and a commissioner of the Treasury, and placed on the foreign committee. He procured the new Caroline Charter for Oxford, and continued his munificent gifts. He took especial care of the restoration of the cathedrals and of the Cathedral service, with all the old accustomed appointments and ceremonies.

Laud, like Wolsey when in favor with Henry VIII, had reached the highest pinnacle of his greatness. All honor, power, and splendor seemed to converge towards him. All around was buoyant with success and glowing with promise. It was Laud here, it was Laud there, it was Laud everywhere. He had three kingdoms well in hand. Church and State lay submissive at his feet. But the scene was soon to change. He was disporting himself upon the bosom of a volcano, whose vent-holes he was hoping to keep stopped up with his puny engineering. The quakings and rumblings of the approaching eruption were already increasing. In the year 1637, "some factious and refractory men had determined to establish their enthusiasm on the shores of America, amid the forests of New England." These disorderly emigrations without a royal license it was thought expedient to restrain, "because of the many idle and obstinate humors whose only or principal end was to live without the reach of authority." Eight ships in the Thames were stopped by an order of Council, and no clergyman was allowed to leave the country without the approbation of the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London. Among those intended emigrants Oliver Cromwell is said to have been thus stopped. The symptoms of dissatisfaction and uneasiness were drawing towards a crisis, and some prosecutions of this same year accelerated the national calamities. The first case was the trial of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in the Star Chamber. Prynne was a graduate of Oxford, and a barrister of Lincoln's Inn; Bastwick left Cambridge before taking his degree, and, having travelled nine years on the Continent, took the degree of M.D. at Padua; Burton was A.M. and B.D. at Oxford, and had been clerk of the closet to the Prince of Wales, and rector of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, London. Prynne, for his *Histrio-Mastyx*, had already been condemned to pay a fine of £5000, to be expelled from Oxford and from Lincoln's Inn, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and at Cheapside, and at each place to have an ear cut off, to have his book burnt before his face, and to remain a prisoner for life. In the execution of the sentence it is said that Prynne had nearly been suffocated with the smoke of his book. From prison, however, the irrepressible Prynne, as soon as he could procure writing materials, continued audaciously, and with amazing industry, to send forth his pamphlets against his persecutors; and now the doctor Bastwick and the rector Burton had joined the lawyer in the fray. These pamphlets were no doubt intemperate and extravagant, coarse and violent in their language; they were naturally branded as scurrilous and seditious by the other side. But it is to be remembered their authors were persecuted fanatics; and it is a better excuse for them to say that the controversial language of the age was coarse, than it is for their enemies to say that the punishments of the age were barbarous. The use of epithets is largely a matter of taste and fashion; but humanity itself, wherever it exists, is shocked at the sight of torture, and cruelty, and blood. All three of the accused were condemned; Prynne to pay a fine of £5000, to lose the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the initials of slanderous libeler, and to be immured for life in Caernarvon Castle. Bastwick and Burton were to pay the same fine, were to lose their ears in the pillory, and to be imprisoned for life in separate castles. On this occasion, Laud, who was a member of the court, made a long speech. As he had everything under his own control, he had no temptation to use violent language. He assumed an air of studied coolness and dignity. Having descanted upon the merits of his own immaculate administration in Church and State, and set forth in strong colors the dangerous and abominable character of factious and seditious libeling, he added, "But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, *I shall forbear to censure them*, and leave them to God's mercy and the king's justice." That is to say, having fully given his views, he would not cast his formal vote in the case, but, knowing full well what the decision, yea, the "unanimous" decision of the judges would be, he concludes his speech thus: "I give all your lordships hearty thanks for your noble patience, and your just and honorable sentence upon these men, and your unanimous dislike of them and defence of the Church." Who can doubt that Prynne was right in afterwards declaring that Laud was "the cause and contriver of the sentence before it was given, and that he approved and thanked the lords for it when it was given?" The three victims underwent their "punishment" (as Laud's friends delight to call it) with the most astonishing heroism. Such "punishment" of such men, however ignominious or degrading it was meant to be, could never elevate the dignity or strengthen the position of the party that inflicted it. The sufferers were no doubt supported by the sympathies of an immense mass of the people, as well as by their own courage or obstinacy, their religious principle or fanaticism. No wonder that libels against the archbishop were multiplied and intensified, and that his victims were honored with abundant and galling demonstrations of popular favor. It was found necessary, in order to remove them out of the reach of their friends, to transfer them from the prisons to which they had been condemned to other castles in the Channel Islands.

Having now seen the leaders of the "malignant faction" visited with condign "punishment" and put out of the way, Laud had the pleasure of having his early patron, bishop Williams—against whom he seems to have nursed a rancorous grudge, as though fearing that one

day he might be a dangerous rival—arraigned before him in the Star Chamber, at first on the old charge of revealing the king's secrets, and afterwards in that of suborning a witness; and, having again delivered himself of a long and dignified speech, magnifying the enormity of the crime of subornation of perjury, especially in a clergyman and a bishop, and at the same time protesting his personal friendliness, he graciously and humbly leaves the accused to the tender mercies of a court thus "tuned," who sentenced him to pay a fine of £10,000, to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, and to be suspended from all his offices, preferments, and functions.

Upon Laud's recommendation, a decree was passed by the Star Chamber in 1637 for restraining the freedom of the press. The provisions of the edict were sufficiently severe. It limited the number of master printers under penalty of whipping; it forbade the printing of books without a license from the archbishop or the bishop of London, or their chaplains, or from the chancellors or vice-chancellors of the universities. It prohibited the sale of imported books without a similar license; it authorized the Company of Stationers to seize on all such books as they found to be schismatical or offensive, and to lay them before the ecclesiastical authorities; it enacted that no one in England should cause to be printed any books in English beyond the seas, or to import them into the country; and finally it provided that offences against the decree should be punished by the court of Star Chamber or High Commission. Such was the law enacted—not by the English Parliament, but by the Star Chamber—to protect, not the English Protestant Church, but the Laudian ecclesiastical system against the "Puritan faction."

The "Short Parliament" of 1640 had been dissolved after a session of three weeks; but as the Convocation continued to sit, a set of new canons was drawn up under the influence and presidency of Laud, which contained the famous *election* oath; and the first of which proclaimed that monarchy was of divine right, that the royal authority was independent, not only of the bishop of Rome, but of every other earthly power, and that it cannot be assailed on any pretence without resistance to the ordinance of God. Not only this canon, but the whole body of them, were of the most arbitrary character, especially enjoining, under severe penalties, the ceremonies to which the archbishop was notoriously attached; and all this at a time most unwisely chosen, when the whole condition of the empire was imminently critical; so that, as Clarendon remarks, "the season in which that synod continued to sit was in so ill a conjuncture of time that nothing could have been transacted there of a popular and prevailing influence."

The archbishop prime minister had so completely established uniformity in England that he now had leisure to turn his particular attention to the reformation of Puritan abuses in the outlying islands of Jersey and Guernsey. He claims to have brought Chillingworth back from the Church of Rome. If he did, he certainly did not make that irrefragable defender of the religion of Protestants a disciple of his own system. He urged bishop Hall to write his treatise on Episcopacy; but Hall's claims were not put high enough to satisfy Laud, who was particularly offended because the pope was plainly called Antichrist. The plot now thickens. The Scottish troubles growing out of the attempted imposition of the new canons and liturgy upon the Scottish people, beginning with the "profane imprecation" of the dame Janet Geddes, in St. Giles's, at the first reading of the detested service: "Out, out, thou false thief; dost thou say mass at my lug?" had now swollen into an irresistible storm of violence and rebellion. The uproar of the "old woman" in a church, and the brickbats of the mob around it, had turned into a national conspiracy. Through all the business Laud had adroitly managed to incur no responsibility without the participation or authority of the king or the Scottish bishops; nevertheless, it is evident he was mixed up with it all, not only as accessory, but as prime minister. He corresponded constantly with the Scottish bishops as well as with the civil authorities in Scotland. To him they made their reports and their excuses, and his advice and direction were required and sought on all occasions.

The invasion of England by the army of the Covenanters at length compelled Charles once more to summon the English Legislature. The Long Parliament met. Then the bubble burst; then the flaunting splendors of a luxurious and insolent court were exchanged for humiliation and deepening gloom; then the vast machinery of ecclesiastical despotism, pushed to its utmost tension of pride and tyranny, suddenly gave way with a crash, and the accumulated usurpations of royal prerogative hastened to their final and irreversible doom. The odious courts of the Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished, and all judges were henceforth made independent of the crown; no taxes, of whatever description, were to be levied without authority of Parliament, and Parliaments were by law to be triennial. The earl of Strafford, lord deputy of Ireland, Laud's most intimate friend, the king's ablest political adviser, and the most skilful commander of the royal forces against the Scotch, was impeached for high treason. Laud's own impeachment soon followed, and he was forthwith committed to the Tower, where he was kept imprisoned three years (1641–5); his jurisdiction and all his offices and emoluments were sequestered by the House of Peers. Lambeth Palace was made a state prison, and Leighton, now almost a maniac, was put in charge of it; Prynne was made his warden in the Tower. The bishops were unseated from the House of Lords; episcopacy and the liturgy were abolished by act of Parliament; and Laud—having seen the complete triumph of the miserable "fanatical faction" over which he had wielded the rod of power and of punishment so long, the utter destruction and abolition of the hierarchy and the ceremonies to whose aggrandizement and magnificence he had devoted his life, and the annihilation of all his fond dreams of personal grandeur, and glory, and lordly munificence—was at length condemned by an ordinance of Parliament, and suffered decapitation on Tower Hill, meeting his doom with perfect composure and quiet dignity, on the 10th of January, 1645.

Thus fell the famous archbishop Laud, perhaps the best praised and most blamed man that ever lived. As to the formal legality of his sentence, it may be admitted that it cannot be constitutionally or technically justified. As to the specific charges against him, it may be granted that they could not, except constructively, amount to treason even if proved, and that few of any weight were proved with such evidence as would be satisfactory under the strict rules of an impartial court of justice. But it must be remembered that Laud was tried before a revolutionary tribunal; that, in such circumstances, moral, not legal evidence swayed his judges; and that the general, known truth of the case, not the detailed proof of specific articles, determined the conclusion.

It may be conceded that the arbitrary and tyrannical acts of the administration of Charles and of Laud, whether in Church or State, did not go beyond the precedents which had been set from Henry VIII downwards; but it must be remembered that the spirit of the times had changed, and it was the bounden duty of wise men in high places to know it, and act accordingly. A people educated under Romish domination and superstition might submit to the imposition of taxes or of creeds by the sovereign and established authority, which a people educated under even an imperfect influx of Protestant light, and of its attendant maxims of personal liberty and freedom of thought, could no longer brook. Moreover, a tyrannical despotism once constitutionally established can never be abolished or got rid of unless the governors either yield to the popular demands or are illegally put down by revolutionary force and violence.

It may be conceded that Laud was honest and con-

scientious in defending the extreme doctrines of the divine right, of the royal prerogative, and of passive obedience, and in his endeavors to suppress the "Puritan faction" in Church and State; but, in a historical estimate of his career and character, this proves nothing. The constitution of successive Parliaments shows that this "faction" was an increasing majority of the nation; they, too, were conscientious; Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton were conscientious—fanatically, not by policy, conscientious; the parliamentary leaders, those noble defenders of English liberty, were conscientious; most despots, tyrants, and conservatives, as well as rebels, revolutionists, and reformers, are conscientious. Their conduct and character must be judged of by rules independent of their well informed or ill informed private consciences. There may be fault on both sides: one extreme begets another. So it was then; so it was afterwards.

It may be conceded that the charge of popery against Laud—a charge from which he suffered more severely than from any other, and which more than any other was the cause of his ruin—was not literally true. What was substantially true was thus put into the false and extravagant formula of the demagogue—it was a caricature. Laud was a loyal son of the Church of England, "as by law established," so long as the laws were in accordance with his notions, or as he had the interpretation and execution of them in his own hands. It was not Roman popery, but Anglican or Laudean popery which he would establish. No doubt he was more of a Papist than of a Protestant in the true sense of that word. His sympathies were more with Rome than with Augsburg or Geneva; and the people, who are instinctively sagacious in questions of this kind, did not fail to perceive it, and they expressed their judgment, as is their wont, in the most summary and positive terms.

As to ecclesiastical ceremonies, Laud's devotion to them and to their enforcement is certainly not among the marks of his greatness of mind. The opposition to them may have been as unreasonable as their imposition; yet the fact was they were generally unpopular and odious, and Laud, in his position, was bound to have the discretion to accommodate himself to that fact. It boots nothing to say that they were not illegal; it is enough that they were both unpopular and unnecessary. It boots nothing to talk of the irreverence and slovenliness of the Puritan worship; that is mostly exaggeration; but, at all events, decency and reverence could have been preserved without the precision and multiplied formalities of the Laudean ceremonial.

It may be conceded that Laud was a munificent patron of learning and of the universities, with whose dignities he was invested; but it might not be altogether amiss to inquire whence came all the funds of which he made all this lordly distribution; and perhaps we shall find that, in this matter, Laud deserves only this honor above many other men, that he honestly paid over at least a portion of the money to those to whom, after all, it rightfully belonged. He never stinted the splendor or sumptuousness of his own establishment, or the appointments of his personal retinue. Of his wealth and grandeur he enjoyed what he could. But let it remain to his credit that his vanity—if it were nothing better—took the form of magnificent public benefactions.

As to intellectual abilities, Laud's must have been considerable, or he could never have been the historical personage he was. In the personal habits of his private life he was irreproachable. As a clergyman he was indefatigable and punctilious in the discharge of his duties. He was always narrow and bigoted in his views, but he lived in narrow and bigoted times. How far his high political positions were compatible with his ecclesiastical character may well be doubted, and his example can never be repeated again in England. How far the corrupting influence of political place, and of the association of political persons and of political life, may have contributed to develop and exaggerate his worst faults—which, after all, were chiefly those of administration—it is impossible to say. It must be remembered that he was a courtier long before he was even a bishop, and continued a courtier till he became primate of all England, and thereafter till he was "translated" from the court to the Tower of London. If lawn sleeves could pass unsullied through the scenes of such a life, a naturally ambitious churchman could hardly grow in grace in such an atmosphere. Laud's devotional compositions, in the form of private prayers, are often admirable, and are thought to give a very favorable insight into his interior religious life. Let us hope that the prayers were sincere and acceptable.

Laud's character may be considered with reference to the rightness of his general purpose, or to the wisdom of his aiming at its accomplishment, or to the manner in which he endeavored to effect it. As to the right or wrong of his general purpose, his theory and aim, whether in Church or State, but particularly in the Church, it always has been, and perhaps always will be, a matter of dispute. It is useless to discuss it. Any judgment of his character based upon the assumption of this question is no better than a *petitio principii*. As to the wisdom or folly of undertaking to accomplish that purpose in those times and under those circumstances, it is more and more generally admitted that he made a mistake in the attempt. His friends regard it as a venial error, his enemies reckon the blunder a crime. As to the means he employed, and, in general, his whole manner and bearing in seeking his end, there is a very general verdict against him. He had great personal faults. Prominent among them were an overweening ambition, self-sufficiency, and insolence. An aristocratic estimate of the structure of society, and a sovereign contempt for the people and the popular will—very natural, but the more inexcusable in a man of his origin and profession—an utter destitution of the grand idea of *humanity*, underlie all the mistakes and all the misfortunes of his life.

We conclude our sketch with the following candid admissions from Le Bas, one of Laud's most earnest apologists and admirers. "That the administration of Laud was in some respects injurious to the Church can hardly be denied; but then it is most important to keep in mind that the injury was inflicted not so much by the measures which he adopted as by the manner in which he enforced them. There has seldom, perhaps, lived a man who contrived that his good should be so virulently evil spoken of. From all that we learn of him, his manner appears to have been singularly ungracious and unpopular, and his temper offensively irascible and hot. If we are to trust the representations of him left us either by friend or foe, he must have been one of the most disagreeable persons in the three kingdoms except to those who were intimately acquainted with his worth. There was nothing affable or engaging in his general behavior. His very integrity was often made odious by wearing an aspect of austerity and haughtiness. It would almost seem as if prudence had been struck out of his catalogue of the cardinal virtues. He was unable, as Warburton remarks, to comprehend one important truth, with which Richelieu was so familiar, when he said that if he had not spent as much time in civilities as in business he had undone his master. The consequence of this ignorance, or of this disdain, of the ways of the world was unspeakably hurtful to the cause which at all times was nearest his heart. In the minds of many who were ignorant of the essential excellence of the man, the interests of the Establishment were, by his demeanor, associated with almost everything that is harsh and repulsive. For a considerable portion of his life he was regarded not only as the leader, but the representative of the ecclesiastical body; and the impression which he communicated to the public was too often that of unfeeling arrogance and lofty impatience of control. Whether the Church could have been saved by any combination, in the person of its

ruler, of those rare endowments which secure at once both reverence and attachment, no human sagacity can at this day be competent to pronounce; but it certainly is not altogether surprising that this unhappy defect should, even in the minds of judicious and impartial men, have connected his administration with the ruin of the Establishment. In such unquiet times, more especially, a man like Laud would not only be dreaded as a firm and conscientious disciplinarian, but as the rigorous and overbearing priest; and the Church would be sure to suffer most grievously for the unpopularity of her governor."

In England, the parties with which Laud's life was implicated have not yet passed away, so that it is almost impossible even now to get an impartial estimate of the man from his own countrymen; but it can hardly be doubted that the ultimate verdict of history will be his final condemnation. The English monarchy has gloriously survived the political principles which he defended; his ecclesiastical principles will ultimately be found equally unnecessary, nay, hostile, to the true strength and glory of the English Church. (D. R. G.)

Laud's writings are few. Wharton published his *Diary* in 1694, and Parker his *Works* (Oxford, 1847–60), containing, among other things, his letters and miscellaneous papers, many of them then published for the first time, and, like his *Diary*, invaluable as contributions to the personal history of this noted archbishop and his associates. See Hume, *Hist. of Engl.* chap. lii; Hallam, *Constit. Hist. of Engl.* (Lond. 1854), ii, 38, 167; Macaulay, *Essays* (1854), i, 159 sq., 424 sq.; Short, *Ch. Hist.* (Lond. 1840), p. 486 sq., 553 sq.; Tulloch, *English Puritanism*, p. 45 sq.; Fletcher, *History of Independency*, vols. ii, iii, iv; Collier. *Eccl. Hist.* (see Index); Prynne, Heylin, Le Bas, Lawson, and Baines, on the *Life of Laud; Westm. Rev.* xvii, 478 sq.; 1870, p. 294; *London Month. Rev.* cxviii, 317 sq.; *Lond. Retrosp. Rev.* vii (1827), 49 sq.; *Blackw. Mag.* xxv, 619 sq.; xxvii, 179; xxix, 523; l, 806; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* x, 101 sq.; *North. Amer. Review*, 1864, 606 sq.

Lauda Sion Salvatōrem is the beginning of the renowned sequence of Thomas Aquinas (1224–1274) for Corpus-Christi day. It consists of twelve double verses, which are as follows:

1. Lauda Sion salvatorem,
Lauda ducem et pastorem
In hymnis et canticis: [de,
Quantum potes, tantum au-
Quia major omni laude,
Nec laudare sufficis.

2. Laudis thema specialis,
Panis vivus et vitalis
Hodie proponitur,
Quem in sacræ mensa cœnæ
Turbæ fratrum duodenæ
Datum non ambigitur.

3. Sit laus plena, sit sonora,
Sit jucunda, sit decora,
Mentis jubilatio:
Dies enim sollemnis agitur
In qua mensæ prima recoli-
Hujus institutio. [tur

4. In hac mensa novi regis
Novum pascha novæ legis
Phase vetus terminat.
Vetustatem novitas,
Umbram fugat veritas,
Noctem lux eliminat.

5. Quod in cœna Christus ges-
Faciendum hoc expressit [sit
In sui memoriam.
Docti sacris institutis,
Panem, vinum in salutis
Consecramus hostiam.

6. Dogma datur Christianis,
Quod in carnem transit panis
Et vinum in sanguinem
Quod non capis, quod non vi-
Animosa firmat fides [des,
Præter rerum ordinem.

7. Sub diversis speciebus,
Signis tantum et non rebus,
Latent res eximiæ.
Caro cibus, sanguis potus:
Manet tamen Christus totus
Sub utraque specie.

8. A sumente non concisus,
Non confractus, non divisus,
Integer accipitur.
Sumit unus, sumunt mille,
Quantum isti, tantum ille,
Nec sumptus consumitur.

9. Sumunt boni, sumunt mali,
Sorte tamen inæquali
Vitæ vel interitus.
Mors est malis, vita bonis:
Vide, paris sumptionis
Quam sit dispar exitus.

10. Fracto demum sacramen-
Ne vacilles, sed memento [to
Tantum esse sub fragmento
Quantum toto tegitur:
Nulla rei fit scissura,
Signi tantum fit fractura
Qua nec status nec statura
Signati minuitur.

11. Ecce panis angelorum,
Factus cibus viatorum,
Vere panis filiorum,
Non mittendus canibus.
In figuris præsignatur,
Quum Isaac immolatur,
Agnus Paschæ deputatur,
Datur manna patribus.

12. Bone pastor, panis vere,
Jesu, nostri miserere.
Tu nos pasce, nos tuere,
Tu nos bona fac videre
In terra viventium.
Tu qui cuncta scis et vales,
Qui nos pascis hic mortales:
Tuos ibi commensales,
Cohæredes et sodales
Fac sanctorum civium.

Lauda Sion, although full of the doctrine of transubstantiation, as was to be expected from its author, yet contains no allusion to the priestly power "*deum conficere*," which is the chief characteristic of Corpus-Christi day, but ends with an inward prayer for adoption and participation in the eternal feast of grace. A German translation was made of it by the monk John of Salzburg (1366–1396), beginning with the words *Lob, O Syon, deinen Schöpfer*. We know of no English translation. See Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, i, 45–66; Daniel, *Thesaur. Hymnologicus*, ii, 97 sq. (Lips. 1855, 5 vols. 8vo).



Specimen of the *Codex Laudianus* (Acts xx, 28: regere | ecclesiam | domini ‖ ποιμενειν | την εκκλησιαν | του κυ).

Laudian Manuscript (Codex Laudianus, so called because presented by archbishop Laud in 1636 to the University of Oxford, now in the Bodleian Library, where it is numbered 35), usually designated as E of the Acts, is a very valuable MS. of the Acts, with the Greek and Latin in uncial letters in parallel columns, the Latin words (which are neither Jerome's nor the Vulgate, but a closely literal version) always exactly opposite the Greek. It is defective at Acts xxvi, 29–xxvii, 26. It is in size nine inches by seven and a half, and consists of 226 leaves of 23–26 lines. The vellum is rather poor, and the ink faint. There are no stops, and few breathings. It was probably written in the West during the sixth century. Readings were taken from it by Fell (1675) and Mill (1707). Hearne published the text in full: *Acta Apostolorum Græco-Latinæ*, literis majusculis (Oxon. 1715, 8vo); now very scarce. See Davidson, *Bib. Crit.* ii, 293; Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 187 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 128. See Manuscripts.

Laudemium, a name given to the sum which heirs, on obtaining their inheritance, are to pay to certain parties. It was to be paid for the recognition and establishment (*laudatio*) of the claim, and even, occasionally, on coming into possession other than an inheritance, as, for instance, by gift, etc. It subsequently became obligatory only in cases of sale, of inheritance from collateral relations, or sometimes from descendants, etc. The Roman law states the amount to be paid in the case of a copyhold to be one fiftieth of the principal ("quinquagesima pars pretii vel æstimationis loci, qui transfertur," cap. 3, *Cod. Just.* de jure emphyteutico, iv, 66). It subsequently increased to one thirtieth, one

twentieth, and even one tenth. This, however, is named the *laudemium majus*, and distinguished from the *laudemium minus*. See J. C. H. Schröter, *V. d. Lehensware*, etc. (Berlin, 1789); Christ, *Analecta de sportula clientelari vulgo de taxa feudali* (Lips. 1757).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 230.

Lauds, *Hymns of praise* (from Latin *laus*, praise). In some of the ancient councils the hallelujah appointed to be sung after the Gospel is termed *Laudes*. Also the name of the service which, before the Reformation, followed after the Nocturn, celebrated between 12 and 3 A.M., or in the 3d watch. Du Cange assigns them this place, but cites a passage from which it would appear that they rather belong to *matins* in the following watch. The Lauds, Du Cange tells us, consisted, in the monastic or pre-reformatory service, of the last three psalms. Durand, however, names five. See Procter, *Common Prayer*, p. 186 sq.— Eden, *Theolog. Dict.* s. v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See Breviary; Canonical Hours; Liturgy; Matins.

Lauffer, Jacob, a Swiss Protestant minister and historian, was born at Zoffingen July 25, 1688, and studied theology at Halle and Utrecht. In 1718 he became professor of history and eloquence at Berne. He died Feb. 26, 1734. His works are not of special interest to theological students, excepting, perhaps, *De Hostium Spoliis Deo sacratis et sacrandis* (1717).

Laughter (צְחֹק, γέλως), an action usually expressing joy (Gen. xxi, 6; Psa. cxxvi, 2; Eccles. iii, 4; Luke vi, 21); sometimes mockery (Gen. xviii, 13; Eccles. ii, 2; James iv, 9); and occasionally conscious security (Job v, 22). When used concerning God (as in Psa. ii, 4; lix, 8; Prov. i, 26) it signifies that he despises or pays no regard to the person or subject. See Isaac.

Laughton, George, D.D., an English minister, lived in the latter half of the 18th century. Among his works of importance are his *History of Ancient Egypt* (Lond. 1774, 8vo):—*Reply to Chap. XV of Gibbon's Decline and Fall* (1780–86). His *Sermons* were published from 1773–90.—Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, ii, 1064.

Laugier, Marc Antoine, a French Jesuit, was born at Manos July 25, 1713. He was a priest at Paris until 1757, when he was appointed to the abbey of Ribeauté. He died April 7, 1769. For a list of his works on various subjects, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxix, 894.

Launay, Pierre de, lord of La Motte and Vaufeelan, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Blois in 1573. After holding a high position in the war department, he resigned in 1613, retaining only the title of secretary and counsellor to the king, and devoted himself exclusively to study. He acquired the mastery over Greek, learned Hebrew from a Jewish teacher, and was for forty years a member of the Consistory of Charenton. He took part in several provincial synods, and was secretary of the two national synods of Charenton in 1623 and of Alençon in 1637. He died at Paris June 27, 1661. His works are, *Paraphrase et Exposition du Prophete Daniel* (Sedan, 1624);—*Paraphrase et claire Exposition du Livre de Salomon vulgairement appelé l'Ecclésiaste* (Saint-Maurice, 1624, 8vo):—*Paraphrase et Exposition des Proverbes de Salomon et du premier Chapitre du Cantique des Cantiques* (Charenton, 1650, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1655, 12mo):—*Paraphrase et Exposition de l'Epistre de Saint Paul aux Romains* (Saumur, 1647, 8vo):—*Paraphrase sur les Épistres de Saint Paul* (Charenton 1650, 2 vols. 4to):—*Paraphrase et Exposition de l'Apocalypse* (Geneva, 1651, 4to); published under the name of Jonas le Buy de la Prie. In this work he advances opinions on the Millennium which were strongly opposed by Amyraut:—*Examen de la Réplique de M. Amyraut* (Charenton, 1658, 8vo):—*Traité de la Sainte Cène du Seigneur, avec l'Explication de quelques Passages difficiles du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament* (Saumur, 1659, 12mo):—*Remarques sur le Texte de la Bible, ou Explication des Mots, des Phrases, et des Figures difficiles de la sainte Écriture* (Geneva, 1667, 4to), a posthumous and highly esteemed work. See Haag, *La France Protestante*.— Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 907.

Launoi, Jean de, a noted French Roman Catholic historian and canonist, was born at Val-de-Sis, near Valegne, Dec. 21, 1603. He studied at Constance and Paris, where he was received *magister* in June, 1634. In the same year he entered the Church. He was highly esteemed among the learned men of his time. On a journey to Rome he became the intimate friend of Luc Holstenius and Leo Allatius. His whole life was devoted to the study of theology at the Sorbonne in Paris; he never sought any promotion, but preferred to serve his Church by his pen, which he wielded with great power and ability. He died at Paris March 10, 1678. Moréri says of him: "The great number of his works, and the manner in which they are written, give ample evidence of his extensive reading and ready ability. But his style is neither ornate nor polished; he uses awkward, obsolete expressions; handles his subjects very peculiarly; and, if he overcomes his adversaries, he also tires his readers by the profusion of his quotations. He could not endure fables nor superstitions, and defended with great firmness the rights of the Church and of the king, which were endangered by the ultramontanes." In a noble spirit of independence, he preferred expulsion from the Sorbonne rather than to indorse the condemnation of Arnauld by that body, although he differed from that theologian in his views on grace. He even went so far as to write against the *Formulaire* of the assembly of the clergy of 1656. He particularly distinguished himself by his acumen in discovering the spuriousness of most of the acts of the saints, as also of a number of ecclesiastical privileges. Dom Bonaventure, of Argonne, writes of him: "He is dangerous alike to heaven and to earth; he has overthrown more saints in paradise than were canonized by any ten popes. He looked with suspicion on the whole martyrologia, and examined the claims of the saints one after another, as they do in France about the nobility." His writings are mainly of a historico-critical nature, and in tendency apologetical in behalf of Gallicanism. The most important of them are, *Syllabus rationum quibus caussa Durandi de modo conjuctionis concursuum Dei et creaturæ, defenditur* (Par. 1636, 8vo):—*De mente concilii Tridentini circa satisfactionem in sacramento pœnitentiæ* (1644), in which he maintains that the Council of Trent and the practice of the Church do not prove that satisfaction must precede absolution:—*De frequenti Confessionis et Eucharistiæ usu* (1653):—*De commentitio Lazari, Magdalenæ, Marthæ ac Maximini in provinciam Appulsu* (1660, 8vo):—*De auctoritate negantis argumenti* (Paris, 1650 and 1662, 8vo), wherein he affirms he had himself seen at Sienna, in 1634, the statue of the popess Joanna placed between those of Leo IV and Benedict III. It produced quite a controversy, and abbot Thiers wrote against it *Defensio adversus Joh. de Launoi in qua defensione Launoii fraudes calumniæ, plagia, impostura*, etc. (Paris, 1664):—*De recta Nicæni canonis VI, et prout a Rufino explicatur, Intelligentia*:—*De veteri Ciborum Delectu in jejuniis Christianorum*:—*Judicium de Auctore libri De Imitatione Christi* (Paris, 1649, 1650, 1652, 1663, 8vo). Launoi advocates the claim of Gersen. See Kempis, Thomas à:—*De Cura Ecclesiæ pro Miseris et pauperibus* (Paris, 1663, 8vo):—*Epistolæ* (Par. 1664–1673, 8 vols. 8vo; Cambridge, 1689, 1 vol. folio):—*De vero Auctore fidei professionis quæ Pelagio Hieronymo, Augustino tribui solet*, in which he attempts to prove that Pelagius is the only author of the profession of faith attributed to Jerome and Augustine:—*Explicata Ecclesiæ Traditio circa canonem "Omnis utriusque sexus"* (Par. 1672, 8vo), a highly-esteemed work:—*Regia in Matrimonium Potestas, vel de jure sæcularium principum Christianorum in*

sauciendis impedimentis matrimonium dirimentibus (Par. 1674, 4to). This work was condemned at Rome, Dec. 10, 1688, yet its principles were approved by a number of the most distinguished theologians and jurists:—*Venerandæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ circa simoniam Traditio* (Paris, 1675, 8vo):—*De Sabbatinæ bullæ Privilegio et de Scapularis Carmelitarum Soliditate*:—*In Privilegia ordinis Prænonstratensis*:—*In Chartam immunitatis quam beatus Germanus, episcopus Parisiensis, suburbano monasterio dedisse fertur*:—*In privilegium quod Gregorius I^us^ monasterio Sancti-Medardi Suessonensis dedisse dicitur*. In these works the author examines a number of rights and privileges which he considers as unfounded or unjust:—A treatise on the conception of the Virgin, in which he asserts that if an attempt were made to define "the point of the conception of the Virgin by the Scriptures and tradition, it would be shown that she was conceived in sin." The complete works of Launoi were published by abbot Granet (Geneva, 1731, 10 vols. fol.). See Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, vol. xviii, 34–62; *Journal des Savants*, anno 1664, 1665, 1667, 1668, 1675, 1688, 1698, 1701, 1704, 1705. 1726, 1731; *Bibl. sacrée;* Moréri, *Grand Dictionn. Historique;* Guy-Patin, *Epist.;* Bayle, *Dict. Critique*, and *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres;* Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxxii; Colomiés, *Recueil de Particularites*, p. 329; Reiser, *Elogium Joannis Launoii* (Lond. 1685); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 912 sq., Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 230 sq.

Laura (*collection of anchorites' cells*), a name given by Church historians to collections of cells, the habitations of hermits or monastics of the early days of the Church, but incorrectly used as a synonyme of *monasterium*, from which it greatly differs, inasmuch as the inmates of the latter were cœnobites, and held intercourse with each other, while those of the former lived apart, in seclusion. The holy tenants of a laura passed in solitude and silence five days in a week; their food was bread, water, and dates; on Saturday and Sunday they received the sacrament, and messed together on broth and a small allowance of wine. Bingham states that when many of the cells of anchorets were placed together in the same wilderness, at some distance from one another, they were all called by one common name, laura, which, as Evagrius informs us (i, 21), differed from a cœnobium in this, that a laura was many cells divided from each other, where every monk provided for himself; but a cœnobium was but one habitation, where the monks lived in society, and had everything in common. Epiphanius (*Hæres.* 69, 1) says *Laura*, or *Labra*, was the name of a street or district where a church stood in Alexandria; and it is probable that from this the name was taken to signify a multitude of cells in the wilderness, united, as it were, in a certain district, yet so divided as to make up many separate habitations. The most celebrated lauras were established in the East, especially in Palestine, as the laura of St. Euthymus, St. Saba, the laura of the towers, etc. See MONACHISM; MONASTERY.

Laureate (from the Latin verb *laureatus, crowned with the prize*) was used of a successful theological candidate, in ancient times, at the Scotch universities.

Laurence, RICHARD, D.C.L., a distinguished English prelate, was born at Bath in 1760; matriculated in the University of Oxford July 14, 1778, as an exhibitioner of Corpus Christi College; took the degree of B.A. April 10, 1782; that of M.A. July 9, 1785, and those of B. and D.C.L. June 27, 1794. Upon the appointment in 1796 of his brother, Dr. French Laurence, to the regius professorship of civil law, he was made deputy professor at Oxford. In 1804 he preached the Bampton Lectures, and the reputation thence acquired secured for him from the archbishop of Canterbury the rectory of Mersham, Kent. In 1814 he was appointed to the chair of regius professor of Hebrew, and to the canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, and in 1822 was elevated to the archiepiscopal see of Cashel. He died in Dublin Dec. 28, 1838. His most important works are his translations of certain apocryphal books of the O. T. from the Ethiopic, accompanied by critical investigations: *Ascensio Isaiæ Vatis, opusculum pseudepigraphum, multis abhinc sæculis, ut videtur, deperditum, nunc autem apud Æthiopas compertum et cum versione Latina Anglicanaque publici juris factum* (Oxon. 1819, 8vo):—*Primi Ezræ Libri, qui apud Vulgatum appellatur quartus versio Æthiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata et Latine Anglicæque reddita* (Oxon. 1820, 8vo). The translation is followed by general remarks upon the different versions of this book, its apocryphal character, the creed of its author, and the probable period of its composition [see ESDRAS]:—*The Book of Enoch the Prophet*, an apocryphal production, supposed to have been lost for ages, but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia, now first published from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1821, 8vo; 3d ed. 1838) [see ENOCH, BOOK OF]:—also, *Remarks on the systematical Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach in his Edition of the Greek Testament* (Oxf. 1814, 8vo):—*Dissertation on the Logos of St. John* (Oxf. 1808, 8vo):—*Critical Reflections upon some important Misrepresentations contained in the Unitarian Version of the N. T.* (Oxford, 1811, 8vo):—*The Book of Job in the Words of the A. V.*, arranged and printed in conformity with the Masoretic text (Dublin, 1828, 8vo):—*On the Existence of the Soul after Death* (London, 1834, 8vo). This work, written in opposition to Priestley, Law, and their respective followers, discusses the usage of the terms κοιμᾶσθαι and *Sheol*, and enters into the critical examination of various scriptural narratives:—*An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical* (seven sermons preached as Bampton Lectures, Oxford, 1838, 8vo); and several sermons on the doctrine of *Atonement* (Oxford, 1810, 8vo), *Baptismal Regeneration* (1815, 8vo), and on *Baptism* (1838, 8vo). See Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Am. Auth.* vol. ii, s. v.; *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* 1839, pt. i, p. 205 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* vol. ii, s. v.

Laurentius, anti-pope, lived about 460–520. He was archdeacon of a Church in Rome, and was opposed to Symmachus, who in 498 was elected successor of Anastasius II in the papal chair. This schism created much disturbance in the city, Festus and Probinus, two of the most influential senators, siding with Laurentius. Both parties finally agreed to submit their difficulty to the decision of Theodoric, king of the Goths, though an Arian. He decided in favor of Symmachus, and Laurentius, having withdrawn his claim, was made bishop of Nocera. But as he subsequently created new disturbances, and was, whether justly or unjustly is not known, accused of Eutychianism, he was deposed by the Synodus Palmaris (501), and died an exile. See Anastasius, *Vita Pontif.;* Baronius, *Annales;* Plotina, *Vita Pontif. Roman.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xix, 927. (J. N. r.)

Laurentius, a noted prelate of the early English Church (Anglo-Saxon period), flourished in the first half of the 7th century (A.D. 605) as successor of St. Augustine—suggested for the archbishopric by Augustine himself. Under the reign of Eadbald, the successor of Ethelbert, when England was in danger of a return to heathenish practices by Eadbald's marriage of his own mother-in-law, Laurentius shrewdly managed affairs for the benefit of Christianity; he induced the king to renounce his incestuous marriage, and to embrace the Christian faith. See Churton, *Hist. Early Engl. Church*, p. 41 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. ii. cent. vii, pt. i, ch. i, § 2, and note (5).

Laurentius, ST., according to tradition, was a disciple of pope Sixtus II (257–258), who received him among the seven Roman deacons, and afterwards made

him archdeacon. When the pope, during the persecution of the Christians by Valerian, was led out to suffer martyrdom, Laurentius wished to accompany him, and to share his fate; but Sixtus prevented him, prophesying to him at the same time that he would be called upon to endure even greater sufferings for the cause of Christianity, and that he would follow him within three days. The omen was fulfilled: the Roman governor had heard of treasures belonging to the Christian Church, and wished to obtain possession of them. He desired Laurentius to reveal them to him. Laurentius seemed to comply, and was allowed to depart. Soon the courageous young disciple of Christ returned, accompanied by a crowd of paupers, cripples, and sick, whom he presented to the governor, saying, "These are our treasures." This was regarded as an insult, and in punishment he was condemned to be slowly roasted alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius can as little be hidden as the city of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (*Sti. Laurentii extra muros*); another church dedicated to him is *St. Laurentii in Damaso*. He is commemorated on the 10th of August. The earliest accounts of his martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. *De offic. ministr.* i, 41; ii, 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's *Hymn. in Laur.* (Prudentius, *Peristeph.*).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 232; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 365.

Laurentius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione Declamatio*, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called Apostles' Creed, pointed out the faults contained in the old Latin versions of the Bible, and applied philological exegesis to the New Testament. It is no wonder that by such a course he gained many enemies, especially among the clergy, who denounced him as an infidel. He was compelled to leave Rome, and retired to the court of Alphonse, king of Naples, who, though fifty years of age, now commenced to study Latin under Valla's tuition. Here, however, he commenced anew his arguments on the Trinity, free will, the vows of continence, and other delicate questions, and was therefore accused of heresy by the ecclesiastical authorities. King Alphonse succeeded in saving his life, but could not prevent his being whipped publicly around the convent of St. Jacob. Valla then returned to Rome, where he found a protector in pope Nicholas V, who gave him permission to teach, and granted him a salary. Here again he entered into a most violent controversy with Poggi. He died at Rome in 1457. His works, in which he attacks scholastic theology more with the weapons of common sense than of philosophy, are especially directed against Aristotle and Boetius, whom he considers as the founders of the scholastic dialect. He looked upon the evidences of Christianity as a result of sane human reason, which, in its development, has become participant in the divine revelation. But he was far from attempting to inquire further into these revelations by analyzing their mysteries. He says that there are many things we cannot know, and that we must respect the mystery with which it has pleased God to surround them. His tendency is eminently practical; according to him there is no virtue without faith, and all without it is but sinfulness. Where hope no longer points to higher and eternal happiness, nothing can remain but the false honesty of the stoic, or the material sense of the epicure. Without hope of a future life there can be no virtue, only misery; the peace and inner satisfaction of which philosophers boast are but falsehoods. True virtue is undeniably above worldly desires—it is the chief requisite of happiness; but it must be Christian virtue, not that of the philosophers. Among his works are to be noticed *Elegantiæ Latini sermonis* (Venice, 1471, 6 vols. fol., Par. 1575, 4to):—*De libero arbitrio*:—*De voluptate ac de vero bono libri iii*:—*Fabulæ et facetiæ*; and especially the above *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio*. His collected works were published at Basle in 1540, folio, and at Venice in 1592. See H. Ritter, *Geschichte d. Christl. Philosophie*, v, 243–261; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 232, 233, Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 366.

Lauria, Francis Laurent Brancate de, an Italian theologian, was born at Lauria, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1611. He joined the Franciscans, was made cardinal by Innocent XI in 1687, and died at Rome Nov. 30, 1693. He wrote commentaries on the four books of Scot's sentences (8 vols. folio):—*Devota laudis ad sanctissimam Trinitatem Oratio* (Rome, 1695, 12mo):—*De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione* (Rome, 1688, 4to; Rouen, 1715). In this last work he defended Augustine's doctrine on grace against the Molinists and Jansenists. See Pérennès, *Biographie Chrétienne et Anti-Chrétienne;* Joannes a Sancto-Antonio, *Biblioth. Franciscana.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxix, 939. (J. N. P.)

Laurie, James, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born Feb. 11, 1778, in Edinburgh, Scotland, where he also received his education. He was licensed in 1800, and continued to preach in his native country for two years, after which he came to America, having been previously ordained. In 1803 he was installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Congregation, and was instrumental in the establishment of the first place of Protestant worship in Washington, D. C. He was employed also during his ministry as a clerk in the register's office of the Treasury. He died April 18, 1853. He published *A Sermon.*—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 314.

Lavacrum. See Font; Lavatory.

Laval, François de Montmorency, a noted prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Laval, France, March 23, 1622, and early decided for the priesthood. He was ordained priest at Paris Sept. 23, 1645; became archdeacon of Evreux in 1653, and bishop of Petrea and vicar apostolic of New France in 1658. In the year following he went to Quebec and assumed the government of that see; while there, founded the Seminary of Quebec in 1663, and in 1666 consecrated the parochial church of Quebec. He returned to France in 1674. In 1688, however, he returned again, and retired to the seminary he had founded, and to this school made over all his private possessions. He died at Quebec May 6, 1708. Laval is said to have exercised as powerful an influence over the civil as he did over the ecclesiastical affairs of the colony. See Drake, *Dictionary of American Biography*, s. v.

Lavalette, Anthony de, a French Jesuit, who became the indirect cause of the suppression of his order in France in 1764, was born near Valbres Oct. 21, 1707. He entered the society at Toulouse Oct. 10, 1725; was for a time professor at Puy and Rodez, and was ordained priest in 1740. In 1741 he went to Martinique, where he had at first the care of a parish; then became administrator of the mission, and was intrusted with all its temporal concerns. Appointed general of the Jesuits' mission in South America in 1754, he indulged in wild commercial speculations for the purpose of cancelling the debts of the mission, but they all failed; he became bankrupt, and had to leave the country. He retired to England, was disowned by the society, and died some time after 1762. The society was sued by his creditors, but declined any responsibility for his engagements contracted without the consent or knowledge of his superiors; the question was referred to Parliament, which decided against the Jesuits. The sums claimed amounted to five million francs. On the 8th of May, 1761, the Jes-

uits were condemned to pay the whole amount and costs; and on Aug. 6, 1761, their institution itself was attacked as illegal, and as contrary to the interest of the country. This finally led to the suppression of the order in France by an edict of Nov. 1764. See Senac de Meilhan, *De la Destruction des Jésuites en France*, in the *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Littérature*, published by Crawford, and in the appendix to the *Mémoires de Mme. du Hausset;* Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 296 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 973.

Lavater, Johann Kaspar, a noted Swiss theologian and preacher, one of the most interesting men of the last century, was born at Zürich Nov. 15, 1741. His father, Henry Lavater, was doctor of medicine and member of the government of Zürich. His mother, whose maiden name was Regula Escher, was a woman of marked character and extraordinary gifts. His childhood was not marked by any great signs of promise as a student, but he had a decided tendency to religion, and a great predilection for singing hymns and reading the Bible. It was while at school in Zürich that he conceived the idea of becoming a minister of the Gospel. In 1755 Lavater entered the college in his native city. In 1759 he began his theological studies, and in 1762 was ordained a minister. In consequence of complications in the political affairs of his country, he travelled in company with the celebrated painter Fuseli, and successively visited the universities of Leipsic and Berlin. He also visited Barth, in Pomerania, for the theological advice of the celebrated provost Spalding. In 1764 he returned to his native place, and occupied himself with the duties of the ministerial office and Biblical studies. He also wrote some poetry, inspired by the poetical productions of Bodmer and Klopstock. In 1766 he married Miss Anna Schinz, the daughter of a highly respectable merchant. As the result of his study of Bodmer and Klopstock, he published in 1767 his *Schweitzerlieder*, containing his finest poems, which was followed by his *Aussichten in die Ewigkeit* (1768–73, 3 vols.), the first of a series of works in which he maintained the perpetuity of miracles, the irresistibility of prayer, and the necessity for every person to conceive of God as manifested in Christ crucified in order to be really alive to himself. The last doctrine was called his Christomania. In 1769 Lavater was made deacon of the Orphan-house Church at Zürich, where the extraordinary effect of his sermons, his blameless life, and benevolent disposition made him the idol of his congregation, while his printed sermons sent forth his fame to distant parts. It was reserved, however, for his *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntniss und Menschenliebe* (Leipsic, 1775–78) to extend his celebrity generally. This work, which has often been reprinted and translated (best by Dr. H. Hunter, London, 1789–98, 5 vols. royal 4to), was the first elaborate attempt to reduce physiognomy to a science. Having in early life been acquainted with a large number of eminent men, he had observed corresponding points of resemblance in their minds as well as their features, and from a disposition to generalize he was led to adopt a fixed system, and wrote this work in the hope that it might promote greatly the welfare of mankind, an effort in which he moderately succeeded. He illustrated it with numerous engravings and vignettes, and it is superior in respect of paper and typography to any book previously issued from the German press. Lavater had remarkable powers of observation, and skill in detecting character. He differed from all who had preceded him in this science. In order to form an opinion of the character from the face, he required to see the face at rest—in sleep or in an unconscious state. "The greater part of the physiognomists," he says, "speak only of the passions, or rather of the exterior signs of the passions, and the expression of them in the muscles. But these exterior signs are only transient circumstances, which are easily discoverable. It has therefore always been my object to consider the general and fundamental character of the man, from which, according to the state of his exterior circumstances and relations, all his passions arise as from a root." Lavater's "Fragmente" gave rise to considerable discussion, and occasioned general excitement. He was visited at Zürich by throngs of eminent and curious persons, whose character he usually judged with great sagacity; at a glance he recognised Necker, Mirabeau, and Mercier. In 1775 he was elevated to the pastorate of the Orphan-house; in 1778 was elected second pastor of St. Peter's Church in Zürich, and in 1786 he was called to fill the position of chief pastor, made vacant by the death of his associate. When the French Revolution broke out Lavater was a zealous partisan of it, but the execution of Louis XVI made him turn in disgust from the Republican party, and in 1798, when the French took possession of Switzerland, he protested against their ravages in a publication addressed to the Directory, entitled "Words of a free Swiss to a great Nation," which, on account of its high-toned courage, gained the applause of all Europe. This work was addressed, under his own name, to Reubel, a member of the French government at that time, but was printed without his cooperation, and more than a hundred thousand copies circulated. At the same time he gave a thrilling discourse from his pulpit from the words, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God," etc. (Rom. xiii, 1–4). This, as may be supposed, produced an indescribable excitement. The Swiss Directory at first resolved upon his banishment. Difficulties were in the way of carrying out this rigid measure, and the decree was changed to suspension from his office. This, too, was prevented by his friends, and finally he received only a gentle expression of disapproval. A few months later, however, while away from home for his health, he was seized and carried prisoner to Basle, on the charge of conspiracy against the French, but was released, after a confinement of several weeks, for want of evidence. On his return to Zürich he renewed his pastoral labors, and opposed with all his energies the oppressive measures of the French Directory. On the 26th of September, 1799, after the French had taken possession of Zürich, as Lavater was standing near his own house and trying to pacify some disorderly soldiers with money, he received a gun-shot from one of them, which, though it healed for a time, finally proved fatal. The last year of his life was one of great bodily suffering, occasioned by his wound, which he bore with Christian patience, praying for the man who had wounded him. He desired that the culprit should not be arrested. "I would, with all my severe pain, have much more sorrow if I knew that any punishment were done to him, for he certainly knew not what he did." He at the same time inscribed some beautiful poetical lines to him. During the intervals of suffering his mental activity continued unabated. He was never idle. When travelling or taking daily exercise, and even at his meals, he always had a pencil and paper, that he might write down any new thought that might suggest itself. He wrote, during this period of his life, several small works or poems. Among them were "Zürich at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century;" "Swan Song, or Last Thoughts of a Departing One on Jesus of Nazareth and Memorial Leaves." The latter he desired to be given after his death, as little legacies, to his friends. Lavater's relation to his flock was always of the most intimate character, as is evinced by his request, not long before his death, to be afforded one more opportunity to speak to his beloved congregation, and partake with them of the holy sacrament. He was carried to his much-loved Church, where he met a large assembly of devoted and sorrowing people. One who was present on the occasion wrote: "His face was filled with earnestness and love, by which, though death could be read in every one of his features, he seemed to be reflecting the very glory of heaven." When he was no longer able to sit up and hold his pen, he dictated to an aman-

uensis. On the last evening of the old year, while lying in bed, and his friends were obliged to stand very near to understand him, he dictated some lines (German hexameters) to be read the following day to his congregation. He died the 2d of January, 1801.

Lavater was one of the most remarkable men of his time. He had an original mind, and was a true philosopher. He wrote with acceptance on a great variety of subjects, and on none more effectively than on questions of theology. Among those who knew him best, he was distinguished more by his moral traits than by his intellectual gifts; by his purity of heart, his deep humility, his fervent piety, his Christian charity and zeal for mankind. A more thoroughly good man and devoted Christian the annals of literature do not exhibit. Goethe at one time said of him, "He is the best, greatest, wisest, sincerest of all mortal and immortal men that I know." He always firmly clung to his peculiar religious views, "which were a mixture of new interpretations with ancient orthodoxy, and mystical even to superstition. One leading article of his faith was a belief in the sensible manifestation of supernatural powers. His disposition to give credence to the miraculous led him to believe the strange pretensions of many individuals, such as the power to exorcise devils, to perform cures by animal magnetism, etc. Some even suspected him of Roman Catholicism. Thus, while his mystical tendency rendered him an object of ridicule to the party called the enlightened (Aufgeklärte), the favor he showed to many new institutions offended the religionists of the old school" (*Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.). Yet withal, many of the religious world, even of those not immediately belonging to his congregation, regarded Lavater with great veneration, and those who were entertained by a correspondence with him found his letters the great source of their spiritual consolation. His biography by his son-in-law Gessner (*Lebensbeschreibung Lavaters*), by far the most complete, appeared in 1802 (3 vols. 8vo), and an excellent selection from his works by Orelli (Zürich, 1841–44, 8 vols. 8vo). See Appleton's *New American Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hedge, *Prose Writers of Germany* (Philadel. 1848), p. 187–189; *Anna Lavater, or Picture of Swiss Pastoral Life in the Last Century* (Cincinnati, 1870); Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries* (New York, 1869); Bodemann, *Lavater* (1856); Nitzsch, *Lavater u. Gellert* (1857); *Ueber Lavater's, Herder's, und Schleiermacher's Kirchengeschichtliche Bedeutung*, in the *Allgem. Kirchenzeit.* 1856, No. 91 sq.; and the excellent article by Schenkel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 233 sq.

Lavater, Louis, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Kybourg March 1, 1527. He went to Strasburg in 1545, and there became intimately acquainted with the theologians Bucer and Sturm. He afterwards removed to Paris, and studied theology with Turnebus, Ramus, and Lambin. After visiting Italy he returned to Zürich, where he became archdeacon and canon in 1550, and finally head pastor in 1585. He died July 15, 1586. His principal works are, *De Ritibus et Institutis ecclesiæ Tigurinæ* (Zürich, 1559, 8vo):—*Historia de origine et progressu Controversiæ Sacramentariæ de Cœna Domini* (Zürich, 1563 and 1572, 8vo):—*De Spectris, Lemuribus et magnis atque insolitis fragoribus et præsagitionibus quæ obitum hominum, clades, mutationesque imperiorum præcedunt* (Zür. 1570, 12mo; translated into most European languages):—*Vom Leben u. Tod Heinrich Bullingers* (Zürich, 1576); and a number of exegetical and devotional works. See Adam, *Vitæ Theolog. Germ.*; Verhegden, *Elogia*; Hottinger, *Bibl. Tigurina.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 994.

Lavatory (Lat. *lavatorium*), a cistern or trough to wash in. There was usually a lavatory in the cloisters of monastic establishments, at which the inmates washed their hands and faces, also the surplices and other vestments; some are still extant. This name is also given to the *piscina* (q. v.). In the south of Germany the



Lavatory at Selby, Yorkshire.

lavatory is an important feature resembling a baptistery; it is a separate chamber, square or octagonal, standing on one side of the cloister-court, with a reservoir of water or a fountain in the middle, and water-troughs around the sides for washing at.—Parker, *Glossary*, s. v.

Laver (כִּיּוֹר and כִּיֹּר, *kiyor'*, prop. a *basin* for boiling in, and so signifying a "pan" for cooking, 1 Sam. ii, 14; or a *fire-pan*, "hearth," Zech. xii, 6; also a *pulpit* or "scaffold" of similar form for a rostrum, 2 Chron. vi, 13; elsewhere spoken of the sacred wash-bowl of the tabernacle and Temple, Exod. xxx, 18, 28; xxxi, 9, xxxv, 16; xxxviii, 8; xxxix, 39; xl, 7, 11, 30; Lev. viii, 11; 2 Kings xvi, 17; plur. fem. 1 Kings vii, 30, 38, 40, 43; plural masc. 2 Chron. iv, 6, 14; Sept. λουτήρ, Vulg. *labrum*), a basin to contain the water used by the priests in their ablutions during their sacred ministrations. This was of two sorts in different periods.

1. The original one was fabricated at the divine command (Exod. xxx, 18) of brass (*copper*, נְחֹשֶׁת, see Bähr, *Symbolik*, i, 484, 485; Michaelis, *Soc. Gött. comment.* iv; Umbreit, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1843, p. 157), out of the metal mirrors which the women brought from Egypt (Exod. xxxviii, 8). The notion held by some Jewish writers, and reproduced by Franzius, Bähr (*Symb.* i, 484), and others, founded on the omission of the word "women," that the brazen vessel, being polished, served as a mirror to the Levites, is untenable. (See the parallel passage, 1 Sam. ii, 22, where נָשִׁים, γυναικῶν, is inserted; Gesenius on the prep. ב, p. 172; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* pt. i, c. 1, § 19; Glassius, *Phil. Sacr.* i, 580, ed. Dathe; Lightfoot, *Descr. Templ.* c. 37, 1; Jennings, *Jew. Antiq.* p. 302; Knöbel, *Kurtzg. Exeg. Handb.* Exod. xxxviii; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* iii, 15; ii, 156, ed. Mangey.) Its size and shape are not given, but it is thought to have been circular. It contained water wherewith the priests were to wash their hands and their feet whenever they entered the tabernacle, or came near to the altar to minister (Exod. xl, 32). It stood in the court between the altar and the door of the tabernacle, and, according to Jewish tradition, a little to the south (Exod. xxx, 19, 21; Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* pt. i, ch. iv, 9; Clemens, *De Labro Æneo*, iii, 9; ap. Ugolini *Thes.* xix). It rested on a basis (כֵּן, *ken*, Sept. βάσις), i. e. a foot, though by some explained to be a cover (Clemens, *ibid.* c. iii, 5), of copper or brass, which was likewise made from the same mirrors of the women who assembled at the door of the tabernacle court (Exod. xxxviii, 8). This "foot" seems, from the distinct mention constantly made of it, to have been something more than a mere stand or support. Probably it formed a lower basin to catch the water which flowed, through taps or otherwise, from the laver. The priests could not have washed in the laver itself, as all the water would have been

thereby defiled, and so would have had to be renewed for each ablution. The Orientals, in their washings, make use of a vessel with a long spout, and wash at the stream which issues from thence, the waste water being received in a basin which is placed underneath. See ABLUTION. It has therefore been suggested that they held their hands and feet under streams that flowed from the laver, and that the "foot" caught the water that fell. As no mention is made of a vessel whereat to wash the parts of the victims offered in sacrifice, it is presumed that the laver served this purpose also. The Jewish commentators state (perhaps referring, however, to the later vessels in the Temple) that any kind of water might be used for the laver, but that the water must be changed every day. They also mention that ablution before entering the tabernacle was in no case dispensed with. A man might be perfectly clean, might be quite free from any ceremonial impurity, and might even have washed his hands and feet before he left home, but still he could by no means enter the tabernacle without previous ablution at the laver. "In the account of the offering by the woman suspected of adultery there is mention made of 'holy water' mixed with dust from the floor of the tabernacle, which the woman was to drink according to certain rites (Numb. v, 17). Most probably this was water taken from the laver. Perhaps the same should be said of the 'water of purifying' (Numb. viii, 7), which was sprinkled on the Levites on occasion of their consecration to the service of the Lord in the tabernacle." Like the other vessels belonging to the tabernacle, the laver was, together with its "foot," consecrated with oil (Lev. viii, 10, 11). No mention is found in the Hebrew text of the mode of transporting it, but in Numb. iv, 14 a passage is added in the Sept., agreeing with the Samaritan Pent. and the Samaritan version, which prescribes the method of packing it, viz. in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. See TABERNACLE.

2. In the Temple of Solomon, when the number of both priests and victims had greatly increased, *ten* lavers were used for the sacrifices, and the molten sea for the personal ablutions of the priests (2 Chron. iv, 6). These lavers are more minutely described than that of the tabernacle. These likewise were of copper ("brass"), raised on bases (מְכֹנוֹת, from כּוּן, to "stand upright," Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 665, 670, Sept. Græcizes *μεχωνώθ*, Vulg. *bases*) (1 Kings vii, 27, 39), five on the north and south sides respectively of the court of the priests. They were used for washing the animals to be offered in burnt-offerings (2 Chron. iv, 6). Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 3, 6) gives no distinct account of their form. Ahaz mutilated the laver, and removed it from its base (2 Kings xvi, 17). Whether Hezekiah restored the parts cut off is not stated, but in the account of the articles taken by the Chaldæans from the Temple only the bases are mentioned (2 Kings xxv, 16; Jer. lii, 17; Josephus omits even these, *Ant.* x, 8, 5).

"The dimensions of the bases, with the lavers, as given in the Hebrew text, are four cubits in length and breadth, and three in height. The Sept. gives 4 by 4, and 6 in height. Josephus, who appears to have followed a various reading of the Sept., makes them five in length, four in width, and six in height (1 Kings vii, 28; Thenius, ad loc.; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 3, 3). There were to each four wheels of one and a half cubit in diameter, with spokes, etc., all cast in one piece. The principal parts requiring explanation may be thus enumerated: (*a*) 'Borders' (מְסִגְּרוֹת, Sept. *συγκλείσματα*, Vulgate *sculpturæ*), probably panels. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 938) supposes these to have been ornaments like square shields, with engraved work. (*b*) 'Ledges' (שְׁלַבִּים, *ἐξεχόμενα*, *juncturæ*, from שָׁלַב, 'to cut in notches,' Gesenius, p. 1411), joints in corners of bases or fillets covering joints. (*c*) 'Additions' (לִיוֹת, from לָוָה, 'to twine,' Gesenius, p. 746; *χῶραι*, *lora*, whence Thenius suggests *λῶροι* or *λῶρα* as the true reading), probably festoons; Lightfoot translates 'margines oblique descendentes.' (*d*) 'Plates' (סְרָנִים, *προέχοντα*, *axes*, Gesenius, p. 972; Lightfoot, *massæ æreæ tetragonæ*), probably axles, cast in the same piece as the wheels. (*e*) 'Undersetters' (כְּתֵפוֹת, *ὠμίαι*, *humeruli*, Gesen. p. 724), either the naves of the wheels, or a sort of handles for moving the whole machine; Lightfoot renders 'columnæ fulcientes lavacrum.' (*f*) 'Naves' (חִשּׁוּרִים, *modioli*). (*g*) 'Spokes' (חִשֻּׁקִים, *radii;* the two words combined in the Sept. *ἡ πραγματεία*, Gesen. p. 536; Schleusner, *Lex. V. T. πραγμ.*). (*h*) 'Felloes' (גַּבִּים, *νῶτοι*, *canthi*, Gesen. p. 256). (*i*) 'Chapiter' (כֹּתֶרֶת, *κεφαλίς*, *summitas*, Gesen. p. 725), perhaps the rim of the circular opening ('mouth,' 1 Kings vii, 31) in the convex top. (*k*) A 'round compass' (סֶבִיב עֲגֹל, Gesenius, p. 935, 989, *στρόγγυλον κύκλῳ*; *rotunditas*), perhaps the convex roof of the base. To these parts Josephus adds chains, which may probably be the festoons above mentioned (*Ant.* viii, 3, 6).



Conjectural Diagram of the Laver. (After Thenius.)
a, borders; *b*, ledges; *c*, additions; *d*, plates; *e*, undersetters; *f*, naves; *g*, spokes; *h*, felloes; *i*, chapiter; *k*, round compass.

"Thenius, with whom Keil in the main agrees, both of them differing from Ewald, in a minute examination of the whole passage, but not without some transposition, chiefly of the greater part of ver. 31 to ver. 35, deduces a construction of the bases and lavers, which seems fairly to reconcile the very great difficulties of the subject. Following chiefly his description, we may suppose the base to have been a quadrangular hollow frame, connected at its corners by pilasters (ledges), and moved by four wheels or high castors, one at each corner, with handles (plates) for drawing the machine. The sides of this frame were divided into three vertical panels or compartments (borders), ornamented with bass-reliefs of lions, oxen, and cherubim. The top of the base was convex, with a circular opening of one and a half cubit diameter. The top itself was covered with engraved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees or branches. The height of the convex top from the upper plane of the base was one and a half cubit, and the space between this top and the lower surface of the laver one and a

half cubit more. The laver rested on supports (undersetters) rising from the four corners of the base. Each laver contained 40 'baths' (Gr. χόας), or about 300 gallons. Its dimensions, therefore, to be in proportion to seven feet (four cubits, ver. 38) in diameter, must have been about thirty inches in depth. The great height of the whole machine was doubtless in order to bring it near the height of the altar (2 Chron. iv, 1; Arias Montanus, *De Templi Fabrica*, in *Crit. Sac.* viii, 626, Lightfoot, *Descr. Temnli*, c. xxxvii. 3, vol. i, p. 646; Thenius, in *Kurzg. Exeg. Handb.* on 1 Kings vii, and Append. p. 41; Ewald, *Geschichte*, iii, 313; Keil, *Handb. der Bibl. Arch.* § 24, p. 128, 129)." Mr. Paine, in his work on *Solomon's Temple* (plate xii, fig. 5), gives the following conjectural view of one of these lavers, which is more compact, less likely to be overturned, and more closely analogous to the form of the great or molten sea



Form of the "Laver" according to Paine.

(q. v.). Yet in neither of these figures does the "base," with its chest-like form and inconvenient height, seem at all adapted to the above purpose of catching the waste water, or of aiding in any way the ablutions, unless the laver itself were furnished with a spout, and the box below formed a tank with openings on the top for receiving the stream after it had served its cleansing purpose. The portable form was doubtless for convenience of replenishing and emptying.

3. In the second Temple there appears to have been only one laver of brass (Mishna, *Middoth*, iii, 6), with twelve instead of two stop-cocks, and a machine for raising water and filling it (Mishna, *Tamid*, iii, 8; compare i, 4; *Zoma*, iii, 10). Of its size or shape we have no information, but it was probably like those of Solomon's Temple. Josephus, in his description of Herod's Temple (*War*, v, 5), scarcely alludes to this laver. See H. G. Clemens, *De labro aeneo* (Utr. 1725; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xix); Lamy, *De tabernac. fœd.* iii, 6, 7, p. 460 sq., and table 16; Vilalpandus, *On Ezek.* ii, p. 492; L'Empereur in Surenhusius's *Mischna*, v, 360; Schaacht, *Animadv. ad Iken. antiq.* p. 297 sq.; Züllig, *Cherubimwagen*, p. 50 sq.; Grüneisen, in the *Stuttgart. Kunstbl.* 1834, No. 5 sq.; A. Clants, *Scription. biblic.* (Groningen, 1733), p. 65; Scacchi, *Myroth. sacr. elæochrism.* p. 41; and the various commentators on the passages of Scripture, especially Rosenmüller, and Hengstenberg's *Pentat.* ii, 133. See Temple.

Laverty, William W., an American Presbyterian minister, was born in Union County, Pa., June 15, 1828; was educated at Washington College, Pa. (class of 1849), and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In the fall of 1853 he was ordained and installed pastor of Big Spring and New Cumberland churches, Ohio. In connection with his ministerial duties he also filled the position of principal of Hagerstown Academy. In 1857 he accepted the pastorate of the Wellsville and East Liverpool churches, Ohio, and in the spring of 1864 he was elected principal of Mongolia Academy, at Morgantown, West Va., where he died Oct. 28, 1865. Mr. Laverty was especially adapted to the training and instruction of youth, and he always devoted himself with untiring assiduity to whatever he undertook.—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1866, p. 167.

Lavialle, Pierre Joseph, a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Mauriac, France, in 1820, and received both a collegiate and theological education in the universities of his native city. In 1843 he came to the United States, and was ordained priest the following year. After a year's service in New York City he was made professor of theology in St. Mary's College, Lebanon, Ky., and in 1855 was appointed president of the same institution. In 1859 he declined the proffered bishopric of Savannah, but in 1865 accepted that of Louisville. He died May 11, 1867. Bishop Lavialle was a man of great zeal and energy. He founded several educational and benevolent institutions in his diocese. His character was such as to win him the esteem not only of his own people, but of the citizens generally.—*American Annual Cyclopœdia*, 1867, p. 428.

Lavington, George, an English prelate, noted for his antagonism to Wesley and Whitefield, was born in Wiltshire in 1683; became canon of St. Paul's, London, in 1732, and in 1747 was promoted to the bishopric of Exeter. Shortly after his elevation to the episcopal dignity, Lavington, who had from the first looked unfavorably upon the Methodistic movement, found an opportunity to exert his episcopal jurisdiction upon one of the ministers of his diocese, the Rev. Mr. Thompson, "the tolerant and zealous rector of St. Gennis," who had dared to exert himself in behalf of a more genuine and active religious spirit among the people of his own parish, and the community in its neighborhood. In this instance the bishop failed utterly of cutting short the evangelizing efforts of an earnest and zealous servant of God, and he gave vent to his feelings by a public attack on the originators of the whole movement—Wesley and Whitefield—in a pamphlet entitled *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared* (London, 1749, 3 parts, 8vo), in which he "exaggerated their real faults, and imputed to them many that were monstrous fictions." The attack was at once taken up by both the persons assailed in the pamphlet, and from the position assumed by Wesley in his answer many of the English Church divines have plucked an arrow in defence of their own Church in Wesley's day. Southey was the first to censure Wesley for the use of intemperate language in his reply to Lavington, but there is really no reason for any one, however anxious to shield Mr. Wesley, to defend his harsh treatment of the bishop, when we consider that the provocation was great indeed. Mr. Tyerman, Wesley's latest biographer (London, 1871, 3 vols. 8vo; N. York, Harper and Brothers, 3 vols. 8vo, 1872), certainly goes too far when he attempts to clear Wesley's skirts by saying that Lavington "deserved all he got," and that he was "a buffooning bishop" and "a cowardly calumniator" (ii, 94, 153). But there is no justice in the attempts of modern English writers to praise bishop Lavington at the expense of Mr. Wesley. The bishop made a most undignified assault on men who were engaged in a work approved and owned of God, and, as his later conduct towards lady Huntingdon and Wesley himself proves, retreated from the position he had taken, "apologizing to her ladyship [Huntingdon] and the Messrs. Whitefield and Wesley for the harsh and unjust censures which he was led to pass on them," and even requested them to "accept his unfeigned regret at having unjustly wounded their feelings, and exposed them to the odium of the world" (*Lady Huntingdon's Life and Times*, ch. vii). How in the face of this position, however hypocritical on the part of Lavington, any English writers can afford to defend bishop Lavington's position, as has been done lately in the *North British Review* (Jan. 1871), seems to us still more

strange when we take into consideration the attitude of Wesley on his last meeting with bishop Lavington: "I was well pleased to partake of the Lord's Supper with my old opponent, bishop Lavington. Oh, may we sit down together in the kingdom of our Father!" recorded by Wesley himself in his journal of 1762. Bishop Lavington, indeed, seems to have been fond of polemical extravagances, for a few years after his attack on Methodism he wrote *The Moravians compared and detected* (1755, 8vo). Besides these two attacks upon fellow-Christians, he published some *occasional Sermons*. He died in 1762. See, besides the references already made, Polwhele, *History of Devonshire*, i, 313; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 247, 306; *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1871, p. 306 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lavipedium. See FOOT-WASHING.

Law is usually defined as *a rule of action;* it is more properly a precept or command coming from a superior authority, which an inferior is bound to obey. Such laws emanate from the king or legislative body of a nation. Such enactments of "the powers that be" are recognised in Scripture as resting upon the ultimate authority of the divine Lawgiver (Rom. xiii, 1). We propose in this article to discuss only the various distinctions or applications of the term, in an ethical sense, reserving for a separate place the consideration of the Mosaic law, in its various aspects, ceremonial, moral, and civil.

I. *Classification of Laws as to their interior Nature.*—1. "*Penal Laws*" are such as have some penalty to enforce them. All the laws of God are and cannot but be penal, because every breach of his law is sin, and meritorious of punishment.

2. "*Directing Laws*" are prescriptions or maxims without any punishment annexed to them.

3. "*Positive Laws*" are precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given. Thus, in the state of innocence, God gave the law of the Sabbath; of abstinence from the fruit of the tree of knowledge, etc. In childhood most of the parental commands are necessarily of this nature, owing to the incapacity of the child to understand the grounds of their inculcation.

II. *Certain Special Uses of the Term.*—1. "*Law of Honor*" is a system of rules constructed by people of fashion, and calculated to facilitate their intercourse with one another, and for no other purpose. Consequently nothing is adverted to by the law of honor but what tends to incommode this intercourse. Hence this law only prescribes and regulates the duties betwixt equals, omitting such as relate to the Supreme Being, as well as those which we owe to our inferiors, and in most instances is favorable to the licentious indulgence of the natural passions. Thus it allows of fornication, adultery, drunkenness, prodigality, duelling, and of revenge in the extreme, and lays no stress upon the virtues opposite to these.

2. "*Laws of Nations*" are those rules which, by a tacit consent, are agreed upon among all communities, at least among those who are reckoned the polite and humanized part of mankind.

3. "*Laws of Nature.*"—"The word law is sometimes also employed in order to express not only the moral connection between free agents of an inferior, and others of a superior power, but also in order to express the *nexus causalis*, the connection between cause and effect in inanimate nature. However, the expression *law of nature, lex naturæ*, is improper and figurative. The term law implies, in its strict sense, *spontaneity*, or the power of deciding between right and wrong, and of choosing between good and evil, as well on the part of the lawgiver as on the part of those who have to regulate their conduct according to his dictates" (Kitto, s. v.). Moreover, the powers of nature, which these laws are conceived as representing, are nothing in reality but the power of God exerted in these directions. Hence these laws may at any time be suspended by God when the higher interests of his spiritual kingdom require. Viewed in this light, miracles not only become possible, but even probable for the furtherance of the divine economy of salvation. (See Bushell, *Nature and the Supernatural.*) See MIRACLE.

III. *Forms of the Divine Law.*—The manner in which God governs rational creatures is by a law, as the rule of their obedience to him, and this is what we call God's moral government of the world. At their very creation he placed all intelligences under such a system. Thus he gave a law to *angels*, which some of them have kept, and have been confirmed in a state of obedience to it; but which others broke, and thereby plunged themselves into destruction and misery. In like manner he also gave a law to *Adam*, which was in the form of a covenant, and in which Adam stood as a covenant head to all his posterity (Rom. v). But our first parents soon violated that law, and fell from a state of innocence to a state of sin and misery (Hos. vi, 7). See FALL.

1. The "*Law of Nature*" is the will of God relating to human actions, grounded in the moral difference of things, and, because discoverable by natural light, obligatory upon all mankind (Rom. i, 20; ii, 14, 15). This law is coeval with the human race, binding all over the globe, and at all times; yet, through the corruption of reason, it is insufficient to lead us to happiness, and utterly unable to acquaint us how sin is to be forgiven, without the assistance of revelation. This law is that generally designated by the term *conscience*, which is in strictness a capacity of being affected by the moral relations of actions; in other words, merely a *sense of right and wrong*. It is the judgment which intellectually determines the moral quality of an act, and this always by a comparison with some assumed standard. With those who have a revelation, this, of course, is the test; with others, education, tradition, or caprice. Hence the importance of a trained conscience, not only for the purpose of cultivating its susceptibility to a high degree of sensitiveness and authority, but also in order to correct the judgment and furnish it a just basis of decision. A perverted or misled conscience is scarcely less disastrous than a hard or blind one. History is full of the miseries and mischiefs occasioned by a misguided moral sense.

2. "*Ceremonial Law*" is that which prescribes the rites of worship under the Old Testament. These rites were typical of Christ, and were obligatory only till Christ had finished his work, and began to erect his Gospel Church (Heb. vii, 9, 11; x, 1; Eph. ii, 16; Col. ii, 14; Gal. v, 2, 3).

3. "*Judicial Law*" was that which directed the policy of the Jewish nation, under the peculiar dominion of God as their supreme magistrate, and never, except in things relating to moral equity, was binding on any but the Hebrew nation.

4. "*Moral Law*" is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai, to confirm the original law of nature, and correct men's mistakes concerning the demands of it. It is denominated perfect (Psa. xix, 7), perpetual (Matt. v, 17, 18), holy (Rom. vii, 12), good (Rom. vii, 12), spiritual (Rom. vii, 14), exceeding broad (Psa. cxix, 96). Some deny that it is a rule of conduct to believers under the Gospel dispensation; but it is easy to see the futility of such an idea; for, as a transcript of the mind of God, it must be the criterion of moral good and evil. It is also given for that very purpose, that we may see our duty, and abstain from everything derogatory to the divine glory. It affords us grand ideas of the holiness and purity of God; without attention to it, we can have no knowledge of sin. Christ himself came, not to destroy, but to fulfil it; and though we cannot do as he did, yet we are commanded to follow his example. Love to God is the end of the moral law as well as the end of the Gospel. By the law, also, we are led to see the nature of holiness and our own depravity, and learn to be humbled under a sense of our

imperfection. We are not under it, however, as a covenant of works (Gal. iii, 13), or as a source of terror (Rom. viii, 1), although we must abide by it, together with the whole perceptive word of God, as the rule of our conduct (Rom. iii, 31; vii). See LAW OF MOSES.

IV. *Scriptural Uses of the Law.*—The word "law" (תּוֹרָה, *torah'*, *νόμος*) is properly used, in Scripture as elsewhere, to express a definite commandment laid down by any recognised authority. The commandment may be general or (as in Lev. vi, 9, 14, etc., "the law of the burnt-offering," etc.) particular in its bearing, the authority either human or divine. It is extended to prescriptions respecting sanitary or purificatory arrangements ("the law of her that has been in childbed," or of those that have had the leprosy, Lev. xiv, 2), or even to an architectural design ("the law of the house," Ezek. xliii, 12): so in Rom. vii, 2, "the law of the husband" is his authority over his wife. But when the word is used with the article, and without any words of limitation, it refers to the expressed will of God, and, in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch, of which it forms the chief portion.

The Hebrew word (derived from the root יָרָה, *yarah'*, "to point out," and so "to direct and lead") lays more stress on its moral authority, as teaching the truth, and guiding in the right way; the Greek *νόμος* (from *νέμω*, "to assign or appoint") on its constraining power, as imposed and enforced by a recognised authority. But in either case it is a commandment proceeding from without, and distinguished from the free action of its subjects, although not necessarily opposed thereto.

The sense of the word, however, extends its scope, and assumes a more abstract character in the writings of the apostle Paul. *Νόμος*, when used by him with the article, still refers in general to the law of Moses; but when used without the article, so as to embrace any manifestation of "law," it includes all powers which act on the will of man by compulsion, or by the pressure of external motives, whether their commands be or be not expressed in definite forms. This is seen in the constant opposition of *ἔργα νόμου* ("works done under the constraint of law") to faith, or "works of faith," that is, works done freely by the internal influence of faith. A still more remarkable use of the word is found in Rom. vii, 23, where the power of evil over the will, arising from the corruption of man, is spoken of as a "law of sin," that is, an unnatural tyranny proceeding from an evil power without. The same apostle even uses the term "law" to denote the Christian dispensation in contrast with that of Moses (James i, 25; ii, 12; iv, 11; comp. Rom. x, 4; Heb. vii, 12; x, 1); also for the laws or precepts established by the Gospel (Rom. xiii, 8, 10; Gal. vi, 2; v, 23).

The occasional use of the word "law" (as in Rom. iii, 27, "law of faith," in vii, 23, "law of my mind" [*τοῦ νόος*]; in viii, 2, "law of the spirit of life;" and in James i, 25; ii, 12, "a perfect law, the law of liberty") to denote an *internal* principle of action does not really militate against the general rule. For in each case it will be seen that such principle is spoken of in contrast with some formal law, and the word "law" is consequently applied to it "improperly," in order to mark this opposition, the qualifying words which follow guarding against any danger of misapprehension of its real character.

It should also be noticed that the title "the law" is occasionally used loosely to refer to the whole of the Old Testament (as in John x, 34, referring to Psa. lxxxii, 6; in John xv, 25, referring to Psa. xxxv, 19; and in 1 Cor. xiv, 21, referring to Isa. xxviii, 11, 12). This usage is probably due, not only to desire of brevity and to the natural prominence of the Pentateuch, but also to the predominance in the older covenant (when considered separately from the new, for which it was the preparation) of an external and legal character.—Smith, s. v.

It should be noted, however, that *νόμος* very often stands, even when without the article, for the Mosaic law, the term in that sense being so well known as not to be liable to be misunderstood. See ARTICLE, GREEK.

LAW OF MOSES (תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה) signifies the whole body of Mosaic legislation (1 Kings ii, 3; 2 Kings xxiii, 25; Ezra iii, 2), *the law given by Moses*, which, in reference to its divine origin, is called תּוֹרַת יְהוָה, *the law of Jehovah* (Psa. xix, 8; xxxvii, 31; Isa. v, 24; xxx, 9). In the latter sense it is called, by way of eminence, הַתּוֹרָה, THE *law* (Deut. i, 5; iv, 8, 44; xvii, 18, 19. xxvii, 3, 8). When not so much the substance of legislation, but rather the external written code in which it is contained is meant, the following terms are employed: "Book of the Law of Moses" (2 Kings xiv, 6; Isa. viii, 31; xxiii, 6); "Book of the Law of the Lord," or "Book of the Law of God" (Josh. xxiv, 26). "Judgments," "statutes," "testimonies," etc., are the various precepts contained in the law. In the present article (which has been carefully compiled from the most recent codifications, compared with the sacred text, and which strenuously maintains the perpetual obligation of the ten commandments), we propose to give a brief analysis of its substance, to point out its main principles, and to explain the position which it occupies in the progress of divine revelation. For the history of its delivery, see MOSES; EXODE; for its authenticity, see PENTATEUCH; for its particular ordinances, see each in its alphabetical place.

The law is especially embodied in the last four books of the Pentateuch. In Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers there is perceptible some arrangement of the various precepts, although they are not brought into a system. In Deuteronomy the law or legislation contained in the three preceding books is repeated with slight modifications. See each of these books.

The Jews assert that, besides the *written law*, תורה שבכתב, *νόμος ἔγγραφος*, which may be translated into other languages, and which is contained in the Pentateuch, there was communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai an *oral law*, תורה שבעל פה, *νόμος ἄγραφος*, which was subsequently written down, together with many rabbinical observations, and is contained in the twelve folio volumes which now constitute the Talmud, and which the Jews assert cannot be, or at least ought not to be, translated. See TALMUD.

The Rabbins divide the whole Mosaic law into 613 precepts, of which 248 are affirmative and 365 negative. The number of the affirmative precepts corresponds to the 248 members of which, according to rabbinical anatomy, the whole human body consists. The number of the negative precepts corresponds to the 365 days of the solar year, or, according to the rabbinical work *Brandspiegel* (which has been published in Jewish German at Cracow and in other places), the negative precepts agree in number with the 365 veins which, they say, are found in the human body. Hence their logic concludes that if on each day each member of the human body keeps one affirmative precept and abstains from one thing forbidden, the whole law, and not the Decalogue alone, is kept. The whole law is sometimes called by Jewish writers *Theriog*, which word is formed from the Hebrew letters that are employed to express the number 613, viz. 400 = ת + 200 = ר + 10 = י + 3 = ג. Hence 613 = תריג *theriog*. Women are subject to the negative precepts or prohibitions only, and not to the affirmative precepts or injunctions. This exception arises partly from their nature, and partly from their being subject to the authority of husbands. According to some rabbinical statements women are subject to 100 precepts only, of which 64 are negative and 36 affirmative. The number 613 corresponds also to the number of letters in the Decalogue. Others are inclined to find that there are 620 precepts according to the numerical value of the word כתר = crown, viz., 400 = ת + 200 = ר + 20 = כ; and others, again, observe that the numerical value of the let-

ters תורה, *law*, amounts only to 611. The first in order of these laws is found in Gen. i, 27, פרו ורבו, *be fruitful and multiply*. The transgressor of this law is, according to Rabbi Eliezer, as wicked as a murderer. He who is still unmarried at twenty years of age is a transgressor; and the law is binding upon every man, according to Schamai, until he has two sons; or, according to Hillel, one son and one daughter (compare *Juris Hebræorum leges*, ductu Rabbi Levi Barzelonitæ, auctore J. Henrico Hottinger). See CABALA.

I. *The Law with reference to the Past History of the People.*—1. Here it is all-important, for the proper understanding of the law, to remember its *entire dependence on the Abrahamic Covenant*, and its adaptation thereto (see Gal. iii, 17–24). That covenant had a twofold character. It contained the "spiritual promise" of the Messiah, which was given to the Jews as representatives of the whole human race, and as guardians of a treasure in which "all families of the earth should be blessed." This would prepare the Jewish nation to be the centre of the unity of all mankind. But it contained also the temporal promises subsidiary to the former, and requisite in order to preserve intact the nation, through which the race of man should be educated and prepared for the coming of the Redeemer. These promises were special, given distinctively to the Jews as a nation, and calculated to separate them from other nations of the earth. It follows that there should be in the law a corresponding duality of nature. There would be much in it peculiar to the Jews, local, special, and transitory; but the fundamental principles on which it was based must be universal, because expressing the will of an unchanging God, and springing from relations to him inherent in human nature, and therefore perpetual and universal in their application.

2. The nature of this *relation of the law to the promise* is clearly pointed out. The belief in God as the Redeemer of man, and the hope of his manifestation as such in the person of the Messiah, involved the belief that the spiritual power must be superior to all carnal obstructions, and that there was in man a spiritual element which could rule his life by communion with a Spirit from above. But it involved also the idea of an antagonistic power of evil, from which man was to be redeemed, existing in each individual, and existing also in the world at large. The promise was the witness of the one truth, the law was the declaration of the other. It was "added because of transgressions." In the individual it stood between his better and his worse self, in the world, between the Jewish nation as the witness of the spiritual promise, and the heathendom which groaned under the power of the flesh. It was intended, by the gift of guidance and the pressure of motives, to strengthen the weakness of good, while it curbed directly the power of evil. It followed inevitably that, in the individual, it assumed somewhat of a coercive, and, as between Israel and the world, somewhat of an antagonistic and isolating character; and hence that, viewed without reference to the promise (as was the case with the later Jews), it might actually become a hinderance to the true revelation of God, and to the mission for which the nation had been made a "chosen people."

3. Nor is it less essential to note the *period of the history* at which it was given. It marked and determined the transition of Israel from the condition of a tribe to that of a nation, and its definite assumption of a distinct position and office in the history of the world. It is on no unreal metaphor that we base the well-known analogy between the stages of individual life and those of national or universal existence. In Israel the patriarchal time was that of childhood, ruled chiefly through the affections and the power of natural relationship, with rules few, simple, and unsystematic. The national period was that of youth, in which this indirect teaching and influence gives place to definite assertions of right and responsibility, and to a system of distinct commandments, needed to control its vigorous and impulsive action. The fifty days of their wandering alone with God in the silence of the wilderness represent that awakening to the difficulty, the responsibility, and the nobleness of life, which marks the "putting away of childish things." The law is the sign and the seal of such an awakening.

4. Yet, though new in its general conception, it was probably *not wholly new in its materials*. Neither in his physical nor his spiritual providence does God proceed *per saltum*. There must necessarily have been, before the law, commandments and revelations of a fragmentary character, under which Israel had hitherto grown up. Indications of such are easily found, both of a ceremonial and moral nature, as, for example, in the penalties against murder, adultery, and fornication (Gen. ix, 6; xxxviii, 24), in the existence of the Levirate law (Gen. xxxviii, 8), in the distinction of clean and unclean animals (Gen. viii, 20), and probably in the observance of the Sabbath (Exod. xvi, 23, 27–29). But, even without such indications, our knowledge of the existence of Israel as a distinct community in Egypt would necessitate the conclusion that it must have been guided by some laws of its own, growing out of the old patriarchal customs, which would be preserved with Oriental tenacity, and gradually becoming methodized by the progress of circumstances. Nor would it be possible for the Israelites to be in contact with an elaborate system of ritual and law, such as that which existed in Egypt, without being influenced by its general principles, and, in less degree, by its minuter details. As they approached nearer to the condition of a nation they would be more and more likely to modify their patriarchal customs by the adoption from Egypt of laws which were fitted for national existence. This being so, it is hardly conceivable that the Mosaic legislation should have embodied none of these earlier materials. It is clear, even to human wisdom, that the only constitution which can be efficient and permanent is one which has grown up slowly, and so been assimilated to the character of a people. It is the peculiar mark of legislative genius to mould by fundamental principles, and animate by a higher inspiration, materials previously existing in a cruder state. The necessity for this lies in the nature, not of the legislator, but of the subjects, and the argument, therefore, is but strengthened by the acknowledgment in the case of Moses of a divine and special inspiration. So far, therefore, as they were consistent with the objects of the Jewish law, the customs of Palestine and the laws of Egypt would doubtless be traceable in the Mosaic system.

5. In close connection with this, and almost in consequence of this reference to antiquity, we find an *accommodation of the law* to the temper and circumstances of the Israelites, to which our Lord refers in the case of divorce (Matt. xix, 7, 8) as necessarily interfering with its absolute perfection. In many cases it rather should be said to guide and modify existing usages than actually to sanction them; and the ignorance of their existence may lead to a conception of its ordinances not only erroneous, but actually the reverse of the truth. Thus the punishment of filial disobedience appears severe (Deut. xxi, 18–21); yet when we refer to the extent of parental authority in a patriarchal system, or (as at Rome) in the earlier periods of national existence, it appears more like a limitation of absolute parental authority by an appeal to the judgment of the community. The Levirate law, again, appears (see Mich. *Mos. Recht*, bk. iii, ch. vi, art. 98) to have existed in a far more general form in the early Asiatic peoples, and to have been rather limited than favored by Moses. The law of the avenger of blood is a similar instance of merciful limitation and distinction in the exercise of an immemorial usage, probably not without its value and meaning, and certainly too deep-seated to admit of any but gradual extinction. Nor is it less noticeable that the degree of prominence given to each part of the Mosaic system

has a similar reference to the period at which the nation had arrived. The ceremonial portion is marked out distinctly and with elaboration; the moral and criminal law is clearly and sternly decisive; even the civil law, so far as it relates to individuals, is systematic, because all these were called for by the past growth of the nation, and needed in order to settle and develop its resources. But the political and constitutional law is comparatively imperfect; a few leading principles are laid down, to be developed hereafter; and the law is directed rather to sanction the various powers of the state than to define and balance their operations. Thus the existing authorities of a patriarchal nature in each tribe and family are recognised, while side by side with them is established the priestly and Levitical power which was to supersede them entirely in sacerdotal, and partly also in judicial functions. The supreme civil power of a "judge," or (eventually) a king, is recognised distinctly, although only in general terms, indicating a sovereign and summary jurisdiction (Deut. xvii, 14–20); and the prophetic office, in its political as well as its moral aspect, is spoken of still more vaguely as future (Deut. xviii, 15–22). These powers, being recognised, are left, within due limits, to work out the political system of Israel, and to ascertain by experience their proper spheres of exercise. On a careful understanding of this adaptation of the law to the national growth and character of the Jews (and of a somewhat similar adaptation to their climate and physical circumstances) depends the correct appreciation of its nature, and the power of distinguishing in it what is local and temporary from that which is universal.

6. In close connection with this subject we observe also *the gradual process by which the law was revealed* to the Israelites. In Exod. xx–xxiii, in direct connection with the revelation from Mount Sinai, that which may be called the rough outline of the Mosaic law is given by God, solemnly recorded by Moses, and accepted by the people. In Exod. xxv–xxxi there is a similar outline of the Mosaic ceremonial. On the basis of these it may be conceived that the fabric of the Mosaic system gradually grew up under the requirements of the time. In certain cases, indeed (as *e. g.*, in Lev. x, 1, 2, compared with 8–11; Lev. xxiv, 11–16; Numb. ix, 6–12, xv, 32–41; xxvii, 1–11, compared with xxxvi, 1–12), we actually see how general rules, civil, criminal, and ceremonial, originated in special circumstances; and the unconnected nature of the records of laws in the earlier books suggests the idea that this method of legislation extended to many other cases.

The first revelation of the law in anything like a perfect form is found in the book of Deuteronomy, at a period when the people, educated to freedom and national responsibility, were prepared to receive it, and carry it with them to the land which was now prepared for them. It is distinguished by its systematic character and its reference to first principles; for probably even by Moses himself, certainly by the people, the law had not before this been recognised in all its essential characteristics; and to it we naturally refer in attempting to analyze its various parts. See DEUTERONOMY. Yet even then the revelation was not final; it was the duty of the prophets to amend and explain it in special points (as in the well-known example in Ezek. xviii), and to bring out more clearly its great principles, as distinguished from the external rules in which they were embodied; for in this way, as in others, they prepared the way of Him who "came to fulfil" (πληρῶσαι) the law of old time.

II. *Analysis of its Contents.*—It is customary to divide the law into the Moral, the Ceremonial, and the Political. But this division, although valuable if considered as a distinction merely subjective (as enabling us, that is, to conceive the objects of law, dealing as it does with man in his social, political, and religious capacity), is wholly imaginary if regarded as an objective separation of various classes of laws. Any single ordinance might have at once a moral, a ceremonial, and a political bearing; and in fact, although in particular cases one or other of these aspects predominated, yet the whole principle of the Mosaic institutions is to obliterate any such supposed separation of laws, and refer all to first principles, depending on the will of God and the nature of man. In giving an analysis of the substance of the law, it will probably be better to treat it, as any other system of laws is usually treated, by dividing it into (1) Civil; (2) Criminal; (3) Judicial and Constitutional; (4) Ecclesiastical and Ceremonial.

(I.) LAWS CIVIL.

1. OF PERSONS.

(A) *Father and Son.*

The power of a Father to be held sacred; cursing, or smiting (Exod. xxi, 15, 17; Lev. xx, 9), or stubborn and wilful disobedience to be considered capital crimes. But uncontrolled power of life and death was apparently refused to the father, and vested only in the congregation (Deut. xxi, 18–21).

Right of the first-born to a double portion of the inheritance not to be set aside by partiality (Deut. xxi, 15–17). For an example of the authority of the first-born, see 1 Sam. xx, 29 ("My brother, he hath commanded me to be there").

Inheritance by Daughters to be allowed in default of sons, provided (Numb. xxvii, 6–8; comp. xxxvi) that heiresses married in their own tribe.

Daughters unmarried to be entirely dependent on their father (Numb. xxx, 3–5).

(B) *Husband and Wife.*

The power of a Husband to be so great that a wife could never be *sui juris*, or enter independently into any engagement, even before God (Numb. xxx, 6–15). A widow or divorced wife became independent, and did not again fall under her father's power (ver. 9).

Divorce (for uncleanness) allowed, but to be formal and irrevocable (Deut. xxiv, 1–4).

Marriage within certain degrees forbidden (Lev. xviii, etc.).

A Slave Wife, whether bought or captive, not to be actual property, nor to be sold; if ill treated, to be *ipso facto* free (Exod. xxi, 7–9; Deut. xxi, 10–14).

Slander against a wife's virginity to be punished by fine, and by deprival of power of divorce; on the other hand, ante-connubial uncleanness in her to be punished by death (Deut. xxii, 13–21).

The raising up of seed (Levirate law) a formal right to be claimed by the widow, under pain of infamy, with a view to preservation of families (Deut. xxv, 5–10).

(C) *Master and Slave.*

Power of Master so far limited that death under actual chastisement was punishable (Exod. xxi, 20); and maiming was to give liberty *ipso facto* (ver. 26, 27).

The Hebrew Slave to be freed at the sabbatical year, and provided with necessaries (his wife and children to go with him only if they came to his master with him), unless by his own formal act he consented to be a perpetual slave (Exod. xxi, 1–6; Deut. xv, 12–18). In any case (it would seem) to be freed at the jubilee (Lev. xxv, 10), with his children. If sold to a resident alien, to be always redeemable, at a price proportional to the distance of the jubilee (Lev. xxv, 47–54).

Foreign Slaves to be held and inherited as property forever (Lev. xxv, 45, 46); and fugitive slaves from foreign nations not to be given up (Deut. xxiii, 15). See SLAVE.

(D) *Foreigners.*

They seem never to have been *sui juris*, or able to protect themselves, and accordingly protection and kindness towards them are enjoined as a sacred duty (Exod. xxii, 21; Lev. xix, 33, 34).

2. LAW OF THINGS.

(A) *Laws of Land (and Property).*

(1) *All Land to be the property of God alone*, and its holders to be deemed His tenants (Lev. xxv, 23).

(2) *All sold Land* therefore to *return to its original owners* at the jubilee, and the price of sale to be calculated accordingly; and redemption on equitable terms to be allowed at all times (xxv, 25–27).

A House sold to be redeemable within a year; and, if not redeemed, to pass away altogether (xxv, 29, 30).

But the Houses of the Levites, or those in unwalled villages, to be redeemable at all times, in the same way as land; and the Levitical suburbs to be inalienable (xxv, 31–34).

(3) *Land or Houses sanctified*, or tithes, or unclean firstlings, to be capable of being redeemed at six-fifths value (calculated according to the distance from the jubilee year by the priest); if devoted by the owner and unredeemed, to be hallowed at the jubilee forever, and given to the priests; if only by a possessor, to return to the owner at the jubilee (Lev. xxvii, 14–34).

(4) *Inheritance:*



(B) *Laws of Debt.*

(1) *All Debts* (to an Israelite) to be released at the seventh (sabbatical) year; a blessing promised to obedience, and a curse on refusal to lend (Deut. xv, 1–11).

(2) *Interest* (from Israelites) not to be taken (Exod. xxii, 25–27; Deut. xxiii, 19, 20).

(3) *Pledges* not to be insolently or ruinously exacted (Deut. xxiv, 6, 10–13, 17, 18).

(c) *Taxation.*

(1) *Census-money*, a poll-tax (of a half shekel), to be paid for *the service of the tabernacle* (Exod. xxx, 12–16).

All spoil in war to be halved; of the combatant's half, one five hundredth, of the people's, one fiftieth, to be paid for a "heave-offering" to Jehovah.

(2) *Tithes:*

(*a*) *Tithes of all produce* to be given for maintenance of the Levites (Numb. xviii, 20–24).

(Of this, one tenth to be paid as a heave-offering [for maintenance of the priests] [Numb. xviii, 24–32].)

(*b*) *Second Tithe* to be bestowed in religious feasting and charity, either at the Holy Place, or every third year at home (?) (Deut. xiv, 22–28).

(*c*) *First-fruits* of corn, wine, and oil (at least one sixtieth, generally one fortieth, for the priests) to be offered at Jerusalem, with a solemn declaration of dependence on God, the King of Israel (Deut. xxvi, 1–15; Numb. xviii, 12, 13).

Firstlings of clean beasts; the redemption-money (5 shekels) of man, and (½ shekel, or 1 shekel) of unclean beasts, to be given to the priests after sacrifice (Numb. xviii, 15–18).

(3) *Poor-Laws:*

(*a*) *Gleanings* (in field or vineyard) to be a legal right of the poor (Lev. xix, 9, 10; Deut. xxiv, 19–22).

(*b*) *Slight Trespass* (eating on the spot) to be allowed as legal (Deut. xxiii, 24, 25).

(*c*) *Second Tithe* (see 2, *b*) to be given in charity.

(*d*) *Wages to be paid day by day* (Deut. xxiv, 15).

(4) *Maintenance of Priests* (Numb. xviii, 8–32).

(*a*) *Tenth of Levites' Tithe.* (See 2, *a*.)

(*b*) *The heave and wave offerings* (breast and right shoulder of all peace-offerings).

(*c*) *The meat and sin offerings*, to be eaten solemnly, and only in the holy place.

(*d*) *First-fruits* and redemption money. (See 2, *c*.)

(*e*) *Price of all devoted things*, unless specially given for a sacred service. A man's service, or that of his household, to be redeemed at 50 shekels for man, 30 for woman, 20 for boy, and 10 for girl.

(II.) LAWS CRIMINAL.

1. Offences against God (of the nature of treason).

1st Command. Acknowledgment of false gods (Exod. xxii, 20), as *e. g.*, Moloch (Lev. xx, 1–5), and generally all *idolatry* (Deut. xiii; xvii, 2–5).

2d Command. *Witchcraft and false prophecy* (Exod. xxii, 18; Deut. xviii, 9–22; Lev. xix, 31).

3d Command. *Blasphemy* (Lev. xxiv, 15, 16).

4th Command. *Sabbath-breaking* (Numb. xv, 32–36).

Punishment in all cases, death by stoning. Idolatrous cities to be utterly destroyed.

2. Offences against Man.

5th Command. *Disobedience to* or cursing or smiting of *parents* (Exod. xxi, 15, 17; Lev. xx, 9; Deut. xxi, 18–21), to be punished by death by stoning, publicly adjudged and inflicted; so also of disobedience to the priests (as judges) or Supreme Judge. Comp. 1 Kings xxi, 10–14 (Naboth); 2 Chron. xxiv, 21 (Zechariah).

6th Command. (1) *Murder*, to be punished by death without sanctuary or reprieve, or satisfaction (Exod. xxi, 12, 14; Deut. xix, 11–13). Death of a slave, actually under the rod, to be punished (Exod. xxi, 20, 21).

(2) *Death by negligence*, to be punished by death (Exod. xxi, 28–30).

(3) *Accidental Homicide;* the avenger of blood to be escaped by flight to the cities of refuge till the death of the high-priest (Numb. xxxv, 9–28; Deut. iv, 41–43; xix, 4–10).

(4) *Uncertain Murder*, to be expiated by formal disavowal and sacrifice by the elders of the nearest city (Deut. xxi, 1–9).

(5) *Assault* to be punished by *lex talionis*, or damages (Exod. xxi, 18, 19, 22–25; Lev. xxiv, 19, 20).

7th Command. (1) *Adultery* to be punished by death of both offenders; the rape of a married or betrothed woman, by death of the offender (Deut. xxii, 13–27).

(2) *Rape or Seduction* of an unbetrothed virgin, to be compensated by marriage, with dowry (50 shekels), and without power of divorce; or, if she be refused, by payment of full dowry (Exod. xxii, 16, 17; Deut. xxii, 28, 29).

(3) *Unlawful Marriages* (incestuous, etc.) to be punished, some by death, some by childlessness (Lev. xx).

8th Command. (1) *Theft* to be punished by fourfold or double restitution; a nocturnal robber might be slain as an outlaw (Exod. xxii, 1–4).

(2) *Trespass* and injury of things lent to be compensated (Exod. xxii, 5–15).

(3) *Perversion of Justice* (by bribes, threats, etc.), and especially oppression of strangers, strictly forbidden (Exod. xxiii, 9, etc.).

(4) *Kidnapping* to be punished by death (Deut. xxiv, 7).

9th Command. *False Witness;* to be punished by *lex talionis* (Exod. xxiii, 1–3; Deut. xix, 16–21).

Slander of a wife's chastity, by fine and loss of power of divorce (Deut. xxii, 18, 19).

A fuller consideration of the tables of the Ten Commandments is given elsewhere. See Ten Commandments.

(III.) LAWS JUDICIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL.

1. Jurisdiction.

(*a*) *Local Judges* (generally Levites, as more skilled in the law) appointed, for ordinary matters, probably by the people, with approbation of the supreme authority (as of Moses in the wilderness) (Exod. xviii, 25; Deut. i, 15–18), through all the land (Deut. xvi, 18).

(*b*) *Appeal to the Priests* (at the holy place), or to *the judge;* their sentence final, and to be accepted under pain of death. See Deut. xvii, 8–13 (comp. appeal to Moses, Exod. xviii, 26).

(*c*) *Two witnesses* (at least) required in capital matters (Numb. xxxv, 30; Deut. xvii, 6, 7).

(*d*) *Punishment* (except by special command) to be personal, and not to extend to the family (Deut. xxiv, 16).

Stripes allowed and limited (Deut. xxv, 1–3), so as to avoid outrage on the human frame.

All this would be to a great extent set aside—

1st. By the summary jurisdiction of the king. See 1 Sam. xxii, 11–19 (Saul); 2 Sam. xxii, 1–5; iv, 4–11; 1 Kings iii, 16–28; which extended even to the deposition of the high-priest (1 Sam. xxii, 17, 18; 1 Kings ii, 26, 27).

The practical difficulty of its being carried out is seen in 2 Sam. xv, 2–6, and would lead, of course, to a certain delegation of his power.

2d. By the appointment of the Seventy (Numb. xi, 24–30) with a solemn religious sanction. In later times there was a local Sanhedrim of 23 in each city, and two such in Jerusalem, as well as the Great Sanhedrim, consisting of 70 members, besides the president, who was to be the high-priest if duly qualified, and controlling even the king and high-priest. The members were priests, scribes (Levites), and elders (of other tribes). A court of exactly this nature is noticed, as appointed to supreme power by Jehoshaphat. (See 2 Chron. xix, 8–11.)

2. Royal Power.

The King's Power limited by the law, as written and formally accepted by the king, and directly forbidden to be despotic (Deut. xvii, 14–20; comp. 1 Sam. x, 25). Yet he had power of taxation (to one tenth), and of compulsory service (1 Sam. viii, 10–18); also the declaration of war (1 Sam. xi), etc. There are distinct traces of a "mutual contract" (2 Sam. v, 3 (David); a "league" (Joash), 2 Kings xi, 17); the remonstrance with Rehoboam being clearly not extraordinary (1 Kings xii, 1–6).

The Princes of the Congregation. The heads of the tribes (see Josh. ix, 15) seem to have had authority under Joshua to act for the people (comp. 1 Chron. xxvii, 16–22); and in the later times "the princes of Judah" seem to have had power to control both the king and the priests (see Jer. xxvi, 10–24; xxxviii, 4, 5, etc.).

3. Royal Revenue.

(1) *Tenth of produce.*

(2) *Domain land* (1 Chron. xxvii, 26–29). Note confiscation of criminal's land (1 Kings xxi, 15).

(3) *Bond service* (1 Kings v, 17, 18), chiefly on foreigners (1 Kings ix, 20–22; 2 Chron. ii, 16, 17).

(4) *Flocks and herds* (1 Chron. xxvii, 29–31).

(5) *Tributes* (gifts) from foreign kings.

(6) *Commerce;* especially in Solomon's time (1 Kings x, 22, 29, etc.).

(IV.) ECCLESIASTICAL AND CEREMONIAL LAW.

1. Law of Sacrifice (considered as the sign and the appointed means of the union with God, on which the holiness of the people depended).

(A) *Ordinary Sacrifices.*

(*a*) *The whole Burnt-Offering* (Lev. i) of the herd or the flock; to be offered continually (Exod. xxix, 38–42); and the fire on the altar never to be extinguished (Lev. vi, 8–13).

(*b*) *The Meat-Offering* (Lev. ii; vi, 14–23) of flour, oil, and frankincense, unleavened, and seasoned with salt.

(*c*) *The Peace-Offering* (Lev. iii; vii, 11–21) of the herd or the flock; either a thank-offering, or a vow, or free-will offering.

(*d*) *The Sin-Offering*, or *Trespass-Offering* (Lev. iv, v, vi).

[1] For sins committed in ignorance (Lev. iv).

[2] For vows unwittingly made and broken, or uncleanness unwittingly contracted (Lev. v).
[3] For sins wittingly committed (Lev. vi, 1–7).

(B) *Extraordinary Sacrifices.*
(*a*) *At the Consecration of Priests* (Lev. viii, ix).
(*b*) *At the Purification of Women* (Lev. xii).
(*c*) *At the Cleansing of Lepers* (Lev. xiii, xiv).
(*d*) *On the Great Day of Atonement* (Lev. xvi).
(*e*) *On the great Festivals* (Lev. xxiii).

2. Law of Holiness (arising from the union with God through sacrifice).

(A) *Holiness of Persons.*
(*a*) *Holiness of the whole people* as "children of God" (Exod. xix, 5, 6; Lev. xi–xv, xvii, xviii; Deut. xiv, 1–21) shown in
[1] The Dedication of the first-born (Exod. xiii, 2, 12, 13; xxii, 29, 30, etc.); and the offering of all firstlings and first-fruits (Deut. xxvi, etc.).
[2] Distinction of clean and unclean food (Lev. xi; Deut. xiv).
[3] Provision for purification (Lev. xii, xiii, xiv, xv; Deut. xxiii, 1–14).
[4] Laws against disfigurement (Lev. xix, 27; Deut. xiv, 1; compare Deut. xxv, 3, against excessive scourging).
[5] Laws against unnatural marriages and lusts (Lev. xviii, xx).
(*b*) *Holiness of the Priests* (*and Levites*).
[1] Their consecration (Lev. viii, ix; Exod. xxix).
[2] Their special qualifications and restrictions (Lev. xxi; xxii, 1–9).
[3] Their rights (Deut. xviii, 1–6; Numb. xviii) and authority (Deut. xvii, 8–13).

(B) *Holiness of Places and Things.*
(*a*) *The Tabernacle* with the ark, the vail, the altars, the laver, the priestly robes, etc. (Exod. xxv–xxviii, xxx).
(*b*) *The Holy Place* chosen for the permanent erection of the tabernacle (Deut. xii; xiv, 22–29), where only all sacrifices were to be offered, and all tithes, first-fruits, vows, etc., to be given or eaten.

(C) *Holiness of Times.*
(*a*) *The Sabbath* (Exod. xx, 9, 11; xxiii, 12, etc.).
(*b*) *The Sabbatical Year* (Exod. xxiii, 10, 11; Lev. xxv, 1–7, etc.).
(*c*) *The Year of Jubilee* (Lev. xxv, 8, 16, etc.).
(*d*) *The Passover* (Exod. xii, 3, 27; Lev. xxiii, 4–14).
(*e*) *The Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost) (Lev. xxiii, 15, etc.).
(*f*) *The Feast of Tabernacles* (Lev. xxiii, 33–43).
(*g*) *The Feast of Trumpets* (Lev. xxiii, 23–25).
(*h*) *The Day of Atonement* (Lev. xxiii, 26–32, etc.).

On this part of the subject, see Festival; King; Priest; Tabernacle; Sacrifice, etc.

III. *Distinctive Characteristics of the Mosaic Law.*—1. The leading principle of the whole is its theocratic character, its reference (that is) of all action and thoughts of men *directly and immediately* to the will of God. All law, indeed, must ultimately make this reference. If it bases itself on the sacredness of human authority, it must finally trace that authority to God's appointment; if on the rights of the individual and the need of protecting them, it must consider these rights as inherent and sacred, because implanted by the hand of the Creator. But it is characteristic of the Mosaic law, as also of all Biblical history and prophecy, that it passes over all the intermediate steps, and refers at once to God's commandment as the foundation of all human duty. The key to it is found in the ever-recurring formula, "Ye shall observe all these statutes; I am Jehovah."

It follows from this that it is to be regarded not merely as a law, that is, a rule of conduct, based on known truth and acknowledged authority, but also as a *revelation of God's nature* and his dispensations. In this view of it, more particularly, lies its connection with the rest of the Old Testament. As a law, it is definite and (generally speaking) final; as a revelation, it is the beginning of the great system of prophecy, and indeed bears within itself the marks of gradual development, from the first simple declaration ("I am the Lord thy God") in Exodus to the full and solemn declaration of his nature and will in Deuteronomy. With this peculiar character of revelation stamped upon it, it naturally ascends from rule to principle, and regards all goodness in man as the shadow of the divine attributes, "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev. xix, 2, etc.; comp. Matt. v, 48).

But this theocratic character of the law depends necessarily on the *belief in God* as not only the creator and sustainer of the world, but as, by special covenant, *the head of the Jewish nation.* It is not indeed doubted that he is the king of all the earth, and that all earthly authority is derived from him; but here again, in the case of the Israelites, the intermediate steps are all but ignored, and the people are at once brought face to face with him as their ruler. It is to be especially noticed that God's claim (so to speak) on their allegiance is based, not on his power or wisdom, but on his especial mercy in being their saviour from Egyptian bondage. Because they were made free by him, therefore they became his servants (comp. Rom. vi, 19–22); and the declaration which stands at the opening of the law is, "I am the Lord thy God, *which brought thee out of the land of Egypt.*" (Compare also the reason given for the observance of the Sabbath in Deut. v, 15; and the historical prefaces of the delivery of the second law [Deut. i–iii]; of the renewal of the covenant by Joshua [Josh. xxiv, 1–13]; and of the rebuke of Samuel at the establishment of the kingdom [1 Sam. xii, 6–15].)

This immediate reference to God as their king is clearly seen as the groundwork of their entire polity. The foundation of the whole law of land, and of its remarkable provisions against alienation, lies in the declaration, "The land is mine, and ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. xxv, 23). As in ancient Rome all land belonged properly to the state, and under the feudal system in mediæval Europe to the king, so in the Jewish law the true ownership lay in Jehovah alone. The very system of tithes embodied only a peculiar form of tribute to their king, such as they were familiar with in Egypt (see Gen. xlvii, 23–26); and the offering of the first-fruits, with the remarkable declaration by which it was accompanied (see Deut. xxvi, 5–10), is a direct acknowledgment of God's immediate sovereignty. As the land, so also the persons of the Israelites are declared to be the absolute property of the Lord by the dedication and ransom of the first-born (Exod. xiii, 2–13, etc.), by the payment of the half shekel at the numbering of the people "as a ransom for their souls to the Lord" (Exod. xxx, 11–16), and by the limitation of power over Hebrew slaves as contrasted with the absolute mastership permitted over the heathen and the sojourner (Lev. xxv, 39–46).

From this theocratic nature of the law follow important deductions with regard to (*a*) the view which it takes of political society; (*b*) the extent of the scope of the law; (*c*) the penalties by which it is enforced; and (*d*) the character which it seeks to impress on the people.

(1.) *The basis of human society* is ordinarily sought, by law or philosophy, either in the rights of the individual, and the partial delegation of them to political authorities; or in the mutual needs of men, and the relations which spring from them; or in the actual existence of power of man over man, whether arising from natural relationship, or from benefits conferred, or from physical or intellectual ascendency. The maintenance of society is supposed to depend on a "social compact" between governors and subjects; a compact, true as an abstract idea, but untrue if supposed to have been a historical reality. The Mosaic law seeks the basis of its polity, first, in the absolute sovereignty of God; next, in the relationship of each individual to God, and through God to his countrymen. It is clear that such a doctrine, while it contradicts none of the common theories, yet lies beneath them all, and shows why each of them, being only a secondary deduction from an ultimate truth, cannot be in itself sufficient; and, if it claim to be the whole truth, will become an absurdity. It is the doctrine which is insisted upon and developed in the whole series of prophecy, and which is brought to its perfection only when applied to that universal and spiritual kingdom for which the Mosaic system was a preparation.

(2.) The law, as proceeding directly from God, and

referring directly to him, is necessarily *absolute in its supremacy* and *unlimited in its scope.*

It is supreme over the governors, as being only the delegates of the Lord, and therefore it is incompatible with any despotic authority in them. This is seen in its limitation of the power of the master over the slave, in the restrictions laid on the priesthood, and the ordination of the "manner of the kingdom" (Deut. xvii, 14–20; comp. 1 Sam. x, 25). By its establishment of the hereditary priesthood side by side with the authority of the heads of tribes ("the princes"), and the subsequent sovereignty of the king, it provides a balance of powers, all of which are regarded as subordinate. The absolute sovereignty of Jehovah was asserted in the earlier times in the dictatorship of the judge, but much more clearly under the kingdom by the spiritual commission of the prophet. By his rebukes of priests, princes, and kings for abuse of their power, he was not only defending religion and morality, but also maintaining the divinely-appointed constitution of Israel.

On the other hand, it is supreme over the governed, recognising no inherent rights in the individual as prevailing against, or limiting the law. It is therefore unlimited in its scope. There is in it no recognition, such as is familiar to us, that there is one class of actions directly subject to the coercive power of law, while other classes of actions and the whole realm of thought are to be indirectly guided by moral and spiritual influence. Nor is there any distinction of the temporal authority which wields the former power from the spiritual authority to which belongs the other. In fact, these distinctions would have been incompatible with the character and objects of the law. They depend partly on the want of foresight and power in the lawgiver; they could have no place in a system traced directly to God: they depend also partly on the freedom which belongs to the manhood of our race; they could not, therefore, be appropriate to the more imperfect period of its youth.

Thus the law regulated the whole life of an Israelite. His house, his dress, and his food, his domestic arrangements and the distribution of his property, all were determined. In the laws of the release of debts and the prohibition of usury, the dictates of self-interest and the natural course of commercial transactions are sternly checked. His actions were rewarded and punished with great minuteness and strictness, and that according to the standard, not of their consequences, but of their intrinsic morality, so that, for example, fornication and adultery were as severely visited as theft or murder. His religious worship was defined and enforced in an elaborate and unceasing ceremonial. In all things it is clear that, if men submitted to it merely as a law, imposed under penalties by an irresistible authority, and did not regard it as a means to the knowledge and love of God, and a preparation for his redemption, it would well deserve from Israelites the description given of it by St. Peter (Acts xv, 10) as "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear."

(3.) *The penalties and rewards* by which the law is enforced are such as depend on the direct theocracy. With regard to individual actions, it may be noticed that, as generally some penalties are inflicted by the subordinate, and some only by the supreme authority, so among the Israelites some penalties came from the hand of man, some directly from the providence of God. So much is this the case, that it often seems doubtful whether the threat that a "soul shall be cut off from Israel" refers to outlawry and excommunication, or to such miraculous punishments as those of Nadab and Abihu, or Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. In dealing with the nation at large, Moses, regularly and as a matter of course, refers for punishments and rewards to the providence of God. This is seen not only in the great blessing and curse which enforces the law as a whole, but also in special instances, as, for example, in the promise of unusual fertility to compensate for the sabbatical year, and of safety of the country from attack when left undefended at the three great festivals. Whether these were to come from natural causes, i. e. laws of his providence, which we can understand and foresee, or from causes supernatural, i. e. incomprehensible and inscrutable to us, is not in any case laid down, nor indeed does it affect this principle of the law.

(4.) The bearing of this principle on the inquiry as to the *revelation of a future life, in the Pentateuch*, is easily seen. So far as the law deals with the nation as a whole, it is obvious that its penalties and rewards could only refer to this life, in which alone the nation exists. So far as it relates to such individual acts as are generally cognizable by human law, and capable of temporal punishments, no one would expect that its divine origin should necessitate any reference to the world to come. But the sphere of moral and religious action and thought to which it extends is beyond the cognizance of human laws and the scope of their ordinary penalties, and is therefore left by them to the retribution of God's inscrutable justice, which, being but imperfectly seen here, is contemplated especially as exercised in a future state. Hence arises the expectation of a direct revelation of this future state in the Mosaic law. Such a revelation is certainly not given. Warburton (in his *Divine Legation of Moses*) even builds on its non-existence an argument for the supernatural power and commission of the lawgiver, who could promise and threaten retribution from the providence of God in this life, and submit his predictions to the test of actual experience. The truth seems to be that, in a law which appeals directly to God himself for its authority and its sanction, there cannot be that broad line of demarcation between this life and the next which is drawn for those whose power is limited by the grave. Our Lord has taught us (Matt. xxii, 31, 32) that in the very revelation of God, as the "God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," the promise of immortality and future retribution was implicitly contained. We may apply this declaration even more strongly to a law in which God was revealed as entering into covenant with Israel, and in them drawing mankind directly under his immediate government. His blessings and curses, by the very fact that they came from him, would be felt to be unlimited by time, and the plain and immediate fulfilment which they found in this life would be accepted as an earnest of a deeper, though more mysterious completion in the world to come. But the time for the clear revelation of this truth had not yet come, and therefore, while the future life and its retribution is implied, yet the rewards and penalties of the present life are those which are plainly held out and practically dwelt upon.

(5.) But perhaps the most important consequence of the theocratic nature of the law was the *peculiar character of goodness* which it sought to *impress on the people.* Goodness in its relation to man takes the forms of righteousness and love; in its independence of all relation, the form of purity; and in its relation to God, that of piety. Laws which contemplate men chiefly in their mutual relations endeavor to enforce or protect in them the first two qualities; the Mosaic law, beginning with piety as its first object, enforces most emphatically the purity essential to those who, by their union with God, have recovered the hope of intrinsic goodness, while it views righteousness and love rather as deductions from these than as independent objects. Not that it neglects these qualities; on the contrary, it is full of precepts which show a high conception and tender care of our relative duties to man (see, for example, Exod. xxi, 7–11, 28–36; xxiii, 1–9; Deut. xxii, 1–4; xxiv, 10–22, etc.); but these can hardly be called its distinguishing features. It is most instructive to refer to the religious preface of the law in Deut. vi–xi (especially to vi, 4–13), where all is based on the first great commandment, and to observe the subordinate and dependent character of "the second that is like unto it"—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: *I am the Lord*" (Lev. xix. 18). On the contrary, the care for the purity of the people stands

out remarkably, not only in the enforcement of ceremonial "cleanness," and the multitude of precautions or remedies against any breach of it, but also in the severity of the laws against self-pollution, a severity which distinguishes the Mosaic code before all others, ancient and modern. In punishing these sins, as committed against a man's own self, without reference to their effect on others, and in recognising purity as having a substantive value and glory, it sets up a standard of individual morality such as, even in Greece and Rome, philosophy reserved for its most esoteric teaching.

Now in all this it is to be noticed that the appeal is not to any dignity of human nature, but to the obligations of communion with a holy God. The subordination, therefore, of this idea also to the religious idea is enforced; and as long as the due supremacy of the latter was preserved, all other duties would find their places in proper harmony. But the usurpation of that supremacy in practice by the idea of personal and national sanctity was that which gave its peculiar color to the Jewish character. In that character there was intense religious devotion and self-sacrifice; there was a high standard of personal holiness, and connected with these an ardent feeling of nationality, based on a great idea, and, therefore, finding its vent in their proverbial spirit of proselytism. But there was also a spirit of contempt for all unbelievers, and a forgetfulness of the existence of any duties towards them, which gave even to their religion an antagonistic spirit, and degraded it in after times to a ground of national self-glorification. It is to be traced to a natural, though not justifiable perversion of the law by those who made it their all, and both in its strength and its weaknesses it has reappeared remarkably among those Christians who have dwelt on the Old Testament to the neglect of the New.

(6.) It is evident that this characteristic of the Israelites would tend to preserve *the seclusion* which, under God's providence, was intended for them, and would in its turn be fostered by it. We may notice, in connection with this part of the subject, many subordinate provisions tending to the same direction. Such are the establishment of an agricultural basis of society and property, and the provision against its accumulation in a few hands; the discouragement of commerce by the strict laws as to usury, and of foreign conquest by the laws against the maintenance of horses and chariots, as well as the direct prohibition of intermarriage with idolaters, and the indirect prevention of all familiar intercourse with them by the laws as to meats—all these things tended to impress on the Israelitish polity a character of permanence, stability, and comparative isolation. Like the nature and position of the country to which it was in great measure adapted, it was intended to preserve in purity the testimony borne by Israel for God in the darkness of heathenism, until the time should come for the gathering in of all nations to enjoy the blessing promised to Abraham.

2. The second great and obvious design of the Mosaic statutes was to found, in pursuance of the theocratic idea, a complete system of national CULTUS, and, in order to the perpetuity of this, to establish a permanent sacred caste or HIERARCHY. We here use the word *hierarchy* without meaning to express that the Mosaic legislation was like some later hierarchies falsely so called, in which it was attempted to carry into effect selfish and wicked plans by passing them off as being of divine appointment. In the Mosaic hierarchy the aim is manifest, viz. to make that which is really holy (*τὸ ἱερόν*) prevail, while in the false hierarchies of later times the profanest selfishness has been rendered practicable by giving to its manifestations an appearance of holiness calculated to deceive the multitude. In the Mosaic legislation the priests certainly exercise a considerable authority as external ministers of holiness, but we find nothing to be compared with the sale of indulgences in the Romish Church. There occur, certainly, instances of gross misdemeanor on the part of the priests, as, for instance, in the case of the sons of Eli; but proceedings originating in the covetousness of the priests were never authorized or sanctioned by the law.

In the Mosaic legislation almost the whole amount of taxation was paid in the form of tithe, which was employed in maintaining the priests and Levites as the hierarchical office-bearers of government, in supporting the poor, and in providing those things which were used in sacrifices and sacrificial feasts.

The taxation by tithe, exclusive of almost all other taxes, is certainly the most lenient and most considerate which has ever anywhere been adopted or proposed. It precludes the possibility of attempting to extort from the people contributions beyond their power, and it renders the taxation of each individual proportionate to his possessions; and even this exceedingly mild taxation was apparently left to the conscience of each person. This we infer from there never occurring in the Bible the slightest vestige either of persons having been sued or goods distrained for tithes, and only an indication of curses resting upon the neglect of paying them. Tithes were the law of the land, and nevertheless they were not recovered by law during the period of the tabernacle and of the first Temple. It is only during the period of the second Temple, when a general demoralization had taken place, that tithes were farmed and sold, and levied by violent proceedings, in which refractory persons were slain for resisting the levy. But no recommendation or example of such proceeding occurs in the Bible. This seems to indicate that the propriety of paying these lenient and beneficial taxes was generally felt, so much so that there were few, or perhaps no defaulters, and that it was considered inexpedient on the part of the recipients to harass the needy.

Besides the tithes there was a small poll-tax, amounting to half a shekel for each adult male. This tax was paid for the maintenance of the sanctuary. In addition to this, the first-fruits and the first-born of men and cattle augmented the revenue. The first-born of men and of unclean beasts were to be redeemed by money. To this may be added some fines paid in the shape of sin-offerings, and also the vows and free-will offerings.

3. In addition to these great moral and liturgical ends of the Mosaic institutes, we must not fail to notice their REPUBLICAN ECONOMY. The whole territory of the state was to be so distributed that each family should have a freehold, which was intended to remain permanently the inheritance of that family, and which, even if sold, was to return at stated periods to its original owners. Since the whole population consisted of families of freeholders, there was, strictly speaking, neither citizens, nor a profane or lay nobility, nor lords temporal. We do not overlook the fact that there were persons called heads, elders, princes, dukes, or leaders among the Israelites; that is, persons who by their intelligence, character, wealth, and other circumstances were leading men among them, and from whom even the seventy judges were chosen who assisted Moses in administering justice to the nation. But we have no proof that there was a nobility enjoying prerogatives similar to those which are connected with birth in several countries of Europe, sometimes in spite of mental and moral disqualifications. We do not find that, according to the Mosaic constitution, there were hereditary peers temporal. Even the inhabitants of towns were freeholders, and their exercise of trades seems to have been combined with, or subordinate to, agricultural pursuits. The only nobility was that of the tribe of Levi, and all the lords were lords spiritual, the descendants of Aaron. The priests and Levites were ministers of public worship, that is, ministers of Jehovah the King, and, as such, ministers of state, by whose instrumentality the legislative as well as the judicial power was exercised. The poor were mercifully considered, but beggars are never mentioned. Hence it appears that as, on the one hand, there was no lay nobility, so, on the other, there was no mendicity.

Owing to the rebellious spirit of the Israelites, the salutary injunctions of their law were so frequently transgressed that it could not procure for them that degree of prosperity which it was calculated to produce among a nation of faithful observers; but it is evident that the Mosaic legislation, if truly observed, was more fitted to promote universal happiness and tranquillity than any other constitution, either ancient or modern.

4. We close this part of our discussion by a few miscellaneous observations on minor peculiarities of the Mosaic code.

It has been deemed a defect that there were no laws against infanticide; but it may well be observed, as a proof of national prosperity, that there are no historical traces of this crime; and it would certainly have been preposterous to give laws against a crime which did not occur, especially as the general law against murder, "Thou shalt not kill," was applicable to this species also. The words of Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, ii, 24) can only mean that the crime was against the spirit of the Mosaic law. An express verbal prohibition of this kind is not extant.

There occur also no laws and regulations about wills and testamentary dispositions, although there are sufficient historical facts to prove that the next of kin was considered the lawful heir, that primogeniture was deemed of the highest importance, and that, if there were no male descendants, females inherited the freehold property. We learn from the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews (ix, 16, 17) that the Jews disposed of property by wills; but it seems that in the time of Moses, and for some period after him, all Israelites died intestate. However, the word διαθήκη, as used in Matthew, Mark, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and repeatedly in the Hebrews, implies rather a disposition, arrangement, agreement between parties, than a will in the legal acceptation of the term. See TESTAMENT.

There are no laws concerning guardians, and none against luxurious living. The inefficiency of sumptuary laws is now generally recognised, although renowned legislators in ancient times and in the Middle Ages displayed on this subject their wisdom, falsely so called.

Neither are there any laws against suicide. Hence we infer that suicide was rare, as we may well suppose in a nation of small freeholders, and that the inefficiency of such laws was understood.

The Mosaic legislation recognises the human dignity of women and of slaves, and particularly enjoins not to slander the deaf nor mislead the blind.

Moses expressly enjoined not to reap the corners of fields, in consideration of the poor, of persons of broken fortunes, and even of the beasts of the field.

The laws of Moses against crimes are severe, but not cruel. The agony of the death of criminals was never artificially protracted, as in some instances was usual in various countries of Europe even in the present century; nor was torture employed in order to compel criminals to confess their crimes, as was usual in ancient times, and till a comparatively recent period. Forty was the maximum number of stripes to be inflicted. This maximum was adopted for the reason expressly stated that the appearance of the person punished should not become horrible, or, as J. D. Michaelis renders it, *burnt*, which expresses the appearance of a person unmercifully beaten. Punishments were inflicted in order specially to express the sacred indignation of the divine Lawgiver against wilful transgression of his commandments, and not for any purposes of human vengeance, or for the sake of frightening other criminals. In some instances the people at large were appealed to in order to inflict summary punishment by stoning the criminal to death. This was, in fact, the most usual mode of execution. Other modes of execution also, such as burning, were always public, and conducted with the cooperation of the people. Like every human proceeding, this was liable to abuse, but not to so much abuse as our present mode of conducting lawsuits, which, on account of their costliness, often afford but little protection to persons in narrow circumstances. In lawsuits very much was left to the discretion of the judges, his position greatly resembling that of a permanent jury, who had not merely to decide whether a person was guilty, but who frequently had also to award the amount of punishment to be inflicted.

In the Old Testament we do not hear of a learned profession of the law. Lawyers (νομικοί) are mentioned only after the decline of the Mosaic institutions had considerably progressed. As, however, certain laws concerning contagion and purification were administered by the priests, these might be called lawyers. They, nevertheless, did not derive their maintenance from the administration of these laws, but were supported by glebe-lands, tithes, and portions of the sacrificial offerings. It is, indeed, very remarkable that, in a nation so entirely governed by law, there were no lawyers forming a distinct profession, and that the νομικοί of a later age were not so much remarkable for enforcing the spirit of the law as rather for ingeniously evading its injunctions, by leading the attention of the people from its spirit to a most minute literal fulfilment of its letter. See LAWYER.

IV. In considering *the relation of the law to the future*, it is important to be guided by the general principle laid down in Heb. vii, 19, "The law made nothing perfect" (οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος). This principle will be applied in different degrees to its bearing (*a*) on the after-history of the Jewish commonwealth before the coming of Christ; (*b*) on the coming of our Lord himself; and (*c*) on the dispensation of the Gospel.

1. To that after-history the law was, to a great extent, the key; for in ceremonial and criminal law it was complete and final; while, even in civil and constitutional law, it laid down clearly the general principles to be afterwards more fully developed. It was, indeed, often neglected, and even forgotten. Its fundamental assertion of the theocracy was violated by the constant lapses into idolatry, and its provisions for the good of man overwhelmed by the natural course of human selfishness (Jer. xxxiv, 12–17); till at last, in the reign of Josiah, its very existence was unknown, and its discovery was to the king and the people as a second publication: yet it still formed the standard from which they knowingly departed, and to which they constantly returned, and to it, therefore, all which was peculiar in their national and individual character was due. Its direct influence was probably greatest in the periods before the establishment of the kingdom and after the Babylonian captivity. The last act of Joshua was to bind the Israelites to it as the charter of their occupation of the conquered land (Josh. xxiv, 24–27); and, in the semi-anarchical period of the Judges, the law and the tabernacle were the only centres of anything like national unity. The establishment of the kingdom was due to an impatience of this position, and a desire for a visible and personal centre of authority, much the same in nature as that which plunged them so often into idolatry. The people were warned (1 Sam. xii, 6–25) that it involved great danger of their forgetting and rejecting the main principle of the law—that "Jehovah their God was their king." The truth of the prediction was soon shown. Even under Solomon, as soon as the monarchy became one of great splendor and power, it assumed a heathenish and polytheistic character, breaking the law both by its dishonor towards God and its forbidden tyranny over man. Indeed, if the law was looked upon as a collection of abstract rules, and not as a means of knowledge of a personal god, it was inevitable that it should be overborne by the presence of a visible and personal authority.

Therefore it was that from the time of the establishment of the kingdom the prophetic office began. Its object was to enforce and to perfect the law by bearing testimony to the great truths on which it was built, viz. the truth of God's government over all, kings, priests, and people alike, and the consequent certainty of a

righteous retribution. It is plain that at the same time this testimony went far beyond the law as a definite code of institutions. It dwelt rather on its great principles, which were to transcend the special forms in which they were embodied. It frequently contrasted (as in Isa. i, etc.) the external observance of form with the spiritual homage of the heart. It tended therefore, at least indirectly, to the time when, according to the well-known contrast drawn by Jeremiah, the law written on the tables of stone should give place to a new covenant, depending on a law written on the heart, and therefore coercive no longer (Jer. xxxi, 31–34). In this it did but carry out the prediction of the law itself (Deut. xviii, 9–22), and prepare the way for "the Prophet" who was to come.

Still the law remained as the distinctive standard of the people. In the kingdom of Israel, after the separation, the deliberate rejection of its leading principles by Jeroboam and his successors was the beginning of a gradual declension into idolatry and heathenism. But in the kingdom of Judah, the very division of the monarchy and consequent diminution of its splendor, and the need of a principle to assert against the superior material power of Israel, brought out the law once more in increased honor and influence. In the days of Jehoshaphat we find, for the first time, that it was taken by the Levites in their circuits through the land, and the people were taught by it (2 Chron. xvii, 9). We find it especially spoken of in the oath taken by the king "at his pillar" in the Temple, and made the standard of reference in the reformation of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Kings xi, 14; xxiii, 3; 2 Chron. xxx; xxxiv, 14–31).

Far more was this the case after the captivity. The revival of the existence of Israel was hallowed by the new and solemn publication of the law by Ezra, and the institution of the synagogue, through which it became deeply and familiarly known. See EZRA. The loss of the independent monarchy, and the cessation of prophecy, both combined to throw the Jews back upon the law alone as their only distinctive pledge of nationality and sure guide to truth. The more they mingled with the other subject-nations under the Persian and Grecian empires, the more eagerly they clung to it as their distinction and safeguard; and opening the knowledge of it to the heathen by the translation of the Septuagint, they based on it their proverbial eagerness to proselytize. This love for the law, rather than any abstract patriotism, was the strength of the Maccabæan struggle against the Syrians (note here the question as to the lawfulness of war on the Sabbath in this war [1 Macc. ii, 23–41]), and the success of that struggle, enthroning a Levitical power, deepened the feeling from which it sprang. It so entered into the heart of the people that open idolatry became impossible. The certainty and authority of the law's commandments amidst the perplexities of paganism, and the spirituality of its doctrine as contrasted with sensual and carnal idolatries, were the favorite boast of the Jew, and the secret of his influence among the heathen. The law thus became the moulding influence of the Jewish character; and, instead of being looked upon as subsidiary to the promise, and a means to its fulfilment, it was exalted to supreme importance as at once a means and a pledge of national and individual sanctity.

This feeling laid hold of and satisfied the mass of the people, harmonizing as it did with their ever-increasing spirit of an almost fanatic nationality, until the destruction of the city. The Pharisees, truly representing the chief strength of the people, systematized this feeling; they gave it fresh food, and assumed a predominant leadership over it by the floating mass of tradition which they gradually accumulated around the law as a nucleus. The popular use of the word "lawless" (*ἄνομος*) as a term of contempt (Acts ii, 23; 1 Cor. ix, 21) for the heathen, and even for the uneducated mass of their followers (John vii, 49), marked and stereotyped their principle.

Against this idolatry of the law (which, when imported into the Christian Church, is described and vehemently denounced by St. Paul) there were two reactions. The first was that of the *Sadducees;* one which had its basis, according to common tradition, in the idea of a higher love and service of God, independent of the law and its sanctions, but which degenerated into a speculative infidelity and an anti-national system of politics, and which probably had but little hold of the people. The other, that of the *Essenes*, was an attempt to burst the bonds of the formal law, and assert its ideas in all fulness, freedom, and purity. In its practical form it assumed the character of high and ascetic devotion to God; its speculative guise is seen in the school of Philo, as a tendency not merely to treat the commands and history of the law on a symbolical principle, but actually to allegorize them into mere abstractions. In neither form could it be permanent, because it had no sufficient relation to the needs and realities of human nature, or to the personal subject of all the Jewish promises; but it was still a declaration of the insufficiency of the law in itself, and a preparation for its absorption into a higher principle of unity. Such was the history of the law before the coming of Christ. It was full of effect and blessing when used as a means; it became hollow and insufficient when made an end.

2. The relation of the law to the advent of Christ is also laid down clearly by St. Paul. The law was the *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*, the servant (that is) whose task it was to guide the child to the true teacher (Gal. iii, 24); and Christ was "the end" or object "of the law" (Rom. x, 4). As being subsidiary to the promise, it had accomplished its purpose when the promise was fulfilled. In its national aspect it had existed to guard the faith in the theocracy. The chief hinderance to that faith had been the difficulty of realizing the invisible presence of God, and of conceiving a communion with the infinite Godhead which should not crush or absorb the finite creature (compare Deut. v, 24–27; Numb. xvii, 12, 13; Job ix, 32–35; xiii, 21, 22: Isa. xlv, 15, lxiv, 1, etc.). From that had come in earlier times open idolatry, and a half-idolatrous longing for and trust in the kingdom; in after times the substitution of the law for the promise. The difficulty was now to pass away forever, in the incarnation of the Godhead in one truly and visibly man. The guardianship of the law was no longer needed, for the visible and personal presence of the Messiah required no farther testimony. Moreover, in the law itself there had always been a tendency of the fundamental idea to burst the formal bonds which confined it. In looking to God as especially their king, the Israelites were inheriting a privilege, belonging originally to all mankind, and destined to revert to them. Yet that element of the law which was local and national, now most prized of all by the Jews, tended to limit this gift to them, and place them in a position antagonistic to the rest of the world. It needed, therefore, to pass away before all men could be brought into a kingdom where there was to be "neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian, Scythian, bond, or free."

In its individual, or what is usually called its "moral" aspect, the law bore equally the stamp of transitoriness and insufficiency. It had, as we have seen, declared the authority of truth and goodness over man's will, and taken for granted in man the existence of a spirit which could recognise that authority; but it had done no more. Its presence had therefore detected the existence and the sinfulness of sin, as alien alike to God's will and man's true nature; but it had also brought out with more vehement and desperate antagonism the power of sin dwelling in man as fallen (Rom. vii, 7–25). It only showed, therefore, the need of a Saviour from sin, and of an indwelling power which should enable the spirit of man to conquer the "law" of evil. Hence it bore testimony to its own insufficiency, and led men to Christ. Already the prophets, speaking by a living and indwelling spirit, ever fresh and powerful, had been passing beyond

the dead letter of the law, and indirectly convicting it of insufficiency. But there was need of "*the* Prophet" who should not only have the fulness of the Spirit dwelling in himself, but should have the power to give it to others, and so open the new dispensation already foretold. When he had come, and by the gift of the Spirit implanted in man a free internal power of action tending to God, the restraints of the law, needful to train the childhood of the world, became unnecessary and even injurious to the free development of its manhood.

The relation of the law to Christ, in its sacrificial and ceremonial aspect, will be more fully considered elsewhere. See SACRIFICE. It is here only necessary to remark on the evidently typical character of the whole system of sacrifices, upon which alone their virtue depended; and on the imperfect embodiment, in any body of mere men, of the great truth which was represented in the priesthood. By the former declaring the need of atonement, by the latter the possibility of mediation, and yet in itself doing nothing adequately to realize either, the law again led men to him who was at once the only mediator and the true sacrifice.

Thus the law had trained and guided man to the acceptance of the Messiah in his threefold character of king, prophet, and priest; and then, its work being done, it became, in the minds of those who trusted in it, not only an encumbrance, but a snare. To resist its claim to allegiance was therefore a matter of life and death in the days of St. Paul, and, in a less degree, in after ages of the Church.

3. It remains to consider how far it has any obligation or existence under the dispensation of the Gospel. As a means of justification or salvation, it ought never to have been regarded, even before Christ: it needs no proof to show that still less can this be so since he has come. But yet the question remains whether it is binding on Christians, even when they do not depend on it for salvation.

It seems clear enough, that its formal coercive authority as a whole ended with the close of the Jewish dispensation. We may indeed distinguish its various elements; yet he who offended "in one point against it was guilty of all" (James ii, 10). It referred throughout to the Jewish covenant, and in many points to the constitution, the customs, and even the local circumstances of the people. That covenant was preparatory to the Christian, in which it is now absorbed; those customs and observances have passed away. It follows, by the very nature of the case, that the former obligation to the law as such must have ceased with the basis on which it is grounded. This conclusion is stamped most unequivocally with the authority of St. Paul through the whole argument of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians. That we are "not under law" (Rom. vi, 14, 15; Gal. v, 18); "that we are dead to law" (Rom. vii, 4–6; Gal. ii, 19), "redeemed from under law" (Gal. iv, 5), etc., is not only stated without any limitation or exception, but in many places is made the prominent feature of the contrast between the earlier and later covenants. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that the formal code, promulgated by Moses, and sealed with the prediction of the blessing and the curse, cannot, *as a law*, be binding on the Christian.

But what, then, becomes of the declaration of our Lord, that he came "not to destroy the law, but to perfect it," and that "not one jot or one tittle of it shall pass away?" what of the fact, consequent upon it, that the law has been reverenced in all Christian churches, and had an important influence on much Christian legislation? The explanation of the apparent contradiction lies in several considerations.

(1.) The *positive* obligation of the law, as such, has passed away; but every revelation of God's will, and of the righteousness and love which are its elements, imposes a *moral* obligation, by the very fact of its being known, even on those to whom it is not primarily addressed. So far as the law of Moses is such a revelation of the will of God to mankind at large, occupying a certain place in the education of the world as a whole, so far its declarations remain for our guidance, though their coercion and their penalties may be no longer needed. It is in their general principle, of course, that they remain, not in their outward form, and our Lord has taught us, in the Sermon on the Mount, that these principles should be accepted by us in a more extended and spiritual development than they could receive in the time of Moses.

To apply this principle practically there is need of study and discretion, in order to distinguish what is local and temporary from what is universal, and what is mere external form from what is the essence of an ordinance. The moral law undoubtedly must be most permanent in its influence, because it is based on the nature of man generally, although at the same time it is modified by the greater prominence of love in the Christian system. Yet the political law, in the main principles which it lays down as to the sacredness and responsibility of all authorities, and the rights which belong to each individual, and which neither slavery nor even guilt can quite eradicate, has its permanent value. Even the ceremonial law, by its enforcement of the purity and perfection needed in any service offered, and in its disregard of mere costliness on such service, and limitation of it strictly to the prescribed will of God, is still in many respects our best guide. In special cases (as, for example, that of the sabbatic law and the prohibition of marriage within the degrees) the question of its authority must depend on the further inquiry whether the basis of such laws is one common to all human nature, or one peculiar to the Jewish people. This inquiry may occasionally be difficult, especially in the distinction of the essence from the form; but by it alone can the original question be thoroughly and satisfactorily answered.

(2.) A plain distinction of this kind seems to lie on the face of the subject, as to the main question at issue. The ceremonial or ritual department of the Mosaic laws, which stood in meats, and drinks, and carnal ordinances (Heb. ix, 10); which were of a typical character, and a mere shadow of good things to come, was abolished by the introduction of the Gospel; for then they ceased to have any pertinence, the reality having come of which they were the figures. But the kernel of the law, properly speaking, the moral law, which is a transcript of the divine mind, is eternal and unchangeable in its obligations and sanctions. It was *fulfilled* rather than abrogated by the Gospel. It was confirmed by Christ, and explained in its infinite comprehension and spirituality by him and his apostles throughout the New Testament (Matt. v, 17, 18; Luke x, 26–28; Rom. v, 15–viii, 39). Hence, when, in Rom. vi, 14; vii, 1–6; Gal. ii, 19; v, 18, the moral law is spoken of as not being the mere rule of life for persons who rely on the grace of God, and who are authorized to expect a salvation not to be purchased by their works, it is so depreciated simply because in that aspect it is regarded as a law according to which rewards and punishments should be adjudged in so rigid and inexorable a manner as to exclude all grace, and all reliance on grace (Rom. iv, 12–14; Gal. ii, 31; iii, 10–12). In short, it is abrogated as a justifying ground of salvation by good works, because none can keep it perfectly to that end. Yet it is not abolished as an external criterion of virtue and piety, and as the final test before the assembled universe. See ANTINOMIANS.

(3.) Another very important fact in this discussion is that all the moral precepts of the Decalogue have been *re-enacted* by our Lord and his apostles, not only in principle, but in explicit terms (Mark x, 19; Rom. xiii, 9). It is true Jesus sums up the spirit of the whole ten commandments in the two of love to God and man (Matt. xxii, 37–40), and St. Paul (Rom. xiii, 10), as well as St. John (1 John iii, 11), substantially do the same. But this is not done with a view to derogate from the precise form of the Mosaic commands, much less to abolish them; but rather with a view to re-enforce them by

educing their permanent and universal principle of obligation. Christianity has therefore in all ages justly recognised the paramount and unvarying force of the moral law as promulgated on Mount Sinai.

The only exception to the above remark of the direct renewal of all these commandments by Christ and his apostles is that relating to the Sabbath, which is never quoted among the rest, but is noticeably omitted, and has even been held to be intentionally discarded, by precept, inference, and example, by them. The exception, however, is only apparent, and is due to the peculiar nature of this observance. It really rests upon an earlier than the Mosaic institute, for it dates from the creation, and was therefore appropriately introduced at Sinai by the allusion, "Remember the Sabbath day." Moreover, the Jews of our Lord's day were in no need of being reminded of this institution; they were slavishly and superstitiously observant of it. Finally, as the day of its observance was changed by the very first Christians, there would have been an obvious impropriety in their referring to the institution itself *under that name*. That the obligation to occupy in religious rest one day in seven was scrupulously recognised by them the historical fact of the "Lord's day" abundantly attests. See SABBATH.

(4.) Indeed, the same remark as to primeval origin and validity applies to the whole Decalogue, although this cannot be so clearly proved in a historical argument as with regard to the Sabbath. Yet it has been shown above (§ i, No. 4) that these moral enactments at least were nothing new; indeed, as all must at once admit, they lie at the very foundation of civil law and social organization; and it could easily be shown that the Hebrews had substantially recognised their force for ages. They were therefore, in fact, but republished on Sinai, under new sanctions, and do not require for their authority the support of any special dispensation.

The argument of the apostle Paul, especially in the epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, invariably is an appeal from the legal bondage of Judaism—not merely, be it observed, the intolerable ceremonial yoke (Acts xv, 10), but still more emphatically the law of "good works," including, of course, especially the moral code (see Rom. ii, 21, 22; vii, 7)—to the ante-Mosaic dispensation, the *faith* which Abraham had when yet a Gentile (Rom. iv, 10; Gal. iii, 17, 18), and the primitive priesthood of Jesus (Heb. vii). Yet this law of faith, so far from ignoring the moral law, is its only effectual support (comp. John vi, 29); and thus the solution of this question becomes likewise the reconciliation of the doctrine of St. Paul with that of St. James. See JAMES, EPISTLE OF.

V. *Literature.* — J. D. Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht* (Frkft. 1770–75), translated by Alexander Smith under the title *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (London, 1814); J. H. Hottinger, *Juris Hebræorum leges* cclxi, *ad Judæorum mentem explicatæ* (Tiguri, 1655); Selden, *De Jure naturali et gentium juxta Hebræorum Disciplinam* (Argentorati, 1665); Reimarus, *De legibus Mosaicis ante Mosem* (Hamb. 1741); D. Hornsyli *De principiis Legum Mosaicarum* (Hafniæ, 1792); Stäudlin, *Commentationes II de Legum Mosaicarum* (Gottingæ, 1796); Purmann, *De fontibus et œconomia Legum Mosaicarum* (Francofurti, 1789); T. G. Erdmann, *Leges Mosis præstantiores esse legibus Lycurgi et Solonis* (Vitebergæ, 1788); Pastoret, *Histoire de la Législation* (Par. 1817), vols. iii et iv; J. Salvador, *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse et du Peuple Hébreu* (Paris, 1828, 3 vols.), Manson, *De legislatura Mosaica quantum ad hygienen pertinet* (Haag, 1835); Welker, *Die Letzten Gründe von Recht*, p. 279 sq.; Stäudlin, *Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu*, i, 111 sq.; Holberg, *Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu*, ii, 331 sq.; De Wette, *Sittenlehre*, ii, 21 sq. Luther's views are given by C. H. F. Bialloblotzky, *De Legis Mosaicæ Abrogatione* (Gottingæ, 1824). For other, chiefly older, works on the subject in general, see Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Gesetz; Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Moses; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 37; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* column 237 sq. Among later discussions we may name Duncan, *Character and Design of the Law of Moses* (Edinburgh, 1851); an art. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, i, 43 sq.; Saalschütz, *D. mos. Recht m. Berücksicht. des spät. Jüd.* (Berl. 1846); Piccard, *De legislationis Mosaïcæ indole morali* (Utr. 1841); Kübel, *Das alttestam. Gesetz und seine Urkunde* (Stuttg. 1867). See MOSES.

Law, Edmund, D.D., a noted English prelate, was born in 1703, near Cartmel, in Lancashire, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; was elected fellow upon graduation, and in 1737 was, by the university, presented with the rectory of Graystock, in Cumberland. To this living was added in 1743 the archdeaconry of Carlisle. These positions he held until 1756, when he returned to Cambridge as master of St. Peter's College. Later he was appointed librarian of the university and professor of casuistry, was made archdeacon of Stafford, was presented with a prebend in the church of Lincoln, and in 1767 with one of the rich prebends in the church of Durham, and in 1768, finally, was honored with the bishopric of Carlisle. He died in 1787. While yet a student at Cambridge, Law published two works which show at once the peculiar turn of his own mind, and secured him a place among the best and wisest instructors of their species. The first of these was his translation of archbishop King's *Essay on the Origin of Evil*, with copious notes, in which many of the difficult questions in metaphysical science are considered; the second was his *Inquiry into the Ideas of Space and Time*. In 1743, while a resident of Salkeld, on the pleasant banks of the Eden, a part of the living of Carlisle, which Law was then holding, he began his third work, *Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, etc. (Camb. 1745, 1749, 1755, 1765, 8vo; London, 1774, 8vo, 7th ed., Carlisle, 1784, 8vo; new edit. by bishop George H. Law, of Chester, with Life of bishop Edmund Law by William Paley, D.D., Lond. 1820, 8vo), and shortly after, *Reflections on the Life and Character of Christ* (Camb. 1749, 8vo; often reprinted with the *Considerations*), "a work of singular beauty, not to be read by any person without edification and improvement." In 1777 he published an edition of the works of Locke, with a life of the author. Of this English philosopher bishop Law was ever an ardent follower and able interpreter. Indeed, "the peculiar character of Dr. Law's mind appears to have been acquired in a great measure by a devoted study of the writings of that philosopher. From him he seems to have derived that value which he set on freedom of inquiry, in relation to theology as well as to every other subject. He took a prominent part in the great controversy respecting subscription, and acted accordingly himself. The most striking proof of this is afforded in the later edition of his *Considerations*, which contains many important alterations. From Locke also he seems to have derived his notions of the proper mode of studying the sacred Scriptures in order to come at their true sense. He was, in short, an eminent master in that school of rational and liberal divines which flourished in England in the last century, and is adorned by the names of Jortin, Blackburne, Powell, Tyrwhitt, Watson, Paley, and many others." See *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1065.

Law, George Henry, D.D., an English divine, second son of Edmund Law, D.D., was born in 1761. He became bishop of Chester in 1812, and of Bath and Wells in 1824. He died in 1845. Bishop Law published a number of his *Sermons*, for a list of which, and a biographical notice of the author, see the *London Gent. Mag.* 1845, pt. ii, p. 529.—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Law, Isaac, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, was born Sept. 5, 1815, at Salem, N. York; was educated at Union College (class of 1838), and became shortly after a student of theology at Canonsburg, Pa.

and was licensed March 26, 1840. In 1842 he was ordained missionary by the East Salem Presbytery, and labored in this capacity until 1847, when he was ordained pastor at Cambridge. He died Jan. 28, 1861. Law "proved himself 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.' . . . As a minister, in the discharge of every public and private duty of religion he was exact, fixed, and regular."—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 22.

Law, Joseph, a Methodist minister, was born in Washington County, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1798; was converted in 1815, and admitted into the New York Conference in 1830, after eight years' service as a local preacher. Although he had not enjoyed the advantages of early education, he soon, by unwearied perseverance, fitted himself for usefulness in the ministry, and quickly gained distinction among his ministerial brethren and among the people, and he was honored with some of the best appointments in the Conference. He was for many years confined in his labors to the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and New Haven (First and Second Church) and Hartford. In the city of Brooklyn he was instrumental in the building of five large churches. He was superannuated in 1861, and died June 11, 1863. On his dying bed he frequently requested the sorrowing friends around him to sing; and a little before his spirit departed, as they were singing one of his favorite hymns—"On Jordan's stormy banks I stand," etc.—his eye kindled with rapture, and he gave the whispered assurance, "All is well."—Smith, *Sacred Memories*, p. 243.

Law, Samuel Warren, a Methodist minister, the son of the Rev. Joseph Law (q. v.), was born at Marlborough, Ulster County, N. Y., November, 1821, was converted in his fourteenth year, and in 1841 entered the itinerancy. He had many excellences, and was an able and successful minister. His death, which occurred April 28, 1857, was such as his life had promised—calm, confiding, and peaceful.—Smith, *Sac. Memories*, p. 230.

Law, William, an eminent English nonjuring divine and able religious writer of the mystic school of the last century, was born at Kingscliffe, Northamptonshire, in 1686, and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1712, and became fellow in 1713. Shortly after this he began to preach, but was obliged to quit the ministry, and also to give up his fellowship, on the accession of George I in 1714, because of his refusal to take the required oath. He now became tutor to his relative and friend, Edward Gibbon, father of the historian, who speaks of his piety and talents with unusual warmth. Later, two of his friends, Miss Hester Gibbon, sister of his pupil, and Mrs. Hutcheson, widow of a London barrister, having resolved to retire from the world, and devote themselves to works of charity and a religious life, selected Law for their almoner and instructor. He accepted the position, and the three parties settled in a house at Kingscliffe, where Law died, April 9, 1761. Law's writings are tinged with what is commonly called mysticism, as he became an ardent follower of the noted mystic, Jacob Böhme. His principal work, and, indeed, one of the best books of the kind, is his *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1729), a treatise that first awakened the religious sensibilities of Dr. Samuel Johnson, who speaks of it in high terms, and from which the brothers Wesley also derived much advantage. Next to the *Serious Call*, his most important works are his answer to Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* (published in 1724; republished, with an introduction by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, in 1844), his letters to the bishop of Bangor, *The Way to Knowledge*, and *The Spirit of Love*. A collective edition of his works was published at London in 9 vols. 8vo in 1762. It has fallen to the lot of but few English writers to elicit such general comment and commendation as has been the fortune of William Law. The rationalistic Gibbon, the liberal Macaulay, the pious John Wesley, and the morose Sam. Johnson, all were of one mind in their praise of William Law. See Richard Tighe, *Life and Writings of William Law* (1813, 8vo); *Lond. Gent. Mag.* vol. lxx; *Theol. Eclectic*, Jan. 1868; *Contemporary Review*, Oct., 1867; *Christian Examiner*, 1869, p. 157; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, ii, 1065 sq.

Lawn Sleeves. See Rochette.

Lawrence, Abbott, an eminent American merchant and philanthropist, was born at Groton, Mass., Dec. 16, 1792; was elected to Congress in 1839, and in 1843 was appointed commissioner to settle the northeast boundary question with Great Britain; United States minister to England in 1849; and died Aug. 18, 1855. Among his numerous and munificent donations was that of $100,000 to Harvard University, to found the scientific school called by his name. He also bequeathed the sum of $50,000 towards erecting model lodging-houses.—Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* p. 1384.

Lawrence, Amos, a distinguished American philanthropist, was born at Groton, Mass., April 22, 1786. He spent a great part of his immense fortune in various charities and donations to public institutions. He died Dec. 31, 1852. His *Life and Correspondence* was published by his son in 1855.—Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* p. 1384.

Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery, brother of sir Thomas Lawrence, the "Saviour of India," is noted for his philanthropy and Christian bearing as a soldier in the British army in India. He was born in Ceylon in 1806, and after entering the army quickly rose to distinction. In the campaigns of the Sutlej he served with distinction, and about 1850 was appointed president of the board of government in the Punjaub, and in 1857, when the Indian mutiny broke out, chief commissioner of Lucknow, and virtually governor of Oude. While in command of the handful of heroic men who defended the women and children in the residency of Lucknow, sir Henry was wounded by the explosion of a shell, and died July 4, 1857. He was the founder of the *Lawrence Asylum* for the reception of the children of European soldiers in India. A monument to his memory has been placed in St. Paul's Cathedral. See J. W. Kaye, *Lives of Indian Officers* (London, 1867); *Fraser's Magazine*, Dec. 1857; *North British Review*, May, 1860; Butler, *Land of the Veda*, p. 319 sq.

Lawrence, St. See Laurentius, St.

Lawrence, St., Regular Canons of, a religious order, said to have been founded by St. Benedict in the 6th century. Its seat was in Dauphiné. It was reformed in the 11th century, under the patronage of Odo, count of Savoy. The bishop of Turin in 1065 conferred many gifts upon it, and several popes enriched it with benefactions.

Lawrenson, Laurence, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1779; entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1810, and died April 4, 1829. He possessed a strong and generous mind, and deep piety. He was an excellent presiding elder, and preached with distinguished success the word of life.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 38.

Lawyer (*νομικός, relating to* the *law*, as in Tit. iii, 9), "in its general sense, denotes one skilled in the law, as in Tit. iii, 13. When, therefore, one is called a lawyer, this is understood with reference to the laws of the land in which he lived, or to which he belonged. Hence among the Jews a lawyer was one versed in the laws of Moses, which he taught in the schools and synagogues (Matt. xxviii, 35; Luke x, 25). The same person who is called 'a lawyer' in these texts is in the parallel passage (Mark xii, 28) called 'a scribe' (*γραμματεύς*), whence it has been inferred that the functions of the lawyers and the scribes were identical. The individual may have been *both* a lawyer and a scribe, but it does not thence follow that all lawyers were scribes. Some suppose, however, that the 'scribes' were the public expounders of the law, while the 'lawyers' were the private expounders and teachers of it. But this is a mere conjec-

ture, and nothing more is really known than that the 'lawyers' were expounders of the law, whether publicly or privately, or both" (Kitto). Hence the term is equivalent to "teacher of the law" (*νομοδιδάσκαλος*, Acts v, 34). "By the use of the word *νομικός* (in Tit. iii, 9) as a simple adjective, it seems more probable that the title 'scribe' was a legal and official designation, but that the name *νομικός* was properly a mere epithet signifying one 'learned in the law' (somewhat like the *οἱ ἐκ νόμου* in Rom. iv, 14), and only used as a title in common parlance (comp. the use of it in Tit. iii, 13, 'Zenas the lawyer'). This would account for the comparative infrequency of the word, and the fact that it is always used in connection with 'Pharisees,' never, as the word 'scribe' so often is, in connection with 'chief priests' and 'elders'" (Smith). See Lilienthal, *De νομικοῖς juris utriusque apud Hebræos* (Hal. 1740). Comp. SCRIBE.

Lawyers. In the Roman and Spanish churches, pleaders before the courts were not eligible to the clerical office. The rule, however, was not universal, for the Council of Sardica enacted that a lawyer might be ordained a bishop if he passed through the inferior grades of reader, deacon, and presbyter. On the other hand, clergymen were not allowed to act as lawyers, or to plead either their own cause or even an ecclesiastical one. Bribery and extortion were forbidden to lawyers under severe penalties.

Lay, Benjamin, an eccentric philanthropist, was born at Colchester, in England, in 1681, and settled in Barbadoes in 1710, but became obnoxious to the people by his abolition principles, came to the United States, and settled at Abington, Pa. He was one of the earliest and most zealous opponents of slavery in the United States, and the coadjutor of Franklin and Benezet. He was originally a member of the Society of Friends, but so decidedly opposed was he to the practice of slaveholding then prevalent among them (e. g. he resolutely refused to partake of any food or wear any clothing which was wholly or in part produced by the labor of slaves) that he was obliged to leave the society in 1717. Before his death (in 1760), however, he had the pleasure of seeing his society take a decided stand against this abominable institution. His opposition to slavery was noticeable on every public occasion where he had any opportunity to manifest his disapprobation. He always expressed himself in strong terms, and sometimes resorted to methods for enforcing his arguments that evinced great eccentricity. Says Janney (iii, 246): "He came into the yearly meeting with a bladder filled with blood in one hand and a sword in the other. He ran the sword through the bladder, and sprinkled the blood on several Friends, declaring that so the sword would be sheathed in the bowels of the nation if they did not leave off oppressing the negroes." In 1737 he wrote a treatise entitled *All Slave-keepers that keep the Innocent in Bondage Apostates*, which was published by Franklin. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, iii, 245. (J. H. W.)

Lay Abbots or Abbacomites. Prior to the period of Charlemagne the court appointed its favorites to the office of abbot: rich abbacies were given to the higher secular clergy *in commendam*, i. e. simply to enjoy its revenues, or else to counts and military chiefs in reward for their services. These lay abbots occupied the monasteries with their families, or with their friends and retainers, sometimes for months, converting them into banqueting halls, or using them for hunting expeditions or for military exercises. The wealthiest abbacies the kings either retained for themselves or bestowed on their sons and daughters, their wives and mistresses. Charlemagne corrected this abuse: he insisted on strict discipline, and made it a rule that schools should be planted in connection with the various monasteries, and that literary labors should be prosecuted within their walls. See also ABBOT.

Layard, CHARLES PETER, D.D., an English theologian, grandfather of Austin Henry Layard, the celebrated traveller, and himself a descendant of an ancient French family, was born about 1748. He was educated at Westminster School and St. John's College, Cambridge; was then appointed minister of Oxendon Chapel, and librarian to Tenison's Library, Westminster; and in 1800 was promoted to the deanery of Bristol, and to the royal chaplaincy. He died April 11, 1803. Besides an essay on Charity and Duelling (1774 and 1776), he published several of his *Sermons*. Layard was one of the most popular preachers of his day. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1071; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 39.

Lay Baptism. See BAPTISM, LAY.

Lay Brothers, a name for a class of Romish illiterate persons who in convents devote themselves to the service of the monks. They wear a different habit from the monks, but never enter the choir, nor are present at the chapters. The only vow they make is of obedience and constancy. They were first employed in the 11th century. In the nunneries there are also *lay sisters*, or *sisters converse*, who hold a similar relation in the service of the nuns. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Lay Chancellors. This office is found in the Church at an early period. Bishops were often appealed to in civil causes, especially when both parties agreed to refer any dispute to them; and in this case their sentence was valid, but its execution was left to the civil power. When civil causes began to multiply, the bishops were compelled to devolve some part of this service on others, in whose fidelity and integrity they could confide. Some bishops selected laymen for this purpose, and this, according to Bingham, probably originated the office of lay chancellor.

Lay Elders. See ELDER.

Laying on of Hands. See HANDS, IMPOSITION OF.

Layish. See LION.

Laymann, PAUL, a German Jesuit, was born at Innsbruck in 1576, and died of the plague at Constance Nov. 13, 1635. He was distinguished in life for a remarkable knowledge of canonical law, so that he became an oracle in these matters. His *Moraltheologie*, published first at Munich (1625, 4to), passed through many editions (one of the best at Mayence, 1723). His work, *Justa defensio Sanctissimi Romani Pontificis, etc., in causa Monasteriorum et bonorum ecclesiastic. vacantium*, etc. (Diling. 1631), was replied to by the Benedictine Roman Hay, in *Aster inextinctus*, and led to an answer by Laymann, entitled *Censura Astrolog. ecclesiasticæ, et Astri inextincti*. After his death appeared his *Jus canonicum* (Diling. 1643) and *Repertorium* (Diling. 1644). See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 383.

Laynez. See LAINEZ.

Lay Preaching. In order to form just views of this subject, it is well to consider that primary design of Christianity which contemplates world-wide diffusion. For the accomplishment of that design, preaching is the grand and divinely appointed agency. But the true idea of preaching, as instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ, is not narrow and exclusive. It is comprehensive and manifold. It demands adaptation to all men and all circumstances. Preaching warns, proclaims, invites, teaches. Although made the special work of certain representative disciples, it is, in fact, enjoined upon the Church as a whole, and upon its members in particular, "as of the ability which God giveth" (1 Pet. iv, 10, 11). There is no Christian so humble as to be beneath the application of the following and many kindred precepts: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v, 16); "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples" (John xv, 8); "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God" (Luke xii,

8). These declarations of the Saviour have a special significance when viewed in comparison with various other passages which indicate that an important element of preaching consists in bearing witness of things seen, heard, and experienced in reference to Christ and his kingdom (see Luke xxiv, 48; Acts i, 21, 2; ii, 32; iv, 20; xxii, 15).

When considered in the plain light of Christian history and obligation, the subject of lay preaching becomes relieved from both the difficulties and the technicalities with which it has sometimes been invested by a pretentious ecclesiasticism. None of our Lord's disciples were priests, and yet, from the moment of their call to his discipleship, he proceeded to instruct them in the matter and duty of preaching. At an early period of their instruction they were sent out to preach experimentally (see Matt. x, 5–42; Luke ix, 1–6). Not only were the twelve thus sent forth to preach, but "other seventy also." The number seventy was symbolic both of multiplicity and completeness, and the act of sending out seventy (lay) disciples, "two by two, before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come," was in itself significant of our Lord's purpose to employ all his true disciples in spreading the truth and establishing his kingdom upon the earth.

In imitation of its divine Lord, the Apostolic Church employed not only the apostles, but its lay members in preaching the Word. "At that time (after the death of Stephen) there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word" (Acts viii, 1, 4). The same fact is illustrated by the course of Paul, of whom, immediately after his conversion, and long prior to his ordination, it is recorded, "and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues" (Acts ix, 20). In this act the regenerated persecutor showed that Christian obligations precede ministerial, and that whosoever is born of God not only hath the witness in himself, but is prompted by the Holy Spirit to utter his testimony in the ears and to the hearts of his fellow-men.

The allusions to the modes and accompaniments of worship in Rom. xii, 6–8, and 1 Cor. xiv, as well as in several less detailed passages, clearly imply that the apostles were accustomed to encourage the exercise of all species of gifts in the Church, but especially those of exhortation and prophecy. From these scriptural examples, it is just to infer that lay preaching, in the various forms of teaching, evangelizing, and prophesying, had from the first a double object: 1, to do good to all men; and, 2, to develop and prove the gifts of those who from time to time were called from the ranks of the laity to the more public ministry of the Word. Such, doubtless, continued to be the practice of the Church during the early centuries, and it was only by degrees that it became modified under the hierarchical spirit which became developed at a later period. Interesting proof of this is found in connection with the history of Origen of Alexandria. He, as a layman of known learning and skill in exposition, having gone to Cæsarea, was invited by the bishops there to preach. True, his preaching on that occasion was made the ground of a charge from Demetrius of Alexandria against the bishops who invited him. But the form which the charge took is in favor of the general right of laymen to exercise their teaching functions in the Church. His alleged offence was not that he, being a layman, taught, but that he taught when bishops were present. The accused bishops, Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistos of Cæsarea, defended themselves, not with a plea of ignorance or of exceptional circumstances, but by an appeal to the common law of the Church. They knew the custom, even in the form of which Demetrius complained, to prevail at Iconium and other churches of Asia. They believed it to prevail elsewhere, and thought it proper to be recognised at Alexandria also (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 19).

In the fourth Council of Carthage we find, with the name of Augustine among the subscriptions to its laws, the rule, "Laicus præsentibus clericis, nisi ipsis jubentibus, docere non audeat" (can. 98). From this we may infer that in the absence of the clergy a layman might teach, and also in their presence at their request. It is noted by Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* v, 22) as an exceptional custom of the Alexandrian Church that the office of reader might be filled by even an unbaptized catechumen. The commentary of the pseudo-Ambrose on Eph. 4th recognises that at the commencement "omnibus concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et scripturas in ecclesiâ explanare." In the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, representing the practice of the Church in the 3d and 4th centuries, we find the law that "if any man, though a layman, is skilful in expounding doctrines, and of venerable manners, he may be allowed to teach" (viii, 32). Similar indications are also found in the Shepherd of Hermas. See LAITY.

But it is unnecessary to dwell upon the lingering evidences of a custom that was destined to be crushed out by increasing perversions of the original spirit of the Gospel. When ritual ceremonies came to supersede not only the practice, but the very idea of evangelization, it is not surprising that preaching itself became a ceremony, and at length a rare and infrequent ceremony. Not merely laymen, but even presbyters of the Church, were inhibited from preaching, except by special permission of bishops; while many of the bishops, who had arrogated to themselves the exclusive right of preaching, either through ignorance or indolence practically abandoned the custom. "There was a time when the bishops of Rome were not known to preach for five hundred years together!—insomuch that, when Pius Quintus made a sermon, it was looked upon as a prodigy, and, indeed, was a greater rarity than the *Sæculares Ludi* were in old Rome" (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book ii, ch. iii, § 4). This general abandonment of the great and peculiar work of the Christian ministry had its counterpart of error in monasticism, which, by an equal perversion, sent myriads of the best men in the Church during successive centuries to waste their lives and religious zeal in fruitless penances in desert places and gloomy cloisters. Had the lives and talents which were thus thrown away in monastic idleness been wisely employed in various forms of evangelization, whether lay or clerical, who can tell how much better the world would have been to-day! In fact, nearly all the real progress made by Christianity during several of the mediæval centuries was by exceptional missionary effort among various aboriginal nations of Europe. The general abandonment of preaching above alluded to formed a pretext for the establishment, in the 13th or 14th centuries, of several preaching orders of monks, specially the Franciscans and Dominicans. These monks, in an ecclesiastical point of view, were laymen, and by profession they were also mendicants. Nevertheless, they acquired great influence and great wealth for their several orders. But such results did not relieve the evangelical barrenness of the period, nor render less necessary the great Reformation of the 16th century. In the Reformed churches there was a general breaking away from the trammels of ecclesiasticism, together with an energy of purpose which did not scruple to employ any agencies at its command for the dissemination of truth. Still, under the influence of long-prevailing custom, that great element of Christian power to be derived from the personal activity of devoted laymen was to a large degree suffered to lie dormant, and in some cases actually repressed. The first formal and greatly effective organization of lay preaching as a system, and as a recognised branch of Church effort, took place under John Wesley at an early period of that great religious movement known as the revival of the 18th century. See Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i, 173, 174.

Not only was great good accomplished by the Wesleyan lay preachers in England, but by persons of this class Methodism was introduced into America. See EMBURY, PHILIP; STRAWBRIDGE, ROBERT; WEBB, Capt. In all parts of the world, wherever Methodism has extended its activities, organized lay preaching has been a leading feature of its evangelical movements. See EXHORTERS; LOCAL PREACHERS; READERS. During the current century other evangelical churches have adopted analogous measures in various forms, and employed lay evangelists under such names as Bible-readers, prayer-leaders, colporteurs, etc. In some churches in which official sanction has not been given to lay preaching—e. g. the national churches of England and Scotland, many earnest Christian laymen, including some noblemen, have gone forth independently, under their personal convictions of duty, preaching wherever they could assemble congregations.

The vast Sunday-school enterprises of modern times are themselves at once a grand result and agency of lay teaching in perfect harmony with the design of the Christian ministry, and powerfully auxiliary to its most effective administration by regularly ordained ministers of the Word. The Christian Associations of the present day are chiefly composed of laymen, and the whole weight of their influence is given to encourage the evangelization of the neglected classes of society by all available agencies, such as lay preaching and its various auxiliary forms of Christian work. By these numerous and multiplying means of Christian teaching and influence the modern Church is approximating the intense activity of the apostolic Church, and at the same time adapting itself to the moral necessities and special conditions of the present age. In this manner the primary design of Christianity is answered, and great good is accomplished among classes of people that would scarcely be reached by the regular clergy of any of the churches. Nor are the just prerogatives of ordained preachers in any degree prejudiced by the co-operative action of pious and judicious laymen. On the other hand, all ministers of a truly apostolic type cannot fail to see that their own success is greatly promoted by their imitation of the apostle to the Gentiles in enlisting and encouraging as extensively as possible all worthy helpers in Christ. See YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS. (D. P. K.)

Lay Representation. The participation of the laity, by their representatives, in the government of the Church, is one of the fruits of the Protestant Reformation. The ground of their claim to be represented in ecclesiastical government is found, however, in the nature of the Christian priesthood, and the constitution of the Church itself. Christ having satisfied, by his offering of himself, that sense of need which leads men to seek for mediators, there remains to the Christian community the offering of themselves, as a priestly body, in sacrifice and service to their Redeemer. Towards God, all are spiritually equal, and the Church, therefore, as originally constituted, was without an external priestly caste. "As all believers," says Neander, in his *Planting and Training of the Church*, "were conscious of an equal relation to Christ as their Redeemer, and of a common participation of communion with God through him, so on this consciousness an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religion subsisting between a priestly caste and a people of whom they were mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles themselves were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any relation to a mediating priesthood; in this respect they always placed themselves on a footing of equality."

Yet apostolic churches were by no means without a distinct method of government. Following the example of the synagogue, elders very soon appear in the Christian community; and the choosing of deacons by the people, with the approval of the apostles, is one of the earliest facts recorded in the New Testament history of the organizing Church. The *charisms*, or gifts of the Spirit, included that of government (1 Cor. xii); yet this gift was used, not as of exclusive right, but in co-operation with other gifts for the common welfare. The gift of the Spirit was a designation to the Christian community of the persons fitted for the exercise of this function. The Gentile churches adopted substantially the form of government in use among their Jewish fellow-Christians; "but their government," says Neander, "by no means excluded the participation of the whole Church in the management of their common concerns, as may be inferred from what we have already remarked respecting the nature of the Christian communion, and is also evident from many individual examples in the apostolic Church. The whole Church at Jerusalem took part in the deliberation respecting the relation of the Jewish and Gentile Christians to each other, and the epistle drawn up after these deliberations was likewise in the name of the whole Church. The epistles of the apostle Paul, which treat of various controverted ecclesiastical matters, are addressed to whole churches, and he assumes that the decision belonged to the whole body. Had it been otherwise, he would have addressed his instructions and advice principally, at least, to the overseers of the Church."

In the post-apostolic age, with the growth of the sacerdotal system, the laity gradually disappeared from participation in the government of the Church. As religion became more external, the minister became more a mediating priest, until finally the churches were represented in the provincial and other councils solely by their bishops. See LAITY. The hardening process went on till the fabric of mediæval Christianity was complete. The laity were held in a state of pupilage, their capability of self-guidance in matters of faith and practice was denied, and the powers of the Church were wholly absorbed by the hierarchy. This continued till the spell of mediævalism was broken by Luther.

The doctrine of justification by faith alone abolished human mediation between man and God. Luther fully recognised the New-Testament idea of the priesthood of all believers, and proclaimed it with all the force of his eloquence. His language on this subject is very explicit: "Every Christian man is a priest, and every Christian woman a priestess, whether they be young or old, master or servant, mistress or maid-servant, scholar or illiterate. All Christians are, properly speaking, members of the ecclesiastical order, and there is no difference between them except that they hold different offices" (see citations in Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 24). By the inculcation of this fundamental principle the laity recovered their position in the Church of Christ, and lay representation again became possible. "The restoration," says Litton, in his work on the Church, "in theory at least, of the laity to their proper place in the Church, was an immediate consequence of the Reformation. By reasserting the two great scriptural doctrines of the universal priesthood of Christians, and of the indwelling of the Spirit, not in a priestly caste, but in the whole body of the faithful, Luther and his contemporaries shook the whole fabric of sacerdotal usurpation to its base, and recovered for the Christian laity the rights of which they had been deprived. The lay members of the body of Christ emerged from the spiritual imbecility which they had been taught to regard as their natural state, and became free, not from the yoke of Christ, but from that of the priest."

The right of the laity to representation has ever since remained one of the points of difference between Protestantism and Romanism. The Council of Trent reaffirmed the mediæval doctrine in the strongest terms. In its decree on the sacrament of "order" it says, "And if any one affirm that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which

is as an army set in array; as if, contrary to the doctrine of the blessed Paul, all were apostles, all prophets, all evangelists, all pastors, all doctors." In the development of Protestantism the lay power was unfortunately absorbed by the state. The State-Church system has hindered the free growth of the Christian community; but wherever Protestantism has had the opportunity of freely unfolding its principles, lay representation has been recognised as just and fitting.

The form of lay representation varies in the Protestant churches. Among the Presbyterians the laity are represented by ruling elders, who are chosen for life. A presbytery usually consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district; a synod is a similarly constituted body from a larger district, embracing several presbyteries; and a general assembly consists of an equal delegation of ministers and elders from each presbytery, in a certain fixed proportion. In the General Assembly of the State Church of Scotland, the crown is also represented by a lord high commissioner. The Lutheran Church adheres to the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, as taught by Luther: "The ultimate source of power is in the congregation, and synods possess such powers as the congregations delegate to them." In the United States most of the synods are connected with a more general body (the General Synod, the General Council, or the Southern General Synod). Among the Friends, or Quakers, the legislative power is exercised by a yearly meeting, which embraces the whole society within a certain district. In this the proceedings of the quarterly and monthly meetings are reviewed. There are also "district meetings" for the supervision and care of the ministry, which are composed of ministers and elders. The Congregationalists hold the entire independence of each Christian congregation, and its right to manage its own affairs without interference from other churches. In each church all the brethren have equal rights. Councils may be called by letters addressed to neighboring churches, and, when assembled, are composed of a pastor and a delegate from each church invited. They have, however, no authoritative power. In the United States all the congregational bodies (Baptists, Orthodox Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists) hold general conventions, in which the laity are always represented.

In the Established Church of England the lay power has been jealously retained and guarded by the crown and Parliament, but the Disestablished Church of Ireland has reorganized with lay representation. In the councils of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the laity have an important place. In each diocese there is held annually a convention composed of the bishop, the clergy, and a lay delegate from each church. This is the governing body of the diocese. The legislative authority of the entire Church resides in a general convention, which meets once in three years, and is composed of the bishops and four clerical and four lay delegates from each diocese, elected by the diocesan convention. The bishops form one house, and the clerical and lay delegates another. The concurrence of both houses is necessary for the passage of any law, and, if asked for, the concurrence of the three orders becomes necessary.

Direct representation of the laity is not established among the Wesleyan Methodists of England. There are, however, preparatory committees appointed by the conference, and composed of ministers and laymen, who revise the connectional business in advance of the annual assembling of the conference. These committees shape the measures adopted subsequently by the conference, their recommendations being usually concurred in. Direct lay representation has been proposed by the Rev. William Arthur and Mr. Percival Bunting, and no doubt the proposal will hereafter be much discussed. The Irish Wesleyans are making steady progress towards lay delegation. The minor Wesleyan bodies in England (the Primitive Methodists, New Connection Methodists, etc.) have adopted lay representation. Lay representation first went into effect in the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1869. It also exists in the Methodist Protestant, the Methodist, the African Methodist, and the African Meth. Episcopal Zion churches.

The history of lay representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church has been quite eventful. Originally and for many years the Church was governed by the travelling ministers, through annual conferences and a delegated general conference. Early in this century symptoms of a desire for a change in the form of government appeared. About 1822 the *Wesleyan Repository*, a paper advocating reform (as it was then called), was established in Philadelphia. This was followed by a convention of "reformers" in Baltimore in 1824, who established as their periodical organ in that city *The Mutual Rights*. The objects of attack were the episcopacy and the clerical government of the Church. In 1827 Dr. Thomas E. Bond issued an appeal to Methodists against lay delegation which exerted a great influence in determining the maintenance of the existing system. At the General Conference of 1828 the subject was discussed in the celebrated "Report on Petitions and Memorials," which denied the claims of the petitioners. This report was unanimously adopted. By this time Church proceedings had been instituted against some of the "reform party" in Baltimore, which resulted in expulsion. Others withdrew, and in 1830 the Constitution of the "Methodist Protestant Church" was formed. The controversy was accompanied and followed with great bitterness on both sides. Looked at from this distance of time, it is apparent that both parties numbered among their leaders good and strong men, who unfortunately stood upon extreme and irreconcilable propositions. The "reformers" claimed the admission of the laity to the General Conference on the ground of the right of the people to share in ecclesiastical legislation; this claim was denied by the conservative side chiefly on the ground that the General Conference possessed "no strictly legislative powers."

The discussion rested, after the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church, for more than twenty years. Shortly before the General Conference of 1852, a convention of laymen was held in Philadelphia to take measures for bringing the subject before the Church once more. This convention, however, disclaimed all connection with the principles of the reformers of 1828, and asked for lay representation on the grounds of expediency solely. Dr. Thomas E. Bond, the great antagonist of the "radicals," met the members of the convention in the most friendly spirit, and conceded to them that lay delegation put on the ground of expediency was an open question. While still denying the claim of right, he went so far as to suggest a plan of lay co-operation in the annual conferences. The petition of the convention to the General Conference was denied. In the General Conference of 1856 an appeal for lay delegation was presented again, but received very little attention. By 1860 such progress had been made that the General Conference, assembled in that year, referred the measure to a popular and ministerial vote, to be taken in 1861 and 1862. Both votes were adverse to lay representation; but the vote, though adverse, developed the fact of a growing favor for this important measure. The *Methodist*, which was established in 1860, devoted itself to the advocacy of it; other papers, especially the *Zion's Herald* and the *North-Western Advocate*, urged it upon the Church. A largely-attended convention of laymen was held in New York in the spring of 1863. At this meeting it was resolved to hold another convention, concurrently with the session of the General Conference at Philadelphia, in 1864. The convention was so held, and presented through a deputation of its delegates a memorial to the General Conference, though without immediate result. A third convention was held, concurrently with the session of the General

Conference at Chicago, in 1868. At this conference a popular and ministerial vote was ordered for a second time. The vote of the lay members, which was large, showed a majority of two to one for lay delegation, and the necessary three fourths of the ministry were secured. At the session of General Conference which assembled in Brooklyn May 1, 1872, the measure was fully inaugurated, and the lay delegates already elected were admitted to equal powers. The plan thus adopted provides for two lay delegates for every Annual Conference, with separate votes of the lay and clerical members on any question in case one third of either order demand it.

References.—Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, book i, chapter ii, and book iii, chap. v; Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrines*, ii, 277–283; Litton, *History of the Church*, book iii, chapter ii; Waterworth, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 172 sq.; *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.* (publ. by Presb. Board, Philadelphia); *Life of Bishop Emory*, chaps. x, xi; *Economy of Methodism Illustrated and Defended*, by Dr. T. E. Bond, Introduction and Appendix; Perrine (Prof. W. H.), *The "Wesleyan Axiom" expounded: a Plea for a Lay Delegation thoroughly Scriptural, Wesleyan, and Democratic* (N. Y. 1872), attacking the plan adopted by the General Conference of 1868. See Laity. (G. R. C.)

Layritz, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born July 15, 1641, at Hof, in Bavaria. In 1667 he entered the university at Jena; in 1677 he was graduated M.A., and became in 1673 professor of Church and profane history at the gymnasium of Baireuth; in 1675, librarian and instructor of the margraves Erdmann, Philipp, and Georg Albrecht; in 1685, deacon of the court Church; in 1688, superintendent at Neustadt. In 1697 he accepted the call of the duke Wilhelm Ernst of Weimar, and he then became superintendent in general, counsellor of the consistory, first preacher of the Petri-Paul Church, and director of the gymnasium. He died April 4, 1716. He left numerous productions, e. g. *Diss. de simplici et composito* (Jenæ, 1668, 4to):—*Auszug der Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testam.* (Baireuth und Nüremb. 1678, 12mo):—*Synopsis historiæ ecclesiasticæ Novi Testam.* (ibid. 1678, 12mo):—*Der römische Papst-Thron, d. i. gründliche und ausführliche Beschreibung des päpstlichen Ehr- und Macht- und Wachsthums* (ibid, 1685, 4to).

Layritz, Paul Eugen, a noted German theologian and Moravian bishop, was born Nov. 13, 1707, at Wunsiedel, in Bavaria; was educated at the university of Leipsic, where, besides theology, he studied philosophy and mathematics. In 1731 he became subrector, and in 1735 rector of the town-school at Neustadt. Through an early acquaintance with the count Zinzendorf, however, he was in 1749 intrusted with the directorship of the Moravian seminary and grammar-school at Marienborn, and henceforth with different commissions on the affairs of the denomination; in 1749 he was sent by them to England; in 1763 to St. Petersburg, to procure permission for the Moravians to settle in the Russian empire; in 1773 to Labrador, to inquire into the progress of their missions there. In 1775, at the Synod of Barby, he was appointed a bishop, and intrusted with the supervision of the Moravian communities throughout Silesia. In 1782 he undertook also the supervision of the communities in upper Lusatia, especially that of Herrnhut. He died Aug. 3, 1788. Besides his practical activity, of great importance to his denomination, and his extended knowledge of the Oriental languages, and of the modern also, his productions as an author received a hearty welcome by his contemporaries, and are by no means useless to us, a few of which are here mentioned: *Erste Anfangsgründe der Vernunftlehre* (Züllichau, 1743, 8vo; 2d ed., ibid, 1748, 8vo; 3d ed., ibid. 1755, 8vo; 4th ed., ibid. 1764, 8vo; translated into Latin, with the title *Elementa Logicæ*, Stuttgard, 1766, 8vo):—*Betrachtungen über eine vollständige und christliche Erziehung der Kinder* (Barby, 1776, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theolog. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lazæ or **Lazi** (Λαζαι), the name of a large nation inhabiting Colchis, between the rivers Bathys and Phasis. Under the Romans the name *Lazica* was applied to the whole of Colchis. In 520 the prince of the Lazæ, Tyathus (Zathus or Tzathus), went to Constantinople to ask the aid of the emperor Justin against the Persians. He was baptized there, with the emperor himself as his sponsor, married a Grecian Christian lady of high rank, and requested the emperor to crown him king, in order that, if he should receive the crown at the hands of the king of Persia, as was formerly the custom, he should not be obliged to take a part in the heathen ceremonies and sacrifices which would follow. Justin recognised him as an independent sovereign, and crowned him himself. Soon after this the whole of the Lazæ appear to have become zealous Christians. Procopius calls them "the most zealous of all Christians," and this seems to be to some extent corroborated by the fact that Chosroes, king of Persia, endeavored to remove them into the interior of his empire, as they and their neighbors the Iberians, who were also Christians, opposed an invincible barrier to the extension of Persia. One of their princes, Gubazes, having been assassinated by a Roman general, they entertained for a moment the idea of attaching themselves to Persia, but relinquished it for fear of thereby being in danger of losing their faith: "qui enim varia senserint, versari simul nil possunt, et sane nec timore intercedente nec beneficio duce fides in his stabilis manet, ni forte eadem et rectius senserint" (Agath. iii, 12). From the statement in Procopius (*Bell. Goth.* iv, 2), that the bishops of the Lazæ sent priests to neighboring independent Christian nations, it appears that the Lazæ were zealous in propagating their faith. Among the converts they made to Christianity are the Abasians, to whom Justinian I sent priests. See Theophan. *Chronogr.* anno 512; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 250; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 386; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.

Lazarists, or Priests of the Mission, a society of missionary priests in the Roman Catholic Church. It was founded in 1624 by St. Vincent of Paul, who, while living as tutor and chaplain in the house of count Gondi, general of the royal galleys, was induced by the general confession of sick men to give a mission for the people of the dominions of the count. The results of the mission so well pleased the count that he offered a sum of money to any religious congregation which would be willing to give a mission in his dominions. Vincent in vain offered this sum to the members of his own order, the Oratorians, and to the Jesuits. Both were so overwhelmed with business that they could not accept the offer. This refusal, and the wish of the family of count Gondi, as well as of the brother of the count, the archbishop of Paris, induced Vincent in 1624 to establish the society of the missionary priests, who were chiefly to devote themselves to the religious care of the country people and the lower classes. The new institution soon received the royal sanction, and pope Urban VIII made it a special religious society under the name of the Priests of the Mission. In 1632 they received the college of St. Lazarus in Paris, whence their usual name Lazarists is derived. Their more spacious establishment and the increase of their income now enabled the congregation

Lazarist, or Priest of the Mission.

to extend their sphere of action. In addition to the revival of religion among the masses of the people, the chief objects of the Priests of the Mission were the reformation of the clergy by means of conferences, and the establishment of seminaries in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent. Even during the lifetime of St. Vincent nearly all the dioceses of France had been visited by his disciples; and, besides, also Italy, Corsica, Poland, Ireland, Scotland, Algeria, Tunis, and Madagascar received the missionaries, who, on the coast of Africa, vied with the Order of Mercy in the redemption of slaves. To Poland they were called by the queen, Maria Louisa, wife of king John Casimir II. They established a missionary institution, under the direction of Lambert, while the plague and famine were raging, in particular in Warsaw. Lambert and his successor, Ozenne, fell victims to the epidemic, but the mission became very prosperous. The first successors of Vincent as superiors general were Réné Almeras (1672), Edmund Jolly (1697), and Nicolas Pierron; at the time of the first revolution abbé Cayla de la Garde was the head of the congregation. At this time the congregation had reached its zenith; and as in France no less than forty-nine theological seminaries were conducted by it, it exercised a great influence on the theological views of the French clergy. During the Revolution, the Lazarists, in common with all the other religious denominations, perished; but they were restored as early as 1804, and even received from the public exchequer a support of 15,000 francs. At Paris a hospital belonging to the public domain was given to them for the establishment of a central institution and a novitiate; they also received several houses in the departments beyond the Alps, and the right to accept legacies. But when Napoleon had fallen out with the pope he again abolished the Lazarists by a decree of 1809, suppressed all their houses, cancelled the dotation, and confiscated the property which had been given to them or acquired by them. They were legally restored in 1816; and, though they could not recover their original house, St. Lazare, they acquired another house in the Rue Sèvres, whither they also transferred their seminary. They now resumed their former labors, but remained for some time without a regular superior general. After the death of Cayla de la Garde two vicars general had been appointed, but in 1829 the pope appointed a new superior general (Pierre Dewailly), as the convocation of a chapter general presented insurmountable obstacles. The pope, in making this appointment, expressly recognised the fact that the office of superior general had always been filled by a Frenchman. According to the Roman Almanac for 1870, the office of superior general was at that time filled by father Etienne. In 1862 (according to P. Karl vom heil. Aloys, *Statisches Jahrbuch der Kirche*, Ratisbon, 1862) the Lazarists had 18 houses in France, 27 in Italy, 4 in the British Isles, 6 in Germany, 3 in the Pyrenean peninsula, 10 in Poland (with 143 members). In Asia they had establishments in Asiatic Turkey, in Persia, in Manilla, and in five provinces of China; in Africa, at Alexandria, in Egypt, at Algiers and Mustapha, in Algeria, and at Adowa, in Abyssinia. In America they had 17 establishments. In all, there were in 1862 about 100 establishments, with 2000 members. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 383; Fehr, *Gesch. der Mönchsorden*, ii, 254. (A. J. S.)

Laz'arus (Λάζαρος, an abridged form of the Heb. name *Eleazar*, with a Greek termination, which in the Talmud is written לזור [see Bynæus, *De morte Chr.* i, 180; comp. Josephus, *War*, v, 13, 7; Simonis, *Onomast. N. T.* p. 96; Fuller, *Miscell.* i, 10; Suicer, *Thesaur.* ii, 205]. It is proper to note this here, because the parable which describes Lazarus in Abraham's bosom has been supposed to contain a latent allusion to the name of Eliezer, whom, before the birth of Ishmael and Isaac, Abraham regarded as his heir [see Geiger, in the *Jüd. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 196 sq.]), the name of two persons in the N. T.

1. An inhabitant of Bethany, brother of Mary and Martha, honored with the friendship of Jesus, by whom he was raised from the dead after he had been four days in the tomb (John xi, 1–17). A.D. 29. This great miracle is minutely described in John xi (see Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). The credit which Christ obtained among the people by this illustrious act, of which the life and presence of Lazarus afforded a standing evidence, induced the Sanhedrim, in plotting against Jesus, to contemplate the destruction of Lazarus also (John xii, 10). Whether they accomplished this object or not we are not informed, but the probability seems to be that when they had satiated their malice on Christ they left Lazarus unmolested. According to an old tradition in Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxvi, 34, p. 652), he was thirty years old when restored to life, and lived thirty years afterwards. Later legends recount that his bones were discovered A.D. 890 in Cyprus (Suicer, *Thesaur.* ii, 208), which disagrees with another story that Lazarus, accompanied by Martha and Mary, travelled to Provence, in France, and preached the Gospel in Marseilles (Fabricius, *Codex Apocr. N. Test.* iii, 475, and *Lux evang.* p. 388; Thilo, *Apocryph.* p. 711; see Launoii *Dissert. de Lazari appulsu in Provinciam*, in his *Opera*, ii, 1).

"The raising of Lazarus from the dead was a work of Christ beyond measure great, and of all the miracles he had hitherto wrought undoubtedly the most stupendous. 'If it can be incontrovertibly shown that Christ performed one such miraculous act as this,' says Tholuck (in his *Commentar zum Evang. Johannis*), 'much will thereby be gained to the cause of Christianity. One point so peculiar in its character, if irrefragably established, may serve to develop a belief in the entire evangelical record.' The sceptical Spinoza was fully conscious of this, as is related by Bayle (*Dict.* s.v. Spinoza). It is not surprising, therefore, that the enemies of Christianity have used their utmost exertions to destroy the credibility of the narrative. The earlier cavils of Woolston and his followers were, however, satisfactorily answered by Lardner and others, and the more recent efforts of the German neologists have been ably and successfully refuted by Oertelius, Langius, and Reinhard, and by H. L. Heubner in a work entitled *Miraculorum ab Evangelistis narratorum interpretat. grammatico-historica* (Wittenb. 1807), as well as by others of still more recent date, whose answers, with the objections to which they apply, may be seen in Kuinoel." See also Flatt, in *Mag. für Dogmat. und Moral.* xiv, 91; Schott, *Opusc.* i, 259; Ewald, *Lazarus für Gebildete Christusverehrer* (Berl. 1790); and the older monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 49; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 169. The rationalistic views of Paulus (*Kritisch. Kommentar*) and Gabler (*Journal f. Auserl. Theol. Lit.* iii, 235) have been successfully refuted by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*), and the mythological dreams of the latter have been dissipated by a host of later German writers, and the reality of the story triumphantly established (see especially Neander, *Das Leben Jesu Christi;* Stier and Olshausen, ad loc.). The last modification of Strauss's theory (*Die Halben und die Ganzen*, p. 79 sq., Berl. 1865) has been demolished by Hengstenberg (*Zeitschr. f. Protestant. u. Kirche*, p. 39 sq., 1868); comp. Späth (*Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* p. 339, 1868) and Holzmann (*ibid.* p. 71 sq., 1869). The views of Paulus have just been revived in the lively romance of M. E. Rénan, entitled *Vie de Jesus;* and the latter's theory of a *pious fraud* has been completely demolished by Ebrard, Pressensé, and Ellicott, in their works on our Lord's life. See also the *Studien und Krit.* ii, 1861; Watson, *Lazarus of Bethany* (London, 1844). Compare Jesus; Mary.

2. A beggar named in the parable of Dives (Luke xvi, 20–25) as suffering the most abject poverty in this life, but whose humble piety was rewarded with ultimate bliss in the other world; the only instance of a proper name in a parable, and probably selected in this instance on account of its frequency. He is an imaginary representative of the regard which God exercises towards those of his saints whom the world spurns and passes

unnoticed; by others, however, he has been considered a real personage, with which accords the old tradition that even gives the name of the rich man as being *Dobruk* (see F. Fabri, *Evagat.* i, 35 sq.). Some interpreters think he was some well-known mendicant of Jerusalem (see Seb. Schmid, *Fascic. disputat.* p. 878 sq.), and have attempted to define his disease (see Wedel, *Exercit. Med.* cent. ii, dec. ii, No. 2; Bartolini, *Morb. bibl.* c. xxi) with the success that might be expected (S. G. Feige, *De morte Laz.* [Hal. 1733]).

The history of this Lazarus made a deep impression upon the Church, a fact illustrated by the circumstance to which Trench calls attention, "that the term *lazar* should have passed into so many languages, losing altogether its signification as a proper name" (*On Parables*, p. 459, note). Early in the history of the Church Lazarus was regarded as the patron saint of the sick, and especially of those suffering from the terrible scourge of leprosy. "Among the orders, half military and half monastic, of the 12th century, was one which bore the title of the Knights of St. Lazarus (A.D. 1119), whose special work it was to minister to the lepers, first of Syria, and afterwards of Europe. The use of *lazaretto* and *lazar-house* for the leper hospitals then founded in all parts of Western Christendom, no less than that of *lazzarone* for the mendicants of Italian towns, are indications of the effect of the parable upon the mind of Europe in the Middle Ages, and thence upon its later speech. In some cases there seems to have been a singular transfer of the attributes of the one Lazarus to the other. Thus in Paris the prison of St. Lazare (the Clos S. Lazare, so famous in 1848) had been originally a hospital for lepers. In the 17th century it was assigned to the Society of Lazarists, who took their name, as has been said, from Lazarus of Bethany, and St. Vincent de Paul died there in 1660. In the immediate neighborhood of the prison, however, are two streets, the Rue d'Enfer and Rue de Paradis, the names of which indicate the earlier associations with the Lazarus of the parable.

"It may be mentioned incidentally, as there has been no article under the head of DIVES, that the occurrence of this word, used as a quasi-proper name, in our early English literature, is another proof of the impression which was made on the minds of men, either by the parable itself, or by dramatic representations of it in the mediæval mysteries. It appears as early as Chaucer ('Lazar and Dives,' Sompnoure's Tale) and Piers Ploughman ('Dives in the deyntees lyvede,' l. 9158), and in later theological literature its use has been all but universal. In no other instance has a descriptive adjective passed in this way into the received name of an individual. The name *Nimeusis*, which Euthymius gives as that of the rich man (Trench, *Parables*, l. c.), seems never to have come into any general use." See Klinkhardt, *De homine divite et Lazaro* (Lipsiæ, 1831); Walker, *Parable of Lazarus* (Lond. 1850); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July and Oct. 1859; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, July, and Oct. 1864. See PARABLE.

Lazarus, a noted French prelate, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. It is supposed that he was raised to the archbishopric of Aix in 408, and resigned in 411, at the death of Constantine. In 415 he distinguished himself among the most zealous adversaries of Pelagius, and of his disciple Cœlestius, for we find that the Council of Diospolis, in the meeting of Dec. 20, 415, condemned the errors attributed to Pelagius, and denounced by Lazarus, then archbishop of Aix, and by Heros, bishop of Arles. Pelagius having succeeded in persuading the Eastern bishops that he did not hold the condemned doctrines, Lazarus and Heros addressed further memorials against him to the bishops of Africa, who were on the eve of holding the Council of Carthage. Here Pelagius and Nestorius were finally condemned. The letters of pope Zosimus, who favored Pelagius, are full of bitterness against Lazarus. See Augustine, *Epistolæ*, passim, et *Gesta Pelagii;* Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium;* Zosimi *Epistolæ*, a J. Sirmondo editæ; *Gallia Christ.* vol. i, col. 299; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, ii, 147; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 43. (J. N. P.)

Leach. See HORSE-LEECH.

Leach, JAMES, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stafford County, Va., July 15, 1791. He was educated in Hampden Sidney College, Va., studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, Va., and was licensed by the Winchester Presbytery Oct. 10, 1818. He was a predestinarian of the order of Augustine and Calvin. His ordination and installation took place soon after his call, Sept. 27, 1819, and in 1824 he was transferred from Berkeley to Hanover by the Presbytery. At the disruption of the Church he took sides with those opposed to the Old-School party, believing the action of the Assembly of 1837 unconstitutional as well as injudicious. He died Sept. 4, 1866.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1869, p. 442.

Leacock, HAMBLE JAMES, a missionary of the Church of England, was born at Cluff's Bay, Barbadoes, Feb. 14, 1795. His family was descended from a noble English ancestry. Slaves were an element of respectability in Barbadoes, and his father had many. Young Leacock received his early education at Codrington College, Barbadoes. Through Dr. Coleridge, bishop of Barbadoes and Leeward Islands, he became reader in his native parish, and in connection studied with his pastor, Rev. W. M. Harte, and obtained deacon's orders in January, 1826. While acting as assistant priest of St. John's Church he became very decided in his religious views, and extended the privileges of the Church to all the parish's slaves, at the same time liberating all his own slaves. The hatred and open reproach of the whites even the bishop could not calm. Leacock was transferred to the island of St. Vincent, and then to Nevis, where he became rural dean and pastor of St. Paul's Church, Charlestown. He there fought polygamy with success. But soon reverses came—difficulty with the bishop, insurrections of the slaves, and fall of property. He left for the United States, and settled in Lexington, Ky., in 1835. His confirmation, neglected in his youth, here took place on arrival. He fell into the society of such men as Dr. Coit, Dr. Cooke, Amos Cleaver, and found many friends in Transylvania University. He gained a livelihood by teaching until 1836, when he became pastor of a new congregation, St. Paul's. Difficulty soon arose here also, and led to his removal. His friends scattered to different parts of the Union. Bishop Otey stationed him in Franklin parish, Tenn. Soon after, urged by friends, he preached six months to a new congregation in Louisville, Ky.; he then returned to his old parish. He bought a small farm in New Jersey, near the city of New Brunswick, and settled on it in 1840. He now preached in different places—for a few Sundays in and about Bridgeport, Conn.; then he supplied the winter service of the absent pastor of Christ Church, New Brunswick. In 1841 his personal appearance in the West Indies recovered for him some of his property there. He returned to the States, and was appointed to two small stations near his farm. In 1843 he became rector of St. Paul's Church, Perth Amboy. In 1847 his health and property called him to the West Indies again. By a letter from bishop Doane, bishop Parry's reception was such that he decided to remain, and in 1848 his Perth Amboy congregation accepted his resignation. He revisited the island of Nevis, and, at the peril of his life, preached vehemently against some of the immoral practices prevalent there. In 1852 he preached again for one year in St. Peter's Church, Speightstown, Barbadoes. In 1854 he preached in St. Leonard's Chapel, Bridgetown. On July 15, 1855, he became the first volunteer to the West Indian Church Association for the furtherance of the Gospel in Western Africa (recently formed by bishop Parry), sailed for England, visited and prepared there, reached Africa, and landed at Freetown, Sierra Leone, Nov. 10. Aided by

the bishop of Sierra Leone and colonel Hill, its governor, he founded at length a station, the Rio Pongas. At Tintima village he gained over one out of the five hostile negro chiefs. An educated black coming with him from Barbadoes, John H. A. Duport, and a converted negro chief, Mr. Wilkinson, aided him greatly; the latter gave him a site for his dwelling and chapel. Ill health drove the missionary to Freetown to recruit. Returning, he opened a school for boys, with an attendance which increased to forty. He was aided with money, books, and clothing from England, and his congregations in Perth Amboy, Kentucky, and Tennessee. His territory soon widened, the natives became favorable, and the school increased. Again sickness drove him to his friends in Sierra Leone. Against their advice, and that of the bishop of Barbadoes, he returned to his post. He seemed to recover, and laid plans for future efforts; but died August 20, 1856. As a result of his labors, a large missionary field was opened. His biography is written by Rev. Henry Caswall, D.D. (London, 1857, 12mo), a friend, and English secretary of the society under which he acted.

Lead (עֹפֶרֶת, *ophe'reth*, from its *dusty* color, in pause עֹפֶרֶת, Exod. xv, 10; Numb. xxxi, 22; Job xix, 24; Jer. vi, 29; Ezek. xxii, 18, 20; xxvii, 12; Zech. v, 7, 8; Sept. μόλιβδος), a well-known metal, generally found in veins of rocks, though seldom in a metallic state, and most commonly in combination with sulphur. Although the metal itself was well known to the ancients and to the Hebrews, yet the early uses of lead in the East seem to have been comparatively few, nor are they now numerous. One may travel far in Western Asia without discovering a trace of this metal in any of the numerous useful applications which it is made to serve in European countries. We are not aware that any native lead has been yet found within the limits of Palestine. But ancient lead mines, in some of which the ore has been exhausted by working, have been discovered by Mr. Burton in the mountains between the Red Sea and the Nile; and lead is also said to exist at a place called Sheff, near Mount Sinai (Kitto, *Phys. Hist. Pal.* p. lxxiii).

The ancient Egyptians employed lead for a variety of purposes, but chiefly as an alloy with more precious metals. On the breasts of mummies that have been unrolled there is frequently found in soft lead, thin and quite flexible, the figure of a hawk, with extended wings, emblematical of Re, or Phra, the sun. Specimens of lead have also been discovered among the Assyrian ruins (Layard's *Nin. and Bab.* p. 357); and a bronze lion is found attached to its stone base by means of this metal (Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 325).

The first scriptural notice of this metal occurs in the triumphal song in which Moses celebrates the overthrow of Pharaoh, whose host is there said to have "sunk like *lead*" in the waters of the Red Sea (Exod. xv, 10). That it was common in Palestine is shown by the expression in Ecclus. xlvii, 18, where it is said, in apostrophizing Solomon, "Thou didst multiply silver as *lead*;" the writer having in view the hyperbolical description of Solomon's wealth in 1 Kings x, 27: "The king made the silver to be in Jerusalem as *stones*." It was among the spoils of the Midianites which the children of Israel brought with them to the plains of Moab, after their return from the slaughter of the tribe (Numb. xxxi, 22). The ships of Tarshish supplied the market of Tyre with lead, as with other metals (Ezek. xxvii, 12). Its heaviness, to which allusion is made in Exod. xv, 10, and Ecclus. xxii, 14, caused it to be used for weights, which were either in the form of a round flat cake (Zech. v, 7), or a rough unfashioned lump or "stone" (ver. 8); stones having in ancient times served the purpose of weights (comp. Prov. xvi, 11). This fact may perhaps explain the substitution of "lead" for "stones" in the passage of Ecclesiasticus above quoted; the commonest use of the cheapest metal being present to the mind of the writer. If Gesenius is correct in rendering אֲנָךְ, *anák*, by "lead," in Amos vii, 7, 8, we have another instance of the purposes to which this metal was applied in forming the ball or bob of the plumb-line. See PLUMB-LINE. Its use for weighting fishing-lines was known in the time of Homer (*Il.* xxiv, 80). In Acts xxvii, 28, a plummet (βολίς, in the form βολίζω, to *heave the lead*) for taking soundings at sea is mentioned, and this was, of course, of lead.

But, in addition to these more obvious uses of this metal, the Hebrews were acquainted with another method of employing it, which indicates some advance in the arts at an early period. Job (xix, 24) utters a wish that his words, "with a pen of iron and lead, were graven in the rock forever." The allusion is supposed to be to the practice of carving inscriptions upon stone, and pouring molten lead into the cavities of the letters, to render them legible, and at the same time preserve them from the action of the air. Frequent references to the use of leaden tablets for inscriptions are found in ancient writers. Pausanias (ix, 31) saw Hesiod's *Works and Days* graven on lead, but almost illegible with age. Public proclamations, according to Pliny (xiii, 21), were written on lead, and the name of Germanicus was carved on leaden tablets (Tacitus, *Ann.* ii, 69). Eutychius (*Ann. Alex.* p. 390) relates that the history of the Seven Sleepers was engraved on lead by the cadi. The translator of Rosenmüller (in *Bib. Cab.* xxvii, 64) thinks, however, that the poetical force of the scriptural passage has been overlooked by interpreters: "Job seems not to have drawn his image from anything he had actually seen executed: he only wishes to express in the strongest possible language the durability due to his words; and accordingly he says, 'May the pen be iron, and the ink of lead, with which they are written on an everlasting rock,' i. e. Let them not be written with ordinary perishable materials." The above usual explanation seems to be suggested by that of the Septuagint, "that they were sculptured by an iron pen and lead, or hewn into rocks." See PEN.

Oxide of lead is employed largely in modern pottery for the formation of glazes, and its presence has been discovered in analyzing the articles of earthen-ware found in Egypt and Nineveh, proving that the ancients were acquainted with its use for the same purpose. The A. V. of Ecclus. xxxviii, 30 assumes that the usage was known to the Hebrews, though the original is not explicit upon the point. Speaking of the potter's art in finishing off his work, "he applieth himself to *lead* it over," is the rendering of what in the Greek is simply "he giveth his heart to complete the smearing," the material employed for the purpose not being indicated. See POTTERY.

In modern metallurgy lead is employed for the purpose of purifying silver from other mineral products, instead of the more expensive quicksilver. The alloy is mixed with lead, exposed to fusion upon an earthen vessel, and submitted to a blast of air. By this means the dross is consumed. This process is called the cupelling operation, with which the description in Ezek. xxii, 18–22, in the opinion of Mr. Napier (*Met. of Bible*, p. 20–24), accurately coincides. "The vessel containing the alloy is surrounded by the fire, or placed in the midst of it, and the blowing is not applied to the fire, but to the fused metals. . . . When this is done, nothing but the perfect metals, gold and silver, can resist the scorifying influence." In support of his conclusion he quotes Jer. vi, 28–30, adding, "This description is perfect. If we take silver having the impurities in it described in the text, namely, iron, copper, and tin, and mix it with lead, and place it in the fire upon a cupell, it soon melts; the lead will oxidize and form a thick coarse crust upon the surface, and thus consume away, but effecting no purifying influence. The alloy remains, if anything, worse than before. . . . The silver is not refined because 'the bellows were burned'—there existed nothing to blow upon it. Lead is the purifier, but only so in connection with a blast blowing upon the precious metals."

An allusion to this use of lead is to be found in Theognis (*Gnom.* 1127 sq., ed. Welcker), and it is mentioned by Pliny (xxxiii, 31) as indispensable to the purification of silver from alloy. Comp. also Mal. iii, 2, 3. See METAL.

By modern artificers lead is used with tin in the composition of solder for fastening metals together. That the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the use of solder is evident from the description given by the prophet Isaiah of the processes which accompanied the formation of an image for idolatrous worship. The method by which two pieces of metal were joined together was identical with that employed in modern times; the substances to be united being first clamped before being soldered. No hint is given as to the composition of the solder, but in all probability lead was one of the materials employed, its usage for such a purpose being of great antiquity. The ancient Egyptians used it for fastening stones together in the rough parts of a building. Mr. Napier (*Metallurgy of the Bible*, p. 130) conjectures that "the solder used in early times for lead, and termed lead, was the same as is now used—a mixture of lead and tin." See SOLDER.

Leade or Leadly, JANE, an English mystic, founder of the *Philadelphians*, was born in the county of Norfolk in 1623. According to her own accounts she was convicted of sin in her sixteenth year by a mysterious voice whispering in her ear, and found peace in the grace of God three years after. Her parents, whose name was Ward, seriously opposed Jane's firm religious stand, and, having decided to withdraw from the parental roof, she removed in 1643 to London to join a brother of hers living there. She had spent a year in the English metropolis, constantly growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christian truths, when a summons came to her from her parents to return home, which request was at once obeyed. Shortly afterwards she was married to William Leade, a pious, noble-hearted man, with whom she lived happily, blessed with a family of four daughters, until 1670, when William was suddenly removed at the age of forty-nine. From the time of her earliest conversion she had shown signs of a mystical tendency; she found the greatest delight in seeking private communion with God; now the loss of her husband drew her still further away from the world, and she became a confirmed mystic. As early as 1652, Dr. Pordage (q. v.) and his wife, together with Dr. Thomas Bromley (q. v.), had succeeded in gathering a congregation of mystics of the Jacob Böhme (q. v.) type, but the pestilence of 1655 had necessitated separation, and they were just gathering anew at London when Jane Leade was deprived of the earthly association of her husband. She joined them readily, and soon became one of the leading spirits of this new mystical movement, and rose until she finally became the founder of a distinct mystical school known as the *Philadelphians* (q. v.). As her motive for joining Pordage, she assigned certain secret divine revelations and visions which she claimed to have had in the spring of 1670, and shortly after she actually brought before the society a set of laws which she professed to have received of the Lord, in like manner as Moses had been intrusted with the Ten Commandments. (For a complete copy, see *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* 1865, p. 187 sq.) A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1683, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes—very scarce at present—like those of Jacob Böhme, though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently to spread her peculiar views, and by these means to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been informed by revelation was near at hand (for 1700). She was led to seek the establishment of a distinct organization by the movements of the German Pietists and Chiliasts at this period. In 1690, Kilner, of Moscow, agitated this subject still further by an effort to establish a *patriarchal and apostolical society* of true and persecuted Christians, and in 1696 Mrs. Petersen, in her *Anleitung z. Verständniss d. Offenbarung*, and again in 1698 in *Der geistliche Kampf* (Halle, 8vo), called upon the regenerate Christians to separate from the world and to form a new Jerusalem. In 1695, Jane Leade, together with her friends Bromley and Pordage, removed to carry out these projects in London, and proposed a new society, to consist only of Christians, who, without separating from the different churches to which they belonged, should form a pure and undefiled Church of true Christians, to be governed only by God's will and the Holy Spirit, and who should hasten the second coming of Christ and the beginning of the millennium. So successful was this effort that by 1702 the *Philadelphians*, as they now called themselves, were able to send missionaries to Germany and Holland with a view to making proselytes; and, although they failed to accomplish their object immediately, the idea which constituted it took ground and spread, especially in Germany. Conrad Brüsske of Offenbach, a disciple of Beverley, Dr. Horch of Marburg, and Dr. Kaiser of Stuttgard, labored to propagate it; the latter wrote a number of works on the subject under the name of Timotheus Philadelphus, and established a Philadelphian community at Stuttgard. An approximate estimate of the extent of Jane Leade's influence on Germany and Holland may be obtained by a reference to the extensive list of her correspondents in those countries (comp. *Zeitsch. f. hist. Theol.* 1865, p. 222, note 38). Many, without being outwardly members of this and similar societies, were evidently favorable to them. But some enthusiasts, as Gebhard, Wetzel, Eva von Buttlar, etc., caused the movement to fall into discredit. The scattered elements of the divers societies were afterwards reunited by count Zinzendorf, and formed part of the Moravian institution. But to return to Jane Leade herself. In 1702 she felt that her end was near at hand. She wrote out her funeral discourse, to be read at her grave, and made all manner of preparations for departure. One of the strangest features of this period of her life is her study of the writings of cardinal Petrucci and of Richard of Samson. She died Aug. 19, 1704. The most noted of her works are, *The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of eight Worlds, as they were made known experimentally to the Author* (Lond. 1695, 24mo): —*The Tree of Faith, or the Tree of Life, springing up in the Paradise of God* (Lond. 1696, 24mo). See G. Arnold, *Kirchenhistorie*, vol. ii; Gichtel, *Theosophia practica;* Poiret and Arnold, *Gesch. d. Mystik;* Corrodi, *Kritische Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, iii, 403–421; Gobel, *Gesch. d. Christl. Lebens*, vols. ii and iii; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. ii, ch. vii, § 5; Lee, *Life of Jane Leade;* J. W. Jœger, *Dissert. de Vita et Doctrina Janæ Leadæ;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 50; Hochhuth, *Gesch. der philadelphischen Gemeinden*, Part I, *Jane Leade und die Philadelphier in England*, in the *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theolog.* 1865, p. 172–290. See PHILADELPHIANS. (J. H. W.)

Leaders. This term has a technical significance as applied to leaders of religious classes in the original Methodist societies, and in the Methodist churches of the present day. See CLASS-MEETINGS. The leader's office is one of pastoral help. It therefore involves great responsibility, and requires for the proper discharge of its duties a deep religious experience, combined with a capacity to instruct believers in the practical details of religious truth, to console the afflicted, to encourage the despondent, to guide the erring, and, in short, both by precept and example, to lead Christians and penitents forward in the pathway of holiness. Leaders are ex-

pected to meet the several members of their classes weekly for religious worship and conversation, to visit those who are detained by sickness, and to take all suitable means for aiding the religious life and progress of those under their care. They are also required to meet their pastors weekly, to report respecting the welfare of the members and probationers attached to their classes. See LEADERS' MEETINGS and PROBATIONERS. In some cases women are appointed leaders, more especially of classes composed of females or of children. That the office of class-leader has been greatly helpful to the pastorate in those churches which have employed it does not admit of question. Hence it is a recognised obligation of pastors in those churches not only to select the best persons for the office, but also to aid them in acquiring the best qualifications for its useful exercise. To aid in the task of instructing leaders various tracts and small books have been published. See Tract list of the Methodist Episcopal Church. (D. P. K.)

Leaders' Meetings. As an essential part of the Wesleyan system of subpastoral superintendence by means of class-leaders [see LEADERS], an organized meeting was appointed to be held weekly under the above title. A leaders' meeting is composed of the itinerant ministers of any circuit or station, and all persons regularly in office as leaders or stewards. See STEWARDS. In England, the powers of leaders' meetings have been considerably enlarged since such meetings were instituted by Mr. Wesley. "They have now a veto upon the admittance of members into the society, when appealed to in such cases by any parties concerned: they possess the power of a jury in the trial of accused members: without their consent, no leader or steward can be appointed to office, or removed from it, excepting when the crime proved merits exclusion from membership, in which case the superintendent can at once depose the offender from office, and expel him from the society. Without their consent, in conjunction with the trustees of the chapel in which their meeting is attached, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper cannot be administered in the said chapel; and the fund for the relief of poor and afflicted members of the society is distributed under their direction and management. Regular leaders' meetings have from the beginning been found essential to the pastoral care and spiritual prosperity of our societies, as well as to the orderly transaction of their financial concerns. The ministers are directed attentively to examine, at each meeting, the entries made in the class-books in reference to the attendance of members, in order that prompt and timely measures may be adopted in cases which, on inquiry, shall appear to demand the exercise of discipline, or the interposition of pastoral exhortation and admonition" (Grindrod's *Compendium of Wesleyan Methodism*). In the Methodist Episcopal Church leaders' meetings have no judicial or veto powers as described above. They are held monthly, or at the call of the pastor. Their usual business embraces the following items: *a.* That the leaders have an opportunity "to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reproved." *b.* That the pastor may examine the several class-books, and ascertain the Christian walk and character of each member of the Church, and learn what members of the flock especially need his watch-care and counsel. *c.* To inquire into the religious state of all persons on trial, and ascertain who can be recommended by the leader for admission into full connection, and who should be discontinued. *d.* To examine the several leaders respecting their "method of leading their classes." *e.* To recommend to the quarterly conference suitable candidates for appointment as local preachers. The leaders' meeting also becomes to pastors a convenient and appropriate body of men with whom they can take counsel from time to time respecting many minor matters of Church interest in reference to which advice or co-operation may seem desirable. See CLASS-MEETINGS. (D. P. K.)

Leaf, a term occurring in the Bible, both in the singular and plural, in three senses.

1. LEAF OF A TREE (prop. עָלֶה, *aleh'*, so called from springing up; Gr. φύλλον; also עָפְאִי, *ophi'*, foliage [Psa. civ, 12], or in Chald. the top of a tree [Dan. iv, 9, 11, 18], and טָרֶף, *te'reph*, a *fresh* leaf [Ezek. xvii, 9] "plucked off" [Gen. viii, 11]). The olive-leaf is mentioned in Gen. viii, 11. Fig-leaves formed the first covering of our parents in Eden. The barren fig-tree (Matt. xxi, 19; Mark xi, 13) on the road between Bethany and Jerusalem "had on it nothing but *leaves*." The fig-leaf is alluded to by our Lord (Matt. xxiv, 32; Mark xiii, 28): "When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh." The oak-leaf is mentioned in Isa. i, 30, and vi, 13. Leaves, the organs of perspiration and inhalation in plants, are used symbolically in the Scriptures in a variety of senses; sometimes they are taken as an evidence of grace (Psa. i, 3), while at others they represent the mere outward form of religion without the Spirit (Matt. xxi, 19). Their flourishing and their decay, their restoration and their fragility, furnish the subjects of numerous allusions of great force and beauty (Lev. xxvi, 36; Isa. i, 30; xxxiv, 4; Jer. viii, 13; Dan. iv, 12, 14, 21; Mark xi, 13; xiii, 28; Rev. xxii, 2). The bright, fresh color of the leaf of a tree or plant shows that it is richly nourished by a good soil, hence it is the symbol of prosperity (Psa. i, 3; Jer. xvii, 8). A faded leaf, on the contrary, shows the lack of moisture and nourishment, and becomes a fit emblem of adversity and decay (Job xiii, 25; Isa. lxiv, 6). Similar figures have prevailed in all ages (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dictionary*, s. v.). In Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters, the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom are spoken of under the image of trees growing on a river's bank; there "shall grow all trees for food, whose leaf shall not fade" (Ezek. xlvii, 12). In this passage it is said that "the fruit of these trees shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine" (margin, *for bruises and sores*). With this compare John's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. xxii, 1, 2): "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life . . . . and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." There is probably here an allusion to some tree whose leaves were used by the Jews as a medicine or ointment; indeed, it is very likely that many plants and leaves were thus made use of by them, as by the old English herbalists. See TREE OF LIFE.

2. LEAF OF A DOOR (צֶלַע, *tse'la*, a *side*, in 1 Kings vi, 34 [where the latter clause has, prob. by error, קֶלַע, *ke'lang*, a curtain], means the *valve* of a folding door; so also דֶּלֶת, *de'leth*, a *door* [Isa. xlv, 1]). See DOOR.

3. LEAF OF A BOOK (דֶּלֶת, *de'leth*, a *door-valve*, as above, hence perhaps a fold of a roll [Jer. xxxvi, 23], like our *column* of a volume). See BOOK.

League (בְּרִית, *berith'*, a *contract* or "covenant;" also חָבַר, *chabar'* [Dan. xi, 23], to "*join*" in alliance; כָּרַת, *karath'*, to *cut*, i. e. "make" a league), a political confederacy or treaty. That the Hebrews, surrounded on every side by idolatrous nations, might not be seduced to a defection from Jehovah their king, it was necessary that they should be kept from too great an intercourse with those nations by the establishment of various singular rites; but, lest this seclusion from them should be the source of hatred to other nations, Moses constantly taught them that they should love their *neighbor*, i. e. every one with whom they had intercourse, including foreigners (Exod. xxii, 21; xxiii, 9; Lev. xix, 34; Deut. x, 18, 19; xxiv, 17, 18; xxvii, 19; comp. Luke x, 25-37). To this end, he showed them that the benefits which God had conferred upon them in preference to other nations were undeserved (Deut. vii, 6-8; ix, 4-24). But, although the Hebrews individually were debarred from any close intimacy with idolatrous nations by various rites, yet as a nation they were permitted to form trea-

ties with Gentile states, with the following exceptions: (1.) The *Canaanites*, including the *Philistines;* with these nations the Hebrews were not permitted to enter into any alliance whatever (Exod. xxiii, 32, 33; xxxiv, 12-16; Deut. vii, 1-11; xx, 1-18). The Phœnicians, although Canaanites, were not included in this deep hostility, as they dwelt on the northern shore of the country, were shut up within their own limits, and did not occupy the land promised to the patriarchs. (2.) The *Amalekites*, or Canaanites of Arabia, were also destined to hereditary enmity, unceasing war, and total extermination (Exod. xvii, 8, 14; Deut. xxv, 17-19, Judg. vi, 3-5; 1 Sam. xv, 1, 33; xxvii, 8, 9; xxx, 1, 17, 18). (3.) The *Moabites* and *Ammonites* were to be excluded forever from the right of treaty or citizenship with the Hebrews, but were not to be attacked in war, except when provoked by previous hostility (Deut. ii, 9-19; xxiii, 3-6; Judg. iii, 12-30; 1 Sam. xiv, 47; 2 Sam. viii, 2; xii, 26). With the Midianitish nation at large there was no hereditary enmity, but those tribes who had conspired with the Moabites were ultimately crushed in a war of dreadful severity (Numb. xxv, 17, 18; xxxi, 1-18). Yet those tribes which did not participate in the hostilities against the Hebrews were included among the nations with whom alliances might be formed, but in later times they acted in so hostile a manner that no permanent peace could be preserved with them (Judg. vi, 1-40; vii, 1-25; viii, 1-21). No war was enjoined against the Edomites; and it was expressly enacted that, in the tenth generation, they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship (Numb. xx, 14-21; Deut. ii, 4 8). The Edomites also, on their part, conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war, in which they were overcome. From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrews (2 Sam. viii, 13, 14). War had not been determined on against the Amorites on the east of the Jordan; but, as they not only refused a free passage, but opposed the Hebrews with arms, they were attacked and beaten, and their country fell into the hands of the Hebrews (Numb. xxi, 21-35; Deut. i, 4; ii, 24-37; iii, 1-18; iv, 46 49; Judg. xi, 13 23). Treaties were permitted with all other nations, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. David accordingly maintained a friendly national intercourse with the kings of Tyre and Hamath, and Solomon with the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and with the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into compact with the Romans. When the prophets condemn the treaties which were made with the nations, they did so, not because they were contrary to the Mosaic laws, but because they were impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in Jehovah their king. The event always showed in the most striking manner the propriety of their rebukes (2 Kings xvii, 4; xviii, 20, 21; xx, 12, 13; 2 Chron. xx, 35-37; xxviii, 21; Isa. vii, 2; xxx, 2-12; xxxi, 1-3; xxxvi, 4-7; xxxix, 1-8; Hos. v, 13; vii, 11; xii, 1; Jer. xxxvii, 5-10). See ALLIANCE.

League of Cambray is the name of the league entered into (A.D. 1508) between pope Julius II, the emperor Maximilian, and the kings of France and Navarre, to make war, by the aid of both spiritual and temporal arms, against the republic of Venice. See JULIUS II; MAXIMILIAN; VENICE.

League and Covenant. See COVENANT, SOLEMN LEAGUE AND.

League, Holy. See HOLY LEAGUE.

League of Smalcalde. See SMALCALDE.

Le'äh (Heb. *Leäh'*, לֵאָה, *weary;* Sept. Λεία, Vulg. *Lia*), the eldest daughter of the Aramæan Laban, and sister of Rachel (Gen. xxix, 16). Instead of the latter, for whom he had served seven years, Jacob took her through a deceit of her father, who was unwilling to give his younger daughter in marriage first, contrary to the usages of the East (Gen. xxix, 22 sq.; compare Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* i, 138 sq.). B.C. 1920. She was less beautiful than her younger sister (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* i, 19, 7), having also weak eyes (עֵינַיִם רַכּוֹת, Sept. ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀσθενεῖς, Vulg. *lippis oculis*, Auth. Vers. "tender-eyed," Gen. xxix, 17; comp. the opposite quality as a recommendation, 1 Sam. xvi, 12), which probably accounts for Jacob's preference of Rachel both at first and ever afterwards, especially as he was not likely ever to love cordially one whom he did not voluntarily marry (comp. Gen. xxx, 20). See RACHEL. Leah bore to Jacob, before her sister had any children, six sons, namely, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (Gen. xxix, 32 sq.), Issachar, and Zebulon (Gen. xxx, 17 sq.; compare xxxv, 23); also one daughter, Dinah (Gen. xxx, 21), besides the two sons borne by her maid Zilpah, and reckoned as hers, namely, Gad and Asher (Gen. xxx, 9), all within the space of seven years, B.C. 1919-1913. See CONCUBINE; SLAVE. "Leah was conscious and resentful (chap. xxx) of the smaller share she possessed in her husband's affections; yet in Jacob's differences with his father-in-law his two wives appear to be attached to him with equal fidelity. In the critical moment when he expected an attack from Esau, his discriminate regard for the several members of his family was shown by his placing Rachel and her children hindermost, in the least exposed situation, Leah and her children next, and the two handmaids with their children in the front. Leah probably lived to witness the dishonor of her daughter (ch. xxxiv), so cruelly avenged by two of her sons, and the subsequent deaths of Deborah at Bethel, and of Rachel near Bethlehem." Leah appears to have died in Canaan, since she is not mentioned in the migration to Egypt (Gen. xlvi, 5), and was buried in the family cemetery at Hebron (Gen. xlix, 31). See JACOB.

Leake, LEMUEL FORDHAM, a minister of the Presbyterian (O. S.) Church, was born in Chester, Morris County, N. J., and was educated at Princeton College, class of 1814. After graduation he taught two years, then studied theology at Princeton Seminary, was licensed by the Newton Presbytery Oct. 7, 1818, and became pastor of the churches of Oxford and Harmony in 1822. In 1825 he resigned this position, and labored for the missionary interests of the Church. In 1831 he was called to Chartiers Church, at Canonsburg, as successor to Dr. M'Millan, and there he labored until 1850, when he became president of Franklin College, New Athens, Ohio. Later he removed to Zelienople, Pa.; thence to Waveland, Ind. He died Dec. 1, 1866.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 168.

Leaming, JEREMIAH, D.D., an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Middletown, Conn., in 1717, graduated at Yale College in 1745, and, after entering the ministry, quickly rose to distinction. He was at one time spoken of for the office of first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. He died at New Haven, Conn., in 1804. Among his publications are *A Defence of Episcopal Government of the Church:—Evidences of the Truth of Christianity;* etc.—Allibone, *Dict. British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leander, ST., a Spanish prelate, flourished towards the close of the 6th century. He died March 13, 601 (according to some, Feb. 27, 596). He was a son of Severianus, governor of Carthage, and brother of Fulgentius, bishop of that city, and of St. Isidore of Seville, who succeeded him as bishop of Seville. Leander especially distinguished himself by his zeal against the Arians. Among his converts was Hermenigilde, eldest son of Leuvigilde, king of the Goths. Upon the defeat of the former by the latter Leander was sent into exile, but he was recalled in the same year, and converted Reccarede, second son of the king. After the death of Leuvigilde he assembled at once the third Council of Toledo, and caused Arianism to be solemnly condemned. For his services in making Spain an adherent of the faith of

Rome he was specially rewarded by Gregory I. The cathedral of Seville claims to possess his remains, and he is commemorated on the 13th of March. He wrote a number of works, of which there are yet extant *De Institutione Virginum et contemptu mundi* (to be found in the *Codex Regularum* of St. Benedict of Amiane, published by Holstenius, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. xii). It is a letter to his sister, St. Florentine:—*Homilia in laudem Ecclesiæ*, etc. (Labbé, *Concil.* vol. v), a discourse on the conversion of the Goths, pronounced at the third Council of Toledo. Leander is considered as the originator of the Mozarabic rite completed by St. Isidore. St. Gregory the Great dedicated to Leander his dissertations on Job, which he had undertaken by his advice. See St. Isidore, *De Viris illustribus*, etc.; St. Gregory the Great, *Epist.* and *Dialog.*; St. Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* vol. v; Baronius, *Annales*; Dom Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis Benedicti*, etc.; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, i, Mar. 13; Dom Ceillier, *Hist. d. Auteurs sacrés*, xvii, 115, etc.; Dom Rivet, *Hist. Littéraire de la France*; Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 55; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 388.

Leang-Oo-Tee, emperor of China, and founder of the Leang dynasty, usurped the throne about A. D. 502. Through devotion to the doctrines of Fo and mysticism of the bonzes (priests of Fo or Buddha), he neglected the care of the empire. He was dethroned by one of his officers, Heoo-King, and died soon after (549).

Lean'noth (Heb. *le-annoth'*, לְעַנּוֹת, *for answering*, i. e. singing; Sept. *τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι*, Vulg. *ad respondendum*), a musical direction occurring in the title of Psa. lxxxviii, and denoting that it was to be chanted in the manner indicated by the associated terms. See Psalms, Book of.

Learning, skill in any science, or that improvement of the mind which we gain by study, instruction, observation, etc. An attentive examination of ecclesiastical history will lead us to see how greatly learning is indebted to Christianity, and that Christianity, in its turn, has been much served by learning. "All the useful learning which is now to be found in the world is in a great measure owing to the Gospel. The Christians, who had a great veneration for the Old Testament, have contributed more than the Jews themselves to secure and explain those books. The Christians, in ancient times, collected and preserved the Greek versions of the Scriptures, particularly the Septuagint, and translated the originals into Latin. To Christians were due the old Hexapla; and in later times Christians have published the Polyglots and the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was the study of the Holy Scriptures which excited Christians from early times to study chronology, sacred and secular; and here much knowledge of history, and some skill in astronomy, were needful. The New Testament, being written in Greek, caused Christians to apply themselves also to the study of that language. As the Christians were opposed by the pagans and the Jews, they were excited to the study of pagan and Jewish literature, in order to expose the absurdities of the Jewish traditions, the weakness of paganism, and the imperfections and insufficiency of philosophy. The first fathers, till the 3d century, were generally Greek writers. In the 3d century the Latin language was much upon the decline, but the Christians preserved it from sinking into absolute barbarism. Monkery, indeed, produced many sad effects; but Providence here also brought good out of evil, for the monks were employed in the transcribing of books, and many valuable authors would have perished if it had not been for the monasteries. In the 9th century the Saracens were very studious, and contributed much to the restoration of letters. But, whatever was good in the Mohammedan religion, it is in no small measure indebted to Christianity for it, since Mohammedanism is made up for the most part of Judaism and Christianity. If Christianity had been suppressed at its first appearance, it is extremely probable that the Latin and Greek tongues would have been lost in the revolutions of empires, and the irruptions of barbarians in the East and in the West, for the old inhabitants would have had no conscientious and religious motives to keep up their language; and then, together with the Latin and Greek tongues, the knowledge of antiquities and the ancient writers would have been destroyed. . . . As religion has been the chief preserver of erudition, so erudition has not been ungrateful to her patroness, but has contributed largely to the support of religion. The useful expositions of the Scriptures, the sober and sensible defences of revelation, the faithful representations of pure and undefiled Christianity—these have been the works of learned, judicious, and industrious men. Nothing, however, is more common than to hear the ignorant decry all human learning as entirely useless in religion; and, what is still more remarkable, even some, who call themselves preachers, entertain the same sentiments. But to such we can only say what a judicious preacher observed upon a public occasion, that if all men had been as unlearned as themselves, they never would have had a text on which to have displayed their ignorance" (Jortin's *Sermons*, vol. vii, Charge I). See More, *Hints to a Young Princess*, i, 64; Cook, *Miss. Ser. on Matt. vi.* 3; Stennett, *Ser. on Acts xxvi*, 24, 25. See Knowledge.

Leasing (כָּזָב, *kazab'*, Psa. iv, 2; v, 6), an old English word equivalent to *lying* or *lies*, as the term is elsewhere rendered.

Leather (עוֹר, *ôr*, 2 Kings i, 6, properly *skin*, as elsewhere rendered, i. e. on a person or animal, also as taken off, *hide*, sometimes as prepared or tanned, Lev. xi, 32; xiii, 48 sq.; Numb. xxxi, 20; in the N. T. only in the adj. δερμάτινος, "leathern," Matt. iii, 4; lit. *of skin*, as in the parallel passage, Mark i, 6). A girdle of leather is referred to in the above passage (2 Kings i, 6) as characteristic of Elijah, which, with the mantle of hair, formed the humble attire that the prophets usually wore. In like manner John the Baptist had his raiment of camels' hair and a leathern girdle about his loins (Matt. iii, 4). Strong and broad girdles of leather are still much used by the nomade tribes of Western Asia (see Hackett's *Illustr. of Script.* p. 96). See Skin; Dress.

We learn from the monuments [see cut on page 308] that the ancient Egyptians were well acquainted with the various processes of tanning and working in leather, and from them the Hebrews undoubtedly derived their knowledge of the art of preparing leather for a variety of useful purposes. It appears that the Egyptian tan was prepared in earthen vessels, and that the workmen could preserve skins either with or without the hair. The preparation of leather was an important branch of Egyptian industry (see Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, ii, 93, 99, 105). Leather appears to have been used by the ancient Assyrians in some cases for recording documents upon (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 147). See Tanner.

Leaven. In the Hebrew we find two distinct words, both translated *leaven* in the common version of the Bible. This is unfortunate, for there is the same distinction between שְׂאֹר, *seör'*, and חָמֵיץ, *chamets'*, in the Hebrew, as between *leaven* and *leavened bread* in the English. The Greek ζύμη appears to be used only in the former sense, and it is doubtful if it applies to a liquid. Chemically speaking, the "ferment" or "yeast" is the same substance in both cases; but "leaven" is more correctly applied to solids, "ferment" both to liquids and solids.

1. שְׂאֹר, *seör'*, occurs only five times in the Scriptures, in four of which (Exod. xii, 15, 19; xiii, 7; Lev. ii, 11) it is rendered "leaven," and in the fifth (Deut. xvi, 4) "leavened *bread*." It seems to have denoted originally the *remnant* of dough left on the preceding baking, which had fermented and turned acid; hence (accord-


a, a skin hanging up in the shop, indicating the trade of leather cutter.
b, cutting thongs out of a circular piece of skin.
c, knife used for cutting thongs.
d arranges the separate thongs, which are twisted by i, and, when finished, are bound together and hung up in the shop, g h.
k, a weight, which gives a greater impetus to the tube, l, when thrown round.
m, cobbler, perforating the sole of a sandal to receive the thong.
n n, thongs ready for fixing to the sole.
o, pieces of leather, ready for cutting into soles.
p, an awl.
q, a stand.
Ancient Egyptians working in Leather.

ing to the *Lexicon* of Dr. Avenarius, 1588) the German *sauer*, English *sour*. Its distinctive meaning therefore is, *fermented* or *leavened mass*. It could hardly, however, apply to the murk or lees of wine.

2. חָמֵץ, *chamets'*, ought not to be rendered "leaven," but *leavened bread*. It is a more specific term than the former, but is confounded in our translation with it. In Numb. vi, 3, the cognate noun is applied to wine as an adjective, and is there properly translated "*vinegar of* wine." In this last sense it seems to correspond to the Greek ὄξος, a sort of acid wine in very common use among the ancients, called by the Latins *posca*, *vinum culpatum* (Adam, *Rom. Antiq.* p. 393; Jahn, *Bibl. Archæol.* § 144). This species of wine (and in hot countries pure wine speedily passes into the acetous state) [see DRINK] is spoken of by the Talmudists, who inform us that it was given to persons about to be executed, mingled with drugs, in order to stupefy them (Prov. xxxi, 6; *Sanhedrin*, folio 43, 1, c. vi). This serves to explain Matt. xxvii, 34. A sour, fermented drink used by the Tartars appears to have derived its name *kumiss* from the Hebrew *chamets'*. From still another root comes also מַצָּה, *matstsah'* (*sweet*, "without leaven" [Lev. x, 11]), *unleavened* (i. e. bread, though in several passages "bread" and "cakes" are *also* expressed). In Exod. xiii, 7, both *seör'* and *chamets'* occur together, and are evidently distinct: "*Unleavened bread* (*matstsah'*) shall be eaten during the seven days, and there shall not be seen with thee *fermented bread* (*chamets'*), and there shall not be seen with thee *leavened dough* (*seör'*) in all thy borders." See WINE.

The organic chemists define the process of fermentation, and the substance which excites it, as follows: "*Fermentation* is nothing else but the putrefaction of a substance containing no nitrogen. *Ferment*, or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion" (Turner's *Chemistry*, by Liebig). This definition is in strict accordance with the views of the ancients, and gives point and force to many passages of sacred writ (Psa. lxxix, 21; Matt. xvi, 6, 11, 12; Mark viii, 15; Luke xii, 1; xiii, 21; 1 Cor. v, 5–8; Gal. v, 9). *Leaven*, and fermented, or even some readily fermentible substances (as honey), were prohibited in many of the typical institutions both of the Jews and Gentiles. The Latin writers use *corruptus* as signifying *fermented;* Tacitus applies the word to the fermentation of wine. Plutarch (*Rom. Quæst.* cix, 6) assigns as the reason why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch *leaven*, "that it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled." See also Aulus Gellius, viii, 15. The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in all offerings made to the Lord by fire, as in the case of the meat-offering (Lev. ii, 11), the trespass-offering (Lev. vii, 12), the consecration-offering (Exod. xxix, 2; Lev. viii, 2), the Nazarite-offering (Numb. vi, 15), and more particularly in regard to the feast of the Passover, when the Israelites were not only prohibited on pain of death from eating leavened bread, but even from having any leaven in their houses (Exod. xii, 15, 19) or in their land (Exod. xiii, 7; Deut. xvi, 4) during seven days, commencing with the 14th of Nisan. The command was rigidly enforced by the zeal of the Jews in later times (compare Mishnah, *Pesach.* ii, 1; Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, i, 598). It is in reference to these prohibitions that Amos (iv, 5) ironically bids the Jews of his day to "offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving *with leaven*." Hence, likewise, even honey was prohibited (Lev. ii, 11) on account of its occasionally producing fermentation. In other instances, where the offering was to be consumed by the priests and not on the altar, leaven might be used, as in the case of the peace-offering (Lev. vii, 13) and the Pentecostal loaves (Lev. xxiii, 17). It is to be presumed also that the shew-bread was unleavened, both, *à fortiori*, from the prohibition of leaven in the bread offered on the altar, and because, in the directions given for the making of the shew-bread, it is not specified that leaven should be used (Lev. xxiv, 5–9); for, in all such cases, what is not enjoined is prohibited. Jewish tradition also asserts that the shew-bread was without leaven (Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 6, 6; Talm. *Minchoth*, v, 2, 3). On Lev. ii, 11, Dr. Andrew Willet observes, "They have a spiritual signification, because ferment signifieth corruption, as St. Paul applieth (1 Cor. v, 8). The honey is also forbidden because it had a leavening force" (Junius, *Hexapla*, 1631). On the same principle of symbolism, God prescribes that *salt* shall always constitute a part of the oblations to him (Lev. ii, 31) on account of its antiseptic properties. Thus St. Paul (comp. Col. iv, 6; Eph. iv, 29) uses "salt" as preservative from corruption, on the same principle which leads him to employ that which is *unfermented* (ἄζυμος) as an emblem of purity and uncorruptedness. See PASSOVER.

The Greek word ζύμη, rendered "*leaven*," is used with precisely the same latitude of meaning as the Hebrew *seör'*. It signifies *leaven*, *sour dough* (Matt. xiii, 33; xvi, 12; Luke xiii, 21). Another quality in leaven is noticed in the Bible, viz., its *secretly penetrating* and *diffusive* power; hence the proverbial saying, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. v, 6; Gal. v, 9). In this respect it was emblematic of moral influence generally, whether good or bad, and hence our Saviour

adopts it as illustrating the growth of the kingdom of heaven in the individual heart and in the world at large (Matt. xiii, 33). Leaven, or ferment, is therefore used tropically for *corruptness, perverseness,* of life, doctrine, heart, etc. (Matt. xvi, 6, 11; Mark viii, 15; Luke xii, 1; 1 Cor. v, 7, 8; comp. Col. iv, 6; Eph. iv, 29). The idea seems to have been familiar to the Jews; compare Otho, *Lex Rabbin. Talm.* p. 227. They even employed leaven as a figure of the inherent corruption of man: "R. Alexander, when he had finished his prayers, said, Lord of the universe, it is clearly manifest before thee that it is our will to do thy will: what hinders that we do not thy will? The leaven which is in the mass (*Gl.*, The evil desire which is in the heart)" (*Babyl. Berachoth*, xvii, 1; ap. Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talmude ill.*). We find the same allusion in the Roman poet Persius (*Sat.* i, 24; compare Casaubon's note, *Comment.* p. 74). See Wernsdorf, *De fermento Herodis* (Alt. 1724). See Unleavened Bread.

"The usual *leaven* in the East is dough kept till it becomes sour, and which is kept from one day to another for the purpose of preserving leaven in readiness. Thus, if there should be no leaven in all the country for any length of time, as much as might be required could easily be produced in twenty-four hours. *Sour dough*, however, is not exclusively used for leaven in the East, the *lees of wine* being in some parts employed as yeast" (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, i, 161). In the Talmud mention is made of leaven formed of the קולן של סופרים, *bookmakers' paste* (*Pesach.* iii, 1). As the process of producing the leaven itself, or even of leavening bread when the substance was at hand, required some time, unleavened cakes were more usually produced on sudden emergencies (Gen. xviii, 6; Judg. vi, 19). See Bake; Bread, etc.

Leb'ana (Neh. vii, 48). See Lebanah.

Leb'anah (Heb. *Lebanah'*, לְבָנָה, the *moon* as being white, as in Cant. vi, 10, etc.; Sept. in Ezra ii, 45 Λαβανώ; Chaldaistically written *Lebana'*, לְבָנָא, in most MSS. in Neh. vii, 48, Sept. Λαβανά, Auth. Vers. "Lebana"; Vulg. in both passages *Lebana*), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536.

Leb'anon, the loftiest and most celebrated mountain range in Syria, forming the northern boundary of Palestine, and running thence along the coast of the Mediterranean to the great pass which opens into the plain of Hamath. The range of *Anti-Lebanon*, usually included by geographers under the same general name, lies parallel to the other, commencing on the south at the fountains of the Jordan, and terminating in the plain of Hamath. The two are in fact but a northern partition of the great central ridge or back-bone of the entire country. See Palestine.

I. *The Name.*—In the O. Test. these mountain ranges are always called לְבָנוֹן, *Lebanôn'*, to which, in prose, the art. is constantly prefixed, הַלְּבָנוֹן; in poetry the art. is sometimes prefixed and sometimes not, as in Isa. xiv, 8, and Psa. xxix, 5. The origin of the name has been variously accounted for. It is derived from the root לָבַן, "to be *white*." הַר הַלְּבָנוֹן is thus emphatically "The White Mountain" of Syria. It is a singular fact that almost uniformly the names of the highest mountains in all countries have a like meaning—*Mont Blanc, Himalaya* (in Sanscrit signifying "snowy"), *Ben Nevis, Snowdon*, perhaps also *Alps* (from *alb*, "white," like the Latin *albus*, and not, as commonly thought, from *alp*, "high"). Some suppose the name originated in the white snow by which the ridge is covered a great part of the year (Bochart, *Opera*, i, 678; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 741; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 395). Others derive the name from the whitish color of the limestone rock of which the great body of the range is composed (Schulz, *Leitungen des Hochsten*, v, 471; Robinson, *Biblic. Res.* ii, 493). The former seems the more natural explanation, and is confirmed by several circumstances. Jeremiah mentions the "snow of Lebanon" (xviii, 14); in the Chald. paraphrase טוּר תִּלְגָּא, "snow mountain," is the name given to it, and this is equivalent to a not uncommon modern Arabic appellation, *Jebel eth-Thelj* (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, l. c.; Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 18). Others derive the name Lebanon from λιβανωτός, "frankincense," the gum of a tree called λίβανος (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 312; Herod. i, 183), which is mentioned among the gifts presented by the magi to the infant Saviour (Matt. ii, 11). This, however, is in Hebrew לְבוֹנָה, *Lebonah* (Exod. xxx, 34; Isa. lx, 6). The Greek name of Lebanon, both in the Septuagint and classic authors, is uniformly Λίβανος (Strabo, xvi, 755; Ptol. v, 15). The Septuagint has sometimes Ἀντι-λίβανος instead of Λίβανος (Deut. i, 7; iii, 25; Josh. i, 4; ix, 1). The Latin name is *Libanus* (Pliny, v, 17), which is the reading of the Vulgate. It would appear that the Greek and Roman geographers regarded the name as derived from the snow. Tacitus speaks of it as a remarkable phenomenon that snow should lie where there is such intense heat (*Hist.* v, 6). Jerome writes, "Libanus λευκασμός — id est, *candor* interpretatur" (*Adversus Jovianum*, in *Opera*, ii, 286, ed. Migne); he also notes the identity of the name of this mountain and *frankincense* (*in Osee*, in *Opera*, vi, 160). Arab geographers call the range *Jebel Libnân* (Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 163; Edrisi, p. 336, edit. Jaubert). This name, however, is now seldom heard among the people of Syria, and when used it is confined to the western range. Different parts of this range have distinct names—the northern section is called *Jebel Akkâr*, the central *Sunnîn*, and the southern *J. ed-Druze*. Other local names are also used.

The *eastern range*, as well as the western, is frequently included under the general name *Lebanon* in the Bible (Josh. i, 4; Judg. iii, 3); but in Josh. xiii, 5 it is correctly distinguished as "*Lebanon toward the sunrising*" (הַלְּבָנוֹן מִזְרַח הַשָּׁמֶשׁ; Sept. Λίβανον ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου, and translated in the Vulg. *Libani quoque regio contra orientem*). The southern section of this range was well known to the sacred writers as Hermon, and had in ancient times several descriptive titles given to it—Sirion, Shenir, Sion; just as it has in modern days—*Jebel esh-Sheik, J. eth-Thelj, J. Antâr*. Greek writers called the whole range Ἀντιλίβανος (Strabo, xvi, p. 754; Ptolemy, v, 15), a word which is sometimes found in the Sept. as the rendering of the Hebrew *Lebanon* (ut supra). Latin authors also uniformly distinguish the eastern range by the name *Anti-libanus* (Pliny, v, 20). The name is appropriate, describing its position, lying "opposite" or "over against" Lebanon (Strabo, *l. c.*). Yet this distinction does not seem to have been known to Josephus, who uniformly calls the eastern as well as the western range Λίβανος; thus he speaks of the fountains of the Jordan as being near to Libanus (*Ant.* v, 3, 1), and of Abila as situated in Libanus (xix. 5, 1). The range of Anti-Lebanon is now called by all native geographers *Jebel esh-Shurky*, "East mountain," to distinguish it from Lebanon proper, which is sometimes termed *Jebel el-Ghurby*, "West mountain" (Robinson, *Biblical Res.* ii, 437; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 4).

To insure greater definiteness, and to prevent repetition, the name *Lebanon* will be applied in this article to the *western range*, and *Anti-Lebanon* to the *eastern*.

II. *Physical Geography.*—1. *Lebanon.*—(1.) *Limits.*—The mountain-chain of Lebanon commences at the great valley which connects the Mediterranean with the plain of Hamath (anciently called "the entrance of Hamath," Numb. xxxiv, 8), in lat. 34° 40′, and runs in a southwestern direction along the coast, till it sinks into the plain of Acre and the low hills of Galilee, in lat. 33°. Its extreme length is 110 geographical miles, and the average breadth of its base is about 20 miles. The highest peak, called *Dahar el-Kudib*, is about 25 miles



View of Lebanon above Beirût.

from the northern extremity, and just over the little cedar grove; its elevation is 10,051 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 170). From this point the range decreases in height towards the south. The massive rounded summit of Sunnîn, 23 miles from the former, is 8500 feet high. Jebel Kenîseh, the next peak, is 6824 feet; and Tomat Nîha, "the Twin-peaks," the highest tops of southern Lebanon, are about 6500 feet. From these the fall is rapid to the ravine of the river Litâny, the ancient Leontes.

The chain of Lebanon, or at least its higher ridges, may be said to terminate at the point where it is thus broken through by the Litâny. But a broad and lower mountainous tract continues towards the south, bordering the basin of the Huleh on the west. It rises to its greatest elevation about Safed (Jebel Safed), and at length ends abruptly in the mountains of Nazareth, as the northern wall of the plain of Esdraelon. This high tract may very properly be regarded as a prolongation of Lebanon.

Some writers regard the Litâny as marking the southern limit of Lebanon; and it would seem that the ancient classical geographers were of this opinion (Smith, *Dict. of G. and R. Geog.* s. v. Libanus; Kitto, *Physical Hist. of Pal.* p. 32). Diodorus Siculus describes Lebanon as extending along the coast of Tripolis, Byblus, and Sidon (*Hist.* xix, 58); and the Litâny falls into the sea a few miles south of Sidon. The notices of Ptolemy are somewhat indefinite, and represent the two chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon as commencing at the Mediterranean—the former on the north, the latter on the south (*Geog.* v, 15). Strabo is more definite and less accurate: "There are two mountains which inclose Cœle-Syria lying parallel to each other. The commencement of both these mountains, Libanus and Anti-Libanus, is a little way above the sea. Libanus rises from the sea near Tripolis and Theoprosopon, and Anti-Libanus from the sea near Sidon. They terminate somewhere near the Arabian mountains, which are above the district of Damascus and the Trachones. . . . A hollow plain lies between them, whose breadth towards the sea is 200 stadia, and its length from the sea to the interior about twice as much. Rivers flow through it, the largest of which is the Jordan" (xvi, 754). According to Pliny the chains begin at the sea, but they run from south to north (*H. N.* v, 17; compare Ammian. Marcel. xiv, 26). Cellarius merely repeats these ancient authors (*Geog.* ii, 439). Reland shows their errors and contradictions, but he cannot solve them, though he derived some important information from Maundrell (*Palæst.* p. 317 sq.; comp. *Early Trav. in Pal.* Bohn, p. 483). Rosenmüller (*Bib. Geog.* ii, 207, Clark), Wells (*Geog.* i, 239), and others, only repeat the old mistakes. The source of these errors may be seen by an examination of the physical geography of the district east of Tyre and Sidon. There can be no doubt that the range of Lebanon, viewed in its physical formation, extends from the entrance of Hamath to the plain of Acre; but between the parallels of Tyre and Sidon it is cut through by the chasm of the Litâny, which drains the valley of Cœle-Syria. That river enters the range obliquely on the eastern side, turns gradually westward, and at length divides the main ridge at right angles. Here, therefore, it may be said, in one sense, that the chain terminates; and though on the south bank of the Litâny another chain rises, and runs in the line of the former, it is not so lofty, its greatest height scarcely exceeding 3000 feet. Ancient geographers thought Lebanon terminated on the north bank of the Litâny; and as that river drains the valley of Cœle-Syria, which lies between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, they naturally supposed that the chain on the south bank of the Litâny was the commencement of the latter range. Here lies the error, which Dr. Porter was among the first to detect, by an examination of the general conformation of the mountain ranges from the summit of Hermon (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, xi, 52; Porter, *Damascus*, i, 296).

Anti-Lebanon is completely separated from this western range by a broad and deep valley. The great valley of the Jordan extends northward to the western base of Hermon, in the parallel of the chasm of the Litâny. From this point a narrower valley, called wady el-Teim, runs northward, till it meets an eastern branch of Cœle-Syria. These three valleys, forming a continuous line, constitute the western boundary of Anti-Lebanon. No part of that chain crosses them (Robinson, ii, 438). The southern end of the plain of Cœle-Syria is divided by a low ridge into two branches. Down the eastern branch runs wady el-Teim, conveying a tributary to the Jordan (*Bib. Sac.* l. c.; Robinson, iii, 428-430); down the western runs the Litâny. The latter branch soon contracts into a wild chasm, whose banks are in some places above a thousand feet high, of naked rock, and almost perpendicular. At one spot the ravine is only 60 feet wide, and is spanned by a natural bridge, at the height of about 100 feet above the stream. Over it rise jagged walls of naked limestone, pierced with numerous caves. The scenery is here magnificent; as one stands on this arch of nature's own building, he can scarcely repress feelings of alarm. The cliffs almost meet overhead; rugged masses of rock shoot out from dizzy heights, and appear as if about to plunge into the chasm; the mad river far below dashes along from rapid to rapid in sheets of foam. In wild grandeur this chasm has no equal in Syria, and few in the world. Yet, from a short distance on either side, it is not visible. The mountain chain appears to run on in its course, declining gradually, but without any interruption. The ridge, in fact, has been cleft asunder by some terrible convulsion, and through the cleft the waters of Cœle-

Syria have forced their way to the Mediterranean instead of the Jordan, which is the natural outlet. It will thus be seen that the ridge on the south bank of the Litâny is the prolongation of that on the north, and is a part of Lebanon (Robinson, ii, 438); and that the chasm of the Litâny, though the drain of Cœle-Syria, is no part of that valley. Neither Cœle-Syria, therefore, nor Anti-Lebanon, at any point, approaches within many miles of the Mediterranean (*Handbook for S. and P.* p. 571; Robinson, iii, 420 sq.; Van de Velde, *Travels*, i, 145 sq.).

(2.) *Western Aspect.*—The view of Lebanon from the Mediterranean is exceedingly grand. On approaching, it appears to rise from the bosom of the deep like a vast wall, the wavy top densely covered with snow during winter and spring, and the two highest peaks capped with crowns of ice on the sultriest days of summer. The *western slopes* are long and gradual, furrowed from top to bottom with deep rugged ravines, and broken everywhere by lofty cliffs of white rock, and ragged banks, and tens of thousands of terrace walls, rising like steps of stairs from the sea to the snow-wreaths. "The whole mass of the mountain consists of whitish limestone, or at least the rocky surface, as it reflects the light, exhibits everywhere a whitish aspect. The mountain teems with villages, and is cultivated more or less almost to the top; yet so steep and rocky is the surface, that the tillage is carried on chiefly by means of terraces, built up with great labor, and covered above with soil. When one looks upward from below, the vegetation on these terraces is not seen, so that the whole mountain side appears as if composed of immense rugged masses of naked whitish rock, severed by deep wild ravines, running down precipitously to the plain. No one would suspect among these rocks the existence of a vast multitude of thrifty villages, and a numerous population of mountaineers, hardy, industrious, and brave" (Robinson, ii, 493; comp. Volney, *Travels*, i, 272 sq.).

On looking *down* the western slopes from the brow of one of the projecting bluffs, or through the vista of one of the glens, the scenery is totally different; it is now rich and picturesque. The tops of the little stair-like terraces are seen, all green with corn, or straggling vines, or the dark foliage of the mulberry. The steeper banks and ridge-tops have their forests of pine and oak, while far away down in the bottom of the glens, and round the villages and castellated convents, are large groves of gray olives. The aspect of the various sections of the mountains is, however, very different, the rocks and strata often assuming strange, fantastic shapes. At the head of the valley of the Dog river are some of the most remarkable rock formations in Lebanon. Here numbers of little ravines fall into the main glen, and their sides, with the intervening ridges, are thickly covered with high peaks of naked limestone, sometimes rising in solitary grandeur like obelisks, but generally grouped together, and connected by narrow ledges like arched viaducts. In one place the horizontal strata in the side of a lofty cliff are worn away at the edges, giving the whole the appearance of a large pile of cushions. In other places there are tall stalks, with broad tops like tables. In many places the cliffs are ribbed, resembling the pipes of an organ, or columnar basalt. A single perch of clear soil can scarcely be found in one spot throughout the whole region, but every minute patch is cultivated, even in grottoes and under natural arches (Porter's *Damascus*, ii, 289). The highest peaks of the range are naked, white, and barren. A line drawn at the altitude of about 6000 feet would mark the limits of cultivation. Above that line the shelving sides and rounded tops are covered with loose limestone débris, and are almost entirely destitute of vegetable life.

The western base of Lebanon does not correspond with the shore-line. In some cases bold spurs shoot out from the mountains, and dip perpendicularly into the sea, forming bluff promontories, such as the "Ladder of Tyre," Promontorium Album, or "White Cape," the well-known pass of the Dog River, and the Theoprosopon, now called Ras esh-Shuk'ah. In other places the mountains retire, or the shore-line advances (as at Beyrût and Tripolis), leaving little sections of fertile plain, varying from half a mile to three miles in width. This was the territory of the old Phœnicians, and on it still lie the scattered remains of their once great cities. See PHŒNICIA. From the promontory of Theoprosopon a low ridge strikes northward along the shore past Tripolis, separated from the main chain by a narrow valley. When it terminates, the coast-plain becomes much wider, and gradually expands, till it opens at the northern base of Lebanon into the valley leading to the "entrance of Hamath" (Robinson, iii, 385).

(3.) *Eastern Declivities.*—From the east Lebanon presents a totally different aspect. It does not seem much more than half as high as when seen from the west. This is chiefly owing to the great elevation of the plain extending along its base, which is on an average about 3000 feet above the level of the sea (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 175). The ridge resembles a colossal wall, its sides precipitous, and thinly covered, in most places, with oak forests. There are very few—only some two or three—glens furrowing them. The summit of the ridge, or backbone, is much nearer the eastern than the western side; and extending in gentle undulations, white with snow, far as the eye can see to the right and left, it forms a grand object from the ruins of Ba'albek, and still more so from the heights of Anti-Lebanon. A nearer approach to the chain reveals a new feature. A side ridge runs along the base of the central chain from the town of Zahleh to its northern extremity, and is thinly covered throughout with forests of oak intermixed with wild plum, hawthorn, juniper, and other trees. A little south of the parallel of Sunnîn this ridge is low and narrow, and the Bukâ'a is there widest. Advancing northwards the ridge increases in height, and encroaches on the plain, until, at the fountain of the Orontes ('Ain el-'Asy), it attains its greatest elevation, and there the plain is narrowest. From this point southwards to where the road crosses from Ba'albek to the Cedars, the central chain is steep, naked, and destitute of vegetation, except here and there a solitary oak or blasted pine clinging to the rocks (Porter's *Damascus*, ii, 303 sq.; Robinson, iii, 530 sq.).

The side ridge above described sinks down in graceful wooded slopes into wady Khâled, which drains a part of the plain of Hums, and falls into Nahr el-Kebîr. The main chain also terminates abruptly a little farther west, and its base is swept by the waters of the Kebir, the ancient river Eleutherus (Robinson, iii, 558–60).

(4.) *Rivers.*—Lebanon is rich in rivers and fountains, fed by the eternal snows that crown its summit, and the vapors which they condense. The "streams from Lebanon" were proverbial for their abundance and beauty in the days of the Hebrew prophets (Cant. iv, 15), and its "cold-flowing waters" were types of richness and luxury (Jer. xviii, 14). Some of them, too, have obtained a classic celebrity (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 269, 437). They are all small mountain torrents rather than rivers. The following are the more important: 1. The Eleutherus (now Nahr el-Kebîr), rising in the plain of Emesa, west of the Orontes, sweeps round the northern base of Lebanon, and falls into the Mediterranean midway between Tripolis and Aradus. Strabo states that it formed the northern boundary of Phœnicia and Cœle-Syria (xvi, 753; Robinson, iii, 576). 2. The Kadisha, or "sacred river," now generally called Nahr Abu-Aly, has its highest sources around the little cedar grove, and descends through a sublime ravine to the coast near Tripolis. At one spot its glen has perpendicular walls of rock on each side nearly 1000 feet high. Here, on opposite banks, are two villages, the people of which can converse across the chasm, but to reach each other requires a toilsome walk of two hours. In a wild cleft of the ravine is the convent of Kanobin, the chief residence of the Maronite patriarch (*Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 586). 3. The

Adonis (Nahr Ibrahîm), famous in ancient fable as the scene of the romantic story of Venus and Adonis. Killed by a boar on its banks, Adonis dyed with his blood the waters, which ever since, on the anniversary of his death, are said to run red to the sea (Lucian, *De Syria Dea*, 6; Strabo, xv, 170). Adonis is supposed to be identical with Tammuz, for whom Ezekiel represents the Jewish women as weeping (viii, 14). The source is a noble fountain beside the ruins of a temple of Venus, and near the site of Apheca, now marked by the little village of Afka (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii, 55; Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 297; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* iv, 558). The Adonis falls into the sea a few miles south of the Biblical Gebal. 4. The Lycus flumen, now Nahr el-Kelb, or "Dog River," rises high up on the flank of Sunnîn, and breaks down through a picturesque glen. At its mouth is that famous pass on whose sculptured rocks Assyrian, Egyptian, Roman, and French (!) generals have left records of their expeditions and victories (Robinson, iii, 618; *Handbook*, p. 407 sq.; Strabo, xvi, 755). 5. The Magoras of Pliny (v, 17) is probably the modern Nahr Beyrût. 6. The Tamyras or Damuras (Strabo, xvi, 756; Polybius, v, 68) rises near Deir el-Kamr, the capital of Lebanon. It is now called Nahr ed-Dammûr. 7. The Bostrenus of ancient authors appears to be identical with Nahr el-Awaley, though some doubt this. 8. The Leontes has already been mentioned. The lower section of it is now generally termed Kasimîyeh, and the upper section Litâny. Its chief sources are at Chalcis and Ba'albek; but a large tributary flows down from the ravine of Zahleh, and is the only stream which descends the eastern slopes of Lebanon. See LEONTES.

2. *Anti-Lebanon.*—(1.) *Peaks.*—The centre and culminating point of Anti-Lebanon is HERMON. From it a number of ranges radiate, like the ribs of a half-open fan. The first and loftiest runs north-east, parallel to Lebanon, and separated from it by the valley of Cœle-Syria, whose average breadth is about six miles. This ridge is the backbone of Anti-Lebanon. Where it joins Hermon it is broad, irregular, intersected by numerous valleys and little fertile plains, and covered with thin forests of dwarf oak Its elevation is not more than 4500 feet. Advancing northwards, its features become wilder and grander, oak-trees give place to juniper, and the elevation increases until, above the beautiful plain of Zebedâny—which lies embosomed in its very centre —it attains a height of about 7000 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 175). From this point to the parallel of Ba'albek there is little change in the elevation or scenery. Beyond the latter it begins to fall, and declines gradually until at length it sinks down into the great plain of Hamath, eight miles east of Riblah, and sixteen south of Emesa. With the exception of the little upland plains, and a few of the deeper valleys, this ridge is incapable of cultivation. The sides are steep and rugged, in many places sheer precipices of naked, jagged rock, nearly 1000 feet high. They are not so bare or bleak, however, as the higher summits of Lebanon. Vegetation is abundant among the rocks; and though the inhabitants are few and far between, immense flocks of sheep and goats are pastured upon the mountains, and wild beasts—bears, boars, wolves, jackals, hyænas, foxes —are far more abundant than in any other part of Syria or Palestine (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 315).

The lowest and last of the ridges that radiate from Hermon runs nearly due east along the magnificent plain of Damascus, and continues onward to Palmyra. Its average elevation is not more than 3000 feet, and it does not rise more than about 700 feet above the plain, though some of its peaks are much higher. Its rock is chalky, almost pure white, and entirely naked—not a tree, or shrub, or patch of verdure is anywhere seen upon it. It thus forms a remarkable contrast to the rich green of the plain of Damascus. From the central range to this ridge there is a descent, by a series of broad, bare terraces or plateaus, supported by long, continuous walls of bare, whitish limestone, varying from 100 to 1000 feet in height. Nothing could be more dreary and desolate than the scenery on these steppes. The gravelly soil, in many places thickly strewn with flints, is as bare as the cliffs that bound them. Yet they are intersected by several rich and beautiful glens, so deep, however, that their verdure and foliage can not be seen from a distance. Towards the east these steppes gradually expand into broad upland plains, and portions of them are irrigated and tilled. On them stand the small but ancient towns of Yabrûd, Nebk, Jerûd, etc., around which madder is successfully cultivated.

(2.) *Rivers.*—Anti-Lebanon is the source of the four great rivers of Syria: 1. The Orontes (q. v.), springing from the western base of the main ridge, beside the ruins of Lybo, flows away northward through a broad, rich vale, laving in its course the walls of Emesa, Hamath, Apamea, and Antioch. 2. The Jordan (q. v.), Palestine's sacred river, bursting from the side of Hermon, rolls down its deep, mysterious valley into the Sea of Death. 3. The Abana, the "golden-flowing" stream of Damascus (*Chrysorrhoas*, Pliny, v, 16; also called *Bardines*, Steph. Byz.; see ABANA), rises on the western side of the main ridge, cuts through it and the others, and falls into the lake east of the city. 3. The Leontes (q. v.), Phœnicia's nameless stream, has its two principal fountains at the western base of Anti-Lebanon, beside Chalcis and Ba'albek (Porter, *Damascus*, i, 11; Robinson, iii, 498, 506). The only other streams of Anti-Lebanon are (4) the Pharpar, now called el-'Awaj, rising on the eastern flank of Hermon (see PHARPAR), and (5) the torrent which flows down the fertile glen of Helbon (q. v.) into the plain of Damascus.

3. These parallel ranges enclose between them a fertile and well-watered valley, averaging about fifteen miles in width, which is the Cœle-Syria (Hollow Syria) of the ancients, but is called by the present inhabitants, by way of pre-eminence, el-Bekaa, or "the Valley." This is traversed through the greater portion of its length by the river Litâny, the ancient Leontes. It is the "valley of Lebanon" (בִּקְעַת הַלְּבָנוֹן) mentioned in Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7, and later "the plain of Aven" (בִּקְעַת־אָוֶן) alluded to by Amos (i, 5), where also Solomon constructed one of his palaces (1 Kings vii, 2; ix, 9; x, 17; Cant. vii, 4). See CŒLE-SYRIA.

III. *Natural Science.*—1. The *geology* of Lebanon has never been thoroughly investigated. Dr. Anderson, who accompanied the United States expedition under lieutenant Lynch, is the only man who has attempted anything like a scientific examination of the mountains. We are much indebted to his *Reconnaissance*, embodied in Lynch's *Official Report*. The German traveller Russegger also supplies some facts in his *Reisen* (vol. iii). Tristram, in his *Land of Israel* (s. f.) has considerably enlarged our knowledge of the geology as well as natural history of Lebanon.

The main ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon are composed of Jura limestone, hard, partially crystallized, and containing few fossils. The strata have been greatly disturbed. In some places they are almost perpendicular; in others tilted over, laying bare veins and detached masses of trap. In the southern part of Lebanon, near Kedesh and Safed, are many traces of recent disturbance. From the earliest ages earthquakes have been frequent and most destructive in that region. The earthquake of 1837 buried thousands of the inhabitants of Safed beneath the ruins of their houses (Robinson, ii, 422 sq.; *Handb.* p. 438). In the upper basin of the Jordan, and along the eastern flank of Hermon, trap rock abounds; the latter is the commencement of the great trap-fields of Haurân (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 240 sq.).

Over the Jura limestone there is in many places a more recent cretaceous deposit; its color is gray, and sometimes pure white. It is soft, and abounds in flints and fossils, ammonites, echinites, ostræa, chenopus, nerinea, etc., often occurring in large beds, as at Bhamdûn above Beyrût. Fossil fish are also found imbedded in

the rock near the ancient Gebal (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 321). These cretaceous deposits occur along the whole western flank of Lebanon, and the lower eastern ranges of Anti-Lebanon are wholly composed of them (D'Arvieux, *Mémoires*, ii, 393; Elliot, *Travels*, ii, 257; Volney, ii, 280).

Extensive beds of soft, friable sandstone are met with both in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. According to Anderson, the sandstone is of a more recent period than the cretaceous strata. This change in the geological structure gives great variety to the scenery of Lebanon. The regular and graceful outlines of the sandstone ridges contrast well with the bolder and more abrupt limestone cliffs and peaks, while the ruddy hue and sombre pine forests of the former relieve the intense whiteness of the latter.

Coal has been found in the district of Metn, east of Beyrût, but it is impure, and the veins are too thin to repay mining. Iron is found in the central and southern portions of Lebanon, and there is an extensive salt marsh on one of the eastern steppes of Anti-Lebanon (Porter, *Damascus*, i, 161; *Handbook*, p. 363; Volney, i, 281; Burckhardt, p. 27).

2. The *Botany* of Lebanon, like the geology, is to a great extent unknown. It appears to be very rich in the abundance, the variety, and the beauty of the trees, shrubs, and flowers of these noble mountains. The great variety of climate, from the tropical heat of the Jordan valley at the base of Hermon, to the eternal snows on its summit, affords space and fitting home for the vegetable products of nearly every part of the globe. The forests of Lebanon were celebrated throughout the ancient world. Its cedars were used in the temples and palaces of Jerusalem (1 Kings vi; 2 Sam. v, 11; Ezra iii, 7; Isa. xiv, 8; Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 2), Rome (Pliny, *H. N.* xiii, 11), and Assyria (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 356, 644); and the pine and oak were extensively employed in ship-building (Ezek. xxvii, 4–6). See CEDAR. On these mountains we have still the cedar, pine, oak of several varieties, terebinth, juniper, walnut, plane, poplar, willow, arbutus, olive, mulberry, carob, fig, pistachio, sycamore, hawthorn, apricot, plum, pear, apple, quince, pomegranate, orange, lemon, palm, and banana. The vine abounds everywhere. Oleanders line the streams, and rhododendrons crown the peaks higher up, with the rock-rose, ivy, berberry, and honeysuckle. The loftiest summits are almost bare, owing to the cold and extreme dryness. There are even here, however, some varieties of low prickly shrubs, which lie on the ground like cushions, and look almost as sapless as the gravel from which they spring. Many of the flowers are bright and beautiful—the anemone, tulip, pink, ranunculus, geranium, crocus, lily, star of Bethlehem, convolvulus, etc. Thistles abound in immense variety. The *cereals* and *vegetables* include wheat, barley, maize, lentils, beans, peas, carrots, turnips, potatoes, melons, pumpkins, cucumbers, tobacco, cotton, and numerous others.

Irrigation is extensively practiced, and wherever water is abundant the crops are luxuriant. Probably in no part of the world are there more striking examples of the triumph of industry over rugged and intractable nature than along the western slopes of Lebanon. The steepest banks are terraced; every little shelf and cranny in the cliffs is occupied by the thrifty husbandman, and planted with vine or mulberry (Robinson, iii, 14, 21, 615; Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 283; *Handbook*, p. 410, 413).

3. *Zoology.*—Considerable numbers of wild beasts still inhabit the retired glens and higher peaks of Lebanon, including jackals, hyenas, wolves, bears, and panthers (2 Kings xiv, 9; Cant. iv, 8; Hab. ii, 17). See PALESTINE.

Anti-Libanus is more thinly peopled than its sister range, and it is more abundantly stocked with wild beasts. Eagles, vultures, and other birds of prey may be seen day after day sweeping in circles round the beetling cliffs. Wild swine are numerous, and vast herds of gazelles roam over the bleak eastern steppes. See ZOOLOGY.

IV. *Climate.*—There are great varieties of climate and temperature in Lebanon. In the plain of Dan, at the fountain of the Jordan, the heat and vegetation are almost tropical, and the exhalations from the marshy plain render the whole region unhealthy. The semi-nomads who inhabit it are as dark in complexion as Egyptians. The thermometer often stands at 98° Fahr. in the shade on the site of Dan, while it does not rise above 32° on the top of Hermon. The coast along the western base of Lebanon, though very sultry during the summer months, is not unhealthy. The fresh sea-breeze which sets in in the evening keeps the night comparatively cool, and the air is dry and free from miasma. Snow never falls on the coast, and it is very rarely seen at a lower elevation than 2000 feet. Frost is unknown. In the plains of Cœle-Syria (3000 feet) and Damascus (about 2300 feet), snow falls more or less every winter, sometimes eight inches deep on the streets and terraced roofs of Damascus, while the roads are too rough and hard with frost for travelling. The main ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon are generally covered with snow from December to March, sometimes so deeply that the roads are for weeks together impassable. During the whole summer the higher parts of the mountains are cool and pleasant, the air is extremely dry, and malaria is unknown. From the beginning of June till about the 20th of September rain never falls, and clouds are rarely seen. At the latter date the autumn rains begin, generally accompanied with storms of thunder and vivid lightning. January and February are the coldest months. The barley harvest begins, on the plain of Phœnicia, about the end of April, but in the upper altitudes it is not gathered in till the beginning of August. During the summer, in the village of Shumlân, on the western declivity of Lebanon, at an elevation of 2000 feet, in the hottest part of the day the thermometer does not rise above 83° Fahr., and in the night it usually goes down to 76°. From June 20th to August 20th the barometer often does not vary a quarter of an inch; there are few cloudy days, and scarcely even a slight shower. At Bludân, in Anti-Lebanon, with an elevation of 4800 feet, the air is extremely dry, and the thermometer never rises in summer above 82° Fahr. in the shade. The nights are cool and pleasant. The *sirocco* wind is severely felt along the coast and on the western slopes of Lebanon, but not so much in Anti-Lebanon. It blows occasionally during March and April. *Dew* is almost unknown along the mountain ridges, but in the low plains, and especially at the base of Hermon, it is very abundant (Psa. cxxxiii, 3).

V. *Historical Notices.*—Lebanon is first mentioned as a boundary of the country given by the Lord in covenant promise to Israel (Deut. i, 7; xi, 24). To the dwellers in the parched and thirsty south, or on the sultry banks of the Nile, the snows, and streams, and verdant forests of Lebanon must have seemed an earthly paradise. By such a contrast we can understand Moses's touching petition, "I pray thee let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain, and Lebanon" (Deut. iii, 25). The mountains were originally inhabited by a number of warlike, independent tribes, some of whom Joshua conquered on the banks of Lake Merom (xi, 2–18). They are said to have been of Phœnician stock (Pliny, v, 17; Eusebius, *Onom.* s. v.; compare 1 Kings v). Further north were the Hivites (Judg. iii, 3), and the Giblites, and Arkites, whose names still cling to the ruins of their ancient strongholds. See GIBLITE; ARKITE. The Israelites never completely subdued them, but the enterprising Phœnicians appear to have had them under their power, or in their pay, for they got timber for their fleets from the mountains, and they were able to supply Solomon from the same forests when building the Temple (1 Kings v, 9–11; Ezek. xxvii, 9 sq.). At a later period we find the king of Assyria felling its timber for his military engines (Isa. xiv, 8; xxxvii, 24, Ezek. xxxi, 16), and it is mentioned on the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). Diodorus Siculus relates that in like manner Antigonus,

A suppliant Native of Lebanon (the hieroglyph reads *l-m-n-n*). From the Egyptian Monuments.

having collected from all quarters hewers of wood, and sawyers, and ship-builders, brought down an immense quantity of timber from Libanus to the sea to build himself a navy (xix, 58). The same fact that this mountain was the famous resort for timber, whether for architectural, naval, or military purposes, appears from the Egyptian monuments, where the name is found in the corrupted form of *Lemanon* (Wilkinson, *Egyptians*, i, 403). It is there represented as a mountainous country, inaccessible to chariots, and abounding in lofty trees, which the affrighted mountaineers, having fled thither for refuge, are engaged in felling, in order to impede the advance of the invading Egyptian army.

During the conquests of David and the commercial prosperity of the nation under Solomon, the Jews became fully acquainted with the richness, the grandeur,

Natives felling Trees in Lebanon. From the Egyptian Monuments.

and the luxuriant foliage of Lebanon, and ever after that mountain was regarded as the emblem of wealth and majesty. Thus the Psalmist says of the Messiah's kingdom, "The fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon" (lxxii, 16); and Solomon, praising the beauty of the Bridegroom, writes, "His countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars" (Cant. v, 15). Isaiah also predicts of the Church, "The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it" (xxxv, 2; compare lx, 13; Hos. xiv, 5, 6). Indeed, in Scripture, Lebanon is very generally mentioned in connection with the cedar-trees with which it abounded; but its wines are also noticed (Hos. xiv, 8); and in Cant. iv, 11; Hos. xiv, 7, it is celebrated for various kinds of fragrant plants. Lebanon is greatly celebrated both in sacred and classical writers, and much of the sublime imagery of the prophets of the Old Test. is borrowed from this mountain (e. g. Psa. xxix, 5, 6; civ, 16–18; Cant. iv, 8, 15; Isa. ii, 13; Zech. xi, 1, 2).

Anti-Lebanon seems to have been early brought under the sway of Damascus, though amid its southern strongholds were some fierce tribes who preserved their independence down to a late period (1 Chron. v, 19–23; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 11, 3; Strabo, xvi, p. 755, 756).

During the reign of the Seleucidæ several large cities were founded or rebuilt in these mountains, as Laodicea at the northern end of Anti-Lebanon, Chalcis at its eastern base, Abila in the wild glen of the Abana (Luke iii, 1). See ABILA. At the commencement of our æra, Lebanon, with the rest of Syria, passed into the hands of Rome, and under its fostering rule great cities were built and beautiful temples erected. The heights on which Baal-fires had burned in primeval times, and the groves where the rude mountain tribes worshipped their idols, became the sites of noble buildings, whose ruins to this day excite the admiration of every traveller. Greece itself cannot surpass in grandeur the temples of Ba'albek and Chalcis. There are more than thirty temples in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 454, 457, 557, 411; comp. Robinson, iii, 438, 625).

During the wars of the Seleucidæ, the Romans, and the Saracens, the inhabitants of Lebanon probably remained in comparative security. When, under the Muslem rule, Christianity was almost extirpated from the rest of Syria, it retained its hold there; and the *Maronites* (q. v.), who still occupy the greater part of the range, are doubtless the lineal descendants of the old Syrians. The sect originated in the 7th century, when the monk Maron taught them the Monothelitic heresy. In the 12th century they submitted to the pope, and have ever since remained devoted Papists. They number about 200,000. The *Druses* (q. v.), their hereditary foes, dwell in the southern section of the range, and number about 80,000. The jealousies and feuds of the rival sects, fanned by a cruel and corrupt government, often desolate "that goodly mountain" with fire and sword. Anti-Lebanon has a considerable Christian population, but they are mixed with Mohammedans, and have no political status. The whole range is under the authority of the pasha of Damascus.

The American missionaries have established several schools among the people of Lebanon, and for some years past pleasing success has attended their efforts in the mountain, which, however, were almost wholly interrupted by the violent outbreak among the Druses in 1860, ending in a wholesale massacre of the Christians. On the suppression of this, a Maronite governor was appointed over the district by the Turkish government, under the protectorate of the five great European powers.

V. *Literature.*—Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, iii, 344, 345, 439; Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, Introd. p. xxxii–xxxv, lv; Reland, *Palæstina*, i, 311; Rosenmüller, *Biblisch. Alterthum.* ii, 236; Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 29–35; D'Arvieux, *Mémoires*, ii, 250; Volney, *Voyage en Syrie*, i, 243; Seetzen, in Zach's *Monatl. Correspond.* June, 1806; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syr.* p. 1 sq.; Richter, *Wallfahrten*, p. 102, etc.; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 206–220; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 468 sq.; Fisk, in *Missionary Herald*, 1824; Elliot, *Travels*, ii, 276; Hogg, *Visit to Alexandria, Jerusalem*, etc., i, 219 sq., ii, 81 sq.; Addison, *Palmyra and Damascus*, ii, 43–82; Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvii, div. 1; Robinson's *Researches*, new edit., iii, 584–625; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 205–253; 1848, p. 1–23, 243–262, 447–480, 663–700; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 55; Kelly's *Syria and Holy Land*, p. 76–165; Porter, *Damascus* (Lond. 1855); Thomson, *Land and Book*, vol. i; Van de Velde, *Travels*, etc., vol. i; Churchill, *Lebanon* (London, 1853, 1862); also *Druses and Maronites* (Lond. 1862); Tristram, *Land of Israel* (London, 1865); Palmer, in the *Quarterly Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," April, 1871, p. 107 sq. See PALESTINE.

Leb'aöth (Heb. *Lebaöth'*, לְבָאוֹת, *lionesses;* Sept. Λαβαώθ), a city in the southern part of Judah, i. e. Simeon (Josh. xv, 32); elsewhere more fully BETH-LEBAOTH (Josh. xix, 6); also BETH-BIREI (1 Chron. iv, 31). The associated names in all these passages suggest a location in the wild south-western part of the tribe, possibly at the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Map* as *Sbeta*, on wady Suniyeh, not very far from Elusa, towards Gaza.

Lebbæ'us (Λεββαῖος), a surname of Judas or Jude (Matt. x, 3), one of the twelve apostles; a member, together with his namesake "Iscariot," James the son of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes, of the last of the three sections of the apostolic body. The name Judas only, without any distinguishing mark, occurs in the lists given in Luke vi, 16; Acts i, 13; and in John xiv, 22 (where we find "Judas not Iscariot" among the apostles), but the apostle has been generally identified with "Lebbæus whose surname was Thaddæus" (Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος) (Matt. x, 3; Mark iii, 18), though Schleiermacher (*Critical Essay on St. Luke*, p. 93) treats with scorn any such attempt to reconcile the lists. In both the last quoted places there is considerable variety of reading, some MSS. having both in Matt. and Mark Λεββαῖος or Θαδδαῖος alone, others introducing the name Ἰούδας, or *Judas Zelotes*, in Matt., where the Vulgate reads *Thaddæus* alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* i, 13) that the true name of Thomas (the twin) was Judas (Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμᾶς), and that Thaddæus was one of the "seventy," identified by Jerome *in Matt. x* with "Judas Jacobi," as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the "Levi" (Λευὶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) of Mark ii, 14; Luke v, 27, who is called "Lebes" (Λεβῆς) by Origen (*Cont. Cels.* l. i, § 62), as the same with Lebbæus. The safest way out of these acknowledged difficulties is to hold fast to the ordinarily received opinion that Jude, Lebbæus, and Thaddæus were three names for the same apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome (*in Matt. x*) to have been "trionimus," rather than introduce confusion into the apostolic catalogues, and render them erroneous either in excess or defect. See THADDÆUS.

The interpretation of the names Lebbæus and Thaddæus is a question beset with almost equal difficulty. The former is interpreted by Jerome "hearty," *corculum*, as from לֵב, *cor*, and Thaddæus has been erroneously supposed to have a cognate signification, *homo pectorosus*, as from the Syriac תַּד, *pectus* (Lightfoot, *Horæ Heb.* p. 235; Bengel, *Matt. x*, 3), the true signification of תַּד being *mamma* (Angl. *teat*) (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2565). Winer (*Realwörterb.* s. v.) would combine the two, and interpret them as meaning *Herzenskind*. Another interpretation of Lebbæus is *the young lion* (*leunculus*), as from לָבִיא, *leo* (Schleusner, s. v.), while Lightfoot and Baumg.-Crusius would derive it from *Lebba*, a maritime town of Galilee mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 19), where, however, the ordinary reading is *Jebba*. Thaddæus appears in Syriac under the form Adai; hence Michaelis admits the idea that Adai, Thaddæus, and Judas may be different representations of the same word (iv, 370), and Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.* in Matt. x, 3) identifies Thaddæus with Judas, as both from הוֹדָה, "to praise." Chrysostom (*De Prod. Jud.* l. i, c. ii) says that there was a "Judas Zelotes" among the disciples of our Lord, whom he identifies with the apostle. See JUDE.

Lebeuf, JEAN, a French priest and antiquary, was born at Auxerre March 6, 1687, and became a priest in the cathedral of his native place. Later he made an antiquarian visit through France, and in 1740 was chosen a member of the Academy of Inscriptions, for which he wrote many memoirs. He died in 1760. Lebeuf published several dissertations on French history, for a list of which, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 84.

Lebi, Lebiyah. See LION.

Leblond, GASPARD MICHEL, a noted French ecclesiastic and antiquary, was born at Caen Nov. 24, 1738, and, after entering the priesthood, became abbot of Vermort. Later he lived in Paris as keeper of the Mazarin Library. He was also a member of the Institute, and wrote several archæological treatises. He died June 17, 1809. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 97.

Lebon, JOSEPH, a noted French priest and politician, was born Sept. 25, 1765, at Arras; pursued his studies under the Brethren of the Oratory, and entered their order afterwards; then taught rhetoric at one of their colleges; but upon the outbreak of the Revolution he caught the intoxication of the hour, and finally became one of the worst Terrorists, mingling beastly profligacy with unquenchable bloodthirstiness. He was particularly severe upon the clergy, more especially monastics; but when the reaction set in he suffered for his conduct death-punishment by the guillotine in 1795, at Amiens. See Lacroix's Pressensé, *Religion and the Reign of Terror*, p. 200, 407.

Lebonah. See FRANKINCENSE.

Lebo'nah (Heb. *Lebonah'*, לְבוֹנָה, *frankincense*, as often; Sept. Λεβωνά), a town near Shiloh, north of the spot where the Benjamite youth were directed to capture the Shilonite maidens at the yearly festival held "on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem" (Judg. xxi, 19). The earliest modern mention of it is in the Itinerary of the Jewish traveller hap-Parchi (A.D. cir. 1320), who describes it under the name of *Lubin*, and refers especially to its correspondence with the passage in Judges (see Asher's *Benjamin of Tudela*, ii, 435). Brocardus mentions it as a very handsome village, by the name of *Lemna*, four leagues south of Nablûs, on the right hand of the road to Jerusalem (chap. vii, p. 178). The identity of this place was again suggested by Maundrell, who calls it *Leban* (*Trav.* p. 86). It is no doubt the *Lubban* visited by Dr. Robinson on his way from Jerusalem to Nablûs (*Bib. Researches*, iii, 90). He describes the khan el-Lubban as being now in ruins; but near by is a fine fountain of running water. From it a beautiful oval plain extends north about fifteen minutes, with perhaps half that breadth, lying here deep among the high rocky hills. About the middle of the western side, a narrow chasm through the mountain, called wady el-Lubban, carries off the waters of the plain and surrounding tract. The village of Lubban is situated on the north-west acclivity, considerably above the plain. It is inhabited; has the appearance of an old place; and in the rocks above it are excavated sepulchres (comp. De Saulcy, *Narrative*, i, 94, 95; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 130; Wilson, ii, 292 sq.; Bonar, p. 363; Mislin, iii, 319; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 330; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 330; Tristram, p. 160).

Lebrija, ÆLIUS ANTONIUS OF (or LEBRIXA, vulgarly *Nebrissensis*, from Lebrixa or Lebrija, the old Nebrissa, on the Guadalquivir), "un humanista de prima nota," the Erasmus of Spain, was born at that place in 1442 according to Munnoz (Nichol. Anton and Cave say 1444). He studied in his native city, and afterwards went to the University of Salamanca. In 1461 he went to Italy to perfect himself in the classics. He visited the best schools, heard the most renowned teachers, and made great proficiency in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, etc., and even in theology, jurisprudence, and medicine. After ten years thus employed he returned to Spain, intending to effect a reformation, and with the special aim of promoting classical learning, in the universities of that country. He first labored in an unofficial way, and as teacher in the college of San Miguel at Seville; but Salamanca was the object of his ambition. His lessons met with great success, and he soon became popular throughout Spain. He contributed very largely to the expulsion of barbarism from the seats of education, and to the diffusion of a taste for elegant and useful studies. He also published a large number of philological works, such as Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammars, and especially a Latin lexicon, which was enthusiastically received by the universities of all countries. He likewise applied philology to theology, and by that means caused it to make a great progress: in order to correct the text of the Vulgate, he compared it with the older texts, the Hebrew and Greek originals, and was one of the chief

writers on the Polyglot of the Alcala, prepared under the direction of cardinal Ximenes. This course naturally brought him into conflict with the scholastics, whose system had to his day prevailed. He was charged with having approached the intricate subject of theology without any knowledge of it, and to have undertaken an unprecedented labor on the mere strength of his philological talents. The Inquisition interfered, and part of his Biblical works were prohibited. He, however, protested against this measure in his *Apologia*, addressed to his protector, cardinal Ximenes, and had it not been for the interference of the latter, and of other influential friends at the court, he would no doubt have suffered severely (compare his *Apologia*, in Antonii *Bibl. Hisp. Vet.* ii, 310 sq.); as it was, he was appointed, in 1513, professor of Latin literature at the newly established University of Alcala de Henares (*Complutum*), and here was suffered to end his days in peace. He died July 2, 1522, according to Munnoz. Most of his works are still extant, among them a history of the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic, made by order of that prince, under the title *Decades duæ*, etc. (posthumously edited, 1545). See Nicolai Antonii *Bibliotheca Hispana* (Rom. 1672), p. 104 A, 109 B; Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles.* xiv, 120–123; Guil. Cave, *Scriptor. eccl. Historia litter.* (Genevæ, 1694), Appendix, p. 116 B, 118 A: Hefele, *Cardinal Ximenes*, p. 116, 124, 379, 458; Munnoz, *Elogio de Antonio de Lebrija*, in the *Memorias de la real Academia de la Historia*, iii, 1–30; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 265; M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 61, 75, 105. (J. H. W.)

Lebrun, Pierre, a French theologian, born at Brignolles in 1661, was professor in several colleges, and died June 6, 1729. He wrote, among other works, a *Critical History of Superstitious Practices which have Seduced the People* (1702).

Lebuin or **Liafwin**, a noted colleague of Gregory in his mission among the inhabitants of Friesland. According to his painstaking biographer, Hunebald, a monk of the convent of Elnon in the 10th century (in Surius, vi, 277, and in Pertz, ii, 360), Lebuin was a native of Brittany, and joined Gregory at Utrecht, having been directed to do so in a dream. Gregory sent him on a mission to the neighboring people, and gave him the Anglo-Saxon Marchelin or Marcellin as assistant. They preached with great success, and soon established a church at Wulpen, on the eastern shore of the Yssel, and another at Deventer. These churches afterwards closing by an invasion of the Saxons, Lebuin courageously resolved to go as a missionary among that nation, and went to Marklo, one of their principal cities; later he went further north, towards the Weser, and there was well received by an influential chief named Folkbert, who seems to have been a Christian. Folkbert advised him not to visit Marklo during the reunion which was held there yearly to discuss the general interests of the nation, but to conceal himself in the house of one of his friends, Davo. Lebuin, however, did not abide by this counsel, and went to the assembly. Being aware how "omnis concionis illius multitudo ex diversis partibus coacta primo suorum proavorum servare contendit instituta, numinibus videlicet suis vota solvens ac sacrificia," he appeared in the midst of the assembled warriors dressed in his priestly robes, the cross in one hand and the Gospel in the other, and announced himself as an envoy of the Most High, the one true God and creator of all things, to whom all must turn, forsaking our idols: "but," said he, at the close of his address, "if you wickedly persist in your errors, you will soon repent it bitterly, for in a short time there will come a courageous, prudent, and strong monarch of the neighborhood who will overwhelm you like a torrent, destroying all with fire and sword, taking your wives and children to be his servants, and subjecting all who are left to his rule." This discourse greatly excited the Saxons against him; but one of them, Buto, took his part, and Lebuin was permitted to depart unharmed. He now returned to Friesland, and rebuilt the church of Deventer, where he remained until his death. When Liudger built a third time the church which had been again destroyed during an invasion of the Saxons in 776, the remains of Lebuin were discovered. Lebuin is not to be mistaken for Livin, the pupil of Augustine, who went to evangelize Brabant towards the middle of the 7th century. The biography of Livin, believed to have been written by Boniface, cannot for a moment be considered as referring to the apostle of Germany. It is full of legends, and of no historical value. See F. W. Rettberg, *K. Gesch. Deutschlands*, ii, 405, 536, 509.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 266; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 401 sq.

Le'cah (Heb. *Lecah'*, לֶכָה, perh. for יֶלֶכָה, a *journey*, but according to Fürst, *annexation;* Sept. Ληχά v. r. Ληχάδ and Ληχαβ; Vulg. *Lecha*), a place in the tribe of Judah founded by Er (or rather, perhaps, by a son of his named Lecah), the first-named son of Shelah (1 Chron. iv, 21). As Mareshah is stated in the same connection to have been founded by a member of the same family, we may conjecture that Lecah (if indeed a town) lay in the same vicinity, perhaps westerly.

Lecène, Charles, a French Protestant theologian, was born in 1647 at Caen, in Normandy. After studying theology at Sedan, Geneva, and Saumur, he was in 1672 appointed pastor at Honfleur. In 1682 he supplied for one year the Church of Charenton, but was accused of Pelagianism by Sartre, pastor of Montpellier. Unable to obtain from the Consistory of Charenton a certificate of orthodoxy such as he desired, he appealed to the next national synod, where he was warmly sustained by Allix, but the revocation of the Edict of Nantes suddenly put an end to the discussion. Lecène went to Holland, and there connected himself with the Arminians. He then went to England, but, refusing to be reordained, and being, moreover, strongly suspected of Socinianism, he was unable to accomplish anything there, and returned to Holland, where he remained until 1697. He then went again to England, and settled at London. He vainly tried to found an Arminian Church in the English metropolis. He died in 1703. Lecène was, even by his theological adversaries, considered a very learned theologian. A plan of his for the translation of the Bible was taken up by his son, Michel Lecène (Amst. 1741, 2 vols. folio): *Projet d'une nouvelle version Françoise de la Bible* (Rotterdam, 1696, 8vo; translated, *An Essay for a new Translation of the Bible, wherein is shown that there is a necessity for a new Translation*, 2d ed., to which is added a table of the texts of Scripture [Lond. 1727, 8vo]). He wrote *De l'État de l'homme après le péché et de sa prédestination au salut* (Amsterd. 1684, 12mo):—*Entretiens sur diverses matières de théologie*, etc. (1685, 12mo):—*Conversations sur diverses matières de religion* (1687, 12mo). See Colani, in *Revue de Théologie*, vii, 343 sq., 1857; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxix, 185; and the sketch in the *Avertissement de sa traduction de la Bible* (Amst. 1742, 2 vols. folio). (J. H. W.)

Leckey, William, a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He made himself conspicuous by the part he took in the Blood plot—an attempt, after the Restoration, to complicate the Nonconformists and the government by warring against Romanism. He was imprisoned May 22, 1663, and, refusing to conform, was condemned to death, and executed on July 15 at Gallows Green, near Dublin. Leckey was a fine preacher and an able scholar, a fellow of the College of Dublin, which high school petitioned for his life. This request was granted upon the conformity of Leckey, which, as we have seen above, he refused. See Reid, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Ch. in Ireland*, ii, 275–282.

Leclerc, David, a Protestant theologian, was born at Geneva Feb. 19, 1591. He studied at Geneva, Strasburg, and Heidelberg, and in 1615 went to England to

perfect himself in the study of Hebrew. He subsequently returned to his native place, and in 1618 was appointed professor of Hebrew at the university. He was ordained for the ministry in 1628, and died April 21, 1654. He wrote *Quæstiones sacræ, in quibus multa Scripturæ loca variaque linguæ sacræ idiomata explicantur, etc.; accesserunt similium argumentorum diatribæ Steph. Clerici* (Amst. 1685, 8vo):—*Orationes* (*xiii*), *conspectus ecclesiasticus et poemata; accedunt Steph. Clerici Dissertationes philologicæ* (Amsterd. 1687, 8vo):—a Latin translation of Buxtorf's *Synagogue* (Basle, 1641, 8vo and 4to); etc. See *La Vie de David Leclerc*, in his *Quæstiones sacræ;* Senebier, *Hist. Littéraire de Genève;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 195.

Leclerc, James Theodore, a Swiss Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Geneva Nov. 25, 1692. He became pastor and professor of Oriental languages in that city in 1725, and died in 1758. He wrote, *Préservatif contre le Fanatisme, ou Réfutation des prétendus Inspirés de ce Siècle, trad. du Latin de Sam. Turretin* (Gen. 1723, 8vo): it is a work against the prophets of the Cevennes:—*Supplément au Préservatif contre le Fanatisme* (Gen. 1723, 8vo):—*Les Psaumes traduits en Français sur l'original Hébreu* (Gen. 1740 and 1761, 8vo). See Senebier, *Hist. Littéraire de Genève;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 200. (J. N. P.)

Le Clerc, John (1), first martyr of the Reformation in France, a mechanic by trade, was born at Meaux towards the close of the 15th century. He was brought to the knowledge of divine truth by reading the N. T. translated into French by Lefévre d'Étaples, and in his zeal for the cause he dared to post on the door of the cathedral a bill in which the pope was called antichrist. For this offence he was condemned to be whipped in Paris and at Meaux, was branded on the forehead, and exiled. He retired to Rosey, then to Metz in 1525, where he continued to work at his trade, wool-carding. Here he one day broke the images which the Romanists intended to carry in procession. Instead of trying to hide himself, he boldly confessed his deed, and was condemned to fearful bodily punishment. His right hand was cut off, his nose torn out, his arm and breast torn with red-hot pincers, and his head encircled with two or three bands of red-hot iron; amid all his torments he sung aloud the verse of Psa. cxv, "Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands." He was finally thrown into the fire, and thus died. His brother Peter, also a wool-carder, was chosen by the Protestants of Meaux for their pastor, and fell a victim to persecution in 1546. See Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. vi; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 193; Browning, *History of the Huguenots*, i, 23.

Le Clerc, John (2). See Clerc, Le.

Leclerc, Laurent José, a French priest, was born in Paris Aug. 22, 1677, studied theology, and was then admitted into the community of the preachers of St. Sulpice, was licensed by the Sorbonne in 1704, and taught theology at Tulle and at Orleans. In 1722 he became principal of the theological seminary at Orleans, and died May 6, 1736. He published, besides other works, *A Critical Letter on Bayle's Dictionary*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 201.

Lecomte, Louis, a French Jesuit, was born at Bordeaux about the middle of the 17th century. He was sent as missionary to China in 1685, and, after a stay of some years in the mission of Shensee (Chensi), returned to France, and published in 1696 *Memoirs on the present State of China*, a work which was censured by the faculty of theology. He died in 1729.

Lectern, or **Lettern** (Lat. *lectorium* or *lectricium*), a *reading-desk* or stand, properly movable, from which the Scripture "*lessons*" (*lectiones*), which form a portion



Lectern in Ramsay Church, Huntingdonshire (about 1450).

of the various church-services, are chanted or read in many churches. The lectern (also called *pulpitum, ambo, suggestus, pyrgus, tribunal, lectricium*, or, most frequently, *lectorium*), of very ancient use, is of various forms and of different materials, and is found both in Roman Catholic churches and in the cathedrals and college-chapels of the Church of England. Originally they were made of wood, but later they were frequently also made of stone or metal, and sometimes in the form of an eagle (the symbol of St. John the Evangelist), the outspread wings of which form the frame supporting the volume. In Scotland, during the last century, the precentor's desk was commonly called by that name, and pronounced *lettern*. See Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, vol. vi, s. v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 345. See Eagle.

Lecticarii, the same as the *copiatæ*. They were called *lecticarii* from the fact that they *carried the corpse* or bier at funerals. See Copiatæ.

Lectionarium, or Lessons. Of the many real and supposed meanings of the expression *lectio* (*ἀνάγνωσις, ἀνάγνωσμα*), we have here only to consider the liturgical. In this sense it is used to designate the reading, which, together with singing, prayers, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments, constitutes public worship.

This part of worship is adopted from the Jews, and, like that of the synagogues, was at first restricted to the reading of their sacred books (O. T.). The first record we find of the reading of the N.-Test. Scriptures in the churches is in Justin, *Apol.* i, cap. 67. But the fact of the reading of the Bible in general from the earliest times is clearly established by passages of Tertullian (*Apolog.* cap. 39; *De anima*, cap. 9), Cyprian (*Ep.* 24, 33, edit. Oberth. 34), Origen (*Contra Cels.* iii, 45, ed. Oberth. 50), etc. It is self-evident that the canonical books and the homologoumena were those most generally read. But that lessons were occasionally read also from the Apocrypha and Antilegomena is shown by the yet remaining lists of *libri ecclesiastici* and *ἀναγινωσκόμενα*, i. e. of such books as, although not recognised as authorities in matters of faith, are still permitted to be read in the churches. Other writings, especially *acta martyrum*, and sermons of some of the most distinguished fathers, came afterwards to be also read to the people. The number of pieces (*lectiones*) read at each service varied; the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (ii, c. 57) mentions four; two was the minimum—one from the Gospels, the other from the epistles or other books, including those of the O. T. See Pericopæ. At first the portions to be read, at least on every ordinary Sunday, were taken in succession in the sacred books (*lectio continua*), but afterwards special portions were appointed to be read on certain Sundays, and the selection was made by the bishop, until at last a regular system of lessons was contrived, which is the base of the one still used at present in churches where the strictly liturgical service is adhered to. For feast-days, at first, special lessons were appointed (for instance, the account of the resurrection on Easter: see Augustine, *Serm.*

139, 140). But it is not known at what time the plan which forms the basis of the present system was first adopted. Yet Ranke (*Das Kirchl. Perikopensystem*, Berl. 1847) gives us good reasons for thinking that tradition may be correct in representing Jerome as the author of the ancient list of lessons known under the name of "comes," and as the originator of the system in the Western Church.

Such lists, indicating the portions of Scripture to be read in public assemblies on the different days of the year, are named *lectionaria* (sc. volumina) or *lectionarii* (libri); Greek, *ἀναγνωστικά*, *εὐαγγελιστάρια*, *ἐκλογάδια* (they are also called *evangeliarium et epistolare; evangelia cum epistolis; comes*). In Latin the principal are the "*Lect. Gallicanum*," in Mabillon, *Liturg. Gallic.*, the "*comes*" of Jerome; the "*Calendarium Romanum*" (edit. Fronto, Par. 1652); the "*Tabula antiquarum lectionum*," in Pauli, *Ad missas*, in Gerbert, *Monum. liturg. Alem.* i, 409. See Augusti, *Denkwürdigk.* vol. vi; *Handb. der chr. Arch.* ii, 6; Ranke, *Das Kirchl. Perikopensystem;* Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* I, i, 10; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* xiv, 3, § 2; Procter, *History of Book of Common Prayer*, p. 216 sq.; Marténe, *De Ant. Eccles. Rit.* iv, 5, 1 sq.; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, i, 125 sq. See LITURGY.

The reading of the lesson in the early ages of the Church was intrusted to the *lector* (q. v.). At present, in the Romish mass, when the number of officiating priests is complete, the epistle is read by the subdeacon and the Gospel by the deacon. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 268; Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* p. 408 sq. See LESSON. (J. H. W.)

Lectisternium (Lat. *lectus*, a couch, and *sternere*, to spread), a religious festival ceremony among the ancient Romans. It was celebrated during times of public calamity, when the gods were invited to the entertainment, and their statues taken from their pedestals and laid on couches. The lectisternium, according to Livy (v, 13), was first celebrated in the year of Rome 354 (on the occasion of a contagious disease which committed frightful ravages among the cattle), and lasted for eight successive days. On the celebration of this festival enemies were said to forget their animosities, and all prisoners were liberated. — Brande and Cox, *Dictionary of Art and Sciences*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lector (*ἀναγνώστης*) or READER was the name of an officer in the ancient Church whose place it was to read the holy Scriptures and other lessons (for instance, the *Acta martyrum*) in public worship. He was also intrusted with the keeping of the sacred volumes. This reading of the Word of God formed an important part in the service of the Jewish synagogues (see Luke iv, 16; Acts xiii, 15, 27; 2 Cor. iii, 14), and was introduced into the Christian Church from thence. But we do not know at what period the performance of it became a special office. Yet Tertullian, *De præscr. hær.* c. 41, expressly speaks of the lector as a special officer in the Church, and Cyprian (*Ep.* 33, and edit. Oberth. 34) mentions the ordination of two readers. The early Church councils (*Concil. Chalcedon.* a. 451, c. 13, 14; *Tolet.* 7, 2; *Vasense*, ii, 2; *Valentin.* c. 1; *Arausial*, i, 18) give directions about the duties of readers. Still, although the most eminent fathers laid great stress on the reading of Scripture in the churches, and Cyprian declares their office one of great honor (*Epist.* 34), it was yet classed among the *ordines inferiores*. This is easily accounted for from the fact that the simple reading, without any exegetical or homiletical explanations (which are not in the province of the reader), was a mere mechanical performance, and in after times often intrusted to children. After the form of the liturgy of the mass was finally settled, the lectors were forbidden to read the pericopes occurring in the missa fidelium. They were also thereafter excluded from the altar, and suffered to read only at the *pulpitum*, and finally were obliged to leave to the deacon or presbyter the pronouncing of the formula solennis, probably because the reader was of lower degree in the hierarchy. Yet in some churches the ordination of readers was a very solemn affair, especially among the Greeks, where it was accompanied by imposition of hands. In course of time the office of reader in the Romish Church came to be absorbed in the deacon's, and identified with it. See C. Schöne, *Geschichtsforschungen ü. d. Kirchl. Gebr.* iii, 108 (Berlin, 1822); Jo. Andr. Schmidt, *De primitivæ eccles. lectoribus illustribus* (Helmstadt, 1696); Bingham, *De origin. eccles.* ii, 29; Suicer and Du Fresne, *Lexica;* Augusti, *Denkwürd.* vol. vi; *Handb. d. chr. Arch.* i, 262; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 268.

Lectorium. See LECTERN.

Lecturers, an order of preachers in the Church of England, distinct from the incumbent or curate, usually chosen by the vestry or chief inhabitants of the parish, and supported either by voluntary contributions or legacies. They preach on the Sunday afternoon or evening, and in some instances on a stated day in the week. The lecturers are generally appointed without any interposition of the incumbent, though his consent, as possessor of the freehold of the Church, is necessary before any lecturer can officiate: when such consent has been obtained (but not before), the bishop, if he approve of the nominee, licenses him to the lecture. Where there are lectures founded by the donations of pious persons, the lecturers are appointed by the founders, without any interposition or consent of the rectors of the churches, though with the leave and approbation of the bishop, and after the candidate's subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Act of Uniformity, such as that of lady Moyer at St. Paul's, etc. When the office of lecturer first originated in the English Church it is difficult to determine. It is manifest from the statute (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4, § 19), commonly known as the *Act of Uniformity* (1662), that the office was generally recognised in the second half of the 17th century. Even as early as 1589, however, an evening lecture on Fridays was endowed in the London parish of St. Michael Royal, and at about the same time three lecture-sermons were established in St. Michael's, Cornhill — two on Sundays after evening prayers, and a third at the same time on Christmas day. During the Great Rebellion lecturers used their influence and opportunities for the overthrow of the State Church and the monarchy. — Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 371.

Lectures, Bampton. See BAMPTON LECTURES.

Lectures, Boyle. See BOYLE LECTURES.

Lectures, Congregational. See CONGREGATIONAL LECTURES.

Lectures, Hulsean. See HULSEAN LECTURES.

Lectures, Merchants', a lecture set up in Pinner's Hall in the year 1672, by the Presbyterians and Independents, to show their agreement among themselves, as well as to support the doctrines of the Reformation against the prevailing errors of Popery, Socinianism, and infidelity. The principal ministers for learning and popularity were chosen as lecturers, such as Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Messrs. Collins, Jenkins, Mead, and afterwards Messrs. Alsop, Howe, Cole, and others. It was encouraged and supported by some of the principal merchants and tradesmen of the city. Some misunderstanding taking place, the Presbyterians removed to Salter's Hall and the Independents remained at Pinner's Hall, and each party filled up their numbers out of their respective denominations. This lecture is kept up to the present day, and is now held at Broad Street meeting every Tuesday morning.

Lectures, Monthly. A lecture preached monthly by the Congregational ministers of London in their different chapels, taken in rotation. These lectures have of late been systematically arranged, so as to form a connected course of one or more years. A valu-

able volume on the evidences of Revelation, published in 1827, is one of the fruits of these monthly exercises.

Lectures, Morning, certain casuistical lectures, which were preached by some of the most able divines in London. The occasion of these lectures seems to be this: During the troublesome times of Charles I., most of the citizens having some near relation or friend in the army of the earl of Essex, so many bills were sent up to the pulpit every Lord's day for their preservation that the minister had neither time to read them nor to recommend their cases to God in prayer; several London divines therefore agreed to set apart a morning hour for this purpose, one half to be spent in prayer, and the other in a suitable exhortation to the people. When the heat of the war was over, it became a casuistical lecture, and was carried on till the restoration of Charles II. These sermons were afterwards published in several volumes quarto, under the title of the *Morning Exercises*. The authors were the most eminent preachers of the day; among them was, e. g. archbishop Tillotson. It appears that these lectures were held every morning for one month only, and, from the preface to the volume, dated 1689, the time was afterwards contracted to a fortnight. Most of these were delivered at Cripplegate Church, some at St. Giles's, and a volume against popery in Southwark. Mr. Neale observes that this lecture was afterwards revived in a different form, and continued in his day. It was kept up long afterwards at several places in the summer, a week at each place, but latterly the time was exchanged for the evening.

Lectures, Moyer's, a course of eight sermons, preached annually, founded by the beneficence of lady Moyer about 1720, who left by will a rich legacy as a foundation for the same. A great number of English writers having endeavored in a variety of ways to invalidate the doctrine of the Trinity, this opulent and orthodox lady was influenced to think of an institution which should provide for posterity an ample collection of productions in defence of this branch of the Christian faith. The first course of these lectures was preached by Dr. Waterland, on the divinity of Christ. These lectures were discontinued about the middle of the last century.

Lectures, Religious, are discourses or sermons delivered by ministers on any subject in theology. Besides lectures on the Sabbath day, many think proper to preach on week-days; sometimes at five in the morning, before people go to work, and at seven in the evening, after they have done. In London there is preaching almost every forenoon and evening in the week at some place or other.

Lectures, Warburtonian, a lecture founded by bishop Warburton to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament which relate to the Christian Church, especially to the apostasy of papal Rome. To this foundation we owe the admirable discourses of Hurd, Halifax, Bagot, Apthorp, and many others.

Lecturn. See LECTERN.

Ledge (only in the plural שְׁלַבִּים, *shelabbim'*, from שָׁלַב, to *mortice* together; Sept. ἐξεχόμενα, Vulg. *junctura*), prop. *joints*, e. g. at the corners of a base or pedestal; hence perhaps an ornament overlaying these angles to hide the juncture (1 Kings vii, 28, 29). In verses 35, 36, the term thus rendered is different, namely יָד, *yad*, lit. a *hand*, i. e. a lateral projection, probably referring to *side-borders* to the same pedestals. The description is too brief and the terms too vague to allow a more definite idea of these appendages to the bases in question. See LAVER.

Ledieu, FRANÇOIS, abbé, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer, was born at Péronne about the middle of the 17th century. In 1684 he became private secretary of the celebrated French pulpit orator Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, and was by this prelate made canon of the church at Meaux. He died at Paris Oct. 7, 1713. He wrote *Mémoires et Journal de l'Abbé Ledieu sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet* (Paris, 1856-57, 4 vols. 8vo), upon which the late Sainte-Beuve thus comments: "L'abbé Ledieu n'a pas le dessein de diminuer Bossuet, mais il souvient son illustre maître à une épreuve à laquelle pas une grande figure ne résisterait; il note jour par jour à l'époque de la maladie dernière et du declin tous les actes et toutes les paroles de faiblesse qui lui échappent, jusqu'aux plaintes et doléances aux quelles on se laisse aller la nuit quand on se croit seul, et dans cette observation il porte un esprit de petitesse qui se prononce de plus en plus en avançant, un esprit bas, qui n'est pas moins dangereux que ne le serait une malignité subtile" (*Moniteur*, Mar. 31, 1856). Ledieu also left in MS. *Mémoires sur l'Histoire et les Antiquités du diocèse de Meaux*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 262.

Ledru, ANDRÉ PIERRE, a French priest and naturalist, was born at Chantenay, Main, January 22, 1761. When quite young he entered the priesthood, and during the Revolution adopted its principles, and was appointed curate at Pré-au-Mans. Later he was employed as botanist in Baudin's expedition to the Canaries and the Antilles (in 1796). He died July 11, 1825. Ledru wrote several works, for a list of which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 267.

Ledwich, EDWARD, D.D., an Irish antiquary, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, subsequently vicar of Aghaboe, Queens County, Ireland, was born in 1739, and died in 1823. He published *The Antiquities of Ireland* (1794), a very valuable work. He offended many of his countrymen by denying the truth of the legend of St. Patrick.

Lee, Andrew, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 7, 1745 (O. S.), at Lyme, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1766; entered the ministry in 1768; was ordained pastor at Lisbon, Conn., Oct. 26, 1768; and died Aug. 25, 1832. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1807. Dr. Lee published *An Inquiry whether it be the Duty of Man to be willing to suffer Damnation for the Divine Glory* (1786):—*Sermons on various important Subjects* (8vo, 1803); and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 668.

Lee, Ann, the founder of the sect of *Shakers*, was born in Manchester, England, Feb. 29, 1736. She was the daughter of a poor mechanic, a blacksmith by trade, and a sister of general Charles Lee of Revolutionary fame. When yet a young girl she married Abraham Standley, of like trade as her father, and she became the mother of four children, who all died in infancy. When about twenty-two years of age Jane came under the influence of James Wardley, at this time the great exponent of the Millenarian doctrines of the *Camisards* and *French Prophets*. These religious fanatics, after enduring much persecution and great suffering in their native country, had sought a refuge in England in 1705. Gradually they spread their views—communicating inspiration, as they thought—finding ready followers, particularly among the Quakers, and one of this number—James Wardley—in 1747 actually formed a separate society, consisting mainly of Quakers, claiming to be led by the Spirit of God, and indulging in all manner of religious excesses, similar to those of the *Camisards* (q. v.) and *French Prophets* (q. v.). Wardley claimed to have supernatural visions and revelations, and as both he and his adherents were noted for their bodily agitations, they came to be known as *Shaking Quakers*. Of this sect Ann Lee, now Mrs. Standley, became one of the leading spirits. From the time of her admission she seems to have been particularly inspired for leadership and action. Naturally of an excitable temper, her experience in the performance of the peculiar religious

duties of this society—by them termed "religious exercises"—was most singular and painful. Of a pious nature, she hesitated not to subject herself to all the torments of the flesh. Often in her fits or paroxysms, as she clinched her hands, it is said, the blood would flow through the pores of her skin in a kind of sanguinary perspiration. This her followers believe was a miraculous phenomenon, and they liken it to the "bloody sweat" of our Saviour in the garden. Her flesh wasted away under these exercises, and she became so weak that her friends were obliged to feed her like an infant. Then, again, according to the account given by her followers, she would have "intervals of releasement, in which her bodily strength and vigor were sometimes *miraculously* renewed, and her soul filled with heavenly visions and divine revelations." All these mortifications of the flesh were by her sect accepted not only as evidences of great spiritual fervor, but as proofs of the indwelling of the divine spirit in Ann in an uncommon measure. She rose rapidly in the favor and confidence of her brethren, and we need not wonder that soon she came to have visions and revelations, and that they frequently and gladly "attested" them as manifestations of God to the believers. By the year 1770 she had grown so much in favor among her people that her revelations and visions were looked upon with more than ordinary interest; and when in this year she was subjected to persecution and imprisonment by the secular authorities, her followers claim that the Lord Jesus manifested himself to her in an especial manner, and from this time dates the beginning of that "latter day of glory" in which they are now rejoicing. Immediately after her release from prison she professed supernatural powers in the midst of the little society gathered about her, and she was acknowledged as their spiritual *mother in Christ*. Ann was thereafter accepted as the only true leader of the Church of Christ—not in the common acceptation of that term, but as the incarnation of infinite wisdom and the "second appearing of Christ," as really and fully as Jesus of Nazareth was the incarnation of infinite power, or Christ's first appearing, and she now hesitated not to style herself "*Ann, the Word*," signifying that in her dwelt the *Word*. Among other things revealed to her at this time was the displeasure of the Almighty against the matrimonial state, and she opened her testimony on the wickedness of marriage. If nothing else could have provoked the secular powers to put a stop to her fanatic excesses in the garb of religion, her attack on one of the most sacred institutions of the civilized state demanded immediate action, and she was again imprisoned, this time for misdemeanor. Set free once more, she began to spread her revelations more generally, and actually entered upon an open warfare against "the root of human depravity," as she called the matrimonial act, and the people of Manchester were so enraged that she was shut up in a *madhouse*, and was kept there several weeks. Thus harassed and persecuted on English soil, she finally decided to seek quiet and peace on this side of the Atlantic, and in 1773 professed to have a "special revelation" to emigrate to America. Several of her congregation asserted that they also had had revelations of a like nature, and she accordingly set out for this country. She came to America in the ship Maria, Captain Smith, and arrived at New York in May, 1774, having as her companions her brother, William Lee, James Whitaker, John Hocknell, called elders, and others. In the spring of 1776 she went to Albany, and thence to Niskayuna, now Watervliet, eight miles from Albany. Here she successfully established a congregation, which she called "*the Church of Christ's second appearing*," formally dissolved her connection with the man to whom she had in her youth given her hand and heart, and became their recognised head. It was not, however, until 1780 that Ann Lee succeeded in gathering about her a very large flock. At the beginning of this year an unusually great religious revival occurred at New Lebanon, and, improving this opportunity, she went prominently before the people, taking an active part in the religious commotion. This proved to her cause a fine harvest indeed, and the number of her deluded followers greatly increased, and resulted in the establishment of the now flourishing society of New Lebanon. See SHAKERS. One of these New Lebanon converts, Valentine Rathbun, previously a Baptist minister, who, however, after the short period of about three months, recovered his senses, and published a pamphlet against the imposture, says that "there attended this infatuation an inexplicable agency upon the body, to which he himself was subjected, that affected the nerves suddenly and forcibly like the electric fluid, and was followed by tremblings and the complete deprivation of strength. When the good mother had somewhat established her authority with her new disciples, she warned them of the great sin of following the vain customs of the world, and, having fleeced them of their ear-rings, necklaces, buckles, and everything which might nourish pride, and having cut off their hair close by their ears, she admitted them into her Church. Thus metamorphosed, they were ashamed to be seen by their old acquaintances, and would be induced to continue Shakers to save themselves from further humiliation." But whether it was the success of their unworthy cause, or their religious excesses, or their unwillingness to take the oath of allegiance to the State of New York, they made themselves obnoxious here also to the secular authorities, and, as in her native country, Ann Lee was subjected to imprisonment, and escaped trial and punishment only by the kind offices of the governor, George Clinton. In 1781 she set out, in company with her elders, on a quite extended preaching tour through the New England States, in the course of which societies were founded at Harvard, Mass., and sundry other places. She had always asserted that she was not liable to the assaults of death, and that, when she left this world, she should ascend in the twinkling of an eye to heaven; but, unhappily for her claims, "the mighty power of God, the second heir of the covenant of promise" and "the Lamb's bride," or, as she styled herself, "the spiritual mother of the new creation, the queen of Mount Zion, the second appearing of Christ," died a natural death at Watervliet, September 8, 1784.

Strange as must ever appear the fanatical excesses of Ann Lee, and her willingness to lead men to acts of depravity, to blasphemous religious pretensions, it must be conceded that she was certainly a wonderful woman. Deprived of all the advantages of education, she nevertheless, by the power of a will wholly unyielding and a mind of no common order, succeeded in establishing a religious sect, by which, at present consisting of more than four thousand people, some of them of marked intelligence and superior talents, possessing, in the aggregate, wealth to the amount of more than *ten millions of dollars*, she is considered as the very Christ—standing in the Church as God himself, and at whose tribunal the world is to be judged. Over this society her influence is spoken of as complete. Her word was a law from which there was no appeal. Obedience then, as now, was the one lesson that a Shaker was required to learn perfectly—an obedience unquestioned and entire; and all this when the very foundation upon which they rested their faith, namely, *her divine mission*, was notoriously antagonized by a life accused, and not without some show of truthfulness, as openly and shamefully impure. See H. P. Andrews in the *Ladies' Repository*, 1858, p. 646 sq.; Marsden (Rev. J. B.), *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects*, ii, 320 sq.; *Galaxy*, 1872 (Jan. and April). See SHAKERS.

Lee, Charles, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flemingsburg, Ky., May 12, 1818; was converted when about twenty years of age, and, though hitherto a farmer by employment, he decided at once upon the ministry, entered the college at Hanover, Ind., and, after graduating in 1853, studied theology with the president

of his alma mater. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Madison in 1855, and became pastor at Graham, Ind. He died May 27, 1863. "With fair talents, and yet amid many discouragements both in himself and from without, he was still not only a faithful, but a successful pastor of the churches committed to his care. God gave him the witness of approval in the conversion of many under his ministry."—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 169.

Lee, Chauncey, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, Conn., 1763; graduated at Yale College in 1784; entered the ministry June 3, 1789; and was ordained pastor in Sunderland, Vt., March 18, 1790, where he remained a few years, and in Jan., 1800, became pastor in Colebrook, Conn. This connection he dissolved in 1827, to become pastor at Marlborough, Conn., Nov. 18, 1828, which place he held until Jan. 11, 1837. He died in Hartwick, N. Y., Dec., 1842. Lee published the *American Accomptant: an Arithmetic* (1797):—*The Trial of Virtue: a metrical Version of the Book of Job* (1807):—*Sermons especially designed for Revivals* (12mo, 1824):—*Letters from Aristarchus to Philemon* (1833); and two or three occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 288.

Lee, Edward, an English prelate, was born in Kent in 1482; was educated at Oxford and Cambridge; became chaplain of Henry VIII, and was finally employed by him in several diplomatic missions. In 1529 he was sent to Rome to negotiate for the divorce of the king, and in 1531 was appointed archbishop of York. He opposed the Reform doctrines of Luther, but favored the innovations which Henry VIII made in the Church. Lee died in 1544. He wrote, *Apologia adversus quorumdam calumnias* (Louvain, 1520):—*Epistola nuncupatoria ad Des. Erasmum* (Louvain, 1520):—*Annotationum Libri duo in annotationes Novi Testamenti Erasmi* (Bâle, 1520):—*Epistola apologetica qua respondet D. Erasmi Epistolis.*—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lee, Jason, a Methodist Episcopal minister, pioneer missionary to Oregon, was born at Stanstead, Lower Canada, in 1803; labored with the Wesleyan missionaries there until 1833; joined the New England Conference in that year, and was ordained missionary to Oregon. Here he labored nobly, buried two wives, and in 1844 returned to New York to raise funds for the Oregon Institute, for which he was made agent by the New England Conference, but he died at his birthplace, March 12, 1845. His loss was a blow to the mission, but it is his glorious monument for two worlds.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 617. (G. L. T.)

Lee, Jesse, one of the most eminent preachers in the early history of the American Methodist Church, and recognised as the founder of Methodism in New England, was born in Prince George's County, Virginia, March 12, 1758. He received a fair education, was diligently instructed in the Prayer-book and Catechism, and early acquired skill in vocal music, which served him in all his subsequent labors. His early life was moral. "I believe I never did anything in my youth that the people generally call wicked," is the record in his journal. His father was led to a more serious mode of life than prevailed generally in that community chiefly by the influence of Mr. Jarratt, an Episcopal clergyman. Jesse's parents, however, finally, in 1773, joined the Methodist Society then formed under Robert Williams, one of Wesley's preachers, the promoter of Methodism in those parts. In this very year Jesse experienced in a marked manner the sense of pardoned sin, and continued to benefit by the powerful revival influences which for some years prevailed in the neighborhood. In 1776 he experienced a state of grace which he called "perfect love." "At length I could say, 'I have nothing but the love of Christ in my heart,'" is his record. In 1777 he removed from his home into the bounds of Roanoke Circuit, North Carolina, where the next year he was appointed a class-leader. He preached his first sermon November 17, 1779, and for a time supplied the preacher's place. In the summer of 1780 he was drafted into the militia to meet the approach of the British army in South Carolina. Excused from bearing arms on account of his religious scruples, he rendered various other services, especially by preaching. Soon obtaining a discharge, he was earnestly solicited to enter the itinerant ministry, but shrank from the responsibility, "fearing lest he should injure the work of God." At the tenth Conference, held at Ellis Meeting-house, Sussex County, Virginia, April 17, 1782, Lee was deeply impressed with "the union and brotherly love" prevalent among the preachers, notwithstanding the warm difference that had of late existed among the Methodist preachers on the subject of the administration of the sacraments, and at a quarterly meeting in November he was prevailed upon to take charge, together with Mr. Dromgoole, of a circuit near Edenton, North Carolina — the Amelia Circuit. At the Ellis Meeting-house Conference, May 6, 1783, he was received on trial. This year he preached with marked success. He writes, "I preached at Mr. Spain's with great liberty . . . the Spirit of the Lord came upon us, and we were bathed in tears." "I preached at Howel's Chapel from Ezek. xxxiii, 11. . . . . I saw so clearly that the Lord was willing to bless the people, even while I was speaking, that I began to feel distressed for them. . . . After stopping and weeping for some time, I began again, but had spoken but a little while before the cries of the people overcame me, and I wept with them so that I could not speak. I found that love had tears as well as grief." Under appointment of the Conference, which *began* at Ellis Preaching-house, Virginia, April 30, 1784, and *ended* at Baltimore May 28 following (see minute for that year), he labored in different circuits with like success, and was now regarded as an important man in the connection. December 12 he was invited to meet Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey at the celebrated Christmas Conference of 1784 at Baltimore, where, with the aid of these persons, ordained and sent out for the purpose by Mr. Wesley, the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. Lee could not attend the Conference from his distant circuit on so short a notice and at that season of the year, but was immediately after requested by bishop Asbury to travel with him in a Southern tour. This was an important event for Lee. He preached with the bishop at Georgetown and Charleston. At Cheraw he met with a merchant who gave him such information of New England as awakened in him an eager desire to transfer his field of labor to that region. At the Southern Conference, held in North Carolina April 20, 1785, Lee, in ardent controversy with Coke, who was still in the country, sought the abrogation of certain stringent rules on slavery adopted in 1784, which required of each member of the society the gradual emancipation of his slaves. His views soon prevailed. He preached, 1786, in Kent Circuit, Maryland; 1787, in Baltimore; 1788, in Flanders Circuit, embracing a portion of New Jersey and New York. Previously to the General Conference of 1796 there were no prescribed limits to the several conferences, but they were held at the discretion of the bishop as to time and place, the same preacher being sometimes appointed from different Conferences in the same year. At the Conference held in New York, May 28, 1789, Lee was appointed to Stamford Circuit, in Connecticut, and now began his career in New England, which continued for eleven years. New England, from the natural temperament of its inhabitants, and their previous theological education, was a hard field for the introduction of Methodism, into which —though spread into all the other Atlantic States, far into the West, to Canada and Nova Scotia—it had not hitherto ventured with a set purpose of permanent occupancy. The dearth of earnest religious interest which succeeded the revivals under Edwards, Whitefield, and Tennant, as well as the prevalent reactionary tendency to rationalism, furnished sufficient demand for the zeal-

ous preaching of the Methodists. They felt themselves called also to a special mission in upholding their form of doctrine concerning entire sanctification in this life; but their views on the subject of *free will* were greatly misunderstood, the Methodist Arminianism being confounded with Pelagianism. "The argument," says John Edwards, "most constantly used against Arminianism in those days was its tendency to prepare the way for Popery" (as being a doctrine of salvation by good works). The dominant theology, therefore, gave the Methodist preachers but a cold reception. Lee preached at Norwalk first in the street, but was subsequently allowed, both in this and other places, the use of the court-house, and sometimes of the meeting-house. Thomas Ware, who heard Lee about this time, writes, "When he stood up in the open air and began to sing, I knew not what it meant. I drew near, however, to listen, and thought the prayer was the best I had ever heard. . . . When he entered upon the subject-matter of his text, it was with such an easy, natural flow of expression, and in such a tone of voice, that I could not refrain from weeping, and many others were affected in the same way. When he was done, and we had an opportunity of expressing our views to each other, it was agreed that such a man had not visited New England since the days of Whitefield." At Stratfield he formed the first *class*, consisting of three women, September 26, 1787. At Reading, December 28, he formed another *class* of two. Thus, at the end of seven months' labor, he had secured *five* members in society. But the spirit with which he labored appears in his journal as follows: "I love to break up new ground, and hunt the lost souls in New England, though it is hard work; but when Christ is with me, hard things are made easy, and rough ways made smooth." After preaching to a large congregation on one occasion, he was, as usual, left to find shelter where he could, and, as he records, rode through storm, "my soul transplanted with joy, the snow falling, the wind blowing, prayer ascending, faith increasing, grace descending, heaven smiling, and love abounding."

In February, 1790, he received three helpers, Brush, Roberts, and Smith, and formed the New Haven Circuit. He passed through Rhode Island, and appeared in Boston July 9. Boardman and Garrettson had before preached there, but no permanent fruit remained of their labors. Lee, finding no house opened, preached on the Common to 3000 hearers. Though Lee often returned to the city, no society was formed there till July 13, 1792. He had better success elsewhere, and constantly labored throughout New England in supervision of the work, till the General Conference of 1796. Soon after this date he began to travel at large with bishop Asbury, as his authorized assistant in preaching and in holding Conferences. Thus employed, he revisited the scenes of his former labors in the South, and travelled also through New England. The period of his labors in that section closed in 1800. It had continued for eleven years, amid great difficulties, frequent theological controversies, and no small degree of persecution. The statistical result at this date was 50 preachers and 6000 members. At the General Conference held May 6, 1800, at Baltimore, Lee was nearly elected a bishop, Whatcoat being chosen over him by four votes. The subsequent portion of his life was spent mostly in the South, in earnest and successful labor as pastor and presiding elder. He preferred, says his biographer, the former position. At the Virginia Conference of 1807 his influence defeated, from an opinion of its unconstitutionality, the proposition to call an extraordinary General Conference, in order to elect a bishop in place of bishop Whatcoat, deceased. He had, for like reason, opposed his own ordination as assistant bishop in 1796. In the Virginia Conference of 1808 he advocated a petition to the following General Conference of May 20, 1808, to establish a *delegated* General Conference. This proposition had been urged by Lee as early as 1792. Such action was taken by the Conference of 1808, and the powers of the General Conference, as the supreme authority of the Church, were defined in what are termed the Restrictive Rules. In the same year Lee made a last visit and journey throughout New England, which was "an humble but exultant religious ovation." In the summer of 1807 he published at Baltimore his *History of Methodism* in America, which was the first work of the kind. During that year he served the House of Representatives at Washington as chaplain, as he did also in 1812 and 1813. In 1814 he was chaplain of the Senate. At the General Conference of 1812, in New York, Lee strongly advocated, as he had previously done, the proposition to make the office of presiding elder elective. He opposed with equal zeal the principle of advancing local preachers to elders' orders. He continued his faithful career as circuit preacher and as chaplain to Congress till 1816. He was present at the funeral services of his veteran colaborer, bishop Asbury, held by the General Conference of 1816 at Baltimore, and did not long survive himself, but died at the age of fifty-eight, Sept. 12, 1816. Dr. Stevens closes his history of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the following characterization of Jesse Lee: "A man of vigorous, though unpolished mind, of rare popular eloquence and tireless energy, an itinerant evangelist from the British Provinces to Florida for thirty-five years, a chief counsellor of the Church in its annual and general conferences," "founder of Methodism in New England . . . he lacked only the episcopal office to give him rank with Asbury and Coke. Asbury early chose him for the position of bishop. Some two or three times it seemed likely that he would be elected to it, but his manly independence and firmness of opinion in times of party strife were made the occasion of his defeat." "In public services he may fairly be ranked next to Asbury, and as founder and apostle of Eastern Methodism he is above any other official rank. In this respect his historic honor is quite unique; for, though individual men have in several other sections initiated the denomination, no other founder has, so completely as he, introduced, conducted, and concluded his work, and from no other one man's similar work have proceeded equal advantages to American Methodism" (iv, 510, 511). The same author, in another place, thus presents his qualities as a preacher: "Pathos was natural to him. Humor seems, in some temperaments, to be the natural counterpart, or, at least, reaction of pathos. Lee became noted for his wit; we shall see it serving him with a felicitous advantage in his encounters with opponents, especially in the Northeastern States. It flowed in a genial and permanent stream from his large heart, and played most vividly in his severest itinerant hardships; but he was full of tender humanity and affectionate piety. His rich sensibilities, rather than any remarkable intellectual powers, made him one of the most eloquent and popular preachers of his day. One of his fellow-laborers, a man of excellent judgment, says that he possessed uncommon colloquial powers and a fascinating address; that his readiness at repartee was scarcely equalled, and by the skillful use of this talent he often taught those who were disposed to be witty at his expense that the safest way to deal with him was to be civil. He was fired with missionary zeal, and, moreover, was a man of great moral courage" (i, 413). "It was a kind of fixed principle with him," says his biographer Lee (p. 350), "never to let a congregation go from his preaching entirely unaffected. He would excite them in some way. He would make them weep if he could. If he failed in this, he would essay to alarm them with deep and solemn warning of words and manner; and, if all failed, he would shake their sides with some pertinent illustration or anecdote, and then, having moved them, seek, by all the appliances of truth, earnestness, and affection, to guide their stirred-up thoughts and sympathies to the fountains of living waters."—See *Life and Times of Jesse Lee*, by Leroy M. Lee (Richmond, Va., 1848); Stevens, *History of the M. E. Church; Memoirs of Rev. T. Ware.* (E. B. O.)

Lee, Robert, D.D., a noted Scotch Presbyterian

divine, was born at Tweedmouth about 1796; was educated at St. Andrew's University, and became a minister of the Gospel. After occupying two other charges, he became, with Chalmers and others, minister of old Grayfriars, Edinburgh. He died in March, 1868, at Torquay, Devonshire. Dr. Robert Lee published a translation of the *Thesis of Erastus* (1844):—*Prayers for Public Worship:*—*Handbook of Devotion:*—*Prayers for Family Worship:*—*The Bible, with New Marginal References;* a work which brought upon him severe condemnation for Rationalistic tendency. It is, however, by no means to be inferred from this that Dr. Lee was not of the evangelical school; he fought the Socinians with the utmost exertion, and, as a Scotchman expressed it, "Dr. Lee emptied the Unitarian chapel" at Edinburgh. Dr. Lee was the leader in innovations and changes in the Church Establishment of Scotland. His views were ultra-liberal; and from the year 1858, when the innovations were complained of before the Low-Church courts, till the commencement of his last illness, he fought a great battle, as the *Daily Review* expresses it, for what he deemed a more liberal construction of the laws of the Church in the matter of public worship—in other words, publishing, using, defending written prayers—and by his own force of character, his ingenuity and power as a controversialist, and his influence over the younger ministers of the Church, he probably did more to carry forward the movement with which his name is identified than all the rest of his brethren who took part with him. See SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. (J. H. W.)

Lee, Robert P., D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in 1803, at Yorktown, N. Y.; graduated at Dickinson College in 1824, and at the theological seminary at New Brunswick in 1828. The first year of his ministry, 1828–9, was spent as a missionary in New York City. He was pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church of Montgomery, in Orange Co., N. Y., from 1829 to 1858, when he died, in the midst of his usefulness. Dr. Lee was a rare man, a close student, a diligent and accurate theologian, an impressive, but not showy preacher. His mind was remarkably clear, comprehensive, and acute. His judgment was ripe and instinctively right. Decided in his theology, he loved its truths, and expounded and defended them with tenacity and power. In the classis and synods of his Church he was a representative man; among his brethren and neighboring congregations he was a trusted counsellor and a peacemaker. Without haste or prejudices, calm and wise, of positive character and noted piety, he was always influential, and yet singularly modest and retiring. His personal presence was commanding, his fine countenance beamed with intelligence and benevolence, and his whole demeanor was such as became the true minister of Christ. His death was a great loss to the whole denomination, of which he was a noble representative.—Corwin, *Manual of Personal Recollections*, p. 136. (W. J. R. T.)

Lee, Samuel (1), D.D., a distinguished English Orientalist and Biblical scholar, was born at Longnor, in Shropshire, May 14, 1783; was educated but moderately, and apprenticed to a carpenter. His aptitude for learning, however, led him to continue his studies privately, and he thus acquired the Latin language. He next mastered the Greek, and from that he advanced to Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan, all of which he acquired by his own unaided efforts before he was twenty-five years of age. By this time he had married, and exchanged his former occupation for that of a schoolmaster. Attracting the notice of archdeacon Corbett and Dr. Jon. Scott, he was, by their aid, enabled to add to his other acquisitions a knowledge of Arabic, Persic, and Hindustanee, as well as some European and other tongues. In 1815 he accepted an engagement with the Church Missionary Society, and became a student of Queen's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. in 1817. At this time he edited portions of the Scriptures, and of the Prayer-book, in several Oriental languages. In 1818 he took orders, and preached at Shrewsbury, still carrying on his Oriental studies; at this time he is said to have had the mastery over eighteen languages. In 1819 he was honored, as his talents certainly deserved, with the professorship of Arabic, and in 1834 was made regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, besides receiving some pieces of Church preferment, and the title of D.D., first from the University of Halle, and then from that of Cambridge. Shortly before his death, Dec. 16, 1852, he was made rector of Barley, in Somersetshire, where he died. Besides the editions of the Scriptures which he carried through the press, he published several valuable linguistical works, of which the most important are, *Grammar of the Hebrew Language, compiled from the best authorities, chiefly Oriental*, which has passed through several editions:—*A Lexicon, Heb., Chald., and Engl.* (Lond. 1840):—*The Book of the Patriarch Job translated, with Introduction and Commentary* (Lond. 1837):—*An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy* (Camb. 1849):—*Prolegomena in Bib. Polygl. Londinens. Minora* (Lond. 1828). He also published an edition of the controversial tracts of Martyn and his opponents; edited Sir William Jones's *Grammar of the Persian Language*, with an addition of his own, containing a synopsis of Arabic grammar; and translated and annotated the travels of Ibn-Batuta from the Arabic. A minor work of his, *Dissent Unscriptural and Unreasonable*, led to a controversy with Dr. J. Pye Smith (in 1834; the pamphlets were published in 1835). Dr. Lee has generally been recognised not only as a great scholar, but also as the greatest British Orientalist of his day, and his writings bear evident traces of a vigorous, earnest, and independent mind, loving truth, and boldly pursuing it. See *Lond. Gentl. Magazine*, 1853, pt. i, 203 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine*, xlix, 597 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lee, Samuel (2), a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, born at Jericho, Vt., July 20, 1805, was converted at the age of nineteen, and educated at Vermont University. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was licensed and ordained by Oneida Congregational Council Sept. 23, 1834. He spent one year of his ministry at Cazenovia, N. Y., and then went to Northern Ohio, and took charge of the Church in Medina, Ohio. Afterwards his labors were divided between the churches of Mantua and Streetsborough, Ohio. He died Jan. 28, 1866.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1867, p. 310.

Lee, Wilson, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sussex County, Del., in 1761; entered the itinerancy in 1784; labored extensively in the West, mostly in Kentucky, until 1794, when he was appointed to New London, Conn.; to New York in 1795; to Philadelphia in 1796–7–8; to Baltimore District in 1801–2–3; superannuated in 1804, and died in Arundel County, Md., Oct. 11 of the same year. Mr. Lee was "one of the most laborious and successful Methodist preachers of his time." He was eminently shrewd and circumspect, and deeply pious. He was "a witness of the perfect love of God for many years before he died. He was an excellent presiding elder, and an eloquent, argumentative, and often overpowering preacher. His labors in the West were very heroic, and contributed largely to the evangelization of Kentucky and Tennessee."—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 127; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, ch. xviii; Bangs, *Hist. Meth. Episc. Ch.* vol. i. (G. L. T.)

Leech. See HORSE-LEECH.

Leek (חָצִיר, *chatsir'*, from חָצַר, to *enclose*, also to *grow green;* occurs in several places in the Old Testament, where it is variously translated, as *grass* in 1 Kings xviii, 5; 2 Kings xix, 26; Job xl, 15; Psa. xxxvii, 2, etc.; Isa. xv, 6, etc.; *herb* in Job viii, 12; *hay* in Prov. xxvii, 25, and Isa. xv, 6; and *court* in Isa. xxxiv, 13; but in Numb. xi, 5 it is translated "*leeks;*" Sept. τὰ πράσα, Vulg. *porri*). Hebrew scholars state that the word signifies "greens" or "grass" in general; and it is no doubt clear, from the context of most of the above

passages, that this must be its meaning. See GRASS. There is, therefore, no reason why it should not be so translated in all the passages where it occurs, except in the last. It is evidently incorrect to translate it *hay*, as in the above passages of Proverbs and Isaiah, because the people of Eastern countries, as it has been observed, do not make hay. The author of *Fragments*, in continuation of Calmet, has justly remarked on the incorrectness of our version, "The *hay* appeareth, and the tender *grass* showeth itself, and the *herbs* of the mountains are gathered" (Prov. xxvii, 25): "Now certainly," says he, "if the *tender grass* is but just beginning to show itself, the *hay*, which is grass cut and dried after it has arrived at maturity, ought by no means to be associated with it; still less ought it to be placed before it." The author continues: "The word, I apprehend, means the first shoots, the rising, just budding spires of grass." So in Isa. xv, 6. See HAY.

In the passage at Numb. xi, 5, where the Israelites in the desert long for "the cucumbers, and the melons, and the *leeks*, and the onions, and the garlic" of Egypt, it is evident that it was not *grass* which they desired for food, but some green, perhaps grass-like vegetable, for which the word *chatsir* is used. In the same way that in this country the word *greens* is applied to many varieties of succulent plants as food, in India *subzi*, from *subz*, "green," is used as a general term for herbs cooked as kitchen vegetables. It is more than probable, therefore, that *chatsir* is here similarly employed, though this does not prove that *leeks* are intended. Ludolphus, as quoted by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 264), supposes that it may mean lettuce, or salads in general, and others that the succory or endive may be the true plant. But Rosenmüller states, "The most ancient Greek and the Chaldee translators unanimously interpret the Hebrew by the Greek πράσα, or leeks." The name, moreover, seems to have been specially applied to leeks from the resemblance of their leaves to grass, and from their being conspicuous for their green color. This is evident from minerals even having been named from πράσον on account of their color, as prasius, prasites, and chrysoprasium. The Arabs use the word *kûras*, or *kûrath*, as the translation of the πράσον of the Greeks, and with them it signifies the leek, both at the present day and in their older works. It is curious that of the different kinds described, one is called *kûrasal-bukl*, or leek used as a vegetable. That the leek is esteemed in Egypt we have the testimony of Hasselquist, who says (*Travels*, p. 291), "The kind called *karrat* by the Arabs must certainly have been one of those desired by the children of Israel, as it has been cultivated and esteemed from the earliest times to the present time in Egypt."

The Leek (*Allium Porrum*).

The Romans employed it much as a seasoning to their dishes (Horace, *Ep.* i, 12, 21; Martial, iii, 47, 8), and it is an ingredient in a number of recipes in Apicius referred to by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 263; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xix, 6; Hiller, *Hierophyt.* pt. ii, p. 36; Diosc. ii, 4; Athen. iv, 137, 170). The leek (*Allium porrum*) was introduced into England about the year 1562, and thence, in due time, into America; and, as is well known, it continues to be esteemed as a seasoning to soups and stews in most civilized countries.

There is, however, another and a very ingenious interpretation of *chatsir*, first proposed by Hengstenberg, and received by Dr. Kitto (*Pictorial Bible*, Numb. xi, 5), which adopts a more literal translation of the original word, for, says Kitto, "among the wonders in the natural history of Egypt, it is mentioned by travellers that the common people there eat with special relish a kind of *grass similar to clover*." Mayer (*Reise nach Ægypten*, p. 226) says of this plant (whose scientific name is *Trigonella Fœnum-grœcum*, belonging to the natural order *Leguminosæ*) that it is similar to clover, but its leaves more pointed, and that great quantities of it are eaten by the people. Forskål mentions the *Trigonella* as being grown in the gardens at Cairo; its native name is *Halbeh* (*Flor. Ægyptiaca*, p. 81). Sonnini (*Voyage*, i, 379) says, "In this fertile country the Egyptians themselves eat the *fenu-grec* so largely that it may be properly called the food of man. In the month of November they cry 'Green halbeh for sale!' in the streets of the town; it is tied up in large bunches, which the inhabitants purchase at a low price, and which they eat with incredible greediness without any kind of seasoning." The seeds of this plant, which is also cultivated in Greece, are often used; they are eaten boiled or raw, mixed with honey. Forskål includes it in the materia medica of Egypt (*Mat. Med. Kahir.* p. 155). There does not appear, however, sufficient reason for ignoring the old versions, which all seem agreed that the *leek* is the plant denoted by *chatsir*, a vegetable from the earliest times a great favorite with the Egyptians, as both a nourishing and savory food. Some have objected that, as the Egyptians held the *leek*, *onion*, etc., sacred, they would abstain from eating these vegetables themselves, and would not allow the Israelites to use them (compare Juvenal, *Sat.* xv, 9). We have, however, the testimony of Herodotus (ii, 125) to show that *onions* were eaten by the Egyptian poor, for he says that on one of the pyramids is shown an inscription, which was explained to him by an interpreter, showing how much money was spent in providing *radishes*, *onions*, and *garlic* for the workmen. The priests were not allowed to eat these things, and Plutarch (*De Is. et Osir.* ii, p. 353) tells us the reasons. The Welshman reverences his leek, and wears one on St. David's day; he *eats the leek* nevertheless, and doubtless the Egyptians were not overscrupulous (*Script. Herbal.* p. 230).

Trigonella Fœnum-grœcum.

Lees (only in the plural שְׁמָרִים, *shemarim'*, from שָׁמַר, to *keep* [Jer. xlviii, 11; Zeph. i, 12; rendered "wines on the lees" in Isa. xxv, 6; "dregs" in Psa. lxxv, 8]; Sept. *τρυγίαι*; Vulgate *fæces*). The Hebrew term שֶׁמֶר, *shémer* (the presumed singular form of the above), bears the radical sense of *preservation*, and was applied to "lees" from the custom of allowing the wine to stand on the lees in order that its color and body might be better preserved; hence the expression "wine on the lees," as meaning a generous, full-bodied liquor (Isa. xxv, 6; see Henderson, ad loc.). The wine in this state remained, of course, undisturbed in its cask, and became thick and sirupy; hence the proverb "to settle upon one's lees," to express the sloth, indifference, and gross stupidity of the ungodly (Jer. xlviii, 11; Zeph. i, 12). Before the wine was consumed it was necessary to strain off the lees; such wine was then termed "well refined" (Isa. xxv, 6). To drink the lees or "dregs" was an expression for the endurance of extreme punishment (Psa. lxxv, 8). An ingenious writer in Kitto's *Cyclopædia* (s. v. Shemarim) thinks that some kind of *preserves* from grapes are meant in Isa. xxv, 6, as the etymology of the word suggests; but this supposition, although it clears the passage from some difficulties, is opposed to the usage of the term in the other places. See Wine.

Leeser, Isaac, a noted Jewish theologian and religious writer, was born at Neukirch, in Westphalia, in 1806. In 1825 he emigrated to America, and became in 1829 rabbi of the principal synagogue of Philadelphia. This position he resigned in 1850, and died in that city in 1868. Leeser was a superior scholar and preacher, and among his people his memory will ever be respected and honored. His works, which are completely cited in Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v., are mainly contributions to Jewish literature—principally Jewish history and theology. In 1843 he assumed the editorship of *the Jewish Advocate* (or *Occident*). Very valuable is his edition of the O.-T. Scriptures in the original, based on the labors of *Van der Hooght*, and published by Lippincott and Co. (Philadel. 1868, 8vo).

Le Fèvre. See Faber Stapulensis.

Left (prop. שְׂמֹאול, *semôl'*, a primitive word; Gr. *εὐώνυμος*, lit. *well-named*, i. e. lucky, by euphemism for *ἀριστερός*, as opposed to יָמִין, *δεξιός*, the right). The left hand, like the Latin *lævus*, was esteemed of ill omen, hence the term *sinister* as equivalent to unfortunate. This was especially the case among the superstitious Greeks and Romans (see Potter's *Gr. Ant.* i, 323. Adams, *Rom. Ant.* p. 301). Among the Hebrews the left likewise indicated the *north* (Job xxiii, 9; Gen. xiv, 15), the person's face being supposed to be turned towards the east. In all these respects it was precisely the opposite of the *right* (q. v.).

LEFT-HANDED (אֲטַר יַד יְמִינוֹ, *shut* as to *his right hand* [Judg. iii, 15; xx, 16]; Sept. *ἀμφοτεροδέξιος*, Vulgate *qui utraque manu pro dextera utebatur*, and *ita sinistra ut dextra prælians*), properly one that is unable skilfully to use his right hand, and hence employs the left; but also, as is usual, *ambidexter*, i. e. one who can use the left hand as well as the right, or, more literally, one whose hands are both right hands. It was long supposed that both hands are naturally equal, and that the preference of the right hand, and comparative incapacity of the left, are the result of education and habit. But it is now known that the difference is really physical (see Bell's *Bridgewater Treatise on the Hand*), and that the ambidexterous condition of the hands is *not* a natural development. See Ambidexter.

The capacity of equal action with both hands was highly prized in ancient times, especially in war. Among the Hebrews this quality seems to have been most common in the tribe of Benjamin, for all the persons noticed as being endued with it were of that tribe. By comparing Judg. iii, 15; xx, 16, with 1 Chron. xii, 2, we may gather that the persons mentioned in the two former texts as "left-handed" were really ambidexters. In the latter text we learn that the Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag were "mighty men, helpers of the war. They were armed with bows, and could use both the right hand and the left in hurling [slinging] and shooting arrows out of a bow." There were thirty of them; and as they appear to have been all of one family, it might almost seem as if the greater commonness of this power among the Benjamites arose from its being a hereditary peculiarity of certain families in that tribe. It may also partly have been the result of cultivation; for, although the left hand is not naturally an equally strong and ready instrument as the right hand, it may doubtless be often rendered such by early and suitable training. See Hand.

Leg is the rendering of several words in the A. V. Usually the Heb. term is כָּרַע, *kara'* (only in the dual כְּרָעַיִם), the lower limb or *shank* of an animal (Exod. xii, 9; xxix, 17; Lev. i, 9, 13; iv, 11; viii, 21; ix, 14; Amos iii, 12) or a locust (Lev. xi, 21); the *σκέλος* of a man (John xix, 31, 32, 33). שׁוֹק, *shók* (Chald. שָׁק, *shâk*, of an image, Dan. ii, 33), is properly the *shin* or lower part of the leg, but used of the whole limb, e. g. of a person (Deut. xxviii, 13; Psa. cxlvii, 10; Prov. xxvi, 7; "thigh," Isa. xlvii, 2; in the phrase "*hip* [q. v.] and thigh," Judg. xv, 7; spoken also of the drawers or *leggins*, Cant. v, 15); also the "heave *shoulder*" (q. v.) of the sacrifice (Exod. xxix, 22, etc.; 1 Sam. ix, 24). Once by an extension of רֶגֶל, *re'gel* (1 Sam. xvii, 6), properly a *foot* (as usually rendered). Elsewhere improperly for שׁוּבָל, *sho'bel*, the *train* or trailing dress of a female (Isa. xlvii, 2); and צְעָדָה, *tseäda'*, a *step-chain* for the feet, or perh. *bracelet* for the wrist ("ornament of the leg," Isa. iii, 20). See Thigh.

Goliath's greaves for his legs doubtless extended from the knee to the foot (1 Sam. xvii, 6). See Greaves. The bones of the legs of persons crucified were broken to hasten their death (John xix, 31). See Crucifixion.

Legalists. Properly speaking, a legalist is one who "acts according to the *law*;" but in general the term is made use of to denote one who *seeks salvation by works of law* (not of *the* law, but of "law" generally, whether moral or ceremonial, *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*, Rom. v, 20) instead of by the merits of Christ. Many who are alive to the truth that it is impossible to do anything that can purchase salvation, and who desire that this doctrine should be earnestly and constantly inculcated by Christian ministers in their teaching, conceive that there is a danger also on the opposite side; and that while plain Antinomian teaching would disgust most hearers, there is a kind of doctrine scarcely less mischievous in its consequences, that which only incidentally touches on good works. They think that whatever leads or leaves men, without distinctly rejecting Christian virtue, to feel little anxiety and take little pains about it; anything which, though perhaps not so meant, is liable to be so understood by those who have the wish as to leave them without any feeling of real shame, or mortification, or alarm on account of their own faults and moral deficiencies, so as to make them anxiously watchful *only* against seeking salvation *by* good works, and not at all against seeking salvation *without* good works—all this (they consider) is likely to be much more acceptable to the corrupt disposition of the natural man than that which urges the necessity of being "*careful* to maintain good works." Those who take such a view of the danger of the case think that Christian teachers should not shrink, through fear of incurring the wrongful imputation of "legalism," from earnestly inculcating the points which the apostles found it necessary to dwell on with such continual watchfulness and frequent repetition. But in general the term is made use of to denote one who expects salvation by

his own works. We may further consider a legalist as one who has no proper conviction of the evil of sin; who, although he pretends to abide by the law, yet has not a just idea of its spirituality and demands. He is ignorant of the grand scheme of salvation by free grace: proud of his own fancied righteousness, he submits not to the righteousness of God; he derogates from the honor of Christ by mixing his own works with his; and, in fact, denies the necessity of the work of the Spirit by supposing that he has ability in himself to perform all those duties which God has required. Such is the character of the legalist, a character diametrically opposite to that of the true Christian, whose sentiment corresponds with that of the apostle, who justly observes, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. ii, 8, 9).—Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification*, Lect. vi, especially p. 153 sq.

Legates and NUNCIOS of the Roman Catholic Church. With reference to the endeavors of that Church to unite all the congregations into one vast system, and to rule over them successfully, preventing all heresy and division, the Council of Sardica (343) expressly stated: "Quod si is, qui rogat causam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moverit episcopum Romanum, *ut de latere suo presbyteros mittat*, erit in potestate ejus," etc. (*Con. Sardic.* c. 7, in c. 36, can. ii, qu. vi). The Romish clergy was therefore sent abroad everywhere. In the African churches, however, they refused to admit into fellowship those "qui ad transmarina (concilia) putaverit appellandum" (*Codex eccles. Afric.* c. 125), and wrote to Celestine at Rome, "Ut aliqui tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum" (*ibid.* c. 138). Thomassin (*Vetus ac nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, p. i, lib. ii, cap. 117) has collected instances of delegations having been sent in various cases during the 4th and 5th centuries. But, as vicars of the bishop of Rome, we find in Western Illyria the bishops of Thessalonica after Damasus (a. 367); in Gaul, the bishops of Arles after Zosimus (a. 417); in Spain, the bishops of Seville after Simplicius (a. 467) (Constant, *De antiquis canonum collectionibus*, No. 23-25; Gallande, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissert.* i, 23 sq.; Petrus de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii ac imperii*, lib. v, cap. 19 sq., 30 sq.). Among the delegates of the bishop of Rome we must also put the Apocrisiarii [see APOCRISIARIUS] sent to the imperial court at Constantinople. Leo I, and particularly Gregory I, carefully continued the relations established by their legates, and created more, in order to improve the condition of the churches, and to increase the influence of Rome. Gregory appointed bishop Maximus of Syracuse over all the churches of Sicily ("super cunctas ecclesias Siciliæ te... vices sedis apostolicæ ministrare decernimus"), with the right of deciding on all except the *causæ majores*. This office was, however, vested only in the individual, not in the see ("Quas vices non loco tribuimus, sed personæ," c. 6, X. *De præsumtionibus*, ii, 23, a. 592; c. 3, can. vii, qu. i, 30 [a. 594], c. 39; can. xi, qu. i, and Gonzalez Tellez to c. 1, X. *De officio legati*, i. 30, a. 9). To England Gregory sent Augustine (a. 601), with the mission of improving the Church organization of that country, and particularly of upholding the episcopacy (*Epist.* 64, a. 601, in c. 3, can. xxv, qu. ii); and Agathon (678) also sent the Roman abbot John to that country to organize worship, convoke a council to inquire into the state of religion, and report thereon at his return (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv, cap. 18). Augustine is said to have himself taken part in settling ecclesiastical affairs during a journey through Gaul, and conferred with the bishop of Arles as his legate. Gregory I sent also other special delegates to Gaul, in order to improve the state of the churches there, with the aid of the bishops and the king (Thomassin, c. 118). In the course of time the legates were empowered to act by themselves on the orders communicated to them at Rome. The vicariates became connected with some of the ancient bishoprics, by whose incumbents they had long been exercised, and it became difficult to erect new permanent ones on account of the opposition of the other dignitaries of the Church; so that special delegates were only sent when affairs of importance rendered such a step necessary. Even then it became customary to await the wish, or at least to secure the sanction, of the governments into whose states they were sent. There were, then, two kinds of legates, the *legati nati*, and the *legati dati* or *missi*.

1. *Legati nati*, in cases where the legation was connected with a bishopric. The rights of such a legate were at first very large; his jurisdiction had the character of *jurisdictio ordinaria;* it also appears as *ordinarii ordinariorum*, and formed a court of last resort for those who voluntarily appealed to it. After the 16th century their prerogatives were gradually restricted, and finally, after the introduction of the *legati a latere*, the title became merely a nominal one, the metropolitan not being even entitled to having the cross borne before him where there was a *legatus a latere* (c. 23, X. *De privilegiis*, v, 33; Innocent III, in c. 5, *Conc. Lateran.* a. 1215).

2. *Legati missi* or *dati*. These are divided into, (1) *Delegati*, appointed for one specific object. It was already forbidden in the Middle Ages to appoint members of the clergy in their place. (2) *Nuncii apostolici*, who are empowered to enforce the commands contained in their mandates. In order to effect this object they were given a right of jurisdiction until the 16th century. To enable them to legislate in reserved cases, they were invested with a *mandatum speciale*, making the reservations *generaliter* for them. They could grant indulgences for any period not exceeding a year. All other legates were subject to them except such as had special privileges granted them by the pope. The insignia of the nuncio comprised a red dress, a white horse, and golden spurs. (3) *Legati ab latere*. Special delegates who acted as actual representatives of the popes, and who possessed all the highest prerogatives. Their plenary power is thus expressed: "Nostra vice, quæ corrigenda sunt corrigat, quæ statuenda constituat" (Gregor. VII, *Ep.* lib. iv, ep. 26). They exercised a *jurisdictio ordinaria* in the provinces, had power to suspend the bishops, and to dispose of all reserved cases. The manifold complaints which arose in the course of time led the popes to alter some points of the system. Leo X, in the Lateran Council of 1515, caused it to be ruled that the cardinal legate should have a settled residence; and the *Congregatio pro interpretatione Conc. Trid.* construed the resolutions of the councils so as to make them very favorable to the bishops.

The Reformation gave occasion for the sending of a large number of legates, and also for the nomination of permanent nuncios at Lucerne, 1579; Vienna, 1581; Cologne, 1582; Brussels, 1588: this, however, gave rise to fresh disturbances in the Church. The troubles caused by the nuncios were the cause of the adoption of a new article under the *gravamina nationis Germanicæ*. In the mean time the French Revolution broke out, disturbing all preconceived plans. After the restoration of order in the hierarchy the system of legations was revived, but with many modifications, altering its Middle-Age features. The second article of the French Concordat of 1801 states expressly: "Aucun individu se disant nonce, légat, vicaire ou commissaire apostolique, ou se prévalant de toute autre dénomination, ne pourra, sans l'autorisation du gouvernement, exercer sur le sol Français ni ailleurs, aucune fonction relative aux affaires de l'église Gallicane." This clearly removed the original foundation of the intercourse formerly existing between the papal see and these countries. Moreover, several Roman Catholic governments, such as Austria, France, Spain, etc., reserved to themselves the right to point out the parties who should be accredited to their courts as nuncios (Klüber, *Europäisches Völkerr.* § 186, Anm. a.). The formula of the oath of obedience to the pope,

which, since Gregory VII, is taken by bishops at their ordination, says: "Legatum apostolicæ sedis . . . honorifice tractabo et in suis necessitatibus adjuvabo" (c. 4, X. *De jurejurando*, ii, 24). This involves the duty of supporting the procurations. But the state is also enlisted on account of its power.

The usual envoys of the pope have now the titles of, 1. *Legati nati*, no longer invested with an inherent right to the management of ecclesiastical affairs. 2. *Legati dati, missi*, which are divided into (1) *Legati a latere* or *de latere*, who, it is stated, are entitled to be canonically designated as cardinals a latere or legates de latere. This is incorrect, for cardinals are now seldom sent on such missions, if ever, but, on the contrary, other members of the clergy, *cum potestate legati a latere*. (2) *Nuncii apostolici*, bearers of apostolic mandates. While the former are looked upon as ambassadors, it is a nice question whether the latter occupy the second position, that of envoys. They are either ordinary permanent nuncios, as in Germany, or extraordinary, sent for some special purpose. (3) *Internuncii* (*residentes*), considered by some as forming a third class, by others as belonging to the second. At the Congress of Vienna, 1815, it was decided by the first article of the *Réglement sur le rang entre les Agens diplomatiques* that the first class would be formed of *Ambassadeurs, Légats ou Nonces;* and in article fourth, that no change would be made in regard to papal representatives. See Klüber, *Völkerrecht;* Hefftter, *Völkerrecht;* Miruss, *Das Europäische Gesandschaftsrecht;* Schulte, *Katholisch. Kirchenrecht* (Giessen, 1856); Walter, *Kirchenrecht* (11th edit. Bonn, 1854); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii. 269 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 409 sq.

Legend (Lat. *legenda*, "things to be read," lessons) was the name given in early times, in the Roman Catholic Church, to a book containing the daily lessons which were wont to be read as part of divine service. This name, however, in process of time, was used to designate the lives of saints and martyrs, as well as the collection of such narratives, from the fact that these were read by the monks at matins, and after dinner in the refectories. Among numerous theories as to the origin of the legends, the following is the most probable. Before colleges were established in the monasteries where the schools were held, the professors in rhetoric frequently gave their pupils the life of some saint for a trial of their talent for *amplification*. The students, being constantly at a loss to furnish out their pages, invented most of these wonderful adventures. Jortin observes that the Christians used to collect, out of Ovid, Livy, and other pagan poets and historians, the miracles and portents to be found there, and accommodated them to their own monks and saints. The good fathers of that age, whose simplicity was not inferior to their devotion, were so delighted with these flowers of rhetoric that they were induced to make a collection of these miraculous compositions, not imagining that at some distant period they would become matters of faith. Yet, when Jacob de Voragine, Peter de Natalibus, and Peter Ribadeneira wrote the lives of the saints, they sought for their materials in the libraries of the monasteries; and, awakening from the dust these manuscripts of amplification, imagined they made an invaluable present to the world by laying before them these voluminous absurdities. The people received these pious fictions with all imaginable simplicity, and, as few were able to read, the books containing them were amply illustrated with cuts which rendered the story intelligible.

Many of these legends, the production of monastics, were invented, especially in the Middle Ages, with a view to serve the interests of monasticism, particularly to exalt the character of the monastic orders, and to represent their voluntary austerities as purchasing the peculiar favor of heaven. For this purpose they unscrupulously ascribe to their patrons and founders the power of working miracles on the most trifling occasions. Many of these miracles are blasphemous parodies on those of our blessed Lord; not a few are borrowed from the pagan mythology; but some are so exquisitely absurd that no one but a monk could have dreamed of imposing such nonsense on the most besotted of mankind. "It would be easy to accumulate proofs of the ready belief which the lower orders of Irish Romanists give to tales of miracles worked by their priests; but it is remarkable that in the earlier legends we very rarely find supernatural powers attributed to the secular ecclesiastics; the heroes of most of the tales are monks and hermits, whose voluntary poverty seemed to bring them down to a level of sympathy with the lower orders. Indiscriminate alms, which have often been demonstrated to be the source of great evils, are always popular with the uninstructed, and hence we find that many of the heroes of the legends are celebrated for the prodigality of their benevolence. The miracles attributed to the Irish saints are even more extravagant than those in the Continental martyrologies. We find St. Patrick performing the miracle of raising the dead to life no less than seventeen times, and on one occasion he restores animation to thirty-four persons at once. Gerald, bishop of Mayo, however, surpassed St. Patrick, for he not only resuscitated the dead daughter of the king of Connaught, but miraculously changed her sex, that she might inherit the crown of the province, in which the Salic law was then established. We find, also, in the ecclesiastical writers, many miracles specially worked to support individual doctrines, particularly the mystery of transubstantiation. Indeed, a miracle appears to have been no unusual resource of a puzzled controversialist. On one occasion the sanctity of the wafer is stated to have been proved by a mule's kneeling to worship it; at another time a pet lamb kneels down at the elevation of the host; a spider, which St. Francis d'Ariano accidentally swallowed while receiving the sacrament, came out of his thigh; and when St. Elmo was pining at being too long excluded from a participation in the sacramental mysteries, the holy elements were brought to him by a pigeon. But the principal legends devised for the general exaltation of the Romish Church refer to the exercise of power over the devil. In the south of Ireland nothing is more common than to hear of Satan's appearance in proper person, his resistance to all the efforts of the Protestant minister, and his prompt obedience to the exorcisms of the parish priest. In general, the localities of the stories are laid at some neighboring village; yet, easy as this renders refutation, it is wonderful to find how generally such a tale is credited. From the archives of the Silesian Church, we find that some German Protestants seem to believe in the exorcising powers of the Romish priests. Next to the legends of miracles rank those of extraordinary austerities, such as that St. Polycronus always took up a huge tree on his shoulders when he went to pray; that St. Barnadatus shut himself up in a narrow iron cage; that St. Adhelm exposed himself to the most stimulating temptations, and then defied the devil to make him yield; and that St. Macarius undertook a penance for sin six months, because he had so far yielded to passion as to kill a flea. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these, because they are manifestly derived from the habits of the Oriental fanatics, and are evident exaggerations made without taste or judgment. See *History of Popery* (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

The most celebrated of these popular mediæval fictions is the *Legenda Aurea*, or Golden Legend, originally written in Latin, in the 13th century, by Jacob de Voragine (q. v.), a Dominican friar, who afterwards became archbishop of Genoa, and died in 1298. This work was the great text-book of legendary lore of the Middle Ages. It was translated into French in the 14th century by Jean de Vigny, and in the 15th into English by William Caxton. It has lately been made more accessible by a new French translation: *La Légende Dorée, traduite du Latin*, par M. G. B. (Par. 1850). There is a copy of the original, with the *Gesta Longobardorum*

appended, in the Harvard College Library, Cambridge, printed at Strasburg in 1496. Longfellow, in a note to his beautiful poem, says, "I have called this poem the Golden Legend, because the story upon which it is founded seems to me to surpass all other legends in beauty and significance. It exhibits, amid the corruptions of the Middle Ages, the virtue of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice, and the power of Faith, Hope, and Charity sufficient for all the exigencies of life and death." The story is told, and perhaps invented, by Hartmann von der Aue, a Minnesinger of the 12th century. The original may be found in Marlath's *Alt-deutsche Gedichte*, with a modern German version. There is another in Marbach's *Volksbücher*, No. 32. We may mention also, among other productions, the *Kaiserchronik* (Imperial Chronicle), where the legendary element forms a very important part of the whole, and Werner's versified *Marienleben* (Life of Mary), written in 1173, etc. The authors of these works were ecclesiastics, but in the following age, when the mediæval poetry of Germany was in its richest bloom, and the fosterers of the poetic art were emperors and princes, the legend was employed by laymen on a grand scale, and formed the subject-matter of epic narratives. Thus Hartmann von der Aue worked up into a poem the religious legends about Gregory; Konrad von Fussesbrunnen those concerning the childhood of Jesus; Rudolph von Ems those about Barlaam and Josaphat; and Rimbat von Durne those about St. George. Between the 14th and 16th centuries legends in prose began also to appear, such as Hermann von Fritzlar's *Von dem Heiligen Leben* (written about 1343), and gradually supplanted the others.

Much of this legendary rubbish was cleared away by Tillemont, Fleury, Baillet, Launoi, and Bollandus, but the faith in many of them still remains strong in the more ignorant minds of the Romish Church. The repeated and still continued editions of the *Acta Sanctorum* (q. v.) afford sufficient evidence of this.

The most comprehensive and valuable work on the subject of the legends is that commenced by the Bollandists in the 17th century, *Acta Sanctorum*, and still in process of publication. Legends are found not only in the Roman Catholic, but also in the Greek Church. They also found an entrance into the *national* literature of Christian nations. Among the Germans especially was this the case, particularly in the 12th century, although specimens of legendary poems are not altogether wanting at an earlier period. In Great Britain, also, the legends of King Arthur and his Round Table have sprung afresh into popular favor, after centuries of comparative obscurity, and have once more become the treasure-house from which poet and painter draw subjects for their pictures, and in which essayists, weary of the old heathen classics, seek for illustrations and allusions. The first of the recent poets, however, who clearly apprehended the poetic and spiritual elements of the old Christian legend was Herder, and his example has been followed by other poets, for example, the romantic school in Germany, and Bulwer and Tennyson in England. The tendency to mythic embellishment showed itself more particularly in regard to the Virgin Mary, the later saints, and holy men and women. Of all these, the most captivating, as an amiable weakness, was the devotion to the Virgin. The denial of the title "The Mother of God" by Nestorius was that which sounded most offensive to the general ear; it was the intelligible, odious point in his heresy, and contributed, no doubt, to the passionate violence with which that controversy was agitated; and the favorable issue to those who might seem most zealous for the Virgin's glory gave a strong impulse to the worship; for, from that time, the worship of the Virgin became in the East an integral part of Christianity. Among Justinian's splendid edifices arose many churches dedicated to the Mother of God. The feast of the Annunciation was celebrated both under Justin and Justinian. Heraclius had images of the Virgin on his masts when he sailed to Constantinople to overthrow Phocas; and before the end of the century the Virgin is become the tutelar deity of that city, which is saved by her intercession from the Saracens. "The history of Christianity," says dean Milman, "cannot be understood without pausing at stated periods to survey the progress and development of the Christian mythology, which, gradually growing up, and springing as it did from natural and universal instincts, took a more perfect and systematic form, and at length, at the height of the Middle Ages, was as much a part of Latin Christianity as the primal truths of the Gospel. This religion gradually moulded together all which arose out of the natural instincts of man, the undying reminiscences of all the older religions—the Jewish, the Pagan, and the Platonic—with the few and indistinct glimpses of the invisible world, and the future state of being in the New Testament, into a vast system, more sublime, perhaps, for its indefiniteness, which, being necessary in that condition of mankind, could not but grow up out of the kindled imagination and religious faith of Christendom. The historian who should presume to condemn such a religion as a vast plan of fraud, or a philosopher who should venture to disdain it as a fabric of folly only deserving to be forgotten, would be equally unjust, equally blind to its real uses, assuredly ignorant of its importance and its significance in the history of man; for on this, the popular Christianity — popular, as comprehending the highest as well as the lowest in rank, and even in intellectual estimation—turns the whole history of man for many centuries. It is at once the cause and the consequence of the sacerdotal dominion over mankind, the groundwork of authority at which the world trembled, which founded and overthrew kingdoms, bound together or set in antagonistic array nations, classes, ranks, orders of society. Of this, the parent, when the time arrived, of poetry, of art, the Christian historian must watch the growth and mark the gradations by which it gathered into itself the whole activity of the human mind, and quickened that activity till at length the mind outgrew that which had been so long almost its sole occupation. It endured till faith, with the schoolmen, led into the fathomless depths of metaphysics, began to aspire after higher truths; with the Reformers, attempting to refine religion to its primary spiritual simplicity, this even yet prolific legendary Christianity, which had been the accessory and supplementary Bible, the authoritative and accepted, though often unwritten Gospel of centuries, was gradually dropped, or left but to the humblest and most ignorant, at least to the more imaginative and less practical part of mankind." "The influence that these works exerted on the mediæval mind," says Hardwick, "was deep and universal. While they fed almost every stream of superstition, and excited an unhealthy craving for the marvellous and the romantic, they were nearly always tending, in their *moral*, to enlist the affections of the reader on the side of gentleness and virtue, more especially by setting forth the necessity of patience, and extolling the heroic energy of faith. One class of those biographies deserve a high amount of credit; they are written by some friend or pupil of their subject; they are natural and life-like pictures of the times, preserving an instructive portrait of the missionary, the recluse, the bishop, or the man of business; yet most commonly the acts and sufferings of the mediæval saint have no claim to a place in the sphere of history, or at best they have been so wantonly embellished by the fancy of the author that we can distinguish very few of the particles of truth from an interminable mass of fiction. As these 'Lives' were circulated freely in the language of the people, they would constitute important items in the fireside reading of the age; and so warm was the response they found in men of every grade, that, notwithstanding feeble efforts to reform them, or at least to eliminate a few of the more monstrous and absurd, they kept their hold on Christendom at large, and are subsisting even now in the creations of the mediæval artist" (*Ch. Hist. Middle Ages*).

On the origin of these legends there is a great diversity of opinion among the learned. Some trace it to the northern Skalds, who, accompanying the army of Rollo in his warlike migrations southward, carried with them the lays of their own mythology, but replaced their pagan heroes by Christian kings and warriors. Salmasius adopted the theory, which was indorsed by Warton, that the germs of romantic fiction originated with the Saracens and Arabians, and ascribes its introduction into Europe to the effects of the Crusades, or, according to Warton himself, to the Arab conquests in Spain; that from thence they passed into France, and took deepest root in Brittany. Others, again, have seen in the tales of chivalry only a new development of the classic legends of Greece and Italy. As Christianity unquestionably borrowed and modified to its own use many of the outward ceremonies of paganism, so they held that the Christian *trouveur* only adopted and transmuted the heroes of classical poetry. The researches of count Villemarqué and lady Charlotte Schreiber, however, to which the attention of the learned world had been directed before by Leyden, Douce, and Sharon Turner, conclusively prove that the true theory as to their origin is that they are Cymric or Armorican, or both. The wealth of the old Cymric literature in this particular respect was never even suspected until lady Charlotte Schreiber, with the aid of an eminent Welsh scholar, the Rev. Thomas Price, brought to light in their original form, accompanied by an English version, the collection of early Cymric tales known as the *Mabinogion*. M. de la Villemarqué, for his own side of the Channel, not only confirms the evidence of lady Schreiber, but brings forward additional items of proof, from fragments of Breton songs and poems, that the roots of their renowned fiction lie deep in their literature also. Their very form—the eight-syllabled rhyme, in which the French metrical version is written—he claims, and apparently with justice, as Cymric. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; *Cyclop. Brit.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* viii, 274 sq.; Vogel, *Versuch. einer Gesch. u. Würdigung der Legenden*, in Illgen's *Hist. theol. Abhandl.* (Lpz. 1824), p. 141 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, and her *Legends of the Madonna*. See Myth.

Legend, Golden. A renowned collection of legends written in the 13th century by Jacob de Voragine (q. v.). See Legend.

Léger, Antoine (1), a French Protestant divine, was born in Savoy in 1594. He was professor of theology and Oriental languages at Geneva from 1645 until his death in 1661. He edited the Greek text of the New Testament (1638).

Léger, Antoine (2), son of the preceding, was born at Geneva in 1652. He also became a Protestant minister, and afterwards filled the chair of philosophy for twenty-four years at Geneva with eminent success. He died in 1719. He published several scientific treatises and many sermons.

Léger, Jean, a French Protestant minister, was born in Savoy in 1615. He was pastor of a Church of the Waldenses, but fortunately escaped from the massacre of 1655. He afterwards went to France, and solicited the intervention of the court for his countrymen. In 1663 he went to Holland, and became pastor of a Walloon Church in Leyden. He died in 1670. Léger wrote a *History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont* (1669). See Waldenses.

Legerdemain. See Magic.

Le'gion (λεγεών, Græcized from the Latin *legio*), a main division of the Roman army, corresponding nearly to the modern *regiment*. It always comprised a large body of men, but the number varied so much at different times that there is considerable discrepancy in the statements with reference to it. The legion appears to have originally contained about 3000 men, and to have risen gradually to twice that number, or even more. In and about the time of Christ it seems to have consisted of 6000 men, and this was exclusive of horsemen, who usually formed an additional body amounting to one tenth of the infantry. As all the divisions of the Roman army are noticed in Scripture, we may add that each legion was divided into ten *cohorts* or battalions, each cohort into three *maniples* or bands, and each maniple into two *centuries* or companies of 100 each. This smaller division into centuries or hundreds, from the form in which it is exhibited as a constituent of the larger divisions, clearly shows that 6000 had become at least the formal number of a legion. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. Army, Roman.

The word *legion* came to be used to express a great number or multitude (e. g. of angels, Matt. xxvi, 53). Thus the unclean spirit (Mark v, 9; compare 15), when asked his name, answers, "My name is Legion, for *we* are many." Many illustrations of this use of the word might be cited from the Rabbinical writers, who even apply it (לְגִיוֹן or לִגְיוֹן) to inanimate objects, as when they speak of "a legion of olives," etc. (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.*; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s. v.).—Kitto. See Army.

Legion, Theban, according to Eucherius, was a legion of 6600 men (the usual number) which had come from the East to render assistance to Maximian. The latter having issued orders to his whole army to persecute the Christians, this legion alone refused to obey. The emperor was in the neighborhood, at Octodurum (Martinach, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard); irritated when he heard of the refusal of the Theban legion, he had it decimated twice, and finally, as he failed to secure its members to join in persecuting their Christian brethren, he ordered their extermination by



Ancient Legionary Soldiers. (From Titus's Column at Rome.)

the remainder of his army. Another account, giving substantially the same version of this event, embellishes it by what seems to have taken place about the year 286, although it mentions a pope Marcellinus as having advised them rather to submit to death than to act against the dictates of their conscience, while this Marcellinus only became pope ten years after the above time. This second version appears to be but a rearrangement of the legend of Eucherius, just as there have been others until the time of the Reformation (by Petrus Canisius and Gulielmus Baldesanus). This legend was first treated as untrue in Magdeburg; then Jean Armand Dubourdieu, a French Reformed minister at London, undertook to prove that the number of the legion did not by any means amount to 6666 (the figures given in the second version). This led to a protracted controversy. The silence of the leading early ecclesiastical historians — Eusebius, Lactantius, Sulpicius Severus, and Orosius—over the event some have advanced to prove that it is simply a fable, but their silence does not, in our mind, go far to disprove it. Eusebius says little of the Western martyrs, yet mentions that an officer picked out the Christians in the Roman army before the beginning of the great persecution, and gave them the choice of renouncing their religion or of leaving the army, adding that many Christians were killed by his orders. The others either do not mention the martyrs of that period, or were by other circumstances prevented from becoming acquainted with much of their history. On the other hand, Ambrose († 397) says, "Every city prides itself that has had one martyr; how much more, then, can Milan pride herself, who had a whole army of divine soldiers?" Eucherius takes this as an allusion to the Theban legion. Another testimony to the same effect is contained in St. Victricius's work, *De laudibus martyrum* (390). The third is the discovery of a shield in the bed of the Arve, near Geneva, representing the Thebans, with the inscription *Largitas D. M. Valentiniani Augusti.* A fourth is found in the life of St. Romanus (520), who mentions, among others, his journey to Agaunum (*Castra martyrum*), probably between the years 460 and 470. It also corroborates Eucherius's figures (6600). The fifth is that of Avitus, archbishop of Vienna, a breastplate originally belonging to whom is yet kept in the convent: this dates from the year 517. A sixth is given in the *Vita* of Victor of Marseilles. It is most probable, however, that while the legend rests on a foundation of facts, these facts were generalized and amplified, so that a number of Christian soldiers in the Roman army became a legion first of 6600, then of 6666. Those who deny the truth of the legend take their stand on its similarity with that of a certain Simeon Metaphrastes, according to whom, also, one Mauritius, under the same emperor, is said to have suffered martyrdom with Photinus, Theodorus, Philippus, and sixty-seven others, all of the military order. But, aside from the name of Mauritius, all the others have different names, while the details of the event also vary. Among the writers who have contested the truthfulness of the legend concerning the Theban legion, the most important are Dubourdieu, Hottinger, Moyle, Burnet, and Mosheim; it has been defended by George Hickes, M. Felix de Balthasar (*Défense de la Légion Thébéenne*, Lucerne, 1760, 8vo), Dom Joseph de Lisle (*Défense de la Vérité du Martyre de la Légion Thébéenne*, 1737, 8vo), Rossignoli (*Historia di San Maurizio*), and P. de Rivaz (*Eclaircissements sur les Martyres de la Légion Thébéenne*, Paris, 1779, 8vo). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. ix, s. v. Mauritius. See Mauritius.

Legion, Thundering (*Legio fulminatrix*), the title of a Roman legion in the time of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, which, after the expulsion of the Marcomanni and Quadi from Hungary, while the emperor Aurelius was pursuing these German tribes with a detachment of his forces (A.D. 174), was shut up in a valley surrounded on every side by high mountains, and both by the heat of the weather and the want of water was suffering more cruelly than from the attacks of the enemy, when suddenly, in this crisis, a shower of rain reanimated the Roman soldiers, while at the same time a storm of hail, attended with thunder, assailed the enemy, who were then easily repulsed and conquered. Both heathen and Christian authors agree in their relation of the principal circumstances of this event. The adherents of each religion saw in it the influence of the prayers of their brethren. According to Dio Cassius (*Excerpta Xiphilin.* I, lxxi, cap. 8), the miracle was wrought by an Egyptian sorcerer in the train of the emperor; according to Capitolinus (*Vita Marc. Aurel.* cap. 24), it was the effect of the emperor's prayers; but according to Tertullian (*Apologet.* cap. 5; *Ad Scopul.* cap. 4) and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. v, cap. 5), it was brought about by the prayers of the Christians in his army; hence the legion to which these Christians belonged was denominated *fulminatrix.* The letter of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, commonly printed in Greek in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, gives the same account with the Christian writers, but it is spurious. The marble pillar erected at Rome in honor of Marcus Aurelius, and still standing, represents this deliverance of the Roman army—the Roman soldiers catching the falling rain, and a warrior praying for its descent. It is not, however, to be considered as a memorial of any influence exercised by the Christians in that event. See Milman, *History of Christianity*, ii, 145 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* I, bk. i, cent. ii, part i, chap. i, § 9; Pressensé, *History of Early Christianity*, p. 129. (J. H. W.)

Legists and **Decretists**, the interpreters and editors (*glossatores*) of the Roman law. See Glosses and Decretals.

Legrand, Antoine, a French writer and monk, born at Douay, lived about 1650–80. He was professor of philosophy and theology in Douay, and was a disciple of the Cartesian philosophy, on which he wrote several treatises. He published a *Sacred History from the Creation to Constantine the Great* (1685), and other works. —Thomas, *Biog. Dictionary*, s. v.

Legrand, Joachim, a French historian and abbé, born at Saint-Lo in 1653, was a person of great erudition. He was secretary of legation in Spain about 1702, and was afterwards employed in the foreign office. He died in 1733. He published a *History of the Divorce of Henry VIII of England* (1688), and a few other historical works.

Legrand, Louis, a French theologian, was born in Burgundy in 1711, became professor in the seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and died in 1780. He published, besides other works, a *Treatise on the Incarnation of the Word* (1751). He composed the censures which the faculty of theology published against Rousseau's *Emile* (1762) and Buffon's *Epoques de la Nature* (Diedin, 1780). —Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Legris-Duval, René Michel, a French priest, who was born at Bretagne in 1705, and died in 1816, is noted as a zealous and efficient promoter of benevolent institutions.

Legros, Antoine, a French scholar and writer, who was born in Paris about 1680, and died in 1751, published, besides other works, *The Works of the Fathers who lived in the Time of the Apostles, with Notes* (1717).

Legros, Nicolas, a French Jansenist theologian, was born at Rheims in 1675. He passed the last twenty-five years of his life in Holland, to which he retired for refuge from persecution. He died in 1751. Among his works are a French translation of the Bible (1739), which is esteemed for fidelity; and a *Manual for the Christian* (1740).

Le'habim (Heb. *Lehabim'*, לְהָבִים, prob. for לוּבִים, *Lubim;* Sept. Λαβιείμ, v. r. in Chron. Λαβείν; Vulg. *Laabim*), a people reckoned among the Midianitish stock (Gen. x, 13; 1 Chron. i, 11). See Ethnology.

The word is in the plural, and evidently signifies a tribe, doubtless taking the name of *Lehab*, Mizraim's third son (Gen. x, 13). Bochart affirms that the Lehabim are not, as is generally supposed, identical with the Libyans. His reasons are, That Libya was much too large a country to have been peopled by one son of Mizraim; and that in other parts of Scripture Libya is either called Phut (פוּט, Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxx, 5), or Lubim לוּבִים, 2 Chron. xii, 3; Nahum iii, 9), and Phut was a brother, and not a son of Mizraim (Gen. x, 6; Bochart, *Opera*, i, 279). These arguments do not stand the test of historical criticism. Phut and Lubim are not identical (Nahum iii, 9); and the Lehabim may have been joined by other tribes in colonizing Libya. It is quite true there is no direct evidence to identify the Lehabim and Lubim; yet there seems a high probability that the words are only different forms of the same name—the former being the more ancient, the middle radical ה was afterwards softened (as is not unusual in Hebrew, Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 743, 360) into ו quiescent. The Lehabim are not again mentioned in Scripture, but we find the Lubim connected with Mizraim (2 Chron. xii, 3), and the Kushites or Ethiopians (xvi, 8). We may therefore safely infer that the Lehabim were the ancient Lubim or Libyans, who perhaps first settled on the borders of the Nile, among or beside the Mizraim; but, as they increased in number, migrated to the wide regions south-west, and occupied the vast territory known to classical geographers as Libya (Kalisch *On Gen.* x, 13; see also Michaelis, *Spicileg. Geogr.*; Knobel *Völkertafel des Pent.*). Dr. Beke maintains that the Lehabim, as well as the Mizraim, were a people of north-western Arabia; but his views are opposed alike to the opinions of ancient and modern geographers, and his arguments do not appear of sufficient weight to command acceptance (*Origines Biblicæ*, p. 167, 198 sq.). There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the ReBU or LeBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from them Libya and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is, from the time of Menptah, B.C. cir. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B.C., and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B.C., to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the west of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under Lubim. Geographically, the position of the Lehabim in the enumeration of the Mizraites immediately before the Naphtuhim suggests that they at first settled to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them. See Mizraim. Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the ReBU and Libyans with Egypt and its people suggests their kindred origin with the Egyptians. See Libya.

Le'hi (Heb. *Lechi'*, לֶחִי, in pause *Le'chi*, לֶחִי, a *cheek* or *jaw-bone* [usually with the art. הַלֶּחִי]; Sept. Λεχί v. r. Λευί), a place in the tribe of Judah where Samson achieved one of his single-handed victories over the Philistines (Judg. xv, 9, 14, 19, in which last passages the Sept. translates σιάγων, Vulg. *maxilla*). It contained an eminence—Ramath-lehi, and a spring of great and lasting repute (see Ortlob, *De fonte Simeonis*, Lips. 1703) —En hak-kore (ver. 17). The name of the place before the conflict was evidently Lehi, as appears from verses 9 and 14; perhaps so called from the form of some hill or rock (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 752). After the slaughter of the Philistines, Samson, with a characteristic play upon the name, makes it descriptive of his signal and singular victory. Lehi is possibly mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiii, 11—the relation of another encounter with the Philistines hardly less disastrous than that of Samson. The Heb. there has לַחַיָּה, as if חַיָּה, from the root חַי (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 470). In this sense the word very rarely occurs (see A. V. of Psa. lxviii, 10, 30; lxxiv, 19). It elsewhere has the sense of "living," and thence of wild animals, which is adopted by the Sept. in this place, as remarked above. In ver. 13 it is again rendered "troop." In the parallel narrative of 1 Chron. (xi, 15), the word מַחֲנֶה, a "camp," is substituted. In the passage 2 Sam., it is rendered in the A. V. "into a troop," but by alteration of the vowel-points becomes "to Lehi," which gives a new and certainly an appropriate sense. This reading first appears in Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 12, 4), who gives it "a place called Siagona" —the jaw—the word which he employs in the story of Samson (*Ant.* v, 8, 9). It is also given in the Complutensian Sept., and among modern interpreters by Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 2, ch. xiii), Kennicott (*Dissert.* p. 140), J. D. Michaelis (*Bibel für Ungelehrt.*), Ewald (*Geschichte*, iii, 180, note). The great similarity between the two names in the original (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 175 *b*), has led to the supposition that Beer-Lahai-roi was the same as Lehi. But the situations do not suit. The well Lahai-roi was below Kadesh, very far from the locality to which Samson's adventures seem to have been confined. Jerome states that Paula, when on her way from Bethlehem to Egypt, passed from Sochoth to the fountain of Samson (*Opera*, i, 705, ed. Migne). Later writers locate it beside Eleutheropolis (Anton. Mar. *Itin.* 30; Reland, p. 872); but the tradition appears to have been vague and uncertain (Robinson, ii, 64 sq.). There is only a deep old well, which would not answer to the Scripture narrative (Robinson, ii, 26 sq.).—Smith; Kitto. Van de Velde (*Narrative*, ii, 140, 141) proposes to identify Ramoth-Lehi with Ramoth Nekeb (1 Sam. xxx, 27), as well as with Baalath (1 Kings ix, 18; 2 Chron. viii, 6), Baalath-beer (Josh. xix, 8), or Bealoth (Josh. xv, 24); and all these with some ruins on tell *Lekiyeh*, three or four miles north of Bir es-Seba (comp. *Memoir*, p. 343), a view to which we yield an assent, reluctantly, however, owing to its great distance from the Philistine territory, and the want of exact agreement in the Arabic name (*Lechi* and *Legiyeh*). The *Beit-Likiyeh*, mentioned by Tobler (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 189) as a village on the northern slopes of the great wady Suleiman, about two miles below the upper Beth-horon, is a position at once on the borders of both Judah and the Philistines, and within reasonable proximity to Zorah, Eshtaol, Timnath, and other places familiar to the history of the great Danite hero. But this, again, is too far north for any known position of the adjoining rock Etam (q. v.).

Lehmann, Christian Abraham, a German theologian, was born at Tütenbock Jan. 4, 1735, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg (1754–58). In 1760 he became deacon, in 1764 pastor at Lockwitz, and in 1806 senior of the district of the Dresden diocese. He died Dec. 30, 1813. He spent his life in practical activity. He was remarkably successful in an attempt to hold prayer-meetings, connected with Bible instruction, thus influencing and affecting the heart in a time when the great majority of the pulpits of Germany were occupied by rationalism. Of the few books he composed, we mention *Kunzer Entwurf der Glaubenslehre für erwachsene Kinder*, etc. (1772, 8vo; new and enlarged edit., 1797, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lehnberg, Magnus, a Swedish prelate, noted as a pulpit orator, was born in 1758, and became bishop of Linköping. He died in 1809.

Lehnin, Hermann von, a monk of the convent of that name, said to have flourished about the close of the 13th century, as the author of a prophetic poem, in 100 Latin hexameter verses, concerning his convent and the house of Brandenburg, entitled *Vaticinium Lehninense*. According to the legend, the MS. was discovered in an old wall, in the 17th century, by the elector, when the latter intended to build a palace on the ruins of the convent. The poem is written in the interest of the

hierarchy; it deplores the heresy of the former house of Brandenburg in the ascendant house of Hohenzollern (the latter family adhering to Protestantism), and prophesies the downfall of the now ruling family, to be followed by the restoration of the unity of Germany and the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic Church. The existence of this poem is not, however, to be traced with any certainty further back than the year 1693. It was first published in Lilienthal (Königsb. 1723, 1741), then at Berlin and Vienna, 1745; Bern, 1758; Leipsic, 1807; also in France, in 1827 and 1830, by W. Meinhold, with a metrical translation, Leips. 1849; C. Rösch, Stuttgard, 1849; Gieseler, *Die Lehninsche Weissagung* (Erf. 1849); Guhrauer, *Die Weissagungen v. Lehnin* (Bresl. 1850); M. Heffter, *Geschichte des Klosters Lehnin* (Brandenburg, 1851). Those who consider this poem a mere mystically-shaped narrative of past events, name as its author M. F. Seidel, assessor of the privy council († at Berlin in 1693); or Andrew Fromm, counsellor of the Consistory († at Prague in 1688); or Nicolas von Zitzwitz, abbot of Huysburg, who, they say, composed it about 1692; or the Jesuit Frederick Wolf, chaplain to the Austrian embassy at Berlin in 1685–86 († 1708); or Œlven, captain of cavalry at Stettin († 1727). See L. de Bouverois, *Extrait d'un manuscrit rélatif à la prophétie du frère St. de Lehnin* (German transl. by W. von Schütz (Würzb. 1847); J. A. Boost, *Die Weissagungen des Mönchs H. z. Lehnin* (Augsb. 1848).—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, viii, 273; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 757 sq.

Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm, *Baron von*—philosopher, theologian, jurist, historian, poet, mathematician, mechanician, naturalist, and votary of all arts and all sciences—was the most brilliant, profound, and versatile scholar of the century following the death of Des Cartes—perhaps of modern times. He is among the few who have earned the honors of all-embracing erudition—*ultra progredi nefas est.* As the opponent of Spinoza, Bayle, and Locke; as the conciliator of Plato and Aristotle; as the reverential follower of the discredited schoolmen; as the precursor of Kant, and as the vindicator "of the ways of God to man," Leibnitz occupies an equally eminent and important position in the history of philosophic opinion. His metaphysical speculations were, however, but a small portion of his labors. His greatest achievements in nearly all cases were only the liberal recreations of his idle hours. He rendered all learning and nearly all knowledge tributary to his genius, and deserved the happy eulogy of Fontenelle, that "he drove all the sciences abreast." He reformed and enlarged old systems of doctrine, he added new provinces to them, he improved their methods, he supplied them with keener instruments, he discovered new continents of study, and delineated them for future occupation and culture. Whatever region he visited in the wide circuit of his explorations was quickened into bloom and fruitage beneath his feet—

"Suaveis Dædala tellus
Summittit flores."

Life.—Leibnitz was the son of Frederick Leibnitz, professor of ethics in the University of Leipsic, and was born there July 3, 1646. He was early placed at school. At six years of age he lost his father, from whom he inherited a small fortune and an extensive library. This library inspired, moulded, and furnished forth his career. He buried himself in his young years amid its volumes, and delighted in the unaided perusal of the ancient classics. His attention was not confined to the great masters of style, nor to linguistic pursuits. He read with like diligence poets, orators, jurists, travellers—works of science, medicine, philosophy, and general information. Nothing came amiss to his insatiable appetite and incredible industry. At fifteen he entered the University of Leipsic, and was directed by Jacobus Thomasius to mathematical and philosophical studies. He applied himself assiduously to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and already, at the age of eighteen, was endeavoring to harmonize and combine their antagonistic systems. One year he spent at the University of Jena, but he returned to his own city to prosecute his professional studies. Applying for the degree of doctor of law when he had scarcely attained his twentieth year, he was refused the diploma on the pretext of his youth. It was cheerfully accorded by the University of Altdorf, which tendered him a professorship; but this was declined. To this period belong his *Ars Combinatoria*—a curious adaptation of Raymond Lully's Art of Meditation and Logical Invention—and his *Mathematical Demonstration of the Existence of God.* His estimate in declining life of the former treatise may be seen from his fourth letter to Remond de Montmort in 1714.

From Altdorf Leibnitz proceeded to Nuremberg, where, in consequence of an application filled with cabalistic terms, unmeaning to himself and to every one else, he was admitted into an association for the pursuit of the philosopher's stone, and was appointed its secretary. Half a century before, Des Cartes had been similarly seduced in the same regions. From these visionary occupations the young alchemist was soon withdrawn by the baron De Boineburg, chancellor of the elector of Mayence, who recommended him to prosecute history and jurisprudence, and invited him to Frankfort, with the promise of preferment. He illustrated his change of abode by publishing *Nova methodus discendæ docendæque Jurisprudentiæ* (1667), to which was appended a *Catalogus Desideratorum.* The unsystematic treatment of jurisprudence had long needed reform. Leibnitz continued his efforts in this direction by an essay, *De Corpore Juris reconcinnando.* He contemplated at this time a new and enlarged edition of Alsted's Encyclopædia, and never abandoned, but never commenced his design. From these vast projects he was diverted by Boineburg, at whose instance he composed a diplomatic exposition of the claims of Philip William, duke palatine of Neuburg, to the vacant throne of Poland. He declined an invitation to the duke's court, remained at Frankfort, and brought out a new edition of the forgotten work of Marius Nizolius, *De Veris Principiis et Vera Ratione Philosophandi.* He added notes, and prefixed two dissertations; one on *The Philosophical Style of Composition*, the other *On Writing the History of Philosophy.* In the latter he treated of Des Cartes, Aristotle, and the schoolmen, and on the mode of harmonizing the Peripatetic with later philosophy. All his writings exhibit pronounced Cartesianism. His first approaches to physical science were made in his *Theoria Motus Abstracti*, containing the germs of his Calculus, and his *Theoria Motus Concreti* (1671). They were not favorably received; but Leibnitz was still only twenty-five years old. Next year appeared his *Sacrosancta Trinitas per nova argumenta defensa*, directed against Wissowatius, a Polish Unitarian. Thus, say the writers in the *Biographie Universelle*, "each year brought a new title of glory to Leibnitz, and gave him rank among the masters of the different sciences." He was already a counsellor of the chancery of Mayence. At length his desire of seeing Paris was gratified. Boineburg sent him thither as tutor to his sons, and in charge of some public affairs. He was at once admitted into the most brilliant scientific circles, in the most brilliant period of the reign of Louis XIV. Here he made the acquaintance of Huyghens, and improved the calculating machine of Pascal. He was also induced to aid in preparing the Latin classics *in usum Delphini.* On the death of Boineburg (1673) he passed over into England, where he was received with distinction by Boyle, Oldenburg, and other members of the recent Royal Society. Intelligence of the demise of the elector of Mayence reached him in London. He was thus deprived of the means of support. Flattering proposals had been made to him by Louis XIV, but they had been refused, as they required adhesion to the Catholic communion. In his anxiety and distress, he was appointed by the duke of Brunswick a counsellor, with an adequate pension, and with the privilege of remaining abroad. He re-

turned to Paris, and remained there fifteen months. In 1676 he revisited England, and thence proceeded to Hanover by way of Holland. Here he entered upon his duties as counsellor, and—strange duties for a minister of state!—employed himself in arranging and enlarging the library of his protector, and improving the drainage of his mines. His services were rewarded with a considerable salary, but the duke soon died (1679). He found other employment, for he was never idle, and composed a treatise on *The Rights of Ambassadors*, arguing the question of States' Rights, which has assumed such prominence in Germany in recent years. The new duke of Brunswick engaged Leibnitz to compose the *History of the House of Brunswick*. To prepare for the task, he visited southern Germany and Italy, consulting the learned, exploring monasteries, ransacking libraries, examining old charters, deciphering mouldy manuscripts, and transcribing worm-eaten documents. Whatever he undertook he projected on a scale proportionate to his own vast comprehension and various knowledge, with little regard to the legitimate magnitude of the subject, or to the brevity of human life. He brought back from his wanderings an abundant supply of diplomatic materials, which he arranged, and from which he extracted extensive works, sometimes having little direct connection with the Chronicles of Brunswick. The first-fruits of these collections were the *Codex Juris Gentium Diplomaticus*, of which the first volume was issued in 1693, in folio; the second in 1700, with the title *Mantissa Codicis*. Valuable as were the documents, the most valuable part of the work was the Introduction, reviewing the principles of natural and international law, and sketching the reform of civil jurisprudence ultimately achieved by Napoleon. Other works of wide comprehension were due to these archæological researches: the demonstration of the descent of the Guelphic line from the Italian house of Este; the *Accessiones Historicæ* (1698, 2 vols. 4to, containing a multitude of unpublished papers), and the *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium*. The first volume of this historical collection appeared in 1707, folio; the second in 1710; the third in 1711. These extensive accumulations were only materials to be employed for *The History of the House of Brunswick*. In the Introduction to the *Corpus Scriptorum* Leibnitz discussed everything connected with the family, the realm, and the country of the Guelphs, investigating the traditions of the early tribes that dwelt on the Elbe and the Weser, tracing their changes and migrations, marshalling the passages of the ancient authors in which they were mentioned, and examining their language and the mixture of their dialects. It inaugurated ethnological science and comparative philology. His inquiries, however, stretched far beyond the *incunabula gentis*, and contemplated the primitive condition of the abode of the race. This preliminary outline is given in the *Protogæa* (1693), which founded the modern sciences of geology and physical geography. It is interesting to compare this fragmentary sketch with the *Vulgar Errors* of Sir Thomas Browne, and to note the immense stride which was made by Leibnitz. Of the main work, to which this essay was to be introductory—the *History of the House of Brunswick*—only a brief and imperfect outline was ever drawn by the accomplished author. It was published after his death by Eccard, in the *Acta Eruditorum*, in 1717.

These historical labors were the real task of the life of Leibnitz. But the long years of plodding industry were abundantly filled with other enterprises, and it is to them that his reputation is mainly due.

By his exertions chiefly, the *Acta Eruditorum*—a scientific and philosophical periodical—was established (vol. i, Leipsic, 1682). To this he contributed largely, and in its pages appeared many of his most luminous discoveries and suggestions. In it was published his *Meditationes de Cognitione, Veritate et Ideis* (1684), propounding his modifications of the Cartesian doctrine of knowledge. In the same year, and in the same work, appeared his rules for the Differential Calculus, the germs of which had been indicated in his *Theoria Motus Abstracti* thirteen years before. He gave no demonstrations: these were divined with wonderful ingenuity, and promulgated by the Bernouilli brothers. In 1687 the world was enriched by Sir Isaac Newton's *Principia Mathematica Philosophiæ Naturalis*, which employed a mathematical device closely analogous to the Calculus of Leibnitz. A bitter controversy in regard to priority of discovery and originality of invention sprung up between the partisans of these great mathematicians. It is scarcely yet terminated. The rigorous and repeated examination of the question justifies the conclusion that both had independently discovered corresponding procedures. The history of inventions is full of such coincidences. There is sufficient difference between the Fluents and Fluxions of Newton and the Calculus of Leibnitz to indicate the originality of each. Neither was the first to enter upon this line of inquiry. To Leibnitz is specially due the acquisition of the powerful instrument by which so many of the triumphs of modern science have been won. In this connection a passing reference may be made to his *Arithmetica Binaria* (1697)—a method of notation and computation employing only the symbols 1 and 0; and also to the *Philosophy of Infinity*, long meditated, but never made public.

The conception of dynamical science continually occupied the mind of Leibnitz, and was the natural tendency of his philosophical method. The *Acta Eruditorum* for 1695 contained his *Specimen Dynamicum;* and in the same year he gave to the world, through the *Journal des Sçavans*, his *Systema de Natura et Communicatione Substantiarum, itemque Unione inter Corpus et Animam intercedente*. In the latter he propounded his celebrated dogma of *Pre-established Harmony*. The connection between mind and body, between force and matter, between the *natura naturans* and the *natura naturata*, is still an insoluble enigma, after all the speculations of transcendental philosophy, and all the researches of modern philosophy and modern chemistry. We still grope for life in the dust and ashes of death. The veil of Isis has not been raised. Spencer, and Huxley, and Tyndall, *et id genus omne*, are compelled to acknowledge their inability to penetrate the mystery of the connection. However untenable, however hazardous, however absurd the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz may be, it was a beautiful dream, generated in some sort by the atmosphere of the time, and certainly a bold and ingenious attempt to escape from the brute mechanism of Des Cartes, the pantheism of Spinoza, the puppetry of Malebranche, and the materialism of the Sensationalists. The doctrine was illustrated, explained, and expanded in the *Théodicée*, and in many short essays and letters. So much, indeed, of the philosophy of Leibnitz was communicated only by occasional papers and correspondence, so little by systematic works, that it is impossible to trace the course and development of his views in any brief notice. His two formal metaphysical works belong to the last period of his life. The *Nouveaux Essais*, in reply to Locke, answering the English philosopher chapter by chapter, and section by section, were completed in 1704, but were not published for more than half a century. They were withheld from the press in consequence of Locke's death in that year, and were first published by Raspé in 1763. The *Théodicée*, which was designed as a refutation of Bayle, and was undertaken at the request of the queen of Prussia, was completed two years after the death of that princess and of Bayle, but was not published till 1710, six years before Leibnitz's own decease. Like the *Nouveaux Essais*, it was composed in French, of which language Leibnitz was a perfect master. It is exquisitely written, and is the finest specimen of philosophical literature since the Dialogues of Plato. A very large portion of the metaphysical and other writings of Leibnitz have been transmitted to us only by posthumous publication.

Though Leibnitz composed only these two formal

treatises, his philosophical and scientific labors were multitudinous and multifarious. He was indefatigable in labor, and his mind ranged with equal rapidity and splendor over the whole domain of knowledge. Nothing was too vast for his comprehension, too dark for his penetration, too humble for his notice. He corresponded with Pelisson on the conciliation and union of the Protestant and Catholic communions, and was thus brought into connection with Bossuet. With Burnet he discussed the project of uniting the Anglicans and the Continental Protestants. He expended much time over the invention of a universal language. He wrote extensively on etymology, and the improvement of the German language, which he so rarely employed. Medicine, botany, and other branches of natural history attracted his earnest regards. He addressed a memoir to Louis XIV on *the Conquest and Colonization of Egypt, with the view to establishing a Supremacy over Europe.* The age of chivalry and the Crusades was not over with him. He certainly pointed out the road to Napoleon. He was deeply interested in the accounts of the Chinese, and in the Jesuit missions for their conversion. He wrote much upon the *philosophia Sinensis*, in accordance with the delusion of the age. He engaged in an active but courteous controversy with Samuel Clarke, in which the highest and most abstruse riddles of metaphysics were discussed. From his historical researches he drew the materials for an instructive essay, *De Origine Francorum* (1715); and so various was the range of topics that engaged his attention, that he commented on the political position and rights of English freeholders. His mind, like the sun, surveyed all things, and brightened all that it shone upon. This enumeration of his inquiries gives a very imperfect view of either the number or the variety of his productions. The catalogue of his writings fills thirty-three pages in the 4to edition of his works by Dutens.

The literary fecundity of Leibnitz was equalled by his activity in promoting the practical interests of intelligence. His correspondence linked together the scholars of all countries, furnished a bond of connection between all learning and science, and created for the first time a universal republic of letters. He thus communicated an impulse to the dissemination of knowledge not less potent than that given by Bacon's *New Atlantis*, and by the institution of the Royal Society of England. Of that society he was an adjunct member, as he was the chief of the foreign associates of the Academy of Sciences of France. He suggested to the first king of Prussia the foundation of the Royal Academy of Berlin, aided in its establishment, and became its first president (1700). He proposed a like institution for Dresden, but was frustrated by the wars in Poland, for his zeal for liberal studies was contemporaneous with the conquering campaigns of Charles XII of Sweden. When the Berlin Academy was endangered by the death of its royal founder, Leibnitz sought to open a new home for learning by establishing a similar society at Vienna (1713). The design was not carried into effect. The exhaustion of the finances by the War of the Spanish Succession, which was scarcely closed, was unfavorable to the scheme. Leibnitz was warmly received, was encouraged by prince Eugene, was created a baron of the empire, and was appointed aulic counsellor, with a salary of 2000 florins. Two years previously he had been consulted at Torgau, in regard to the civilization of Russia, by Peter the Great, who had made him a counsellor of the Russian empire, and had conceded a handsome pension to him. All the while he remained historiographer of Brunswick. It is reported that the elector of Brunswick was much dissatisfied with the slow progress of the history of his house. When the elector became king of England (1714), Leibnitz hastened from Vienna to pay his court to the monarch, but his new majesty had departed for his new dominions. He met the sovereign, however, on his return to his paternal domain. The years of Leibnitz were now drawing to an end. He suffered from acute rheumatism and other painful disorders. Having much acquaintance with medicine, he tried novel remedies upon himself, with no good result. He prolonged his studies almost to his last days, and died tranquilly, with scarcely a word, on Nov. 14, 1716, having reached the age of "threescore and ten years." His monument at the gates of Hanover, erected by king George, bears the modest inscription *Ossa Leibnitii.*

Leibnitz was of medium height, and slender. He had a large head, black hair, which soon left him bald, and small eyes. He was very short-sighted, but his vision was otherwise sound to the end of his days. His constitution was remarkably good, for he reached old age without serious malady, notwithstanding the strain to which it was subjected. He drank moderately, but ate much, especially at supper, and immediately after this heavy meal retired to rest. He was wholly irregular in eating. He took his food whenever he was hungry, usually in his library, without abandoning his books. Frequently he took his only repose in his chair, and occasionally pursued his reflections or researches, without change of place, for weeks—Fontenelle says for months. He read everything—good books and bad books, and books on all manner of subjects. He extracted largely from the authors perused, and made copious annotations upon them. His memory was so tenacious that he rarely recurred to these *Adversaria.* He sought intercourse with men of all occupations and of all grades of intelligence. Every work of God or man was an object of interest and regard to him. He stretched forth his hand to everything—the election of a king of Poland, the revival of the Crusades, the conversion of the heathen, the reunion of the churches, the codification of laws, the history of a dynasty and people, the constitution of the universe, the creation of new sciences, the derivation of words, the invention of a calculating machine, the projection of a universal language, the construction of windmills, or the improvement of pleasure carriages. The extent of his correspondence was amazing, and may be conjectured from the list of distinguished correspondents culled by Brucker from the ampler catalogues of Feller and Ludovici. The courtesy of his epistles was as notable as their multitude. They were scattered over all civilized nations, and were on an endless diversity of topics, but they were uniformly marked by deference for the persons and opinions of others. This gentleness sprung from an amiable and cheerful nature. It was cultivated and refined by intercourse with princes, and statesmen, and philosophers, and scholars, and also with the humblest classes of society. It was confirmed by his belief that no honest conviction can be entirely wrong. His conversation was easy and abundant—as full of charm as of instruction. It may be conceded to Gibbon that completeness was sacrificed by Leibnitz to universality of acquirement; but, when all his gifts and accomplishments are embraced in one view, he may be justly deemed to merit the eulogy of his French editor, Jacques: "In point of speculative philosophy he is the greatest intellect of modern times; and had but two equals, but no superiors, in antiquity."

Leibnitz was never married. He contemplated the experiment once, when he was fifty years of age ("de quo semel tantum in vita, ætate jam provectior, sed frustra cogitavit"). The lady asked time for reflection. The opportunity for reflection cooled the ardor of the philosopher—the match was not decreed by any pre-established harmony, and the suit was not pressed.

The religious fervor of Leibnitz was undoubted, but he was negligent of the offices of religion. In his efforts to promote Christian unity, and to recognise only "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," he may have felt too keenly the defects of rival creeds, so as to accept from none the truth which seemed mutilated and imperfect in each.

Philosophy.—The mathematical and scientific, the historical and juridical, the linguistic and miscellaneous speculations of Leibnitz have been noticed very inade-

quately, but as fully as comports with the design of this Cyclopædia. His philosophy awaits and merits more precise consideration. It must be premised that all his labors, however remote in appearance from philosophical speculation, were inspired and animated by his own peculiar scheme of doctrine, and were really fragmentary applications of his distinctive principles. Hence proceeded that pervading spirit of reform which is manifested in all the departments of knowledge handled by him, and which was rewarded by numerous great triumphs in so many and such dissimilar directions. When details are neglected, the whole body of his writings is found to be connected by many lines of interdependence, and to be harmonized into unity by a common relation to the central thought around which his own reflections incessantly revolved. God is one, and there must be consistency and concord in the creation of God. It is no easy task to discern this unity, and to detect the general scheme of the Leibnitzian philosophy. Leibnitz nowhere presents a symmetrical exposition of his whole doctrine. His *Monadologie*, or *Principia Philosophiæ, seu Theses in Gratiam Principis Eugenii*, furnishes a clew to his system, but it is only a slender clew. Even if the *Principes de la Nature et de la Grace* be added as a supplement, the guiding thread is very frail. His views must be painfully gathered from elaborate treatises, from occasional essays, from scientific papers, from passing hints, from explanations of controverted points, from elucidations of obscure or misapprehended statements, and from the series of his multifarious epistles. Here a principle is thrown out, there its applications are illustrated; in one place an erroneous conclusion or a mistaken inference is corrected, in another, or in many others, fresh limitations or further expansions of a hypothesis are proposed. These different members of the imperfect whole are separated by months or years in the life of the author, or by hundreds of pages, or whole volumes in his collected works. It required the patient diligence of Christian Wolf to combine, complete, and organize in cumbrous quartos leaves scattered like the oracles of the Sibyl. Leibnitz had, indeed, no system to propound; he had no thought of promulgating a system or of establishing a sect. Yet his mind was thoroughly systematic. The system which resulted from perfect coherence of thought was latent in his own mind from the beginning, and was consistently evolved as the occasion furnished the opportunity of presenting its several parts. The highest intellect attaches itself instinctively to a principle, and allows accident to determine how far and when its consequences shall be unrolled. Leibnitz only desired to reconcile the opinions of his illustrious predecessors; to correct the errors and to supply the deficiencies which he recognised in the theory of his chief leader, Des Cartes, and to redress the evils which had flowed logically from those errors. The main design of his profound investigations was to give precision, harmony, and veracity to the immense stock of his own acquisitions and meditations. Had he reached the years of Methuselah he might have proposed a system, but it would have been simply the rectification of Cartesianism, or the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle, of Buonaventura and Aquinas. It must be remembered that, of his two systematic treatises, one was published towards the close of his life, the other not till half a century after his death. His natural disposition apparently inclined him to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, and to reflect upon his acquisitions for his own satisfaction. He seemed to be impelled to publication only by some accidental stimulus. His whole life was a discipline and preparation for what he never found time to execute—never, perhaps, seriously thought of executing—a vast encyclopædia embracing all that could be known by man. The hints thrown out in his long career, apt as they are for the construction of a consistent globe of speculation, only indicate an undeveloped system, which is revealed by glimpses as the need or provocation of the moment inspired. From such broken and dispersed lights his philosophy must be divined.

Leibnitz was essentially a Cartesian. He was Cartesian in his method, and Cartesian in his fundamental principles. He never revolted from his great teacher. He pursued the Cartesian mode of analysis and abstraction, he employed the Cartesian procedure by mathematical demonstration, he reasoned, like Des Cartes, from presumptive principles, he accepted the Cartesian *indicia* of truth; but he rendered them more precise, and was not wholly negligent of experience. He also rehabilitated the Scholastic or Aristotelian logic. He endeavored to combine with the dominant doctrine all that seemed valuable in elder systems, and he found some truth in all the schemes that he rejected. His imagination was too bold and too active to permit him to be the servile follower of any master, and his perspicacity was too acute to overlook the fatal defects of the principles and conclusions of Des Cartes. The main errors to be corrected sprung from the distinction made by the French reformer between mind and matter. According to his theory, the one could not act upon the other. The intelligent and the material universe were thus hopelessly divorced. Mind was pure thought; matter was simple extension; the apparent concurrence of the two in the phenomena of existence was due to divine assistancy. See Des Cartes. Beasts were machines galvanized into the semblance of voluntary action by the intervention of divine power. Every movement was a *nodus vindice dignus*. If mind is pure thought, all mental action must be an effluence, an effect, or a manifestation of the one sole Intelligence. The distinction of minds was an impossibility. To Leibnitz the want of any *principium individuationis*—that old war-cry of the schoolmen—was apparent. He discussed this topic in a public thesis before he was seventeen (May 30, 1663, *Opera*, tom. ii, part i, p. 400, ed. Dutens). He ascribed *entitative* activity to matter, and a distinct entity to each individual mind. He regarded the human mind as an assemblage of dormant capacities (*ἐντελεχείαι*), to be called into action by the stimulation of sensations from without, and of promptings from within. He departed so far from the teachings of Des Cartes that he ascribed soul and reason to brutes, and in some sort to all matter also (*Leibnitiana*, § c, *Opera*, t. vi, part i, p. 315; comp. § clxxxi, p. 331; see Bayle, *Dict. Hist. Crit.* tit. Rorarius, Pereira). If matter is mere extension, it must be identical with space, and is "without form and void," impalpable, inconceivable, unreal. To give shape to "that which shape had none," motion must be recognised as an essential quality of matter, because form is produced by movement in space. Leibnitz at times goes so far as to suspect that all space is matter. For the production of motion, force—determinate power in action—is necessary. Of the real existence of force the human consciousness affords assurance. From these corrections of the Cartesian posturates proceeded the mathematical and philosophical speculations of Leibnitz in regard to *vis viva*, his *Theory of Motion, Abstract and Concrete*, his *Dynamics*, and even his *Calculus of Infinitesimals*. All internal and external change, all properties and accidents of matter, are only "modes of motion." The latest science is returning to similar hypotheses, though the language of science is altered. Observed phenomena appeared to be contradicted by the definition of body, as the conjunction of extension and motion. Bodies were often at rest, undergoing no sensible change. Motion could not belong to them essentially as aggregates, but only to the constituents from whose conjoint operation the external or the internal movements of the mass proceeded. If a property was to inhere in such constituents, matter could not be infinitely divisible: the process of division must be ultimately arrested by reaching an irreducible atom:

> "Fateare necesse 'st,
> Esse ea, quæ nullis jam prædita partibus exstent,
> Et minima constent natura."

The motion attributed to these primordial particles is due to an indwelling force. Thus, from his definition of matter as the union of motion with extension, Leibnitz was led to recognise as the primary units of the universe an infinity of simple elementary substances or forces, which he designated MONADS. These monads have some resemblance to those of Pythagoras, Democritus, and Epicurus, and also to the Ideas of Plato; but, unlike the Epicurean atoms, they are not *solida*, though they are *æterna*. They are not material, but they are the souls of matter. This vaporous dematerialization of matter may be illustrated by Plotinus's definition of matter by the successive segregation of all the properties of specific body. Is not the theory of Boscovich, that matter is only an assemblage of points of force, an adaptation of Leibnitz's conception? Has not the theory of Boscovich won admiration and hesitating approval from many distinguished men of science?

The consequences of the rectification of the Cartesian conception of matter do not end here. As the motions or manifestations of force constitute the difference between the several simple substances or monads, when there is no diversity of motion there is no difference of properties and no distinction of nature. Hence follows another dogma of Leibnitz, the *Identity of Indiscernibles*. The monads are infinite in number, but they are unlike, and present an infinite diversity of forces. There is also an infinite variety of gradations, from the lowest atoms of matter up through human souls to the supreme monad, or God. Each monad is in some sort the mirror of the universe of things; each possesses spontaneous energy or life within itself, and, in consequence of these characteristics, each has its own peculiar kind of reason, passive in matter unorganized, rudimentary in crystals and vegetable existence, unreflecting and instinctive in brutes, self-conscious and introspective in man, and ascending through numberless orders of angelic intelligences. As motion is the principle of *quiddity* ("the ghosts of defunct" terms must be evoked), force is an essential quality of all existence, and is as imperishable as the monad is indestructible, unless both are annihilated by the same Power by which they were created. Here is another anticipation of recent scientific deductions. As these forces are immutable, their separate spheres of action must be exempt from intrusion. There may be composition of motions, or equilibrium of antagonisms, but there can be no interaction or reciprocal influence.

Here presents itself the ancient insoluble enigma, How can bodies act upon each other? How can matter be moulded or modified by vital action? How can it be subdued or directed by the intelligent volition of man? How can it be conjoined with spirit in any form of animate existence? Des Cartes so completely contradistinguished mind and matter that it was impossible for mind to act upon matter or matter upon mind—*frustra ferro diverberat umbras*. Leibnitz so completely assimilated material to spiritual existence, giving body to spirit, and spirit to body (*Théod.* § 124), that they were indistinguishable except by their properties —the one possessing *perception* only, the other having *apperception* also. There could be no intercommunion, no reciprocal influence between them, or between any monads. To cut rather than to loose the intellectual knot, which was only rendered more intricate, Leibnitz proposed an explanation in his *Systema Naturæ* (1695). It is his celebrated doctrine of *Pre-established Harmony*. The monads are forces, sometimes active, sometimes suspended, ἐνεργείαι and δυνάμεις, governed by their own inherent tendencies, and without power of acting upon each other; but their separate actions are so foreknown on one side, and predetermined on the other, in the moment of creation, that their concurrent evolutions reciprocally correspond, and effectuate all the phenomena of the universe. Mind, therefore, does not coerce matter, nor does one form of matter control another, but the inclination of the will and the disposition of the matter, or the diverse evolutions of different monads, conjoin independently and without connection in the production of one result, in consequence of the preadaptation of all the elementary forces to that particular change, at that particular moment, in that particular composition, and with that particular consequence. Dugald Stewart illustrates this harmony by the supposition of two clocks so regulated and adjusted as to strike the hours in unison. It may be an illustration; it is scarcely an elucidation of the doctrine. The agreement is only in time and performance: there is no concordance of dissimilar processes. The machinery of *Divine Assistance*, which Des Cartes had employed for the explanation of the phenomena of animal life, was generalized by Leibnitz, applied to the whole order of things, and transferred to the original of all creation. There is thus much more than a poetic symbolism—there is a distinctive philosophical tenet involved in his fine expression that "the universe is the knowledge of God." This preordination of concurrences, apt for each occasion, between monadic developments, each of which is determined by its own inherent force, which is will in intelligences and nature in material things, makes the whole endless series of change the realization of foreseen and prearranged correspondences. It is the continual evolution of the immeasurable plan entertained by the Creator before the beginning of the ages, and brought into act at the appointed time and in the appointed order, with mathematical precision, though beyond the calculation of mathematical devices. Certain fabrics are curiously woven with colors so arranged in the yarn that when the weaving is performed each color falls with exact propriety into its due place, and contributes accurately to form, to tint, to perfect the contemplated pattern. So, in the system of pre-established harmony, "the web of creation is woven in the loom of time," with threads prepared from the beginning to fall into the requisite connections, and to produce a foreknown design. Each concurrent movement arrives at the appropriate time and place in consequence of the whole antecedent series of changes in each case, for nowhere is there any solution of continuity, and the present is always the progeny of the past and the parent of the future. The innumerable lines of evolution continually interosculate with each other, but never are blended together. It will readily be perceived that the whole intricate phantasmagoria of these unconnected monads is only a grand and beautiful variation of the Cartesian hypothesis, and is neither more valid nor more satisfactory than the fantasy it was designed to supplant.

This doctrine of pre-established harmony is in perfect consonance with Leibnitz's vindication of the ways of God to man, if it did not necessitate his theological expositions. The *Théodicée* is the most exquisite, the most brilliant, the most profound, the most learned, and, in some respects, the most satisfactory of all treatises of philosophical theology. Many of its conclusions are either true, or as near the truth as the human intellect can attain in such inquiries. Others are merely conjectural, and are sometimes fantastic, as they lie beyond the domain of possible knowledge. Several of its positions have furnished pretexts for sweeping censures; but in such speculations error is inevitable, and a slight error opens the way for a host of pernicious and undesigned heresies. The most notable and characteristic of Leibnitz's theological dogmas, which provoked the malicious wit of Voltaire's *Candide*, is intimately associated with the explanation of the combined action of monads. This is the theory known as *Optimism*. Without absolutely asserting that "Whatever is, is best," it alleges that the actual world is the best of all possible worlds, despite of acknowledged evils and defects. This is supposed to be proved, among other evidences, by the Leibnitzian principle of the *sufficient reason*, since, if any better world had been possible, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been selected by God in preference to that which He actually created. The acute

conceptions, the ingenious arguments, the various illustrations, the abundant analogies by which this thesis is maintained and adorned, can receive here only their merited tribute of admiration. When God looked upon the work of each of the six days of creation, "He saw that it was good." More than this it is not given man to know: "that which is wanting cannot be numbered." But, if all events, if all changes, if all composite actions occur by divine preadaptation, it must be presumed that this is the best of worlds. There is wonderful coherence in the views of Leibnitz, interrupted and fragmentary as is their exposition. This dialectical consistency is so perfect, and in its evolution so splendid and imposing, that his scheme presents, both in the process of its construction and in its structure, the charm of a dream of the imagination. Nothing approaches it in magnificence but the ideal universe of Plato.

Of course, if this is the best of possible worlds, and if its phenomena are determined by the divine preordination or preorganization, evil, too apparent everywhere, must be merely contingent—a negative characteristic, a nonentity in itself. Leibnitz accordingly regards evil simply as imperfection—the privation of good. God is perfect: anything less than God must be imperfect. All limitation is imperfection; all imperfection is defect of good—is evil. The evil increases in quality and in degree with each remove from the perfection of the Supreme Existence. Hence, in this best of worlds, the taint of evil is over the whole creation:

"The trail of the serpent is over it all."

All this may be admitted, but it affords only an inadequate explanation. It does not justify the retribution which is merited by all evil; it does not recognise the positive character of evil as the violation of the divine law and order; it hardly permits the notion of such violation. Leibnitz denies the existence of physical evil except as a consequence of moral evil; and moral evil consists in voluntary increase of imperfection, in wilful estrangement from the Supreme Monad. Even thus, no sufficient reason can be assigned for ascribing sin, and for attaching a material or moral penalty to what is the result of a natural and inevitable imperfection. This defect in the system is clearly pointed out by Kant.

The unfathomable immensity of the creation can be but dimly apprehended by the finite and fallible mind of man. The mighty plan and purpose of God cannot be compressed within the compass of human intelligence. "We see as through a glass darkly." Schemes of the universe framed from broken and darkling glimpses become more delusive as they become more systematic. Leibnitz's intuitive principles, abstract analysis, and scholastic deduction were peculiarly apt to produce hallucinations.

Analysis for the discovery of *ultimate abstracts;* intuition for the acceptance of clear, distinct, and adequate ideas; the principle of contradiction as the test of verity; the principle of the sufficient reason as the canon of actuality—these are the metaphysical principles or postulates of Leibnitz. The resulting philosophy, both in conception and in construction, is exposed to "such tricks *as* hath strong imagination," and wants firm and assured foundation. It is a complex fantasy, a mathematical romance, a universe of shadows. Still, it is marked by wonderful acuteness, logical coherence, and purity of spirit. It preludes, if it does not anticipate, the main doctrines of Kant, and is the fruitful parent of all the subsequent philosophy of Germany.

This exposition presents the leading tenets, the *idées mères* of Leibnitz, but it affords no image of the splendid completeness of the entire theory, in which God is presented as the first beginning and the last end—the Alpha and Omega of the whole order of things in time and out of time. Nor does it do justice to the vigorous thought, the profound reflection, the comprehensive intelligence, the keen penetration, the exhaustless learning, the wealth of knowledge, the variety of illustration, the fervent and lofty morality, which give grace, and dignity, and grandeur to the whole and to all its parts. *Edidi quæ potui, non ut volui, sed ut me spatii angustiæ coëgerunt.* Fuller information must be sought from his own extensive works, and from the elucidations afforded by the numerous commentators on them.

Literature.—Leibnitii Opera (ed. Dutens, Gen. 1768, 6 vols. 4to). A complete edition of all his works is that by Pertz (Hamburg, 1845–47, 1st series; 1847, 2d series; 1853–62, 3d series). The latest is by Onno Klopp, 1st series, 1864–66 (5 vols. 8vo). Other editions are: *Œuvres* (ed. Foucher de Careil, Paris, 1854 sq., 20 vols.); *Deutsche Schriften* (ed. Guhrauer, Berlin, 1838); *Opera Philosophica* (ed. Erdmann, Berl. 1839–40); *Opera Mathematica* (ed. Gerhardt, Berlin, 1849–50); *Œuvres* (ed. Jacques, Par. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); *Œuvres philosophiques* (ed. Janet, Par. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo); Raspé, *Œuvres Philosophiques de feu M. Leibniz* (Amsterd. et Leips. 1765, 4to); Feder, *Lettres Choisies de la Correspondance de M. Leibniz* (Hanover, 1805); Leibnitz, *Memoir recommending the Conquest of Egypt to Louis XIV*, etc. (London, 1801); Eccard, *Leben des Leibnitz* (Berl. 1740); Jancourt, *Vie de Leibniz* (Amsterdam, 1756); Guhrauer, *Leben des Leibnitz* (Bresl. 1842; enlarged 1846); Vogel, *Leben des Leibnitz* (Leipsic, 1846); Mackie, *Life of Leibnitz* (Boston, 1845). Leibnitz transmitted an *Autobiography* to his friend Pelisson, but it has never seen the light. See also Fontenelle, *Eloge de Leibniz* (Paris, 1716); Bailly, *Eloge de Leibniz* (Paris, 1769); Kästner, *Lobschrift auf Leibnitz* (Altenb. 1769); Hanscius, *G. G. Leibnitii Principia Philosophiæ more Geometrico demonstrata* (1728, 4to); Ludovici, *Principia Leibnitiana* (Lips. 1737, 2 vols. 8vo); Bayle, *Hist. Crit. Dict.*, may be consulted, especially under the title Rorarius; Emery, *Esprit de Leibniz*, etc. (Lyons, 1772, 2 vols. 8vo; reprinted, Paris, 1803); Emery, *Exposition de la Doctrine de Leibniz sur la Religion* (Paris, 1819, 8vo); Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ* (Lips. 1767; still an indispensable authority for Leibnitz); Dugald Stewart, *Suppl. Encyclop. Britannica;* Sir James Mackintosh, *ibid.;* Morell, *Hist. Phil. XIXth Century* (New York, 1848, 8vo); Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy* (new edition, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii; and the other historians of modern philosophy; *Biographie Universelle*, s. v. Leibniz, by Biot, Duvau, Maine de Biran, and Stapfer; Schelling, *Leibnitz als Denker;* Helferich, *Spinoza und Leibnitz;* Zimmermann, *Leibnitz und Herbart* (Wien, 1849); Feuerbach, *Darstellung, Entwickelung und Kritik der Leibnitzschen Philosophie* (Anspach, 1837); Leckey, *Hist. of Morals*, i, 25; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.;* Hunt, *Pantheism*, p. 247; Gass, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii and iii; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 6, 103; Saintes, *Rationalism*, p. 56; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 56 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. protest. Theol.* p. 684 sq.; *Journal of Spec. Philos.* vol. i, No. 3, art. i; vol. iii, No. 1, art. v; *Revue Chrét.* 1868, p. 9; Brewster, *Life of Sir Isaac Newton; Edinb. Rev.* 1846 (July); *Atlantic Monthly*, 1858 (June); *Christian Examiner*, xxviii, 418 sq.; *Contemp. Review*, May, 1867, art. iii; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1851 (April), p. 189, 211; 1862 (April), p. 335; *Revue des d. Mondes*, 1861 (Jan.), p. 15; also (Sept.), p. 81. (G. F. H.)

Leidradt, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, probably a Bavarian, flourished in the 8th century. He was librarian to Charlemagne until 798, when he was made archbishop of Lyons. He was sent soon after by Charlemagne, together with the bishop of Orleans and other prelates, into the southern provinces of France, to suppress by moral means the spreading heresy of Adoptianism, and they succeeded in bringing the chief teacher of this doctrine, Felix, to acknowledge his error before the council held at Aix in 799. In 800 Leidradt was successful with his co-laborers in restoring 20,000 Adoptianists. The zeal which he everywhere displayed appears in a letter written to Charlemagne not long before the latter's death. He writes: "I have done my best to increase as far as necessary the number of priests. I have established the Psalm service after the model of that observed in your palace, and have erected singing-

schools by which the instruction may be continued. I have reading-schools where not only the appointed services are repeated, but where the holy Scriptures in general are studied and explained, and in which are those who understand the spiritual meaning not only of the Gospels, but also of the prophets, the books of Samuel, the Psalms, and Job. I have had as many books as possible transcribed for the churches in Lyons, procured vestments and other necessary appointments for divine service, and have repaired the churches." After Charlemagne's death, in the subscription to whose will the name of Leidradt appears, he resigned the bishopric and retired to the convent of the Holy Medardus, where he died. Neither the year of his death nor of his birth are known. He wrote in a clear and concise style some works which have since been edited. Of special value is a treatise of his on baptism, which was published by Mabillon (*Annales*, vol. ii). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* art. Baluze; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol. vi, s. v.

Leifchild, John, D.D., an eminent English Independent minister, was born in 1780 of Methodist parentage, and was brought up, and began to preach among the Methodists; but afterwards embracing Calvinistic opinions, it was impossible for him to continue preaching among them, and he was advised by Mr. Bunting, then the junior preacher in the circuit, to seek other associations. Accordingly, in 1804, he entered Hoxton Academy, but he retained through life a friendly feeling for the friends of his youth, and profited largely by what he learned among them. He died in June, 1862. Without possessing any very extraordinary natural endowments, he attained by faithful, earnest, and diligent labor a most successful and honorable career, and his life is a noble example of what may be effected by the right cultivation of the powers a man possesses within himself. Irreproachable in character, faithful in pastoral attentions, powerful in the pulpit, he filled every chapel he occupied, built up every Church he was the pastor of, and, when enfeebled by age, retired from his work laden with honors, and not without very substantial tokens of the love and gratitude of those whom he had served in the Gospel. One of the deacons of Craven Chapel states that, during the twenty-three years of his ministry there, more than fifteen hundred persons had been brought to decision and added to the Church through his faithful ministry. The catholic spirit of Dr. Leifchild was almost as prominent a feature in his character as his intense and pervading earnestness. He was well known and well liked by Christians of various denominations, with whom he mingled freely, and whom he loved for the truth's sake. See J. R. Leifchild, *John Leifchild, his public Labors, private Usefulness, and personal Characteristics* (Lond. 1860); Grant, *Metropolitan Pulpit* (1839), ii, 152; *Pen Pictures of Popular English Preachers* (1852), p. 130; Allibone, *Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Leigh, Edward, a learned English layman, was born in 1602, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He was a member of the Long Parliament, but was expelled on account of his intercession in behalf of the life of king Charles. He was also a member of the Assembly of Divines, and held the office of parliamentary general. He died in 1671. Edward Leigh wrote largely. Of his Greek works, one of the best is *Critica Sacra* (1639, 4to, and often; best ed. 1662, folio), which not only gives the literal sense of every word in the Old and New Testaments, but enriches the definitions with philological and theological notes. It was held in high esteem until supplanted by the more fundamental works of later Hebrew lexicographers. He also wrote *Annotations on the New Testament*, which are short and judicious, and other theological works of considerable value. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, ii, 1079.

Leigh, *Sir* Egerton, an English nobleman, who flourished towards the close of the last century, is noted for his piety and charitable acts. He was a member of the "London Missionary Society" from its very infancy (1795), as he was, indeed, the friend of every cause connected with the glory of God and the good of souls. "He devoted," says Morison (*Fathers and Founders of the London Miss. Soc.* p. 554), "much of his time, property, and influence to the spread of evangelical religion both at home and abroad, and was so zealous in the cause of his divine Master as occasionally to merge the baronet in the humble preacher of the cross of Christ."

Leigh, Hezekiah G., D.D., an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Perquimas County, N. C., Nov. 23, 1795, was converted in 1817, joined the Virginia Conference in 1818, was set off with the N. C. Conference in 1836, was a delegate to every General Conference from 1824 to his death, and died in Mecklenburg Co., Va., Sept. 18, 1853. He was also a member of the Louisville Convention at the organization of the M. E. Church South, and as one of the founders and first agents of Randolph Macon College, and one of the organizing committee of Greensboro' Female College, N. C., he rendered long and very important service to the cause of education in the Church. He received a good academical education while young, and throughout his life was a diligent general student. Most of his ministry was spent in the office of presiding elder in Virginia and N. Carolina. His character was noble and attractive, and his mind full of lofty ardor for the welfare of Christianity. His influence was wide and controlling for many years. He was an earnest and useful minister of the Gospel, and will long be remembered in the Carolinas.—Summers's *Biograph. Sketches*, p. 165. (G. L. T.)

Leighlin, Synod of, was held in Campo-Lene, Ireland, near Old Leighlin, A.D. 633, with the purpose of settling the time as to the observance of Easter. A few years before (630), Honorius I had addressed an expostulatory letter to the Irish clergy on the paschal question; and it is worthy of remark that this was the first notice taken by the bishops of Rome in regard to the Church founded by St. Patrick, and was about 200 years after its commencement. At this period the Irish were divided on the time of keeping Easter, some advocating the Roman practice, others the Irish way of observing the 14th day of the first vernal month (if a Sunday), instead of adopting its celebration on the Sunday *following* the 14th, and the matter even resulted in a controversy. Laurentius of Canterbury relates that Dugan, an Irish bishop, when in North Britain, declared that he would neither eat, drink, or sleep under the same roof with those who held to the Roman practice. Cummian, who for twelve years had been an abbot of Iona, was greatly troubled about it, and in its investigation he said, "I turned over the holy Scriptures, studied history and all the cycles I could find. I inquired diligently what were the sentiments of the Hebrews, Grecians, Latins, and the Egyptians concerning this solemnity." A deputation was sent from this synod, of which most probably Cummian was one, to ascertain from personal inspection whether, as they had heard in Ireland, other nations kept Easter at the same time that the Romans did. The object of this deputation has been greatly perverted in the interest of Romanism. It was not to get a decision from the pope, for this they had had for years, and had not obeyed it; but it was, as before stated, simply to determine for themselves. They remained at Rome or in the East about two years. On their return they reported that all they had heard in Ireland they had seen in Rome—even more (*valde certiora*) than they had heard. But even this report was not decisive, for the Venerable Bede says, "Though the south of Ireland partially conformed, the northern provinces and all Iona adhered to their former practice." This and other questions of nonconformity were for a long time pressed and resisted. In A.D. 664, when Theodore, the Italian archbishop of Canterbury, by order of the pope, came to establish the entire regime of Roman

Catholicism in North Britain, the paschal and many other questions were again so fiercely urged that Colman and most of the former clergy left and returned to Ireland. Again, in 1070, when Malcolm Canmore brought Margaret, his Saxon wife, to Scotland, she was shocked to find the faith and public worship of her new subjects so different from the Catholic Church of England. After laboring long to induce her husband to adopt the rites and order of the Saxon Catholics, she had a three days' discussion with the existing clergy and the Culdees of Iona, she speaking in Saxon and her husband interpreting in Irish. See Todd, *Irish Church*, chap. vi; Usher, *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* cap. xvii (*Works*, vi, 492–510).

Leighton, Alexander, a Scottish divine, was born at Edinburgh in 1568. He was professor of moral philosophy in that city for several years prior to 1613, when he removed to London, and obtained a lectureship. For libellous or offensive expressions against the king, queen, and the bishops, in his book called *Zion's Plea* (1629), he was punished by the Star Chamber with mutilation, the pillory, and long imprisonment. He was released in 1640, and died about 1646. Archbishop Laud was no doubt responsible for the cruel and inhuman treatment of Leighton. See LAUD.

Leighton, Robert, a Scottish prelate, one of the most distinguished preachers and theologians of the 17th century, was born in Edinburgh, or, as others think, in London, in the year 1611. He was educated at the university of the former city, and there took his degree of M.A. in 1631, when he went to the Continent to study, especially in France. Here he resided with some relatives at Douay, and formed the acquaintance of several Roman Catholic students, whose Christian virtues made him a charitable Christian towards all who bore the name of his Master. "Gentle, tender, and pious from his earliest years, he shrunk from all violence and intolerance; but his intercourse with men whose opinions were so different from his own convinced his reason of the folly and sinfulness of 'thinking too rigidly of doctrine.'" He returned to Scotland in 1641, and was immediately appointed to the parish of Newbattle, near Edinburgh; but as Leighton identified himself with the cause of Charles I when the latter was confined, by the commissioners of the Parliament, in Holmby House, he brought upon his head the displeasure of the Presbyterians, and, according to bishop Burnet, "he soon came to dislike their Covenant, particularly their imposing it, and their fury against all who differed from them. He found they were not capable of large thoughts; theirs were narrow as their tempers were sour; so he grew weary of mixing with them," and became an Episcopalian. For this change, however, there were serious obstacles in Leighton's case, and it has therefore been a matter of general disapprobation. Certainly the facility with which he fraternized with the party that had inflicted such horrid cruelties on his excellent father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, in 1630, for merely publishing a book in favor of Presbyterianism, cannot be altogether approved (comp. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, iv, 463 sq.). In 1652 he resigned his charge, and in the following year was elected principal of the University of Edinburgh, a dignity which he retained for ten years. Earnest, spiritual, and utterly free from all selfish ambition, he labored without ceasing for the welfare of the students. He delivered lectures especially to the students of theology, and occasionally supplied the place of divinity professor. His theological lectures are known to the learned world, and have been translated into English. For pure Latin, sublime thought, and warm diction, they have never been surpassed, and seldom equalled. In that office Dr. Leighton was truly the ornament and delight of the university, and a blessing to studious youth. After the restoration of Charles II and the re-establishment of the episcopacy in Scotland, Leighton, after much reluctance, accepted the bishopric of Dunblane, a small and poor diocese, and was consecrated at Westminster Dec. 15, 1661. Unfortunately for his peace, the men with whom he was now allied were even more intolerant and unscrupulous than the Presbyterians. The despotic measures of Sharpe and Lauderdale sickened him. Twice he proceeded to London (in 1665 and 1669) to implore the king to adopt a milder course—on the former of these occasions declaring "that he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion in such a manner, much less as a form of government." Nothing was really done, though much was promised, and Leighton had to endure the misery of seeing an ecclesiastical system which he believed to be intrinsically the best, perverted to the worst of purposes, and himself the accomplice of the worst of men. In 1670, on the resignation of Dr. Alexander Burnet, he was made, quite against his personal wishes, archbishop of Glasgow, and he finally accepted this great distinction only on the condition that he should be assisted in his attempts to carry out a liberal measure for "the comprehension of the Presbyterians." But finding, after a time, that his efforts to unite the different parties were all in vain, and that he could not stay the high-handed tyranny of his colleagues, he finally determined to resign the ecclesiastical dignity (in 1673). After a short residence in Edinburgh, he went to live with his sister at Broadhurst, in Sussex, where he spent the rest of his days in a retired manner, devoted chiefly to works of religion. He died at London June 25, 1684. Leighton published nothing during his lifetime. His great work is his *Practical Commentary upon the First General Epistle of St. Peter;* not a learned exposition by any means, for the writer hardly notices questions of philology at all, but perhaps no more remarkable instance is extant of the power which sympathy with the writer gives in enabling an expositor to bring out and elucidate his meaning. Another able work of his is *Prælectiones Theologiæ*, of which an edition was published a few years ago by the late professor Scholefield of Cambridge; also some sermons and charges. There is an edition of his work in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1819; but the best edition is that of Pearson (Lond. 1828; N. Y. 1859, 8vo). Another good edition was published in 1871, in 6 vols. 8vo. All of Leighton's writings have received the highest commendations because of the lofty and evangelical spirit that pervades them. They present the truths of Christianity in the spirit of Plato, and it was this that recommended them so much to Coleridge, whose *Aids to Reflection* are simply commentaries on the teachings of archbishop Leighton. "Few uninspired writings," says Dr. Doddridge, "are better adapted to mend the world: they continually overflow with love to God and man." See Hetherington, *Ch. of Scotland*, ii, 22 sq., 70 sq.; Burnet's *History of his Own Times;* Burnet's *Pastoral Care;* Doddridge's *Preface to Leighton's Works; The Remains of Archbishop Leighton*, by Jerment (1808); his *Select Works*, by Cheever (Boston, 1832); Pearson, *Life of Robert Leighton* (1832); Kitto, *Cycl. Bibl. Liter.* vol. ii, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* vol. vi, s. v.; Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leipsic, Colloquy of, in 1631. The disputes which occurred in the 16th century, when the two evangelical churches framed their confession of faith, had produced great bitterness between the Lutherans and Calvinists. Attempts at reconciliation had already been made by pious individuals in the 16th century, and still others in the 17th, as, for instance, by the indefatigable Scotchman Duræus, and by Rupertus Meldenius, but with little success. It was the trial which the evangelical churches of Germany underwent during the Thirty Years' War that really first made the two sister communions forsake their former hostility. They saw that they were both standing on the brink of a precipice, and the ties which bound them to each other were strengthened. Both the authorities and the people

now used their utmost efforts to secure, if not unity, yet at least peace and harmony between the two churches. In the early part of 1631, after Gustavus Adolphus, the champion of evangelical liberty, had already come to Germany, the landgrave William of Hesse and the elector Christian William of Brandenburg joined the elector George of Saxony at Leipsic, and they resolved to oppose, by main force if necessary, the carrying out of the Edict of Restitution. The landgrave William had brought with him the professor of theology Crocius and the court preacher Theophilus Neuberger; the elector Christian William was accompanied by the court preacher John Bergius. The theologians of Hesse and Brandenburg invited those of Leipsic to a conference in order to attempt a reconciliation between the evangelical churches, or, at least, to promote a better understanding between them. It was intended that this conference should be of a private character, yet with the hope that the other parts of Germany would follow the example. The Reformed party demanded only that the court preacher Matthias Hoe, of Hohenegg, should in the discussions abstain from the vehemence which distinguished his writings, and the theologians of Leipsic failed not to grant this request, with the assurance that Hoe was very gentle *in conversatione*. The elector George having sanctioned the plan of a private conference, the meetings commenced, March 3, at the residence of the upper court preacher, and under his presidency. They were held daily, and continued until March 23. On motion of the Reformed party the Confession of Augsburg was taken as a basis, they announcing their willingness to sign it, such as it then was in the Saxon form (published by order of the elector George, in 1628). They also thought that the princes of their different provinces were ready to do the same, without, however, undertaking to vouch for it. They stated furthermore that they would neither reject the altered edition of the Colloquy of Worms (in 1540) nor that of Regensburg (in 1541); they referred to the position taken at the convention of Naumburger in 1561, and by the Saxons in the preface to the Book of Concord. The Confession of Augsburg being thus adopted as a whole, every article was taken up separately and examined. They thus found that both parties fully coincided in the articles v–vii and xii–xxviii, while their differences on the articles i and ii were comparatively unimportant. With regard to the iiid article, they all agreed as to the interpretation of the words, but the Saxon theologians maintained that not only the divine, but also the human nature of Christ possessed omniscience, omnipotence, etc., by virtue of the union of the two natures in his personality, and that all the glory which Christ received was only received by his human nature. The Reformed theologians, on the contrary, denied that Christ, as man, was omnipresent, or that in him the human nature had become omniscient and omnipotent. They agreed also in the ivth article, and the Reformed theologians affirmed that they did not believe Christ had come to save all men. They also agreed in the ixth article, to which they made some addition on the necessity of baptism, and on infant baptism. The xth article, concerning the Eucharist, came up on March 7. Here they could not agree, the Reformed theologians denying the physical participation in the body and blood of Christ, and asserting a spiritual participation through faith; of unworthy communicants, they asserted that these partook only of simple bread and wine. The Reformed theologians, however, maintained that if it was impossible to agree on this point, it was at least possible for the two parties to bear charitably with each other, and to unite in opposing Romanism. The Saxons, who did not wish to bind themselves by any promises in a private conference, said that this proposition would have to be further considered in the fear of the Lord. After all the remaining articles had been agreed to, they came to the question of election, although this doctrine is not expressly presented in the Confession of Augsburg. Both Lutherans and Reformed agreed in the doctrine that only a part of mankind will be saved, the Reformed theologians basing election on the absolute will of God, and reprobation on the unbelief of man. The Lutherans, on the other hand, considered election as the result of God's prescience of the faith of the elect. The fact that the theologians of the contending churches had been brought to meet together peaceably, and to explain to each other their respective doctrines, was not without a great influence for good, although the greater hopes for the future to which it gave rise were not destined to be fulfilled. As the colloquy was a private conference, it was thought best not to give its proceedings an undue publicity, and only four copies of its protocols were published, and delivered one to each of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, one to the landgrave of Hesse, and one to the theological faculty of Leipsic. A full account, however, was subsequently published in England, France, Switzerland, Holland, and Sweden. The suspicions of both parties made any decided advance impossible, and resulted finally in greater estrangement of both, and in renewed attacks by the able Lutheran polemic Hoe (q. v.), of which a new and lengthy controversy was the result. See C. W. Hering, *Gesch. d. Kirchlichen Unionsversuche*, etc. (Lpz. 1836), i, 327 sq.; Alex. Schweizer, *D. protestantischen Centraldogmen*, part ii, p. 525; *Kurtzer Discurs von d. z. Leipzic* 1631 mense Martio *angestellten Religionsvergleychung*, etc. (Berlin, 1635); Niemeyer, *Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum* (Lpz. 1840), p. 653 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book iv, cent. xvii, sect. ii, pt. ii, ch. i, § 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 286.

Leipsic, Discussion of. See Eck; Carlstadt, etc.

Leipsic, Interim of. See Interim (III).

Leitch, William, D.D., a Scotch divine, was born in 1814 in the town of Rothesay, a famous watering-place on the island of Bute, Scotland, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, which he entered at the age of eighteen, and graduated as master in 1836 with the highest honors in the departments of mathematical and physical science. While a student he also lectured in the university on astronomy, and as a result of his studies in this department we have from him a work entitled *God's Glory in the Heavens; or, Contributions to Astro-theology*, which contains the most recent astronomical discoveries stated with special reference to theological questions. In 1838 he was licensed as a preacher of the Gospel in the Church of Scotland by the Presbytery of Dunoon. In 1843 he received a presentation to the parish of Monimail. He continued minister of this parish until 1859, when he was selected as principal of Queen's University. He is well known to have been the author of certain articles in which, in a masterly manner, the views of the late Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, on the subject of miracles, are controverted. For several years he conducted a series of investigations on the subject of partheno-genesis and alternate generations, as illustrated by the phenomena of sexual development in hymenoptera. The result of these researches, which conflicts with that of the German physiologist Siebald in the same field, is given in the *Transactions of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, and in the *Annals of the Botanical Society of Canada*. Several separate publications of his also appeared on the subject of education. In 1860 he became principal of Queen's University, and this connection afforded him a seat in the Presbytery of Kingston, and, in consequence, in the synod also. His position also gave him a seat in the senatus of the University of Toronto, and he was appointed an examiner of that university. He died in 1862. See Appleton's *Amer. Ann. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 625.

Leitomysl or **Leitomischel,** John, a Bohemian prelate noted for his energetic character and his unrelenting hostility to the Hussites, flourished in the latter

part of the 14th and the early years of the 15th century. He first comes under our notice as one of the two prelates—the archbishop of Prague being the other—before whom John Huss was to be cited for heresy. His position and influence in Bohemia were such that Stephen Paletz, writing against Huss, dedicated to him his *Dialogus Volatilis*. As the troubles at Prague increased, he was one of those to whom the archbishop of Prague applied for advice, and his response was in accordance with his notoriously stern and unbending character. When the Council of Constance met in 1414, he was present as a member, and took a leading part in its proceedings. He was the first to denounce the Calixtine practice, recently introduced by Jacobel at Prague, and he was commissioned by the council to take measures for its suppression. His enmity to Huss was signalized by the language used by him in the council, and excited the deep indignation of the friends of the Reformer, who did not hesitate to reprehend his course publicly in severe terms. His persistent energy, however, merited the eulogiums of the council, and by them he was appointed to bear their threatening letter to Bohemia, in which they attempted to terrify the followers of Huss into submission. The mission, however, proved a failure. The person of the bishop was no longer safe in his own country, and he returned to the council. The first reward of his diligence was his promotion, about A.D. 1416, to the bishopric of Olmutz, in Moravia. On the secession of Conrad, archbishop of Prague, to the Calixtines a short time afterwards, he was promoted to the vacant dignity. This, however, he was not destined to enjoy. The ascendency of the Calixtines must have excluded him from Prague, if not from Bohemia; and perhaps among all the enemies of the Hussites, during the period of their religious wars, there was no one who could have been sooner made the victim of their vengeance than the obnoxious bishop. But as no mention is made of him at a subsequent date, and as he does not appear to have fallen into the hands of the Hussite leaders, we may presume that his life must have closed soon after the dissolution of the Council of Constance. He was eminently a martial prelate, and was known by the sobriquet of "John the Iron." Notices of him will be found in many histories of his times. See Von der Hardt, *Authorities on the Council of Constance;* Lenfant, *Council of Constance;* Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, vols. i and ii; F. Polacky, *Mag. J. Hus Documenta.*—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 296 sq. (E. H. G.)

Lejay, Gui-Michel, a noted French scholar in exegetical theology, was born at Paris in 1588. While at the high school he paid particular attention to the Eastern languages, and in 1615 projected a polyglot of the Bible, known as the Paris Polyglot (Paris, 1629–45, 10 vols. folio), and entitled *Biblia Hebraica, Samaritana, Chaldaica, Græca, Syriaca, Latina, Arabica, quibus textus originales totius Scripturæ sacræ, quarum pars in editione Complutensi, deinde in Antverpiensi regiis sumptibus extat, nunc integri ex manuscriptis toto fere orbe quæsitis exemplaribus exhibentur*. The first four vols. contain the Heb., Chald., Sept., and Vulg. texts of the O. T.; vols. v and vi the N. T. in Gr., Syr., Arab., and Lat.; vol. vii, the Heb. Samar. Pent., the Sam. version, with translation by Morinus, the Arab. and Syr. Pent.; vols. viii–x, the rest of the books of the O. Test. in Syr. and Arab. Lejay lost largely by this publication; but, as a reward for his labor and cost, he was ennobled. The work was the best of its kind till the London Polyglot appeared, by which it was soon superseded. See Lelong, *Discours historique sur les principales editions des Bibles polyglottes* (Paris, 1713, 12mo), p. 104 sq., 379, 399 sq., 545, 546 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 512 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lejbowicz. See Frank.

Lejuive, Paul, a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1592, entered the Jesuitical order, and labored in Canada for seventeen years. He returned to France in 1632, and died Aug. 7, 1664. He published a descriptive work on Canada and its native tribes (7 vols., 1640).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 518.

Leland, Aaron, a Baptist minister, sixth in descent from Henry Leland, the Puritan ancestor of all the Lelands in America, but in a different line from his more noted contemporary, Rev. John Leland, was born in Holliston, Mass., May 28, 1761. Of a naturally vigorous and inquisitive mind, he grew up with a larger measure of intelligence than his limited means of early culture would have indicated as probable. He united in 1785 with the Baptist Church in Bellingham, by which Church he was licensed to preach, and subsequently ordained. He soon after removed to Chester, Vt., where he gathered a small Church, which in thirteen years had become five—in Chester, Andover, Grafton, Wethersfield, and Cavendish. From Chester he visited Jamaica, in the same county, guided through the wilderness by marked trees: these visits resulted in the formation of several churches in that vicinity. He was not only an active and successful minister, but had important civil trusts committed to him by the suffrages of his fellow-citizens. He sat in the state Legislature several years; three years he was speaker of the House; four years a member of the council; five years successively lieutenant governor; and nothing but his own conviction of its incompatibility with the duties of his higher calling prevented his election to the governorship of the state. He refused to permit any civil engagements to hinder his usefulness and success as a Christian minister, and he continued to fulfil his calling with great energy, zeal, and success, until worn out with toil. He died August 25, 1833. He was a popular and effective preacher. His commanding form and countenance; his musical and sonorous voice; his ready and fervid, often impassioned utterance; his vigorous intellect and great tenderness of spirit, gave him unusual power over congregations. He was often sought as an orator on public occasions, and called to give counsel in ecclesiastical questions. His zeal was enlisted in the temperance cause, insisting on total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, and in promoting ministerial education and all liberal culture. He was in the board of fellows of Middlebury College from the year 1800 till his death. (L. E. S.)

Leland, John (1), a celebrated English divine, was born at Wigan, Lancashire, Oct. 18, 1691, and was educated at the University in Dublin. In 1716 he became pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Dublin. He afterwards distinguished himself in a series of works in which he defended with great eloquence the Christian religion against the attacks of Atheists and Deists. As an acknowledgment of his services, the University of Aberdeen gave him the title of D.D. He died Jan. 16, 1766. His important works are, *Defence of Christianity* (Dublin, 1733, 2 vols. 8vo, and often; intended as an answer to Tindal's *Christianity as old as the Creation*, Dublin, 1773, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The divine Authority of the Old and New Testament asserted, with a particular Indication of the Characters of Moses and the Prophets, and Jesus Christ and his Apostles, against the unjust Aspersions and false Reasoning of a Book entitled "The Moral Philosopher"* (Lond. 1739, 8vo):—*View of the principal Deistical Writers in England in the last and present Century* (ibid. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo), and two supplements. A new edition, with Appendix, by W. L. Brown, D.D., was published in 1798 (2 vols. 8vo). The best edition is the fifth, which has a valuable Introduction, comprising a succinct view of the subsequent history of the controversy, by Cyrus R. Edmonds (London, 1837, 8vo). He who can read this work and yet remain an unbeliever in Christianity must be hopelessly obtuse or perversely prejudiced:—*Advantage and Necessity of Christian Revelation* (London, 1764, 2 vols. 4to). After his death, his *Sermons* were published in 4 volumes 8vo by Dr. Isaac Weld, with the Life of Dr. Leland. See the last work,

and *British Biog.* vol. x; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leland, John (2), a Baptist minister, distantly related to Aaron Leland (see above), was born in Grafton, Massachusetts, May 14, 1754. About the age of eighteen he had strong and painful religious impressions; he emerged into light and peace gradually, and, after the lapse of several months, was baptized in June, 1774, in Bellingham, and was regularly licensed by the Church. He removed in 1776 to Virginia, where for above fourteen years he exercised an itinerant ministry, preaching over all the eastern section of the state, sometimes extending his tours southward into North Carolina, and northward as far as Philadelphia. He was ordained in Virginia, somewhat irregularly, in 1777, and again ten years later, with more regard to form and customary usage. His evangelical labors were attended with large success. He baptized seven hundred persons, and gathered churches at Orange and Louisa, one of three hundred and the other of two hundred members. He made the acquaintance of Mr. Madison, with whom he maintained a pleasant correspondence for many years, effectively co-operating with him to secure the ratification by Virginia of the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he returned to New England, and the year following settled in Cheshire, Mass., where he resided till his death. Though acting for a limited period as pastor of the Church in Cheshire, he was always an itinerant, making extensive tours over western Massachusetts, often into the adjacent parts of New York, and into more distant sections of New England; twice visiting Virginia, and, wherever he went, preaching and baptizing—these two items of "the great commission" (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20) being all to which he felt himself called. His last record of baptism was Aug. 17, 1834, when he was over eighty years of age, which brought up the number of baptisms in his ministry to 1524. He still continued to preach, and died in the work at North Adams, Mass., Jan. 14, 1841. He recorded, when at the age of sixty-six, that he had then preached eight thousand sermons, and in order to do it had travelled distances which would thrice girdle the globe. His *Life and Remains*, edited by his daughter, including an autobiography, additional memoirs, and eighty pieces—sermons, tracts, public addresses, and essays on religious, moral, and political topics—most of which had been printed in pamphlet form during his life, were published not long after his decease, forming a volume of 700 pages 8vo. "Elder" Leland, as he was commonly styled, was in theology a Calvinist of the old school. He was always popular as a preacher and writer, especially among the less-cultivated class. The elements of his success were a strikingly original, often eccentric cast of thought; a terse, telling expression, abounding in compact, apothegmatic, easily-remembered sentences; a vigorous Saxon-English diction; slightly provincial ("Yankee"), homely illustration, often a spice of humor, and his sermons were never wanting in earnest appeal. These qualities were aided by his tall figure, the compass of his voice, and a peculiar but effective action. His singular views as to the limit of his ministerial duty, leading him to baptize converts without gathering them into churches, caused his success as an evangelist to leave less durable traces than might otherwise have been looked for. The relations of Church and State in Virginia and in most of New England, during the earlier period of his ministry, led him into a habit of political activity which was sometimes censured by persons unable to appreciate a state of society which had passed away. Two hymns, published anonymously in most hymn-books—one the popular evening hymn, "The day is past and gone;" the other beginning, "Now the Saviour standeth pleading"—are ascribed to his pen, and not improbably the simple melodies in which they are oftenest sung. His productions, consisting of several sermons, essays, and addresses, were published after his death, with a memoir of the author by Miss L. F. Greene (1845, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vi, 174. (L. E. S.)

Leland, Thomas, D.D., an English divine, was born at Dublin in 1722, and was educated at Trinity College in that city. He became senior fellow of the college, and was made a professor of poetry there in 1763; afterwards vicar of Bray, and later chaplain to the lord lieutenant of Ireland. He died in 1785. Leland was a profound scholar and a most eloquent preacher. He published the *Orations of Demosthenes*, Latin version and notes (London, 1754, 2 vols. 12mo), in conjunction with Dr. John Stokes:—the *Orations* [19] *of Demosthenes*, in English (1756–61–70, 3 vols. 4to; last ed. 1831, 12mo):—*Hist. of the Life and Reign of Philip, King of Macedon* (1758, 2 vols. 4to; last ed. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Dissertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence*, etc. (1764, 4to), elicited by bishop Warburton's Discourse on the Doctrine of Grace: answered (anonymously) by Hurd, on behalf of Warburton, in a very petulant letter. Answer to a letter to him, etc., 1764, 4to. This is a reply to Hurd. Leland answered for himself, and, in the opinion of all the world, completely demolished his antagonist. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lelong, Jacques, an eminent French bibliographer, was born at Paris April 19, 1665. In 1677 he was sent by his father to Malta, to be educated as a member of the order of Knights, but not liking the severity with which he was treated, he obtained permission to return to Paris. Here he continued his studies, and, as he had not yet taken the vows of the Order of St. John of Malta, he entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1686. He became successively professor of mathematics in the College of Juilli, and afterwards in the seminary of Notre Dame des Vertus, near Paris. Later he was appointed librarian of that institution, and in 1699 was transferred in the same capacity to the library of the Oratoire St. Honoré, at Paris, one of the richest in that city, especially in Oriental books and MSS. This position he occupied for twenty-two years, rendering the greatest services to the scientific world by his valuable bibliographical researches, and by a threefold catalogue. He died Aug. 17, 1721. His most important work, which is yet highly prized by students, is his *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Par. 1709, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1723, 2 vols. fol.—this latter ed. is by far the best). Another augmented edition was published after his death by Desmolets, a priest of the Oratory (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. fol.). A valuable supplement was afterwards added to it, and the whole work carefully revised, by Chr. Fr. Börner (Lips. 1709); another enlarged and extended edition was published by A. G. Masch (Halle, 1778–1790, 5 vols. 4to). As a historian, Lelong distinguished himself particularly by his *Bibliothèque historique de la France, contenant le catalogue des ouvrages imprimés et manuscrits, qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume* (Par. 1719; 2d ed. by Fevret de Fontette, Par. 1768, 5 vols. fol.). This was to have been followed by notices on the author of these works. Lelong wrote *Discours historiques sur les principales editions des Bibles Polyglottes* (Paris, 1713):—*Supplément à l'histoire des dictionnaires Hébreux de Wolfius* (Par. 1707):—*Nouvelle methode des langues Hébraique et Chaldaique* (Par. 1708), etc. See Desmolets, *Vie du P. Lelong*, in the 2d and 3d edition of the *Bibliotheca Sacra;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 290; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 540 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Lemaistre de Saci (or **Sacy**), Isaac Louis, a noted French Jansenist theologian, a nephew of Antoine Arnauld le Grand, was born in Paris March 29, 1613; was ordained a priest in 1650, and became confessor or principal director of the recluses of Port Royal. Entangled in a controversy with the Jesuits, he was persecuted by the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, in 1661, and, after having vainly sought refuge among friends, was confined in the Bastile in 1666. During his imprisonment, which lasted two years, he made a French trans-

lation of the Old Testament. He had previously been one of the translators of the New Testament of Mons (1667), which was often reprinted. In consequence of renewed persecution, he left Port Royal in 1679, seeking peace and quiet at the country seat of a friend of his. There he died, Jan. 4, 1684. He published French versions of several classical works, and of valuable theological treatises; also of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 568; Ste. Beuve, *Port Royal*, ii, 1, 2; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v. Sacy, de.

Le Mercier, Jacques, a French architect, born at Pontoise about 1600, is noted as the builder of the Church of the Sorbonne at Paris, reared by order of cardinal Richelieu about 1635. Le Mercier obtained the title of chief architect to the king. Among other admired works of his are the Church of the Annonciade at Tours, and that of Saint Roch in Paris. He died in 1660.—Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* p. 1401; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 583.

Lemoine, François, a celebrated French painter of the 18th century, was born at Paris in 1688. He was the pupil of Louis Galloche, early distinguished himself, and in 1718 was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Painting. His great reputation at this time is due mainly to his painting, in oil, of the Transfiguration of Christ on the ceiling of the choir of the Church des Jacobins, Rue du Bacq. In 1724 Lemoine visited Italy, and in the year following, on his return to France, was made professor of painting in the Academy. Louis XV appointed him in 1736 his principal painter, with a salary of 4100 francs, in the place of Louis de Boullogne, deceased. The first of Lemoine's great works was the cupola of the chapel of the Virgin in St. Sulpice, in fresco, which he commenced in 1729—a work of three years' labor. His masterpiece, however, is the Apotheosis of Hercules, painted in oil on canvas pasted on the ceiling of the Salon d'Hercule at Versailles, commenced in 1732, and finished in 1736. He committed suicide June 4, 1737. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 617, *English Cyclopœdia*, s. v.

L'Empereur, Constantine, a celebrated Dutch Orientalist, was born at Oppyck, in the Netherlands, about 1570. He was professor of Hebrew at Harderwyk until 1627, when he was called to the University of Leyden as professor of Hebrew, and some time after was made professor of theology in that high school. He died in 1648. L'Empereur edited the Commentary of Aben-Ezra and Mos. Alschech on Isa. lii, 13–liii, 12, with notes (Leyd. 1633); and the Paraphrase of Joseph ben-Jachja on Daniel, with translation and notes (Amsterd. 1633), also the Mishnic tracts *Baba Kama* and *Middoth* (Leyd. 1737, 4to). He wrote himself *De Dignitate et Utilitate Linguæ Hebraicæ* (1627, 8vo):—*Clavis Talmudica, complectens formulas, loca dialectica et logica priscorum Judæorum* (Leyden, 1634, 4to):—*De legg. Hebr. forens.* (Leyd. 1637, 4to); and *Disputationes theologicæ* (Leyd. 1648, 8vo). See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 642; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 245 sq.

Lemprière, John, a distinguished English biographer, was born in Jersey about 1760. He was educated at Winchester and at Pembroke College, Oxford, and subsequently became first head master of Abingdon Grammar-school, and later of the school at Exeter. In 1810 he resigned the latter, and the following year was presented to the livings of Meeth and Newton Petrock, in Devonshire, which he retained until his death, Feb. 1, 1824. Lemprière was a man of extensive learning, and thoroughly acquainted with antiquity. His *Bibliotheca Classica* (1788, 8vo; subsequently reprinted, with additions by himself) is still in general use in the universities. He wrote also a translation of *Herodotus*, with notes (1792), of which the first volume only was published, and a *Universal Biography* (1803, 4to and 8vo). This last work, compiled with great care, has run through several editions. The name of Lemprière was once well known to every English-speaking classical student, but the rising generation is forgetting it, and it will soon become *vox et præterea nihil*. A *Classical Dictionary* (*Bibliotheca Classica*, 1788) of his was for many years the English standard work of reference on all matters of ancient mythology, biography, and geography. See Davenport, *Ann. Biog.* 1824; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxx, 643; Chambers, *Cyclopœdia*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lem'uël (Hebrew *Lemuël'*, לְמוּאֵל, Prov. xxxi, 1; Sept. ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, Vulgate *Lamuel;* also *Lemoël*, לְמוֹאֵל, Prov. xxxi, 4; Sept. *πάντα ποιεῖ*, Vulgate *Lamuel*), an unknown prince, to whom the admonitory apothegms of Prov. xxxi, 2–9 were originally addressed by his mother. Most interpreters understand Solomon to be meant either symbolically (the name signifying *to God*, i. e. created by him) or by a pleasing epithet (see Rosenmüller, *Scholia ad Prov.* p. 718). The Rabbinical commentators identify Lemuel with Solomon, and tell a strange tale that when he married the daughter of Pharaoh, on the day of the dedication of the Temple, he assembled musicians of all kinds, and passed the night awake. On the morrow he slept till the fourth hour, with the keys of the Temple beneath his pillow, when his mother entered, and upbraided him in the words of Prov. xxxi, 2–9. Others (e. g. Grotius) refer it to Hezekiah (by a precarious etymology), while still others (e. g. Gesenius) think that no Israelite is referred to, but some neighboring petty Arabian prince. On the other hand, according to Eichhorn (*Einleitung*, v, 106), Lemuel is altogether an imaginary person (so Ewald; comp. Bertholdt, v, 2196 sq.). Prof. Stuart (*Comment. on Prov.* p. 403 sq.) renders the expression "Lemuel, the king of Massa," and regards him as the brother of Agur, whom he makes to have been likewise a son of the queen of Massa, in the neighborhood of Dumah. See Agur; Ithiel. In the reign of Hezekiah, a roving band of Simeonites drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir and settled in their stead (1 Chron. iv, 38–43), and from these exiles of Israelitish origin Hitzig conjectures that Lemuel and Agur were descended, the former having been born in the land of Israel; and that the name Lemuel is an older form of Nemuel, the first-born of Simeon (*Die Sprüche Salomo's*, p. 310–314). But this interpretation is far-fetched; and none is more likely than that which fixes the epithet upon Solomon. See Proverbs.

Lemŭrès, the general designation given by the Romans to all spirits of departed persons, of whom the good were honored as Lares (q. v.), and the bad (Larvæ) were feared, as ghosts or spectres still are by the superstitious. The common idea was that the Lemures and Larvæ were the same, and were said to wander about during the night, seeking for an opportunity of inflicting injury on the living (Horat. *Epist.* ii, 2, 209; Pers. v, 185). The festival called *Lemuria* was held on the 9th, 11th, and 13th of May, and was accompanied with ceremonies of washing hands, throwing black beans over the head, etc., and the pronunciation nine times of these words: "Begone, you spectres of the house!" which deprived the Lemures of their power to harm. Ovid describes the Lemuria in the fifth book of his *Fasti*. See *De Deo Sacr.* p. 237, ed. Bip.; Servius, *ad Æn.* iii, 63; Varro, *ap. Non.* p. 135; comp. Hartung, *Die Religion der Römer*, i, 55, etc.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* vol. ii, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Lend (represented by several Heb. words which in other forms likewise signify to *borrow*, e. g. לָוָה, *lavah'*; נָשָׁה, *nashah'*; עָבַט, *abat'*; Gr. *δανείζω*, *χράω*). Among the Israelites, in the time of Moses, it must have been very common to lend on pledge, in the strict sense, according to the meaning of the word in natural law, which allows the creditor, in case of non-payment, to appropriate the pledge to his own behoof, without any authoritative interference of a magistrate, and to keep it just as rightfully as if it had been bought with the sum

which has been lent for it, and which remaims unpaid. But while pledges are under no judicial regulation, much extortion and villainy may be practiced, when the poor man who wishes to borrow is in straits, and must of course submit to all the terms of the opulent lender. It will not be imputed to Moses as a fault that his statutes contain not those legal refinements, which probably were not then invented, and which even yet may be said rather to be on record in our statute-books than to be in our practice. They would have been dangerous to his people, and peculiarly oppressive to the poor. He let *pledge* remain in its proper sense, pledge, and thus facilitated the obtaining of loans, satisfying himself with making laws against some of the chief abuses of pledging (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.*). See PLEDGE. These laws may be found in Exod. xxii, 25; Deut. xxiv, 6, 10–13. By the analogy of these laws, other sorts of pledges equally, if not more indispensable, such as the utensils necessary for agriculture, or the ox and ass used for the plough, must certainly, and with equal, and even greater reason, have been restored. The law in Deut. xxiv, 12, 13, is expressed in such general terms, that we cannot but see that *the pledge* under which the debtor must sleep is merely given as an example, and conclude, of course, that, in general, from the needy no pledge was to be exacted, the want of which might expose him to an inconvenience or hardship, more especially when we find the lawgiver here declaring that God would regard the restoration of such pledges as almsgiving, or righteousness. So it was in fact, and at the same time it was attended with no loss whatever to the creditor; for he had it in his power, at last, by the aid of summary justice, to lay hold of the whole property of the debtor, and if he had none, of his person; and in the event of non-payment, to take him for a hired servant. The law gave him sufficient security; but with this single difference, that he durst not make good payment at his own hand, but must prosecute (Lev. xxv, 39–55; Neh. v, 5). See DEBT. In the book of Job, the character of a lender upon pledge is thus depicted: "He extorts pledges without having lent, and makes his debtors go naked" (xxii, 6; xxiv, 7); "He takes the widow's ox for a pledge" (xxiv, 3); "He takes the infant of the needy for a pledge" (xxiv, 9–11). On this subject our Saviour exhorted his disciples to the most liberal and forbearing course towards all whom they could aid or who were indebted to them (Luke vi, 30–35). See LOAN; USURY.

Lenfant, Alexandre-Charles-Anne, a French priest of note, was born at Lyons Sept. 6, 1726, and was educated by the Jesuits of his native place. In 1741 he entered the order, and became professor of rhetoric at Marseilles. Endowed with great talent as a speaker, he became one of the most popular pulpit orators of his order. After its suppression Lenfant combated the doctrines of the philosophical antagonists of Christianity, particularly Diderot. In 1792 he was arrested by the Revolutionists, and subjected to capital punishment at Paris Sept. 3, 1793. His works are an *Oraison funèbre* on Belzunce, archbishop of Marseilles (1756, 8vo), and another on the father of Louis XVI (Nancy, 1766):—*Sermons pour l'Avent et pour le Carême* (Paris, 1818, 8 vols. 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 658.

Lenfant, Jacques, a very noted French preacher and theologian, the son of Paul Lenfant, the Protestant minister of Châtillon-sur-Seine, was born at Bazoche, in Beaure, a district of the ancient province of Orléannois, in France, April 13, 1661. Intended for the same profession as his father, he was sent to prosecute his studies at Saumur; and during his residence at that university he lived with the learned Jacques Cassel, the professor of Hebrew, with whom he formed a friendship which continued during their lives. He completed his theological education at Geneva and Heidelberg, in which latter town he was admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Church in 1684. Soon after his ordination he obtained the appointment of minister of the French Church at Heidelberg, and chaplain to the dowager electress Palatine. The invasion of the Palatinate by the French troops, under marshal Turenne, compelled Lenfant to leave Heidelberg in 1688, and he settled at Berlin. The fear of meeting his countrymen arose from his having rendered himself obnoxious to the Jesuits by two letters which he had written against that society, and which are appended to his work, entitled *A Preservative against a Reunion with the Church of Rome.* Though the Protestant French church of that city had already a sufficient number of pastors attached to it, the reigning elector of Brandenburg, Frederick, afterwards king of Prussia, who knew Lenfant by reputation, appointed him to that church, where for upwards of thirty-nine years he performed duty. In 1707, on a visit to England, he preached before queen Anne, and it is said that he so pleased the queen that she desired him to enter the Church of England, and offered him the appointment as her chaplain. In 1710 he obtained the situation of chaplain to the king of Prussia, and councillor of the High Consistory. Lenfant was suddenly attacked with paralysis, while in the apparent enjoyment of perfect health, July 29, 1728, and died on the 7th of August following. His disposition is represented as having been extremely amiable, and his manner simple and modest. Of a reflective turn of mind, he spoke but little, and that little well. Though a most voluminous writer, he was fond of society, and opened himself without reserve to the confidence of his friends. As a preacher, his manner was pleasing and persuasive; the matter of his discourse was chiefly of a practical nature, and his eloquence was rather chaste than energetic. The style of his writing is elegant, though never florid; it has less force than that of Jurieu, and less eloquence than that of Saurin, but the French is purer, and the diction more refined. It is not certain whether he was the first to form the design of the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, which was commenced in 1720, but he took a prominent part in its execution, and is the acknowledged author of the preface. Lenfant's first work, which appeared in 1683, was a review of one of Brueys, who, though a celebrated French dramatist, has written several theological works in defence of the Roman Catholic faith. In 1688 he published a translation of a selection from the letters of St. Cyprian; in 1690, a defence of the Heidelberg Catechism, which is generally annexed to his *Preservative*, etc., a work we have before alluded to; and in 1691, a Latin translation of the celebrated work of the père Malebranche, *La Recherche de la Verité.* His history of the female pope Joan appeared in 1694: the arguments in it are drawn from the Latin dissertation on that subject of Spanheim. It is said, however, that in after life Lenfant discovered and acknowledged the absurdity of this fiction. See JOAN, POPE. In 1708 appeared his remarks on the Greek edition of the New Testament by Mill, which are in the *Bibliothèque Choisie* of Le Clerc, vol. xvi. The following works afterwards appeared in succession: 1. *Réflexions et Remarques sur la Dispute du Père Martiany avec un Juif*:—2. *Mémoire Historique touchant la Communion sur les deux espèces*:—3. *Critique des Remarques du Père Vavaseur; sur les Réflexions de Rapin touchant la Poëtique*:—4. *Réponse de Mons. Lenfant à Mons. Dartis au sujet du Socinianisme.* The above short works are to be found in the *Nouvelle de la République des Lettres*, a review to which Lenfant was a frequent contributor. In 1714 was published his learned and interesting *Histoire du Concile de Constance* (Amsterd. 1714, 2 vols. 4to; 1727, and an Engl. transl. Lond. 1730, 2 vols. 4to). Two years after he wrote an apology for this work, which had been severely attacked in the *Journal de Trévoux.* In 1718, in conjunction with Beausobre, he published a translation of the New Testament, with explanatory notes, and a long and most learned introduction. It is by this work (*Le Nouv. Test. traduit en Français sur l'original Grec*, Amsterdam, 1718, 2 vols. 4to), perhaps, that he is best known to English-speaking students.

Among the most important of his other productions are *Poggiana, or the Life, Character, and Maxims of the celebrated Florentine Writer Poggio* (Amsterdam, 1720):—*A Preventive against Reunion with the See of Rome, and Reasons for Separation from that See* (Amsterdam, 1723), a work which continues to enjoy great popularity among Protestants:—*Histoire du Concile de Pise, et de ce qui s'est passé de plus mémorable depuis ce Concile jusqu'a celui de Constance*, a learned and accurate work, written with sufficient impartiality (Amsterd. 1724, 2 vols. 4to):—a volume containing sixteen *Sermons on different Texts of Scripture* (1728):—a small volume of *Remarks on Gisbert's Treatise on Pulpit Eloquence*, a work which has greatly added to his already high reputation:—*Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Bâle* (Amsterd. 1731, 2 vols. 4to), for which he had been many years collecting materials, and in the preparation of which, through the influence of the king of Prussia, he had access to the archives of the corporation of Basle. See *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 657; *Biblioth. Germanique*, xvi, 115 sq.

Leng, John, an English prelate, was born in 1665, and, after having completed his studies at Cambridge, became chaplain to king George I. In 1723 his royal master made Leng bishop of Norwich. He died in 1727. He published editions of the Plutus and Nubes of Aristophanes (1695):—an excellent edition of Terence (Cambridge, 1701):—*Sermons at Boyle's Lectures* (1717–18), and twelve separate *Sermons* (1699–1727). See Nichols's *Lit. Anec. Lyson's Environs.*— Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, ii, 1084.

Lengerke, Cäsar, a noted German theologian, was born at Hamburg March 30, 1803. He was educated at the University of Königsberg, and became a professor of theology and Oriental languages at that high school in 1829. He died Feb. 3, 1855. His most important works are, *De Ephræmi Syri arte hermeneutica liber* (1831):—*Das Buch Daniel* (1835):—*Kenaan, Volks und Religionsgesch. Israels*, vol. i (1814).

Lenoir, John, a French Jansenist priest, was born at Alençon in 1622. He became theological canon of Seez in 1652, and acquired great reputation as a preacher both in Normandy and at Paris. He was accused of Jansenism, and by his quarrelsome disposition was made the subject of many annoyances. Rouxel de Medavy, bishop of Seez, who had issued a charge for the publication of the Formulary, accused him of various errors, namely, of having permitted the publication of a work entitled *Le Chrétien Champêtre* by a layman, who said expressly that "there are four divine persons who are to be worshipped by the faithful, namely, Jesus Christ, St. Joseph, St. Anna, and St. Joachim; and that our Lord is present in the sacrament of the altar like a chicken in an egg-shell." Lenoir presented then a petition to Louis XIV, together with an attack on some propositions which he considered as heretical. His writings on these subjects were exceedingly violent: he attacked Rouxel de Medavy, who was then archbishop of Rouen, and even De Harlay, the archbishop of Paris. A commission was appointed to judge him, and he was condemned, April 24, 1684, to make a public apology in front of the cathedral at Paris, and to work for life on the galleys. The sentence was not fully carried out; but he remained à prisoner successively in the prisons of St. Malo, Brest, and Nantes until his death, April 22, 1692. He wrote, *Avantages incontestables de l'Église sur les Calvinistes* (Paris and Sens, 1673, 12mo):—*Nouvelles Lumières politiques, ou l'Evangile nouveau* (1676 and 1687, 12mo: this work arrested the publication of a French translation of the History of the Council of Trent by Pallavicini, and went through a third edition under the title of *Politique et Intrigues de la cour de Rome* [1696, 12mo]):—*L'évêque de cour opposé à l'évêque apostolique* (Cologne, 1682, 2 vols, 12mo):—*Lettre à Mme la duchesse de Guise sur la domination épiscopale*, etc. (1679, 12mo). See *Supplém. au Nécrolog. de Port Royal*, 1735; *Dict. hist. des auteurs eccles.*; Feller, *Dict. hist.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxviii, 203. (J. N. P.)

Lent, the forty days' fast, is the preparation for Easter in the Western, Eastern, and Lutheran churches, and in the Church of England, and was instituted at a very early age of Christianity. In most languages the name given to this fast signifies the number of the days —*Forty*; but our word *Lent* signifies the *Spring Fast*, for "Lenten-Tide" in the Anglo-Saxon language was the season of spring, in German *Lenz*. (For another etymology, see Lentile.) It is observed in commemoration of our Lord's fast in the wilderness (Matt. iv); and although he did not impose it on the world by an express commandment, yet he showed plainly enough by his example that fasting, which God had so frequently ordered in the *old* covenant, was also to be practised by the children of the *new*. The observance of Lent was doubtless strongly confirmed by those words of the Redeemer in answer to the disciples of John the Baptist: "Can the children of the Bridegroom mourn as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast" (Luke v, 34, 35). Hence we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples, after the foundation of the Church, applied themselves to fasting. In their epistles, also, they recommended it to the faithful. The primitive Christians seem to have considered Christ, in the above-mentioned passage, as alluding to the institution of a particular season of fasting and prayer in his future Church, and it was therefore only natural that they should have made this period of penitence to consist of *forty days*, seeing that our divine Master had consecrated that number by his own fast, and before him Moses and Elijah had done the same; it was even deduced from the forty years' staying of the Israelites in the desert (Augustine, *Serm.* cclxiv, § 5). See Fasting, vol. iii, p. 489 (II).

I. *Practice of the Early Church.*—In the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles, it does not appear that much value was attached to the practice of fasting. In the *Shepherd* of Hermas it is spoken of in disparaging terms. Very little notice was taken of fasting by the writers of the first centuries, which may be accounted for from the discouraging influence of the doctrines of Montanus, the tenets of the new Platonic school, and the progress of Gnosticism. Hence it seems that the observance of fasts was introduced into the Church slowly and by degrees. We learn from Justin Martyr that fasting was joined with prayer at Ephesus in the administration of baptism, which is worthy of being noted as an early addition to the original institution. In the 2d century, in the time of Victor and Irenæus, it had become usual to fast before Easter, yet it consisted not in a single fast, but rather in a series of solemnities, which were deemed worthy of celebration. It was therefore the custom of several congregations to prepare themselves by mortification and fasting, inaugurated on the afternoon of the day on which they commemorated the crucifixion, and it was continued until the morning of the anniversary of the resurrection. The whole interval would thus be only about forty hours (Chrysostom, *Orat. adv. Judæos*, iii, § 4, vol. i, p. 611: *οἱ πατέρες ἐτύπωσαν, κ.τ.λ.*; *Hom.* ii *in Genesin*, § 1, vol. iv, p. 8; Irenæus, *Epist. ad Victorin. Papam*; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v, 24; Dionys. Alex. *Epist. Canon.*; Beveridge, *Synoduon*). Clement of Alexandria, however, speaks of weekly fasts. Tertullian, in his treatise *De Jejunio*, complains bitterly of the little attention paid by the Church to the practice of fasting; by which we may see that even orthodox Christians exercised in this matter that liberty of judgment which had been sanctioned by the apostles. Origen adverts to this subject only once, in his 10th *Homily on Leviticus*, where he speaks in accordance with the apostolical doctrine. It appears, however, from his observations, that at Alexandria Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as fast-days, on

the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday, and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be seen from a passage of Epiphanius: "In the whole Christian Church the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed: On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour," etc.

But even at this comparatively late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. Only later was the number of days (namely, *forty*) fixed according to the Greek and Latin names (τεσσαρακόστη = quadragesima). But for a long time the Oriental and Occidental churches differed. As the former did not permit its members to fast on the Sabbath, their fast continued one week longer (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* i, v, c. 22; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 24; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 19). The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary at first. This fasting consisted in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon, but at a later period a custom was introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water.

Some, however, who had become subject to the rules of the Church, tried to compensate themselves for their privation during the fasts by banqueting on the days preceding them (Chrysostom, *De pœnitentia*, hom. v, § 5, vol. ii, p. 315). Others adhered literally to the rules of fasting by avoiding strictly the prohibited food, but prepared from that which was permitted costly dainties (Augustine, *Serm.* ccviii, § 1). The fathers and teachers of the Church of this period, as Chrysostom, Augustine, Maximus of Turin, Cæsarius of Arles, etc., spoke often against this hypocritical fasting, and showed that abstinence would then only be of service when avoidance of sinful habits, etc., as well as contrition of heart, was connected with it. The general design, then, of the primitive Church in fasting forty days, we may give in the words of Chrysostom: "Many heretofore were used to come to the communion indevoutly and inconsiderately, especially at that time, when Christ first gave it to his disciples. Therefore our forefathers, considering the mischief arising from such careless approaches, meeting together, appointed forty days for fasting and prayer, and hearing sermons, and for holy assemblies; that all men in these days, being carefully purified by prayer, and alms-deeds, and fasting, and watching, and tears, and confession of sins, and other like exercises, might come, according to their capacity, with a pure conscience, to the holy table."

"The rule of fasting for Lent varied greatly. It was usual to abstain from food altogether until evening, change of diet not being accounted sufficient. St. Ambrose exhorts men: 'Differ aliquantulum, non longe fines est diei' (*Serm. viii in Psalm cxviii*). The food, when taken, was to be of the simplest and least delicate kind, animal food and wine being prohibited. St. Chrysostom (*Hom. iv on Stat.*) speaks of those who for two days abstained from food, and of others who refused not only wine and oil, but every other dish, and throughout Lent partook of bread and water only. The Eastern Church, at the present day, observes a most strict rule of fasting. Wine and oil are allowed on Saturdays and Sundays, but even these days are only partially excepted from the restrictions of Lent. The discipline of Holy Week is exceedingly rigorous. During Lent corporeal punishment was forbidden by the laws of Theodosius the Great: 'Nulla supplicia sint corporis quibus (diebus) absolutio expectatur animarum' (*Cod. Theodos.* ix, tit. xxxv, leg. v.). Public games, and the celebration of birthdays and marriages, were also interdicted (*Concil. Laodic.* li, liii). It was the special time for preparing catechumens for baptism, and most of St. Cyril's catechetical lectures were delivered during Lent. St. Chrysostom's celebrated *Homilies on the Statutes* were preached during this season. Daily instruction formed a part of the service, and holy communion was celebrated at least every Lord's day. The last week, the Holy or Great Week, was kept with still greater strictness and solemnity" (Blunt, *Dict. of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, p. 408).

II. *Practice of later Times.*—Fasting, after a time, ceased to be a voluntary exercise. By the second canon of the Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one who should neglect to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. The eighth Council of Toledo, in the 7th century (canon 9), condemns any one who should eat flesh during the fast before Easter, and says that such offenders should be forbidden the use of it throughout the year. In the 8th century fasting began to be regarded as a meritorious work, and the breach of the observance at the stated times subjected the offender to excommunication. In later times some persons who ate flesh during Lent were punished with the loss of their teeth (Baronius, *Annal.* ad an. 1018). Afterwards these severities were to a great extent relaxed. Instead of the former limitation of diet on fast-days to bread, salt, and water, permission was given for the use of all kinds of food except flesh, eggs, cheese, and wine. Then eggs, cheese, and wine were allowed, flesh only being prohibited, an indulgence which was censured by the Greek Church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Latin. In the 13th century a cold collation in the evening of fast-days was permitted.

The following are the fasts which generally obtained in the Church: 1. *The annual fast of forty days* before *Easter*, or the *Season of Lent*. The duration of this fast at first was only forty hours (Tertull. *De Jejun.* c. 2, 13; Irenæus, ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. v, c. 24). By the time of Gregory the Great (in the 8th century) it had extended to thirty-six days, and it had been so accepted by the Council of Nicæa; but by Gregory the Great, or by Gregory II, it was extended to forty days, the duration of the recorded fasts of Moses, Elias, and our blessed Saviour (Exod. xxxiv, 28; 1 Kings xix, 8; Matt. iv, 2). Hence the term *Quadragesima* (q. v.), which had already been used to denote this period, became strictly applicable. Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* l. vii, c. 19), Basil the Great, Ambrose, and Leo the Great speak of this quadragesimal fast as a divine institution but this can mean no more than that the fast was observed in imitation of the example of the divine Redeemer (*Concil. Genonens.* c. 7—*in canone apostolorum*, 68: "Si quis Episcop., aut Presbyt., etc., sac. Quadragesimam Paschæ, aut quartam feriam, aut Parasecevem non jejunaverit," etc.: *Concil. Coloniens.* ii, pt. 9, can. 6). 2. *Quarterly fasts*, no traces of which occur before the 5th century, although Bellarmine (*De bonis operibus*, lib. ii, c. 19) says that the first three of these fasts were instituted in the times of the apostles, and the last by pope Calixtus, A.D. 224. 3. *A fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension*, introduced by Mamercus, bishop of Vienne, in the middle of the 5th century. In some places it was not celebrated until after Whitsuntide. It was called *Jejunium Rogationum*, or *Jejunium Litaniarum*, "the fast of Rogations or Litanies," on account of certain litanies sung on those days. The words λιτανεία and λιταί, "litanies," in Latin *Supplicationes* et *Rogationes*, in their original signification, are but another name for prayers in general, of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church or by any private person. (See Euseb. *Vit. Const.* l. i, c. 14; l. iv, c, 66; Chrysost. *Hom. antequam iret in exilium; Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi, tit. v, "De hæreticus," 1, 30, 1.) 4. *Monthly fasts*, a fast-day in every month except July and August (*Concil. Illiberit.* can. 23; *Turon.* ii, can. 18, 19). 5. *Fasts before festivals*, in the place of the ancient vigils which were abolished in the 5th century. 6. *Weekly fasts*, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled *stationes*, from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called *statio* by the Romans ("Stationum dies," Tertullian, *De Orat.*; "Stationibus quartam et sextam Sabbati dicamus," Idem, *De*

Jejunio; Τῆς νηστείας, τῆς τετράδος καὶ τῆς παρασκευῆς, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* l. 7). These fasts were not so strictly observed as some others, and were altogether omitted between Easter and Whitsuntide. The observance was enjoined especially upon the clergy and monks (*Constit. Apost.* v, 15; *Can. Apost.* 69). By the Council of Elvira, c. 26, at the beginning of the 4th century, Saturday was added to the weekly fasts, and this led to the gradual neglect of the Wednesday fast in the Western Church. The stations, or fasts on stationary days, terminated at three o'clock P.M. ("non ultra nonam detinendum," Tertullian, *De Jejunio;* "Quando et orationes fere nona hora concludat de Petri exemplo quod Act. x refertur," *ib.* c. 2). Hence Tertullian calls them *half-fasts* ("semijejunio stationum," *De Jejun.* c. 13). When a fast was continued the whole day, it was entitled *Jejunium*, or *Jejunium perfectum;* and when it lasted until the morning of the following day, or for several days together, it was distinguished by the title *Superpositio* (ὑπέρθησις). The latter kind of fasts was commonly observed during the *great week*, or week before Easter; but it was not strictly peculiar to that season. It exceeded the others not only in point of time, but by the observance of additional austerities, such as the ξηροφαγία, or *living on dry food*, namely, bread, salt, and water, taken only in the evening. 7. There were also *occasional fasts*, appointed by ecclesiastical authority in times of great danger, emergency, or distress (Cyprian, *Epist.* 8, § 1; 57, § 3; Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 40; *De Jejun.* c. 13).

III. *Practice in Modern Times.*—The Christians of the *Greek Church* observe *four* regular fasts. The first commences on the 15th day of November, or forty days before Christmas. The second is the one which immediately precedes Easter. The third begins the week after Whitsunday, and continues till the festival of St. Peter and Paul. The number of days, therefore, comprised in these seasons of fasting is not settled and determined, but they are more or less long, according as Whitsunday falls sooner or later. The fourth fast commences the 1st of August, and lasts no longer than till the 15th. These fasts are observed with great strictness and austerity. The only days when they indulge themselves in drinking wine and using oil are Saturdays and Sundays.

In the *English Church* Lent was first commanded to be observed in England by Ercombert, seventh king of Kent, before the year 800. The Lenten fast does not embrace all the days included between Ash-Wednesday and Easter, for the Sundays are so many days above the number of *forty*. They are excluded because the Lord's day is always held as a *festival*, and never as a *fast*. These six Sundays are therefore called Sundays *in* Lent, not Sundays *of* Lent. The principal days of Lent are the first day of Lent (*Caput Jejunii*, or *Dies Cinerum*), *Ash-Wednesday*, and the *Passion-week*, particularly Thursday and Friday in that week. There is also a solemn service appointed for Ash-Wednesday, under the title of a "Commination or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners." The last week of Lent, called Passion-week, has always been considered as its most solemn season. It is called the *great week*, for the important transactions which are then commemorated.

The same rules, observations, services, etc., are observed in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America as in the Church of England during the solemn season of Lent.

In nearly all the Protestant churches of Europe, particularly in the *Lutheran Church*, fasts and Lenten-season remain up to this day pretty much the same as in the Roman Catholic Church.

See Bellarmine, *Opera;* Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, art. Carême; Pascal, *La Liturgie catholique*, s. v.; Gfrörer's *Church History;* Hook, *Ch. Dict.* s. v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 660, 668; Hall, *Harmony* (see Index); *Bible and Missal*, p. 170; Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 348; Procter, *On Book of Common Prayer*, p. 250, 276, 277; Wheatley, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 217 sq. See FASTING.

Lentile (only in the plural עֲדָשִׁים, *adashim'*, prob. from an obsolete root signifying to *fodder;* Sept. φακός, Vulg. *lens*) is probably a correct rendering of the plant thus designated (Gen. xxv, 34; 2 Sam. xvii, 28; xxiii, 11; Ezek. iv, 9). In Syria lentiles are still called in Arabic *addas* (Russel, *N. H. of Aleppo*, i, 74). They appear to have been chiefly used for making a kind of pottage. The *red* pottage, for which Esau bartered his birthright, was of lentiles (Gen. xxv, 29–34). The term *red* was, as with us, extended to *yellowish-brown*, which must have been the true color of the pottage if derived from lentiles, being that of the seeds rather than that of the pods, which were sometimes cooked entire (Mishna, *Shabb.* vii, 4). The Greeks and Romans also called lentiles red (see authorities in Celsius, *Hierobotanic.* i, 105). Lentiles were among the provisions brought to David when he fled from Absalom (2 Sam. xvii, 28), and a field of lentiles was the scene of an exploit of one of David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 11). From Ezek. iv, 9, it would appear that lentiles were sometimes used as bread (comp. Athen. iv, 158). This was doubtless in times of scarcity, or by the poor (compare Aristoph. *Plut.* 1005). Sonnini (*Travels*, p. 603) assures us that in southernmost Egypt, where corn is comparatively scarce, lentiles mixed with a little barley form almost the only bread in use among the poorer classes. It is called *bettan*, is of a golden yellow color, and is not bad, although rather heavy. In that country, indeed, probably even more than in Palestine, lentiles anciently, as now, formed a chief article of food among the laboring classes. This is repeatedly noticed by ancient authors; and so much attention was paid to the culture of this useful pulse that certain varieties became remarkable for their excellence (comp. Dioscor. ii, 129). The lentiles of Pelusium, in the part of Egypt nearest to Palestine, were esteemed both in Egypt and foreign countries (Virgil, *Georg.* i, 228), and this is probably the valued Egyptian variety which is mentioned in the Mishna (*Kilaim*, xviii, 8) as neither large nor small. Large quantities of lentiles were exported from Alexandria (Augustine, *Comm. in Psa. xlvi*). Pliny, in mentioning two Egyptian varieties, incidentally lets us know that one of them was red (compare Diog. Laertius, vii, 3), by remarking that they like a red soil, and by speculating whether the pulse may not have thence derived the reddish color which it imparted to the pottage made with it (*Histor. Natur.* xviii, 12). This illustrates Jacob's red pottage. Dr. Shaw (i, 257) also states that these lentiles easily dissolve in boiling, and form a red or chocolate-colored pottage much esteemed in North Africa and Western Asia (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 409). Dr. Kitto also says that he has often partaken of red pottage, prepared by seething the lentiles in water and then adding a little suet to give them a flavor, and that he found it better food than a stranger would imagine; "the mess," he adds, "had the redness which gained for it the name of *adom*" (*Pict. Bible*, Gen. xxv, 30, 34). Putting these facts together, it is likely that the reddish lentile, which is now so common in Egypt (*Descript. de l'Égypte*, xix, 65), is the sort to which all these statements refer. The tomb-paintings actually exhibit the operation of preparing pottage of lentiles, or, as Wilkinson (*Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 387) describes it, "a man engaged in cooking

Ancient Egyptians cooking Lentiles.

lentiles for a soup or porridge; his companion brings a bundle of fagots for the fire, and the lentiles themselves are seen standing near him in wicker baskets." The lentiles of Palestine have been little noticed by travellers (e. g. Burckhardt, *Arab.* p. 51). Nau (*Voyage Nouveau*, p. 13) mentions lentiles along with corn and peas, as a principal article of traffic at Tortura; D'Arvieux (*Mém.* ii, 237) speaks of a mosque, originally a Christian church, over the patriarchal tomb at Hebron, connected with which was a large kitchen where lentile pottage was prepared every day, and distributed freely to strangers and poor people, in memory of the transaction between Esau and Jacob, which they (erroneously) believe to have taken place at this spot. When Dr. Robinson was at Akabah, he says: "The commissary in the castle had also a few stores for sale at enormous prices, but we bought little except a supply of lentiles, or small beans, which are common in Egypt and Syria under the name of *addas* (the name in Hebrew and Arabic being alike)—the same from which the pottage was made for which Esau sold his birthright. We found them very palatable, and could well conceive that, to a weary hunter faint with hunger, they might be quite a dainty" (*Bib. Res.* i, 146). Again, when at Hebron, on the 24th of May, he observes: "The wheat harvest here in the mountains had not yet arrived, but they were threshing barley, *addas* or lentiles, and also vetches, called by the Arabs kersuma, which are raised chiefly for camels" (*Bib. Res.* ii, 242).

The lentile (*Ervum lens* of Linnæus, class xvii, 3) is an annual plant, and the smallest of all the leguminosæ which are cultivated. It rises with a weak stalk about eighteen inches high, having pinnate leaves at each joint composed of several pairs of narrow leaflets, and terminating in a tendril, which supports it by fastening about some other plant. The small flowers,

The Lentile (*Ervum Lens*), with enlarged View of the Pod and Seed.

which come out of the sides of the branches on short peduncles, three or four together, are purple, and are succeeded by the short and flat legumes, which contain two or three flat round seeds, slightly curved in the middle (as indicated in the Latin *lens*, which optical science has appropriated as a name for circular glasses with spherical surfaces), and of a color varying from tawny red to almost black. The flower appears in May, and the seeds ripen in July. When ripe, the plants are rooted up if they have been sown along with other plants, as is sometimes done, but they are cut down when grown by themselves. They are threshed, winnowed, and cleaned like grain. There are three or four kinds of lentiles, all of which are still much esteemed in those countries where they are grown, viz., the south of Europe, Asia, and North Africa. The red lentile is a small kind, the seeds of which, after being decorticated, are commonly sold in the bazaars of India. To the present day a favorite dish among the Portuguese and Spaniards is lentiles, mixed with their unfailing oil and garlic, and flavored with spices and aromatic herbs. In the absence of animal food, it is a great resource in Catholic countries during the season of Lent, and some say that from hence the season derives its name. It is occasionally cultivated in England, but only as fodder for cattle; it is also imported from Alexandria. From the quantity of gluten the ripe seeds contain, they must be highly nutritious, though they have the character of being heating if taken in large quantities. Under the high-sounding name "Revalenta Arabica," we pay a high price for lentile flour, and in various culinary preparations are unawares repeating Jacob's pottage (Playfair, *Analysis;* Hogg, *Veg. Kingdom*, p. 275). In Egypt the haulm is used for packing.

Lentŭlus, Epistle of (*Epistola Lentuli*), is the well-known title of an apocryphal letter on the physical appearance of Christ, which the Romish Church receives as authentic, and as having been written by Publius Lentulus, a Roman of Palestine, and perhaps of Jerusalem, to Rome. Manuscript copies of it are to be found, according to Joh. Albert Fabricius (*Cod. apocryph. Novi Testamenti*, i, 302), in several libraries of England, France, and Italy (viz., in those of the Vatican and of Padua), Germany (at Augsburg and Jena, where two copies formerly existed, one of which was embellished with a fine image of Christ, and had been presented to the elector Frederick the Wise by pope Leo X). A librarian of Jena, Christopher Mylius (*Memorab. biblioth. academ. Jenensis*, Jen. 1746, 8vo, p. 301 sq.), states that this copy was written in golden letters upon red paper, very richly bound, and beautifully illustrated. This copy, however, is lost. The work was first printed in the Magdeburg Centuries (q. v.) (Basil. 1559), i, 344; it was then reproduced in Mich. Neandri *Apocrypha* (Basil. 1567), p. 410 sq., afterwards in Joh. Jac. Grynæi *Monumenta s. Patrum orthodoxographa* (Basil. 1569, fol.). Joh. Reiskius, in *Exercitatt. histor. de imaginibus Jes. Chr. rel.* (Jen. 1685, 4to), gave a twofold version of it, one after Grynæus, the other a reproduction of that described by Mylius. This epistle was highly regarded in former times; the papal legate, Jerome Xavier, translated it into Portuguese (in his history of Christ, a work full of legends and fables), and from this language it was subsequently translated into Persian; Reiske and Fabricius translated it into German, and published it at Nurenberg and at Erfurt. It is also to be found in a condensed form in the introduction to the works of archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, which, though without date or name of place, are, from internal evidence, supposed to have been published at Paris towards the close of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century; in this work it is accompanied by a description of the personal appearance of the Virgin Mary. In the earliest ages of the Church the question of the personal appearance of Christ while on earth had begun to attract considerable attention. Had there been anything positively known on the subject then, it would certainly have been eagerly received. Yet, although the Church fathers Justin, Tertullian, Hegesippus, and Eusebius mention a letter of Pilate to Tiberius, one of Abgarus to Christ, and one of Jesus to Abgarus, they make no mention of any letter of Lentulus concerning Christ. On the contrary, during the first century, while the Christian Church was suffering persecution, the impression prevailed, derived from Isa. liii, 2, 3, that the

Lord's personal appearance was very unprepossessing. But as the Church grew in prosperity and power this idea underwent a complete change. Eusebius and Augustine are heard to complain that nothing is known as to the Lord's personal appearance. In the Middle Ages a directly opposite opinion from that of the ancients prevailed, and the Lord was considered as having been an eminently handsome man, which opinion was only based on the passage Psa. xlv, 2. In the works of the Greek historian Nicephorus (surnamed Callistus Xanthopulus), who lived in the 14th century, and whom Weismann considers a credulous, uncritical writer, we find a description of Christ's personal appearance, for which, however, the writer gives no authority, saying only that it is derived from the ancients. As it greatly resembles that of Lentulus, and perhaps served as its basis, we give it here as a curiosity: Ἡ μέντοι διάπλασις τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐξ ἀρχαίων παρειλήφαμεν, τοία δέ τις ὡς ἐν τύπῳ παραλαβεῖν ἦν, ὡραῖος μὲν ἦν τὴν ὄψιν σφόδρα. Τήν γε μὲν ἡλικίαν εἰτ' οὖν ἀναδρομὴν τοῦ σώματος, ἑπτὰ σπιθαμῶν ἦν τελείων. Ἐπίξανθον ἔχων τὴν τρίχα καὶ οὐ πάνυ δασεῖαν, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ πρὸς τὸ οὖλον μετρίως πῶς ἀποκλίνουσαν, μελαίνας δέ γε τὰς ὄφρυς εἶχε καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἐπικαμπεῖς, τοὺς δὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς χαρόπους τινὰς καὶ ἤρμα (sic!) ἐπιξανθίζοντας, εὐοφθαλμὸς δ' ἦν καὶ ἐπίῤῥιν· τὴν μέντοι τρίχα τοῦ πωγῶνος ξανθήν τινὰ εἶχε, καὶ οὐκ εἰς πολὺ καθειμένην. Μακροτέραν δὲ τὴν τρίχα κεφαλῆς περιέφερεν· οὐδέποτε γὰρ ξυρὸς ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ χεῖρ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ νηπιάζοντος. Ἤρεμα ἐπικλινὴς τὴν αὐχένα, ὡς μηδὲ πάνυ ὀρθίου, καὶ εὐτεταμένην ἔχειν τὴν ἡλικίαν τοῦ σώματος· σιτόχρους δὲ καὶ οὐ στρογγύλην ἔχων τὴν ὄψιν ἐτύγχανεν, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ μικρὸν ὑποκαταβαίνουσαν, ὀλίγον δὲ ἐπιφοινισσομένην, ὅσον ὑποφαίνειν τὸ σεμνόν τε καὶ τὸ σύνετον τοῦ ἤθους καὶ ἥμερον καὶ τὸ κατάπαξ ἀόργητον. Κατὰ πάντα δὲ ἦν ἐμφερὴς τῇ θείᾳ καὶ πανασπίλῳ ἐκείνου μητρί. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τούτοις. Compare the articles CHRIST, IMAGES AND PORTRAITS OF; JESUS CHRIST (II, 11, in vol. iv, p. 884). The same tendency prevailed also in the Western Church until the Reformation, when Luther took a more reasonable view of the question, saying, "It is very possible that some may have been as handsome, physically, as Christ. Perhaps some were even handsomer, for we do not see it mentioned that the Jews ever wondered at his beauty." The same view was taken by a Roman Catholic writer (*In libro de forma Christi*, Paris, 1649), who said that the Redeemer was not either ill favored nor more handsome than other men. In other cases, however, the Roman Catholic Church has retained the ideas presented in the epistle of Lentulus.

If we now look more closely into this epistle of Lentulus, we find in the edition of Grynæus (*Monum. orthodoxographa*) that it reads, "Lentulus, Hierosolymitanorum Præses, S. P. Q. Romano S.: Apparuit temporibus nostris et adhuc est homo magnæ virtutis, nominatus Christus Jesus, qui dicitur a gentibus propheta veritatis, quem ejus discipuli vocant filium Dei, suscitans mortuos et sanans languores [MS. Vatic. "languentes"]. Homo quidem staturæ proceræ [Goldast. addit. "scilicet xv palmorum et medii"], spectabilis, vultum habens venerabilem, quem intuentes possunt et diligere et formidare: Capillos vero circinos, crispos aliquantum cæruliores et fulgentiores [MS. 1 Jen. "Capillos habens coloris nucis avellanæ præmaturæ et planos usque ad aures, ab auribus vero circinos, crispos aliquantulum cæruliores et fulgentiores"], ab humeris volitantes [omnes alii: "ventilantes"], discrimen habens in medio capitis juxta morem Nazarenorum [Centur. Magd. et Anselmi opp. "Nazaræorum"]: frontem planam et serenissimam, cum facie sine ruga (ac) macula aliqua, quam rubor moderatus venustat. Nasi et oris nulla prorsus est reprehensio, barbam habens copiosam et rubram [fere omnes alii: "impuberem"], capillorum colore, non longam sed bifurcatam [omnes addunt: "adspectum habet simplicem et maturum"], oculis variis et claris existentibus. In increpatione terribilis, in admonitione placidus [plurimi alii: "blandus"] et amabilis, hilaris servata gravitate, qui nunquam visus est ridere, flere autem sæpe. Sic in statura corporis propagatus [plurimi alii addunt: "et rectus"] manus habens et membra [ceteri omnes: "brachia"] visu delectabilia in eloquio [rectius ceteri: "colloquio"] gravis, rarus et modestus speciosus inter filios hominum. Valete [Hoc Valete deest in reliquis MSS. et edd.]."

The very contents of the letter are sufficient evidence of its spuriousness. Had it really been written by a Roman, it would not have been addressed to the senate, but to the emperor, who was the immediate master of the Syrian provinces. It appears that this objection was already noticed in former times, for in the Magdeburg Centuries it is said to have been addressed to the emperor Tiberius. A fact of still greater importance is that Lentulus is designated as *Hierosolymitanorum præses*. No such office existed. There was a *Præses Syriæ* and a *Procurator Judææ* but no *Præses* of the Roman inhabitants at Jerusalem. For this reason he is called in the Manuscr. Jen. i, *Proconsul in partibus Judææ*, and in the Manuscr. Vatic. and Jen. ii, in a thoroughly Roman Catholic manner, *Officialis in provincia Judæa*, while there was no such office known in Rome at that period. But he is nowhere represented as a friend of Pilate, as Zimmermann attempts to make him in his *Lebensgeschichte d. Kirche Christi*, i, 70. We know most of the proconsuls or præsides of Syria, and all the procurators of Judæa, but none of them was named Lentulus. In the classics there are forty-three persons of that name mentioned, but four only belonged to the times of Tiberius. One of them only, Enæus Lentulus Gætulicus, was, according to Tacitus (*Ann.* iv, 46), in the year 26, consul with Tiberius, and in 34 was the chief of the legions in upper Germany (Tacitus, *Annal.* vi, 30); he may, indeed, according to Suetonius (*Calig.* c. 8) and Pliny (*Epist.* v, 3), have been in Judæa during the years 26 to 33, but there is no proof of it. On the other hand, the Lentulus who wrote the epistle is expressly called in the MS. Jen. i, *Publius*. Moreover, there is no mention at all made of the epistle by any of the ancient writers, whilst other epistles, even some of an apocryphal nature, are mentioned by them, and this one, had it then been known, would certainly have attracted the attention of the apologists at a time when the general impression was so strong against the fine personal appearance of the Lord. Nicephorus Xanthopulus, whose description of Christ's personal appearance we gave above, states only that it is based on old traditions, while, if such a description as that given in the Epistle of Lentulus had been known in the Greek Church in the 14th century, he would certainly not have failed to quote it as an authority. Regarding the literary merits of the work, it must be confessed that it is written in old Latin; but as it is full of expressions which would not naturally be used by a Roman citizen—as the whole tenor of the work, moreover, is thoroughly unclassical, it is to be supposed that its writer aimed to imitate the style of the ancients, and pass it off as a work of their age. A Roman would never have used the expression *propheta veritatis, filii hominum*, at the beginning and at the end of the epistle. So also the appellation *Christus Jesus* is evidently taken from the New Test., for the Redeemer was never thus designated during his lifetime. Jesus himself declined the name of Christ, forbade his disciples calling him thus, and he never was called so by his enemies. How, then, could a heathen have come to call him Christ, and even to put that appellation before that of Jesus—a change which only took place after his claim to be considered as the Messiah had been established beyond cavil. If it is claimed that Christ was called by the heathen the prophet of truth, yet, as Christ's activity during his life was not directed towards the heathen in general, it could only apply to the Romans residing in Palestine. Yet these we do not find to have been des-

ignated as heathen, but as Romans; and they did not interest themselves enough in the wandering Rabbi to render such an expression general among them. Nor was it otherwise with the heathen residing on the frontiers of Palestine. "His disciples called him the Son of God." Though they gave him occasionally that name, it was so far from being a general custom that the governor himself knew nothing of it. So this, like the following sentences on the raising of the dead and healing of the sick, is all taken from the Gospel. It also says that his hair was parted after the manner of the Nazarites: we find the substitution of Nazarene for Nazarite, which only took place afterwards. Now a Roman officer would know little or nothing about the Nazarites; moreover, Christ could not properly be called a Nazarite, for he drank wine, touched the dead, and did many other things contrary to the customs of the Nazarites. The remark that he was never seen to laugh, but often to weep, proves him to have led a solitary life, such as we have no example of at the supposed time of the writing of this epistle, and is only an idea derived from the Gospels, and from the state of things in the Middle Ages. The last words also, "beautiful among the sons of men," are quite unsuited to the mouth of a Roman, who would never have made use of such a Hebraism, and it is clearly taken from the xlvth Psalm, which is the basis of the whole description. This consequently could not apply to our Lentulus, but only to a monk of the Middle Ages.

Having thus seen how this epistle carries within itself the proofs of its spuriousness, the question arises, When was it written? If it were included in the works of Anselm, we would have to consider it as having been composed in the 11th century. Yet it is simply appended to the works of this author, and was never made use of until the 15th century, to give favor to an opinion which the monks had an interest to propagate. Laurentius Valla, who lived in the 15th century, was the first who made any mention of it in his argument against the pseudo donation of Constantine. A postscript of great interest is appended to the 2d Jena MS., and it, in our estimation, tends to reveal the true character of the work: "Explicit epistola Jacobi de Columpna anno Domini 1421 reperit eam in annalibus Romæ, in libro antiquissimo in Capitolio ex dono Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani." If this postscript is to be relied on, this epistle was sent to Rome in the 14th century by a patriarch of Constantinople as a present, just as it was afterwards sent to the elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony by pope Leo. But as from Constantinople there were generally sent Greek MSS. only, and as there is no mention made of the name of the patriarch supposed to have sent it, and as, moreover, the work is claimed to be a very old one, it is most likely that this description is a Latin translation of that of Nicephorus, which we gave above, that the translator added the postscript with the intention of rendering his spurious work more credible, and that consequently both epistle and postscript are spurious. The imitator or translator of Nicephorus, who gives ample proofs in his work of the source whence he drew when he speaks of the stature of Christ (in a copy in Goldast we find, after *statura procerus*, "*scilicet xv palmorum et medii*"), gave the work the form of an epistle, and gave it the name of Lentulus, taken from some tradition, or which otherwise seemed suitable to him. It is now evident that the epistle could only have been written at some time after Nicephorus, and before the year 1500, consequently in the 14th century. Dr. Edward Robinson, after carefully examining all the evidences for and against the authenticity of this work, thus presents the results of his inquiry: "In favor of the authenticity of the letter we have only the purport of the inscription. There is no external evidence whatever. *Against* its authenticity we have the great discrepancies and contradictions of the inscription; the fact that no such official person as Lentulus existed at the time and place specified, nor for many years before and after; the utter silence of history in respect to the existence of such a letter; the foreign and later idioms of its style; the contradiction in which the contents of the epistle stand with established historical facts; and the probability of its having been produced at some time not earlier than the 11th century." See Joh. Bened. Carpzov, *Theologi Helmstadiensis programma: de oris et corporis Jesu Christi*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1774, 4to); Joh. Phil. Gabler, *Theologus Altorfensis an.* 1819 *and* 1822 *in Authentium epistolæ Publii Lentuli ad Senatum Romanum de Jesu Christo scriptæ;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 292 sq.; Dr. Robinson in *Biblical Repository*, ii, 367; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 569; Jamieson, *Our Lord*, i, 35; *Friends' Review*, March 3, 1867, p. 769 sq. See JESUS CHRIST.

Leo OF ACHRIS or ACHRIDIA (now *Ohkrida*, in Albania), was so called because he held the archbishopric of Achris, in the Greek Church, among the Bulgarians. He joined about A.D. 1053, with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, in writing a very bitter letter against the pope, which they sent to John, archbishop of Trani, in Apulia, to be distributed among the members of the Latin Church—prelates, monks, laity. A translation of this letter is given by Baronius (*Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 1053, xxii, etc.). Pope Leo IX replied in a long letter, which is given in the *Concilia* (vol. ix, col. 949, etc., ed. Labbe; vol. vi, col. 927, ed. Hardouin; vol. xix, col. 635, ed. Mansi), and the following year both Cerularius and Leo of Achris were excommunicated by cardinal Humbert, the papal legate (Baronius, ad ann. 1054, xxv). Leo wrote many other letters, which are extant in MS. in various European libraries, and are cited by Allatius, in his *De Consensu Eccles. Orient. et Occident.*; by Beveridge, in his *Codex Canonum*; by Alexis Aristenus, in his *Synopsis Epistolarum Canonicarum*; and by Comnenus Popadopoli, in his *Prænotiones Mystagogicæ*. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, ii, 715; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 138, ed. Oxon. 1740; Oudin, *De Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* ii, 603.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 741.

Leo ÆGYPTIUS, or THE EGYPTIAN. The early Christian writers, in their controversy with the heathen, refer not unfrequently to a Leo or Leon as having admitted that the deities of the ancient Gentile nation had originally been men, agreeing in this respect with Evemerus, with whom he was contemporary, if not perhaps rather earlier. Augustine (*De Consensu Evangel.* i, 33, and *De Civ. Dei*, viii, 5), who is most explicit in his notice of him, says he was an Egyptian priest of high rank, "magnus antistes," and that he expounded the popular mythology to Alexander the Great in a manner which, though differing from those rationalistic explanations received in Greece, accorded with them in making the gods (including even the Dii majorum gentium) to have originally been men. Augustine refers to an account of the statements of Leo contained in a letter of Alexander to his mother. It is to be observed, though Leo was high in his priestly rank at the time when Alexander was in Egypt (B. C. 332–331), his name is Greek; and Arnobius (*adv. Gentes*, iv, 29) calls him *Leo Pellæus*, or Leo of Pella, an epithet which Fabricius does not satisfactorily explain. Worth (*Not. ad Tatian.* p. 96, ed. Oxford, 1700) would identify our Leo with Leo of Lampsacus, the husband of Themista or Themisto, the female Epicurean (Diog. Laert. x, 5, 25); but the husband of Themista was more correctly called Leonteus, while the Egyptian is never called by any other name than Leo. Arnobius speaks in such a way as to lead us to think that in his day the writings of Leon on the human origin of the gods were extant and accessible, but it is possible he refers, like Augustine, to Alexander's letter. The reference to Leon in Clemens Alexandrinus is not more explicit (*Stromata*, i, 21, § 106, p. 139, Sylburg; p. 382, edit. Pott; ii, 75, edit. Klotz, Lipsiæ, 1831, 12mo). But Tatian's distinct mention of the Ὑπομνήματα, or *Commentaries* of Leo, shows that this system

had been committed to writing by himself; and Tertullian (*De Corona*, c. 7) directs his readers "to unroll the writings of Leo the Egyptian." Hyginus (*Poeticon Astronomicon*, c. 20) refers to Leon as though he wrote a history of Egypt ("Qui res Ægyptiacus scripsit"); and the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (iv, 262) gives a reference here to what Leon had said respecting the antiquity of the Egyptians, probably depending upon the statements of Alexander. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 713, 719; xi, 664; Voss, *De Hist. Græc.* libri iii, p. 179, edit. Amsterdam, 1699.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 742.

Leo Diaconus, or the Deacon, a Byzantine historian of the 10th century, of whose personal history but little is known, except the incidental notices in his principal works (collected by C. B. Hase in his *Præfatio* to his edition of Leo), was born at Caloë, a town of Asia, beautifully situated at the side or foot of Mount Tmolus, near the sources of the Caÿstrus, in Asia Minor, and was at Constantinople pursuing his studies A.D. 966, where he was an admiring spectator of the firmness of the emperor Nicephorus II, Phocas, in the midst of a popular tumult (iv, 7). Hase places his birth in or about A.D. 950. He was in Asia in or about the time of the deposition of Basilius I, patriarch of Constantinople, and the election of his successor, Antonius III, A.D. 973 or 974, and relates that at that time he frequently saw two Cappadocians, twins of thirty years' age, whose bodies were united from the armpits to the flanks (x, 3). Having been ordained deacon, he accompanied the emperor Basilius II in his unfortunate expedition against the Bulgarians, A.D. 981, and when the emperor raised the siege of Tralitza or Triaditza (the ancient Sardica), Leo barely escaped death in the headlong flight of his countrymen (x, 8). Of his history after this nothing is known; but Hase observes he must have written his history after A.D. 989, as he adverts to the rebellion and death of Phocas Bardas (x, 9), which occurred in that year. He must have lived later than Hase has remarked, and at least till A.D. 993, as he notices (x, 10) that the emperor Basilius II restored "in six years the cupola of the great church (St. Sophia's) at Constantinople, which had been overthrown by the earthquake (comp. Cedren. *Compend.* ii, 438, ed. Bonn) of A.D. 987." His works are, Ἱστορία Βιβλίοις ῑ̀, or *Historia libris decem:*—*Oratio ad Basilium Imperatorem:*—and, unless it be the work of another Leo Diaconus, *Homilia in Michaëlæm Archangelium.* The two last are extant only in MS. The history of Leo includes the period from the Cretan expedition of Nicephorus Phocas, in the reign of Romanus II, A.D. 959. to the death of John I, Tzimisces, A.D. 975. It relates the victories of the emperors Nicephorus and Tzimisces over the Mohammedans in Cilicia and Syria, and the recovery of those countries, or the greater part of them, to the Byzantine empire, and the wars of the same emperors with the Bulgarians and Russians. According to Hase, Leo employs unusual and unappropriate words (many of them borrowed from Homer, Agathias the historian, and the Septuagint) in the place of simple and common ones, and abounds in tautological phrases. His knowledge of geography and ancient history is slight, but with these defects his history is a valuable contemporary record of a stirring time, honestly and fearlessly written. Scylitzes and Cedrenus are much indebted to Leo, and Hase considers Zonaras also to have used his work. The *Historia* was first published at the cost of count Nicholas Romanzof, chancellor of Russia, by Car. Bened. Hase (Paris, 1818). Combefis had intended to publish it in the Paris edition of *Corpus Historiæ Byzantinæ*, with the *Historia* of Michael Psellus, but was prevented by death, A.D. 1679. The Latin version which he had prepared was communicated by Montfaucon to Pagi, who inserted some portions in his *Critice in Baronium* (ad ann. 960, No. ix). The papers of Combefis were, many years after, committed to Michael le Quien, that he might publish an edition of Psellus and Leo, and part of the latter's work was actually printed. In the disorders of the French Revolution the papers of Combefis were finally lost or destroyed. Hase, in his edition, added a Latin version and notes to the text of Leo, and illustrated it by engravings from ancient gems: this edition is, however, scarce and dear, the greater part of the copies having been lost by shipwreck, but his text, preface, version, and notes (not engravings) have been reprinted in the Bonn ed. of the *Corpus Hist. Byzantinæ* (1828, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 684, note 1; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 106; Hase, *Præfatio ad Leon Diacon. Historian.*—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 743 sq.

Leo the Great. See Leo the Thracian (emperor) and Leo I (pope).

Leo the Isaurian is the name which is commonly given in history to Leo III or Flavius Leo Isaurus, emperor of Constantinople from the year 718 to 741, a man remarkable on many accounts, but who, from his connection with the great contest about image-worship in the Christian Church, became one of the most prominent historical names among the emperors of the East.

1. *Early History.*—He was born in or on the borders of the rude province of Isauria, and his original name was *Conon.* He emigrated with his father, a wealthy farmer or grazier of that country, to Thrace. Young Conon obtained the place of spatharius, or broadswordsman, in the army of Justinian II, and soon, by his military talents, excited the jealousy of the emperor, as he drew the eyes of the people, and especially of the soldiers, towards him as one fitted to command, and competent even for the empire. He was sent forward, therefore, with a few troops, against the Alani, and then abandoned by the emperor without succor, in the hope that he would be cut off and destroyed, but from this critical position Leo extricated himself with consummate dexterity and courage. Anastasius II (A.D. 713–716) gave him the supreme command of the troops in Asia, which was exposed to the terrible onslaughts of the Arab or Saracen hordes, by whom it had already been half overrun and conquered. This command was still in his hands when Theodosius III, at the beginning of 716, rose against Anastasius, deposed him, and seated himself upon the throne. Leo, being summoned to acknowledge Theodosius, at once denounced him as a usurper, and attacked him under pretext of restoring the rightful sovereign to the throne, but probably with the design of seizing for himself the imperial dignity. He secured the support of the principal leaders in the army, reached the imperial troops before they could be gathered in sufficient force to resist him, and slew them. At Nicomedia he met the son of Theodosius, whom he defeated and captured. He next marched direct upon Constantinople, and Theodosius, seeing no hope of resistance, quietly resigned his sceptre in March, 718, and retired into a convent, while the vacant throne was forthwith occupied by Leo himself, by the suffrages of the troops.

2. *Imperial History.*—No sooner was Leo arrayed in the purple than the caliph Soleiman, together with the noted Moslima, appeared before Constantinople with an immense and enthusiastic army, supported by a powerful fleet, determined to retrieve their sullied fame. The city was invested by sea and land, and its capture was considered certain; but the indefatigable energy, military skill, and fearless courage of Leo, aided by the new invention of the Greek fire, saved the capital from falling, five centuries before its time, into the hands of the Moslems. The superstitious people ascribed their deliverance to the constant interposition of the Virgin, in which they gave the greatest possible praise to the genius of Leo. This third (Gibbon calls it the second) siege of Constantinople by the Saracens lasted precisely two years (Gibbon calls it thirteen months) from the 15th of August, 718. On the 15th of August, 720, the caliph (now Omar, who had succeeded Soleiman shortly

after the commencement of the siege) was compelled to raise the siege, losing in a storm the greater part of the remnants of his third fleet before reaching the harbors of Syria and Egypt. So close had been the investment of the city, so enormous the preparations, and so loud the boasts of the Saracens, that in the provinces Constantinople was given up as lost, notwithstanding all the splendid victories of Leo, for the very news of those victories had been intercepted by the vigilant blockade of the besiegers. The whole empire was in consternation, and in the West the rumor was credited that the caliph had actually ascended the throne of Byzantium. Accordingly, Sergius, governor of Sicily, took measures to make himself independent, and to secure the crown for himself in case of complete success; but Leo immediately dispatched a small force to Sicily, which soon crushed the rebellion. The deposed monarch Anastasius, also, was tempted to plot the recovery of the throne, and in the attempt lost his life. In spite of his defeats before Constantinople, Omar continued the war for twenty years; and though, in 726, he captured Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, yet Leo maintained an acknowledged superiority. The great work of ecclesiastical reform occupied the attention of the empire, without any considerable interruption from the infidels, until the year 734. What belongs to this chapter of domestic history, though it includes elements and facts of political and military significance, is reserved for the next head. During the last seven years of Leo's reign (from 734) falls the protracted life-struggle with the Saracens. The caliph Hesham instigated the Syrians to support an adventurer who pretended to be the son of Justinian II, and who, under the protection of the caliph, entered Jerusalem arrayed in the imperial purple. This proved a mere farce. But something more serious happened when, in 739, the Arab general Soleiman invaded the empire with an army of 90,000 men, distributed into three bodies. The first entered Cappadocia, and ravaged it with fire and sword; the second, commanded by Malek and Batak, penetrated into Phrygia; the third, under Soleiman, covered the rear. Leo was actually taken by surprise; but he soon assembled an army and defeated the second body, in Phrygia, in a pitched battle, and obliged Soleiman to withdraw hastily into Syria. The Saracens had, in the mean time, been routed in their invasion of Europe by Charles Martel in 732, and the progress of their conquests seemed now for some time to be checked both in the East and in the West. The remaining great event of Leo's reign was the terrible earthquake of October, 740, which caused great calamities throughout the empire.

3. *The Iconoclastic Controversy.*—In this business Leo would seem to have begun of his own motion, and almost single-handed. No party of any account against image-worship existed in the Church, but he believed that by taking the side of iconoclasm he could hasten the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans, and though at first very cautious, he finally, after some nine or ten years of his reign, issued his edict prohibiting the worship of all images, whether statues or pictures, of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints. Christendom was astounded by this sudden proscription of its then common religious usages. See ICONOCLASM. Leo, in fact, found arrayed against him not only the bigoted and exasperated monastics, but the superstitious masses of the people of the East and West, and almost all the clergy, with all the bishops, excepting Claudius, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, and Theodosius, metropolitan of Ephesus, and perhaps two or three more. Even Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, joined with Gregory II of Rome in the universal outcry against the emperor's attempt, and thus, almost for the first time, the bishops of the two Romes were (like Pilate and Herod) united in one common cause. Whether provoked by the violence, and unreasonableness, and rebellious spirit of the opposition, or prompted by a growing zeal for the purity of religion, or by the obstinacy of personal pride and arbitrary power, or guided by considerations of presumed policy, or from whatever motives, the emperor soon after issued a second edict far more stringent and decisive. It commanded the total destruction of all images (or statues intended for worship) and the effacement of all pictures by whitewashing the walls of the churches. The image-worshippers were maddened. The officer who attempted, in Constantinople, to execute the edict upon a statue of Christ renowned for its miracles, was assaulted by the women and beaten to death with clubs. The emperor sent an armed guard to suppress the tumult, and a frightful massacre was the consequence. Leo was regarded as no better than a Saracen. Even his successes against the common foe were ingeniously turned against him. A certain Cosmas was proclaimed emperor in Leo's stead, a fleet was armed, and Constantinople itself was menaced; but the fleet was destroyed by the Greek fire, the insurrection was suppressed, the leaders either fell or were executed along with the usurper. A second revolt at Constantinople was not suppressed till after much bloodshed. Everywhere in the empire the monks were busy instigating and fomenting rebellion. Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, already an octogenarian, as he could not conscientiously aid in the execution of the imperial decree, quietly retired, or suffered himself to be removed from his see. Not quite so peaceful was the position pope Gregory II of Rome assumed. Following the bent of his own superstitious character, he seized the opportunity when the emperor had his hands full with seditious tumults and disturbances at home, and, confidently relying upon the support of the ignorant, and monk-ridden, and half-Christianized population of the West, dispatched to the emperor two most arrogant and insolent letters, and condemned in unmeasured terms his war upon images as a war upon the Christian religion itself. The emperor ordered the exarch of Ravenna to march upon Rome; but the pope, by the aid of the Lombards, compelled him to retire, and he had enough to do to maintain himself even at home. In fact, he was reduced to live in one quarter of Ravenna as a sort of captive; and finally Gregory III, the successor of Gregory II, in 731 held a council at Rome in which the Iconoclasts were anathematized. The emperor hereupon sent a formidable expedition against Italy, with special orders to reduce Ravenna. The expedition, however, failed, and Ravenna, with the Exarchate, fell into the hands of the Lombards, and thus Italy and the pope became practically independent of the Eastern empire. Leo now only sought the accomplishment of one object, viz., the detachment of Greece, Illyria, and Macedonia from the spiritual authority of the popes, and he consequently annexed them to that of the patriarchs of Constantinople, and this created the real effective cause of the final schism of the Latin and Greek churches (734). The pope henceforth never submitted to the emperor, nor did he ever recover the lost portions of his patriarchate. Meantime, from the East, another voice joined in the fray—John of Damascus. He issued his fulminations against the emperor securely from under the protection of the caliphs, who were more pleased with the attacks upon Leo than scandalized by the defence of image worship. See JOHN OF DAMASCUS. It was in the midst of this wild and protracted controversy that Leo died of dropsy in 741, and left to his son the accomplishment of a task which he had hoped he would himself effect.

As to the controversy itself, one of the strongest points ever made against the position of Leo is that he attacked the fine arts, and sought to destroy and abolish all the beauty and ornamentation of the Christian edifices. On this ground an earnest appeal has been made against him, and against all opponents of image worship, in the interests of esthetics. Even Neander seems quite to take sides with Gregory against the barbarian emperor in this point of view. But, in the first place, it is by no means historically certain that Leo proceeded to any such lengths, or with any such motives, in his

iconoclasm. He proposed simply to destroy objects of worship. He made no war upon beauty or art. If, in accomplishing his purpose, in the face of the furious opposition he met with, he was carried further, it was not strange, especially considering his education, the great difficulty of making nice distinctions in such cases and under such circumstances, and the known propensity of human nature to run to extremes in the heat of controversy and conflict. Many of the holiest and most orthodox of the early fathers would have proscribed all classical learning, lest with it the classical paganism should be imbibed. But, in fact, neither Gregory nor the monks defended the use of images on esthetic grounds, and if they had they would have compromised their whole cause. It was not at all the beauty of the statue, but the sacred object represented, which gave it its meaning and value. Churches might be made as beautiful and decorated as highly as possible without the people's adoring or bowing down to the church, or its altar, or its ornaments. Besides, it is not probable that the images or the pictures of Leo's time were any very admirable specimens of esthetic achievement; and, if they had been, it is not likely that they would have attracted the reverence of the vulgar so much as they did. Artistic perfection tends rather to distract and dissipate than to intensify the religious reverence for images. With the development of Grecian art Grecian idolatry lost its hold. It is a remarkable fact that the ugliest, and most misshapen, and hideous idols among the heathen have secured the widest and intensest devotion; and among the Christians, it has been some winking or bleeding statue, rudely imitating the human form, and not some Sistine Madonna, that has bent the knees of adoring multitudes. The image whose toe is now devoutly kissed by the faithful at St. Peter's, in Rome, is not remarkable for its esthetic claims. If Leo was a barbarian, Gregory was hardly less so, as is evident from the letters of the latter to his emperor. The ignorance of the pope is almost as remarkable as his impudence. He expressly and repeatedly confounds the pious Hezekiah, who destroyed the brazen serpent, with his pious ancestor Uzziah, and under this last name pronounces him a self-willed violator of the priests of God. He apparently confounded them both with Ahaz, who was the grandson of the one and the father of the other. It is true, he professes to quote the passage from the emperor's edict, but it is plain from internal evidence that, in the terms in which he gives it, it could not have been in that edict; and if it had been, he did not know enough to correct the blunder. It is said that Leo was cruel in the execution of his decree. It may be so. He was a soldier, a Byzantine emperor, and lived in the 8th century. But if the monks, and the pope, and the priests, and the populace, which they controlled, had not violently resisted the imperial decree, there would have been no cruelty. It is said that Leo acted arbitrarily, as if he had been the master of the minds and consciences of men, to make and unmake their religion for them. This is too true, and this was his mistake; but all his predecessors, with Constantine the Great, had made the same mistake. It was a Byzantine tradition. It was the theory of the age. Protestantism, with the same creed in regard to images, has proceeded upon a different theory, and has succeeded. It is said that the Church, in her general councils, has decided against Leo. If so, it was not till after, in his son's reign, a council styling itself œcumenical, and regularly convoked as such, consisting of no less than 348 bishops, had unanimously decided in his favor. It is said that, at all events, the question has been historically settled against Leo in the subsequent history of the Church: that iconoclasm was crushed and brought to naught in the East and in the West, and images achieved a complete triumph. Iconoclasm was indeed crushed by the unnatural and murderous monster Irene, whose character will hardly be regarded as superior to that of Leo. In fact, far as images are distinguished from pictures, iconoclasm has thus far triumphed in the East; and in the West it was not until after the earnest and manly resistance of Charlemagne and the Council of Frankfort that the image-worshipping pope and priests finally, or rather for a time, carried their point.

4. *Character of Leo.*—Almost all we know of Leo comes to us through his enemies—his prejudiced, bigoted, unprincipled, deadly enemies. Some of the most odious acts alleged against him, as the burning of the great library at Constantinople, are purely their malignant inventions. His motives are seen only through their jaundiced or infuriated eyes. His very words come to us, for the most part, only through their garbled versions; yet, with all their zeal, they have not been able so to distort, or blacken, or hide his true lineaments, but that he still stands out to an impartial observer one of the ablest, purest, manliest, and most respectable sovereigns that ever occupied the Constantinopolitan throne. His rapid rise from obscurity to the pinnacle of power, his firm and successful administration amid foreign assaults and domestic plots, and his resolute prosecution of the reformation of the Church, all indicate a wise and provident policy, great vigor, and decision of will. His early military life may have rendered him cruel and obstinate, but did not taint the purity of his manners. He was in many respects, and particularly in a certain rugged and straightforward honesty and strength of purpose, just the man needed for the times. How much better and wiser he was than he appears we cannot say, but there is every reason to believe that a full and fair view of his history, if it could now be unearthed from the monkish rubbish, and rottenness, and filth that have overwhelmed it, would present him in a vastly more favorable light than that in which he has been left to stand. (D. R. G.)

5. *Literature.* — See Henke in Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, sect. ii, vol. xvi (1839), 119 sq.; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.; Marsden, *Hist. Christian Churches and Sects*, ii, 153; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, ii, 305 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, v, 10 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 46 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Morals*, ii, 282; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, vol. i and ii; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* (Freib. 1855); English transl. *History of Councils* (Lond. 1872, 8vo), vol. i; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste* (Elbfeld, 1868), vol. i; Hergenröther, *Photius* (Regensb. 1867), vol. i; and the references in the article Iconoclasm.

Leo the Magentian (Μαγεντῖνος or Μαγεντῖνος), a commentator on Aristotle, flourished during the first half of the 14th century. His first name, Leo, is frequently omitted in the MSS. of his works. He was a monk, and afterwards archbishop of Mytilene. He wrote Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὸ Περὶ ἑρμηνείας Ἀριστοτέλους, *Commentarius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Librum* (published by Aldus, Venice, 1503, folio, with the commentary of Ammonius, from which Leo borrowed very largely, and the paraphrase of Psellus on the same book of Aristotle, and the commentary of Ammonius on Aristotle's *Categoriæ s. Prædicamenta*. In the Latin title of this edition, by misprint, the author is called *Margentinus*. A Latin version of Leo's commentary, by J. B. Rasarius, has been repeatedly printed with the Latin version of Ammonius. Another Latin version by Jerome Leustrius has also been printed):—Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὰ Πρότερα ἀναλυτικὰ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους, *Commentarius in Priora Analytica Aristotelis* (printed with the commentary of John Philoponus on the same work by Trincavellus [Venice, 1536, fol.]; and a Latin version of it by Rasarius has been repeatedly printed, either separately or with other commentaries on Aristotle). The following works in MS. are ascribed, but with doubtful correctness, to Leo Magentenus: *Commentarius in Categorias Aristotelis* (extant in the King's library, Paris):—Ἀριστοτέλους σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων ἑρμηνεία, *Expositio Aristotelis De Sophisticis Elenchis*; and Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ εὐπορίας προτάσεων. These two works

are mentioned by Montfaucon (*Bibl. Coislin.* p. 225); the latter is perhaps not a distinct work, but a portion of the above. In the MS. the author is called *Leontius Magentenus:—Commentarius in Isagogen s. Quinque Voces Porphyrii.* Buhle doubts if this work, which is in the Medicean library at Florence (Bandini, *Catalog. Codd. Laur. Medic.* iii, 239), is correctly ascribed to Magentenus. In the catalogue of the MSS. in the King's library at Paris (ii, 410, 421), two MSS., No. mdcccxlv and mcmxxviii, contain scholia on the *Categoriæ*, the *Analytica Priora et Posteriora* and the *Topica* of Aristotle, and the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, by "Magnentius." Buhle conjectures, and with probability, that Magnentius is a corruption of Magentenus or Magentinus; if so, and the works are assigned to their real author, we must add the commentaries on *Topica* and *Analytica Posteriora* to the works already mentioned. Nicolaus Comnenus Popadopoli speaks of many other works of Leo, but his authority is of little value. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iii, 210, 213, 215, 218, 498, vii, 717; viii, 143; xii, 208; Montfaucon, *l. c.*, and p. 219; Buhle, *Opera Aristotelis*, i, 165, 305, 306, ed. Bipont; *Catalog. MStor. Biblioth. Regiæ* (Paris, 1740, fol.), l. c.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 744 sq.

Leo of Modena. See Leon da Modena.

Leo the Philosopher (*Sapiens* or *Philosophus*), a surname of Flavius Leo VI, emperor of Constantinople, noted as the publisher of the *Basilica*, was born A. D. 865, and succeeded his father, Basil I, the Macedonian, on March 1, 886. His reign presents an uninterrupted series of wars and conspiracies. In 887 and 888 the Arabs invaded Asia Minor, landed in Italy and Sicily, plundered Samos and other islands in the Archipelago, and until 892 did away with imperial authority in the Italian dominions. By Stylianus, his father-in-law and prime minister, Leo was subjected to a bloody war with the Bulgarians; but, by involving them, through intrigues, in a war with the Hungarians, he succeeded in bringing the war with himself to a speedy termination. The following years were rendered remarkable by several conspiracies against his life. That of 895 proved nearly fatal; it was fortunately discovered in time, and quelled by one Samonas, who, in reward, was created patrician, and enjoyed the emperor's favor until 910, when, suspected of treachery, and accused of abuse of his position, he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. At the opening of the 10th century, the Arabs and northern neighbors of the empire made another attack on the imperial possessions. The former once more invaded Sicily, and took Tauromenium, and in 904 appeared in the harbor of Thessalonica with a numerous fleet, soon made themselves masters of this splendid city, destroyed a great portion of it, plundered the inhabitants generally, and left laden with booty and captives. Leo died in 911. He was married four times, in consequence of which he was excluded from the communion with the faithful by the patriarch Nicolaus, as the Greek Church only tolerated a second marriage; it censured a third, and condemned a fourth as an atrocious sin.

How Leo came by the exalted name of Philosopher it is difficult to understand, except it be taken in an ironical sense. Gibbon, with a few striking words, gives the following character to this emperor: "His mind was tinged with the most puerile superstition; the influence of the clergy and the errors of the people were consecrated by his laws; and the oracles of Leo, which reveal in prophetic style the fates of the empire, are founded in the arts of astrology and divination. If we still inquire the reason of his sage appellation, it can only be replied that the son of Basil was only less ignorant than the greater part of his contemporaries in Church and State; that his education had been directed by the learned Photius, and that several books of profane and ecclesiastical science were composed by the pen or in the name of the imperial philosopher."

In speaking of Leo's literary merits, it is necessary to say a few words of his legislation. In his time the Latin language had long ceased to be the official language of the Eastern empire, and had gradually fallen into such disuse as only to be known to a few scholars, merchants, or navigators. The original laws, being written in Latin, opposed a serious obstacle to a fair and quick administration of justice; and the emperor Basil I, the father of Leo, formed and partly executed the plan of issuing an authorized version of the code and digest. This plan was carried out by Leo, who was ably assisted by Sabathius, the commander of the imperial life-guards. The new Greek version is known under the title of Βασιλικαὶ Διατάξεις, or, shortly, Βασιλικαί; in Latin, *Basilica*, which means "Imperial Constitutions" or "Laws." It is divided into sixty books, subdivided into titles, and contains the whole of Justinian's legislation, viz. the Institutes, the Digest, the Codex, and the Novellæ; also such constitutions as were issued by the successors of Justinian down to Leo VI. There are, however, many laws of the Digest omitted in the Basilica, while they contain, on the other hand, a considerable number of laws, or extracts from ancient jurists, not in the Digest. The Basilica likewise give many early constitutions not in Justinian's Codex. They were afterwards revised by the son of Leo, Constantine Porphyrogenitus. For the various editions published of the *Basilica*, see Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 741.

The principal works written, or supposed to be written, by Leo VI of special interest to us are, 1. *Oracula*, written in Greek iambic verse, and accompanied by marginal drawings, on the fate of the future emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, showing the superstition of Leo if he believed in his divination, and that of the people if they believed in the absurd predictions. The seventeenth oracle, on the restoration of Constantinople, was published in Greek and Latin by John Leunclavius (ad calcem Const. Manassæ, Basil. 1573, 8vo). Janus Rutgersius edited the other sixteen, with a Latin version by George Dousa (Leyden, 1618, 4to). Other editions, *Espositione delli Oracoli di Leoni imperatore*, by T. Patricius (Brixen, 1596), by Petrus Lambecius, with a revised text from an Amsterdam codex, also notes and new translation (Par. 1655, fol., ad calcem Codini). A German and a Latin translation by John and Theodore de Bry appeared (Frankf. 1597, 4to). It is doubtful whether Leo is actually the author of the Oracles. Fabricius gives a learned disquisition on the subject:—2. *Orationes*, mostly on theological subjects: one of them appeared in a Latin version by F. Metius, in Baronius's *Annales;* nine others by Gretserus, in the 14th volume of his *Opera* (Ingolstadt, 1660, 4to); three others, together with seven of those published by Gretserus, by Combefis, in the 1st volume of his *Biblioth. Pat. Græco-Lat. Auctor.* (Paris, 1648, folio); *Oratio de Sto. Nicolo*, Greek and Latin, by Petrus Possime (Toulouse, 1654, 4to); *Oratio de Sto. Chrysostomo*, restored from the life of that father by Georgius Alexandrinus in the 8th volume of the Savilian ed. of Chrysostom (Antwerp, 1614, folio); some others in Combefis, *Biblioth. Concionatoria*, in the *Biblioth. Patrum Lugdun.*, and dispersed in other works; *Leoni Imp. Homilia nunc primum vulgata Græce et Latine ejusdemque qua Photium est Confutatio, a Scipione Maffei* (Padua, 1751, 8vo):—3. *Epistola ad Omarum Saracenum de Fidei Christianæ Veritate et Sarcenorum Erroribus* (in Latin [Lyons, 1509] by Champerius, who translated a Chaldæan version of the Greek original, which seems to be lost: the same in the different *Biblioth. Patrum*, and separately by Prof. Schwarz in the *Program.* of the University of Leipsic, in the year 1786):—4. Ἡ γεγονῖα διατύπωσις παρὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως Λεόντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ, κ.τ.λ., *Dispositio facta per Imperatorem Leontem Sapientem*, etc. (Greek and Latin, by J. Leunclavius, in *Jus Græco-Romanum;* by Jac. Goar, ad calcem Codini, Par. 1648, folio):—5. Εἰς τὰ Μονομερίου, *In spectaculum Unius Dei*, an epigram of little value, with notes by Brodæus and Opsopæus, in *Epigrum. libri vii*, edit. Wechel (Frankfort, 1600). See Zonaras, ii, 174,

etc.; Cedrenus, p. 591, etc.; Joel, p. 179, etc.; Manass. p. 108, etc.; Glycas. p. 296, etc.; Genesius, p. 61, etc.; Codin. p. 63, etc.; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii, 693 sq.; Hamberger, *Nachrichten von Gelehrten Männern*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.*; Hankius, *Script. Byzant.*; Oudin, *Comment. de SS. Eccl.* ii, 394 sq.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 739 sq.

Leo of Saint-Jean, a French theologian and controversialist, was born at Rennes July 9, 1600. He entered the Carmelite convent when quite young, and, being greatly esteemed by the order, he successively filled nearly all the positions in their gift. He died at the convent "des Billettes," Dec. 30, 1671. He wrote *Carmelus restitutus* (Par. 1634, 4to):—*Encyclop. Præmissum, seu sapientiæ universalis delineatio*, etc. (1635, 4to):—*Hist. Carmelit. provinciæ Turonensis* (1640, 4to). His sermons were published under the title *La Somme des Sermons parénétiques et panégyriques* (1671-75, 4 vols. fol.). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 738.

Leo Stypiōta, or Styppa, or Stypa (Στύπης), patriarch of Constantinople in the 12th century (A.D. 1134 to 1143), flourished until about the time of the accession of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus. A decree of Leo Stypiota on the lawfulness of certain marriages is given in the *Jus Orientale* of Bonefidus (Θεσμοὶ Ἀρχιερατικοί, *Sanction. Pontific.* p. 59), and in the *Jus Græco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (liber iii, vol. i, p. 217). He is often cited by Nicolaus Comnenus Papadopoli. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* viii, 721; xi, 666. —Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 745.

Leo of Thessalonīca, an eminent Byzantine philosopher and ecclesiastic of the 9th century, characterized by his devotion to learning, studied grammar and poetry at Constantinople, and rhetoric, philosophy, and arithmetic under Michael Psellus on the island of Andros, and at the monasteries on the adjacent part of continental Greece. He afterwards settled at Constantinople and became an instructor. Introduced to the notice of emperor Theophilus, he was appointed public teacher or professor, and the Church of the Forty Martyrs was assigned him for a school. Soon after the patriarch John, who appears hitherto to have neglected his learned kinsman, promoted Leo to the archbishopric of Thessalonica. Upon the death of Theophilus (A.D. 842), when the government came into the hands of Theodora, the iconoclastic party was overthrown, and Leo and John were deposed from their sees; but Leo, whose worth seems to have secured respect, escaped the sufferings which fell to his kinsman's lot; and when Cæsar Bardas, anxious for the revival of learning, established the mathematical school at the palace of Magnaura, in Constantinople, Leo was placed at the head. Leo was still living in A.D. 869; how much later is not known. Symeon (*De Mich. et Theodora*, c. 46) has described a remarkable method of telegraphic communication invented by Leo, and practiced in the reigns of Theophilus and his son Michael. Fires kindled at certain hours of the day conveyed intelligence of hostile incursions, battles, conflagrations, and the other incidents of war, from the confines of Syria to Constantinople; the hour of kindling indicating the nature of the accident, according to an arranged plan, marked on the dial-plate of a clock kept in the castle of Lusus, near Tarsus, and of a corresponding one kept in the palace at Constantinople. The Μέθοδος προγνωστική, *Methodus Prognostica*, or instructions for divining by the Gospel or Psalter, by Leo Sapiens, in the Medicean Library at Florence (Bandini, *Catalog. Codd. Laur. Medic.* iii, 339), is perhaps by another Leo. Combefis was disposed to claim for Leo of Thessalonica the authorship of the celebrated Χρησμοί, *Oracula*, which are commonly ascribed to the emperor Leo VI, Sapiens, or the Wise, and have been repeatedly published. But Leo of Thessalonica is generally designated in the Byzantine writers *the philosopher* (φιλόσοφος), not *the wise* (σοφός); and if the published *Oracula* are a part of the series mentioned by Zonaras (xv, 21), they must be older than either the emperor or Leo of Thessalonica. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iv, 148, 158; vii, 697; xi, 665; Allatius, *De Psellis*, c. 3-6; Labbe, *De Byzant. Histor. Scriptoribus* Προτρεπτικόν, pt. ii, p. 45.—Smith, *Dict. of Grk. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 745 sq.

Leo the Thracian (also *the Great*), or Flavius Leo I, emperor of Constantinople, was born in Thrace of obscure parents, entered the military service, and rose to high rank. At the death of the emperor Marcian in A.D. 457, he commanded a body of troops near Selymbria, and was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers, at the instigation of Aspar, a Gothic chief, who commanded the auxiliaries. The senate of Constantinople confirmed the choice, and the patriarch Anatolius crowned him. This is said to have been the first instance of an emperor receiving the crown from the hands of a bishop, a ceremony which was afterwards adopted by all other Christian princes, and from which the clergy, as Gibbon justly observes, have deduced the most formidable consequences. See Investiture. Leo followed the measures of Marcian against the Eutychians, who had been condemned as heretics, and who had recently excited a tumult at Alexandria, had killed the bishop, and placed one Ælurus in his stead. Aspar for a time screened Ælurus; but Leo at last had him exiled, and an orthodox bishop put in his place. The Huns, having entered the province of Dacia, were defeated by the imperial troops, and a son of Attila was killed in the battle. Soon after, Leo, in concert with Anthemius, emperor of the West, prepared a numerous fleet, with a large body of troops on board, for the recovery of Africa, which was occupied by the Vandals. Part of the expedition attacked and took the island of Sardinia; the rest landed in Libya, and took Tripolis and other towns; but the delay and mismanagement of the commander, who was Leo's brother-in-law, gave time to Genseric to make his preparations. Coming out of the harbor of Carthage by night, with fire-ships impelled by a fair wind, he set fire to many of the imperial ships, dispersed the rest, and obliged the expedition to leave the coast of Africa. Leo died in January, 474.—*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii, 734.

Leo I, saint and pope, surnamed *the Great*, noted as the real founder of the papacy, was born about the year 390, though the exact date is not ascertained. We have also no precise information as to his birthplace; for while the *liber pontificalis* describes him as a Tuscan, and names Quintianus as his father, Quesnel, on the authority of an expression in one of Leo's own letters (xxxi, 4), and an account of his election by a certain Prosper, stated that he was born at Rome, and this opinion has been accepted without further inquiry by most subsequent ecclesiastical writers. While yet an acolyte, Leo was dispatched, in A.D. 418, to Carthage, for the purpose of conveying to Aurelius and the other African bishops the sentiments of Zosimus concerning the Pelagian doctrines of Cœlestius (q. v.). Under Celestine (q. v.) he discharged the duties of a deacon; and the reputation even then (431) enjoyed by him is clearly indicated by the terms of the epistle prefixed to the seven books *De Incarnatione Christi* of Cassianus, who at his request had undertaken this work against the Nestorian heresy. About this time he was applied to by Cyril of Alexandria to settle a difficulty between Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, and the primate of the ecclesiastical province of Jerusalem. Having obtained a great reputation for his knowledge, energy, and untiring activity, he failed not to secure the full confidence of Sixtus III (432–440), to whom he rendered valuable service, in several important offices intrusted to him. Attracting also the notice of Valentinian III, he undertook, by request of this emperor, a mission to Gaul, to soothe the formidable dissensions existing between the two generals Aëtius and Albinus. While Leo was engaged in this delicate ne-

gotiation, which was conducted with singular prudence and perfect success, Sixtus III died, Aug. 3, 440, and by the unanimous voice of the clergy and laity the absent deacon Leo was chosen to fill the vacant seat. Envoys were at once sent to Gaul to apprise him of his election, and having returned to Rome he was duly installed, Sept. 29, 440. Both the State and the Church were then in a critical position; the former in consequence of the frequent invasions of barbarians; the Church through its inner dissensions and quarrels. From the earliest ages until this epoch no man who combined lofty ambition with commanding intellect and political dexterity had presided over the Roman see; and although its influence had gradually increased, and many of its bishops had sought to extend and confirm that influence, yet they had merely availed themselves of accidental circumstances to augment their own personal authority, without acting upon any distinct and well-devised scheme. But Leo, while he zealously watched over his own peculiar flock, concentrated all the powers of his energetic mind upon one great design, which he seems to have formed at a very early period, and which he kept steadfastly in view during a long and eventful life, following it out with consummate boldness, perseverance, and talent. This was nothing less than the establishment of the "apostolic chair" as a spiritual supremacy over every branch of the Catholic Church, and the exclusive appropriation for its occupant of the title of *Papa*, or father of the whole Christian world. Leo may therefore be regarded as the precursor of Gregory the Great, and in this respect certainly deserved the surname of Great, which was given him. The evil days amid which his lot was cast were not unfavorable, as might at first sight be supposed, to such a project. The contending parties among the orthodox clergy, terrified by the rapid progress of Arianism, were well disposed to refer their minor disputes to arbitration. Leo, who well knew, from the example of his predecessor Innocent I, that the transition is easy from instruction to command, in the numerous and elaborate replies which he addressed to inquiries proceeding from various quarters, studiously adopted a tone of absolute infallibility, and assumed the right of enforcing obedience to his decisions as an unquestionable prerogative of his office, deriving authority for such a position from the relation of Peter to Christ and to the other apostles. He represented Peter as most intimately connected with Christ: "Petrum in consortium individuæ unitatis assumtum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari dicendo: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, ut æterni templi ædificatio, mirabili munere gratia dei, in Petri solidítate consisteret; hac ecclesiam suam firmitate corroborans, ut illam nec humana temeritas posset appetere, nec portæ contra illam inferi prævalerent" (*Letters*, x, 1). This community of person into which the Lord received Peter is then made to extend into a community of power: "Quia tu es Petrus, i. e. cum ego sim lapis angularis, qui facio utraque unum, ego fundamentum, præter quod nemo potest aliud ponere; tamen tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidaris, et quæ mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecum participatione communia" (*Letters*, iv, 2). Peter had been received into the community of person with the Lord as a reward for his recognition and worship of Christ: true, he had denied his Master, but this the Lord had intentionally permitted to happen. But, in comparison with the other apostles, he possessed not only all that every one of them did, but also much that the others did not (*Letters*, iv, 2), and was their original chief: "Transivit quidem etiam in alios apostolos jus potestatis istius (ligandi et solvendi) et ad omnes ecclesiæ principes decreti hujus constitutio commeavit, sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimetur. Petro enim ideo hoc singulariter creditur, qui cunctis ecclesiæ rectoribus Petri forma præponitur." It is only *in him* that the apostles were intrusted with their mission—in him they are all saved; and it is for this reason that the Lord takes special care of him, and that his faith is prayed for specially, "tanquam aliorum status certior sit futurus, si mens principis victa non fuerit." After identifying the Church with the incarnation of Christ, Leo identifies Peter with Christ. This primacy of Peter continues, therefore, for while the faith of Peter is retained, all the privileges attached to this faith in Peter remain also. This primacy continues among the followers of Peter, for they hold the same relation towards Peter that Peter held towards Christ; as Christ was in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; it is still Peter who, through them, fulfils the command of Christ, "*Feed my sheep!*"—"Christus tantam potentiam dedit ei, quem totius ecclesiæ principem fecit, ut si quid etiam nostris temporibus recte per nos agitur recteque disponitur, illius operibus, illius sit gubernaculis deputandum, cui dictum est: Et tu conversus confirma fratres tuos" (*Sermon.* iv, 4). While affecting the utmost humility when speaking of himself personally as unworthy of his high office, he speaks of that office itself as the most exalted station.

It was more difficult for Leo, however, to prove that the bishop of *Rome* is the successor of St. Peter. Rome, says Leo, has been glorified by the death of the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul, who brought the Gospel to the Eternal City; and Leo claims to discover a special Providence in this coming of Peter to Rome, so that that city should through him and in him become the centre of the Christian world. "Ut hujus enarrabilis gratiæ (incarnationis) per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia præparavit; cujus ad eos limites incrementa perducta sunt, quibus cunctarum undique gentium vicina et contigua esset universitas. Disposito namque divinitus operi maxime congruebat, ut multa regna uno confœderarentur imperio et cito pervios haberet populos prædicatio generalis, quos unius teneret regimen civitatis" (*Serm.* lxxxii, 2). Here, finding dogmatical arguments unavailable for his purpose, Leo turns to history, which he arranges to suit himself. With regard now to the relation existing between the bishop of Rome and the other bishops, Leo says expressly, "All the bishops have indeed the same office, but not the same power. For even among the apostles, although they were all called apostles, there existed a remarkable distinction, for one only, Peter, held the first rank. From this results the difference among the bishops. It is a fundamental law of the Church that all have not the equal right to express all things, but that in each province there is one (the bishop of the principal place in the province) who has the first voice among his brethren. Again, those who occupy more important sees (the metropolitans of dioceses) have still greater power. But the direction of the whole Church is the care of the chair of St. Peter, and no one can take anything away from him who is the head of all." Potent but unconscious instruments in forwarding Leo's ambitious schemes were found in the barbarian chiefs whose power was not yet consolidated, and who were eager to propitiate one who possessed such weight with the priesthood, and through them could either calm into submission or excite to rebellion an ignorant and fanatic multitude. But, though the minds of men were in some degree prepared and disposed to yield to such domination, it was scarcely to be expected that the effort should not provoke jealousy and resistance. A strong opposition was speedily organized both in the West and in the East, and soon assumed the attitude of open defiance. In the West the contest was brought to an issue by the controversy with Hilary of Arles (see Hilarius Arelatensis) concerning the deposition of Chelidonius, bishop of Vesontio (Besançon), who had married a widow, which was forbidden by the canons. Chelidonius appealed to Leo, who reinstated him in his see. Hilary was summoned to Rome upon several charges brought against him by other bishops of Gaul, to whom his severity was obnoxious; and Leo obtained a rescript from the emperor Valentinian III suspending Hilary from his episcopal office. This sus-

pension, however, does not appear to have been lasting, although the fact has been taken hold of by controversial writers as a stretch of jurisdiction in the see of Rome. Quesnel published a dissertation upon this controversy in his edition of the works of Leo (Paris, 1675). The total defeat and severe punishment of the Gallican bishop filled his supporters with terror, and the edict of Valentinian served as a sort of charter, in virtue of which the Roman bishops exercised for centuries undisputed jurisdiction over France, Spain, Germany, and Britain. In the East the struggle was much more complicated and the result much less satisfactory. The archimandrite Eutyches (q. v.), in his vehement denunciation of Nestorius, having been betrayed into errors, very different, indeed, but considered equally dangerous, was anathematized, deposed, and excommunicated, in A.D. 448, by the synod of Constantinople. Against this sentence he sought redress by soliciting the interference of the bishops of Alexandria and Rome. His cause was eagerly espoused by the former. As for Leo, he wrote to the patriarch Flavianus (q. v.), telling him that "he had been informed of the disturbances which had taken place in the Church of Constantinople by the emperor, and was surprised that Flavianus had not at once written to him about it, and informed him thereof before the subject had been disclosed to any one else." Leo also informed Flavianus that he had received a letter from Eutyches complaining that his excommunication had been without just cause, and that his appeal to Rome had not been considered. Flavianus was to send to Rome a competent envoy, with full information of all the particulars of the case, to render final judgment in the matter. In a case like the present, says Leo, in his conclusion, the first thing of all to be attended to is "ut sine strepitu concertationum et custodiatur caritas et veritas defendatur." In a letter of the same date to the emperor, Leo rejoices that Theodosius has not only a royal, but also a priestly heart, and carefully guarded against schism, for "the state also is in the best condition when the holy Trinity is worshipped in unity." Meanwhile a general council was summoned to be held on the 1st of August, 449, at Ephesus, and thither the ambassadors of Leo repaired, for the purpose of reading publicly the above letter to Flavianus. But a great majority of the congregated fathers, acting under control of the president, Dioscurus of Alexandria, refused to listen to the document, passed tumultuously a series of resolutions favorable to Eutyches, excommunicated the most zealous of his opponents, and not only treated the Roman envoys with indignity, but even offered violence to their persons. Hence this assembly, whose acts were all subsequently annulled, is known in ecclesiastical history as the *Synodus Latrocinalis*. The vehement complaints addressed to Theodosius by the orthodox leaders proved fruitless, and the triumph of their opponents was for a time complete, when the sudden death of the emperor, in 450, again awakened the hopes and called forth the exertions of Leo. In consequence of the pressing representations of his envoys, Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus, together with all the clergy of Constantinople, was induced to subscribe the Confession of Faith contained in the Epistle to Flavianus, and to transmit it for signature to all the dioceses of the East. Encouraged by this success, Leo solicited the new monarch, Marcian, to summon a grand council for the final adjustment of the question concerning the nature of Christ, which still proved a source of discord, and strained every nerve to have it held in Italy, where his own adherents would necessarily have preponderated. In this, however, he failed, as the council was held at Chalcedon in October, 451. Although the Roman legates, whose language was of the most imperious description, did not fail broadly to assert the pretensions put forth by the representative of St. Peter, at first all went smoothly. The Epistle to Flavianus was admitted as a rule of faith for the guidance of the universal Church, and no protest was entered against the spirit of arrogant assumption in which it was conceived. But when the whole of the special business was concluded, at the very last sitting, a formal resolution was proposed and passed, to the effect that while the Roman see was, in virtue of its antiquity, entitled to take formal precedence of every other, the see of Constantinople was to stand next in rank, was to be regarded as independent from every other, and to exercise full jurisdiction over the churches of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus. The resistance of Leo was all in vain. The obnoxious canons were fully confirmed, and thus one half of the sovereignty at which he aimed was lost forever, at the very moment when victory seemed no longer doubtful. Leo made another and last effort on the 22d of May, 452, when he wrote to Marcian and to Pulcheria, threatening, but in vain, to excommunicate Anatolius. In 457, after the death of Marcian, the party of Eutyches made a last effort, and besought the new emperor to assemble a council to condemn the decrees of that of Chalcedon, but the emperor refused to yield to this request.

In the mean time serious events were taking place at Rome. In 452 the dreaded king of the Huns, Attila, invaded Italy, and, after sacking and plundering Aquileia, Pavia, and Milan, he marched against Rome. Valentinian, proving himself unfit for his high position, remained at Ravenna, and Ætius himself saw safety in flight only. The Roman senate assembled to deliberate on what should be done in this emergency, and resistance being considered impossible, Leo was chosen as a mediator and sent to Attila. What the arguments employed by the eloquent suppliant may have been history has failed to record; but the Huns spared Rome, and, in consideration of a sum paid by the inhabitants, withdrew from Italy and retired beyond the Danube. This action of Attila appeared so strange that it was considered impossible to account for it except by a miracle. According to the legend, Attila confessed to his officers that during the address of Leo a venerable old man appeared to him, holding a sword with which he threatened to slay him if he resisted the voice of God. When again in 455 Rome lay at the mercy of the Vandals, who, taking advantage of the disturbances which followed the death of Valentinian, had invaded Italy, the senate had a second time recourse to Leo, and sent him to Genseric. But this time his eloquence did not prove so successful. Genseric consented only to promise not to burn the city, and to spare the life of the inhabitants, and from plunder three of the most important churches. The other parts of the town were abandoned to the soldiers for a fortnight. The remainder of Leo's life passed without further disturbance. While engaged in his schemes of aggrandizement, he never neglected for a moment to pursue and repress heresy within the states where his authority was recognised. Having learned that there were still a large number of Manichæans in Rome, he caused them to be hunted up and punished. He acted with as much severity against the Pelagians and the Priscillianists. Barbeyrac (*Traité de la morale des Pères*, c. 17, § 2) even accuses him of having approved, and perhaps instigated, the violent measures taken against the heretics during his pontificate, and adduces in proof the letter of this pope to Turibius, bishop primate of Spain, concerning the Priscillianists. Beausobre (in his *Histoire du Manich.*, l. 9, c. 9, t. 2, p. 756) goes further, and charges Leo with having falsely accused the Manichæans and Priscillianists of the misdeeds for which they were condemned.

Leo is said to have been the originator of the fasts of Lent and Pentecost. An old legend, found in a number of ancient writers, relates that in the latter part of his life Leo cut off one of his hands; some, Th. Raynaud among them, give as the reason that a woman of great beauty having once, on Easter-day, been permitted to kiss his hand, the pope felt unholy desires, and thus punished this rebellion of the flesh, and they add that it is from that time the custom of kissing the pope's foot was introduced. Sabellicus and others assert that the

pope only punished himself for having conferred orders on a man who proved unworthy. All state that his hand was finally restored to him by a miracle. He died April 11, 461.

The works of Leo consist of discourses delivered on the great festivals of the Church, or on other solemn occasions, and of letters. I. Sermones.—Of these, the first by the Roman pontiffs which have come down to posterity, we possess 96. There are 5 *De Natali ipsius*, preached on anniversaries of his ordination, 6 *De Collectis*, 9 *De Jejunio Decimi Mensis*, 10 *De Nativitate Domini*, 8 *In Epiphania Domini*, 19 *De Passione Domini*, 2 *De Resurrectione Domini*, 2 *De Ascensione Domini*, 3 *De Pentecoste*, 4 *De Jejunio Pentecostes*, 1 *In Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, 1 *In Natali S. Petri Apostoli*, 1 *In Octavis Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, 1 *In Natali S. Laurentii Martyris*, 9 *De Jejunio Septimi Mensis*, 1 *De Gradibus Ascensionis ad Beatitudinem*, 1 *Tractatus contra Hæresim Eutychis*. Milman (*Hist. Lat. Christianity*, i, 258) thus comments on these productions of Leo: "His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe, without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion; it is the Roman censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman prætor dictating the law, and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian—Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with special emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ." II. Epistolæ.—These, extending to the number of 173, are addressed to the reigning emperors and their consorts, to synods, to religious communities, to bishops and other dignitaries, and to sundry influential personages connected with the ecclesiastical history of the times. They afford an immense mass of most valuable information on the prevailing heresies, controversies, and doubts on matters of doctrine, discipline, and Church government. Besides the 96 *Sermones* and 173 *Epistolæ* mentioned above, a considerable number of tracts have from time to time been ascribed to this pope, but their authenticity is either so doubtful or their spuriousness so evident that they are now universally set aside. A list of these, and an investigation of their origin, will be found in the edition of the brothers Ballerini, more particularly described below. In consequence of the reputation deservedly gained by Leo, his writings have always been eagerly studied. But, although a vast number of MSS. are still in existence, none of these exhibit his works in a complete form, and no attempt seems to have been made to bring together any portion of them for many hundred years after his death. The *Sermones* were dispersed in the *Lectionaria*, or select discourses of distinguished divines, employed in places of public worship until the 11th century, when they first began to be picked out of these cumbrous storehouses and transcribed separately, while the *Epistolæ* were gradually gathered into imperfect groups, or remained embodied in the general collections of papal constitutions and canons.

Of the numerous printed editions of Leo I's works, the first was published by Sweynheym and Pannartz (Rome, 1470, fol.), under the inspection of Andrew, bishop of Aleria, comprising 92 *Sermones* and 5 *Epistolæ*. The best two editions were published at Paris (1675, 2 vols. 4to) by Pasquier Quesnel and by the Ballerini (Verona, 1755–57, 3 vols. fol.). Of Quesnel's edition it is due to say that, by the aid of a large number of MSS., preserved chiefly in the libraries of France, he was enabled to introduce such essential improvements into the text, and by his erudite industry illustrated so clearly the obscurities in which many of the documents were involved, that the works of Leo now for the first time assumed an unmutilated, intelligible, and satisfactory aspect. But the admiration excited by the skill with which the arduous task had been executed soon received a check. Upon attentive perusal the notes and dissertations were found to contain such free remarks upon many of the opinions and usages of the primitive Church, and, above all, to manifest such unequivocal hostility to the despotism of the Roman see, that the volumes fell under the ban of the Inquisition very shortly after their publication, and were included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of 1682. Notwithstanding these denunciations, the book enjoyed great popularity, and was reprinted, without any suppression or modification of the obnoxious passages, at Lyons, in 1700. Hence the heads of the Romish Church became anxious to supply an antidote to the poison so extensively circulated. This undertaking was first attempted by Peter Cacciari, a Carmelite monk of the Propaganda, whose labors (*S. Leonis Magni Opera omnia* [Rome, 1753–1755, 2 vols. fol.]; *Exercitationes in Universa S. Leonis Magni Opera* [Rome, 1751, fol.]) might have attracted attention and praise had they not been, at the very moment when they were brought to a close, entirely thrown into the shade by those of the brothers Peter and Jerome Ballerini, presbyters of Verona. Their edition, indeed, is entitled to take the first place, both on account of the purity of the text, corrected from a great number of MSS., chiefly Roman, not before collated, the arrangement of the different parts, and the notes and disquisitions. A full description of these volumes, as well as of those of Quesnel and Cacciari, is to be found in Schönemann (*Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. ii, § 42), who has bestowed more than usual care upon this section. See Maimbourg, *Histoire du Pontificat de Léon* (Paris, 1687, 4to); Arendt, *Leo d. Grosse* (Mainz, 1835, 8vo); *Gesch. d. Röm. Literat.* (Suppl. Band. 2d part, § 159–162); Alex. de Saint-Chéron, *Histoire du Pontificat de St. Léon le Grand et de son siècle* (2 vols. 8vo.); Ph. de Mornay, *Histoire Pontificale* (1612, 12mo, p. 71); Bruys, *Hist. des Papes* (La Haye, 1732, 5 vols. 4to), i, 218; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Lucques, 1738, 19 vols. fol.), vii, 535–638; viii, 1–240; G. Bertazzolo, *Breve Descrittione della Vita di san Leone primo et di Attila Flagello di Dio* (Mantua, 1614, 4to); Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 1; E. Perthel, *Pabst Leo's I Leben u. Lehren* (1843); C. T. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, vol. i, ch. iv; Neander, *Church History*, ii, 104, 169 sq., 508 sq., 708 sq.; Dumoulin, *Vie et Religion de deux bons Papes Léon I et Grégoire I* (1650); Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, i, 13 sq.; Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* (Phil. 1869, 8vo: see its Index); Riddle, *Hist. Papacy*, i, 171 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii, 90 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* viii, 296–311; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth.* ii, 746 sq.; Migne, *Nouv. Encyc. Théol.* ii, 1152; Bergier, *Dict. de Théol.* iv, 34 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 704–708; *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; *Christian Remembrancer*, 1854, p. 291 sq.

Leo II, Pope, was born at Cedelle, in Sicily, in the early part of the 7th century. He became first canon regular, then cardinal priest, and finally pope, as successor of Agatho. Although his predecessor had died in January of the same year, he was installed as late as August, 682, by the emperor Constantine V, as "the most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and universal pope." The reasons of this delay are unknown. Soon after his election Constantine requested him to send to Constantinople an ambassador, with full authority to decide at once on all questions of dogmas and canons, and other ecclesiastical interests. But Leo, perceiving the aim of the request, sent only a sub-deacon, who would not act in matters of any importance without first consulting with Rome. He also immediately assembled a synod to approve of the acts of the sixth œcumenical council held at Constantinople in 681, which had been brought to Rome by the legates of Agatho. In 683 he sent a legate to Constantine, with a letter anathematizing the heresy of the Monothelites, and also pope Honorius (625–638), "who, instead of purifying the Apostolic Church by the doctrines of the apostles,

has come near overthrowing the faith by his treason" (Labbe, *Conc.* vi, 1246). Leo sought to induce all the churches to accept the decisions of that council, and for that purpose translated them from Greek into Latin, sending a copy of them in the latter language to the Spanish bishops. He appears also to have given his ambassador four letters, somewhat similar as to their contents (see Mansi, xi, 1050–1058), addressed to the bishops of Ostrogothia, count Simplicius, king Erwig, and the metropolitan bishop Quiricus of Toledo, expressing his wish that all the bishops of Spain would indorse the acts of the Council of Constantinople. In these letters he says: "Honorius has falsified the inviolable rule of apostolic succession which he had received from his predecessors." Baronius, wishing to rehabilitate Leo, denies the authenticity of these letters, while Pagi attempts to uphold it; Gfrörer (*Kirchengesch.* vol. iii, pt. i, p. 397 sq.) also maintains their genuineness, and adduces in proof of it their corresponding precisely with the decisions of the fourteenth Council of Toledo. Leo also obtained from Constantine a promise that after the death of the titular archbishop of Ravenna his successors should, according to an old custom fallen into disuse, come to Rome to be consecrated. In exchange for this concession, Leo relieved the see of Ravenna from the obligation of paying the taxes formerly levied on the occasion of such consecration. Leo was a great friend of Church music, and did much towards improving the Gregorian chant. He built a church to St. Paul, and is said to have originated the custom of sprinkling the people with holy water. He died in July, 683: the exact date is not ascertained, and the Roman Catholic Church commemorates him on the 28th of June. See Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles.* v, 105; Platina, *Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontefici;* Ciaconius, *Vitæ et Res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum* (Rom. 1677, 4 vols. folio), i, 478; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 311; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 708; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, i, 185; Bower, *History of the Popes*, iii, 134 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 300.

Leo III, Pope, who brought about the elevation of the Frankish king to the position of emperor of the West, and thus relieved the Roman pontificate of further subjection to the Greek emperors, was a native of the Eternal City, and was elected after the death of Adrian I, Dec. 25, 795. Immediately after his election he communicated the intelligence to Charlemagne, and, like his predecessor, acknowledged allegiance. Charlemagne replied by a letter of congratulation, which he intrusted to the abbot Angilbertus, whom he commissioned to confer with the new pontiff respecting the relations between the see of Rome and the "Patrician of the Romans," for this was the title which Charlemagne had assumed. In 796 Leo sent to Charlemagne the keys of St. Peter and the standard of the city of Rome, requesting the king to send some of his nobles to administer the oath of allegiance to the people of Rome, and thus the dominion of Charlemagne was extended over the city and duchy of Rome. In the year 799, an atrocious assault, the motive of which is not clearly ascertained, was committed on the person of the pope. While Leo was riding on horseback, followed by the clergy, and chanting the liturgy, a canon by the name of Paschal and a sacristan called Campulus, accompanied by many armed ruffians, fell upon him, threw him from his horse, and dragged him into the convent of St. Sylvester, when they stabbed him in many places, endeavoring to put out his eyes and cut out his tongue. Leo, however, was delivered by his friends from the hands of the assassins, and taken to Spoleti under the protection of the duke of Spoleti, where he soon after recovered; thence he travelled as far as Paderborn in Germany, where Charlemagne then was, by whom the pope was received with the greatest honors. Charlemagne sent him back to Rome with a numerous escort of bishops and counts, and also of armed men. The pope was met outside of the city gates by the clergy, senate, and people, and accompanied in triumph to the Lateran palace. A court composed of the bishops and counts proceeded to the trial of the conspirators who had attempted the life of the pope, and the two chiefs, Paschal and Campulus, were exiled to France. From this very lenient sentence and other concomitant circumstances, it appears that Charlemagne had greatly at heart the conciliation of the Romans in general, in order to deter them from betaking themselves again to the protection of the Greek emperors. In 800 Charlemagne himself visited Italy, and was met at Nomentum, outside of Rome, by the pope, and the next day he repaired to the Basilica of the Vatican, escorted by the soldiers and the people. After a few days Charlemagne convoked a numerous assembly of prelates, abbots, and other persons of distinction, Franks as well as Romans, to examine certain charges brought against the pope by the partisans of Paschal and Campulus, but no proofs were elicited, and Leo himself, taking the book of gospels in his hand, declared himself innocent. On Christmas-day of that year the pontiff officiated in the Basilica of the Vatican, in presence of Charlemagne and his numerous retinue. As Charlemagne was preparing to leave the church, the pontiff stopped him, and placed a rich crown upon his head, while the clergy and the people, at the same moment, cried out "Carolo piissimo," "Augusto magno imperatori," with other expressions and acclamations which were wont to be used in proclaiming Roman emperors. Three times the acclamations were repeated, after which the pope was the first to pay homage to the new emperor. From that time Charlemagne left off the titles of king and patrician, and styled himself Augustus and emperor of the Romans, and he addressed the emperor of Constantinople by the name of brother. Thus was the Western empire revived 325 years after Odoacer had deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last nominal successor of the Cæsars on the throne of the West. From that time all claim of the Eastern emperors to the supreme dominion over the duchy of Rome was at an end, and the popes from the same date assumed the temporal authority over the city and duchy, in subordination, however, to Charlemagne and his successors; they began, also, to coin money, with the pontiff's name on one side and that of the emperor on the other. In 804 the pope, during Christmas, visited Charlemagne at his court at Aquisgrana (Aix-la-Chapelle). In the division which Charlemagne made by will of his dominions among his sons, the city of Rome was declared to belong to him who should bear the title of emperor. Louis le Debonnaire was afterwards invested with that title by Charlemagne himself, and we find him accordingly, after the death of his father, assuming the supreme jurisdiction over that city on the occasion of a fresh conspiracy which broke out against Leo, the heads of which were convicted by the ordinary courts of Rome, and put to death. Louis found fault with the rigor of the sentence and the haste of its execution, and he ordered his nephew, Bernard, king of Italy, to proceed to Rome and investigate the whole affair. Leo, who seems to have been alarmed at this proceeding, sent messengers to the court of Louis to justify himself. Meanwhile he fell seriously ill, and the people of Rome broke out into insurrection, and pulled down some buildings he had begun to construct on the confiscated property of the conspirators. The duke of Spoleti was sent for with a body of troops to suppress the tumult, when Leo suddenly died in 816, and Stephen IV was elected in his place. Leo is praised by Anastasius, a biographer of the same century, for the many structures, especially churches, which he raised or repaired, and the valuable gifts with which he enriched them. In his temporal policy he appears to have been more moderate and prudent than his predecessor, Adrian I, who was perpetually soliciting Charlemagne in his letters for fresh grants of territory to his see. Thirteen letters of Leo are published in Labbe's *Concilia*, vii, 1111–1127. He is also considered the author of the *Epistolæ ad Carolum Magnum imp.*, ex edi-

tione et cum notis Hermanni Conringii (Helmst. 1647, 4to). The *Enchiridion Leonis papæ*, containing seven penitential psalms and some prayers, has been erroneously attributed to him. See Ph. Jaffé, *Reg. Pontific.* (Berlin, 1851, 4to), p. 215; F. Pagi, *Breviarium historico-chronologico-criticum illustriora pontif.* (4to), ii, 1; J. G. Faber, *Dissertatio de Leone III, papa Romano* (Tübing. 1748, 4to); Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, ii, 454 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of Papacy*, i, 24 sq.; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, i, 304; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii (see Index); Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, i, 326; Bower, *Hist. Popes*, iv, 142 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix, 600 sq.; xx, 510; xxii, 37 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 72 sq.; Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.* p. 34 sq., 38, 58, 88 note, 179; *Engl. Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 710; Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* iii, 1, 2.

Leo IV, Pope, was a native of Rome, and succeeded Sergius II in 847. He was hastily elected, and consecrated without waiting for the consent of the emperor Lotharius, because Rome was then threatened by the Saracens, who occupied part of the duchy of Benevento, and who a short time before had landed on the banks of the Tiber, and plundered the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, which was outside of the walls. Leo's consecration, however, was undertaken with the express reservation of the emperor's rights, and when, in order to prevent a recurrence of the violence of the Saracens, Leo undertook to surround the basilica and the suburb about it with walls, the emperor sent money to assist in the work. The building of this Roman suburb occupied four years, and it was named after its founder, *Civitas Leonina*. Leo also restored the town of Porta, on the Tiber, near its mouth, settling there some thousands of Corsicans, who had run away from their country on account of the Saracens. Towers were built on both banks of the river, and iron chains drawn across to prevent the vessels of the Saracens from ascending to Rome. The port and town of Centum Cellæ being forsaken on account of the Saracens, Leo built a new town on the coast, about twelve miles distant from the other, which was called Leopolis; but no traces of it remain now, as the modern Civita Vecchia is built on or near the site of old Centum Cellæ. Leo IV held a council at Rome in 853, in which Anastasius, cardinal of St. Marcel, was deposed for having remained five years absent from Rome, notwithstanding the orders of the pope. Leo died in July, 855, and fifteen days after his death Benedict III was elected in his place, according to the most authentic text of Anastasius, who was a contemporary; but later writers introduce between Leo IV and Benedict III the fabulous pope Joan (q. v.). Leo has left us two entire epistles, as also fragments of several others, and a good homily, which are contained in Labbe's *Conc.* See Baronius, *Annal.* xiv, 340; Ciaconius, i, 614; Gfrörer, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii, 1, 2; Baxmann, *Politik d. Päpste*, i, 281, 352; Lea, *Studies in Ch. History*, p. 61, 91; Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, i, 336 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 96; Labbe, *Concil.* ix, 995; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 220 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 312; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* ii, 77; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxx, 711; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Leo V, Pope, was born at Priapi, near Ardea (according to some at Arezzo). He entered the order of Benedictines, became cardinal, and was finally elected to the papal chair Oct. 28, 903. A few days afterwards, Christopher, cardinal priest of St. Lorenzo, in Damaso, and chaplain of Leo, instigated an insurrection at Rome, and made the pope prisoner, under the plea that he was incapable of governing. Christopher now exacted from Leo a formal abdication, and the promise of returning into his convent. According to Sigonius, Leo died "of grief" in his prison one month and nine days after his election. He was buried in St. John of Lateran. But Christopher himself did not remain long in the papal chair, as a new revolt of the Romans drove him from the usurped see, and put in his place Sergius III, who was the favorite of the celebrated Marozia, a powerful but licentious woman, who disposed of everything in Rome. The 10th century may well be termed the darkest æra of the papacy. See Platina, *Historia de Vitis Pontificum*, etc.; Artaud de Montor, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains*, ii, 62; Du Chêne, *Hist. des Papes*; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, ii, 76 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 86; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 36; Genébrard, *Chron.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 315; *English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 711.

Leo VI, Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded John X July 6, 928, and died seven months afterwards; some say that he was put to death by Marozia, like his predecessor. He was succeeded by Stephen VII.—*English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 712; Bower, *History of the Popes*, v, 95.

Leo VII, Pope, a Roman, sometimes called Leo VI, succeeded John XI, the son of Marozia, January 8, 936. He mediated peace between Alberic, duke of Rome, and Hugo, king of Italy, who had offered to marry Marozia, in order to obtain by her means the possession of Rome, but was driven away by Alberic, also Marozia's son. Leo is said to have been a man of irreproachable conduct, but little is known of him. He died in 939, and was succeeded by Stephen VIII. We have of him an *epistola* to Hugo, abbot of St. Martin of Tours, published in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*; two others to Gerard, archbishop of Lorch, and to the bishops of France and Germany. See Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, vols. ii and iv; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. iii; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiast.*; Baronius, *Annal.* cent. x; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 97 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 121; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, ii, 93; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 316; *English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 712.

Leo VIII, Pope, a Roman, succeeded John XII, who was deposed for his misconduct by a council assembled at Rome, in presence of the emperor Otho I, in 963. But soon after Otho had left Rome, John XII came in again at the head of his partisans, obliged Leo to run away, and resumed the papal office. John, however, shortly after died or was murdered while committing adultery, and the Romans elected Benedict V. Otho, returning with an army, took the city of Rome, exiled Benedict, and reinstated Leo, who died about 965, and was succeeded by John XIII. See Baronius, *Annal.* xvi, 129; Platina, *Historia*, p. 14; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 112 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 42; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 126 sq., 216; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, ii, 114; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxx, 713.

Leo IX (Bruno), Pope, bishop of Toul, was born in Alsace in 1002, and was cousin-german of the emperor Conrad the Salic. He was noted for great scholarly attainments, and was elected in 1049 to succeed Damasus II, at the joint recommendation of the emperor Henry III and of the famous Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII), who became one of Leo IX's most trusted advisers and guides. Indeed, it has often been a matter of comment that the reign of Leo IX was rather Gregorian in tendency. Leo was continually in motion between Germany and Italy, holding councils and endeavoring to reform the discipline and morals of the clergy, and also to check the progress of the Normans in Southern Italy, against whom he led an army, but was defeated in Apulia and taken prisoner by the Normans, who treated him with great respect, but kept him for more than a year in Benevento. Having made peace with them by granting to them as a fief of the Roman see their conquests in Apulia and Calabria, he was allowed to return to Rome, where he died in 1054, and was succeeded by Victor II. Among the councils held by Leo IX, one was convened at Rome (1050) against Berengar (q. v.), and in favor of Lanfranc (q. v.). Another important council held during his pontificate was that of Rheims in 1049, where many laws were enacted against simony, clerical matrimony, and the conditions and relations of

monks and priests. Labbe and Cossart's *Conc.* contain nineteen letters of this pope (ix, 949–1001). See Baronius, *Annal.* xvii, 19–107; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iii, 277, 278; Gfrörer, *Kirchengeschichte*, iv, 1; Höfler, *Die deutschen Päbste*, ii, 3–214; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, i, 359 sq.; ii, 191 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 164 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 105 sq.; Hunkler, *Leo IX u. s. Zeit* (Mayence, 1851); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, iii, 240 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy;* Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 189 sq., 191 sq., 217, 244, 292; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 317 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 714.

Leo X (*Giovanni de' Medici*), pope from 1513 to 1521, was born at Florence Dec. 11, 1475. He was the second son of the celebrated Lorenzo de' Medici (born Jan. 31, 1448; died April 8, 1492), surnamed "the Magnificent," and grandson of Cosmo de' Medici (born in 1389, died in 1464). From infancy Giovanni had been destined by his father to an ecclesiastical career, for to the lot of Pietro, the elder child, fell the succession in the Florentine government, and, as Giovanni early showed signs of ability, the great aim of Lorenzo was to secure for his house, by his second child, the influence of the Church. At the tender age of seven Giovanni was subjected to the tonsure, and at once presented by Louis XII of France with the rich living of the abbey of Fontdouce, and by pope Sixtus IV himself with that of the wealthy convent of Passignano. Various other rich livings were added to these successively, and in 1488, finally, the youthful ecclesiastic, of but thirteen years of age, was by pope Innocent VIII (father-in-law of Giovanni's sister Maddalena) presented with the cardinal's rank, limited by the condition only that the insignia of this distinction should not be assumed until his studies had been completed at Pisa. Hitherto his education had been intrusted to tutors mainly, and among them were the famous Greek historian Chalcondylas, and the learned Angelo Poliziano; he now set out at once for Pisa, and having there completed his theological studies in 1492, was on March the 9th of this same year installed at Florence into the cardinal's position, and three days after set out for and took up his residence in the Eternal City. Scarce had a month passed his induction to the cardinal's dignity when intelligence reached Rome that Lorenzo the Magnificent was no more, and hastily Giovanni retraced his steps to Florence, to afford succor and support to his weak but elder brother Pietro, upon whom now depended the continuance of the power of the Medici over Florence. In July of this year (1492) Innocent VIII died, and as Giovanni had opposed the election of his successor, Alexander VI, the Medici could no longer hope for support from the papacy. Blindly and madly, amid all these disadvantages, Pietro, unsatisfied with absolute power unless he could display the pomp and exercise the cruelties of despotism, contrived, in the short space of two years, to secure, instead of the love and good will, the hatred of the Florentines. Their enthusiastic devotion to the house of the Medici hitherto alone prevented any attempt to subvert his authority. They remained quiet even in 1494, when Charles VIII of France came into Italy to enforce his claim to the throne of Naples, and when Pietro joined the house of Aragon, instead of becoming a confederate of the French, as his ancestors had always been. But when Pietro, equally presumptuous in security and timid in danger, terrified by the unexpected success of the French, fled to the camp of Charles, and, kneeling at his feet, abandoned himself and his country to his mercy, the indignation of the Florentines could no longer be stayed, and, entering into a treaty with the French, they stipulated especially the exile of the Medici (Nov. 1494). After his capitulation to king Charles, Pietro had returned to Florence, but the enraged populace made his stay impossible, and he quickly fled the city. Giovanni, bolder and more courageous than his elder brother, assisted by a few faithful friends, well-armed, made a last attempt to assert the Medicean authority, and put down the insurrection by a bold exercise of force. It soon, however, became but too apparent to the young cardinal that his hope was all vanity. "The people multiplied themselves against Pietro," as Guicciardini (*Storia Fiorentina* [Opere inedite], iii, 110) phrases it, and Giovanni, in the disguise of a friar, was glad enough to find himself outside the city gates, and on the open Bologna road, taking the same road as Pietro, followed by their younger brother Giuliano, still a mere lad. They went first to John Bentivoglio in Bologna, but, as they were not received here, went to Castello, and found a refuge with Vitelli. In this and other places, the Medici, the cardinal included, lived for some time, having frequent endeavors made for their restoration. But when Giovanni was finally persuaded that all such efforts were fruitless, he decided to quit his native country, now ravaged by foreign armies, and betrayed by the wretched policy of pope Alexander VI, and he set out on a journey to France, Germany, and the Netherlands. For the assertion that the cardinal undertook this journey for political ends there is not the slightest foundation. While abroad he sought literary associations mainly. He courted the acquaintance of men of learning, and not unfrequently displayed his own taste for literature and the liberal arts. In 1503, upon the death of Alexander VI, against whom he cherished a bitter hatred, and on whose account only he had avoided Rome after the expulsion of his family from Florence, he returned to the banks of the Tiber. Pius III, who succeeded Alexander VI, lived only a few weeks, and, upon a further election, the pontifical chair was occupied by Julius II, a friend and admirer of Giovanni de' Medici. Our cardinal's elder brother had died in the mean time (in the battle of Garigliano in 1503), and, no longer distracted by the imprudent conduct and the wild plans of an imbecile, he gave himself up wholly to the interests of his ecclesiastical position. By the friendship of a nephew of the pontiff, Galeotto della Rovere, he was brought into closer relations with Julius II, and, after the latter had entered Perugia in 1506 (Sept. 12), cardinal Giovanni was intrusted with the government of that town, and only a short time after was honored with the appointment of papal field marshal, under the title of "legate of Bologna," to the army against the French. The campaign, however, proved rather unsuccessful, and at the battle of Ravenna the cardinal was taken prisoner and sent to Milan, whence he made his escape while the French soldiers were busy in preparations for their removal to France. The cardinal's great aim, now that the French had quitted Lombardy and the Florentine republic, was to re-establish his house in the government of Florence. During the first eight years of their exile the Medici had made four unsuccessful attempts to regain their power; on the failure of their last attempt, their successful opponent, Pietro Soderini, had been chosen gonfaloniere for life: to dethrone Soderini, then, was the great object to be accomplished by the cardinal. The gonfaloniere's reign thus far had been noted for its moderation and benign influence on Florence, and had secured to the country great prosperity; but Soderini's integrity was not unimpeachable to the mind of the Medici, and Giovanni appealed to the *Holy League*, consisting of the pope, the emperor, the Venetians, and Ferdinand of Aragon, to undertake the restoration of the Medici, on the ground that Soderini showed great partiality to foreigners, and that his government was extremely corrupt. To secure the services of the *Holy League* no charges against Soderini were really needed, but he brought them, and promptly they replied. A body of 5000 Spaniards, brave to ferocity, were marched under Raymond de Cardona against Florence in August, 1512. On their way they stormed the town of Prato, and massacred the citizens, which so intimidated the Florentines that they immediately capitulated, and consented to the return of the Medici as private citizens. Cardinal de' Medici and his brother Gi-

uliano soon after entered Florence, and, though they had asked only their restoration as private citizens, without any share in the government, they had hardly been readmitted when they forced the signoria, or executive, to immediately call a "parlamento," or general assembly of the people, in the great square (September). This general assembly of the sovereign people had repeatedly been used by ambitious men as a ready instrument of their views, and it proved such on this occasion. All the laws enacted since the expulsion of the Medici in 1494 were abrogated. A "balia," or commission, was appointed, consisting of creatures of that family, with dictatorial powers, to reform the state. No bloodshed, however, accompanied the reaction; but Soderini, having been deposed by the establishment of this new form of government, he and other citizens opposed to the Medici were banished, and "thus once again, after an exile of eighteen years, the fatal Medici were restored to Florence; once again fixed their fangs in the prey they had been scared away from, and 'the most democratical democracy in Europe' was once again muzzled and chained. A conspiracy of priest and soldier—that detestable and ominous combination, more baneful to humanity than any other of the poisonous mischiefs compounded out of its evil passions and blind stupidities—had as usual trampled out the hopes and possibilities of social civilization and progress" (Trollope, iv, 348).

Scarcely had the Medici re-established themselves at Florence when news came from Rome that the supreme pontiff had died. It was on the 20th of February, 1513, that "the furious nature" of his holiness the pope Julius II was quieted forever. Leaving his brother Giuliano, and his nephew Lorenzo, son of Pietro, at the head of the affairs of Florence, "our cardinal posts up in all haste to Rome," says Trollope (iv, 351), "to see whether mayhap Providence, in the utter inscrutableness of its wisdom, may consider him, Giovanni de' Medici, as the best and fittest person to be intrusted with heaven's vicegerency," accompanied in this excursion to the conclave by Filippo Strozzi—son of the great banker, the founder of the still well-known Strozzi palace, possessor of one of the then largest fortunes in Florence, and "on whose young shoulders was one of the longest heads that day in Florence"—as his friend, companion, and ... banker. "Especially in this last capacity was Filippo necessary to the aspiring cardinal, so soon to become pope by the grace of God and the capital of Strozzi." The younger members of the conclave had previously decided to elect one of their own age as successor to Julius II, and upon cardinal de' Medici, only thirty-seven years old, fell their choice, influenced, as we have seen by the quotation from Trollope, in a great measure by the *exertions* of the banker Strozzi. One of the first acts of the new pontiff, who assumed the name of Leo X, was to appoint two men of learning, Bembo and Sadoleto, for his secretaries. He next sent a general amnesty to be published at Florence, where a conspiracy had been discovered against the Medici, for which two individuals had been executed, and others, with the celebrated Machiavelli among the rest, had been arrested and put to the torture. Leo ordered Giuliano even to release the prisoners and recall those that were banished, Soderini among the rest. This accomplished, Giuliano was invited to Rome, where he was made gonfalionere of the Holy Church. "All the rich and lucrative offices of the apostolic court were conferred on Florentines, not a little to the disgust of the Roman world" (Trollope, iv, 359). Of course, that Leo should do anything and everything to enhance the dignity and greatness of the Medicean family no one could object to, and, consequently, no one had aught to say when he appointed his nephew Lorenzo, the eldest son of Pietro, a profligate young scapegrace, but the only heir remaining to succeed in the government of Florence, governor of the republic and general in chief, with absolute and supreme authority over all the Tuscan forces contributed by the commonwealth to the armies of a new league formed in 1515 by the emperor, the king of Aragon, the duke of Milan, and the Florentines against France and Venice. To have made Lorenzo, as Leo would have liked to do, sovereign prince, under the title of duke or some other like distinction, would have been premature, but with the appointment as made no one found fault, and it passed generally approved. Nor was any objection raised to Leo's further action in behalf of Florence, constituting it a dependency of Rome, which it continued during the remainder of his life. His cousin Giulio de' Medici, archbishop of Florence, on the decease of Julius II, Leo X at once promoted to the cardinal's dignity, and, in addition, intrusted him with the legateship of Bologna. By these new positions the influence of the Medici had been greatly improved, but the ever-plotting Leo, farseeing as he was, comprehended clearly that still more was needed to secure to his house the throne of Florence. Upon his accession to the pontificate he found the war renewed in Northern Italy. Louis XII had sent a fresh army, under La Trimouille, to invade the duchy of Milan. The Swiss auxiliaries of duke Maximilian Sforza defeated La Trimouille at Novara, and the French were driven out of Italy. The Venetians, however, had allied themselves with Louis XII, and Leo sent Bembo to Venice to endeavor to break the alliance. Differences occurred between Leo and Alfonso d'Este, duke of Ferrara, who demanded the restoration of Reggio, taken from him by Julius II, which Leo promised, but never performed; on the contrary, he purchased Modena of the emperor Maximilian, disregarding the rights of the house of Este to that town. The pope held likewise Parma and Piacenza, and it appears that he intended to form out of these a territory for his brother Giuliano, and he made attempts to surprise Ferrara also with the same view. His predecessor Julius had had in view the independence of all Italy, and he boldly led on the league for this purpose; Leo had a narrower object—his own aggrandizement and that of his family, and he pursued it with a more cautious and crooked policy. To secure the adhesion of Louis XII, Leo reopened the Council of the Lateran, which had begun under Julius II, for the extinction of the schism produced by the Council of Pisa, convoked by Louis XII in order to check the power of Julius, who was his enemy. For such proceedings there was now no longer any reason, and Louis XII gladly made his peace with Leo in 1514, renounced the Council of Pisa, and acknowledged that of the Lateran. But in the following year Louis XII died, and his successor, Francis I, among other titles assumed that of duke of Milan. Under him a new Italian war opened. The Venetians joined Francis I, while the emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand of Spain, duke Sforza, and the Swiss made a league to oppose the French. The pope did not openly join the league, but he negotiated with the Swiss by means of the cardinal of Sion, and paid them considerable sums to induce them to defend the north of Italy. The Swiss were posted near Susa, but Francis, led by old Trivulzio, passed the Alps by the Col de l'Argentier, entered the plains of Saluzzo, and marched upon Pavia, while the Swiss hastened back to defend Milan. The battle of Marignano was fought on the 14th of September, 1515. The Swiss made desperate efforts, and would probably have succeeded had not Alviano, with part of the Venetian troops, appeared suddenly with cries of "Viva San Marco," which dispirited the Swiss, who believed that the whole Venetian army was coming to the assistance of the French. The result was the retreat of the Swiss, and the entrance of the French into Milan, who took possession of the duchy. Leo now saw clearly that the salvation of his house lay in a union with France, and at once made proposals to Francis, who, in turn, eagerly embraced the proffered aid of the Church. It was on the 21st of October, 1515, that news reached Florence of this new alliance concluded by the holy father and the French king Francis I for the mutual defence of their Italian states, the king obliging himself specially to protect the pontiff, Giuliano and Lorenzo de'

Medici, and the Florentines, and that both Lorenzo and Giuliano should receive commissions in the French service, with pay and pensions. If there had been danger to the Medici government in Florence, it threatened from the side of France, but that danger they escaped by this new alliance, brought about, in a great measure, by the sympathy which the two parties felt for each other.

At a meeting which these new allies subsequently held at Bologna (December, 1515) a marriage was agreed upon between Lorenzo, the pope's nephew, and Madeleine de Boulogne, niece of Francis de Bourbon, duke of Vendôme, from which marriage Catharine de' Medici, afterwards queen of France, was born, and thus the union of the French and Florentine interests became more closely cemented. But in ecclesiastical affairs also new measures were taken by a concordat, only abrogated by the French Revolution, which regulated the appointment to the sees and livings in the French kingdom. Instead of capitular election, the king was to nominate, the pope to collate to episcopal sees. Annates were restored to the pope, who also received a small stipulated patronage in place of his indefinite prerogative of reserving benefices. It is true the Parliament and University of Paris both opposed this concordat, but the king and the pope each secured what they desired. To the king thus fell the real power and the essential patronage of the Church; by the pope the recognition of his own authority was obtained. The two, as Reichel (*See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 538) has aptly said, by this new measure, "shared between them the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church. The rising freedom of the laity was thereby crushed; the pope recovered most of his ancient power." Nothing could seem brighter now than the Medicean prospects and the future of the papacy. There was only one more thing to be immediately accomplished—to make Lorenzo a sovereign prince "by grace of God, or, at all events, clearly by grace of God's vicegerent on earth." Upon the most flagrant of pretences, the duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Revere, was deposed, and upon Lorenzo fell the mantle of the duchy's sovereignty, and at last the measure of Leo's ambition was nearly full. (In 1519, upon the death of Lorenzo, the duchy of Urbino was added to the territory of the Church.) This family ambition, however, by no means found pleasure in the eyes of the Roman people, while the Florentines were flattered by the advance of their "first citizens" to the position of prince and pope. Prominent among the enemies of the Medici was the house of Petrucci, headed by the cardinal of that name, who was led into a conspiracy to murder the pope by the latter's expatriation of his brother from Sienna. Not satisfied with the acquisition of the duchy of Urbino, Leo longed also for the possession of the free state of Sienna, lying between the territories of the Church and those of the republic of Florence, and to this end sent Borghesi, its governor, into exile. At first Borghesi's brother, cardinal Petrucci, formed the mad design of stabbing Leo on their first meeting, but he finally abandoned this enterprise as too daring, and a conspiracy was formed instead to cause the death of Leo X by poison. Fortunately for Leo, the plot to take his life was timely discovered, and the cardinal expiated the intended crime with his life by secret strangling, while many others of like social standing suffered abasement and other punishment. To secure himself against a second attempt of the kind, Leo now (in 1517) created a whole host of able and experienced Florentines cardinals —no less than thirty-one of them altogether.

It was about this time also that the Lateran Council approached its close, and that the measures were inaugurated which resulted so unfavorably to the cause of the papacy and the Church of Rome, and have made the year 1517 forever memorable in the ecclesiastical annals for the foundation and commencement it gave to the revolution in the Church, commonly known by the name of *the Reformation* (q. v.). One of the greatest desires of Leo X, as pope of Rome, was the continuation of the incomplete structure commenced under Julius II—the building of St. Peter's church. Leo, who had made for himself a name as the protector and patron of art, and had well-nigh revived the Periclean age of the Greeks, could not brook the thought that, while he was pontiff within the walls of the Eternal City, this great enterprise, likely to immortalize the name of its patron in the annals of art, should be passed over, and, finding the coffers of the papacy drained by his predecessor, saw only one way in which to secure the necessary funds for so stupendous an undertaking—the sale of *indulgences* (q. v.), securing to the contributor for this object forgiveness of sin in any form (comp. Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* ii, 66, note 6; Bower, *Hist. of Papacy*, vii, 409 sq.; Robertson, *Hist. of Reign of Charles V*, Harper's edit., p. 125 sq., especially the footnotes on p. 126). Such utter disregard of the essence of religion resulted in one of the boldest assaults on the Romish Church that it had ever sustained. The very thought that forgiveness of sin was to be offered on sale for money "must have been mortally offensive to men whose convictions on that head had been acquired from contemplating the eternal relation between God and man, and who, moreover, had learned what the doctrine of Scripture itself was on the subject" (Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* i, 66). In Saxony, especially, men of piety and thought generally commended the interpretation which Luther gave to this subject. They all regretted the delusion of the people, who, being taught to rely for the pardon of their sins on the indulgences which they could secure by purchase, did not think it incumbent on themselves either to study the doctrines of genuine Christianity, or to practice the duties which it enjoins. Even the most unthinking were shocked at the scandalous behavior of the Dominicans—John Tetzel (q.v.) and his associates, who had the sale of indulgences intrusted to them—and at the manner in which they spent the funds accumulated from this traffic. These sums, which had been piously bestowed in hopes of obtaining eternal salvation and happiness, they saw squandered by the Dominican friars in drunkenness, gaming, and low debauchery, and "all began to wish that some check were given to this commerce, no less detrimental to society than destructive to religion" (Robertson, p. 126). Indeed, even the princes and nobles objected to this traffic; they were irritated at seeing their vassals drained of so much wealth in order to replenish the treasury of a profuse pontiff, and when Luther's warm and impetuous temper did not suffer him any longer to conceal his aversion to the unscriptural doctrine of the Thomists, or to continue a silent spectator of the delusion of his country, from the pulpit in the great church of Wittenberg he inveighed bitterly against the false opinions, as well as the wicked lives, of the preachers of indulgences (see Löscher's *Reformationsakten*, i, 729). "Indignation against Roman imposture increased; universal attention and sympathy were directed towards the bold champion of the truth" (Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* [Harper's edit.] iv, 33). On Oct. 31, 1517, finally, to gain also the suffrage of men of learning, Luther published ninety-five theses against the traffic in indulgences, setting forth his objections to this abuse of ecclesiastical power. Not that he supposed these points fully established or of undoubted certainty, but he advanced them as the result of his own investigation, and as subjects of inquiry and disputation unto others, that he might be corrected if his position could be impugned. He sent them to the neighboring bishops with a petition for the abolition of the evil if his views were found to be well grounded, and appointed a day on which the learned churchmen might publicly dispute the point at issue, either in person or by writing; subjoining to them, however, solemn protestations of his high respect for the apostolic see, and of his implicit submission to its authority. Many zealous champions immediately arose to defend opinions on which the wealth and power of the Church were founded; in especial manner the opposition of the Dominicans (q. v.) was roused, for the spirit of this order had become pe-

culiarly sensitive on account of some recent humiliations, particularly by the fate of Savonarola (q. v.), the events at Berne, and by the still surviving controversy with Reuchlin (q. v.), aside from the fact that the different mendicant orders cherished constant jealousy against each other. (The conjecture of some that the jealousy of the Augustine monk was apparent in Luther's attack on Tetzel because to the Dominicans had been intrusted the indulgence traffic is too ridiculous to need repetition here. Comp. however, Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 25, note 17; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv, cent. xvi, sec. i, ch. ii, note 18.) In opposition to Luther's theses, Tetzel himself came forward with counter theses, which he published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Prominent among others also were Eck (q. v.), the celebrated Augsburg divine, and Prierias (q. v.), the inquisitor general, who both replied to the Augustine monk with all the virulence of scholastic disputants. "But the manner in which they conducted the controversy did little service to their cause. Luther attempted to combat indulgences by arguments founded in reason or derived from the Scriptures; they produced nothing in support of them but the sentiments of the schoolmen, and the conclusions of the canon law, and the decrees of popes. The decision of judges so partial and interested did not satisfy the people, who began to call into question even the authority of these venerable guides when they found them standing in direct opposition to the dictates of reason and the determination of the divine law" (Robertson, p. 128). See Luther; Reformation.

At Rome these controversies, though they had become a matter of interest to all the German people, were looked upon with great indifference. Leo judged it simply a wrangling of two mendicant orders, and he was determined to let the Augustinians and Dominicans settle their own quarrels. The adversaries of Luther, however, feared for their cause, and they saw no other way by which to secure anew peace to themselves, and the respect of the people, than by a wholesale slaughter of the Reformer and his friends. The solicitations of the Dominicans at the Vatican became daily more frequent and urgent; and when at last it became necessary for Leo to take some decided action, he simply commissioned his cardinal legate Cajetan (q. v.) to bring the Augustinian friar to his senses, and Luther was summoned to and promptly appeared at the Diet of Augsburg, in October, 1518. If Leo ever committed a blunder, it was done in this instance by appointing to the task of converting Luther a monastic of the very order he had so seriously attacked for its complicity in the indulgence traffic. If Luther was ever so much inclined to yield, a Dominican was certainly not the proper agent to accomplish such a purpose. Cajetan, moreover, treated Luther rather imperiously, and peremptorily required him to confess his errors, before the least attempt had been made to reply to his arguments, and of course our Augustinian, high-spirited as he was, turned away in disgust, and appealed *a papa non bene informato ad melius informandum;* and afterwards, when the whole doctrine of indulgence, as it had been developed up to the present time, was confirmed by a papal bull, the new heretic appealed from the pope to a general council (at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1518). By this time, however, the strife had assumed more gigantic proportions; around Luther were now gathered the great, and the strong, and the learned of the Teutonic race. A special helpmeet he had found in his colleagues of the lately founded high school of learning at Wittenberg; and as in the 13th century from Oxford and Prague had proceeded the action against the Latin system, so it now proceeded from Wittenberg, until it terminated in the Reformation. When too late, the Roman court realized the mistake it had committed in intrusting Cajetan with the settlement of this difficulty, and another legate, the pope's own chamberlain, Charles of Miltitz (q. v.), was dispatched in December (1518) to give assurances to the electoral prince Frederick, by the valuable present of the consecrated golden rose (q. v.), of the good intentions of pope Leo towards Saxony, and at the same time, if possible, to conciliate Luther, in whom was now seen the representative of Wittenberg University, and at whose back stood one to whom even his enemies confess but few men of any age can be compared, either for learning and knowledge of both human and divine things, or for richness, suavity, and facility of genius, or for industry as a scholar—Philip Melancthon (q. v.). Unfortunately for the cause of the Dominicans, this very elector of Saxony, who had identified himself with and become the champion of the cause of the Wittenberg reform movement, was now, upon the death of Maximilian I, made regent of the empire in northern Germany (Jan. 12, 1519), and Miltitz saw only one way in which to settle the controversy—by appeasing the wrath of Luther. He accordingly flattered "the friar of Wittenberg," as he was contemptuously called at Rome, by all manner of kindness, assured him that his case had been misrepresented to Leo, and actually succeeded in inducing Luther to promise, not, indeed, recantation, as he desired, but a promise to be silent if his opponents were silent, and an open declaration of obedience to the see of Rome: thus the whole matter apparently had reached its end. The opponents, however, were not silent; the controversy was renewed with greater animosity than before. See Carlstadt; Eck; Leipsic Disputation. Luther was forced to reply; the primacy of the pope and other questions became involved, which obliged additional research and study on the part of the reformers, and "in this way Luther gained so thorough an insight into the errors and corruption of the Roman Church that he gradually began to see the necessity of separating himself from it. He felt himself called as a soldier of God to fight against the wiles and deceit of the devil, by which the Church was corrupted" (Gieseler, iv, 42). This he did hereafter, fearless of consequences, by both his pen and tongue. Luther's was a nature that recoiled from no extremity. The result was "the bull of condemnation," issued June 15, 1520, which brought about the formal abjuration of the papacy on the part of Luther by the public burning of the bull, together with the papal law-books, Dec. 10 of this very year. January 3, 1521, came the bull of excommunication, and a demand for its execution by the Diet of Worms, the body to which Luther appealed. See Reformation.

While these religious disputes were carried on with great warmth in Germany, and threatened the very existence of Romanism, pope Leo was much more concerned with what occurred around him in Italy. A politician of the best sort in the affairs of his native country, ever solicitous for its welfare, he saw greater danger calling for prompter action on the political horizon than any that had yet appeared, in his estimation, on that of ecclesiasticism. Leo, indeed, trembled for Florence at the prospect of beholding the imperial crown placed on the head of the king of Spain and of Naples, and the master of the New World; nor was he less afraid of seeing the king of France, who was the duke of Milan and lord of Genoa, exalted to that dignity. He even foretold that the election of either of them would be fatal to the independence of the holy see, to the peace of Italy, and perhaps to the liberties of Europe. But June 28, 1519, the king of Spain was elected successor to Maximilian. This was, indeed, an event calculated to cause a series of infinite perplexities to God's vicegerent on earth. So the important decision was taken, a secret league, offensive and defensive, signed with the new Cæsar on July 8, 1521, by which it was stipulated that the duchy of Milan was to be taken from the French and given to Francesco Maria Sforza, and Parma and Piacenza to be restored to the pope. Leo subsidized a body of Swiss, and Prospero Colonna, with the Spaniards from Naples, joined the papal forces at Bologna, crossed the Po at Casalmaggiore, joined the Swiss, and drove the French governor Lautrec out of Milan. In a short time the duchy of Milan was once

more clear of the French, and restored to the dominion of Sforza. Parma and Piacenza were again occupied by the papal troops. At the same time Leo declared Alfonso d'Este a rebel to the holy see for having sided with the French, while the duke, on his part, complained of the bad faith of the pope in keeping possession of Modena and Reggio. The news of the taking of Milan was celebrated at Rome with public rejoicings, but in the midst of all this Leo fell ill on Nov. 25, and died Dec. 1, 1521, not without reasonable suspicion of poison, though some have maintained that he died a natural death. (See Trollope, *Hist. of Florence*, iv, 385 sq., who quotes strong proof in favor of the assertion that Leo X died of poison.)

Personally Leo was generous, or rather prodigal; he was fond of splendor, luxury, and magnificence, and therefore often in want of money, which he was obliged to raise by means not often creditable. He had a discerning taste, was a ready patron of real merit, was fond of wit and humor, not always refined, and at times degenerating into buffoonery: this was, indeed, one of his principal faults. His state policy was like that of his contemporaries in general, and not so bad as that of some of them. He contrived, however, to keep Rome and the papal territory, as well as Florence, in profound peace during his reign—no trifling boon—while all the rest of Italy was ravaged by French, and Germans, and Spaniards, who committed all kinds of atrocities. He was by no means neglectful of his temporal duties, although he was fond of conviviality and ease, and many charges have been brought against his morals. He did not, and perhaps could not, enforce a strict discipline among the clergy or the people of Rome, where profligacy and licentiousness had reigned almost uncontrolled ever since the pontificate of Alexander VI. It is to be regretted, however, that any one should have been able to say of a pope so distinguished as a patron of learning as Leo X that in his splendid and luxuriant palace Christianity had given place, both in its religious and moral influence, to the revived philosophy and the unregulated manners of Greece; that the Vatican was visited less for the purpose of worshipping the footsteps of the apostles than to admire the great works of ancient art stored in the papal palace (comp. *London Quart. Rev.* 1836, p. 294 sq.; Taine, *Italy* [Rome and Naples], p. 185). As a pontificate, that of Leo X, though it lasted only nine years, "forms one of the most memorable epochs in the history of modern Europe, whether we consider it in a political light as a period of transition for Italy, when the power of Charles V of Spain began to establish itself in that country, or whether we look upon it as that period in the history of the Western Church which was marked by the momentous event of Luther's Reformation. But there is a third and a more favorable aspect under which the reign of Leo ought to be viewed, as a flourishing epoch for learning and the arts, which were encouraged by that pontiff, as they had been by his father, and, indeed, as they have been by his family in general, and for which the glorious appellation of the age of Leo X has been given to the first part of the 16th century" (*Engl. Cyclop.*). The services which Leo rendered to literature are many. He encouraged the study of Greek, founded a Greek college at Rome, established a Greek press, and gave the direction of it to John Lascaris; he restored the Roman University, and filled its numerous chairs with professors; he directed the collecting of MSS. of the classics, and also of Oriental writers, as well as the searching after antiquities; and by his example encouraged others, and among them the wealthy merchant Chigi, to the same. He patronized men of talent, of whom a galaxy gathered round him at Rome. He corresponded with Erasmus, Machiavelli, Ariosto, and other great men of his time. He restored the celebrated library of his family, which, on the expulsion of the Medici, had been plundered and dispersed, and which is known by the name of the Biblioteca Laurenziana at Florence. In short, Leo X, if not the most exemplary among popes, was certainly one of the most illustrious and meritorious of Italian princes. See Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia;* Roscoe, *Life and Pontificate of Leo X* (Lond. 1805, 4 vols. 4to); Farroni, *Vita Leonis X* (1797); Audin, *Leon X* (1844); Giovio, *Vita Leonis X* (1651); Artaud de Montor, *Histoire des Souverains papes*, vol. iv. For the bulls and speeches of pope Leo X, see Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina Mediæ et Infirmæ Ætatis;* Sismondi, *Hist. des Republiques Italiennes;* Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, vol. i, ch. ii; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxii, 491 sq.; xxxiv, 83, 91; and his *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* i, 76 sq., 314 sq.; iii, 207 sq., 211 sq.; Raumer, *Gesch. der Pädagogik*, i, 54 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 400 sq.; Trollope, *History of Florence* (Lond. 1865, 4 vols. 8vo), especially vol. iv, book x; Leo, *Gesch. Italiens*, vol. v, ch. iii. (J. H. W.)

Leo XI, Pope (*Alessandro de Medici*), a descendant of the house of the Medici, was born at Florence in 1535. After representing Tuscany for some years at the court of pope Pius V, he was made bishop of Pistoia in 1573, and archbishop of Florence in 1574. Made cardinal in 1583, he was sent by his predecessor, Clement VIII, legate *a latere* to France to receive Henry IV into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. He was very old when elected, on the 1st of April, 1605, by the utmost exertions of the French, against the wishes of the Spanish. He died on the 27th of the same month, it is said, from the fatigue attending the ceremony of taking possession of the patriarchal church of St. John the Lateran. See Artaud de Montor, *Histoire des Souverains Pontifes;* Bower, *History of the Popes*, vii, 476; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 725; *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Leo XII, Pope (cardinal *Annibale della Genga*), was born in the district of Spolcto in 1760, of a noble family of the Romagna; was made archbishop of Tyre in 1793, and was later employed as nuncio to Germany and France by Pius VII, who made him a cardinal in 1816. On the death of this pontiff he was elected pope, in September, 1823. He was well acquainted with diplomacy and foreign politics, and in the exercise of his authority, and in asserting the claims of his see, he assumed a more imperious tone than his meek and benevolent predecessor. He re-established the right of asylum for criminals in the churches, and enforced the strict observance of fast days. He was a declared enemy of the Carbonari and other secret societies. He proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825; and in his circular letter accompanying the bull, addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, he made a violent attack on the Bible Societies, as acting in opposition to the decree of the Council of Trent (session iv) concerning the publication and use of the sacred books. Leo also entered into negotiations with the new states of South America for the sake of filling up the vacant sees. He gave a new organization to the university of the Sapienza at Rome, which consists of five colleges or faculties, viz., theology, law, medicine, philosophy, and philology; and he increased the number of the professors, and raised their emoluments. He published in October, 1824, a *Moto Proprio*, or decree, reforming the administration of the papal state, and also the administration of justice, or *Procedura Civile*, and he fixed the fees to be paid by the litigant parties. He corrected several abuses, and studied to maintain order and a good police in his territories. He died February 10, 1829, and was succeeded by Pius VIII. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Rudoni, *Leone XII e Pio VIII* (1829); Schmid, *Trauerre de ouf Leo XII* (1829); Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Léon XII* (1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Wiseman, *Recollections of the last four Popes* (see Index).

Leodegar, a saint (in French *St. Léger*), was born about 616. He was educated by his uncle (some say his grandfather), the bishop of Poitiers, who made him archdeacon. Leodegar was afterwards called to the

court as adviser of Bathilde, and tutor of her young son Chotaire. In 659 he was appointed bishop of Autun. That diocese was then in a rather dilapidated condition, and Leodegar applied himself at once to its restoration. He supported the poor, instructed the clergy and the people, decorated and enriched the churches, and reformed the morals of convents by introducing the rule of St. Benedict, for which purpose he held a synod at the end of 670. He was also instrumental in securing to Childeric II, of Austrasia, the western part of France in 670; but the fickle monarch did not long consent to be ruled by his advice, and Leodegar was finally disposed of by public execution after Childeric's death, being accused of complicity in his murder, in 678. His death is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church Oct. 2.

Leon da Modena (ben-Isaac ben-Mordecai), also called *Jehudah Arje Modanese*, one of the most celebrated Italian rabbis, the Jewish John Knox of the 16th century in Italy, was born in Venice April 23, 1571, of an ancient and literary family, originally from France. Leon displayed his talents and extraordinary intellectual endowments at a most tender age. The Sabbatic lesson [see Haphtarah], it is said, he read before the whole congregation in the synagogue when he was only two and a half years old, and he began to preach (דרשן) when he had scarce reached the age of ten. At thirteen Leon came before the public with a treatise against gambling with dice and cards (entitled סור מרע, first published in 1596, and reprinted in French, Latin, and German), and thus active, and retaining all the vigor and elasticity of youth, he remained through life, though subjected to great suffering by the great misfortune of passing his days by the side of an insane wife, and by following his promising sons to an early grave. With a genius so fertile, and a mind so well endowed, coupled with a thirst for learning and devotedness to Biblical literature and exegesis, master of the Latin, Italian, and Hebrew, he surveyed the whole theological and philosophical field with ease, and became the author of numerous poetical, liturgical, ethical, doctrinal, polemical, and exegetical works. Unfortunately, however, for Leon Modena, he was fickle in mind, and loth to adhere long to one opinion, in consequence of which we find him to-day the decided exponent of Mosaism, to-morrow the staunch defender of Rabbinism, the next day in favor of a total abrogation of the whole ceremonial law, and perhaps on the day following an apologist for Christianity, because, as he expressed it, Judaism formed its base. Both the orthodox and liberal Jews claim Leon as the exponent of their doctrines; but we think that justly he can be claimed only by the Reformed Jewish Church, for his masterpiece is, after all, the *Kol Sakol* (קול שכל), the existence of which was long known, but it was only in the present century that the MS. was discovered in the library of the duke of Parma. It was then drawn from its hiding-place, and was published under the supervision of the late rabbi Reggio in בחינת הקבלה (Görz, 1852); an English translation appeared in *The Jewish Times* (New York), in the last numbers of 1871. This work contains a concise and terse exposition of the religious philosophy of Judaism, and of the ideas embodied in the various ceremonial practices, and is written from a most liberal stand-point. He also wrote בן דבד, a treatise on Metempsychosis, in which he takes ground against the Cabalists (published in רעם קנים, p. 61 sq.):—*Hebrew and Italian Dictionary*, called גלות יהודה ("The Captivity of Judah"), or פשר דבר ("Explanation of Words"), in which he explains in Italian all the difficult expressions in the Hebrew Bible, and which is preceded by grammatical rules (Venice, 1612; Padua, 1640; also printed in the margin of the Hebrew Bibles published for the use of the Italian Jews, following the order of the canonical books):—*Rabbinical and Italian Vocabulary*, called פי אריה ("The Lion's Mouth"), of which the Italian title is *Raccolta delle voci Rabin. non Hebr. nè Chald.*, etc. (Padua, 1640; appended to the preceding work; afterwards printed separately in Venice, 1648):—A polemical treatise against the Cabalists, whom he despised and derided, on the genuineness of their interpretation of the Pentateuch (*Sohar*), entitled ספר ארך נוחם (edited by Dr. Fürst, Leipzic, 1840):—*Historia dei Riti Hebraici ed observanza degli Hebrei di questi tempi*, or the history of the rites, customs, and manner of life of the Jews, consisting of thirteen chapters, and written in Italian (Paris, 1637; in a revised form, Venice, 1638). This celebrated and most useful manual was translated into English by Edmund Chilmead (Lond. 1650); and also edited by Simon Ockley, under the title *History of the present Jews throughout the World* (London, 1707), in Picard's *Ceremonies and Religious Customs of the various Nations of the known World*, vol. i (London, 1733); into French by father Simon, who prefaced it with an elaborate account of the Karaites and Samaritans (Par. 1674); into Dutch (Amsterd. 1683), and into Latin by Grosgebauer, *Historia rituum Judæorum* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1693):—*Commentary on the Books of Samuel:*—*Commentary on the five Megilloth*, i. e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther:—*Commentary on the Psalms:*—*Commentary on Proverbs:*—*Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons:*—and a polemical work against Christianity, entitled מגן וחרב; but several of these works have not as yet been published. Leo died in Venice, where he was chief rabbi, in 1648. See his autobiography, entitled חיי יהודה, extant only in MS., from which extracts were made by Carmoly, *Rev. Orientale* (1842), p. 49 sq., and Reggio, בחינת הקבלה (1852); Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, ii, 383 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr.* in *Bibl. Bodleiana*, col. 1345-56; *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1854), iv, 91 sq., 186 sq., 247 sq.; 1855, v, 396 sq.; Geiger, in Liebermann's *Volkskalender-Jahrbuch*, 1856; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 141 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leon or **Leone, Jacob Jehudah**, a Jewish writer of note, who was born, of Moorish descent, in 1614, in Holland, and flourished first at Middelburg and later at Amsterdam, is noted as a writer on the Temple model (compare *Retrato del Templo*, Middelb. 1642, or Hebrew תבנית היכל, Amst. 1650), and as an illustrator of the Talmudical writings. He also figured prominently as a polemical writer, contending for the inspiration of the O.-T. writings, while he ruthlessly attacked the Gospel doctrines. He is now generally supposed to have been the author of *Colloquium Middelburgense* (attributed by Fabricius to Manasse ben-Israel), and of *Con differentes theologos de la Christianidad*. Leon died after 1671. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 24 sq., 200 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 232 sq.

Leon, Luis Ponce de, a Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Belmonte, in the south of Spain, in 1527 (according to the *Tesoro de los Prosadores Españoles por Ochod* [Paris, 1841], at Granada; and according to St. Antonio and Ticknor at Belmonte in 1528). He studied at Salamanca, entered in 1543 the order of the Augustines, and was thereafter known under the name of Luis de Leon. Having been received D.D., he was in 1561 appointed to a professorship at St. Thomas. His knowledge and success created him many enemies, at the head of whom were the Dominicans of Granada. Accused of heresy and of having translated parts of the Bible into the vernacular, contrary to the orders of the Sanctum Officium, he was in 1572 imprisoned in the dungeon of the Inquisition at Valladolid, and appeared over fifty times before the high court. His defence, which is extant, contains 200 closely-written pages in the purest Castilian. Although unable to prove anything against him, his judges condemned him to the

rack; but this sentence was reversed by the Inquisitorial high court of Madrid, and he was liberated with the advice of being more careful in future. In 1578 he returned to his convent and resumed his office. He thereafter devoted himself exclusively to theology and to the duties of his order; but his health never recovered entirely from the shock it had undergone while in the prisons of the Inquisition. He became general and provincial vicar of his order in Salamanca, and died in 1591. His principal writings are poems in Latin and in Spanish; the latter are distinguished for beauty of language and purity of style. His original pieces have been published, with a German translation, by C. B. Schlüter and W. Storck (Münster, 1853). His whole works, consisting of the above, together with translations from the classics, the Psalms, and parts of the book of Job, were collected and published (Madrid, 1804–16, 6 vols.). See Quevedo, *Vita de L. de L.* (Madrid, 1631); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Leonard, St., a French nobleman who flourished in the first half of the 6th century, was a convert and pupil of Remigius. He retired at first into a convent near Orleans, and afterwards into a hermitage in the neighborhood of Limoges. Here he applied himself to the conversion of the people. A few followers soon gathered around him, and he founded the convent of Noblac. He took special interest in prisoners, and the legend relates that centuries after his death prisoners were released and captives brought back from distant countries through his intercession. His prayers are said to have saved the life of the queen of France in a dangerous confinement, and he became also the protector of travellers. He died in 559, and is commemorated on the 6th of November. He is especially recognised in France and in England.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 332; Migne, *Nour. Encyc. Théolog.* ii, 1168. (J. N. P.)

Leonard, Abiel, S.T.D., an army chaplain and Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, Mass., Nov. 5, 1740; graduated at Harvard College in 1759; and was ordained pastor of the original Church in Woodstock, Conn., in 1763. In 1775 he was appointed chaplain in the Revolutionary army, and was in the service of his country until 1778, when he went home on a furlough to see his sick child. Having remained longer than the appointed time, he found, upon his return, that he was superseded, which news so affected him that he put an end to his life in the western part of Connecticut, Aug. 14, 1778. Dr. Leonard was an elegant speaker, and published two sermons. See *Cong. Quar.* 1861, p. 350.

Leonard, George (1), a Congregational, and subsequently an Episcopal, minister, was born in Middleborough, Mass., April 6, 1783; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1805; studied with Dr. Perkins, of West Hartford; and was ordained over the Church in Canterbury, Conn., in 1808. After two years he was dismissed, and preached in various places in Massachusetts. In 1817 he was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal Church by bishop Griswold; admitted to priest's orders the following year at Marblehead; and was rector of Trinity Church, Cornish, N. H., and of St. Paul's, Windsor, Vt., until his death, which took place at the house of his sister in Salisbury, N. H., June 28, 1834. "Disinterested and judicious counsellor, open-hearted and honest man, and a sincere Christian." Several of his sermons were published. See *Cong. Quar.* 1859, p. 354.

Leonard, George (2), a Baptist minister, was born in Raynham, Bristol Co., Mass., Aug. 17, 1802; entered Brown University in September, 1820; graduated in 1824; and after being for some time a subordinate instructor in the Columbia College at Washington, went to the Newton Theological Institution to study theology. In August, 1826, he was ordained pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Salem, Mass., and while there filled also the office of secretary of the Salem Bible Translation and Foreign Mission Society; but his health compelled him to resign that position in 1829. Having somewhat recovered, he became pastor of the Church in Portland, Me., in October, 1830. Here he labored faithfully and successfully until his death, Aug. 11, 1831. He wrote a *Dissertation on the Duty of Churches in reference to Temperance* (published in the *Christian Watchman*, 1829). The year after his death (1832), a small volume containing twelve of his *Sermons*, together with the sermon delivered on the occasion of his death by the Rev. Dr. Babcock, was published under the direction of his widow.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vi, 729.

Leonard, Josiah, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Kingsborough, N. Y., April 15, 1816. He graduated from Union College in 1837, and finished his theological course in Union Seminary. He was ordained to the ministry in 1840, and was pastor of the following churches successively: Mexicoville, N. Y., 1840–42; Oswego, 1842–45; Delhi, 1845–48; Fulton, Ill., 1856–71. In 1872 he became stated supply at Clinton, Ia., where he died, Feb. 22, 1880. (W. P. S.)

Leonard, Levi Washburn, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at S. Bridgewater, Mass., June 1, 1790, and was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1805. He then studied theology at Cambridge, and Sept. 6, 1820, became pastor at Dublin, N. H., where he continued until 1854. He died at Exeter Dec. 12, 1864. He published several school-books and other works of general interest only.—Drake, *Dict. of American Biography*, s. v.; Appleton, *Amer. Annual Cyclopædia*, 1864, p. 623.

Leonard, Zenas Lockwood, a Baptist preacher, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., January 16, 1773. In June, 1790, he was converted, and shortly after joined the church in Middleborough. In May, 1792, he entered the sophomore class of Brown University, and graduated with honor in 1794. On leaving college he commenced a course of theological study with Rev. W. Williams, of Wrentham, Mass. In 1796 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist church in Sturbridge, Mass. The next year he opened a grammar-school, which he continued for several years. Mr. Leonard was active in procuring a division of the Warren, R. I., Baptist Association, Nov. 3, 1801, and the formation of the Sturbridge Association, Sept. 30, 1802. He was particularly active in promoting prominent benevolent objects, especially the Sabbath-school, the temperance cause, African colonization, and missions. On Oct. 13, 1832, he was, by his own request, dismissed from the charge of his congregation. For six terms he represented his district in the councils of the state. Mr. Leonard manifested supreme deference to the authority, truth, and spirit of the Gospel; stability of purpose; uncompromising advocacy of the cause of freedom, righteousness, and public virtue; and unwearied activity in performing the various duties of his profession. His piety was of steady progress, ripening continually until his death. He died June 24, 1841. The only printed productions of his pen, with the exception of contributions to various periodicals, are the *Circular Letters to the Association* for the years 1802, 1810, 1822, and 1825.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vi, 347 sq.

Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, a noted missionary priest and the founder of the Brotherhood of the Heart of Jesus, was born in Liguria in 1676. While yet a youth he became a pupil of the Jesuits, and a member of the Order of the Reformed Franciscans. He was especially active in promoting the doctrine of the immaculate conception. He died about the middle of the 18th century, and was sainted by Pius VI in 1796.

Leonardo da Vinci. See Vinci.

Leonardoni, Francesco, an Italian painter, was born at Venice in 1654; visited Spain and settled at Madrid; gained great eminence as a portrait-painter; executed several historical works for the churches, characterized by a grand style of design; and died at Madrid in 1711. Among his principal works are a large altar-piece of the *Incarnation*, in the Church of San Gerónimo el Real, at Madrid:—and two subjects from the *Life of*

St. Joseph, in the Church of the Colegio de Atocha. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s. v.

Leonbruno, Lorenzo, an Italian painter, was born at Mantua in 1489; studied under count Castiglione, the friend of Raphael; appointed painter to the duke of Mantua; gave offence to Giulio Romano, in consequence of which he was obliged to quit Mantua; settled at Milan, and died there about 1537. Three of his pictures at Mantua are very highly praised, viz., *St. Jerome:—The Metamorphosis of Midas:*—and *The Body of Christ in the Arms of the Virgin.* See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s. v.

Leonidas, father of the celebrated Origen, was a Christian martyr of the 3d century. Previous to his execution, his son, in order to encourage him, wrote to him as follows: "Beware that your care for us does not make you change your resolution!" The father accepted the heroic exhortation of the son, and yielded his neck joyfully to the stroke of the executioner.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 23.

Leonistæ is the name by which the *Waldenses* are sometimes referred to, and is derived from Leona (Lyons).

Leontès, an important river of northern Palestine, doubtless the present *Litany*, which bursts in a deep chasm through the Lebanon range (Robinson, *Res.* iii, 409 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* xvii, 48 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.). For a description, see Lebanon.

Leontius, a Christian martyr and saint, probably of Arabian origin, was born at Vicentia, in Venetia, in the 3d century after Christ. He afterwards moved to Aquileia, in Venetia, where, in company with St. Carpophorus, who was either his brother or intimate friend, he distinguished himself by zeal in favor of Christianity. For this offence they were both brought before the governor Lysias, and after being tortured in various modes, and, according to the legend, miraculously delivered, they were at last beheaded, probably A.D. 300. Their memory is celebrated by the Romish Church on Aug. 28. See the *Acta Sanctorum* (in Aug. 20), where several difficulties are critically discussed at length.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leontius of Antioch, a learned Syrian theologian of the early Church, was born in Phrygia about the close of the 3d or the opening of the 4th century. He was a disciple of the martyr Lucianus, and, having entered the Church, was ordained a presbyter. In order to enjoy without scandal the society of a young female, Eustolius or Eustolia, to whom he was much attached, he mutilated himself, but, notwithstanding, did not escape suspicion, and was finally deposed from his office. On the deposition, however, of Stephanus, or Stephen, bishop of Antioch, he was, by the favor of the emperor Constantius and the predominant Arian party, appointed to that see about 348 or 349. Leontius died about A.D. 358. Of his writings, which were numerous, nothing remains except a fragment of what Cave describes, we know not on what authority, as *Oratio in Passionem S. Babylæ* (cited in the *Paschal Chronicle* in the notice of the Decian persecution). In this fragment it is distinctly asserted that both the emperor Philip and his wife were avowed Christians (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 26; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 20; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 10, 24; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 15, 17, 18; Athanasius, *Apolog. de Fuga sua*, c. 26; *Hist. Arianor. ad Monachos*, c. 28; *Chron. Pasch.* i, 270, 289, ed. Paris; p. 216, 231, ed. Venice; p. 503, 535, ed. Bonn; Cave, *Hist. Litteraria*, i, 211, ed. Oxon. 1740-43; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, viii, 324).—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leontius of Arabissus, in Cappadocia, of which town he was bishop, flourished as an ecclesiastical writer. The period in which he lived, however, is quite uncertain. Photius has noticed two of his works: 1. Εἰς τὴν κτίσιν λόγος (*Sermo de Creatione*), and, 2. Εἰς τὸν Λάζαρον (*De Lazaro*), and gives extracts from both these works (Photius, *Cod.* 272). See also Cave, *Hist. Litter.* i, 551; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, viii, 324; x, 268, 771.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leontius of Arelate, or Arles, was bishop of that city about the middle of the 5th century. Several letters were written to him by pope Hilarius, A.D. 461–467, which are given in the *Concilia*, and a letter of Leontius to the pope, dated A.D. 462, is also given in the *Concilia* and in D'Achery's *Spicilegium* (v, 578 of the original edition, or iii, 302 in the edition of De la Barre, Paris, 1723, folio). Leontius presided in a council at Arles, held A.D. 475, to condemn an error into which some had fallen respecting the doctrine of predestination. He appears to have died in A.D. 484. He is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* vii, 6). See *Concil.* iv, col. 1039, 1041, 1044 (1828, ed. Labbe); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 449; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, viii, 324; xii, 653; *Bibl. Med. et Infim. Latinitatis*, v, 268 (ed. Mansi); Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi, 38.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leontius of Byzantium (1), an ecclesiastical writer of the latter part of the 6th and commencement of the 7th century, is sometimes designated, from his original profession, *Scholasticus*, i. e. pleader. As there are several works of that period which bear the name of Leontius, distinguished by various surnames, it is sometimes doubtful to whom they should be assigned. According to Oudin, Leontius flourished as an inmate of the monastery which had been founded by St. Saba near Jerusalem, and was for a time its abbot (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, col. 1462, etc.). Cave, confounding two different persons bearing this name, places our Leontius in the reign of Justinian, but from one of the works with which he is credited it is evident that he flourished half a century later. The works which appear to be by our Leontius are as follows: 1. Σχόλια (*Scholia*), taken down from the lips of Theodorus (first published with Latin version by Leunclavius, and commonly cited by the title *De Sectis* in a volume containing several other pieces [Basle, 1578, 8vo], and reprinted in the *Auctarium Bibliothecæ Patrum* of Ducæus, vol. i [Paris, 1624, folio], in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. xi [Paris, 1644, fol.], and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, xii, 625, etc. [Venice, 1728, folio]. The Latin version alone is given in several other editions of the *Biblioth. Patrum*). 2. *Contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos Libri tres, s. confutatio utriusque Fictionis inter se contrariæ.* Some inaccurately speak of the three books into which this work is divided as distinct works. 3. *Liber adversus eos qui proferunt nobis quædam Apollinarii, falso inscripta nomine Sanctorum Patrum, s. adversus Fraudes Apollinaristarum.* 4. *Solutiones Argumentationum Severi.* 5. *Dubitationes hypotheticæ et definientes contra eos qui negant in Christo post Unionem duas veras Naturas.* These pieces have not been printed in the original, but in a Latin version from the papers of Franciscus Turrianus (published by Canisius in his *Lectiones Antiquæ*, vol. iv, or ii, 525, etc., ed. Basnage, and reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. ix [Lyons, 1677, folio], and in the above-mentioned volume of Galland). 6. *Apologia Concilii Chalcedonensis* (printed, with a Latin version and notes, by Antonio Bougivianni, in the *Concilia*, vii, 799, ed. Mansi [Florence, 1762, folio], and reprinted by Galland, *l. c.*). In the title of this work Leontius is called *Monachus Hierosolymitanus*, but the word Hierosolymitanus is possibly an error of the transcriber. At any rate, Galland identifies the writer with our Leontius, and the subject of the work makes it probable that he is right. 7. *Adversus Eutychianos (s. Severianos) et Nestorianos in octo libros distinctum* (described by Canisius as being extant in MS. at Munich, and by Fabricius as occurring in the catalogue of the Palatine library). 8. *Liber de Duplici Natura in Christo contra Hæresin Monophysitarum* (Labbe and Cave speak of this as extant in MS. at Vienna, and they add to it *Disputatio contra Philosophum Arianum:* this, however, seems to be an extract from Gelasius of Cyzicus), which probably is

one of the discussions between the "holy bishops" of the orthodox party and the "philosophers" who embraced the opposite side, and the Leontius who took a part in it was a bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, and contemporary of Athanasius. 9. According to Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* xviii, 43), our Leontius wrote also "an admirable work," in thirty books, unfortunately lost, in which he overthrew the tritheistic heresy of John the Laborious, and firmly established the orthodox doctrine. Cave also ascribes to our Leontius *Oratio in medium Pentecostem et in Cæcum a Nativitate, necnon in illud: Nolite judicare secundum faciem* (published by Combefis, with a Latin version, in his *Auctarium Novum*, vol. i [Paris, 1648, fol.]). It is so given by the editors of the *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. ix (Lyons, 1671, folio), but Fabricius (*Bibl. Græca*, viii, 321) ascribes the homily to Leontius of Neapolis, while Galland omits it altogether. A homily on the parable of the good Samaritan, printed among the supposititious works of Chrysostom (*Opera*, vii, 506, ed. Savill), seems also to be a production of our Leontius. There are various homilies extant in MS. by "Leontius presbyter Constantinopolitanus." See Canisius, *Vita Leontii* in *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. ix (Lyons, 1677, fol.), and *Lectiones Antiquæ*, i, 527, etc., ed. Basnage; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 543; Vossius, *De Historicis Græcis Liber*, iv, c. 18; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, viii, 309, etc., 318; xii, 648; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* i, col. 1462; Mansi, *Concil.* vii, col. 797, etc.; Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, xii, *Prolegom.* c. 20.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 756 sq.

Leontius OF BYZANTIUM (2), the author of a part of the Χρονογραφία, lived in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. A second portion, bringing the work down to the second year of Romanus, son and successor of Porphyrogenitus, and probably only reaching or designed to reach a later period, is an addition by another hand. In fact, the work which is entitled Χρονογραφία, *Chronographia*, is composed of three parts, by three distinct writers: (1.) The history of the emperor Leo V, the Armenian, Michael II of Aurorium, Theophilus, the son of Michael, and Michael III and Theodora, the son and widow of Theophilus; by the so-called Leontius, from the materials supplied by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. (2.) The life of Basil the Macedonian, by Constantine himself (though Labbe and Cave would assign this also to Leontius); and (3.) The lives of Leo VI and Alexander, the sons of Basil, and of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and the commencement of the reign of Romanus II; by an unknown later hand. This third part is more succinct than the former parts, and is in a great degree borrowed, with little variation, from known and existing sources. The first edition of the *Chronographia* prepared for publication with a Latin version was by Combefis, and was published in the Paris edition of the Byzantine historians, forming a part of the volume entitled Οἱ μετὰ Θεοφάνην, *Scriptores post Theophanem* (1685, folio); again published in the Venetian reprint (1729, folio), and again, edited by Bekker (Bonn, 1838, 8vo). The life of Basil by Constantine Porphyrogenitus was printed separately as early as 1653, in the Συμμικτά of Allatius (Cologne, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 681; viii, 318; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 90.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 757 sq.

Leontius OF NEAPŎLIS (or of *Hagiopolis*, according to his own authority), in Cyprus, who was bishop of that city, which Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, ii, 1061) identifies with the Nova Lemissus, or Nemissus, or Nemosa, that rose out of the ruins of Amathus, flourished in the latter part of the 6th and the early part of the 7th century. Baronius, Possevino, and others call Leontius bishop of Salamis or Constantia, but in the records of the second Nicene or seventh General Council, held A.D. 787, Actio iv (*Concilia*, vii, col. 236, ed. Labbe; iv, col. 193, ed. Hardouin; viii, col. 884, ed. Coleti; and xiii, col. 44, ed. Mansi), he is expressly described as bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus. His death is said to have occurred between 620 and 630. His principal works are Λόγοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν ἀπολογίας κατὰ Ἰουδαίων καὶ περὶ εἰκόνων τῶν ἁγίων, *Sermones pro Defensione Christianorum contra Judæos ac de imaginibus sanctis*. A long extract from the fifth of these sermons was read at the second Nicene Council (*Concilia*, l. c.) to support the use of images in worship; and several passages, most of them identical with those cited in the council, are given by John of Damascus in his third oration, and in *De Imaginibus* (*Opera*, i, 373, etc., ed. Le Quien). A Latin version of another portion of one of these discourses of Leontius is given in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of Canisius, i, 793, edit. Basnage:—Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας τοῦ Ἐλεήμονος, *Vita Sancti Joannis Archiepiscopi Alexandriæ Cognomento Eleemonis, s. Eleemosynarii*. See JOHN THE ALMSGIVER. This life by Leontius was mentioned in the second Nicene Council (*Concilia*, vol. cit., col. 246 Labbe, 202 Hardouin, 896 Coleti, 53 Mansi), and is extant in No. 8 in the Imperial Library at Vienna. An ancient Latin version by Anastasius Bibliothecarius is given by Rosweid (*De Vitis Patrum*, pars i), Surius (*De Probatis Sanctorum Vitis*), and Bollandus (*Acta Sanctorum*, January, ii, 498, etc.). The account of St. Vitalis or Vitalius, given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of Bollandus (January), i, 702, is a Latin version of a part of this life of John the Almsgiver:—Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου Συμεὼν τοῦ σαλοῦ, *Vita Sancta Symeonis Stultitia*, or Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἀββᾶ Συμεὼν τοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπονομασθέντος Σαλοῦ, *Vita et Conversatio Abbatis Symeonis qui cognominatus est Stultus propter Christum*, was also mentioned in the Nicene Council (*l. c.*), and published in the *Acta Sanct.* of the Bollandists (July), i, 136, etc. The other published works of Leontius are homilies: *Sermo in Simeonem quando Dominum in Ulnas suscepit:—In Diem festum mediæ Pentecostes;* both with a Latin version in the *Novum Auctarium* of Combéfis, vol. i (Par. 1648, fol.). As Leontius is recorded to have written many homilies in honor of saints (ἐγκώμια) and for the festivals of the Church (πανηγυρικοὶ λόγοι), especially on the transfiguration of our Saviour, it is not unlikely that some of those extant under the name of Leontius of Constantinople may be by him. He wrote also Παραλλήλων λόγοι β', *Parallelorum, s. Locorum communium Theologicorum Libri ii;* the first book consisted of τῶν θείων, and the other τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων. Turrianus possessed the second book; but whether that or the first is extant, we know not; neither has been published. It has been thought that John of Damascus, in his *Parallela*, made use of those of Leontius. Fabricius also inserts among the works of our Leontius the homily Εἰς τὰ βαΐα, *In Festum* (*s. Ramos*) *Palmarum*, generally ascribed to Chrysostom, and printed among his doubtful or spurious works (vii, 334, ed. Savill; x, 767, ed. Montfaucon, or x, 915, and xiii, 354, in the recent Parisian reprint of Montfaucon's edition). Maldonatus (*ad Joan.* vii) mentions some MS. *Commentarii in Joannem* by Leontius, and an *Oratio in laudem S. Epiphanii* is mentioned by Theodore Studita in his *Antirrheticus Secundus*, apud Sismondi, *Opp.* v, 130. (See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, viii, 320, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 550; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis*, i, col. 1575, etc.; Vossius, *De Histor. Græc.* lib. ii, c. 23; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii, col. 1062; *Acta Sanctor.* July, v, 131.)—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 758.

Leopard (Heb. נָמֵר, *nâmêr'*, so called as being *spotted*, Cant. iv, 8; Isa. xi, 6; Jer. v, 6; xiii, 23; Hos. xiii, 7; Hab. i, 8; Chald. נְמַר, *nemar'*, Dan. vii, 6; Gr. πάρδαλις, Dan. vii, 6; Rev. xiii, 2; Ecclus. xxviii, 23). Though zoologists differ in opinion respecting the identity of the leopard and the panther, and dispute, supposing them to be distinct, how these names should be respectively applied, and by what marks the animals should be distinguished, nevertheless there can be no doubt that the *namer* of the Bible is that great spotted feline which anciently infested the Syrian mountains,

and even now occurs in the wooded ranges of Lebanon, for the Arabs still use *nimr*, the same word slightly modified, to denote that animal. The Abyssinian name differs scarcely from either; and in all these tongues it means spotted. *Pigikris*, according to Kirscher, is the Coptic name; and in English "*leopard*" has been adopted as the most appropriate to represent both the Hebrew word and the Greek *πάρδαλις* (which is imitated in the Talmudic ברדלס, Mishna, *Baba Mez.* viii, 2), although the Latin *leopardus* is not found in any author anterior to the fourth century, and is derived from a gross mistake in natural history. Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 443) contends that the scriptural animal was rather striped than spotted (חַבַּרְבָּרוֹת, Jer. xiii, 23), and thinks that not improbably the *tiger* was also comprised under this name, as the Hebrews had no specific name for that animal (*Thesaur.* p. 889). The panther (*Felis pardus* of

Syrian Panther (*Felis Pardus*).

Linn.) lives in Africa (Strabo, xvii, 828; Pliny, x, 94), Arabia (Strabo, xvi, 774, 777), as well as on Lebanon (Seetzen, xviii, 343; Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 99), and the hills of middle Palestine (Schubert, iii, 119), not to mention more distant countries, as India, America, etc. The most graphic description of the (African and Arabian) panther is by Ehrenberg (*Symbol. phys. Mammal*, dec. 2, pl. 17). The variety of leopard, or rather panther, of Syria is considerably below the stature of a lioness, but very heavy in proportion to its bulk. Its general form is so well known as to require no description beyond stating that the spots are rather more irregular, and the color more mixed with whitish, than in the other pantherine felinæ, excepting the Felis Uncia or Felis Irbis of High Asia, which is shaggy and almost white (Sonnini, *Trav.* i, 395). It is a nocturnal, cat-like animal in habits, dangerous to all domestic cattle, and sometimes even to man (comp. Plin. x, 94; Hom. *Hymn in Ven.* 71; Oppian, *Cyneg.* iii, 76 sq.; Cyrill. Alex. *in Hos.* l. c.; Tsetz. *Chiliad.* ii, 45; Poiret, *Voyage*, i, 224). In the Scriptures it is constantly placed in juxtaposition with the lion (Isa. xi, 6; Jer. v, 6; Hos. xiii, 7; Ecclus. xxviii, 23 [27]; comp. Ælian, *V. H.* xiv, 4) or the wolf. The swiftness of this animal, to which Habakkuk (i, 8) compares the Chaldæan horses, and to which Daniel (vii, 6) alludes in the winged leopard, is well known. So great is the flexibility of its body that it is able to take surprising leaps, to climb trees, or to crawl snake-like upon the ground. Jeremiah and Hosea (as above) allude to the insidious habit of this animal, which is abundantly confirmed by the observations of travellers: the leopard will take up its position in some spot near a village, and watch for some favorable opportunity for plunder. From the Canticles (as above) we learn that the hilly ranges of Lebanon were in ancient times frequented by these animals, and it is now not uncommonly seen in and about Lebanon, and the southern maritime mountains of Syria (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on Cant. iv, 8). There is in Asia Minor a species or variety of panther, much larger than the Syrian, not unfrequent on the borders of the snowy tracts even of Mount Ida, above ancient Troy; and the group of these spotted animals is spread over the whole of Southern Asia to Africa. From several names of places (e. g. Beth-Nimrah, etc.), it appears that, in the earlier ages of Israelitish dominion, it was sufficiently numerous in Palestine, and recent travellers have encountered it there (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 669; Lynch's *Expedition*, p. 212). Leopard skins were worn as a part of ceremonial costume by the superiors of the Egyptian priesthood, and by other personages in Nubia; and the animal itself is represented in the processions of tributary nations (Wilkinson, i, 285, 291, 319). In Dan. vii, 7, the third stage of the prophetical vision is symbolized under the form of a leopard with wings, representing the rapidly formed Macedonian empire; its four heads corresponding to the division of Alexander's dominions among his four generals. In Rev. xiii, 2, the same animal is made a type of the spiritual power of the Roman hierarchy, supported by the secular power in maintaining Paganism in opposition to Christianity. See generally Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 100 sq.; Schoder, *Specim. hieroz.* i, 46 sq.; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*, s. v.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 29 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 156 sq.

Leopold II of Germany (1790–1792) and I of Tuscany (1765–1790), the second son of Maria Theresa of Austria and her husband Francis of Lorraine, is noted in Church History for the part he took in the ecclesiastical affairs of Tuscany, which, after Maria Theresa had succeeded to the Austrian dominions, according to treaties, establishing the independence of Tuscany as a state separate from the hereditary states of Austria, devolved upon Leopold, his elder brother Joseph being the presumptive heir of the Austrian dominions. His principal reforms in Tuscany concerned the administration of justice and the discipline of the clergy in his dominions. By his "Motu proprio" in 1786, he promulgated a new criminal code, abolished torture and the pain of death, and established penitentiaries to reclaim offenders. In the ecclesiastical department, after having instituted various reforms, he actually, in July, 1782, abolished the Inquisition in Tuscany, and placed the monks and nuns of his dominions under the jurisdiction of the respective bishops. The discovery of licentious practices carried on in certain nunneries in the towns of Pistoja and Prato with the connivance of their monkish directors induced Leopold to investigate and reform the whole system of monastic discipline, and he intrusted Ricci, bishop of Pistoja, with full power for that purpose. This occasioned a long and angry controversy with the court of Rome, which pretended to have the sole cognizance of matters affecting individuals of the clergy and monastic orders. Leopold, however, carried his point, and the pope consented that the bishops of Tuscany should have the jurisdiction over the convents of their respective dioceses. Ricci, who had high notions of religious purity, and was by his enemies accused of Jansenism, attempted other reforms: he endeavored to enlighten the people as to the proper limits of image-worship and the invocation of saints; he suppressed certain relics which gave occasion to superstitious practices; he encouraged the spreading of religious works, and especially of the Gospel, among his flock; and, lastly, he assembled a diocesan council at Pistoja in September, 1786, in which he maintained the spiritual independence of the bishops. He advocated the use of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, he exposed the abuse of indulgences, approved of the four articles of the Gallican Council of 1682, and, lastly, appealed to a national council as a legitimate and canonical means for terminating controversies. Several of Ricci's propositions were condemned by the pope in a bull as scandalous, rash, and injurious to the Holy See. Leopold supported Ricci, but he could not prevent his being annoyed in many ways, and at last

he saw him forced to resign his charge. (For further details of this curious controversy, see Potter, *Vie de Scipion de Ricci* [Brussels, 1825, 3 vols. 8vo].) Leopold himself convoked a council at Florence of the bishops of Tuscany in 1787, and proposed to them fifty-seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. He enforced residence of incumbents, and forbade pluralities; suppressed many convents, and distributed their revenues among the poor benefices — thus favoring the parochial clergy, and extending their jurisdiction, as he had supported and extended the jurisdiction of the bishops. He forbade the publication of the bulls and censures of Rome without the approbation of the government; he enjoined the ecclesiastical courts not to interfere with laymen in temporal matters, and restrained their jurisdiction to spiritual affairs only; and he subjected clergymen to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts in all criminal cases. All these were considered in that age as very bold innovations for a Roman Catholic prince to undertake. See RICCI.

Leopold IV, margrave of Austria, son of Leopold III, was born Sept. 29, 1073. He was educated by the priest Udalrich, under the direction of Altmann, bishop of Passau, and succeeded his father in 1096. His chief object during his whole reign was to promote the happiness of his subjects. He avoided war, and husbanded the resources of his country with great care. He was about to accompany the emperor, Henry IV, in a crusade to Jerusalem, when the insurrection of the emperor's son, Henry V, obliged him to change his plans. At first he went to assist the emperor (in 1105), but somewhat later he was influenced by his brother-in-law, Borzywoy II, duke of Bohemia, and the promises of Henry V, to join the latter, to whose sister Agnes, widow of Frederick of Suabia, he was married in 1106. The remainder of his reign passed in peace and prosperity, although occasionally (especially in 1118) he was subjected to annoyances by the inroads of the Hungarians. In 1125, after the death of Henry V, he was spoken of for emperor, but declined in favor of Lothaire, duke of Saxony. Leopold died Nov. 15, 1136, and was canonized by pope Innocent VIII in 1485. He founded a large number of convents, among which are those of Neuburg, of Mariazell, and of the Holy Cross, and built a number of churches. See A. Klein, *Gesch. des Christenthums in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1840), vol. i and ii; *Leopold d. Heilige* (Vien. 1835); L. Lang, *D. hl. Leopold* (Reutlingen, 1836); Pez, *Vita sancti Leopoldi*; same, *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, i, 575; Poltzmann, *Compendium vitæ S. Leopoldi*; Jaffé, *Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter Lothar dem Sachsen* (Berlin, 1843); and his *Geschichte d. deutsch. Reiches u. Konrad III* (Han. 1845); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 332; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxx, 797.

Leper (some form of צָרַע, to *smite* with a providential infliction; λεπρός). See LEPROSY.

Leporius, a monastic who flourished in the second half of the 4th and the early part of the 5th century, a native of Gaul, embraced asceticism under the auspices of Cassianus about the opening of the 5th century, at Marseilles, where he enjoyed a high reputation for purity and holiness. Advancing the view that man did not stand in need of divine grace, and that Christ was born with a human nature only, he was excommunicated in consequence of these heretical doctrines. He betook himself to Africa, and there became familiar with Aurelius and St. Augustine, by whose instructions he profited so much that he not only became convinced of his errors, but drew up a solemn recantation addressed to Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, and Cyllinnius, the bishop of Aix (see below as to the title and value of this treatise), while four African prelates bore witness to the sincerity of his conversion, and made intercession on his behalf. Although now reinstated in his ecclesiastical privileges, Leporius does not seem to have returned to his native country, but, laying aside the profession of a monk, was ordained a presbyter by St. Augustine, A.D. 425, and appears to be the same Leporius so warmly praised in the discourse *De Vita et Moribus Clericorum*. We know nothing further regarding his career except that he was still alive in 430 (Cassianus, *De Incarn.* i, 4). The treatise above alluded to is still extant, under the title *Libellus emendationis sive satisfactionis ad Episcopos Galliæ*, sometimes with the addition *Confessionem Fidei Catholicæ continens de Mysterio Incarnationis Christi, cum Erroris pristini Detestatione*. It was held in very high estimation among ancient divines, and its author was regarded as one of the firmest bulwarks of orthodoxy against the attacks of the Nestorians. Some scholars in modern times, especially Quesnel, who has written an elaborate dissertation on the subject, have imagined that we ought to regard this as a tract composed and dictated by St. Augustine, founding their opinion partly on the style, and partly on the terms in which it is quoted in the acts of the second Council of Chalcedon and early documents, and partly on certain expressions in an epistle of Leo the Great (clxv, edit. Quesnel); but their arguments are far from being conclusive, and the hypothesis is generally rejected. Fragments of the *Libellus* were first collected by Sismondi from Cassianus, and inserted in his collection of Gaulish councils (i, 52). The entire work was soon discovered and published by the same editor in his *Opuscula Dogmatica Veterum quinque Scriptorum* (Par. 1630, 8vo), together with the letter of the African bishops in favor of Leporius. It will be found also in the collection of councils by Labbe (Paris, 1671, folio); in Garnier's edition of *Marius Mercator* (Paris, 1673, fol.), i, 224; in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Max.* (Lugd. 1677), vii, 14; and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Ven. 1773), ix, 396. Consult the dissertation of Quesnel in his edition of the works of Leo, ii, 906 (ed. Paris); *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, ii, 167; the second dissertation of Garnier, his edition of *M. Mercator*, i, 230; the *Prolegomena* of Galland; Schönemann, *Bibliotheca Patr. Latt.* ii, § 20.—Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leprosy (צָרַעַת, *tsara'äth*, a *smiting*, because supposed to be a direct visitation of heaven; Gr. λέπρα, so called from its *scaliness*, hence English "leper," etc.), a name that was given by the Greek physicians to a scaly disease of the skin. During the Dark Ages it was indiscriminately applied to all chronic diseases of the skin, and more particularly to elephantiasis, to which latter, however, it does not bear a complete resemblance. Hence prevailed the greatest discrepancy and confusion in the descriptions that authors gave of the disease, until Dr. Willan restored to the term *lepra* its original signification. In the Scriptures it is applied to a foul cutaneous disease, the description of which, as well as the regulations connected therewith, are given in Lev. xiii, xiv (comp. also Exod. iv, 6,7; Numb. xii, 10–15; 2 Sam. iii, 29; 2 Kings v, 27; vii, 3; xv, 5; Matt. viii, 2; x, 8, etc.). In the discussion of this subject we base our article upon the most recent scientific and archæological distinctions, compared with the present Oriental usages.

I. *Scriptural and Talmudical Statements.*—(I.) *Leprosy in Human Beings.*—1. *Cases and Symptoms of Biblical Leprosy.*—Lev. xiii, 2–44, which describes this distemper as laying hold of man, gives six different circumstances under which it may develop itself. They are as follows:

(1.) The first circumstance mentioned in Lev. xiii, 2-6 is that it may develop itself without any apparent cause. Hence it is enjoined that if any one should notice a rising or swelling (שְׂאֵת), an eruption or scab (סַפַּחַת), or a glossy pimple (בַּהֶרֶת) in the skin of his flesh, which may terminate in leprosy (צָרַעַת), he is at once to be taken to the priest, who is to examine it and pronounce it leprosy, and the man unclean, if it exhibits these two symptoms, viz. *a*, the hair of the affected spot

changed from its natural black color to white; and, *b*, the spot deeper than the general level of the skin of the body (ver. 2, 3). But if these two symptoms do not appear in the bright pimple, the priest is to shut him up for seven days, examine him again on the seventh day, and if the disease appears to have made no progress during this time, he is to remand the patient for another seven days (ver. 4, 5), and then, if on inspecting it again he finds that the bright spot has grown darker (כהה), and that it has not spread on the skin, he is to pronounce it a simple *scab* (ספחת מספחת), and the person clean after washing his garments (ver. 6). If, however, the pustule spreads over the skin after it has been pronounced a simple scab and the individual clean, the priest is to declare it leprosy, and the patient unclean (ver. 7, 8). It is thus evident that the symptoms which indicated scriptural leprosy, as the Mishna rightly remarks (*Negaim*, iii, 3), are bright pimples, a little depressed, turning the hair white, and spreading over the skin.

As the description of these symptoms is very concise, and requires to be specified more minutely for practical purposes, the spiritual guides of Israel defined them as follows: Both the bright pimple (בהרת) and the swelling spot (שאת), when indicative of leprosy, assume respectively one of two colors, a principal or a subordinate one. The principal color of the bright pimple is as white as snow (עזת כשלג), and the subordinate resembles plaster on the wall (כסיד החיכל); whilst the principal color of the rising spot is like that of an eggshell (כקרום בצה), and the secondary one resembles white wool (כצמר לבן, *Negaim*, i, 1); so that if the affected spot in the skin is inferior in whiteness to the film of an egg it is not leprosy, but simply a gathering (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, i, 1). Any one may examine the disease, except the patient himself or his relatives, but the priest alone can decide whether it is leprosy or not, and accordingly pronounce the patient unclean or clean, because Deut. xxi, 5 declares that the priest must decide cases of litigation and disease. But though the priest only can pronounce the decision, even if he be a child or a fool, yet he must act upon the advice of a learned layman in those matters (*Negaim*, iii, 1; Maimonides, *l. c.*, ix, 1, 2). If the priest is blind of one eye, or is weak-sighted, he is disqualified for examining the distemper (Mishna, *l. c.*, ii, 3). The inspection must not take place on the Sabbath, nor early in the morning, nor in the middle of the day, nor in the evening, nor on cloudy days, because the color of the skin cannot properly be ascertained in these hours of the day; but in the third, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, or ninth hour (*Negaim*, ii, 2); and the same priest who inspected it at first must examine it again at the end of the second seven days, as another one could not tell whether it has spread. If he should die in the interim, or be taken ill, another one may examine him, but not pronounce him unclean (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, ix, 4). There must be at least two hairs white at the root and in the body of the bright spot before the patient can be declared unclean (Maimonides, *l. c.*, ii, 1). If a bridegroom is seized with this distemper he must be left alone during the nuptial week (*Negaim*, iii, 2).

(2.) The second case is of leprosy reappearing after it has been cured (Lev. xiii, 9–17), where a somewhat different treatment is enjoined. If a person who has once been healed of this disease is brought again to the priest, and if the latter finds a white rising in the skin (שאת לבנה), which has changed the hair into white and contains live flesh (בשר חי), he is forthwith to recognise therein the reappearance of the old malady, and declare the patient unclean without any quarantine whatever, since the case is so evident that it requires no trial (ver. 9–11). There were, however, two phases of this returned distemper which exempted the patient from uncleanness. If the leprosy suddenly covered the whole body so that the patient became perfectly white, in which case there could be no appearance of live flesh (ver. 12, 13), or if the whiteness, after having once diminished and allowed live flesh to appear, covers again the whole body, then the patient was clean (ver. 14–17). This, most probably, was regarded as indicative of the crisis, as the whole evil matter thus brought to the surface formed itself into a scale which dried and peeled off. The only other feature which this case represents besides the symptoms already described is that leprosy at times also spread over the whole skin and rendered it perfectly white. As to the live flesh (בשר חי), the Sept., the Chaldee, the Mishna, and the Jewish rabbins, in accordance with ancient tradition, take it to denote *sound flesh*, or a spot in the flesh assuming the appearance of life after it had been paled by the whiteness overspreading the whole surface. The size of this spot of live flesh which renders the patient unclean must, according to tradition, be at least that of a lentil (Maimonides, *l. c.*, iii, 1–3).

(3.) The third case is of leprosy developing itself from an inflammation (שחין) or a burn (מכות אש), which is to be recognised by the same symptoms (Lev. xiii, 18–28). Hence, when these suspicious signs were discernible in that part of the skin which was healed of an inflammation, the patient was to go to the priest, who was at once to pronounce it leprosy developed from an inflammation, if the symptoms were unmistakable (ver. 19, 20). If the priest found these marks, he remanded the patient for seven days (ver. 21), and if the disorder spread over the skin during the time the patient was declared leprous and unclean (ver. 22); but if it remained in the same condition, he pronounced it the cicatrix of the inflammation (צרבת השחין) and the patient clean (ver. 23). The same rules applied to the suspicious appearance of a burn (ver. 24–28). According to the Hebrew canons, שחין is defined inflammation arising from "an injury received from the stroke of wood or a stone, or from hot olive husks, or the hot Tiberian water, or from anything, the heat of which does not come from fire, whilst מכות denotes a burn from live coals, hot ashes, or from any heat which proceeds from fire" (*Negaim*, ix, 1; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, v, 1). It will be seen that there is a difference in the treatment of the suspicious symptoms in (1.) and (3.). In the former instance, where there is no apparent cause for the symptoms, the suspected invalid has to undergo two remands of seven days before his case can be decided; whilst in the latter, where the inflammation or the burn visibly supplies the reason for this suspicion, he is only remanded for one week, at the end of which his case is finally determined.

(4.) The fourth case is leprosy on *the head* or *chin* (Lev. xiii, 29–37), which is to be recognised by the affected spot being deeper than the general level of the skin, and by the hair thereon having become thin and yellowish. When these symptoms exist, the priest is to pronounce it *a scall* (נתק), which is head or chin leprosy, and declare the patient unclean (ver. 30). But if this disorder on the head or chin does not exhibit these symptoms, the patient is to be remanded for seven days, when the priest is again to examine it, and if he finds that it has neither spread nor exhibits the required criteria, he is to order the patient to cut off all the hair of his head or chin, except that which grows on the afflicted spot itself, and remand him for another week, and then pronounce him clean if it continues in the same state at the expiration of this period (ver. 31–34); and if it spreads after he has been pronounced clean, the priest is forthwith to declare him unclean without looking for any yellow hair (ver. 35, 36). The Jewish canons define נתק by "an affection on the head or chin which causes the hair on these affected parts to fall off by the roots, so that the place of the hair is quite bare" (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, viii, 1). The condition of the hair, consti-

tuting one of the leprous symptoms, is described as follows: "דק is *small* or *short*, but if it be long, though it is yellow as gold, it is no sign of uncleanness. Two yellow and short hairs, whether close to one another or far from each other, whether in the centre of *the nethek* or on the edge thereof, no matter whether *the nethek* precedes the yellow hair or the yellow hair *the nethek*, are symptoms of uncleanness" (Maimonides, *l. c.*, viii, 5). The manner of shaving is thus described: "The hair round the scall is all shaved off except two hairs which are close to it, so that it might be known thereby whether it spread" (*Negaim*, x, 5).

(5.) The fifth case is leprosy which shows itself in white polished spots, and is not regarded as unclean (Lev. xiii, 38, 39). It is called *bohak* (בֹּהַק, from בָּהַק, *to be white*), or, as the Sept. has it, ἀλφός, *vitiligo alba*, white scurf.

(6.) The sixth case is of leprosy either at the back or in the front of the head (Lev. xiii, 40–44). When a man loses his hair either at the back or in the front of his head, it is a simple case of baldness, and he is clean (ver. 40, 41). But if a whitish red spot forms itself on the bald place at the back or in the front of the head, then it is leprosy, which is to be recognised by the fact that the swelling or scab on the spot has the appearance of leprosy in the skin of the body; and the priest is to declare the man's head leprous and unclean (ver. 42–44). Though there is only one symptom mentioned whereby head leprosy is to be recognised, and nothing is said about remanding the patient if the distemper should appear doubtful, as in the other cases of leprosy, yet the ancient rabbins inferred from the remark, "It is like leprosy in the skin of the flesh," that *all* the criteria specified in the latter are implied in the former. Hence the Hebrew canons submit that "there are two symptoms which render baldness in the front or at the back of the head unclean, viz. live or sound flesh, and spreading; the patient is also shut up for them two weeks, because it is said of them that 'they are [and therefore must be treated] like leprosy in the skin of the flesh'" (Lev. xiii, 43). Of course, the fact that the distemper in this instance develops itself on baldness, precludes white hair being among the criteria indicating uncleanness. The manner in which the patient in question is declared unclean by two symptoms and in two weeks is as follows: "If live or sound flesh is found in the bright spot on the baldness at the back or in the front of the head, he is pronounced unclean; if there is no live flesh he is shut up and examined at the end of the week, and if live flesh has developed itself, and it has spread, he is declared unclean, and if not he is shut up for another week. If it has spread during this time, or engendered live flesh, he is declared unclean, and if not he is pronounced clean. He is also pronounced unclean if it spreads or engenders sound flesh after he has been declared clean" (*Negaim*, x, 10; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, v, 9, 10).

2. *Regulations about the Conduct and Purification of leprous Men.*—Lepers were to rend their garments, let the hair of their head hang down dishevelled, cover themselves up to the upper lip, like mourners, and warn off every one whom they happened to meet by calling out "Unclean! unclean!" since they defiled every one and everything they touched. For this reason they were also obliged to live in exclusion outside the camp or city (Lev. xiii, 45, 46; Numb. v, 1–4; xii, 10–15; 2 Kings vii, 3, etc.). "The very entrance of a leper into a house," according to the Jewish canons, "renders everything in it unclean" (*Negaim*, xii, 11; *Kelim*, i, 4). "If he stands under a tree and a clean man passes by, he renders him unclean. In the synagogue which he wishes to attend they are obliged to make him a separate compartment, ten handbreadths high and four cubits long and broad; he has to be the first to go in, and the last to leave the synagogue" (*Negaim*, xii, 12; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, x, 12); and if he transgressed the prescribed boundaries he was to receive forty stripes (*Pesachim*, 67, *a*). All this only applies to those who had been pronounced lepers by the priest, but not to those who were on quarantine (*Negaim*, i, 7). The rabbinic law also exempts women from the obligation to rend their garments and let the hair of their head fall down (*Sota*, iii, 8). It is therefore no wonder that the Jews regarded leprosy as a living death (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 11, 8, and the well-known rabbinic saying מצורע חשוב כמת), and as an awful punishment from the Lord (2 Kings v, 7; 2 Chron. xxvi, 20), which they wished all their mortal enemies (2 Sam. iii, 29; 2 Kings v, 27).

The healed leper had to pass through two stages of purification before he could be received back into the community. As soon as the distemper disappeared he sent for the priest, who had to go outside the camp or town to convince himself of the fact. Thereupon the priest ordered two clean and live birds, a piece of cedar wood, crimson wool, and hyssop; killed one bird over a vessel containing spring water, so that the blood might run into it, tied together the hyssop and the cedar wood with the crimson wool, put about them the tops of the wings and the tip of the tail of the living bird, dipped all the four in the blood and water which were in the vessel, then sprinkled the hand of the healed leper seven times, let the bird loose, and pronounced the restored man clean (Lev. xiv, 1–7; *Negaim*, xii, 1). The healed leper was then to wash his garments, cut off all his hair, be immersed, and return to the camp or city, but remain outside his house seven days, which the Mishna (*Negaim*, xiv, 2), the Chaldee Paraphrase, Maimonides (*On Leprosy*, xi, 1), etc., rightly regard as a euphemism for exclusion from connubial intercourse during that time (ver. 8), in order that he might not contract impurity (comp. Lev. xv, 18). With this ended the first stage of purification. According to the Jewish canons, the birds are to be "free, and not caged," or sparrows; the piece of cedar wood is to be "a cubit long, and a quarter of the foot of the bed thick;" the crimson wool is to be a shekel's weight, i. e. 320 grains of barley; the hyssop must at least be a handbreadth in size, and is neither to be the so-called Greek, nor ornamental, nor Roman, nor wild hyssop, nor have any name whatever; the vessel must be an earthen one, and new; and the dead bird must be buried in a hole dug before their eyes (*Negaim*, xiv, 1–6; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, xi, 1).

The second stage of purification began on the seventh day, when the leper had again to cut off the hair of his head, his beard, eyebrows, etc., wash his garments, and be immersed (Lev. xiv, 9). On the eighth day he had to bring two he-lambs without blemish, one ewe-lamb a year old, three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, and one log of oil; the one he-lamb is to be a trespass-offering, and the other, with the ewe-lamb, a burnt and a sin-offering; but if the man was poor he was to bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, instead of a he-lamb and a ewe-lamb (ver. 10, 11, 21). With these offerings the priest conducted the healed leper before the presence of the Lord. What the offerer had to do, and how the priest acted when going through these ceremonies, cannot be better described than in the following graphic language of the Jewish tradition. "The priest approaches the trespass-offering, lays both his hands on it, and kills it, when two priests catch its blood, one into a vessel, and the other in his hand; the one who caught it into the vessel sprinkles it against the wall of the altar, the other goes to the leper, who, having been immersed in the leper's chamber [which is in the women's court], is waiting [outside the court of Israel, or the men's court, opposite the eastern door] in the porch of Nicanor [with his face to the west]. He then puts his head into [the court of Israel], and the priest puts some of the blood upon the tip of his right ear; he next puts in his right hand, and the priest puts some blood upon the thumb thereof; and, lastly, puts in his right leg,

and the priest puts some blood on the toe thereof. The priest then takes some of the log of oil and puts it into the left hand of his fellow-priest, or into his own left hand, dips the finger of his right hand in it, and sprinkles it seven times towards the holy of holies, dipping his finger every time he sprinkles it; whereupon he goes to the leper, puts oil on those parts of his body on which he had previously put blood [i. e. the tip of the ear, the thumb, and the toe], as it is written, 'on the place of the blood of the trespass-offering' [Lev. xiv, 28], and what remains of the oil in the hand of the priest he puts on the head of him who is to be cleansed, for an atonement" (*Negaim*, xiv, 8–10; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Mechosrei Kepora*, iv). It is in accordance with this prerogative of the priest, who alone could pronounce the leper clean and readmit him into the congregation, that Christ commanded the leper whom he had healed to show himself to this functionary (Matt. viii, 2, etc.).

(II.) *Leprous Garments and Vessels.*—Leprosy in garments and vessels is indicated by two symptoms, *green* or *reddish spots*, and *spreading*. If a green or reddish spot shows itself in a woollen or linen garment, or in a leather vessel, it is indicative of leprosy, and must be shown to the priest, who is to shut it up for a week. If, on inspecting it at the end of this time, he finds that the spot has spread, he is to pronounce it inveterate leprosy (צרעת מאכלת), and unclean, and burn it (Lev. xiii, 47–52); if it has not spread he is to have it washed, and shut it up for another week, and if its appearance has then not changed, he is to pronounce it unclean and burn it, though it has not spread, since the distemper rankles in the front or at the back of the material (ver. 53–55). But if, after washing it, the priest sees that the spot has become weaker, he is to cut it out of the material; if it reappears in any part thereof, then it is a developed distemper, and the whole of it must be burned; and if it vanishes after washing, it must be washed a second time, and is clean (ver. 56–59). The Jewish canons define the color green to be like that of *herbs*, and red like that of *fair crimson*, and take this enactment literally as referring strictly to wool of sheep and flax, but not to hemp and other materials. A material made of camel's hair and sheep's wool is not rendered unclean by leprosy if the camel's hair preponderate, but is unclean when the sheep's wool preponderates, or when both are equal, and this also applies to mixtures of flax and hemp. Dyed skins and garments are not rendered unclean by leprosy; nor are vessels so if made of skins of aquatic animals exposed to leprous uncleanness (*Negaim*, xi, 2, 3; Maimonides, *ut sup.* xi, 1; xii, 10; xiii, 1–3).

(III.) *Leprous Houses.*—Leprosy in houses is indicated by the same three symptoms, viz. spots of a deep green or reddish hue, depressed beyond the general level, and spreading (Lev. xiv, 33–48). On its appearance the priest was at once to be sent for, and the house cleared of everything before his arrival. If, on inspecting it, he found the first two symptoms in the walls, viz. a green or red spot in the wall, and depressed, he shut the house up for seven days (ver. 34–38), inspected it again on the seventh day, and if the distemper spread in the wall he had the affected stones taken out, the inside of the house scraped all round, the stones, dust, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, and other stones and plaster put on the wall (ver. 39–42). If, after all this, the spot reappeared and spread, he pronounced it inveterate leprosy, and unclean, had the house pulled down, and the stones, timber, plaster, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, declared every one unclean, till evening, who had entered it, and ordered every one who had either slept or eaten in it to wash his garments (ver. 43–47).

As to the purification of the houses which have been cured of leprosy, the process is the same as that of healed men, except that in the case of man the priest sprinkles seven times upon his hand, while in that of the house he sprinkles seven times on the upper door-post without. Of course the sacrifices which the leprous man had to bring in his second stage of purification are precluded in the case of the house (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, xv, 8).

3. *Prevalence, Contagion, and Curableness of Leprosy.*—Though the malicious story of Manetho that the Egyptians expelled the Jews because they were afflicted with leprosy (Josephus, *Ap.* i, 26), which is repeated by Tacitus (lib. v, c. 3), is rejected by modern historians and critics as a fabrication, yet Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, art. 209), Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 652), and others still maintain that this disease was "extremely prevalent among the Israelites." Against this, however, is to be urged that, 1. The very fact that such strict examination was enjoined, and that every one who had a pimple, spot, or boil was shut up, shows that leprosy could not have been so widespread, inasmuch as it would require the imprisonment of the great mass of the people. 2. In cautioning the people against the evil of leprosy, and urging on them to keep strictly to the directions of the priest, Moses adds, "*Remember* what the Lord thy God did to Miriam on the way when you came out of Egypt" (Deut. xxiv, 9). Now allusion to a single instance which occurred on the way from Egypt, and which, therefore, was an *old case*, naturally implies that leprosy was of rare occurrence among the Jews, else there would have been no necessity to adduce a by-gone case; and, 3. Wherever leprosy is spoken of in later books of the Bible, which does not often take place, it is only of isolated cases (2 Kings vii, 3; xv, 5), and the regulations are strictly carried out, and the men are shut up so that even the king himself formed no exception (2 Kings xv, 5).

That the disease was *not contagious* is evident from the regulations themselves. The priests had to be in constant and close contact with lepers, had to examine and handle them; the leper who was *entirely* covered was pronounced clean (Lev. xiii, 12, 13); and the priest himself commanded that all things in a leprous house should be taken out before he entered it, in order that they might not be pronounced unclean, and that they might be used again (Lev. xiv, 36), which most unquestionably implies that there was no fear of contagion. This is, moreover, corroborated by the ancient Jewish canons, which were made by those very men who had personally to deal with this distemper, and according to which a leprous minor, a heathen, and a proselyte, as well as leprous garments, and houses of non-Israelites, do not render any one unclean; nor does a bridegroom, who is seized with this malady during the nuptial week, defile any one during the first seven days of his marriage (comp. *Negaim*, iii, 1, 2; vii, 1; xi, 1; xii, 1; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, vi, 1; vii, 1, etc.). These canons would be utterly inexplicable on the hypothesis that the distemper in question was contagious. The enactments, therefore, about the exclusion of the leper from society, and about defilement, were not dictated by sanitary caution, but had their root in the moral and ceremonial law, like the enactments about the separation and uncleanness of menstruous women, of those who had an issue or touched the dead, which are joined with leprosy. Being regarded as a punishment for sin, which God himself inflicted upon the disobedient (Exod. xv, 26; Lev. xiv, 35), this loathsome disease, with the peculiar rites connected therewith, was especially selected as a typical representation of the pollution of sin, in which light the Jews always viewed it. Thus we are told that "leprosy comes upon man for seven, ten, or eleven things: for idolatry, profaning the name of God, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, perjury, infringing the borders of a neighbor, devising malicious plans, or creating discord between brothers" (*Erachin*, 16, 17; *Baba Bathra*, 164; *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ix; *Midrash Rabba on Levit.* xiv). "Cedar wood and hyssop, the highest and the lowest, give the leper purity. Why these? Because pride was the cause of the distemper, which cannot be cured till man becomes humble, and keeps himself as low as hyssop" (Midrash Rabba, *Koheleth*, p. 104).

As to *the curableness* of the disease, this is unquestionably implied in the minute regulations about the sacrifices and conduct of those who were restored to health. Besides, in the case of Miriam, we find that shutting her up for seven days cured her of leprosy (Numb. xii, 11–13).

II. *Identity of the Biblical Leprosy with the modern Distemper bearing this Name.*—It would be useless to discuss the different disorders which have been palmed upon the Mosaic description of leprosy. A careful classification and discrimination is necessary.

1. The Greeks distinguished three species of *lepra*, the specific names of which were *ἀλφός*, *λευκή*, and *μέλας*, which may be rendered the *vitiligo*, the *white* and the *black*. Now, on turning to the Mosaic account, we also find three species mentioned, which were all included under the generic term of בַּהֶרֶת, *bahéreth*, or "bright spot" (Lev. xiii, 2–4, 18–28). The first is called בֹּהַק, *bóhak*, which signifies "brightness," but in a subordinate degree (Lev. xiii, 39). This species did not render a person unclear. The second was called בַּהֶרֶת לְבָנָה, *bahéreth lebanáh*, or a bright white *bahéreth*. The characteristic marks of the *bahéreth lebanáh* mentioned by Moses are a glossy white and spreading scale upon an elevated base, the elevation depressed in the middle, the hair on the patches participating in the whiteness, and the patches themselves perpetually increasing. This was evidently the true leprosy, probably corresponding to the *white* of the Greeks and the *vulgaris* of modern science. The third was בַּהֶרֶת כֵּהָה, *bahéreth kéhâh*, or dusky *bahéreth*, spreading in the skin. It has been thought to correspond with the *black* leprosy of the Greeks and the *nigricans* of Dr. Willan. These last two were also called צָרַעַת, *tsaráath* (i. e. proper leprosy), and rendered a person unclean. There are some other slight affections mentioned by name in Leviticus (chap. xiii), which the priest was required to distinguish from leprosy, such as שְׂאֵת, *seêth*; שָׂפַל, *shaphól*; נֶתֶק, *néthek*; שְׁחִין, *shechén*, i. e. "elevation," "depressed," etc.; and to each of these Dr. Good (*Study of Med.* v, 590) has assigned a modern systematic name. But, as it is useless to attempt to recognise a disease otherwise than by a description of its symptoms, we can have no object in discussing his interpretation of these terms. We therefore recognise but two species of real leprosy.

(I.) *Proper Leprosy.*—This is the kind specifically denominated בַּהֶרֶת, *bahereth*, whether white or black, but usually called *white leprosy*, by the Arabs *barras*; a disease not unfrequent among the Hebrews (2 Kings v, 27; Exod. iv, 6; Numb. xii, 10), and often called *lepra Mosaica*. It was regarded by them as a divine infliction (hence its Heb. name צָרַעַת, *tsaráath*, a stroke i. e. of God), and in several instances we find it such, as in the case of Miriam (Numb. xii, 10), Gehazi (2 Kings v, 27), and Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 16–23), from which and other indications it appears to have been considered hereditary, and incurable by human means (comp. 2 Sam. iii, 29; 2 Kings v, 7). From Deut. xxiv, 8, it appears to have been well-known in Egypt as a dreadful disease (comp. *Description de l'Egypte*, xiii, 159 sq.). The distinctive marks given by Moses to indicate this disease (Lev. xiii) are, *a depression of the surface and whiteness* or *yellowness of the hair* in the spot (ver. 3, 20, 25, 30), or a *spreading* of the scaliness (ver. 8, 22, 27, 36), or *raw flesh* in it (ver. 10, 14), or a *white-reddish sore* (ver. 43).

The disease, as it is known at the present day, commences by an eruption of small reddish spots slightly raised above the level of the skin, and grouped in a circle. These spots are soon covered by a very thin, semi-transparent scale or epidermis, of a whitish color, and very smooth, which in a little time falls off, and leaves the skin beneath red and uneven. As the circles increase in diameter, the skin recovers its healthy appearance towards the centre; fresh scales are formed, which are now thicker, and superimposed one above the other, especially at the edges, so that the centre of the scale appears to be depressed. The scales are of a grayish-white color, and have something of a micaceous or pearly lustre. The circles are generally of the size of a shilling or half crown, but they have been known to attain half a foot in diameter. The disease generally affects the knees and elbows, but sometimes it extends over the whole body, in which case the circles become confluent. It does not at all affect the general health, and the only inconvenience it causes the patient is a slight itching when the skin is heated; or, in inveterate cases, when the skin about the joints is much thickened, it may in some degree impede the free motion of the limbs. It is common to both sexes, to almost all ages, and all ranks of society. It is not in the least infectious, but it is always difficult to be cured, and in old persons, when it is of long standing, may be pronounced incurable. It is commonly met with in all parts of Europe, and occasionally in America. Its systematic name is *Lepra vulgaris*.

Moses prescribes no natural remedy for the cure of leprosy (Lev. xiii). He requires only that the diseased person should show himself to the priest, and that the priest should judge of his leprosy; if it appeared to be a real leprosy, he separated the leper from the company of mankind (Lev. xiii, 45, 46; comp. Numb. v, 2; xii, 10, 14; 2 Kings vii, 3; xv, 5; Josephus, *Apion*, i, 31; *Ant.* iii, 11, 3; *Wars*, v, 5, 6; see Wetstein, *N. T.* i, 175; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 861; Withob, *Opusc.* p. 169 sq.). Although the laws in the Mosaic code respecting this disease are exceedingly rigid (see Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* xvii, 19 sq.; *Medic. hermeneut. Untersuch.* p. 240 sq.), it is by no means clear that the leprosy was contagious. The fear or disgust which was felt towards such a peculiar disease might be a sufficient cause for such severe enactments. All intercourse with society, however, was not cut off (Matt. viii, 2; Luke v, 12; xvii, 12), and even contact with a leper did not necessarily impart uncleanness (Luke xvii, 12). They were even admitted to the synagogue (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 862). Similar liberties are still allowed them among the Arabians (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 136); so that we are probably to regard the statements of travellers respecting the utter exclusion of modern lepers in the East as relating to those affected with entirely a different disease, the elephantiasis. In Lev. xiv are detailed particular ceremonies and offerings (compare Matt. viii, 4) to be officially observed by the priest on behalf of a leper restored to health and purity. See D. C. Lutz, *De duab. avib. purgationi leprosi destinatis earundemque mysterio*, Hal. 1737; Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 512 sq.; Baumgarten, *Comment.* I, ii, 170 sq.; Talmud, tract *Negaim*, vi, 3; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 365 sq.; Rhenferd, in Meuschen, *N. T. Talmud.* p. 1057.

(II.) *Elephantiasis.* — This more severe form of cutaneous, or, rather, scrofulous disease has been confounded with leprosy, from which it is essentially different. It is usually called *tubercular leprosy* (*Lepra nodosa*, Celsus, *Med.* iii, 25), and has generally been thought to be the disease with which Job was afflicted (שְׁחִין רַע, Job ii, 7; comp. Deut. xxviii, 35). See Job's Disease. It has been thought to be alluded to by the term "botch of Egypt" (שְׁחִין מִצְרַיִם, Deut. xxviii, 27), where it is said to have been endemic (Pliny, xxvi, 5; Lucret. vi, 1112 sq.; comp. Aretæus, *Cappad. morb. diut.* ii, 13; see Ainslie, in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society*, i, 282 sq.). The Greeks gave the name of elephantiasis to this disease because the skin of the person affected with it was thought to resemble that of an elephant, in dark color, ruggedness, and insensibility, or, as some have thought, because the foot, after the loss of the toes, when the hollow of the sole is filled up and the ankle enlarged, resembles the foot of an elephant. The Arabs called it *Judhâm*, which means "mutilation," "amputation," in reference to the loss of the smaller members. They have, however, also described another disease, and a very different one from elephantiasis, to which they

gave the name of *Da'l fil*, which means literally *morbus elephas*. The disease to which they applied this name is called by modern writers the *tumid Barbadoes leg*, and consists in a thickening of the skin and subcutaneous tissues of the leg, but presents nothing resembling the tubercles of elephantiasis. Now the Latin translators from the Arabic, finding that the same name existed both in the Greek and Arabic, translated *Da'l fil* by elephantiasis, and thus confounded the Barbadoes leg with the Arabic *Judhâm*, while this latter, which was in reality elephantiasis, they rendered by the Greek term *lepra*. See Kleyer, in *Miscell. nat. curios.* 1683, p. 8; Bartholin. *Morb. Bibl.* c. 7; Michaelis, *Einleit. ins A. T.* i, 58 sq.; Reinhard, *Bibelkrank.* iii, 52.

Elephantiasis first of all makes its appearance by spots of a reddish, yellowish, or livid hue, irregularly disseminated over the skin and slightly raised above its surface. These spots are glossy, and appear oily, or as if they were covered with varnish. After they have remained in this way for a longer or shorter time, they are succeeded by an eruption of tubercles. These are soft, roundish tumors, varying in size from that of a pea to that of an olive, and are of a reddish or livid color. They are principally developed on the face and ears, but in the course of years extend over the whole body. The face becomes frightfully deformed; the forehead is traversed by deep lines and covered with numerous tubercles; the eyebrows become bald, swelled, furrowed by oblique lines, and covered with nipple-like elevations; the eyelashes fall out, and the eyes assume a fixed and staring look; the lips are enormously thickened and shining; the beard falls out; the chin and ears are enlarged and beset with tubercles; the lobe and alæ of the nose are frightfully enlarged and deformed; the nostrils irregularly dilated, internally constricted, and excoriated; the voice is hoarse and nasal, and the breath intolerably fetid. After some time, generally after some years, many of the tubercles ulcerate, and the matter which exudes from them dries to crusts of a brownish or blackish color; but this process seldom terminates in cicatrization. The extremities are affected in the same way as the face. The hollow of the foot is swelled out, so that the sole becomes flat; the sensibility of the skin is greatly impaired, and, in the hands and feet, often entirely lost; the joints of the toes ulcerate and fall off one after the other; insupportable fœtor exhales from the whole body. The patient's general health is not affected for a considerable time, and his sufferings are not always of the same intensity as his external deformity. Often, however, his nights are sleepless or disturbed by frightful dreams; he becomes morose and melancholy; he shuns the sight of the healthy because he feels what an object of disgust he is to them, and life becomes a loathsome burden to him; or he falls into a state of apathy, and, after many years of such an existence, he sinks either from exhaustion or from the supervention of internal disease.

About the period of the Crusades elephantiasis spread itself like an epidemic over all Europe, even as far north as the Faroë Islands; and henceforth, owing to the above-named mistakes, every one became familiar with leprosy under the form of the terrible disease that has just been described. Leper or lazar-houses abounded everywhere: as many as 2000 are said to have existed in France alone. In the leper hospital in Edinburgh the inmates begged for the general community—sitting for the purpose at the door of the hospital. They were obliged to warn those approaching them of the presence of an infected fellow-mortal by using a wood rattle or clapper. The infected in European countries were obliged to enter leper hospitals, and were considered legally and politically dead. The Church, taking the same view of it, performed over them the solemn ceremonies for the burial of the dead—the priest closing the ceremony by throwing upon them a shovelful of earth. The disease was considered to be contagious possibly only on account of the belief that was entertained respecting its identity with Jewish leprosy, and the strictest regulations were enacted for secluding the diseased from society. Towards the commencement of the 17th century the disease gradually disappeared from Europe, and is now mostly confined to intertropical countries. It existed in Faroë as late as 1676, and in the Shetland Islands in 1736, long after it had ceased in the southern parts of Great Britain. This fearful disease made its appearance in the island of Guadaloupe in the year 1730, introduced by negroes from Africa, producing great consternation among the inhabitants. In Europe it is now principally confined to Norway, where the last census gave 2000 cases. It visits occasionally some of the sea-port localities of Spain. It has made its appearance in the most different climates, from Iceland through the temperate regions to the arid plains of Arabia—in moist and dry localities. It still exists in Palestine and Egypt—the latter its most familiar home, although Dr. Kitto thinks not in such numerous instances as in former ages. The physical causes of the malady are uncertain. The best authors of the present day who have had an opportunity of observing the disease do not consider it to be contagious. There seems, however, to be little doubt as to its being hereditary. See Good's *Study of Medicine*, iii, 421; Rayer, *Mal. de la Peau*, ii, 296; Simpson, *On the Lepers and Leper-houses of Scotland and England*, in *Edinb. Medical and Surgical Journal*, Jan. 1, 1842; J. Gieslesen, *De elephantiasi Norvegica* (Havn. 1785); Michael. *U. orient Bibl.* iv, 168 sq.; B. Haubold, *Vitiliginis leprosæ rarioris historia c. epicrisi* (Lips. 1821); C. J. Hille, *Rarioris morbi elephantiasi partiali similis histor.* (Lips. 1828); Rosenbaum, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* xxxiii, 254 sq.

Elephantiasis, or the leprosy of the Middle Ages, is the disease from which most of the prevalent notions concerning leprosy have been derived, and to which the notices of lepers contained in modern books of travels exclusively refer. It is doubtful whether any of the lepers cured by Christ (Matt. viii, 3; Mark i, 42; Luke v, 12, 13) were of this class. In nearly all Oriental towns persons of this description are met with, excluded from intercourse with the rest of the community, and usually confined to a separate quarter of the town. Dr. Robinson says, with reference to Jerusalem, "Within the Zion Gate, a little towards the right, are some miserable hovels, inhabited by persons called lepers. Whether their disease is or is not the leprosy of Scripture I am unable to affirm; the symptoms described to us were similar to those of elephantiasis. At any rate, they are pitiable objects, and miserable outcasts from society. They all live here together, and intermarry only with each other. The children are said to be healthy until the age of puberty or later, when the disease makes its appearance in a finger, on the nose, or in some like part of the body, and gradually increases as long as the victim survives. They were said often to live to the age of forty or fifty years" (*Bib. Res.* i, 359). With reference to their presence elsewhere, he remarks, "There are said to be leprous persons at Nablûs (Shechem) as well as at Jerusalem, but we did not here meet with them" (*ib.* iii, 113 note). On the reputed site of the house of Naaman, at Damascus, stands at the present day a hospital filled with unfortunate patients, the victims affected like him with leprosy. See PLAGUE.

2. That the Mosaic cases of true leprosy were confined to the former of these two dreadful forms of disease is evident. The reason why this kind of cutaneous distemper alone was taken cognizance of by the law doubtless was because the other was too well marked and obvious to require any diagnostic particularization. With the scriptural symptoms before us, let us compare the most recent description of modern leprosy of the malignant type given by an eye-witness who examined this subject: "The scab comes on by degrees, in different parts of the body; the hair falls from the head and eyebrows; the nails loosen, decay, and drop off; joint after joint of the fingers and toes shrink up, and slowly fall

away; the gums are absorbed, and the teeth disappear; the nose, the eyes, the tongue, and the palate are slowly consumed; and, finally, the wretched victim shrinks into the earth and disappears, while medicine has no power to stay the ravages of this fell disease, or even to mitigate sensibly its tortures" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, p. 653, etc.); and again, "Sauntering down the Jaffa road, on my approach to the Holy City, in a kind of dreamy maze, . . . I was startled out of my reverie by the sudden apparition of a crowd of beggars, 'sans eyes, sans nose, sans hair, sans everything.' They held up towards me their handless arms, unearthly sounds gurgled through throats without palates" (*ibid.* p. 651). We merely ask by what rules of interpretation can we deduce from the Biblical leprosy, which is described as consisting in a rising scab, or bright spot deeper than the general level of the skin, and spreading, sometimes exhibiting live flesh, and which is non-contagious and curable, that loathsome and appalling malady described by Dr. Thomson and others?

3. As to the leprosy of garments, vessels, and houses, the ancient Jewish tradition is that "leprosy of garments and houses was not to be found in the world generally, but was a sign and a miracle in Israel to guard them against an evil tongue" (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, xvi, 10). Some have thought garments worn by leprous patients intended. The discharges of the diseased skin absorbed into the apparel would, if infection were possible, probably convey disease, and it is known to be highly dangerous in some cases to allow clothes which have so imbibed the discharges of an ulcer to be worn again. The words of Jude, ver. 23, may seem to countenance this, "Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." But, 1st, no mention of infection occurs; 2d, no connection of the leprous garment with a leprous human wearer is hinted at; 3d, this would not help us to account for a leprosy of stone walls and plaster. Thus Dr. Mead (*ut sup.*) speaks at any rate plausibly of the leprosy of garments, but becomes unreasonable when he extends his explanation to that of walls. There is more probability in the idea of Sommer (*Bibl. Abhandlungen*, i, 224) that what is meant are the fusting-stains occasioned by damp and want of air, and which, when confirmed, cause the cloth to moulder and fall to pieces. Michaelis thought that wool from sheep which had died of a particular disease might fret into holes, and exhibit an appearance like that described in Lev. xiii, 47, 59 (Michaelis, art. ccxi, iii, 290, 291). But woollen cloth is far from being the only material mentioned; nay, there is even some reason to think that the words rendered in the A.V. "warp" and "woof" are not those distinct parts of the texture, but distinct materials. Linen, however, and leather are distinctly particularized, and the latter not only as regards garments, but "anything (lit. vessel) made of skin"—for instance, bottles. This classing of garments and house-walls with the human epidermis as leprous has moved the mirth of some and the wonder of others. Yet modern science has established what goes far to vindicate the Mosaic classification as more philosophical than such cavils. It is now known that there are some skin-diseases which originate in an acarus, and others which proceed from a fungus. In these we may probably find the solution of the paradox. The analogy between the insect which frets the human skin and that which frets the garment that covers it, between the fungous growth that lines the crevices of the epidermis and that which creeps in the interstices of masonry, is close enough for the purposes of a ceremonial law, to which it is essential that there should be an arbitrary element intermingled with provisions manifestly reasonable. Michaelis (*ibid.* art. ccxi, iii, 293–9) has suggested a nitrous efflorescence on the surface of the stone, produced by saltpetre, or rather an acid containing it, and issuing in red spots, and cites the example of a house in Lubeck; he mentions, also, exfoliation of the stone from other causes; but probably these appearances would not be developed without a greater degree of damp than is common in Palestine and Arabia. It is manifest, also, that a disease in the human subject caused by an acarus or a fungus would be certainly contagious, since the propagative cause could be transferred from person to person. Some physicians, indeed, assert that *only* such skin-diseases *are* contagious. Hence, perhaps, arose a further reason for marking, even in their analogues among lifeless substances, the strictness with which forms of disease so arising were to be shunned.

Whatever the nature of the disorder might be, there can be no doubt, as Baumgarten has remarked (*Comm.* ii, 175), that in the house respect was had to its possessor, since when *it* came to be in a good condition a cleansing or purification quite analogous to the man's was prescribed. He was thus taught to see in his external environments a sign of what was or might be internal. The later Jews appear to have had some idea of this, though others viewed it differently. Some rabbins say that God sent this plague for the good of the Israelites into certain houses, that, they being pulled down, the treasure which the Amorites had hidden there might be discovered (Patrick on Lev. xiv, 34). But "there is good reason," adds the learned prelate, "from these words ['I put the plague of leprosy upon a house'], to think that this plague was a supernatural stroke. Thus Aberbanel understands it: 'When he saith "I put the plague," it shows that this thing was not natural, but proceeded from the special providence and pleasure of the blessed God.' So the author of *Sepher Cosri* (pt. ii, § 58): God inflicted the plague of leprosy upon houses and garments as a punishment for lesser sins, and when men continued still to multiply transgressions, then it invaded their bodies. Maimonides will have this to be the punishment of an evil tongue, i. e. detractions and calumny, which began in the walls of the offender's house, and went no farther, but vanished if he repented of his sin; but if he persisted in his rebellious courses, it proceeded to his household stuff; and if he still went on, invaded his garments, and at last his body" (*More Nebochim*, pt. iii, cap. 47).

Finally, as to the moral design of all these enactments. "Every leper was a living sermon, a loud admonition to keep unspotted from the world. The exclusion of lepers from the camp, from the holy city, conveyed figuratively the same lesson as is done in the New Testament passages (Rev. xxi, 27; Eph. v, 5). . . . It is only when we take this view of the leprosy that we account for the fact that just this disease so frequently occurs as the theocratic punishment of sin. The image of sin is best suited for reflecting it: he who is a sinner before God is represented as a sinner in the eyes of man also, by the circumstance that he must exhibit before men the image of sin. God took care that ordinarily the image and the thing itself were perfectly coincident, although, no doubt, there were exceptions" (Hengstenberg, *Christol.* on Jer. xxxi, 39). See UNCLEANNESS.

Literature.—Besides the above notices and canons on leprosy given in the Mischna, tract *Negaim;* also by Maimonides, *Yod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Mechosse Kapara*, cap. iv, and *Hilchoth Tamath Tsoraoth;* and by Rashi and Rashbam, *Commentar.* on Lev. xiii, xiv; see, among modern writers, Mead, *Medica Sacra*, in his *Medical Works* (Edinb. 1765), iii, 160, etc.; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses* (Lond. 1814), iii, 257–305; Mason Good, *The Study of Medicine* (Lond. 1825), v, 585 sq.; Schilling, *De lepra Commentationes* (Lugd. Bat. 1778); Hensler, *Vom abendländischen Aussatze im Mittelalter* (Hamb. 1790); Jahn, *Biblische Archäologie* (Vienna, 1818), I, ii, 355 sq.; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelb. 1830), ii, 459 sq., 512 sq.; Sommer, *Biblische Abhandlungen*, vol. i (Bonn, 1846); Pruner, *Die Krankheiten des Orients* (Erlang. 1847), p. 163 sq.; Trusen, *Die Sitten, Gebräuche und Krankheiten der Alten Hebr.* (Bresl. 1833); Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853), i, 217 sq.; Keil, *Handbuch der Biblischen Archäologie* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858), i, 270 sq., 288 sq.; Bonorden, *Lepra squamosa* (Hal. 1795); Lutz, *De avibus purgat. leprosi* (Hal.

1757); Withof, *De leprosariis vet. Hebræorum* (Duisb. 1756); Murray, *Historia lepræ* (Gött. 1749); J. Thomas, *De lepra Græcor. et Judæor.* (Basil. 1708); Norberg, *De lepra Arabum* (Lond. 1796); Hilary, *Observ. on the Diseases of Barbadoes* (Lond. 1759), p. 326 sq.; Sprengel, *Pathol.* iii, 794–835; Frank, *De curandis homin. morbis*, I, ii, 476; Schnurrer, in the *Halle Encyklop.* vi, 451 sq.; Rust, *Handb. d. Chirurg.* ii, 581 sq.; Roussille-Chamseru. *Recherches sur le véritable Caractère de la Lèpre des Hébreux*, and *Relation Chirurg. de l'Armée de l'Orient* (Paris, 1804); Cazenave and Schedel, *Abrégé Pratique des Maladies de la Peau;* Aretæus, *Morb. Chron.* ii, 13; Fracastorius, *De Morbis Contagiosis;* Johannes Manardus, *Epist. Medic.* vii, 2, and to iv, 3, 3, § 1; Avicenna, *De Medic.* v, 28, § 19; also Dr. Sim in the *North American Chirurgical Review*, Sept. 1859, p. 876; Hecker, *Die Elephantiasis oder Lepra Arabica* (Lehr, 1858); also the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 42; and by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 137. The ancient authorities are Hippocrates, *Prorrhetica*, lib. xii, ap. fin.; Galen, *Explicatio Linguarum Hippocratis*, and *De Art. Curat.* lib. ii; Celsus, *De Medic.* v, 28, § 19. See DISEASE.

Le Quien, MICHAEL, a Dominican, who was born at Boulogne, Oct. 6, 1661, was remarkable for his learning in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, and in Oriental Church History. His *Joannis Damasceni opera* (Paris, 1712, in two folio volumes) is a superior edition of that father. His most important work is *Oriens Christianus, insuper et Africa*, an account of the churches, patriarchs, etc., of the East (3 vols. 8vo), the first part of which appeared before, the second part after the author's death, which took place at the convent in St. Honoré March 13, 1733.

Lerins, CONVENT OF, one of the oldest, and once one of the most important monastic establishments in France, is situated in the island of St. Honoré, on the coast of Provence, opposite Antibes. The legend concerning its origin is as follows: Honoratus, a man of noble descent, and who had even been once consul, embraced the Christian faith, together with his brother, in spite of the remonstrances of his family. They first retired to an island near Marseilles, but Honoratus afterwards went back to Provence, where he settled at Lerins, under the protection of the bishop of Fryus. His reputation for sanctity induced many to join him, and they lived, some in communities (*cœnobites*), others as hermits in separate cells. It was the time when monachism was lately introduced into Europe from the East, and convents were arising along the shores of the Mediterranean, and on the coasts of Italy (Gallinara, Gorgona, Capraja), of Dalmatia, and of France. Martinus had just established a convent at Turonum, whose rules were adopted in those that were established by Cassian. The statement that the Cassian rules were first introduced at Lerins is therefore erroneous. Under Honoratus, who was afterwards appointed bishop of Arles, the last-named convent made rapid progress. Lerins became one of the most important schools for the clergy of Southern Gaul, and furnished a large number of bishops, among whom we will mention Hilarius of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons: at that time monks were often made bishops. In the 5th century the convent became imbued with semi-Pelagian ideas, which thence spread into Southern France. In the 7th century the monks of Lerins seem to have relaxed in their obedience to their rule, for Gregory wrote to the abbot Conon inviting him to reform their morals. This reform was accomplished by a Benedictine abbot, Aigulf, but only after a struggle which for a while threatened to destroy the convent, the opposition party going so far as to call in the assistance of neighboring lords, and murdering the abbot and some of his followers. Still, as the reform had been inaugurated, the convent resumed its former prosperity, and in the beginning of the 8th century its abbot counted 3700 monks under his command. Soon after, however, it was overrun by the Saracens from Spain; the abbot Porcarius, in prevision of this event, sent thirty-six of the younger monks and forty children to Italy, while he and those who remained were murdered, with the exception of four, who were retained prisoners. They escaped after a while, and, having returned to Lerins, formed the nucleus of a new convent. In 997, under the renowned Odilo, the convent once more rose to eminence, and attained its greatest fame under Adalbert (1030–1066). Raymund, count of Barcelona, gave the monks a whole convent in Catalonia, and they had possessions in France, Italy, Corsica, and the islands belonging to Italy. A nunnery at Tarascon, established by the seneschal of Provence, was also subject to their rule, together with a large number of *canonici regulares*, to whom the abbot Giraud gave two churches in 1226, under the condition that they should always remain subject to the rule of Lerins. Their prosperity decreasing, the abbot, Augustin Grimald, afterwards bishop of Grasse, connected them with the Benedictines in 1505, and this fusion received in 1515 the sanction of pope Leo X and of Francis I. In 1635 the island was taken by the Spaniards, who retained it until 1657; and, although the convent continued to exist, it lost henceforth all its importance. See Vincentius Barralis, *Chronologium Sanctorum et aliorum clarorum virorum insulæ Lerinensis* (1613); *Abrégé de l'Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoist, par la Congrégation de St. Maur*, i, 215 sq., 468 sq.; ii, 245; *Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*, i, 116 sq. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 333 sq.

Lesbōnax (Λεσβῶναξ), a son of Potamon of Mytilene, a philosopher and sophist, lived in the time of Augustus. He was a pupil of Timocrates, and the father of Polemon, who is known as the teacher and friend of Tiberius. Suidas says that Lesbonax wrote several philosophical works, but does not mention that he was an orator or rhetorician, although there can be no doubt that he is the same person as the Lesbonax who wrote μελεταὶ ῥητορικαί and ἐρωτικαὶ ἐπιστολαί (see Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 74, p. 52).—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 772.

Le'shem (Heb. *id.* לֶשֶׁם, a *gem*, as in Exod. xxviii, 19, etc.; Sept. Λέσεμ v. r. Λαχίς), a city in the northern part of Palestine (Josh. xix, 47); elsewhere called LAISH (Judg. xviii, 7). See DAN.

Leshem. See LIGURE.

Lesley, JOHN, a very celebrated Scotch prelate, was born in 1527, and was educated in the University of Aberdeen. In 1547 he was made canon of the cathedral church of Aberdeen and Murray, and after this he travelled into France, and, pursuing his studies in the universities of Toulouse, Poitiers, and Paris, finally took the degree of doctor of laws. He continued abroad till 1554, when he was commanded home by the queen regent, and made official and vicar general of the diocese of Aberdeen; and, entering into the priesthood, he became parson of Une. About this time, the Reformed doctrine, beginning to spread in Scotland, was zealously opposed by Lesley; and at a solemn dispute between the Protestants and Papists, held in 1560 at Edinburgh, Lesley was a principal champion on the side of the latter. However, this was so far from putting an end to the divisions that they daily increased, and, occasioning many disturbances and commotions, both parties agreed to invite home the queen, who was then absent in France. On this errand Lesley was employed by the Roman Catholics, and made such dispatch that he came to Vitri, where queen Mary was then lamenting the death of her husband, the king of France, several days before lord James Stuart, sent by the Protestants. Having delivered to her his credentials, he told her majesty of lord James Stuart's mission, and actually succeeded in persuading her to embark with him for Scotland. Immediately upon his arrival home he was appointed senator to the College of Justice and a privy councillor, and a short time after was presented with the living of Lundores, and, upon the death of Sinclair, was made bishop

of Ross. While in this position he took a prominent part in the civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and secured to the Scots what are commonly called "the black acts of Parliament" (1566). During the flight of queen Mary to England he defended her cause against the Covenanters. In 1579 he was made suffragan bishop and vicar general of Rouen, in Normandy, and, after persecution and imprisonment, died in 1596. His writings are not of particular interest to theological students. See Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of England* (see Index, vol. viii).

Leslie, Charles, a prominent writer in the political and theological controversies of the 17th century, was the son of bishop John Leslie, of the Irish sees of Raphoe and Clogher, and was born in Ireland about 1650, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. His course in life was very eccentric. In 1671 he went to England to study law, but in a few years turned himself to divinity, was admitted into orders, and, settling in Ireland, became chancellor of Connor. He was living in Ireland at the time of the Revolution, and distinguished himself in some disputations with the Roman Catholics on the side of the Protestant Church. Though a zealous Protestant, he scrupled to renounce his allegiance to king James, and to acknowledge king William as his rightful sovereign. There was thus an end to his prospects in the Church, and, leaving Ireland, he went to England, and there employed himself in writing many of his controversial works, especially those on the political state of the country. When James II was dead, Leslie transferred his allegiance to his son, the Pretender; and, as he made frequent visits to the courts of the exiled princes, he so far fell under suspicion at home that he thought proper to leave England, and join himself openly to the court of the Pretender, then at Bar-le-Duc. He was still a zealous Protestant, and had in that court a private chapel, in which he was accustomed to officiate as a minister of the Protestant Church of England. When the Pretender removed to Italy, Leslie accompanied him; but, becoming at length sensible of the strangeness of his position, a Protestant clergyman in the court of a zealous Roman Catholic, and age coming on, and with it the natural desire of dying in the land which had given him birth, he sought and obtained from the government of king George I, in 1721, permission to return. He died at Glaslough, in the county of Monaghan, in 1722. Leslie's writings in the political controversies of the time were all in support of high monarchical principles. His theological writings were controversial; they have been distributed into the six following classes: those against, 1, the Quakers; 2, the Presbyterians; 3, the Deists; 4, the Jews; 5, the Socinians; and, 6, the Papists. Some of them, especially the book entitled *A short and easy Method with the Deists*, are still read and held in esteem. Towards the close of his life he collected his theological writings, and published them in two folio volumes (1721). They were reprinted at Oxford (1832, 7 vols. 8vo). His other numerous works have not been published uniformly. Among them we notice *A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices*, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1750, 6 vols. 12mo): — *The Massacre of Glencoe* (Anon., Lond. 1703, 4to): — *The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity*, etc. (Lond. 1706, 4to): — *Querela temporum, or the Danger of the Church of England* (Lond. 1695, 4to): — *A Letter*, etc., *against the sacramental Test* (Lond. 1708, 4to): — *Answer to the Remarks on his first Dialogue against the Socinians*. Bayle styles him a man of great merit and learning, and adds that he was the first who wrote in Great Britain against the fanaticism of Madame Bourignon; his books, he further says, are much esteemed, and especially his treatise *The Snake in the Grass*. Salmon observes that his works must transmit him to posterity as a man thoroughly learned and truly pious. Dr. Hickes says that he made more converts to a sound faith and holy life than any man of the age in which he lived; that his consummate learning, attended by the lowest humility, the strictest piety without the least tincture of narrowness, a conversation to the last degree lively and spirited, yet to the last degree innocent, made him the delight of mankind. See *Biog. Brit.*; *Encyc. Brit.*; Jones, *Christ. Biog.*; *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1825; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leslie, John, D.D., a noted prelate of the Irish Church, father of the celebrated Charles Leslie, was descended from an ancient family, and born in the north of Scotland about the beginning of the 17th century, and was educated at Aberdeen and at Oxford. Afterwards he travelled in Spain, Italy, Germany, and France. He spoke French, Spanish, and Italian with the same propriety and fluency as the natives; and was so great a master of the Latin that it was said of him when in Spain, "Solus Lesleius Latine loquitur." He continued twenty-two years abroad, and during that time was at the siege of Rochelle, and in the expedition to the isle of Rhé with the duke of Buckingham. He was all along conversant in courts, and at home was happy in that of Charles I, who admitted him into his privy council both in Scotland and Ireland, in which stations he was continued by Charles II after the Restoration. His chief preferment in the Church of Scotland was the bishopric of the Orkneys, whence he was translated to Raphoe, in Ireland, in 1633, and the same year sworn a privy councillor in that kingdom. During the Rebellion he openly and valiantly espoused the cause of his royal master, and after the Restoration was translated to the see of Clogher. He died in 1671. See Chambers, *Biog. of Eminent Scotsmen*, s. v.

Less, Gottfried, a noted German theologian of the Pietistic school, was born in 1736 at Conitz, in West Prussia. He was a pupil of Baumgarten, professor of theology at Göttingen. He studied at the universities of Halle and Jena, and in 1762 became court preacher at Hanover. He was rather a practical than scholastic theologian, and was inclined both to Mysticism and Pietism. Less was author of a work on the authenticity, uncorrupted preservation, and credibility of the New Testament, which has been translated from German into English, and highly commended by Michaelis and Marsh. It is not so prolix as Lardner. The German title is *Beweis der Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (1768). He also wrote *Ueber die Religion* (1786): — *Versuch einer praktischen Dogmatik* (1779): — *Christliche Moral* (1777).

Less(ius), Leonard, a Jesuit moralist, was born at Brecht, in Brabant, Oct. 1, 1554, and was educated at the University of Leyden, to which, after a two years' stay at Rome, he was called as professor of philosophy and theology in 1585. The pope had just condemned seventy-six propositions of Bajus, whom the Jesuits, disciples of Scotus, had attacked; but soon Less and Hamel falling into the opposite extreme of Pelagianism, the faculty, after due remonstrance, solemnly condemned also fifty-four propositions contained in their lectures. Still, as several universities of note were inclined to judge moderately of Less's heretical tendency, he retained his position, and remained in high standing, especially with his order. He died Jan. 5, 1623. His numerous and well-written essays on morals partake of the sophistry so often employed in his order. Among the most important, we notice his *Libri iv de justitia et jure, ceterisque virtutibus cardinalibus*, often reprinted since 1605 (last edit. Lugd. 1653, folio), with an appendix by Theophile Raynaud *pro Leon. Less. de licito usu æquivocationum et mentalium reservationum*. Also the first volume of his *Opp. theol.* (Paris, 1651, fol.; Antw. 1720); and his essays *De libero arbitrio, De providentia, De perfectionibus divinis*, etc. He followed the system of the scholastic moralists, of whom Schröckh (*Kirchengesch. seit d. Reform.* iv, 104) says: "They, in fact, continued the old method of their predecessors since the

13th century, in so far as that branch of theology was then advanced, i. e. treating it as a dependence of the dogmatic system; yet they differed from them inasmuch as they set forth their views in large works of their own, evinced more learning, a better style, and a certain regard for the times in which they lived." Less attacked also the Protestant Church in his *Consultatio, quæ fides et religio sit capessenda* (Amstelod. 1609; last edit. 1701). His chief argument was that that Church did not exist before the Reformation; he was triumphantly answered on this point by Balthasar Meisner, of Wittenberg († 1626), in his *Consultatio catholica de fide Lutherana capessenda et Romano-papistica deserenda* (1623). Still Less always retained the highest consideration in his Church, was even reputed to work miracles, and was finally canonized. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 340; Gieseler, *Kirchen Gesch.* vol. iii; Linsenmann, *Michael Baius* (Tüb. 1867).

Lesser, Friedrich Christian, a German theologian, was born May 29, 1692, at Nordhausen. In early life he manifested a desire for the knowledge of natural history, and in this department he afterwards distinguished himself greatly. In 1712 he entered the University of Halle, to study medicine, but soon altered his plan, and entered on the study of theology, by the advice of the learned theological professor Francke. He finished his theological studies at the University of Leipsic, and became pastor of a Church in his native city in 1716; in addition to it, he assumed in 1724 the supervision of the Orphan House. In 1739 he became pastor at the collegiate church of St. Martin, and in 1743 of St. Jacob's Church. He died Sept. 17, 1754. Besides his works on natural history, in some of which he endeavored to combine natural history with theology, e. g. *Theology of Stones* (*Lithotheologia*, Hamb. 1735, 8vo); *Theology of Insects* (*De sapientia, omnipotentia et providentia ex partibus insectorum cognoscenda*, etc., Nordh. 1735, 8vo), etc., he left productions of a theological character, of which a complete list is given by Doring in his *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 287 sq.

Lessey, Theophilus, a distinguished English Wesleyan minister, was born in Cornwall April 7, 1787; entered the regular ministry about 1808; and after laboring with great ability and success in most parts of the United Kingdom, was in 1839 made president of the Conference, and died June 10, 1841. Mr. Lessey was one of the most eminent preachers and eloquent platform speakers of his time, and was the familiar friend of James Montgomery, the poet, Richard Watson, and Robert Hall. Many instances of his remarkable eloquence are recorded, and many souls were saved by his preaching.—Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 396; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism* (see Index). (G. L. T.)

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, the generator of modern German literature of the 18th century, both secular and ecclesiastic, declared by Macaulay to have been "beyond dispute the first critic in Europe," who "in the same breath convulsed powerfully both the dramatic and theological world, and by his critical acuteness has laid hands on both, and has produced polemics and called forth controversy in art as well as in religion, without having left behind him a finished system in either department, indeed without having been a professional poet in the strict sense of the word, or a professional theologian."

Life.—Lessing was born at Kamentz (Camenz), in Upper Lusatia, Jan. 22, 1729. His father was the Protestant (Lutheran) "pastor primarius" of the place, and was widely noted for his learning, especially in the historical department. Designed for the ministry, young Lessing was trained by his pious parents "in the way he should go;" and he was not simply taught what he should believe, but how and why he should believe. Long before he was old enough to be sent to school the youth displayed an uncommon desire for books. After thorough preparation at an elementary school, he entered at the age of twelve the high-school at Meissen, and of his extraordinary diligence in study a sufficient idea may be formed when it is stated that while there he perused a number of classic authors besides those which entered into the regular course, translated the third and fourth books of Euclid, drew up a history of mathematics, and, on taking leave of it, delivered a discourse "De Mathematica Barbarorum." In 1746 he was ready to proceed to the university, and, as his parents had fondly hoped, to enter upon the studies which should fit him for the ministry of the word of God. His mother, in particular, designed that her Gotthold Ephraim "should be a real man of God."

Like an earnest and ardent student, which he always proved himself, Lessing now devoted his time to all the studies which that university encouraged, except the one upon which the family hopes were set—theology; and this need not be wondered at, if we will but glance for a moment at a programme of the lectures in the four faculties of that high-school upon Lessing's entry. In theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and philosophy twenty-two lectures were delivered weekly, yet the names of the lecturers were prominent only in the last-named department; they were notably obscure in that of theology. In philosophy Gottsched was lecturing upon the early Greek philosophers, Christ upon Horace and Ovid, Jöcher upon the Reformation, Winckler upon Epictetus, Müller upon logic, May upon ethics, and Heinsius upon rectilinear and spherical trigonometry. Ernesti, the future noted theologian, was yet lecturing in the department of ancient literature, and it was by his direct and permanent influence, as well as by the exertions of professor Christ, that Lessing was led to enter upon the profound philological studies, which finally resulted in such great service to classical literature and art. Thrown into company with Mylius, an old schoolmate of his, and an ardent advocate of the stage as a means of moral reform, and other auditors of professor Kästner, who was then lecturing on dramatic art, Lessing acquired a decided taste for the theatre, and was finally led to abandon his classical studies altogether, not only devoting himself more fully to this one study, but actually coming to entertain the thought of going on the stage himself. His conduct greatly displeased his parents and his sister, who warned him against it as being not merely trifling, but sinful. But Lessing continued in his course. Driven further, also, by the announcement that the family could contribute no allowance for his support except with extreme difficulty, he determined to shift for himself, and decided for his subsistence hereafter to devote his talents to poetry, criticism, and belles-lettres, as that field of literature which had been least of all cultivated by his countrymen, and where, besides having few rivals, he might employ his pen with greater advantage to others as well as to himself. His first productions were one or two minor dramatic pieces, which were printed in a journal entitled *Ermunterungen zum Vergnügen*. In the meanwhile the gossip about his relation to the ungodly Mylius, who had by this time become his most intimate associate, spread, and reached the ears of his aged parents. Desperate measures only could secure his return to the parental hearthstone. Madame Lessing was overwhelmed with grief; her Gotthold Ephraim must be restored to her immediate influence, or he would forever be lost to the Church and the blessings of religion, and for once the end should justify the means. Accordingly, the youthful sinner was written to: "On receipt of this, start at once; your mother is dying, and wishes to speak to you before her death." Of course, no sooner had the letter reached Lessing than we find him starting for the little country town. His personal appearance and assurances of his good intentions, both as a Christian and an obedient son, soon quieted the disconsolate parents, and he was suffered once more to return to Leipsic. From this place he removed in 1750 to Berlin—the home of freethinkers, whither the arch-atheist Mylius had preceded him some time—certainly not a very comforting

turn in his personal history for his well-nigh despairing parents.

Lessing was now twenty years of age. He had no money, no recommendations, no friends, scarcely any acquaintances—nothing but his cheerful courage, his confidence in his own powers, and the discipline acquired through past privations. He was so poor that he was unable to obtain even the decent clothing necessary to make a respectable appearance. He applied for aid to his parents, but they neither felt able nor willing to grant his request, and he had no other course open to him but to throw himself upon the influence and resources of his old schoolmate, Mylius, who was now editing a paper in Berlin. By this friend's exertions, oftentimes not stopping short of real sacrifices, Lessing managed to exist. Master of English, French, Italian, and Spanish, he found work in translating from these languages, while he also contributed largely to different literary journals of the Prussian metropolis. Gradually he was introduced to the notice of the scholars of the city, among them Mendelssohn, the Jewish philosopher, and Nicolai, the noted publisher and author of works of value in the department of secular German literature. Indeed, the association of Mendelssohn the Jew, and Lessing the Christian, has perhaps had greater influence on the position which Lessing assumed in after life than any he had with other persons. Both were yet young men. The former had come to Berlin from Dessau in indigent circumstances, ignorant of the German language, but determined, nevertheless, to rise above his condition, and to master not only the German, Latin, and English, but also the intricate subject of philosophy; and in this attempt he had so well succeeded that at the first meeting of Lessing and Mendelssohn, in 1754, the latter was already acknowledged a man of superior ability and a scholar. They recognised in each other qualities that could well be used unitedly for the good of humanity, and they soon were content only when in each other's society. For two hours every day regularly they met and discussed together literary and philosophical subjects. Lessing came to comprehend the truth that virtue, honor, and nobility of character could be found in the Jew also, which the people of his day, led by a narrow-minded clergy, were prone to disbelieve: and this gave rise first to his important play entitled *Die Juden*, and later to his chef-d'œuvre, *Nathan der Weise* (transl. by Ellen Frothingham, N.Y. 1871, 12mo, with which compare the essays by Kuno Fischer [Mannheim, 1865] and David Strauss [Berlin, 1866, 8vo, 2d ed.], and Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, xi, 35 sq.; also the works on German literature at the end of this article). Near the close of 1751 Lessing decided to return once more to the university, and this time chose Wittenberg, to penetrate into "the innermost sanctuary of book-worm erudition." For nearly a year he here gave himself up to the study of philology and history, especially that of the Reformation and the Reformers. His reputation as a critic grew daily, and in five years after his first entry at Berlin he was counted among the most eminent literati of the Prussian capital. Even at this early age Lessing had ventured into the whole circle of æsthetic and literary interests of the day, never failing to bring their essential points into notice, and subjecting them to an exhaustive treatment, notwithstanding the fragmentary form of the composition, while in point of style he had already attained an aptness and elegance of language, a facile grace and sportive humor of treatment, such as few writers of that day had even dreamed of. "His manner lent enchantment to the dryest subjects, and even the dullest books gained interest from his criticisms." It was during his sojourn at Berlin that, with his and Mendelssohn's assistance, Nicolai (q.v.) started the *Library of Polite Literat.* (1757) and the *Universal German Library* (1765). (See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 278, 307.)

In 1760 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin honored itself by conferring membership on Lessing, and shortly after a somewhat lucrative position fell to his lot in Breslau, whither he at once removed, and where he remained five years. It is in this, the chief city of Silesia, that most of Lessing's valuable contributions to the department of general literature were prepared. After a short visit to his parents, Lessing returned in 1765 to Berlin, then removed to Hamburg, and in 1770 finally started for Wolfenbüttel, to assume the duties of librarian to the duke Frederick William Ferdinand of Brunswick, a position congenial to his taste, and here he remained until his death, Feb. 15, 1781.

Theological Position.—We here consider Lessing as a writer and thinker of the 18th century, but in so far only as the works which he published, both his own productions and those that were sent forth with his approval, affected the theological world in his day and since, more especially in Germany. Originally intended for the pulpit, Lessing suddenly came to entertain the belief that morality, which to him was only a synonym of religion, should be taught not only from the pulpit, but also on the stage. Germany, in his day, was altogether Frenchified. "We are ever," said he himself, "the sworn imitators of everything foreign, and especially are we humble admirers of the never sufficiently admired French. Everything that comes to us from over the Rhine is fair, and charming, and beautiful, and divine. We rather doubt our senses than doubt this. Rather would we persuade ourselves that roughness was freedom; license, elegance; grimace, expression; a jingle of rhymes, poetry; and shrieking, music, than entertain the slightest misgiving as to the superiority which that amiable people, that first people in the world (as they modestly term themselves), have the good fortune to possess in everything which is becoming, and beautiful, and noble." Such had been the doctrines taught by the great ruler Frederick II himself, and no wonder the people soon fell into the frivolous ways of the French; and, as the literature is said to be the index of a people, we need feel no surprise at Lessing's great onslaught on Gottsched and his followers while yet a student of the university in which this leader of the school of French taste held a professorship. Nor must it be forgotten that the history of literature stands in unmistakable connection with the history of the thinking and struggling intellect generally, and consequently, also, with the history of religion and philosophy. One is reflected in the other. The influence of the vapid spirit of French literature of the age of Voltaire was transferred to German ground, and soon the fruits became apparent in the general spread of French *illuminism* (q. v.) and a sort of *humanism*. See Rousseau. The great German philosopher Wolf, following closely in the footsteps of Leibnitz, had sought to check this rapid flow of the Germans towards infidelity by a system of philosophy that should lay securely the foundations for religion and morality, "fully persuaded that the so-called natural religion, which he . . . expected to be attained by the efforts of reason, and which related more to the belief in God and in immortality than to anything else, would become the very best stepping-stone to the temple of revealed religion" (Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 78). Indeed, the theologians themselves sought to prove, by the mathematical, demonstrative method, the truth of the doctrines of revelation, and the falsity of infidelity, forgetting altogether the great fact that "that sharp form of thought which bends itself to mathematical formulas is not for every man, least of all for the great mass;" and had it not been for the influence which pietism was exerting in the 18th century upon orthodox Christianity, the latter must have suffered beyond even the most ardent expectations of the most devoted German Voltaireans. As it was, even, there gradually arose a shallow theology, destitute of ideas, and limited to a few moral commonplaces, known under the name of *neology* (q. v.), which, at the time of Lessing's appearance, controlled the German mind. See Semler. An active thinker like Lessing, who, when yet a youth, could write to his father that "the Christian

religion is not a thing which one can accept upon the word and honor of a parent," but that the way to the possession of the truth is for him only "who has once wisely doubted, and by the path of inquiry attained conviction, or at least striven to attain it," such a one was not likely to remain passive in this critical period of the history of thought. Unfortunately, however, the mature Lessing had shifted from the position of the youthful inquirer, and, instead of accepting the truth when attained by conviction, he had come to believe that truth is never to be accepted. "It is not the truth of which a man is, or thinks he is, in possession that measures the worth of the man, but the honest effort he has made to arrive at the truth; for it is not the possession of truth, but the search for it, that enlarges those powers in which an ever-growing capacity consists. Possession satisfies, enervates, corrupts." "If God," he says, "held all truth in his right hand, and in his left hand nothing but the ever-restless instinct for truth, though with the condition of forever and ever erring, and should say to me, Choose, I would bow reverently to his left hand and say, Father, give; pure truth is for thee alone!" Thus, forgetting altogether that Christianity is not a striving after truth, but possession of the truth, Lessing became unconsciously one of the greatest promoters of Rationalism in its worst form (comp. Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, p. 147, 149). We say Lessing *unconsciously* became the promoter of Rationalism; for, with Dorner (*Gesch. d. Protest. Theol.* p. 731), we believe that his object was not to write against religion, but against theology; not against Christianity, but only against the poor proofs that were advanced in its behalf. Indeed, his own words on Diderot's labors condemn the charge so often brought against Lessing, that he was an outright opponent of Christianity, a pure deist, and nothing more. In reviewing one of Diderot's works, he says: "*A short-sighted dogmatist, who avoids nothing so carefully as a doubt of the memorial maxims that make his system, will gather a host of errors from this work.* Our author is one of those philosophers who give themselves more trouble to raise clouds than to scatter them. Wherever the fatal glance of their eyes fall, the pillars of the firmest truth totter, and that which we have seemed to see quite clearly loses itself in the dim, uncertain distance; instead of leading us by twilight colonnades to the luminous throne of truth, they lead us by the ways of fancied splendor to the dusky throne of falsehood. Suppose, then, such philosophers dare to attack opinions that are sacred. The danger is small. The injury which their dreams, or realities—the thing is one with them—inflict upon society is as small as that is great which they inflict who would bring the consciences of all under the yoke of their own."

While librarian of Wolfenbüttel, Lessing discovered there a MS. copy of the long-forgotten work of Berengar (q. v.) of Tours against Lanfranc (q. v.), which proved that some of the views of the Lutheran Church concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist had already been advanced by one of the most eminent teachers of the 11th century. Here was an evident service to theology, and for it he was commended by the theological world. Not so, however, when, with the same intent to serve, he sent forth a work which for years had been waiting for a printer and an editor. It is true the work was of decided infidel tendency, but Lessing never could hesitate on that account to give to the world what had been intended for its perusal and judgment, and he therefore sent forth "the Wolfenbüttel Fragments," as they are termed, in his *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Literatur* (1774–1778), which treat, 1, of the tolerance of the Deists; 2, of the accusations brought against human reason in the pulpit; 3, of the impossibility of a revelation which all men could believe in in the same manner; 4, of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea; 5, of the O. Test. not having been written with the intention of revealing a religion; 6, of the history of the resurrection. The last essay, especially, called forth a storm of opposition, but this did not prevent Lessing's publishing in 1778 a final essay on the object of Jesus and of the apostles. With the views of these fragments, however, Lessing by no means himself coincided. See Wolfenbüttel Fragments. They were intended simply to induce deeper researches on the part of theologians, and to establish a more stringent system of criticism. He desired to raise from a deep lethargy, and to purify from all uncritical elements, the orthodox whom he had so valiantly defended against neology, and proved that this was his intention by the manner in which he opposed the attempt of the Rationalists to substitute the intuitions of reason for the dictates of the heart and for the promptings of faith. "What else," he asks, "is this modern theology when compared with orthodoxy than filthy water with clear water? With orthodoxy we had, thanks to God, pretty much settled; between it and philosophy a barrier had been erected, behind which each of these could walk in its own way without molesting the other. But what is it that they are now doing? They pull down this barrier, and, under the pretext of making us *rational Christians*, they make us most *irrational philosophers*. In this we agree that our old religious system is false, but I should not like to say with you [he is writing to his brother] that it is a patchwork got up by jugglers and semiphilosophers. I do not know of anything in the world in which human ingenuity has more shown and exercised itself than in it. A patchwork by jugglers and semiphilosophers is that religious system which they would put in the place of the old one, and, in doing so, would pretend to more rational philosophy than the old one claims." When assailed by Götze (q. v.) as attacking the faith of the Church by his publication of the *Fragments*, he replied that, even if the Fragmentists were right, Christianity was not thereby endangered. Lessing rejected the letter, but reserved the spirit of the Scriptures. With him the letter is not the spirit, and the Bible is not religion. "Consequently, objections against the letter, as well as against the Bible, are not precisely objections against the spirit and religion. For the Bible evidently contains more than belongs to religion, and it is a mere supposition that, in this additional matter which it contains, it must be equally infallible. Moreover, religion existed before there was a Bible. Christianity existed before evangelists and apostles had written. However much, therefore, may depend upon those Scriptures, it is not possible that the whole truth of the Christian religion should depend upon them. Since there existed a period in which it was so far spread, in which it had already taken hold of so many souls, and in which, nevertheless, not one letter was written of that which has come down to us, it must be possible also that everything which evangelists and prophets have written might be lost again, and yet the religion taught by them stand. The Christian religion is not true because the evangelists and apostles taught it, but they taught it because it is true. It is from their internal truth that all written documents cannot give it internal truth when it has none" (Lessing's *Werke*, ed. by Lachmann, x, 10, as cited by Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 152, 153). Lessing also distinguished between the Christian religion and the religion of Christ; "the latter, being a life immediately implanted and maintained in our heart, manifests itself in love, and can neither stand nor fall with the [facts of the] Gospel. The truths of religion have nothing to do with the facts of history" (Hurst, *Rationalism*, p. 154). "Although I may not have the least objection to the facts of the Gospel, this is not of the slighest consequence for my religious convictions. Although, historically, I may have nothing to object to Christ's having even risen from the dead, must I for that reason accept it as true that this very risen Christ was the Son of God?" Scripture stands in the same relation to the Church as the plan of a large building to the building itself. It would be ridiculous if, at a conflagration, people were first of all to save the *plan;* but

just as ridiculous is it to fear any danger to Christianity from an attack upon Scripture. In his *Duplix* Lessing maintained, in reference to the history of the resurrection, that it contains irreconcilable contradictions; but he held also that it does not follow from this circumstance that the resurrection is unhistorical. "Who has ever ventured to draw the same inference in profane history? If Livy, Polybius, Dionysius, and Tacitus relate the very same event, it may be the very same battle, the very same siege, each one differing so much in the details that those of the one completely give the lie to those of the other, has any one, for that reason, ever denied the event itself in which they agree?"

Such are the thoughts which Lessing advanced in his theological polemical writings, particularly in the controversy with pastor Götze after the publication of the so-called "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," but to present from them a connected theological system strictly defining Lessing's stand-point has not yet been made possible. Indeed, we would say with Hagenbach (*Church Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 288) that "he had none." But just as much difficulty we would find in assigning Lessing a place anywhere in any theological system of thought already in vogue. Really, we think all that can be done for Lessing is to consider in how far his writings justify the disposition that has been made of him as a theological writer. There are at present three different classes of theologians who claim him as their ally and support. By some he has been judged to have held the position of a rather positive, though not exactly orthodox character. This judgment is based upon his views on the doctrine of the Trinity in his *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes*. (He there says: "What if this doctrine [of the Trinity] should lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be *one*, in that sense in which all finite things are *one?* that his unity must be a transcendental unity, which does not exclude a kind of plurality," evidently explaining the Trinity as referring to the essence of the Deity.) By others, either in praise or condemnation, he has been adjudged a "freethinker;" while still others have pronounced him guilty not only of a change of opinion—of a change from the camp of orthodoxy to heterodoxy—but have also given him up in despair, as incapable of having cherished any positive opinion, because he was so many-sided in his polemics; indeed, he had himself explicitly declared that he preferred the search for the possession of the truth. The first to break away from one and all of these classifications has been Dr. J. A. Dorner (*Gesch. der protest. Theol.* [Munich, 1867, 8vo], p. 722 sq.), who assigns Lessing a position similar to that generally credited to Jacobi, the so-called "philosopher of faith" (see JACOBI), and for this there is certainly much in favor in Lessing's own declarations; for, like Jacobi, he held that reason and faith have nothing in conflict with each other, but are one. He held fast, likewise, to a self-conscious personal God of providence, to a living relation of the divine spirit to the world, to whom a place belongs in the inner revelation, notwithstanding that he assails the outer revelation in its historical credibility, and assigns it simply a place in the faith of authority (Autoritätsglauben). "It is true," says Dorner (p. 737), "Lessing has particularly aimed to secure for the purely human and moral a place right by the side of that generally assigned only to Christianity. But he is far from asserting that the understanding (Vernunft) of humanity was from the beginning perfect, or even in a normal development, but rather holds it to be developing in character, and in need of education by the divine Spirit, whom also he refuses to regard as a passive beholder of the acting universe." (We have here a number of premises, which later writers, particularly Schleiermacher, have taken to secure for historical religion a more worthy position.) Indeed, right here, in the attempt to make humanity progressive, and this progress dependent upon revelation, centred the whole of Lessing's theological views. "To the reason," he said, "it must be much rather a proof of the truth of revelation than an objection to it when it meets with things that surpass its own conceptions, for what is a revelation which reveals nothing?" (Comp. Hegel on this point as viewed by Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* ii, 364 sq.) Thus he acknowledged the truth of revelation, though he would not regard the idea of a revelation as settled for all time, but rather as God's gradual act of training; and to elucidate this thought he wrote, in 1780, *Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes* (the authorship of which has sometimes been denied him: comp. *Zeitschr. f. d. hist. theol.* 1839, No. 3; Guhrauer, *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes kritisch und philosophisch erörtert* [Berlin, 1841]), a work in which, concentrated in a hundred short paragraphs, is a system of religion and philosophy—the germ of Herder's and all later works on the education of the human race. "Something there is of it," says a writer in the *Westminster Rev.* (Oct. 1871, p. 222, 223), "that reminds the reader of Plato. It has his tender melancholy and his undertone of inspired conviction, and a grandeur which recalls that moving of great figures and shifting of vast scenes which we behold in the myth of Er. There speaks in it a voice of one crying words not his own to times that are not yet come."

The English Deists, as Bolingbroke and Hobbes, had regarded religion only from the stand-point of politics. "Man," they held, "can know nothing except what his senses teach him, and to this the intelligent confine themselves; a revelation, or, rather, what pretends to be one, might be a good thing for the populace." See DEISM. Lessing came forward, and, while seeking to make morality synonymous with religion, aye, with Christianity, taught that in revelation only lies man's strength for development. "Revelation," says Lessing, "is to the whole human race what education is to the individual man. Education is revelation which is imparted to the individual man, and revelation is education which has been and still is imparted to the human race. . . . . Education no more presents everything to man at once than revelation does, but makes its communications in gradual development." First Judaism, then Christianity; first unity, then trinity; first happiness for this life, then immortality and never-ending bliss. (See the detailed review on these points in Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 291 sq.) The elementary work of education was the O. T. The progress to a more advanced book is marked by the timely coming of Christ, "the reliable and practical teacher of immortality; . . . . reliable through the prophecies which appeared to be fulfilled in him, through the miracles which he performed, and through his own return to life after the death by which he had sealed his doctrine;" whose disciples collected and transmitted in writing his doctrines, "the second and better elementary book for the human race," expecting (according to Ritter [*Lessing's philosophische u. religiöse Grundsätze*, p. 56 sq.]) the complete treatise itself in the fulfilment of the promises of Christianity. Some have interpreted Lessing, because Christianity is spoken of as the second *elementary* work, as anticipating another religion, to be universally enjoyed, to supersede Christianity, but for this we can see no reason, and side with Ritter.

The position of Lessing has sometimes become equivocal by the peculiar interpretation of his *Nathan the Wise*. In his *Education of Humanity*, Christianity unquestionably is the highest religion in the scale; in his "Nathan" it is not so. Hence it has been asserted by many, Christian writers especially, that in his later years Lessing had become a most decided Rationalist, and Jacobi even asserted that he had died a Spinozist. (Compare the article JACOBI, and the literature at the end of this article.) The former interpretation is due, however, to wrong premises. Lessing wrote Nathan the Wise simply for one object: not to aggrandize and ennoble his associate and friend Mendelssohn the Jew, not to deprive Christianity of the best of her beauty, but only

to teach humanity—ay, to the followers of the Christ of the Gospel in the 18th century, the great lesson of *toleration*. The great French infidel-philosopher Voltaire had sought to do this, but he had failed—had failed utterly—and only because his idea of tolerance was really *intolerance*. He meant entirely too much by tolerance, for he demanded of the party tolerating not only to esteem all religions alike, to be content with any and every belief, to have no rights in conflict with another in religious matters, but to be obliged to conform to the notions and inclinations of others out of mere politeness; and we do not wonder when Hagenbach (i, 29) says that "this is the toleration of shallowness, of cowardice, of religious indecision, of religious indifference—a toleration that finally and easily degenerates into intolerance, which is the hatred of every one who wishes to hold and to profess a firm and positive religion. Such persons must come at last to regard the tolerating party as unyielding and stiff-necked. Such was the toleration of the Romans, which was so much praised by Voltaire. It soon came to an end with the Christians, because they neither could nor would submit to a strange worship. Nothing, however, is more foolish or more opposed to true toleration than precisely this effort to force such toleration upon those who do not agree with us in opinion, for toleration no more admits of force than religion does." Lessing believed that this grand lesson was yet to be taught. He would teach it especially to the Christian, who stood higher in the scale, and could easily influence those below him; nay, he believed that he should teach it, and that most effectually, by practicing it upon his inferiors in belief. He therefore would shame the Christian by examples most noble from religions generally regarded as inferior, and its followers as more fanatical. Yet it must not be forgotten that Lessing never went so far as to ignore his own religion, for these grand specimens of Judaism and Mohammedanism reveal their Christian painter after all, when once the lay brother is made to say, "Nathan, you are a Christian. Never was a better" (act iv, scene vii, line 2). He would teach us that Christianity is the most perfect of all religions, but that the others also have in them many parts which go to make it up; that as they shall modify in course of time, so shall also Christianity grow on to perfection (see above, Ritter's view). His principal fault was this, that his peculiar view of revelation led him to believe that no religion is as yet absolutely perfect, and that therefore none of the positive religions could justly claim the character of universality, and of exclusive privileges and rights; and hence he regarded all religions as an individualization of reason, according to time and place, and a product, on the one hand, of the culture of a people, and, on the other, of divine education and communication, thus making Christianity capable also of an objective perfectibility. (This is a view which has been advanced of late by many Christian writers of Mohammedanism; comp. Freeman, *The Saracens* [Oxford and London, 1870, 12mo], lect. i.) Regarding the charge of his Spinozaism, we would say with Mendelssohn, who defended Lessing from this charge after his death: "If Lessing was able absolutely and without all further limitation to declare for the system of any man, he was at that time no more with himself, or he was in a strange humor to make a paradoxical assertion which, in a serious hour, he himself again rejected" (Jacobi, *Werke*, vol. iv, pt. i, p. 44; comp. Kahnis, *Germ. Prot.* p. 164 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. protest. Theol.* p. 723). See MENDELSSOHN. All that Jacobi had for his assertion that Lessing died a Pantheist was a conversation with him a few years before Lessing's death. Upon this fact Prof. Nichol justly observes: "The reporting of such conversation must ever be protested against as breach of confidence, and it is almost as certainly a source of misrepresentation. What thinker does not, in the frankness and confidence of intercourse, give utterance at times to momentary impressions, as if they were his abiding ones? This much is unquestionable: Lessing has not written one solitary word inconsistent with a firmest persuasion in the personality of man. This great writer, indeed, belongs to a class of minds very easily misapprehended—minds which none but others in so far akin to them can rightly understand. Oftenest in antagonism, or in a critical attitude, thinkers like Lessing do not generally express their *whole* thought; they dwell only on the part of the common thought from which they dissent. So far, however, from being ruled by mere negations, it is certainly more probable that their dissent arises from a completer view and possession of truth; and that their effort is confined to the desire to separate truth from error, or, at all events, from non-essentials." Not even the modest charge that Lessing in his latest years, by reason of his affiliation with Nicolai and Mendelssohn, *inclined* towards Rationalism, can, upon examination, be substantiated. His own words from Vienna, whither he had gone on a call from Joseph II, who in 1769 invited all the great and learned men of the times to his capital for a general assemblage, addressed to Nicolai, who had taken this occasion to ridicule Vienna, and praise his own Berlin by contrast, go far to disprove any such assertion: "Say nothing, I pray you, about your Berlin freedom of thinking and writing. It is reduced simply and solely to the freedom of bringing to market as many gibes and jeers against religion as you choose, and a decent man must speedily be ashamed to avail himself of this freedom." If Lessing is to be classed at all with Rationalists, we should first distinguish between the higher Rationalism of humanity and its double-sighted compeer, trivial and vulgar Rationalism, and then assign Lessing a place in that of the former, for to it alone can he be claimed to have rendered intentional aid.

Of his service to German literature generally, it may be truly said "he found Germany without a national literature; when he died it had one. He pointed out the ways in poetry, philosophy, and religion by which the national mind should go, and it has gone in them" (*Westm. Rev.* Oct. 1871, p. 223). "Honor," says Menzel (*German Lit.* [transl. by C. C. Felton, Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 12mo], ii, 405), "was the principle of Lessing's whole life. He composed in the same spirit that he lived. He had to contend with obstacles his whole life long, but he never bowed down his head. He struggled not for posts of honor, but for his own independence. He might, with his extraordinary ability, have rioted in the favor of the great, like Goethe, but he scorned and hated this favor as unworthy a free man. His long continuance in private life, his services as secretary of the brave general Tauenzien during the Seven Years' War, and afterwards as librarian at Wolfenbüttel, proved that he did not aspire to high places. . . . . He ridiculed Gellert, Klopstock, and all who bowed their laurel-crowned heads to heads encircled with golden crowns; and he himself shunned all contact with the great, animated by that stainless spirit of pride which acts instinctively upon the motto *Noli me tangere*."

Literature.—The complete works of Lessing were first published at Berlin (1771, 32 vols. 12mo), then with annotations by Lachmann (1839, 12 vols.), and by Von Maltzahn (1855, 12 vols). See Karl Gotthelf Lessing, *Lessing's Biographie* (Berl. 1793, 2 vols.); Danzel, *Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke* (1850), continued by Guhrauer (1853 54); Stahr, *G. E. Lessing, sein Leben u. s. Werke* (6th ed. Berl. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo, transl. by E. P. Evans, late professor at Mich. Univ., Boston, 1867, 2 vols. 12mo); H. Ritter, in the *Göttingen Studien* (1847); Ritter, *Gesch. d. christl. Philos.* ii, 480 sq.; Bohtz, *Lessing's Protestantismus und Nath. der Weise;* Lang, *Religiöse Charaktere*, i, 215 sq.; Röpe, *Lessing und Götze;* Röhr, *Kleine theologische Schriften* (Schleusingen, 1841, vol. i); Schwarz, *Lessing als Theologe* (1854); Gervinus, *National-Liter. d. Deutschen*, iv, 318 sq.; Mohnike, *Lessingiana* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Schlosser, *Gesch. d. 18ten Jahrhund.* iii, 2; Schmidt, *Gesch. d. geist. Lebens in Deutschld. von Leibnitz bis auf Lessing's Tod;* Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. History*

18th and 19th Cent. vol. i, lect. xiii; *For. Quart. Review*, xxv, 233 sq.; *Westminst. Rev.* 1871, Oct., art. viii; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 336 sq.; Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 145 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lessons. See LECTIONARIUM.

Lestines. See LIPTINES.

Letaah. See LIZARD.

Lethè (λήθη, *oblivion*), in the Grecian mythology, the stream of forgetfulness in the lower world, to which the departed spirits go, before passing into the Elysian fields, to be cleansed from all recollection of earthly sorrows. See HADES.

Le'thech (לֶתֶךְ, *le'thek*, Septuag. νέβελ), a Hebrew word which occurs in the margin of Hos. iii, 2; it signifies *a measure* for grain, so called from *emptying* or *pouring out*. It is rendered "*a half homer*" in the A. V. (after the Vulg.), which is probably correct. See HOMER.

Leti, GREGORY, a historian, born at Milan in 1630, who travelled in various countries, became Protestant at Lausanne, was for a time well received at the court of Charles II in England, and died at Amsterdam in 1701. He wrote, among other things, *Life of Sixtus V:—Life of Philip II:—Monarchy of Louis XIV:—Life of Cromwell:—Life of Queen Elizabeth:—Life of Charles V.*

Letter stands in only two passages of the Bible in its narrow sense of an alphabetical character (γράμμα, in the plural, Luke xxiii, 38; and prob. Gal. vi, 11, πηλίκοις γράμμασι; A. V. "how large a letter," rather *in what a bold hand*); elsewhere it is used (for סֵפֶר, *a book*; γραμμα, either sing. or plur.; but more definitely for the later Heb. אִגֶּרֶת [Chald. אִגְּרָא], נִשְׁתְּוָן [Chald. id. also פִּתְגָם]; ἐπιστολή) in the sense of an *epistle* (q. v.). See ALPHABET; WRITING.

LETTER, THE, a term used especially by the apostle Paul in opposition to the spirit; a way of speaking very common in the ecclesiastical style (Rom. ii, 27, 29; vii, 6; 2 Cor. iii, 6, 7). In general, the word *letter* (γράμμα) is used to denote the Mosaic law. The law, considered as a simple collection of precepts, is but a dead form, which can indeed command obedience, but cannot awaken love. This distinction is shown with great skill in Schleiermacher's *Sermon: Christus, d. Befreier v. d. Sünde u. d. Gesetz* (in his *Sämmt. Werke*, ii, 25 sq.). The law cannot but be something outward, which, as the expression of another's will, appeals more to our comprehension than to our will or to our feelings. This is the reason why the law is the source of the knowledge of sin, and does not impart the life-giving power. But that the Mosaic law was called the letter (γράμμα) results from the fact of its being the *written* law. So Rom. ii, 27, 29: "And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God." The meaning of this passage is, When the heathen does by nature that which the law requires, he puts to shame the Jew who in Scripture and by circumcision transgresses the law. For he is not a true Israelite who is so outwardly only, and merely through physical circumcision (as the sign of the covenant); but he only who is inwardly a Jew, his heart also being circumcised, and consequently after the spirit, and not merely after the letter (or outward form). Such a one is not merely praised by men, but loved by God. Again, Rom. vii, 6: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Being now Christians, we ought to carry the law in our heart, and not merely fulfil it outwardly as a mere letter. 2 Cor. iii, 6, for the letter (i. e. the Mosaic law) killeth (brings about death inasmuch as it discovers sin, Rom. vii, 9; vi, 23; 1 Cor. xv, 56), but the Spirit (the holy Spirit imparted through faith) giveth life (i. e. eternal life, Rom. viii, 10). Once more, 2 Cor. iii, 7: "But if the ministration of death (of the letter), written and engraven in stones, was glorious . . . how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" The law of Moses is incapable of giving life to the soul, and justifying before God those who are most servilely addicted to the literal observance of it. These things can be effected only by means of the Gospel of Christ, and of that Spirit of truth and holiness which attends it, and makes it effectual to the salvation of the soul.—Krehl, *Neu-Test. Handwörterbuch.* See LAW OF MOSES.

Letters, Encyclical. See LITERÆ ENCYCLICÆ.

Letters of Orders, a *document* usually of parchment, and signed by the bishop, with his seal appended, in which he certifies that at the specified time and place he *ordained* to the office of deacon or priest the clergyman whose name is therein mentioned.

Lettice, JOHN, D.D., an English clergyman and poet, was born in Northamptonshire in 1737, and was educated at Cambridge, where he took his first degree in 1761. He soon obtained eminence as a pulpit orator. In 1785 he was presented to the living of Peasemarsh, and later with a prebend in the cathedral of Chichester. He died in 1832. Among his works are *The Conversion of St. Paul*, a poetical essay, which secured him a prize from his alma mater in 1764:—*The Antiquities of Herculaneum*, a translation from the Italian (1773):—*The Immortality of the Soul*, translated from the French (1795). See *Biog. Dict. of Living Authors* (Lond. 1816); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.* s. v.

Let'tus (Λαττούς v. r. Ἀττούς; Vulg. *Acchus*), a "son of Sechenias," one of the Levites who returned from Babylon (1 Esd. viii, 29), evidently the HATTUSH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 2).

Letu'shim (Heb. *Letushim'*, לְטוּשִׁים, *hammered*, plur.; Sept. Λατουσιείμ), the second named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen. xxx, 3; and Vulg. at 1 Chron. i, 32). B.C. considerably post 2024. See ARABIA. "Fresnel (*Journ. Asiat.* iii[e] série, vi, 217) identifies it with *Tasm*, one of the ancient and extinct tribes of Arabia, just as he compares Leummim with Umeiyim. The names may perhaps be regarded as commencing with the article. Nevertheless, the identification in each case seems to be quite untenable. It is noteworthy that the three sons of the Keturahite Dedan are named in the plural form, evidently as tribes descended from him" (Smith). "Forster supposes (*Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 334) that the Letushim were absorbed in the generic appellation of Dedanim (Jer. xxv, 23; Ezek. xxv, 13; Isa. xxi, 13), and that they dwelt in the desert eastward of Edom." See LEUMMIM.

Leucippus, the founder of the atomistic school of Grecian philosophy, and forerunner of Democritus (q. v.). Nothing is known concerning him, neither the time nor the place of his birth, nor the circumstances of his life.

Leucopetrians, the name of a fanatical sect which sprung up in the Greek and Eastern churches towards the close of the 12th century; they professed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated with the utmost contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and all the various branches of external worship; placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone; and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being or genius dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be expelled from thence by no other method than by perpetual supplication to the Supreme Being. The founder of this sect is said

to have been a person called *Leucopetrus*, and his chief disciple Tychicus, who corrupted by fanatical interpretations several books of Scripture, and particularly the Gospel of Matthew. This account is not undoubted.

Leüm'mim (Heb. *Leümmim'*, לְאֻמִּים, *peoples*, as often; Sept. Λαωμείμ), the last named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen. xxv, 3; and Vulgate at 1 Chron. i, 32). B.C. considerably post 2024. See Arabia. They are supposed to be the same with the *Allumæotæ* (Ἀλλουμαιῶται), named by Ptolemy (vi, 7, 24) as near the Gerrhæi, which appears to be a corruption of the Hebrew word with the art. prefixed. "He also enumerates *Luma* among the towns of Arabia Deserta (v, 19), and Forster (*Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 335) suggests that this may have been an ancient settlement of the same tribe" (Kitto). "They are identified by Fresnel (in the *Journ. Asiat.* iii^e^ série, vi, 217) with an Arab tribe called *Umeiyim*, one of the very ancient tribes of Arabia of which no genealogy is given by the Arabs, and who appear to have been ante-Abrahamic, and possibly aboriginal inhabitants of the country." See Letushim.

Leun, Johann Georg Friedrich, a German theologian, was born Aug. 9, 1757, at Giessen. In 1774 he entered the university of his native place; in 1797 he became deacon at Butzbach, near Giessen, and there he remained until his death, March 15, 1823. He possessed an extensive knowledge of the Oriental languages, and was a profound theologian. Among his works deserve special notice, *Von der besten Methode, die hebräische Sprache zu erlernen* (Giessen, 1787–8) :—*Handbuch zur cursorischen Lectüre der Bibel für Anfänger*, etc. (Legmo, 1788-91, 4 th. 8) :—*Handbuch zur cursorischen Lectüre der Bibel des N. T.* etc. (ibid. 1795–96, 3 th. 8).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 292.

Leusden, Johann, a very celebrated Dutch Orientalist and theologian, was born at Utrecht in 1624, and was educated at the then recently founded university of his native place and at Amsterdam, paying particular regard to the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1649 he was appointed professor of Hebrew at Utrecht, and for nearly fifty years he most creditably discharged the duties of this office, for which he had fitted himself, not simply at the universities already mentioned, but also by private study with several learned Jewish rabbis. He died in 1699, regarded by all as one of the best Hebrew scholars of his day, the Buxtorfs only taking precedence in rank. Of his works we may say that the writings of but few Biblical scholars of that day have descended to us which can be said to be of more solid utility than Leusden's. "If they are defective in originality of genius (the amount of which quality, however, it is impossible rightly to determine in works like our author's), they undoubtedly afford evidence of their author's varied resources of learning, adorned by clearness of method and an easy style, characteristics which made Leusden one of the most renowned and successful teachers of his age." His numerous works, which were all *Biblical*, may be classed as follows: (1) Critical, (2) Introductory, and (3) Exegetical. Under the first head we have his valuable *Biblia Hebræa accuratissima notis Hebraicis et lemmatibus illustrata: typis Josephi Athias* (Amstel. 1617 [2d ed. 1667], the first critical edition by a Christian editor ["Æstimatissima primum numeratis versibus, primaque a Christiano adhibitis MSS. facta." Steinschneider, *Catal. Bodl.*]) In 1694 he joined Eisenmenger in publishing a Hebrew Bible without points. The Greek Scriptures also received his careful attention, as is proved by his editions of the Greek Test. in 1675, 1688, 1693, 1698, 1701, and by his edition of the Septuagint (Amsterdam, 1683). After his death, Schaaf completed a valuable edition of the Syriac New Test. (with Tremellius's version) which Leusden had begun. Under this first head we may also place his Hebrew Lexicon (1688); Elementary Heb. Gram., which was translated into English, French, and German (1668); his *Compendia* of the O. T. and the N. Test. (comprising selections of the originals, with translations and grammatical notes in Latin), frequently reprinted; his *Onomasticon Sacr.* 1665, 1684), and his still useful *Clavis Hebr. Vet. Test.* (containing the Masoretic notes, etc., besides much grammatical and philological information), first published in 1683, and his *Clavis Græc. N. T.* (1672). His contributions to the second head of Introduction (*Einleitung*) and sacred archæology were not less valuable than the works we have already commended. Of these we mention three (sometimes to be met with in one volume) as very useful to the Biblical student: *Philologus Hebr. continens Quæstiones Hebr. quæ circa V. Test. Hebr. fere moveri solent* (Utrecht, 1656, 1672, 1695, Amst. 1686, are the best editions, and contain his edition and translation of Maimonides's *Precepts of Moses*, p. 56); *Philologus Hebræo-mixtus, una cum. Spicileg. Philol.* (Utr. 1663, etc., contains treatises on several interesting points of Hebrew antiquities and Talmudical science); *Philologus Hebræo-Græcus generalis* (Utr. 1670, etc.) treats questions relating to the sacred Greek of the Christian Scriptures, its Hebraisms, the Syriac and other translations, its inspired authors, etc., well and succinctly handled (with this work occurs Leusden's translation *into Hebrew* of all the Chaldee portions of the O. T.). Under the last, or Exegetical head, we have less to record. In 1656 (reprinted in 1692) Leusden published in a Latin translation David Kimchi's Commentary on the prophet Jonah (*Jonas illustratus*), and in the following year a similar work (again after David Kimchi) on Joel and Obadiah (*Joel explicatus, adjunctus Obadjas illustratus*). Well worthy of mention are also his editions (prepared with the help of Villemandy and Morinus) of Bochart's works, and the works of Lightfoot (which he published in Latin, in 3 vols. folio, in the last year of his life) and Poole (whose *Synopsis* occurs in its very best form in Leusden's edition, 1684, 5 vols. folio). See Burmann, *Trajectum eruditorum;* De Vries, *Oratio in Obitum J. Leusdenii* (1699); Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth. Græc.* i, 244; Walch, *Biblioth. Theol. Selecta*, vols. iii, iv; *Biographie universelle anc. et mod.* (1819) xxiv, 357; *Elogia Philogorum quorundam Hebræorum* (Lub. 1708, 8vo); Meyer, *Gesch. d. Schrifterklärung*, p. 111, 174 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 11 sq.; Kalsch, *Heb. Gram.* pt. ii (Historical Introd.), p. 37; and in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 345, 346; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Literature*, vol. ii, s. v.

Leutard or **Leuthard**, a French fanatic, flourished among the peasants of Châlons-sur-Marne about A.D. 1000. He claimed the enjoyment of spiritual visions, and authority from on high for separation from his family and his iconoclastic idiosyncracies. He also, by like inspirations, became the opponent of many practices of the Church which had their authority in the sacred Scriptures of both the O. and N. T., and supported his position likewise by the inspired word of God. The bishop of the diocese in which Leuthard flourished—Gebuin by name—treated him with perfect contempt, believing him insane, and, for want of opposition, few followers were found by Leuthard, who in despair destroyed himself by drowning.

Levellers or Radicals, a political and religious sect of fanatics, which arose in the army of Cromwell at the time of the difficulty between the Independents and the Long Parliament (1647), advocating entire civil and religious liberty. They were not only treated as traitors by the king, but persecuted also by Cromwell as dangerous to the state. From one of their own works, *The Leveller, or the Principles and Maxims concerning Government and Religion of those commonly called Levellers* (Lond. 1658), we see that their fundamental principles included, in politics, 1, the impartial, sovereign authority of the law; 2, the legislative power of Parlia-

ment; 3, absolute equality before the law; and, 4, the arming of the people in order to enable all to secure the enforcement of the laws, and also to protect their liberties. In religion they claimed, 1, absolute liberty of conscience, as true religion, with them, consisted in inward concurrence with revealed religion; 2, freedom for every one to act according to the best of his knowledge, even if this knowledge should be false—the government acting on the knowledge and conscience of the people through the ministers it appoints; 3, religion to be considered under two aspects: one as the correct understanding of revelation, and this is quite a private affair, in regard to which every one must stand or fall by himself; the other is its effects as manifested in actions, and these are subject to the judgment of others, and especially of the authorities; 4, they condemned all strife on matters of faith and forms of worship, considering these as only outward signs of different degrees of spiritual enlightening. This sect, like many others, disappeared at the time of the Restoration. See Weingarten, *Revolutions Kirchen Englands* (Lpz. 1868); Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (see Index, vol. ii, Harper's edition).

Lever, Thomas, an eminent English divine, was born in Lancashire in the early part of the 16th century. He was ordained a Protestant minister in 1550. On the accession of Mary (1553) he retired to the Continent. He afterwards dissented from the Anglican Church from a partiality to Calvinism. He died in 1577. No man was more vehement in his sermons against the waste of Church revenues, and other prevailing corruptions of the court, which occasioned bishop Ridley to rank him with Latimer and Knox. Besides a number of sermons, he published a *Meditation on the Lorde's Prayer* (1551):—*Certayne Godly Exercises*:—and a *Treatise on the Danger from Synne*, etc. (1571–1575). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Thomas, *Biog. Dictionary*, s. v.

Le'vi (Heb. *Levi'*, לֵוִי, *wreathed* [see below], being the same Heb. word also signifying "Levite;" Sept. and N. T. Λευΐ or Λευεί), the name of several men.

1. The third son of Jacob by his wife Leah. This, like most other names in the patriarchal history, was connected with the thoughts and feelings that gathered round the child's birth. As derived from לָוָה, to *twine*, and hence to *adhere*, it gave utterance to the hope of the mother that the affections of her husband, which had hitherto rested on the favored Rachel, would at last be drawn to her. "This time will my husband be joined (יִלָּוֶה) unto me, because I have borne him three sons" (Gen. xxix, 34). B.C. 1917. The new-born child was to be a κοινωνίας βεβαιωτής (Josephus, *Ant.* i, 19, 8), a new link binding the parents to each other more closely than before. The same etymology is recognised, though with a higher significance, in Numb. xviii, 2 (יִלָּוּוּ). One fact only is recorded in which he appears prominent. The sons of Jacob had come from Padan-Aram to Canaan with their father, and were with him "at Shalem, a city of Shechem." Their sister Dinah went out "to see the daughters of the land" (Gen. xxxiv, 1), i. e. as the words probably indicate, and as Josephus distinctly states (*Ant.* i, 21), to be present at one of their great annual gatherings for some festival of nature-worship, analogous to that which we meet with afterwards among the Midianites (Numb. xxv, 2). The license of the time or the absence of her natural guardians exposed her, though yet in earliest youth, to lust and outrage. A stain was left, not only on her, but on the honor of her kindred, which, according to the rough justice of the time, nothing but blood could wash out. The duty of extorting that revenge fell, as in the case of Amnon and Tamar (2 Sam. xiii, 22), and in most other states of society in which polygamy has prevailed (compare, for the customs of modern Arabs, J. D. Michaelis, quoted by Kurtz, *Hist. of Old Covenant*, i, § 82, p. 340), on the brothers rather than the father, just as, in the case of Rebekah, it belonged to the brother to conduct the negotiations for the marriage. We are left to conjecture why Reuben, as the first-born, was not foremost in the work, but the sin of which he was afterwards guilty makes it possible that his zeal for his sister's purity was not so sensitive as theirs. The same explanation may perhaps apply to the non-appearance of Judah in the history. Simeon and Levi, as the next in succession to the first-born, take the task upon themselves. Though not named in the Hebrew text of the O. T. till xxxiv, 25, there can be little doubt that they were "the sons of Jacob" who heard from their father the wrong over which he had brooded in silence, and who planned their revenge accordingly. The Sept. does introduce their names in ver. 14. The history that follows is that of a cowardly and repulsive crime. The two brothers exhibit, in its broadest contrasts, that union of the noble and the base, of characteristics above and below the level of the heathen tribes around them, which marks much of the history of Israel. They have learned to loathe and scorn the impurity in the midst of which they lived, to regard themselves as a peculiar people, to glory in the sign of the covenant. They have learned only too well from Jacob and from Laban the lessons of treachery and falsehood. They lie to the men of Shechem as the Druses and the Maronites lie to each other in the prosecution of their blood-feuds. For the offence of one man they destroy and plunder a whole city. They cover their murderous schemes with fair words and professions of friendship. They make the very token of their religion the instrument of their perfidy and revenge. (Josephus [*Ant.* l. c.] characteristically glosses over all that connects the attack with the circumcision of the Shechemites, and represents it as made in a time of feasting and rejoicing.) Their father, timid and anxious as ever, utters a feeble lamentation (Blunt, *Script. Coincidences*, pt. i, § 8), "Ye have made me a stench among the inhabitants of the land . . . I being few in number, they shall gather themselves against me." With a zeal that, though mixed with baser elements, foreshadows the zeal of Phinehas, they glory in their deed, and meet all remonstrance with the question, "Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?" Of other facts in the life of Levi, there are none in which he takes, as in this, a prominent and distinct part. He shares in the hatred which his brothers bear to Joseph, and joins in the plots against him (Gen. xxxvii, 4). Reuben and Judah interfere severally to prevent the consummation of the crime (Gen. xxxvii, 21, 26). Simeon appears, as being made afterwards the subject of a sharper discipline than the others, to have been foremost—as his position among the sons of Leah made it likely that he would be—in this attack on the favored son of Rachel; and it is at least probable that in this, as in their former guilt, Simeon and Levi were brethren. The rivalry of the mothers was perpetuated in the jealousies of their children; and the two who had shown themselves so keenly sensitive when their sister had been wronged, make themselves the instruments and accomplices of the hatred which originated, we are told, with the baser-born sons of the concubines (Gen. xxxvii, 2). Then comes for him, as for the others, the discipline of suffering and danger, the special education by which the brother whom they had wronged leads them back to faithfulness and natural affection. The detention of Simeon in Egypt may have been designed at once to be the punishment for the large share which he had taken in the common crime, and to separate the two brothers who had hitherto been such close companions in evil. The discipline did its work. Those who had been relentless to Joseph became self-sacrificing for Benjamin.

After this we trace Levi as joining in the migration of the tribe that owned Jacob as its patriarch. He, with his three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari, went down into Egypt (Gen. xlvi, 11). As one of the four eldest sons we may think of him as among the five (Gen. xlvii, 2)

that were specially presented before Pharaoh. (The Jewish tradition [*Targ. Pseudojon.*] states the five to have been Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher.) Then comes the last scene in which his name appears. When his father's death draws near, and the sons are gathered round him, he hears the old crime brought up again to receive its sentence from the lips that are no longer feeble and hesitating. They, no less than the incestuous first-born, had forfeited the privileges of their birthright. "In their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness they maimed oxen" (marg. reading of the A. V.; Sept. *ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον*). Therefore the sentence on those who had been united for evil was, that they were to be "divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel." How that condemnation was at once fulfilled and turned into a benediction, how the zeal of the patriarch reappeared purified and strengthened in his descendants, how the very name came to have a new significance, will be found elsewhere. See LEVITE.

The history of Levi has been dealt with here in what seems the only true and natural way of treating it, as a history of an individual person. Of the theory that sees in the sons of Jacob the mythical Eponymi of the tribes that claimed descent from them—which finds in the crimes and chances of their lives the outlines of a national or tribal chronicle—which refuses to recognise that Jacob had twelve sons, and insists that the history of Dinah records an attempt on the part of the Canaanites to enslave and degrade a Hebrew tribe (Ewald, *Geschichte*, i, 466-496)—of this one may be content to say, as the author says of other hypotheses hardly more extravagant, "Die Wissenschaft verscheucht alle solche Gespenster" (*ibid.* i, 466). The book of Genesis tells us of the lives of men and women, not of ethnological phantoms. A yet wilder conjecture has been hazarded by another German critic. P. Redslob (*Die alttestamentl. Namen*, Hamb. 1846, p. 24, 25), recognising the meaning of the name of Levi as given above, finds in it evidence of the existence of a confederacy or synod of the priests that had been connected with the several local worships of Canaan, and who, in the time of Samuel and David, were gathered together, *joined*, "round the Central Pantheon in Jerusalem." Here, also, we may borrow the terms of our judgment from the language of the writer himself. If there are "abgeschmackten etymologischen Mährchen" (Redslob, p. 82) connected with the name of Levi, they are hardly those we meet with in the narrative of Genesis. See JACOB.

2. The father of Matthat and son of Simeon (Maaseiah), of the ancestors of Christ, in the private maternal line between David and Zerubbabel (Luke iii, 29). B.C. post 876. Lord Hervey thinks that the name of Levi reappears in his descendant Lebbæus (*Geneal. of Christ*, p. 132). See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

3. Father of another Matthat and son of Melchi, third preceding Mary, among Christ's ancestors (Luke iii, 24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

4. (*Λευΐς.*) One of the apostles, the son of Alphæus (Mark ii, 14; Luke v, 27, 29), elsewhere called MATTHEW (Matt. ix, 9).

Levi'athan (Heb. *livyathan'*, לִוְיָתָן, usually derived from לָוָה, a *wreath*, with adject. ending ן; but perhaps compounded of לִו, *wreathed*, and תַּן, a sea-*monster*; occurs Job iii, 8; xli, 1 [Hebrew xl, 25], Psa. lxxiv, 14; civ, 26; Isa. xxvii, 1; Sept. *δράκων*, but *τὸ μέγα κῆτος* in Job iii, 8; Vulg. *Leviathan*, but *draco* in Psa.; Auth. Vers. "Leviathan," but "their mourning" in Job iii, 8) probably has different significations, e. g.: (1.) A *serpent*, especially a large one (Job iii, 8), hence as the symbol of the hostile kingdom of Babylon (Isa. xxvii, 1). (2.) Specially, the *crocodile* (Job xli, 1). (3.) A *sea-monster* (Psa. civ, 26); tropically, for a cruel enemy (Psa. lxxiv, 14; compare Isa. li, 9; Ezek. xxix, 3). This Heb. word, which denotes any twisted animal, is especially applicable to every great tenant of the waters, such as the great marine serpents and crocodiles, and, it may be added, the colossal serpents and great monitors of the desert. See BEHEMOTH; DRAGON. In general it points to the crocodile, and Job xli is unequivocally descriptive of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophized under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been made to that interpretation of the term. "It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris (*Dict. Nat. Hist. Bib.*), Mason Good (*Book of Job translated*), Michaelis (*Supp.* 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in *not. ad Bochart Hieroz.* iii, 738) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The *Orca gladiator* (Gray)—the grampus mentioned by Lee—the *Physalus antiquorum* (Gray), or the *Rorqual de la Méditerranée* (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, *Synops. Mamm.* p. 525, and Lacepède, *H. N. des Cetac.* p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous." See WHALE.

The word *crocodile* does not occur in the Auth. Vers., although its Greek form *κροκόδειλος* is found in the Sept. (Lev. xi, 29, where for the "tortoise," צָב, it has *κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος*, Vulg. *crocodilus*); but there is no specific word in the Hebrew of which it is the acknowledged representative. "Bochart (iii, 769, edit. Rosenmüller) says that the Talmudists use the word *livyathân* to denote the crocodile; this, however, is denied by Lewysohn (*Zool. des Talm.* p. 155, 355), who says that in the Talmud it always denotes a *whale*, and never a *crocodile*. For the Talmudical fables about the leviathan, see Lewysohn (*Zool. des Talm.*), in passages referred to above, and Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chald. Talm.* s. v. לויתן" (Smith). Some of these seem to be alluded to in 2 Esdr. vi, 49, 52. The Egyptians called it *tsmok* (see Bunsen's *Ægyptens Stellung*, i, 581), the Arabs name it *tamse* (compare *χάμψη*, Herod. ii, 69); but Strabo says that the Egyptian crocodile was known by the name *suchus*, *σοῦχος*, probably referring to the sacred species). It is not only denoted by the *leviathan* of Job xli, 1, but probably also by the *tamin* of Ezek. xxix, 3; xxxii, 2 (compare Isa. xxvii, 1; li, 9); and perhaps by the *reed-beast* (חַיַּת קָנֶה, "spearmen") of Psa. lxviii, 30. Others confound the leviathan with the *orca* of Pliny (ix, 5), i. e. probably the *Physter macrocephalus* of Linn. (see Th. Hase, *De Leviathan Jobi*, Brem. 1723); Schultens understands the fabulous *dragon* (*Comment. in Job.* p. 1174 sq.; compare Oedmann, *Samml.* iii, 1 sq.); not to dwell upon the supposed identification with fossil species of lizards (Koch, in Lüdde's *Zeitschrift f. vergleich Erdk.* Magdeb. 1844). In the detailed description of Job (ch. xli), probably "the Egyptian crocodile is depicted in all its magnitude, ferocity, and indolence, such as it was in early days, when as yet unconscious of the power of man, and only individually tamed for the purposes of an imposture, which had sufficient authority to intimidate the public and protect the species, under the sanctified pretext that it was a type of pure water, and an emblem of the importance of irrigation; though the people in general seem ever to have been disposed to consider it a personification of the destructive principle. At a later period the Egyptians, probably of such places as Tentyris, where crocodiles were not held in veneration, not only hunted and slew them, but it appears from a statue that a sort of Bestiarii could tame them sufficiently to perform certain exhibitions mounted on their backs. The intense musky odor of its flesh must have rendered the crocodile at all times very unpalatable food, but breast-armor was made of the horny and ridged parts of its back. Viewed as the crocodile of the Thebaid, it is not clear that the leviathan symbolized the Pharaoh, or was a type of Egypt, any more than of several Roman colonies (even where it was not indigenous, as at Nismes, in Gaul, on the ancient coins of which the figure of one chained occurs), and of cities in Phœnicia, Egypt, and other parts of the coast of Africa. During the Roman sway in Egypt, crocodiles had not disap-

peared in the Lower Nile, for Seneca and others allude to a great battle fought by them and a school of dolphins in the Heracleotic branch of the Delta. During the decline of the state even the hippopotamus reappeared about Pelusium, and was shot at in the 17th century (Radzivil). In the time of the Crusades crocodiles were found in the Crocodilon river of early writers, and in the Crocodilorum lacus, still called Moiat el-Temsah, which appear to be the Kerseos river and marsh, three miles south of Cæsarea, though the nature of the locality is most appropriate at Nahr-el Arsuf or el-Haddar" (For a full account of the treatment of the crocodile and its worship in Egypt, see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* i, 243 sq.). See RAHAB.

Most of the popular accounts of the crocodile have been taken from the American *alligator*, a smaller animal, but very similar in its habits to the true crocodile. See generally Herod. ii, 68 sq.; Diod. Sic. i, 35, Ælian, *Hist. Anim.* v, 23; xvii, 6; xii, 15, Ammianus Marcell. xxii, 15; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 344 sq., Pococke, *East*, i, 301 sq.; Oken, *Naturgeschichte*, III, ii, 329 sq.; Cuvier, *Anim. Kingd.* ii, 21; Thom, in the *Halle Encyklop.* xxi, 456 sq., Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 737 sq., Oedmann, iii, 1 sq.; vi, 53 sq.; *Annales du Museum d'histoire natur.* vol. ix, x; Minutoli, *Trav.* p. 246; Rosenmüller, *Alterthumsk.* IV, ii, 244 sq.; Denon, *Trav.* p. 291; Norden, *Reise*, p. 302. Comp. CROCODILE.

Levi ben-Gerson. See RALBAG.

Levi, David, a noted English Jewish writer, was born at London in 1740. He was a hatter by profession, but ardently devoted himself to the study of Jewish literature, and gained great reputation by several learned publications, of which the principal is his *Lingua Sacra*, a dictionary and grammar of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Talmudic dialects (London, 1785-89, 3 vols. 8vo). He wrote also *Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament* (1793, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Defence of the Old Testament, in Letters*, in answer to Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason* (1797, 8vo). Levi died in 1799. See Lyson's Environs, sup. vol. *European Magazine* (1799); *London Gent. Mag.* (1801); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Levings, NOAH, D.D., an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Cheshire County, N. H., Sept. 29, 1796, and early removed to Troy, N. Y.; was converted about 1812; entered the New York Conference in 1818; was stationed at New York in 1827–8; at Brooklyn in 1829 30, at New Haven in 1831–2; at Albany in 1833; on Troy District in 1838, in 1843 at Vestry Street, New York; in 1844 was finally elected financial secretary of the American Bible Society. He died at Cincinnati Jan. 9, 1849. In early life his advantages for education were limited, but the vigor of his mind and untiring effort bore him above all obstacles, and he became one of the most popular and useful ministers of his time. During his eighteen pastoral appointments, Dr. Levings is said to have "preached nearly 4000 sermons, delivered 65 addresses and orations, and to have travelled over no less than 36,500 miles. He also delivered 275 addresses for the American Bible Society." He was an earnest and accomplished minister; many souls were converted under his labors; and as a platform speaker he had few equals amongst the ministry of his age.—*Conf. Min.* iv, 327; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1849, p. 515.

Levirate (from the law-Latin term *levir*, a *husband's brother*), the name applied to an ancient usage of the Hebrews (Gen. xxxviii, 8 sq.), reordained by Moses (Deut. xxv, 5–10; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 23, Matt. xxii, 24 sq.), that when an Israelite died without leaving male issue, his brother (יָבָם, *yabam'*, which was the specific term applied to this relation), resident with him, was compelled to marry the widow, and continue his deceased brother's family through the first-born son issuing from such union as the heir of the former husband (comp. Jul. Afric. in Eusebius, *Hist. Ev.* i, 7). If he was unwilling to do so, he could only be released from the obligation by undergoing a species of insult (Deut. xxv, 9). This is illustrated in the case of Ruth (ch. iii, iv), where, however, as an estate was involved, Boaz is styled by a different term (גֹּאֵל, an *avenger*). The Talmud contains a very subtile exposition of this statute (see Mishna, *Jebamoth*, iii, 1; comp. *Eduj.* iv, 8, on Deut. xxv, 9; see also *Jebam.* xii, 6; comp. Selden, *Uxor Hebr.* i, 12; Gans, *Eherecht*, i, 167 sq.). The high-priest appears to have been free from this law (Lev. xxi, 13), and there must doubtless have been other exceptions, especially in the case of aged persons and proselytes (Mishna, *Jebam.* xi, 2). A similar law prevails among the natives of Central Asia (Bernary, p. 34 sq.; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 70; Bergeron, *Voyages*, i, 28) and Abyssinia (Bruce, *Trav.* ii, 223), and traces of it existed among the ancient Italians (Diod. Sic. xii, 18). This law no doubt originated in the love of offspring, proverbially strong in the Eastern bosom, which sought this method at once of perpetuating a deceased person's name and of procuring progeny for the widow (Jahn's *Archæol.* § 157). See KINSMAN. The law, however, was unquestionably attended with great inconveniences, for a man cannot but think it the most unpleasant of all necessities if he must marry a woman whom he has not chosen himself. Thus we find that the brother in some instances had no inclination for any such marriage (Gen. xxxviii; Ruth iv), and stumbled at this, that the first son produced from it could not belong to him. Whether a second son might follow and continue in life was very uncertain; and among a people who so highly prized genealogical immortality of name, it was a great hardship for a man to be obliged to procure it for a person already dead, and to run the risk meanwhile of losing it himself. Nor was this law very much in favor of the morals of the other sex; for, not to speak of Tamar, who, in reference to it, conceived herself justified in having recourse to most improper conduct, it may be observed that what Ruth did (iii, 6–9), in order to obtain for a husband the person whom she accounted as the nearest kinsman of her deceased husband, is, to say the least, by no means conformable to that modesty and delicacy which we look for in the other sex. A wise and good legislator could scarcely have been inclined to patronize any such law, but then it is not advisable directly to attack an inveterate point of honor, because, in such a case, for the most part nothing is gained; and in the present instance, as the point of honor placed immortality of name entirely in a man's leaving descendants behind him, it was so favorable to the increase of population that it merited some degree of forbearance and tenderness. Moses therefore left the Israelites still in possession of their established right, but, at the same time, he studied as much as possible to guard against its rigor and evil effects by limiting and moderating its operation in various respects. In the first place, he expressly prohibited the marriage of a brother's widow if there were children of his own alive. Before this time, brothers were probably in the practice of considering a brother's widow as part of the inheritance, and of appropriating her to themselves, if unable to buy a wife, as the Mongols do, so that this was a very necessary prohibition. For a *successor præsumptivus in thoro*, whom a wife can regard as her future husband, is rather a dangerous neighbor for her present one's honor, and if she happen to conceive any predilection for the younger brother, her husband, particularly in a southern climate, will hardly be secure from the risk of poison. In the second place, Moses allowed, and, indeed, enjoined the brother to marry the widow of his childless brother; but if he was not disposed to do so, he did not absolutely compel him, but left him an easy means of riddance, for he had only to declare in court that he had no inclination to marry her, and then he was at liberty. This, it is true, subjected him to a punishment, which at first appears sufficiently severe—the slighted widow had a right to revile him in court as much as she pleased; and from his pulling off his shoe and delivering it to the widow,

he received the appellation of Baresole, which anybody might apply to him without being liable to a prosecution. But this infliction was, after all, merely nominal, and we find that it did not prevent the rejection of the widow when there was a decided aversion to it on the part of the surviving relative (Ruth iv, 8). The law, however, only extended to a brother living in the same city or country, not to one residing at a greater distance. Nor did it affect a brother having already a wife of his own. At least, if it had its origin in this, that by reason of the price required for a wife, often only one brother could marry, and the others also wished to do the same, it could only affect such as were unmarried; and in the two instances that occur in Genesis (ch. xxxviii) and Ruth (ch. iv), we find the brother-in-law, whose duty it was to marry, apprehensive of its proving hurtful to himself and his inheritance, which could hardly have been the case if he had previously had another wife, or (but that was at least expensive) could have taken one of his own choice. When there was no brother alive, or when he declined the duty, the levirate law, as we see from the case of Ruth, extended to the nearest relation of the deceased husband, as, for instance, to his paternal uncle or nephew; so that at last even quite remote kinsmen, in default of nearer ones, might be obliged to undertake it. Boaz does not appear to have been very nearly related to Ruth, as he did not so much as know who she was when he met her gleaning in the fields. Nor did she know that he was any relation to her until apprised of it by her mother-in-law. Among the Jews of the present day levirate marriages have entirely ceased, so much so that in the marriage contracts of the very poorest people among them it is generally stipulated that the bridegroom's brother shall abandon all those rights to the bride to which he could lay claim by the law in question (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* ii, 197 sq.). See Perizon. *De constitutione div. super defuncti fratris uxore ducenda* (Hal. 1742); F. Bernary, *De Hebræor. leviratu* (Berlin, 1835); J. M. Redslob, *Die Leviratsche bei den Hebräern* (Leipsic, 1836); C. W. F. Walch, *De lege levir. ad fratres non germ. sed tribules referenda* (Götting. 1763); Hüllman, *Staatsverf. d. Israel*, p. 190 sq.; Rauschenbusch, *De lege leviratus* (Götting. 1765). See MARRIAGE.

Le'vis (Λευΐς), given (1 Esdr. ix, 14) as a proper name, but meaning simply a *Levite*, as correctly rendered in the parallel Hebrew passage (Ezra x, 15).

Levison, MORDECAI GUMPEL, a learned Jewish physician and commentator, was born and educated at Berlin, where he was fellow-student of the celebrated philosopher Moses Mendelssohn. He afterwards removed to London, and was physician in one of the hospitals (1790); was then nominated by Gustavus III, of Sweden, to a professorial chair in Upsala. In 1781 he returned to his native place, but left again three years later for Hamburg, where he died February 10, 1797. His works illustrative of the Bible are *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, called תוכחת מגלה, dedicated to Gustavus III (Hamburg, 1784). This elaborate work is preceded by five introductions, which respectively treat on the import of the book, the appropriateness of its name, Hebrew synonymes, roots, the verb and its inflexions, the names of the Deity, on the design of the Bible, etc.; whereupon follows the Hebrew text with a double commentary: one explains the words and their connection, and the other gives an exposition of the argument of the book:—*A Treatise on Holy Scripture*, published at the request of the king of Sweden (Lond. 1770):—*A Treatise on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Talmud*, entitled סלת מנחה בלולה (Hamb. 1797):—*A Hebrew Lexicon*, called חשרשים:—*A Work on Hebrew Synonymes*, entitled ספר חנרדפים:—and a *Hebrew Grammar*, called דרך חקדש החדשה. The last three works have not as yet been published. See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 238 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Le'vite (בֶּן־לֵוִי, *son of Levi*, or simply לֵוִי, *Levi*, for לֵוִיִּי, Deut. xii, 18; Judg. xvii, 9, 11, xviii, 3; usually in the plur. and with the art. הַלְוִיִּם; Sept. Λευῖται), a patronymic title which, besides denoting all the descendants of the tribe of Levi (Exod. vi, 25, Lev. xxv, 32, etc.; Numb. xxxv, 2; Josh. xxi, 3, 41), is the distinctive title of that portion of it which was set apart for the subordinate offices of the sanctuary, to assist the other and smaller portion of their own tribe, invested with the superior functions of the hierarchy (1 Kings viii, 4; Ezra ii, 70, John i, 19, etc.), and this is the meaning which has perpetuated itself. Sometimes, again, it is added as an epithet of the smaller portion of the tribe, and we read of "the priests the Levites" (Josh. iii, 3; Ezek. xliv, 15). See PRIEST. In describing the institution and development of the Levitical order, we shall treat of it in chronological order, availing ourselves of the best systematizations hitherto produced.

I. *From the Exode till the Monarchy.*—This is the most interesting and important period in the history of the Levitical order, and in describing it we must first of all trace the cause which called it into existence.

1. *Origin and Institution of the Levitical Order.* The absence of all reference to the consecrated character of the Levites in the book of Genesis is noticeable enough. The prophecy ascribed to Jacob (Gen. xlix, 5–7) was indeed fulfilled with singular precision, but the terms of the prophecy are hardly such as would have been framed by a later writer, after the tribe had gained its subsequent pre-eminence. The only occasion on which the patriarch of the tribe appears—the massacre of the Shechemites—may indeed have contributed to influence the history of his descendants, by fostering in them the same fierce, wild zeal against all that threatened to violate the purity of their race, but generally what strikes us is the absence of all recognition of the later character. In the genealogy of Gen. xlvi, 11, in like manner, the list does not go lower down than the three sons of Levi, and they are given in the order of their birth, not in that which would have corresponded to the official superiority of the Kohathites. There are no signs, again, that the tribe of Levi had any special pre-eminence over the others during the Egyptian bondage. As tracing its descent from Leah, it would take its place among the six chief tribes sprung from the wives of Jacob, and share with them a recognised superiority over those that bore the names of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. Within the tribe itself there are some slight tokens that the Kohathites were gaining the first place. The classification of Exod. vi, 16–25 gives to that section of the tribe four clans or houses, while those of Gershon and Merari have but two each. To it belonged the house of Amram, and "Aaron the Levite" (Exod. iv, 14) is spoken of as one to whom the people would be sure to listen. He married the daughter of the chief of the tribe of Judah (Exod. vi, 23). The work accomplished by him, and by his yet greater brother, would naturally tend to give prominence to the family and the tribe to which they belonged, but as yet there are no traces of a caste-character, no signs of any intention to establish a hereditary priesthood. Up to this time the Israelites had worshipped the God of their fathers after their fathers' manner. The first-born of the people were the priests of the people. The eldest son of each house inherited the priestly office. His youth made him, in his father's lifetime, the representative of the purity which was connected from the beginning with the thought of worship (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 273, and comp. PRIEST). It was apparently with this as their ancestral worship that the Israelites came up out of Egypt. The "young men" of the sons of Israel offer sacrifices (Exod. xxiv, 5). They, we may infer, are the priests who remain with the people while Moses ascends the heights of Sinai (xix, 22–24). They represented the truth that the whole people were "a kingdom of priests" (xix, 6). Neither they, nor the "officers and judges"

appointed to assist Moses in administering justice (xviii, 25), are connected in any special manner with the tribe of Levi. The first step towards a change was made in the institution of a hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron during the first withdrawal of Moses to the solitude of Sinai (xxviii, 1). This, however, was one thing; it was quite another to set apart a whole tribe of Israel as a priestly caste. The directions given for the construction of the tabernacle imply no pre-eminence of the Levites. The chief workers in it are from the tribes of Judah and Dan (Exod. xxxi, 2–6). The next extension of the idea of the priesthood grew out of the terrible crisis of Exod. xxxii. If the Levites had been sharers in the sin of the golden calf, they were, at any rate, the foremost to rally round their leader when he called on them to help him in stemming the progress of the evil. Then came that terrible consecration of themselves, when every man was against his son and against his brother, and the offering with which they filled their hands (מַלְּאוּ יֶדְכֶם, Exod. xxxii, 29; comp. Exod. xxviii, 41) was the blood of their nearest of kin. The tribe stood forth separate and apart, recognising even in this stern work the spiritual as higher than the natural, and therefore counted worthy to be the representative of the ideal life of the people, "an Israel within an Israel" (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 279), chosen in its higher representatives to offer incense and burnt-sacrifice before the Lord (Deut. xxxiii, 9, 10), not without a share in the glory of the Urim and Thummim that were worn by the prince and chieftain of the tribe. From this time, accordingly, they occupied a distinct position. Experience had shown how easily the people might fall back into idolatry—how necessary it was that there should be a body of men, an *order*, numerically large, and, when the people were in their promised home, equally diffused throughout the country, as attestators and guardians of the truth. Without this the individualism of the older worship would have been fruitful in an ever-multiplying idolatry. The tribe of Levi was therefore to take the place of that earlier priesthood of the first-born as representatives of the holiness of the people.

The tabernacle, with its extensive and regular sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order regularly to perform the higher functions of the sanctuary, was the special occasion which also called into being the Levitical staff to aid the priests in their arduous task, inasmuch as the primitive and patriarchal mode of worship which obtained till the erection of the tabernacle, and according to which the first-born of all Israelites performed the priestly offices (comp. Exod. xxiv, 5 with xix, 24, and see FIRST-BORN), could not be perpetuated under the newly-organized congregational service without interfering with the domestic relations of the people. It was for this reason, as well as to secure greater efficiency in the sacred offices, that the religious primogeniture was conferred upon the tribe of Levi, which were henceforth to give their undivided attention to the requirements of the sanctuary (Numb. iii, 11–13). The tribe of Levi were selected because they had manifested a very extraordinary zeal for the glory of God (Exod. xxxii, 26, etc.), had already obtained a part of this religious primogeniture by the institution of the hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron (Exod. xxviii, 1), and because, as the tribe to which Moses and Aaron belonged, they would most naturally support and promote the institutions of the lawgiver. To effect this transfer of office, the first-born males of all the other tribes and all the Levites were ordered to be numbered, from the age of one month and upwards; and when it was found that the former were 22,273, and the latter 22,000 (see below), it was arranged that 22,000 of the first-born should be replaced by the 22,000 Levites, that the 273 first-born who were in excess of the Levites should be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, being the legal sum for the redemption of the first-born child (Numb. xviii, 16), and that the 1365 shekels be given to Aaron and his sons as a compensation for the odd persons who, as first-born, belonged to Jehovah. As to the difficulty how to decide which of the first-born should be redeemed by paying this money, and which should be exchanged for the Levites, since it was natural for every one to wish to escape this expense, the Midrash (*On Numb.* iii, 17) and the Talmud relate that "Moses wrote on 22,000 tickets *Levite* (לֵוִי בן), and on 273 *Five Shekels* (חמש שקלים), mixed them all up, put them into a vessel, and then bid every Israelite to draw one. He who took out one with *Levite* on it was redeemed by a Levite, and he who drew one with *Five Shekels* on it had to be redeemed by payment of this sum" (*Sanhedrin*, 17, a). There is no reason to doubt this ancient tradition. It was further ordained that the cattle which the Levites then happened to possess should be considered as equivalent to all the first-born cattle which all the Israelites had, without their being numbered and exchanged one for one, as in the case of the human beings (Numb. iii, 41–51), so that the firstlings should not now be given to the priest, or be redeemed, which the Israelites were hereafter required to do (Numb. xviii, 15). In this way the Levites obtained a sacrificial as well as a priestly character. They for the first-born of men, and their cattle for the firstlings of beasts, fulfilled the idea that had been asserted at the time of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Exod. xiii, 12, 13).

There is a discrepancy between the total number of the Levites, which is given in Numb. iii, 39 as 22,000, and the separate number of the three divisions which is given in verses 22, 28, and 34, as follows: Gershonites, 7500 + Kohathites, 8600 + Merarites, 6200 = 22,300. Compare also verse 46, where it is said that the 22,273 first-born exceeded the total number of Levites by 273. The Talmud (*Bechoroth*, 5, a) and the Jewish commentators, who are followed by most Christian expositors, submit that the 300 surplus Levites were the first-born of this tribe, who, as such, could not be substituted for the first-born of the other tribes, and therefore were omitted from the total. To this, however, it is objected that if such an exemption of first-born had been intended, the text would have contained some intimation of it, whereas there is nothing whatever in the context to indicate it. Houbigant therefore suggests that a ל has dropped out of the word שלש in verse 28, making it שש, and that by retaining the former word we obtain 8300 instead of 8600, which removes all the difficulty. Philippson, Keil, and others adopt this explanation. The number of the first-born appears disproportionately small as compared with the population. It must be remembered, however, that the conditions to be fulfilled were that they should be at once (1) the first child of the father, (2) the first child of the mother, and (3) males. (Compare on this question, and on that of the difference of numbers, Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, iii, 201.)

2. *Division of the Tribe of Levi.*—As different functions were assigned to the separate houses of the Levitical branch of the tribe, to which frequent references are made, we subjoin the following table from Exod. vi, 16–25, italicizing the Aaronic or priestly branch in order to facilitate these references.



N.B.—Those mentioned in the above list are by no means the only descendants of Levi in their respective generations, as is evident from the fact that, though no

sons of Libni, Shimei, Hebron, etc., are here given, yet mention is made in Numb. iii, 21, of "the family of the Libnites and the family of the Shimeites;" in Numb. xxvi, 28, of "the family of the Libnites;" and in Numb. iii, 27; xxvi, 58, of "the family of the Hebronites;" whilst in 1 Chron. xxiii, several sons of these men are mentioned by name. Again, no sons of Mahali and Mushi are given, and yet they appear in Numb. iii as fathers of families of the Levites. The design of the genealogy in question is simply to give the pedigrees of Moses and Aaron, and some other principal heads of the family of Levi, as is expressly stated in Exod. vi, 25: "These are the heads of the fathers of the Levites according to their families." In these heads all the other members of their families were included, according to the principle laid down in 1 Chron. xxiii, 11: "Therefore they were in one reckoning, according to their father's house." Some names are also mentioned for a special purpose, e. g. the sons of Izhar, on account of Korah, who was the leader of the rebellion against Moses. These observations afford an answer to a considerable extent to the conclusions of bishop Colenso upon the number of the Levites (*The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined*, i, 107–112).

It will thus be seen that the Levitical order comprises the whole of the descendants of Gershon and Merari, and those of Kohath through Izhar and Uzziel, as well as through Amram's second son, Moses; whilst Aaron, Amram's first son, and his issue, constitute the priestly order. It must here be remarked that, though Kohath is the second in point of age and order, yet his family will be found to occupy the first position, because they are the nearest of kin to the priests.

3. *Age and Qualifications for Levitical Service.*—The only qualification for active service specified in the Mosaic law is mature age, which in Numb. iv, 3, 23, 30, 39, 43, 47 is said to be from thirty to fifty, whilst in Numb. viii, 24, 25 it is said to commence at *twenty-five*. Various attempts have been made to reconcile these two apparently contradictory injunctions. The Talmud (*Chol.* 24, a), Rashi (*Comment.* ad loc.), and Maimonides (*Jod Ha-Chezaka*, iii, 7, 3), who are followed by some Christian commentators, affirm that from twenty-five to thirty the Levites attended in order to be instructed in their duties, but did not enter upon actual duties until they were full thirty years of age. But this explanation, as Abrabanel rightly remarks, "is at variance with the plain declaration of the text, that the Levites were called at twenty-five years of age *to wait upon the service of the tabernacle*, which clearly denotes not instruction for their ministry, but the ministry itself" (*Commentar. on Numb.* viii, 24). Besides, the text itself does not give the slightest intimation that any period of the Levitical life was devoted to instruction. Hence Rashbam, Aben-Ezra, and Abrabanel, who are followed by most modern expositors, submit that the twenty-five years of age refers to the Levites' entering upon the lighter part of their service, such as keeping watch and performing the lighter duties *in* the tabernacle, whilst the thirty years of age refers to their entering upon the more onerous duties, such as carrying heavy weights, when the tabernacle was moved about from place to place, which required the full strength of a man, maintaining that this distinction is indicated in the text by the words לעבור ולמשא, *for labor and burdens*, when the thirty years' work is spoken of (Numb. iv, 30, 31), and by the omission of the word משא, *burden*, when the twenty-five years' work is spoken of (Numb. viii, 24, etc.). But it may fairly be questioned whether man is more fitted for arduous work from thirty to thirty-five than from twenty-five to thirty. Besides, the Gershonites and the Merarites, who had the charge of the heavier burdens, did not carry them at all (comp. Numb. vii, 3–9, and sec. 4 below). According to another ancient Jewish interpretation adopted by Bähr (*Symbol.* ii, 41) and others, Numb. iv treats of the necessary age of the Levites for the immediate requirements *in the wilderness*, whilst Numb. viii gives their age *for the promised land*, when they shall be divided among the tribes and a larger number shall be wanted (*Siphri on Numb. viii*). Somewhat similar is Philippson's explanation, who affirms that at the first election of the Levitical order the required age for service was from thirty to fifty, but that *all future* Levites had to commence service at *twenty-five*. The Sept. solves the difficulty by uniformly reading twenty-five instead of thirty.

4. *Duties and Classification of the Levites.*—The commencement of the march from Sinai gave a prominence to their new character. As the tabernacle was the sign of the presence among the people of their unseen King, so the Levites were, among the other tribes of Israel, as the royal guard that waited exclusively on him. The warlike title of "host" is specially applied to them (comp. use of צָבָא, in Numb. iv, 3, 30; and of מַחֲנֶה, in 1 Chron. i, 19). As such they were not included in the number of the armies of Israel (Numb. i, 47; ii, 33; xxvi, 62), but were reckoned separately by themselves. When the people were at rest they encamped as guardians around the sacred tent; no one else might come near it under pain of death (Numb. i, 51; xviii, 22). The different families pitched their tents around it in the following manner: the Gershonites behind it on the west (Numb. iii, 23), the Kohathites on the south (iii, 29), the Merarites on the north (iii, 35), and the priests on the east (iii, 38). See CAMP. They were to occupy a middle position in that ascending scale of consecration which, starting from the idea of the whole nation as a priestly people, reached its culminating point in the high-priest, who alone of all the people might enter "within the veil." The Levites might come nearer than the other tribes, but they might not sacrifice, nor burn incense, nor see the "holy things" of the sanctuary till they were covered (Numb. iv. 15). When on the march, no hands but theirs might strike the tent at the commencement of the day's journey, or carry the parts of its structure during it, or pitch the tent again when they halted (Numb. i, 51). It was obviously essential for such a work that there should be a fixed assignment of duties, and now, accordingly, we meet with the first outlines of the organization which afterwards became permanent. The division of the tribe into the three sections that traced their descent from the sons of Levi formed the groundwork of it. The Levites were given as a gift (? נְתִינִים, *Nethinim*) to Aaron and his sons, the priests, to wait upon them, and to do the subordinate work for them at the service of the sanctuary (Numb. viii, 19; xvii, 2–6). They had also to guard the tabernacle and take charge of certain vessels, whilst the priests had to watch the altars and the interior of the sanctuary (i, 50–53; viii, 19; xviii, 1–7). To carry this out effectually, the charge of certain vessels and portions of the tabernacle, as well as the guarding of its several sides, was assigned to each of the three sections into which the tribe was divided by their respective descent from the three sons of Levi, i. e. Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, as follows:

(1.) The Kohathites, who out of 8600 persons yielded 2750 qualified for active service according to the prescribed age, and who were under the leadership of Elizaphan, had to occupy the south side of the tabernacle, and, as the family to whom Aaron the high-priest and his sons belonged, had to take charge of the holy things (משמרת הקדש), viz., the ark, the table of shew-bread, the candlestick, the two altars of incense and burnt-offering, as well as of the sacred vessels used at the service of these holy things, and the curtains of the holy of holies. All these things they had to carry on their own shoulders when the camp was broken up (Numb. iii, 27–32; iv, 5–15; vii, 9; Deut. xxxi, 25), after the priests had covered them with the dark blue cloth which was to hide them from all profane gaze; and thus they became also the guardians of all the sacred treasures which the people had so freely offered. Eleazar, the head of the priests, who belonged to the Kohathites, and was the chief commander of the three Levitical divisions, had the charge of the oil for the candlestick, the incense, the daily meat-offering, and the anointing oil (Numb. iii, 32; iv, 16).

(2.) The Gershonites, who out of 7500 men yielded 2630 for active service, and who were under the leadership of Eliasaph, had to occupy the west side of the tabernacle, and to take charge of the tapestry of the tabernacle, all its curtains, hangings, and coverings, the pillars of the tapestry hangings, the implements used in connection therewith, and to perform all the work connected with the taking down and putting up of the articles over which they had the charge (Numb. iii, 21–26; iv, 22–28).

(3.) The Merarites, who out of 6200 yielded 3200 active men, and who were under the leadership of Zuriel, had to occupy the north side of the tabernacle, and take charge of the boards, bars, pillars, sockets, tent-pins, etc. (Numb. iii, 33–37; iv, 39, 40). The two latter companies, however, were allowed to use the six covered wagons and the twelve oxen which were offered as an oblation to Jehovah; the Gershonites, having the less heavy portion, got two of the wagons and four of the oxen; whilst the Merarites, who had the heavier portions, got four of the wagons and eight of the oxen (Numb. vii, 3–9).

Thus the total number of active men which the three divisions of the Levites yielded was 8580. When encamped around the tabernacle, they formed, as it were, a partition between the people and the sanctuary; they had so to guard it that the children of Israel should not come near it, since those who ventured to do so incurred the penalty of death (Numb. i, 51; iii, 38; xviii, 22); nor were they themselves allowed to come near the vessels of the sanctuary and the altar, lest they die, as well as the priests (Numb. xviii, 3–6). Israelites of any other tribe were strictly forbidden to perform the Levitical office, in order "that there might be no plague when the children of Israel approach the sanctuary" (Numb. iii, 10; viii, 19; xviii, 5); and, according to the ancient Hebrew canons, even a priest was not allowed to do the work assigned to the Levites, nor was one Levite permitted to perform the duties which were incumbent upon his fellow Levite under penalty of death (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kele Ha-Mikdash*, iii, 10).

The book of Deuteronomy is interesting as indicating more clearly than had been done before the other functions, over and above their ministrations in the tabernacle, which were to be allotted to the tribe of Levi. Through the whole land they were to take the place of the old household priests (subject, of course, to the special rights of the Aaronic priesthood), sharing in all festivals and rejoicings (Deut. xii, 19; xiv, 26, 27; xxvi, 11). Every third year they were to have an additional share in the produce of the land (Deut. xiv, 28; xxvi, 12). The people were charged never to forsake them. To "the priests the Levites" was to belong the office of preserving, transcribing, and interpreting the law (Deut. xvii, 9–12; xxxi, 26). They were solemnly to read it every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. xxxi, 9–13). They were to pronounce the curses from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii, 14).

Such, if one may so speak, was the ideal of the religious organization which was present to the mind of the lawgiver. Details were left to be developed as the altered circumstances of the people might require. The great principle was, that the warrior-caste who had guarded the tent of the captain of the hosts of Israel should be throughout the land as witnesses that the people still owed allegiance to him. It deserves notice that, as yet, with the exception of the few passages that refer to the priests, no traces appear of their character as a learned caste, and of the work which afterwards belonged to them as hymn-writers and musicians. The hymns of this period were probably occasional, not recurring (comp. Exod. xv; Numb. xxi, 17; Deut. xxxii). Women bore a large share in singing them (Exod. xv, 20; Psa. lxviii, 25). It is not unlikely that the wives and daughters of the Levites, who must have been with them in all their encampments, as afterwards in their cities, took the foremost part among the "damsels playing with their timbrels," or among the "wise-hearted," who wove hangings for the decoration of the tabernacle. There are, at any rate, signs of their presence there in the mention of the "women that assembled" at its door (Exod. xxxviii, 8, and comp. Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 297).

5. *Consecration of the Levites.*—The first act in the consecration of the Levites was to sprinkle them with the water of purifying (מי חטאת), which, according to tradition, was the same used for the purification of persons who became defiled by dead bodies, and in which were mingled cedar-wood, hyssop, scarlet, and ashes of the red heifer (Numb. xix, 6, 9, 13), and was designed to cleanse them from the same defilement (comp. Rashi, *On Numb. viii*, 7). They had, in the next place, as an emblem of further purification, to shave off all the hair from their body, "to teach thereby," as Ralbag says, "that they must renounce, as much as was in their power, all worldly things, and devote themselves to the service of the most high God," and then wash their garments. After this triple form of purification, they were brought before the door of the tabernacle, along with two bullocks and fine flour mingled with oil, when the whole congregation, through the elders who represented them, laid their hands upon the heads of the Levites, and set them apart for the service of the sanctuary, to occupy the place of the first-born of the whole congregation; whereupon the priests waved them before the Lord (Numb. viii, 5–14), which in all probability was done, as Abrabanel says, by leading them forward and backward, up and down, as if saying, Behold, these are henceforth the servants of the Lord, instead of the first-born of the children of Israel. The part which the whole congregation took in this consecration is a very important feature in the Hebrew constitution, inasmuch as it most distinctly shows that the Levitical order proceeded *from the midst of the people* (Exod. xxviii, 1), was to be regarded as essentially identical with it, and not as a sacred caste standing in proud eminence above the rest of the nation. This principle of equality, which, according to the Mosaic law, was not to be infringed by the introduction of a priesthood or monarchy (Deut. xvii, 14–20), was recognised throughout the existence of the Hebrew commonwealth, as is evident from the fact that the representatives of the people took part in the coronation of kings and the instalment of high-priests (1 Kings ii, 35; with 1 Chron. xxix, 32), and even in the days of the Maccabees we see that it is the people who installed Simon as high-priest (1 Maccab. xiv, 35).

6. *Revenues of the Levites.*—Thus consecrated to the service of the Lord, it was necessary that the tribe of Levi should be relieved from the temporal pursuits of the rest of the people, to enable them to give themselves wholly to their spiritual functions, and to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, as well as to preserve them from contracting a desire to amass earthly possessions. For this reason they were to have no territorial possessions, but Jehovah was to be their inheritance (Numb. xviii, 20; xxvi, 62; Deut. x, 9; xviii, 1, 2; Josh. xviii, 7). To reward their labor, which they had henceforth to perform instead of the first-born of the whole people, as well as to compensate the loss of their share in the material wealth of the nation, it was ordained that they should receive from the other tribes the tithes of the produce of the land, from which the non-priestly portion of the Levites in their turn had to offer a tithe to the priests as a recognition of their higher consecration (Numb. xviii, 21–24, 26–32; Neh. x, 37). If they had had, like other tribes, a distinct territory assigned to them, their influence over the people at large would be diminished, and they themselves would be likely to forget, in labors common to them with others, their own peculiar calling (Neh. x, 37). As if to provide for the contingency of failing crops or the like, and the consequent inadequacy of the tithes thus assigned to them, the Levite, not less than the widow and the orphan, was commended to the special kindness of the people (Deut. xii, 19; xiv, 27, 29).

But, though they were to have no territorial possessions, still they required a place of abode. To secure this, and at the same time to enable the Levites to disseminate a knowledge of the law and exercise a refined and intellectual influence among the people at large, upon whose conscientious payment of the tithes they were dependent for subsistence, forty-eight cities were assigned to them, six of which were to be cities of refuge for those who had inadvertently killed any one (Numb. xxxv, 1–8). From these forty-eight cities, which they obtained immediately after the conquest of Canaan, and which were made up by taking four cities from the district of every tribe, thirteen were allotted to the priestly portion of the Levitical tribe. Which cities belonged to the priestly portion of the tribe, and which to the non-priestly portion, and how they were distributed among the other tribes, as recorded in Josh. xxi, will be seen from the following table:

i. Kohathites:		
a Priests	Judah and Simeon	9
	Benjamin	4
b Not Priests	Ephraim	4
	Dan	4
	Half Manasseh (west)	2
ii. Gershonites	Half Manasseh (east)	2
	Issachar	4
	Asher	4
	Naphtali	3
iii. Merarites	Zebulun	4
	Reuben	4
	Gad	4
Total		48

Each of these cities was required to have an outlying suburb (מִגְרָשׁ, *προάστεια*) of meadow land for the pasture of the flocks and herds belonging to the Levites, the dimensions of which are thus described in Numb. xxxv, 4, 5: "And the suburbs [or pasture-ground] of the cities which ye shall give unto the Levites are from the wall of the city to the outside a thousand cubits round about; and ye shall measure from without the city the east corner two thousand cubits, and the south corner two thousand cubits, and the west corner two thousand cubits, and the north corner two thousand cubits, and the city in the centre." These dimensions have occasioned great difficulty, because of the apparent contradiction in the two verses, as specifying first 1000 cubits and then 2000. The Sept., Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 4, 3), and Philo (*De sacerd. honoribus*) get over the difficulty by reading 2000 in both verses, as exhibited in diagram I, *a*, while ancient and modern commentators,



Levitical City.—Diagram I, *a*.

who rightly adhere to the text, have endeavored to reconcile the two verses by advancing different theories, of which the following are the most noticeable: 1. According to the Talmud (*Erubin*, 51, a), the space "measured from the wall 1000 cubits round about" was used as a common or suburb, and the space measured "from without the city on the east side," etc., was a further tract of land of 2000 cubits, used for fields and vineyards, the former being "the suburbs" properly so called, and the latter "the fields of the suburbs," as represented in diagram I, *b*. Against this view, however, which is the most simple and rational, and which is adopted by Maimonides (*Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel*, xiii, 2), bishop Patrick, and most English expositors, it is urged that



Levitical City.—Diagram I, *b*.

it is not said that the 2000 cubits are to be measured in all directions, but only in the east, south, etc., direction, or, as the Hebrew has it, east, south, etc., *corner* (פֵּאָה). 2. It means that a circle of 1000 cubits radius was to be measured from the centre of the city, and then a square circumscribed about that circle, each of whose sides was 2000 cubits long, as exhibited in diagram II. But the



Diagram II.



Diagram III.

Levitical City.

objection to this is that the 1000 cubits were to be measured "from the wall of the city," and not from the centre. 3. The 1000 cubits were measured perpendicularly to the wall of the city, and then perpendicular to these distances, i. e. parallel to the walls of the city, the 2000 cubits were measured on the north, south, east, and west sides, as shown in diagram III. This, however, is obviously incorrect, because the sides would not be 2000 cubits long if the city were of finite dimensions, but plainly longer. 4. It is assumed that the city was built in a circular form, with a radius of 1500 cubits, that a circle was then described with a radius of 2500 cubits from the centre of the city, i. e. at a distance of 1000 cubits from the walls of the city, and that the suburbs were inclosed between the circumferences of the two circles, and that the corner of the circumscribed square was 1000 cubits from the circumference of the outer circle. Compare diagram IV. But the objection to this



Levitical City.—Diagram IV.

is that by Euclid, i, 47, the square of the diagonal equals the sum of the square of the sides, whereas in this figure 3500^2 does not equal 2500^2+2500^2. The assigned length

of the diagonal varies about 35 cubits from its actual value. 5. The city is supposed to be of a circular form; round it a circle is described at a distance of 1000 cubits from its walls; then from the walls 2000 cubits are measured to the north, south, east, and west corners—the whole forming a starlike figure, as exhibited in diagram V. This view, which is somewhat fanciful, strict-

Levitical City.—Diagram V.

ly meets the requirements of the Hebrew text. 6. The 1000 cubits are measured from the centre in four directions at right angles to one another, and perpendicular to each of these a side of 2000 cubits long is drawn, the whole forming a square. But in this case the condition of "1000 cubits round about" is not fulfilled, the distance of the centre from the corners of the square being plainly more than 1000 cubits. 7. The "1000 cubits round about" is equivalent to 1000 cubits square, or 305 English acres. 8. The city is supposed to be square, each side measuring 1000 or 500 cubits, and then, at a distance of 1000 cubits in all directions from the square, another square is described, as represented in diagrams VI, *a*, and VI, *b*. But this incurs the objection urged



Levitical City—Diagram VI, *a*.



Levitical City.—Diagram VI, *b*.

against 6, that the 1000 cubits cannot be said to be measured "round about," the distance from the corner of the city to the corner of the precincts being plainly more than 1000 cubits. Upon a review of all these theories, we incline to the ancient Jewish view, which is stated first, and against which nothing can be said, if we take "on the south, east," etc., simply to mean, as it often does, *in all directions*, instead of four distinct points. It presupposes that the cities were built in a circular form, which was usual in the cities of antiquity, both because the circle of all figures comprises the largest area within the smallest periphery, and because the inhabitants could reach every part of the walls in the shortest time from all directions, if necessary, for purposes of defence.

These revenues have been thought exorbitant beyond all bounds; for, discarding the unjustifiable conclusion of bishop Colenso, that "forty-four people [Levites], with the two priests, and their families, had forty-eight cities assigned to them" (*The Pentateuch*, etc., i, 112), and adhering to the scriptural numbers, we still have a tribe which, at the second census, numbered 23,000 males, with no more than 12,000 arrived at man's estate, receiving the tithes of 600,000 people; "consequently," it is thought "that each individual Levite, without having to deduct seed and the charges of husbandry, had as much as five Israelites reaped from their fields or gained on their cattle" (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, i, 252). Add to this that, though so small in number, the Levites received forty-eight cities, while other tribes which consisted of more than double the number of men received less cities, and some did not get more than twelve cities. But in all these calculations the following facts are ignored: 1. The tithes were not a regular tax, but a religious duty, which was greatly neglected by the people; 2. Even from these irregular tithes the Levites had to give a tithe to the priests; 3. The tithes never increased, whereas the Levites did increase. 4. Thirteen of the forty-eight cities were assigned to the priests, and six were cities of refuge; and, 5. Of the remaining twenty-nine cities, the Levites were by no means the sole occupants or proprietors; they were simply to have in them those houses which they required as dwellings, and the fields necessary for the pasture of their cattle. This is evident from the fact that the Levites were allowed to sell their houses, and that a special clause bearing on this subject was inserted in the Jubilee law [see JUBILEE]; inasmuch as Lev. xxv, 32–34, would have no meaning unless it is presumed that other Israelites lived together with the Levites.

These provisions for abode, of course, did not apply to the Levites in the time of Moses. While wandering in the wilderness, they were supported like the other Israelites, with but slight emoluments or perquisites, and at first with comparatively little honor, amid their considerable burdens in caring for the religious cultus. But how rapidly the feeling of reverence gained strength we may judge from the share assigned to them out of the flocks, and herds, and women of the conquered Midianites (Numb. xxxi, 27, etc.). The same victory led to the dedication of gold and silver vessels of great value, and thus increased the importance of the tribe as guardians of the national treasures (Numb. xxxi, 50–54).

7. *Modifications under Joshua and the Judges.*—The submission of the Gibeonites, after they had obtained a promise that their lives should be spared, enabled Joshua to relieve the tribe-divisions of Gershon and Merari of the most burdensome of their duties. The conquered Hivites became "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the house of Jehovah and for the congregation (Josh. ix, 27). The Nethinim (*Deo dati*) of 1 Chron. ix, 2; Ezra ii, 43, were probably sprung from captives taken by David in later wars, who were assigned to the service of the tabernacle, replacing possibly the Gibeonites who had been slain by Saul (2 Sam. xxi, 1). See NETHINIM.

The scanty memorials that are left us in the book of Judges are rather unfavorable to the inference that for any length of time the reality answered to the Mosaic idea of the Levitical institution. The ravages of invasion, and the pressure of an alien rule, marred the working of the organization which seemed so perfect. Levitical cities, such as Aijalon (Josh. xxi, 24; Judg. i, 35) and Gezer (Josh. xxi, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 67), fell into the hands of their enemies. Sometimes, as in the case of Nob, others apparently took their place. The wandering, unsettled habits of such Levites as are mentioned in the later chapters of Judges are probably to be traced to this loss of a fixed abode, and the consequent necessity of taking refuge in other cities, even though their tribe as such had no portion in them. The tendency of the people to fall into the idolatry of the neighboring nations showed either that the Levites failed to bear their witness to the truth or had no power to enforce it.

Even in the lifetime of Phinehas, when the high-priest was still consulted as an oracle, the very reverence which the people felt for the tribe of Levi becomes the occasion of a rival worship (Judg. xvii). The old household priesthood revives (see Kalisch, *On Genesis xlix*, 7), and there is the risk of the national worship breaking up into individualism. Micah first consecrates one of his own sons, and then tempts a homeless Levite to dwell with him as "a father and a priest" for little more than his food and raiment. The Levite, though probably the grandson of Moses himself, repeats the sin of Korah. See JONATHAN. First in the house of Micah, and then for the emigrants of Dan, he exercises the office of a priest with "an ephod, and a teraphim, and a graven image." With this exception the whole tribe appears to have fallen into a condition analogous to that of the clergy in the darkest period and in the most outlying districts of the mediæval Church, going through a ritual routine, but exercising no influence for good, at once corrupted and corrupting. The shameless license of the sons of Eli may be looked upon as the result of a long period of decay, affecting the whole order. When the priests were such as Hophni and Phinehas, we may fairly assume that the Levites were not doing much to sustain the moral life of the people.

The work of Samuel was the starting-point of a better time. Himself a Levite, and, though not a priest, belonging to that section of the Levites which was nearest to the priesthood (1 Chron. vi, 28), adopted, as it were, by a special dedication into the priestly line and trained for its offices (1 Sam. ii, 18), he appears as infusing a fresh life, the author of a new organization. There is no reason to think, indeed, that the companies or schools of the sons of the prophets which appear in his time (1 Sam. x, 5), and are traditionally said to have been founded by him, consisted exclusively of Levites; but there are many signs that the members of that tribe formed a large element in the new order, and received new strength from it. It exhibited, indeed, the ideal of the Levitical life as one of praise, devotion, teaching; standing in the same relation to the priests and Levites generally as the monastic institutions of the 5th century, or the mendicant orders of the 13th did to the secular clergy of Western Europe. The fact that the Levites were thus brought under the influence of a system which addressed itself to the mind and heart in a greater degree than the sacrificial functions of the priesthood, may possibly have led them on to apprehend the higher truths as to the nature of worship which begin to be asserted from this period, and which are nowhere proclaimed more clearly than in the great hymn that bears the name of Asaph (Psa. l, 7–15). The man who raises the name of prophet to a new significance is himself a Levite (1 Sam. ix, 9). It is among the prophets that we find the first signs of the musical skill which is afterwards so conspicuous in the Levites (1 Sam. x, 5). The order in which the Temple services were arranged is ascribed to two of the prophets, Nathan and Gad (2 Chron. xxix, 25), who must have grown up under Samuel's superintendence, and in part to Samuel himself (1 Chron. ix, 22). Asaph and Heman, the psalmists, bear the same title as Samuel the Seer (1 Chron. xxv, 5; 2 Chron. xxix, 30). The very word "prophesying" is applied not only to sudden bursts of song, but to the organized psalmody of the Temple (1 Chron. xxv, 2, 3). Even of those who bore the name of a prophet in a higher sense a large number are traceably of this tribe.

The capture of the ark by the Philistines did not entirely interrupt the worship of the Israelites, and the ministrations of the Levites went on, first at Shiloh (1 Sam. xiv, 3), then for a time at Nob (1 Sam. xxii, 11), afterwards at Gibeon (1 Kings iii, 2; 1 Chron. xvi, 39). The history of the return of the ark to Beth-shemesh after its capture by the Philistines, and its subsequent removal to Kirjath-jearim, points apparently to some strange complications rising out of the anomalies of this period, and affecting, in some measure, the position of the tribe of Levi. Beth-shemesh was, by the original assignment of the conquered country, one of the cities of the priests (Josh. xxi, 16). They, however, do not appear in the narrative, unless we assume, against all probability, that the men of Beth-shemesh who were guilty of the act of profanation were themselves of the priestly order. Levites, indeed, are mentioned as doing their appointed work (1 Sam. vi, 15), but the sacrifices and burnt-offerings are offered by the men of the city, as though the special function of the priesthood had been usurped by others, and on this supposition it is easier to understand how those who had set aside the law of Moses by one offence should defy it also by another. The singular reading of the Sept. in 1 Sam. vi, 19 (*καὶ οὐκ ἠσμίνισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰεχονίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσι Βαιθσαμὺς ὅτι εἶδον κιβωτὸν Κυρίου*) indicates, if we assume that it rests upon some corresponding Hebrew text, a struggle between two opposed parties, one guilty of the profanation, the other—possibly the Levites who had been before mentioned—zealous in their remonstrances against it. Then comes, either as the result of this collision, or by direct supernatural infliction, the great slaughter of the Beth-shemites, and they shrink from retaining the ark any longer among them. The great Eben (stone) becomes, by a slight paronomastic change in its form, the "great Abel" (lamentation), and the name remains as a memorial of the sin and of its punishment. See BETH-SHEMESH. We are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which led them, after this, to send the ark of Jehovah, not to Hebron or some other priestly city, but to Kirjath-jearim, round which, so far as we know, there gathered legitimately no sacred associations. It has been commonly assumed, indeed, that Abinadab, under whose guardianship it remained for twenty years, must necessarily have been of the tribe of Levi. See ABINADAB. Of this, however, there is not the slightest direct evidence, and against it there is the language of David in 1 Chron. xv, 2, "None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites, for them hath Jehovah chosen," which would lose half its force if it were not meant as a protest against a recent innovation, and the ground of a return to the more ancient order. So far as one can see one's way through these perplexities of a dark period, the most probable explanation—already suggested under KIRJATH-JEARIM—seems to be the following: The old names of Baaleh (Josh. xv, 9) and Kirjath-baal (Josh. xv, 60) suggest there had been of old some special sanctity attached to the place as the centre of a Canaanitish local worship. The fact that the ark was taken to the house of Abinadab in the *hill* (1 Sam. vii, 1), the Gibeah of 2 Sam. vi, 3, connects itself with that old Canaanitish reverence for high places which, through the whole history of the Israelites, continued to have such strong attractions for them. These may have seemed to the panic-stricken inhabitants of that district, mingling old things and new, the worship of Jehovah with the lingering superstitions of the conquered people, sufficient grounds to determine their choice of a locality. The consecration (the word used is the special sacerdotal term) of Eleazar as the guardian of the ark is, on this hypothesis, analogous in its way to the other irregular assumptions which characterize this period, though here the offence was less flagrant, and did not involve, apparently, the performance of any sacrificial acts. While, however, this aspect of the religious condition of the people brings the Levitical and priestly orders before us as having lost the position they had previously occupied, there were other influences at work tending to reinstate them.

II. *During the Monarchy.*—The deplorably disorganized condition of the Levitical order was not much improved in the reign of the first Hebrew monarch. The rule of Samuel and his sons, and the prophetical character now connected with the tribe, tended to give them the position of a ruling caste. In the strong desire of the people for a king we may perhaps trace a protest against the assumption by the Levites of a higher

position than that originally assigned them. The reign of Saul, in its later period, was at any rate the assertion of a self-willed power against the priestly order. The assumption of the sacrificial office, the massacre of the priests at Nob, the slaughter of the Gibeonites who were attached to their service, were parts of the same policy, and the narrative of the condemnation of Saul for the two former sins, no less than of the expiation required for the latter (2 Sam. xxi), shows by what strong measures the truth, of which that policy was a subversion, had to be impressed on the minds of the Israelites. The reign of David, however, brought the change from persecution to honor. The Levites were ready to welcome a king who, though not of their tribe, had been brought up under their training, was skilled in their arts, prepared to share even in some of their ministrations, and to array himself in their apparel (2 Sam. vi, 14); and 4600 of their number, with 3700 priests, waited upon David at Hebron—itself, it should be remembered, one of the priestly cities—to tender their allegiance (1 Chron. xii, 26). When his kingdom was established, there came a fuller organization of the whole tribe. Its position in relation to the priesthood was once again definitely recognised. When the ark was carried up to its new resting-place in Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was publicly acknowledged (1 Chron. xv, 2). When the sin of Uzza stopped the procession, it was placed for a time under the care of Obed-edom of Gath—probably Gath-rimmon—as one of the chiefs of the Kohathites (1 Chron. xiii, 13, Josh. xxi, 24; 1 Chron. xv, 18). In the procession which attended the ultimate conveyance of the ark to its new resting-place the Levites were conspicuous, wearing their linen ephods, and appearing in their new character as minstrels (1 Chron. xv, 27, 28). The Levites engaged in conveying the ark to Jerusalem were divided into six father's houses, headed by six chiefs, four belonging to Kohath, one to Gershon, and one to Merari (1 Chron. xv, 5, etc.). The most remarkable feature in the Levitical duties of this period is their being employed for the first time in choral service (1 Chron. xv, 16–24; xvi, 4–36); others, again, were appointed as door-keepers (xv, 23, 24). Still the thorough reorganization of the whole tribe was effected by the shepherd-king in the last days of his eventful life, that the Levites might be able at the erection of the Temple "to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts and the chambers, and the purifying of all holy things, and the work of the service of the house of God" (1 Chron. xxiii, 28). This reorganization may be described as follows:

1. *Number of Levites and Age for Service.*—The Levites from thirty years of age and upwards were first of all numbered, when it was found that they were 38,000 (1 Chron. xxiii, 2, 3); this being about 29,500 more than at the first Mosaic census. It will be seen that, according to this statement, the Levites were to commence service at thirty years of age, in harmony with the Mosaic institution (Numb. iv, 3, 23, 30); while in ver. 27 of the same chapter (i. e. 1 Chron. xxiii, 27) it is said that they were to take their share of duty at twenty years of age. Kimchi, who is followed by bishop Patrick, Michaelis, and others, tries to reconcile this apparent contradiction by submitting that the former refers to a census which David made at an earlier period, which was according to the Mosaic law (Numb. iv, 3), while the latter speaks of a second census which he made at the close of his life, when he found that the duties of the fixed sanctuary were much lighter and more numerous, and could easily be performed at the age of twenty, but at the same time required a larger staff of men. Against this, however, Bertheau rightly urges that, 1. The 38,000 Levites of thirty years of age given in the census of ver. 3 are the only persons appointed for the different Levitical offices, and that it is nowhere stated that this number was insufficient, or that the arrangements based thereupon, as recorded in vers. 4 and 5, were not carried out; and, 2. The chronicler plainly indicates, in ver. 25, etc., that he is about to impart a different statement from that communicated in ver. 3; for he mentions therein the reason which induced David not to abide by the Mosaic institution, which prescribes the age of service to commence at thirty, and in ver. 27 expressly points out the source from which he derived this deviating account. The two accounts are, therefore, entirely different; the one records that the Levites, in David's time, were numbered from their thirtieth year; while the other, which appears to the chronicler more trustworthy, states that David introduced the practice which afterwards obtained (2 Chron. xxxi, 17; Ezra iii, 8) of appointing Levites to office at the age of twenty.

2. *Division of the Levites according to the three great Families.*—Having ascertained their number, David, following the example of the Mosaic institution, divided the Levitical fathers' houses, according to their descent from the three sons of Levi, when it was ascertained that these three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were represented by twenty-four heads of fathers' houses (1 Chron. xxiii, 6–23, xxiv, 20–31), as follows:

- **Gershon**
  - Laadan
    - Jehiel.
    - Zetham.
    - Joel.
    - Shelomith or Shelomoth.
    - Haziel.
    - Haran.
  - Shimei
    - Jahath.
    - Zina or Ziza.
    - Jeush and Beriah, counted as one.
- **Kohath**
  - Amram
    - Shubael.
    - Rehabiah.
  - Izhar
    - Shelomith or Shelomoth.
  - Hebron
    - Jeriah.
    - Amariah.
    - Jahaziel.
    - Jekameam.
  - Uzziel
    - Michah.
    - Isshiah.
- **Merari**
  - Jaaziah
    - Shoham.
    - Zaccur.
    - Ibri.
  - Mahli
    - Kish-Jeremeel.
  - Mushi
    - Eder.
    - Jeremoth.

3. *Classification and Duties of the Levites.*—These twenty-four fathers' houses, numbering 38,000 men qualified for active service, were then divided into four classes, to each of which different duties were assigned.

(1.) The first class consisted of 24,000 Levites. These were appointed to assist the priests in the work of the sanctuary (λειτουργοῦντες). They had the custody of the official garments and sacred vessels, had to deliver them when wanted, and collect and lock them up again after they had been used, to replenish the sacrificial storehouse with cattle, flour, wine, oil, incense, and other articles used as sacrifices, and mete out each time the required quantity; to provide the different spices from which the priests compounded the incense (1 Chron. ix, 30); to prepare the shewbread and the other baked things used at sacrifices; to assist the priests in slaughtering the victims, and to attend to the cleaning of the Temple, etc. (1 Chron. xxiii, 28–32; ix, 29). They had most probably, also, the charge of the sacred treasury (1 Chron. xxvi, 20–28). Like the priests, they were subdivided into twenty-four courses or companies, according to the above-named twenty-four Levitical fathers' houses, and were headed respectively by one of the twenty-four representatives of these houses. Each of these courses was a week on duty, and was relieved on the Sabbath (2 Kings xi) by the company whose turn it was to serve next, so that there were always a thousand men of this class on duty, and each man had to serve two weeks during the year. The menial work was done by the *Nethinim*, who were appointed to assist the Levites in these matters. See NETHINIM.

(2.) The second class consisted of 4000, who were the musicians (משוררים, ὑμνῳδοί). They too were subdivided into twenty-four courses or choirs, each headed by a chief (1 Chron. xxv), and are to be traced back to the three great families of Levi, inasmuch as four of the

chiefs were sons of Asaph, a descendant of Gershon (1 Chron. vi, 24–28); six were sons of Jeduthun, also called Ethan (1 Chron. xv, 17), a descendant of Merari (1 Chron. vi, 28); and fourteen were sons of Haman, a descendant of Kohath (1 Chron. vi, 18). Each of these chiefs had eleven assistant masters from his own sons and brothers, thus making together 288 (1 Chron. xxv, 7). Hence, when these are deducted from the 4000, there remain for each band consisting of twelve chief musicians, 154 or 155 subordinate musicians. As twelve musicians were required to be present at the daily morning and evening service, thus demanding 168 to be on duty every week, the twenty-four courses which relieved each other in hebdomadal rotation must have consisted of 4032, and 4000 given by the chronicler is simply to be regarded as a round number. Of this class, therefore, as of the former, each individual had to serve two weeks during the year.

(3.) The third class also consisted of 4000. They were the gate-keepers (שוערים, *πυλωροί*, 1 Chron. xxvi, 1–19), and, as such, bore arms (ix, 19; 2 Chron. xxxi, 2). They had to open and shut the gates, to keep strangers and excommunicated or unclean persons from entering the courts, and to guard the storehouse, the Temple, and its courts at night. They, too, were subdivided into twenty-four courses, and were headed by twenty-four chiefs from the three great families of Levi: seven were sons of Meshelmiah, a descendant of Kohath; thirteen were from Obed-edom, a descendant of Gershon; and four were sons of Hosah, a descendant of Merari. These three families, including the twenty-four chiefs, consisted of ninety-three members, who, together with the three heads of the families, viz. Meshelmiah, Obed-edom, and Hosah, made ninety-six, thus yielding four chiefs for each course. We thus obtain a watch-course every week of 162 or 163 persons, under the command of four superior watches, one of whom was the commander-in-chief. As 24 sentinel posts are assigned to these guards, thus making 168 a week, it appears that each person only served one day in the week (1 Chron. xxvi).

(4.) The fourth class consisted of 6000, who were appointed for *outward affairs* (המלאכת החיצונה), as scribes and judges (1 Chron. xxvi, 29–32), in contradistinction to the work connected with the service of the sanctuary. It appears that this class was subdivided into three branches: Chenaniah and his sons were for the outward business of Israel (1 Chron. xxvi, 29); Hashabiah of Hebron and his brethren, numbering 1700, were officers west of Jordan, "in all the business of the Lord and in the service of the king" (ver. 30); whilst Jerijah, also of Hebron, and his brethren, numbering 2700 active men, were rulers east of Jordan "for every matter pertaining to God and affairs of the king" (vers. 31, 32). It will thus be seen that this class consisted of Kohathites, being descendants of Izhar and Hebron.

The Levites lived for the greater part of the year in their own cities, and came up at fixed periods to take their turn of work (1 Chron. xxv, xxvi). The predominance of the number twelve as the basis of classification might seem to indicate monthly periods, and the festivals of the new moon would naturally suggest such an arrangement. The analogous order in the civil and military administration (1 Chron. xxvii, 1) would tend to the same conclusion. It appears, indeed, that there was a change of some kind every week (1 Chron. ix, 25; 2 Chron. xxiii, 4, 8); but this is, of course, compatible with a system of rotation, which would give to each a longer period of residence, or with the permanent residence of the leader of each division within the precincts of the sanctuary. Whatever may have been the system, we must bear in mind that the duties now imposed upon the Levites were such as to require almost continuous practice. They would need, when their turn came, to be able to bear their parts in the great choral hymns of the Temple, and to take each his appointed share in the complex structure of a sacrificial liturgy, and for this a special study would be required. The education which the Levites received for their peculiar duties, no less than their connection, more or less intimate, with the schools of the prophets (see above), would tend to make them, so far as there was any education at all, the teachers of the others (there is, however, a curious Jewish tradition that the schoolmasters of Israel were of the tribe of Simeon [Solom. Jarchi on Gen. xlix, 7, in Godwyn's *Moses and Aaron*]), the transcribers and interpreters of the law, the chroniclers of the times in which they lived. We have some striking instances of their appearance in this new character. One of them, Ethan the Ezrahite, takes his place among the old Hebrew sages who were worthy to be compared with Solomon, and (Psa. lxxxix, title) his name appears as the writer of the 39th Psalm (1 Kings iv, 31; 1 Chron. xv, 17). One of the first to bear the title of "scribe" is a Levite (1 Chron. xxiv, 6), and this is mentioned as one of their special offices under Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv, 13). They are described as "officers and judges" under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 29), and, as such, are employed "in all the business of Jehovah, and in the service of the king." They are the agents of Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their work of reformation, and are sent forth to proclaim and enforce the law (2 Chron. xvii, 8; xxx, 22). Under Josiah the function has passed into a title, and they are "the Levites that taught all Israel" (2 Chron. xxxv, 3). The two books of Chronicles bear unmistakable marks of having been written by men whose interests were all gathered round the services of the Temple, and who were familiar with its records. The materials from which they compiled their narratives, and to which they refer as the works of seers and prophets, were written by men who were probably Levites themselves, or, if not, were associated with them.

This reorganization effected by David, we are told, was adopted by his son Solomon when the Temple was completed (2 Chron. viii, 14, etc.). The revolt of the ten tribes, and the policy pursued by Jeroboam, led to a great change in the position of the Levites. They were the witnesses of an appointed order and of a central worship. Jeroboam wished to make the priests the creatures and instruments of the king, and to establish a provincial and divided worship. The natural result was that they left the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel and gathered round the metropolis of Judah (2 Chron. xi, 13, 14). Their influence over the people at large was thus diminished, and the design of the Mosaic polity so far frustrated; but their power as a religious order was probably increased by this concentration within narrower limits. In the kingdom of Judah they were from this time forward a powerful body, politically as well as ecclesiastically. They brought with them the prophetic element of influence, in the wider as well as in the higher meaning of the word. We accordingly find them prominent in the war of Abijah against Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii, 10–12). They are, as before noticed, sent out by Jehoshaphat to instruct and judge the people (2 Chron. xix, 8–10). Prophets of their order encourage the king in his war against Moab and Ammon, and go before his army with their loud hallelujahs (2 Chron. xx, 21), and join afterwards in the triumph of his return. The apostasy that followed on the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah exposed them for a time to the dominance of a hostile system; but the services of the Temple appear to have gone on, and the Levites were again conspicuous in the counter-revolution effected by Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiii), and in restoring the Temple to its former stateliness under Jehoash (2 Chron. xxiv, 5). They shared in the disasters of the reign of Amaziah (2 Chron. xxv, 24) and in the prosperity of Uzziah, and were ready, we may believe, to support the priests, who, as representing their order, opposed the sacrilegious usurpation of the latter king (2 Chron. xxvi, 17). The closing of the Temple under Ahaz involved the cessation at once of their work and

of their privileges (2 Chron. xxviii, 24). Under Hezekiah they again became prominent, as consecrating themselves to the special work of cleansing and repairing the Temple (2 Chron. xxix, 12–15); and the hymns of David and of Asaph were again renewed. In this instance it was thought worthy of special record that those who were simply Levites were more "upright in heart" and zealous than the priests themselves (2 Chron. xxix, 34); and thus, in that great Passover, they took the place of the unwilling or unprepared members of the priesthood. Their old privileges were restored, they were put forward as teachers (2 Chron. xxx, 22), and the payment of tithes, which had probably been discontinued under Ahaz, was renewed (2 Chron. xxxi, 4). The genealogies of the tribe were revised (ver. 17), and the old classification kept its ground. The reign of Manasseh was for them, during the greater part of it, a period of depression. That of Josiah witnessed a fresh revival and reorganization (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8–13). In the great Passover of his eighteenth year they took their place as teachers of the people, as well as leaders of their worship (2 Chron. xxxv, 3, 15). Then came the Egyptian and Chaldæan invasions, and the rule of cowardly and apostate kings. The sacred tribe likewise showed itself unfaithful. The repeated protests of the priest Ezekiel indicate that they had shared in the idolatry of the people. The prominence into which they had been brought in the reigns of the two reforming kings had apparently tempted them to think that they might encroach permanently on the special functions of the priesthood, and the sin of Korah was renewed (Ezek. xliv, 10–14; xlviii, 11). They had, as the penalty of their sin, to witness the destruction of the Temple and to taste the bitterness of exile.

III. *After the Captivity.*—The position taken by the Levites in the first movements of the return from Babylon indicates that they had cherished the traditions and maintained the practices of their tribe. They, we may believe, were those who were specially called on to sing to their conquerors one of the songs of Zion (De Wette on Psa. cxxxvii). It is noticeable, however, that in the first body of returning exiles they were present in a disproportionately small number (Ezra ii, 36–42). Those who did come took their old parts at the foundation and dedication of the second Temple (Ezra iii, 10; vi, 18). In the next movement under Ezra their reluctance (whatever may have been its origin) was even more strongly marked. None of them presented themselves at the first great gathering (Ezra viii, 15). The special efforts of Ezra did not succeed in bringing together more than 38, and their place had to be filled by 220 of the Nethinim (ib. 20). There is a Jewish tradition (Surenhusius, *Mishna, Sota*, ix, 10) to the effect that, as a punishment for this backwardness, Ezra deprived them of their tithes, and transferred the right to the priests. Those who returned with him resumed their functions at the Feast of Tabernacles as teachers and interpreters (Neh. viii, 7), and those who were most active in that work were foremost also in chanting the hymn-like prayer which appears in Neh. ix as the last great effort of Jewish psalmody. They were recognised in the great national covenant, and the offerings and tithes which were their due were once more solemnly secured to them (Neh. x, 37–39). They took their old places in the Temple and in the villages near Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 29), and are present in full array at the great feast of the Dedication of the Wall. The two prophets who were active at the time of the return, Haggai and Zechariah, if they did not belong to the tribe, helped it forward in the work of restoration. The strongest measures were adopted by Nehemiah, as before by Ezra, to guard the purity of their blood from the contamination of mixed marriages (Ezra x, 23), and they were made the special guardians of the holiness of the Sabbath (Neh. xiii, 22). The last prophet of the O. T. sees, as part of his vision of the latter days, the time when the Lord "shall purify the sons of Levi" (Mal. iii, 3).

The guidance of the O. T. fails us at this point, and the history of the Levites in relation to the national life becomes consequently a matter of inference and conjecture. The synagogue worship, then originated, or receiving a new development, was organized irrespectively of them [see SYNAGOGUE], and thus throughout the whole of Palestine there were means of instruction in the law with which they were not connected. This would tend materially to diminish their peculiar claim on the reverence of the people; but where priests or Levites were present in the synagogue they were still entitled to some kind of precedence, and special sections in the lessons for the day were assigned to them (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. iv, 23). During the period that followed the captivity they contributed to the formation of the so-called Great Synagogue. The Levites, with the priests, theoretically constituted and practically formed the majority of the permanent Sanhedrim (Maimonides in Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi, 3), and as such had a large share in the administration of justice even in capital cases. In the characteristic feature of this period, as an age of scribes succeeding to an age of prophets, they, too, were likely to be sharers. The training and previous history of the tribe would predispose them to attach themselves to the new system as they had done to the old. They accordingly may have been among the scribes and elders who accumulated traditions. They may have attached themselves to the sects of Pharisees and Sadducees. But in proportion as they thus acquired fame and reputation individually, their functions as Levites became subordinate, and they were known simply as the inferior ministers of the Temple. They take no prominent part in the Maccabæan struggles, though they must have been present at the great purification of the Temple.

How strictly during this post-exilian period the Levitical duties were enforced, and how severely any neglect in performing them was punished, may be gathered from the following description in the Mishna: "The Levites had to guard twenty-four places: five were stationed at the five gates of the Mountain of the House (שערי הר הבית), four at the four corners inside, five at the five gates of the outer court, four at its four corners inside, one at the sacrificial storehouse, one at the curtain depository, and one behind the holy of holies. The inspector of the Mountain of the House went round through all the guards [every night] with burning torches before him. If the guard did not immediately stand up, the inspector of the Mountain of the House called out to him, 'Peace be with thee!' and if he perceived that he was asleep, he struck him with his stick, and even had the liberty of setting his garments on fire; and when it was asked, 'What is that noise in the court?' they were told, 'It is the noise of a Levite who is beaten, or whose clothes have been burnt, because he slept when on duty'" (*Middoth*, i, 1, 2). It is thought that allusion is made to the fact in the Apocalypse when it is said "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments" (Rev. xvi, 15). As for the Levites who were the singers, they were summoned by the blast of the trumpet after the incense was kindled upon the altar, when they assembled from all parts of the spacious Temple at the orchestra which was joined to the fifteen steps at the entrance from the women's outer court to the men's outer court. They sung psalms in antiphonies, accompanied by three musical instruments—the harp, the cithern, and cymbals—while the priests were pouring out on the altar the libation of wine. On Sunday they sung Psa. xxiv, on Monday Psa. xlviii, on Tuesday Psa. lxxxii, on Wednesday Psa. xciv, on Thursday Psa. lxxxi, on Friday Psa. xciii, and on the Sabbath Psa. xcii. Each of these psalms was sung in nine sections, with eight pauses (פרקים), and at each pause the priests blew trombones, when the whole congregation fell down every time worshipping on their faces (*Tamid*, vii, 3, 4).

The Levites had no prescribed canonical dress like the priests, as may be seen from the fact which Josephus narrates, that the singers requested Agrippa "to assemble the Sanhedrim in order to obtain leave for them to wear linen garments like the priests . . . contrary to the laws" (*Ant.* xx, 9, 6). But, though they wore no official garments at the service, yet the Talmud says that they ordinarily wore a linen outer-garment with sleeves, and a head-dress; and on journeys were provided with a staff, a pocket, and a copy of the Pentateuch (*Joma*, 122, a). Some modifications were at this period introduced in what was considered the necessary qualification for service. The Mosaic law, it will be remembered, regarded age as the only qualification, and freed the Levite from his duties when he was fifty years old; now that singing constituted so essential a part of the Levitical duties, any Levite who had not a good voice was regarded as disqualified, and if it continued good and melodious, he was retained in service all his lifetime, irrespective of age, but if it failed he was removed from that class which constituted the choristers to the gate-keepers (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kele Ha-Kodesh*, iii, 8). During the period of mourning a Levite was exempt from his duties in the Temple.

The Levites appear but seldom in the history of the N. T. Where we meet with their names it is as the type of a formal, heartless worship, without sympathy and without love (Luke x, 32). The same parable indicates Jericho as having become—what it had not been originally (see Josh. xxi 1 Chron. vi)—one of the great stations at which they and the priests resided (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chorograph.* c. 47). In John i, 19 they appear as delegates of the Jews—that is, of the Sanhedrim—coming to inquire into the credentials of the Baptist, and giving utterance to their own Messianic expectations. The mention of a Levite of Cyprus in Acts iv, 36, shows that the changes of the previous century had carried that tribe also into "the dispersed among the Gentiles." The conversion of Barnabas and Mark was probably no solitary instance of the reception by them of the new faith, which was the fulfilment of the old. If "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts vi, 7), it is not too bold to believe that their influence may have led Levites to follow their example; and thus the old psalms, and possibly also the old chants of the Temple service, might be transmitted through the agency of those who had been specially trained in them to be the inheritance of the Christian Church. Later on in the history of the first century, when the Temple had received its final completion under the younger Agrippa, we find one section of the tribe engaged in a new movement. With that strange unconsciousness of a coming doom which so often marks the last stage of a decaying system, the singers of the Temple thought it a fitting time to apply for the right of wearing the same linen garment as the priests, and persuaded the king that the concession of this privilege would be the glory of his reign (Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 8, 6). The other Levites at the same time asked for and obtained the privilege of joining in the Temple choruses, from which hitherto they had been excluded. The destruction of the Temple so soon after they had attained the object of their desires came as with a grim irony to sweep away their occupation, and so to deprive them of every vestige of that which had distinguished them from other Israelites. They were merged in the crowd of captives that were scattered over the Roman world, and disappear from the stage of history. The rabbinic schools, that rose out of the ruins of the Jewish polity, fostered a studied and habitual depreciation of the Levitical order as compared with their own teachers (M'Caul, *Old Paths*, p. 435). Individual families, it may be, cherished the tradition that their fathers, as priests or Levites, had taken part in the services of the Temple. If their claims were recognised, they received the old marks of reverence in the worship of the synagogue (comp. the Regulations of the Great Synagogue of London, in Margoliouth's *Hist. of the Jews in Great Britain*, iii, 270), took precedence in reading the lessons of the day (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. iv, 23), and pronounced the blessing at the close (Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, vi, 790). Their existence was acknowledged in some of the laws of the Christian emperors (Basnage, *l. c.*). The tenacity with which the exiled race clung to these recollections is shown in the prevalence of the names (Cohen, and Levita or Levy) which imply that those who bear them are of the sons of Aaron or the tribe of Levi, and in the custom which exempts the first-born of priestly or Levitical families from the payments which are still offered, in the case of others, as the redemption of the first-born (Leo of Modena, in Picart's *Cérémonies Religieuses*, i, 26; Allen's *Modern Judaism*, p. 297). In the mean time, the old name had acquired a new signification. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the later hierarchy the language of the earlier, and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title (ἱερεῖς) that had belonged to the sons of Aaron, while the deacons were habitually spoken of as Levites (Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. Λευίτης).

Though the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews have necessarily done away with the Levitical duties which were strictly local, yet the Levites, like the priests, still exist, have to this day certain functions to perform, and continue to enjoy certain privileges and immunities. On those festivals whereon the priests pronounce the benediction on the congregation of Israel during the morning service, as prescribed in Numb. vi, 22–27, the Levites have "to wait on the priests," and wash their hands prior to the giving of the said blessing. At the reading of the law in the synagogue, the Levite is called to the second section, the first being assigned to the priest. See HAPHTARAH. Moreover, like the priests, the Levites are exempt from redeeming their first-born, and this exemption even extends to women of the tribe of Levi who marry Israelites, i. e. Jews of any other tribe.

IV. *Literature.*—Mishna, *Erachin*, ii, 3–6; *Tamid*, vii, 3, 4; *Succa*, v, 4; *Bikkurim*, iii, 4; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Kele Ha-Mikdash*, iii, 1–11; Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, sec. 52 (English translation, i, 252 sq.); Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, ii, 3, 39, 165, 342, 428; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, p. 126, 204, 387–424 (Bruns. 1847); the same, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Vollendung des zweiten Tempels*, i, 55–58, 63–66, 141 (Nordhausen, 1855); Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, i, 89–106 (Berl. 1853); the same, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, vol. ii, ch. lxxviii, p. 342 (Königsb. 1856); Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie*, i, 160 (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Kalisch, *Historical and Critical Commentary on Genesis*, p. 735–744 (Lond. 1848); Brown, *Antiquities*, i, 301–347; Godwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, i, 5; Witsius, *Dissert. II. de Theocrat. Israelitar.*; Jennings, *Antiquities*, p. 184–206; Carpzov, *Apparat. Crit.* (see Index); Saubert, *Comm. de Sacerdot. et sacris Hæbr. personis*, in *Opp.* p. 283 sq.; Gramberg, *Krit. Geschichte d. Religionsideen des Alten Test.* vol. i, c. iii; Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* ii, 6; Ugolino, *Sacerdot. Hebr.* ch. xii, in his *Thesaur.* vol. xiii; Schacht, *Animadvers. ad Iken.* p. 525 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verfassung.* ii, 377 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 368 sq.; Willisch, *De filiis Levitarum* (Lips. 1708).

Levites, MILITARY, a name given to such ministers in the time of the Commonwealth as filled the office of chaplain in the regiments of the Parliamentary army.

Levit'icus, so called in the Vulgate from treating chiefly of the Levitical service; in the Heb. וַיִּקְרָא, *and he called*, being the word with which it begins; in the Sept. Λευϊτικόν; the third book of the Pentateuch, called also by the later Jews תּוֹרַת כֹּהֲנִים, "law of the priests," and תּוֹרַת קָרְבָּנוֹת, "law of offerings." In our treatment of it we have especial regard to the various sacrifices enumerated.

I. *Contents.*—Leviticus contains the further statement and development of the Sinaitic legislation, the beginnings of which are described in Exodus. It exhibits the *historical* progress of this legislation; consequently, we must not expect to find the laws detailed in it in a systematic form. There is, nevertheless, a certain order observed, which arose from the nature of the subject, and of which the plan may easily be perceived. The whole is intimately connected with the contents of Exodus, at the conclusion of which book that sanctuary is described with which all external worship was connected (Exod. xxxv–xl).

Leviticus begins by describing the worship itself (ch. i–xvii), and concludes with personal distinctions and exhortations as to the worshippers (ch. xviii–xxvii). More specifically the book may be divided into seven leading sections.

(I.) *The Laws directly relating to Sacrifices* (ch. i–vii). —At first God spoke to the people out of the thunder and lightning of Sinai, and gave them his holy commandments by the hand of a mediator; but henceforth his presence is to dwell not on the secret top of Sinai, but in the midst of his people, both in their wanderings through the wilderness and afterwards in the Land of Promise. Hence the first directions which Moses receives after the work is finished have reference to the offerings which were to be brought to the door of the tabernacle. As Jehovah draws near to the people in the tabernacle, so the people draw near to Jehovah in the offering. Without offerings none may approach him. The regulations respecting the sacrifices fall into three groups, and each of these groups again consists of a decalogue of instructions. Bertheau has observed that this principle runs through all the laws of Moses. They are all modelled after the pattern of the ten commandments, so that each distinct subject of legislation is always treated of under ten several enactments or provisions.

1. The first group of regulations (ch. i–iii) deals with three kinds of offerings: the burnt-offering (עוֹלָה), the meat-offering (מִנְחָה), and the thank-offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים).

a. The burnt-offering (chap. i) in three sections. It might be either (1) a male without blemish from the *herds* (מִן הַבָּקָר) (ver. 3–9), or (2) a male without blemish from the *flocks*, or lesser cattle (הַצֹּאן) (ver. 10–13), or (3) it might be fowls, an offering of turtle-doves or young pigeons (ver. 14–17). The subdivisions are here marked clearly enough, not only by the three *kinds* of sacrifice, but also by the *form* in which the enactment is put. Each begins with, "If his offering," etc., and each ends with, "An offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah."

b. The next group (ch. ii) presents many more difficulties. Its parts are not so clearly marked, either by prominent features in the subject-matter, or by the more technical boundaries of certain initial and final phrases. We have here the meat-offering, or bloodless offering, in four sections: (1) in its uncooked form, consisting of fine flour with oil and frankincense (ver. 1–3); (2) in its cooked form, of which three different kinds are specified—baked in the oven, fried, or boiled (verses 4–10); (3) the prohibition of leaven, and the direction to use salt in all the meat-offerings (ver. 11–13); (4) the oblation of first-fruits (ver. 14–16).

c. The *Shelamim*, "peace-offering" (A. V.), or "thank-offering" (Ewald) (chap. iii), in three sections. Strictly speaking, this falls under two heads: first, when it is of the *herd;* and, secondly, when it is of the *flock*. But this last has again its subdivision; for the offering, when of the flock, may be either a lamb or a goat. Accordingly, the three sections are, verses 1–5; 7–11; 12–16. Ver. 6 is merely introductory to the second class of sacrifices, and ver. 17 a general conclusion, as in the case of other laws. This concludes the first decalogue of the book.

2. The laws concerning the sin-offering and the trespass- (or guilt-) offering (chap. iv, v). The sin-offering (chap. iv) is treated of under four specified cases, after a short introduction to the whole in ver. 1, 2: (1) the sin-offering for the priest, 3–12; (2) for the whole congregation, 13–21; (3) for a ruler, 22–26; (4) for one of the common people, 27–35.

After these four cases, in which the offering is to be made for four different classes, there follow provisions respecting three several kinds of transgression for which atonement must be made. It is not quite clear whether these should be ranked under the head of the sin-offering or of the trespass-offering. See OFFERING. We may, however, follow Bertheau, Baumgarten, and Knobel in regarding them as special instances in which a *sin*-offering was to be brought. The three cases are: first, when any one hears a curse, and conceals what he hears (ver. 1); secondly, when any one touches, without knowing or intending it, any unclean thing (ver. 2, 3); lastly, when any one takes an oath inconsiderately (verse 4). For each of these cases the same trespass-offering, "a female from the flock, a lamb or kid of the goats," is appointed; but, with that mercifulness which characterizes the Mosaic law, express provision is made for a less costly offering where the offerer is poor.

This decalogue is then completed by the three regulations respecting the guilt-offering (or trespass-offering): first, when any one sins "through ignorance in the holy things of Jehovah" (ver. 14, 16); next, when a person, without knowing it, "commits any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of Jehovah" (17–19); lastly, when a man lies and swears falsely concerning that which was intrusted to him, etc. (verses 20–26). This decalogue, like the preceding one, has its characteristic words and expressions. The prominent word which introduces so many of the enactments is נֶפֶשׁ, "soul" (see iv, 2, 27; v, 1, 2, 4, 15, 17, vi, 2), and the phrase, "If a soul shall sin" (iv, 2), is, with occasional variations having an equivalent meaning, the distinctive phrase of the section. As in the former decalogue the nature of the offerings, so in this the person and the nature of the offence are the chief features in the several statutes.

3. Naturally upon the law of sacrifices follows the law of the priests' duties when they offer the sacrifices (ch. vi, vii). Hence we find Moses directed to address himself immediately to Aaron and his sons (vi, 2, 18 = vi, 9, 25, A.V.). In this group the different kinds of offerings are named in nearly the same order as in the two preceding decalogues, except that the offering at the consecration of a priest follows, instead of the thank-offering, immediately after the meat-offering, which it resembles, and the thank-offering now appears after the trespass-offering. There are, therefore, in all, six kinds of offering, and in the case of each of these the priest has his distinct duties. Bertheau has very ingeniously so distributed the enactments in which these duties are prescribed as to arrange them all in five decalogues. We will briefly indicate his arrangement.

(1.) The first decalogue. (*a.*) "This is the law of the burnt-offering" (vi, 9, A.V.), in five enactments, each verse (ver. 9–13) containing a separate enactment. (*b.*) "And this is the law of the meat-offering" (verse 14), again in five enactments, each of which is, as before, contained in a single verse (ver. 14–18).

(2.) The next decalogue is contained in verses 19–30. (*a.*) Ver. 19 is merely introductory; then follow, in five verses, five distinct directions with regard to the offering at the time of the consecration of the priests, the first in ver. 20, the next two in ver. 21, the fourth in the former part of ver. 22, and the last in the latter part of ver. 22 and ver. 23. (*b.*) "This is the law of the sin-offering" (ver. 25). Then the five enactments, each in one verse, except that two verses (27, 28) are given to the third.

(3.) The third decalogue is contained in ch. vii, 1–10, the laws of the trespass-offering. But it is impossible

to avoid a misgiving as to the soundness of Bertheau's system when we find him making the words "It is most holy," in verse 1, the first of the ten enactments. This he is obliged to do, as verses 3 and 4 evidently form but one.

(4.) The fourth decalogue, after an introductory verse (verse 11), is contained in ten verses (verses 12–21).

(5.) The last decalogue consists of certain general laws about the fat, the blood, the wave-breast, etc., and is comprised again in ten verses (ver. 23–33), the verses, as before, marking the divisions.

The chapter closes with a brief historical notice of the fact that these several commands were given to Moses on Mount Sinai (verse 35–38).

(II.) *An entirely historical section* (chap. viii–x), in three parts.—1. In ch. viii we have the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses before the whole congregation. They are washed; he is arrayed in the priestly vestments and anointed with the holy oil; his sons also are arrayed in their garments, and the various offerings appointed are offered. 2. In chap. ix Aaron offers, eight days after his consecration, his first offering for himself and the people: this comprises for himself a sin- and burnt- offering, and a peace- (or thank-) offering. He blesses the people, and fire comes down from heaven and consumes the burnt-offering. 3. Ch. x tells how Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, eager to enjoy the privileges of their new office, and perhaps too much elated by its dignity, forgot or despised the restrictions by which it was fenced round (Exod. xxx, 7, etc.), and, daring to "offer strange fire before Jehovah," perished because of their presumption.

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them, therefore, began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (ver. 6, 7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defence, "Such things have befallen me: and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" Moses, the lawgiver and the judge, admits the plea, and honors the natural feelings of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

(III.) *The laws concerning purity and impurity*, and the appropriate sacrifices and ordinances for putting away impurity (chap. xi–xvi). The first seven decalogues had reference to the putting away of *guilt*. By the appointed sacrifices the separation between man and God was healed. The next seven concern themselves with the putting away of *impurity*. That chap. xi–xv hang together so as to form one series of laws there can be no doubt. Besides that they treat of kindred subjects, they have their characteristic words, טמא, טמאה, "unclean," "uncleanness," טהור, טהר, "clean," which occur in almost every verse. The only question is about ch. xvi, which by its opening is connected immediately with the occurrence related in ch. x. Historically it would seem, therefore, that ch. xvi ought to have followed ch. x. As this order is neglected, it would lead us to suspect that some other principle of arrangement than that of historical sequence has been adopted. This we find in the solemn significance of the great day of atonement. The high-priest on that day made atonement "because of the *uncleanness* of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (xvi, 16), and he "reconciled the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar" (ver. 20). Delivered from their guilt and cleansed from their pollutions, from that day forward the children of Israel entered upon a new and holy life. This was typified both by the ordinance that the bullock and the goat for the sin-offering were burnt without the camp (ver. 27), and also by the sending away of the goat laden with the iniquities of the people into the wilderness. Hence ch. xvi seems to stand most fitly at the end of this second group of seven decalogues. It has reference, we believe, not only (as Bertheau supposes) to the putting away, as by one solemn act, of all those uncleannesses mentioned in ch. xi–xv, and for which the various expiations and cleansings there appointed were temporary and insufficient, but also to the making of atonement, in the sense of hiding sin or putting away its guilt. For not only do we find the idea of cleansing as from defilement, but far more prominently the idea of reconciliation. The often-repeated word כפר, "to cover, to atone," is the great word of the section.

1. The first decalogue in this group refers to clean and unclean flesh (ch. xi). Five classes of animals are pronounced unclean. The first four enactments declare what animals may or may not be eaten, whether (1) beasts of the earth (ver. 2–8), or (2) fishes (ver. 9–12), or (3) birds (verse 13–20), or (4) creeping things with wings. The next four are intended to guard against pollution by contact with the carcase of any of these animals: (5) ver. 24–26; (6) ver. 27, 28; (7) ver. 29–38; (8) verse 39–40. The ninth and tenth specify the last class of animals which are unclean for food, (9) ver. 41, 42, and forbid any other kind of pollution by means of them, (10) verse 43–45. Verse 46 and 47 are merely a concluding summary.

2. (*a.*) Women's purification in childbed (chap. xii). The whole of this chapter, according to Bertheau, constitutes (1) the first law of this decalogue. (*b.*) The remaining nine are to be found in the next chapter (xiii), which treats of the signs of leprosy in man and in garments: (2) ver. 1–8; (3) ver. 9–17; (4) ver. 18–23; (5) ver. 24–28; (6) ver. 29–37; (7) ver. 38, 39; (8) ver. 40, 41; (9) ver. 42–46; (10) ver. 47–59. This arrangement of the several sections is not altogether free from objection, but it is certainly supported by the characteristic mode in which each section opens. Thus, for instance, ch. xii, 2 begins with אִשָּׁה כִּי תַזְרִיעַ; ch. xiii, 2 with אָדָם כִּי יִהְיֶה, ver. 9 with נֶגַע צָרַעַת כִּי תִהְיֶה, and so on, the same order being always observed, the substantive being placed first, then כִּי, and then the verb, except only in ver. 42, where the substantive is placed after the verb.

3. "The law of the leper in the day of his cleansing," i. e. the law which the *priest* is to observe in purifying the leper (xiv, 1–32). The priest is mentioned in ten verses, each of which begins one of the ten sections of this law: ver. 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20. In each instance the word הַכֹּהֵן is preceded by ו consecut. with the perf. It is true that in verse 3, and also in verse 14, the word הַכֹּהֵן occurs twice; but in both verses there is MS. authority, as well as that of the Vulg. and Arab. versions, for the absence of the second. Verses 21–32 may be regarded as a supplemental provision in cases where the leper is too poor to bring the required offering.

4. The leprosy in a house (xiv, 33–57). It is not so easy here to trace the arrangement noticed in so many other laws. There are no characteristic words or phrases to guide us. Bertheau's division is as follows: (1) ver. 34, 35; (2) ver. 36, 37; (3) ver. 38; (4) ver. 39; (5) ver. 40; (6) ver. 41, 42; (7) ver. 43–45. Then, as usual, follows a short summary which closes the statute concerning leprosy, ver. 54–57.

5, 6. The law of uncleanness by issue, etc., in two decalogues (xv, 1–15; xv, 16–31). The division is clearly marked, as Bertheau observes, by the form of cleansing, which is so exactly similar in the two principal cases, and which closes each series: (1) ver. 13–15; (2) ver. 28–30. We again give his arrangement, though we do not profess to regard it as in all respects satisfactory.

(*a.*) (1) Ver. 2, 3; (2) ver. 4; (3) ver. 5; (4) ver. 6; (5) ver. 7; (6) ver. 8; (7) ver. 9; (8) ver. 10; (9) ver. 11, 12 [these Bertheau considers as one enactment, because it is another way of saying that either the *man* or *thing* which the unclean person touches is unclean;

but, on the same principle, verses 4 and 5 might just as well form one enactment]; (10) ver. 13–15.

(*b.*) (1) Ver. 16; (2) ver. 17; (3) ver. 18; (4) ver. 19; (5) ver. 20; (6) ver. 21; (7) ver. 22; (8) ver. 23; (9) ver. 24; (10) ver. 28–30. In order to complete this arrangement, he considers ver. 25–27 as a kind of supplementary enactment provided for an irregular uncleanness, leaving it as quite uncertain, however, whether this was a later addition or not. Verses 32 and 33 form merely the same general conclusion which we have had before in xiv, 54–57.

7. The last decalogue of the second group of seven decalogues is to be found in chap. xvi, which treats of the great day of atonement. The law itself is contained in verses 1–28. The remaining verses, 29–34, consist of an exhortation to its careful observance. In the act of atonement three persons are concerned: the high-priest, in this instance Aaron; the man who leads away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; and he who burns the skin, flesh, and dung of the bullock and goat of the sin-offering without the camp. The last two have special purifications assigned them—the second because he has touched the goat laden with the guilt of Israel, the third because he has come in contact with the sin-offering. The ninth and tenth enactments prescribe what these purifications are, each of them concluding with the same formula, וְאַחֲרֵי בֵן יָבוֹא אֶל הַמַּחֲנֶה, and hence distinguished from each other. The duties of Aaron, consequently, ought, if the division into decades is correct, to be comprised in eight enactments. Now the name of Aaron is repeated eight times, and in six of these it is preceded by the perf. with ו consecut., as we observed was the case before when "the priest" was the prominent figure. According to this, then, the decalogue will stand thus: (1) Verse 2, Aaron not to enter the holy place at all times; (2) verses 3–5, with what sacrifices and in what dress Aaron is to enter the holy place; (3) verses 6, 7, Aaron to offer the bullock for himself, and to set the two goats before Jehovah; (4) Aaron to cast lots on the two goats; (5) verses 9, 10, Aaron to offer the goat on which the lot falls for Jehovah, and to send away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; (6) verses 11–19, Aaron to sprinkle the blood both of the bullock and of the goat to make atonement for himself, for his house, and for the whole congregation, as also to purify the altar of incense with the blood; (7) verses 20–22, Aaron to lay his hands on the living goat, and confess over it all the sins of the children of Israel; (8) verses 23–25, Aaron after this to take off his linen garments, bathe himself, and put on his priestly garments, and then offer his burnt-offering and that of the congregation; (9) verse 26, the man by whom the goat is sent into the wilderness to purify himself; (10) verses 27–28, what is to be done by him who burns the sin-offering without the camp.

(IV.) *Laws chiefly intended to mark the Separation between Israel and the Heathen Nations* (chap. xvii–xx).—We here reach the great central point of the book. All going before was but a preparation for this. Two great truths have been established: first, that God can only be approached by means of appointed sacrifices; next, that man in nature and life is full of pollution, which must be cleansed. Now a third is taught, viz., that not by several cleansings for several sins and pollutions can guilt be put away. The several acts of sin are but so many manifestations of the sinful nature. For this, therefore, also must atonement be made by one solemn act, which shall cover all transgressions, and turn away God's righteous displeasure from Israel. Israel is now reminded that it is the holy nation. The great atonement offered, it is to enter upon a new life. It is a separate nation, sanctified and set apart for the service of God. It may not, therefore, do after the abominations of the heathen by whom it is surrounded. Here, consequently, we find those laws and ordinances which especially distinguish the nation of Israel from all other nations of the earth.

Here again we may trace, as before, a group of seven decalogues; but the several decalogues are not so clearly marked, nor are the characteristic phrases and the introductions and conclusions so common. In ch. xviii there are twenty enactments, and in ch. xix thirty. In ch. xvii, on the other hand, there are only six, and in ch. xx there are fourteen. As it is quite manifest that the enactments in ch. xviii are entirely separated by a fresh introduction from those in ch. xvii, Bertheau, in order to preserve the usual arrangement of the laws in decalogues, would transpose this chapter, and place it after ch. xix. He observes that the laws in ch. xvii, and those in chap. xx, 1–9, are akin to one another, and may very well constitute a single decalogue, and, what is of more importance, that the words in xviii, 1–5 form the natural introduction to this whole group of laws: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances," etc. There is, however, a point of connection between chapters xvii and xviii which must not be overlooked, and which seems to indicate that their position in our present text is the right one. All the six enactments in chap. xvii (ver. 3–5, ver. 6, 7, ver. 8, 9, ver. 10–12, ver. 13, 14, ver. 15) bear upon the nature and meaning of the sacrifice to Jehovah as compared with the sacrifices offered to false gods. It would seem, too, that it was necessary to guard against any license to idolatrous practices which might possibly be drawn from the sending of the goat for Azazel into the wilderness [see ATONEMENT, DAY OF], especially, perhaps, against the Egyptian custom of appeasing the evil spirit of the wilderness and averting his malice (Hengstenberg, *Mose u. Ægypten*, p. 179; Movers, *Phönicier*, i, 369). To this there may be an allusion in ver. 7. Perhaps, however, it is better and more simple to regard the enactments in these two chapters (with Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, II, i, 245) as directed against two prevalent heathen practices, the eating of blood and fornication. It is remarkable, as showing how intimately moral and ritual observances were blended together in the Jewish mind, that abstinence "from blood and things strangled, and fornication," was laid down by the apostles as the only condition of communion to be required of Gentile converts to Christianity. Before we quit this chapter one observation may be made. The rendering of the A.V. in ver. 11, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," should be, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement *by means of the life*." This is important. It is not blood merely as such, but blood as having in it the principle of life that God accepts in sacrifice; for, by thus giving vicariously the life of the dumb animal, the sinner confesses that his own life is forfeit.

In ch. xviii, after the introduction to which we have already alluded, ver. 1–5—and in which God claims obedience on the double ground that he is Israel's God, and that to keep his commandments is life (ver. 5)—there follow twenty enactments concerning unlawful marriages and unnatural lusts. The first ten are contained one in each verse (verses 6–15). The next ten range themselves in like manner with the verses, except that verses 17 and 23 contain each two. Of the twenty the first fourteen are alike in form, as well as in the repeated עֶרְוָה לֹא תְגַלֵּה.

In chap. xix are three decalogues, introduced by the words, "Ye shall be holy, for I Jehovah your God am holy," and ending with, "Ye shall observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them. I am Jehovah." The laws here are of a very mixed character, and many of them a repetition merely of previous laws. Of the three decalogues, the first is comprised in verses 3–13, and may be thus distributed: (1) verse 3, to honor father and mother; (2) ver. 3, to keep the Sabbath; (3) ver. 4, not to turn to idols; (4) ver. 4, not to make mol-

ten gods (these two enactments being separated on the same principle as the first and second commandments in the Great Decalogue or Two Tables); (5) verses 5–8, of thank-offerings; (6) ver. 9, 10, of gleaning; (7) verse 11, not to steal or lie; (8) verse 12, not to swear falsely; (9) verse 13, not to defraud one's neighbor; (10) verse 13, the wages of him that is hired, etc.

The next decalogue, verses 14–25, Bertheau arranges thus: ver. 14, ver. 15, ver. 16*a*, ver. 16*b*, ver. 17, ver. 18, ver. 19*a*, ver. 19*b*, ver. 20–22, ver. 23–25. We object, however, to making the words in 19*a*, "Ye shall keep my statutes," a separate enactment. There is no reason for this. A much better plan would be to consider ver. 17 as consisting of two enactments, which is manifestly the case.

The third decalogue may be thus distributed: verse 26*a*, ver. 26*b*, ver. 27, ver. 28, ver. 29, ver. 30, ver. 31, ver. 32, ver. 33, 34, ver. 35, 36.

We have thus found five decalogues in this group. Bertheau completes the number seven by transposing, as we have seen, chap. xvii, and placing it immediately before ch. xx. He also transfers ver. 27 of ch. xx to what he considers its proper place, viz., after ver. 6. It must be confessed that the enactment in ver. 27 stands very awkwardly at the end of the chapter, completely isolated as it is from all other enactments; for ver. 22–26 are the natural conclusion to this whole section. But, admitting this, another difficulty remains, that, according to him, the seventh decalogue begins at ver. 10, and another transposition is necessary, so that ver. 7, 8 may stand after verse 9, and so conclude the preceding series of ten enactments. It is better, perhaps, to abandon the search for complete symmetry than to adopt a method so violent in order to obtain it.

It should be observed that ch. xviii, 6–23, and ch. xx, 10–21, stand in such a relation to one another that the latter declares the penalties attached to the transgression of many of the commandments given in the former. But, though we may not be able to trace in chap. xvii–xx seven decalogues, in accordance with the theory of which we have been speaking, there can be no doubt that they form a distinct section of themselves, of which xx, 22–26 is the proper conclusion.

Like the other sections, it has some characteristic expressions: (*a*) "Ye shall keep my judgments and my statutes" (מִשְׁפָּטַי, חֻקֹּתַי) occurs xviii, 4, 5, 26; xix, 37; xx, 8, 22, but is not met with either in the preceding or the following chapters. (*b*) The constantly recurring phrases, "I am Jehovah," "I am Jehovah your God," "Be ye holy, for I am holy," "I am Jehovah which hallow you." In the earlier sections this phraseology is only found in Lev. xi, 44, 45, and Exod. xxxi, 13. In the section which follows (chap. xxi–xxv) it is much more common, this section being in a great measure a continuation of the preceding.

(V.) We come now to the last group of decalogues—that contained in ch. xxi–xxvi, 2. The subjects comprised in these enactments are—1. The personal purity of the priests. They may not defile themselves for the dead; their wives and daughters must be pure, and they themselves must be free from all personal blemish (ch. xxi). 2. The eating of the holy things is permitted only to priests who are free from all uncleanness: they and their household only may eat them (ch. xxii, 1–16). 3. The offerings of Israel are to be pure and without blemish (ch. xxii, 17–33). 4. The last series provides for the due celebration of the great festivals when priests and people were to be gathered together before Jehovah in holy convocation (ch. xxiii, xxv), with an episode (ch. xxiv).

Up to this point we trace system and purpose in the order of the legislation. Thus, for instance, ch. xi–xvi treats of external purity; ch. xvii–xx of moral purity; chap. xxi–xxiii of the holiness of the priests, and their duties with regard to holy things; the whole concluding with provisions for the solemn feasts on which all Israel appeared before Jehovah. We will again briefly indicate Bertheau's groups, and then append some general observations on this whole section.

a. Chapter xxi, ten laws, as follows: (1) ver. 1–3; (2) ver. 4; (3) ver. 5, 6; (4) ver. 7, 8; (5) ver. 9; (6) ver. 10, 11; (7) ver. 12; (8) ver. 13, 14; (9) ver. 17–21; (10) ver. 22, 23. The first five laws concern all the priests; the sixth to the eighth, the high-priest; the ninth and tenth, the effects of bodily blemish in particular cases.

b. Chap. xxii, 1–16. (1) ver. 2; (2) ver. 3; (3) ver. 4; (4) ver. 4–7; (5) ver. 8, 9; (6) ver. 10; (7) ver. 11; (8) ver. 12; (9) ver. 13; (10) ver. 14–16.

c. Chap. xxii, 17–33. (1) ver. 18–20; (2) ver. 21; (3) ver. 22; (4) ver. 23; (5) ver. 24; (6) ver. 25; (7) ver. 27; (8) ver. 28; (9) ver. 29; (10) ver. 30; and a general conclusion in verse 31–33.

d. Chap. xxiii. (1) ver. 3; (2) ver. 5–7; (3) ver. 8; (4) ver. 9–14; (5) ver. 15–21; (6) ver. 22; (7) ver. 24, 25; (8) ver. 27–32; (9) ver. 34, 35; (10) ver. 36; verses 37, 38 contain the conclusion, or general summing up of the Decalogue. On the remainder of the chapter, as well as chapter xxiv, see below.

e. Chap. xxv, 1–22. (1) ver. 2; (2) ver. 3, 4; (3) ver. 5; (4) ver. 6; (5) ver. 8–10; (6) ver. 11, 12; (7) ver. 13; (8) ver. 14; (9) ver. 15; (10) ver. 16; with a concluding formula in verse 18–22.

f. Chap. xxv, 23–38. (1) ver. 23, 24; (2) ver. 25; (3) ver. 26, 27; (4) ver. 28; (5) ver. 29; (6) ver. 30; (7) ver. 31; (8) ver. 32, 33; (9) ver. 34; (10) ver. 35–37; the conclusion to the whole in verse 38.

g. Chap. xxv, 39–xxvi, 2. (1) ver. 39; (2) ver. 40–42; (3) ver. 43; (4) ver. 44, 45; (5) ver. 46; (6) ver. 47–49; (7) ver. 50; (8) ver. 51, 52; (9) ver. 53; (10) ver. 54.

It will be observed that the above arrangement is only completed by omitting the latter part of ch. xxiii and the whole of ch. xxiv. But it is clear that ch. xxiii, 39–44 is an addition, containing further instructions respecting the Feast of Tabernacles. Verse 39, as compared with verse 34, shows that the same feast is referred to; while ver. 37, 38 are no less manifestly the original conclusion of the laws respecting the feasts which are enumerated in the previous part of the chapter. Ch. xxiv, again, has a peculiar character of its own. First, we have a command concerning the oil to be used in the lamps belonging to the tabernacle, but this is only a repetition of an enactment already given in Exod. xxvii, 20, 21, which seems to be its natural place. Then follow directions about the shewbread. These do not occur previously. In Exodus the shewbread is spoken of always as a matter of course, concerning which no regulations are necessary (comp. Exod. xxv, 30; xxxv, 13; xxxix, 36). Lastly come certain enactments arising out of a historical occurrence. The son of an Egyptian father by an Israelitish woman blasphemes the name of Jehovah, and Moses is commanded to stone him in consequence; and this circumstance is the occasion of the following laws being given: (1) That a blasphemer, whether Israelite or stranger, is to be stoned (comp. Exod. xxii, 28); (2) That he that kills any man shall surely be put to death (comp. Exod. xxi, 12–27); (3) That he that kills a beast shall make it good (not found where we might have expected it, in the series of laws Exod. xxi, 28–xxii, 16); (4) That if a man cause a blemish in his neighbor he shall be requited in like manner (comp. Exod. xxi, 22–25). (5) We have then a repetition in an inverse order of verses 17, 18; and (6) the injunction that there shall be one law for the stranger and the Israelite; (7) finally, a brief notice of the infliction of the punishment in the case of the son of Shelomith, who blasphemed. Not another instance is to be found in the whole collection in which any historical circumstance is made the occasion of enacting a law. Then, again, the laws (2), (3), (4), (5), are mostly repetitions of existing laws, and seem here to have no connection with the event to which they are referred. Either, therefore, some other circumstances took place at the same time with which we are not acquainted, or these isolated laws, detached from their proper connec-

sion, were grouped together here, in obedience perhaps to some traditional association.

(VI.) These decalogues are now fitly closed by words of *promise and threat*—promise of largest, richest blessing to those that hearken unto and do these commandments; threats of utter destruction to those that break the covenant of their God. Thus the second great division of the law closes like the first, except that the first part, or Book of the Covenant, ends (Exod. xxiii, 20–33) with promises of blessing only. *There* nothing is said of the judgments which are to follow transgression, because as yet the covenant had not been made. But when once the nation had freely entered into that covenant, they bound themselves to accept its sanctions, its penalties, as well as its rewards. Nor can we wonder if in these sanctions the punishment of transgression holds a larger place than the rewards of obedience; for already was it but too plain that "Israel would not obey." From the first they were a stiff-necked and rebellious race, and from the first the doom of disobedience hung like a fiery sword above their heads.

(VII.) *On Vows.*—The legislation is evidently completed in the last words of the preceding chapter: "These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses." Chap. xxvii is an *appendix*, again closed, however, by a similar formula, which at least shows that the transcriber considered it to be an integral part of the original Mosaic legislation, though he might be at a loss to assign it its place. Bertheau classes it with the other less regularly grouped laws at the beginning of the book of Numbers. He treats the section Lev. xxvii–Numb. x, 10 as a series of supplements to the Sinaitic legislation.

II. *Integrity.* — This is very generally admitted. Those critics even who are in favor of different documents in the Pentateuch assign nearly the whole of this book to one writer, the Elohist, or author of the original document. According to Knobel, the only portions which are not to be referred to the Elohist are—Moses's rebuke of Aaron because the goat of the sin-offering had been burnt (x, 16–20); the group of laws in chap. xvii–xx; certain additional enactments respecting the Sabbath and the feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles (xxiii, part of ver. 2, from מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה, and ver. 3, ver. 18, 19, 22, 39–44); the punishments ordained for blasphemy, murder, etc. (xxiv, 10–23); the directions respecting the sabbatical year (xxv, 18–22), and the promises and warnings contained in ch. xxvi.

With regard to the section ch. xvii–xx, Knobel does not consider the whole of it to have been borrowed from the same sources. Ch. xvii he believes was introduced here by the Jehovist from some ancient document, while he admits, nevertheless, that it contains certain Elohistic forms of expression, as כָּל בָּשָׂר, "all flesh," ver. 14; נֶפֶשׁ, "soul" (in the sense of "person"), ver. 10–12, 15 חַיָּה, "beast," ver. 13; קָרְבָּן, "offering," ver. 4, רֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ, "a sweet savor," verse 6; "a statute forever," and "after your generations," ver. 7. But it cannot be from the Elohist, he argues, because (*a*) he would have placed it after ch. vii, or at least after ch. xv; (*b*) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (*c*) he would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in ver. 7; and, lastly, (*d*) the phraseology has something of the coloring of ch. xviii–xx and xxvi, which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion. He observes further that the chapter is not altogether Mosaic. The first enactment (ver. 1–7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, and holds good, therefore, for the time of Moses. But the remaining three contemplate the case of strangers living among the people, and have a reference to all time.

Ch. xviii–xx, though they have a Jehovistic coloring, cannot have been originally from the Jehovist. The following peculiarities of language, which are worthy of notice, according to Knobel (*Exod. und Leviticus erklärt*, in the "*Kurzg. Exeg. Hdbuch.*" 1857), forbid such a supposition, the more so as they occur nowhere else in the O. T.: רֶבַע, "lie down to" and "gender," xviii, 23; xix, 19, xx, 16, תֶּבֶל, "confusion," xviii, 23; xx, 12; לֶקֶט, "gather," xix, 9; xxiii, 22; פֶּרֶט, "grape," xix, 10; שְׁאֵרָה, "near kinswomen," xviii, 17; בְּקֹרֶת, "scourged," xix, 20; חָפְשָׁה, "free," *ibid.*; קַעֲקַע, כְּתֹבֶת, "print marks," xix, 28; הֶקִיא, "vomit," in the metaphorical sense, xviii, 25, 28; xx, 22; עָרְלָה, "uncircumcised," as applied to fruit-trees, xix, 23; and מוֹלֶדֶת, "born," xviii, 9, 11; as well as the Egyptian word (for such it probably is) שַׁעַטְנֵז, "garment of divers sorts," which, however, does occur once beside in Deut. xxii, 11.

According to Bunsen, chap. xix is a genuine part of the Mosaic legislation, given, however, in its original form, not on Sinai, but on the east side of the Jordan; while the general arrangement of the Mosaic laws may perhaps be as late as the time of the judges. He regards it as a very ancient document, based on the Two Tables, of which, and especially of the first, it is, in fact, an extension, consisting of two decalogues and one pentad of laws. Certain expressions in it he considers as implying that the people were already settled in the land (ver. 9, 10, 13, 15), while, on the other hand, ver. 23 supposes a *future* occupation of the land. Hence he concludes that the revision of this document by the transcribers was incomplete, whereas all the passages may fairly be interpreted as looking forward to a future settlement in Canaan. The great simplicity and lofty moral character of this section compel us, says Bunsen, to refer it at least to the earlier time of the judges, if not to that of Joshua himself.

III. *Authenticity, etc.*—Some critics, however, such as De Wette, Gramberg, Vatke, and others, have strenuously endeavored to prove that the laws contained in Leviticus originated in a period much later than is usually supposed; but the following observations sufficiently support their Mosaical origin, and show that the whole of Leviticus is historically genuine. The laws in chap. i–vii contain manifest vestiges of the Mosaical period. Here, as well as in Exodus, when the priests are mentioned, Aaron and his sons are named; as, for instance, in chap. i, 4, 7, 8, 11, etc. The tabernacle is the sanctuary, and no other place of worship is mentioned anywhere (i, 3; iii, 8, 13, etc.). The Israelites are always described as a congregation (iv, 13 sq.), under the command of the *elders of the congregation* (iv, 16), or of a *ruler* (iv, 22). Everything has reference to life in a camp, and that camp commanded by Moses (iv, 12, 21; vi, 11; xiv, 8; xvi, 26, 28). A later writer could scarcely have placed himself so entirely in the times, and so completely adopted the modes of thinking of the age of Moses; especially if, as has been asserted, these laws gradually sprung from the usages of the people, and were written down at a later period with the object of sanctioning them by the authority of Moses. They so entirely befit the Mosaical age that, in order to adapt them to the requirements of any later period, they must have undergone some modification, accommodation, and a peculiar mode of interpretation. This inconvenience would have been avoided by a person who intended to forge laws in favor of the later modes of Levitical worship. A forger would have endeavored to identify the past as much as possible with the present.

The section in chap. viii–x is said to have a mythical coloring. This assertion is grounded on the miracle narrated in ch. ix, 24. But what could have been the inducement to forge this section? It is said that the priests invented it in order to support the authority of the sacerdotal caste by the solemn ceremony of Aaron's consecration. But to such an intention the narration

of the crime committed by Nadab and Abihu is strikingly opposed. Even Aaron himself here appears to be rather remiss in the observance of the law (comp. x, 16 sq., with iv, 22 sq.). Hence it would seem that the forgery arose from an opposite or anti-hierarchical tendency. The fiction would thus appear to have been contrived without any motive which could account for its origin.

In ch. xvii occurs the law which forbids the slaughter of any beast except at the sanctuary. This law could not be strictly kept in Palestine, and had therefore to undergo some modification (Deut. xii). Our opponents cannot show any rational inducement for contriving such a fiction. The law (xvii, 6, 7) is adapted to the nation only while emigrating from Egypt. It was the object of this law to guard the Israelites from falling into the temptation to imitate the Egyptian rites and sacrifices offered to he-goats (שְׂעִירִם, *seïrim*, "devils," Sept. *μαραῖα*, Vulg. *dæmones*), which word signifies also dæmons represented under the form of he-goats, and which were supposed to inhabit the desert (comp. Jablonsky, *Pantheon Ægyptiacum*, i, 272 sq.).

The laws concerning food and purifications appear especially important if we remember that the people emigrated from Egypt. The fundamental principle of these laws is undoubtedly Mosaical, but in the individual application of them there is much that strongly reminds us of Egypt. This is also the case in Lev. xviii sq., where the lawgiver has manifestly in view the two opposites, Canaan and Egypt. That the lawgiver was intimately acquainted with Egypt is proved by such remarks as hint at the Egyptian marriages with sisters (xviii, 3); a custom which stands as an exception among the prevailing habits of antiquity (Diod. Siculus, i, 27; Pausanias, *Attica*, i, 7).

The book of Leviticus has a prophetical character. This is especially manifest in ch. xxv, xxvi, where the law appears in a truly sublime and divine attitude, and when its predictions refer to the whole futurity of the nation. It is impossible to say that these were *vaticinia ex eventu*, unless we would assert that this book was written at the close of Israelitish history. We must rather grant that passages like this are the real basis on which the authority of later prophets is chiefly built. Such passages prove also in a striking manner that the lawgiver had not merely an external aim, but that his law had a deeper purpose, which was clearly understood by Moses himself. That purpose was to regulate the national life in all its bearings, and to consecrate the whole nation to God. See. especially, chap. xxv, 18 sq. Although this section has a general bearing, it is nevertheless manifest that it originated in the times of Moses. At a later period, for instance, it would have been impracticable to promulgate the law concerning the Sabbath and the year of jubilee; for it was soon sufficiently proved how far the nation in reality remained behind the ideal Israel of the law. The sabbatical law bears the impress of a time when the whole legislation, in its fulness and glory, was directly communicated to the people in such a manner as to attract, penetrate, and command.

IV. We must not quit this book without a word on what may be called *its spiritual meaning*. That so elaborate a ritual looked beyond itself we cannot doubt. It was a prophecy of things to come; a shadow whereof the substance was Christ and his kingdom. We may not always be able to say what the exact relation is between the type and the antitype. Of many things we may be sure that they belonged only to the nation to whom they were given, containing no prophetic significance, but serving as witnesses and signs to them of God's covenant of grace. We may hesitate to pronounce with Jerome that "every sacrifice, nay, almost every syllable—the garments of Aaron and the whole Levitical system—breathe of heavenly mysteries;" but we cannot read the Epistle to the Hebrews and not acknowledge that the Levitical priests "served the pattern and type of heavenly things"—that the sacrifices of the law pointed to and found their interpretation in the Lamb of God—that the ordinances of outward purification signified the truer inward cleansing of the heart and conscience from dead works to serve the living God. One idea, moreover, penetrates the whole of this vast and burdensome ceremonial, and gives it a real glory, even apart from any prophetic significance. Holiness is its end. Holiness is its character. The tabernacle is holy—the vessels are holy—the offerings are most holy unto Jehovah—the garments of the priests are holy. All who approach him whose name is "Holy," whether priests who minister to him or people who worship before him, must themselves be holy. It would seem as if, amid the camp and dwellings of Israel, was ever to be heard an echo of that solemn strain which fills the courts above, where the seraphim cry one to another, Holy, Holy, Holy.

V. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole or major part of this book, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 179); also *Homiliæ* (*ibid.* iv, 184); Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in Syriac, in *Opp.* ii, 236); Theodoret, *Quæstiones* (in Greek, in *Opp.* i); Isidorus Hispalensis, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* i); Bede, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* viii); also *In Levit.* (*ibid.* iv); Hesychius, *In Levit.* (in Greek, Paris, 1581, 4to; also in the *Biblia Max. Patr.* xii); Claudius Taurinensis, *Præfatio* (in Mabillon, *Veter. Analect.* p. 90); Hugo à St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* i); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Levit.* (in *Opp.* i, 220); Radulphus Flaviacensis, *Commentaria* (Col. 1536, folio; also in the *Biblia Max. Patr.* xvii, 47); Pesiktha-Minus, *Commentarius* (includ. Numb. and Deut.] (from the Heb. in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* xv, 997; xvi sq.); Phrygio, *Explanatio* [together with 1 Tim.] (Basil. 1543, 4to; 1596, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i); Chytræus, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1569, 1575, 8vo); Serranus, *Commentarius* (Antwp. 1572, 1609, fol.); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Babington, *Notes* (in *Works*, p. 349); Pelargus, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1604, 4to); Lorinus, *Commentarii* (Ludgun. 1619, 1622; Duac. 1620; Antwerp, 1620, fol.); Willet, *Sixfold Commentarie* (Lond. 1631, fol.); Franzius, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1696, 4to); Spanheim, *Observationes* (in *Opp.* iii, 617); Cocceius, *Observationes* (in *Opp.* i, 158); *Patrick, *Commentary* (Lond. 1698, 4to; also in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's *Commentary*); Dassovius, *Scholia* (Kilom. 1707, 4to); Hagemann, *Betrachtungen* (Brunswick, 1741, 4to); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1824, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Crit.* i); *Bertheau, *Die Sieben Gruppen Mos. Gesetze* (Lpz. 1840, 8vo); James, *Sermons* (Lond. 1847, 8vo); *Bonar, *Commentary* (Lond. 1851 [3d ed.], 1861; N. Y. 1851, 8vo); *Bush, *Notes* (N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); *Knobel, *Erklärung* [includ. Exod.] (vol. ii of the *Kurtzgef. Exeg. Hdbch.* Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Newton, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); *Kalisch, *Commentary* (London, 1857 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Seiss, *Gospel in Levit.* (Phila. 1860, 12mo); *Keil, *Commentar* (in vol. ii of his Pentateuch, Leipsic, 1862, Edinb. 1866, 8vo); Siphra, *Commentar* (in Heb. Vienna, 1862, folio); Wogue, *Levitique* (vol. iii of his *Pentateuque*, Par. 1864, 8vo); *Murphy, *Commentary* (Lond. and Andover, 1872, 8vo). See PENTATEUCH.

Levity is a term used to designate a certain lightness of spirit in opposition to gravity. Nothing can be more proper than for a Christian to wear an air of cheerfulness, and to watch against a morose and gloomy disposition. But, though it be his privilege to rejoice, yet he must be cautious of that volatility of spirit which characterizes the unthinking, and marks the vain professor. To be cheerful without levity, and grave without austerity, forms both a happy and dignified character. See IDLE WORDS.

Levy (מַס, *mas*, *tribute*, as usually rendered), a *tax* or requirement of service imposed by Eastern kings for public works, hence a *gang* or company of men impressed into such service (1 Kings v, 13, 14; ix, 15). In two

passages other terms (עֲלָה, 1 Kings ix, 21; רוּם, Numb. xxxi, 28) are employed in connection with this, to denote the *exaction* of tribute. See TRIBUTE.

Lew Chew. See LOO CHOO.

Lewd (*πονηρός, bad*, Acts xvii, 5), **Lewdness** (*ῥαδιούργημα, mischief*, Acts xviii, 14), are used elsewhere in their proper sense of *licentiousness* (זִמָּה, etc., Judg. xx, 6; Ezek. often; Jer. xi, 15; xiii, 27; Hos. vi, 9; once for נִבְלוּת, the *parts of shame*, Hos. ii, 10).

Lewin, HIRSCHEL, a Jewish rabbi who was born in 1721 in Poland, and died at Berlin in 1800, is noted for his attitude towards Moses Mendelssohn. Lewin was chief rabbi of Prussia in the days of the great Jewish philosopher, and severely censured Mendelssohn for rationalistic views expressed in his correspondence with Lavater [see MENDELSSOHN], and in his translation of the Pentateuch into German. To the credit of Lewin, however, it must be stated that he by no means condemned, or permitted the condemnation of Mendelssohn as a heretic, as Landau and other Polish rabbis were inclined to do. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, xi, 45 sq.

Lewis, Isaac, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 21, 1746 (O. S.), in Stratford (now Huntington), Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1765; entered the ministry in March, 1768; and was ordained pastor at Wilton, Conn., Oct. 26, 1768. He resigned his charge in June, 1786, and was installed October 18, 1786, pastor in Greenwich, and there he labored until Dec. 1, 1818, when he gave up the work on account of the infirmities of age. He died Aug. 27, 1840. In 1816 he was made a member of Yale College Corporation, but resigned in 1818. He published a few occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i, 662.

Lewis, John Nitchie, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Westchester Co., N. Y., in 1808. He graduated at Yale College in 1828, and studied theology both at Andover and Princeton, and was licensed at Goshen, N. Y., in 1832. He preached for a number of years, principally in the State of New York, and was then chosen secretary of the Central American Education Society in New York. He was for some time editor of the *Seaman's Magazine*, and wrote a Manual for the Presbyterian Church. He died in 1861.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1863.

Lewis, Moses, a Methodist minister, was born in Roxbury, Vt., May 19, 1797, and early decided upon the ministry as his work of life. He entered the travelling connection in 1831 in the New Hampshire Conference. After five years of faithful and successful labors as an itinerant, failing health compelled him to retire from the effective ranks, with the hope of resuming his place as a pastor at no distant day with recuperated physical strength, which, however, he never realized. During thirty-four years he sustained either a supernumerary or superannuated relation to his Conference. In 1844 the New Hampshire Conference was divided, and the Vermont Conference constituted, and of it Lewis, living within the limits of the new Conference, became a member. He died Sept. 26, 1869. "In the domestic circle brother Lewis was beloved and honored; in the community, active and reliable, and in the Church, a pillar of strength, a safe counsellor, and a liberal contributor to all the interests of the Church of his choice."—*Minutes of Conf.* 1870 (see Index).

Lewis, Thomas, an Independent minister, was born in 1777. He was pastor of an Independent congregation at Islington, England, from 1804 till 1852, the year of his death. His published works are, 1. *Christian Duties in the various Relations of Life* (1839):—2. *Religious State of Islington for the last Forty Years* (1842):—3. *Christian Privileges* (1847).—Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lewis, Zechariah, a Presbyterian minister, studied theology at Philadelphia, and was licensed by the Fairfield West Association in 1796. In the autumn of that year he became tutor in Yale College, and held that office until 1799. He was elected a trustee of Princeton Seminary in 1812. For six years he acted as corresponding secretary of the Religious Tract Society, afterwards the American Tract Society. Having resigned that position in 1820, he was elected one of the secretaries of the United Foreign Missionary Society. He died in 1862.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, s. v.

Leyczon Nobla is the name of a poem which was extensively circulated among the Waldenses in the 15th century. It exhorts to repentance and to Christian life, and treats of the temptations to which the wicked subject the pious and the good, and of the punishments for sin. Some, among them Dickhoff, contend that the poem originated with the Bohemian Brethren, but Ebrard and Herzog incline to the general opinion that the "Leyczon" belongs to the Waldensian literature. The name it bears is derived from the first words of the poem, which are "*Leyczon nobla*" (*lectio*, sermon). See *Zeitschrift f. hist. theol.* 1864, 1865; Herzog, *Die romanischen Waldenser*, etc. (Halle, 1853).

Leydecker, MELCHIOR, a Calvinistic theologian, was born at Middelburg in 1642. He became pastor in the province of Zealand in 1662, was appointed professor at Utrecht in 1678, and died in 1721. He was an ardent exponent of the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and violently opposed the systems of Cocceius and Descartes, the works of Drusius, Spencer's book *De Legibus Hebræorum*, and the Lutheran tendencies of Witsius. Very learned in theological, rabbinical, and ecclesiastical literature, he distinguished himself by wielding a strong pen in favor of the Reformed theological system. Among his apologetical works are *De veritate fidei Reformatæ ejusdemque sanctitate, s. Commentarius ad Catech. Palatin.* (Ultrajecti, 1694, 4to):—*De œconomia trium personarum in negotio salutis hum. libri iv, quibus universa Reformata fides certis principiis congruo nexu explicatur* (Traj. ad Rhen. 1682, 12mo):—*Veritas evangelica triumphans de erroribus quorumvis seculorum — opus, quo principia fidei Reformatæ demonstrantur* (Traj. 1688, 4to):—also, *Historia ecclesiæ Africanæ illustrata pro ecclesiæ Reformatæ veritate et libertate* (Ultraj. 1690, 4to). His controversial works against Cocceius met with great success, because they discussed the question with great clearness. Among them we notice his *Synopsis controversiarum de fœdere et testamento Dei, quæ hodie in Belgio moventur* (Traj. 1690, 8vo):—*Vis veritatis s. disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quæ hodie in Belgio moventur de œconomia fœderum Dei, libri v* (Traj. 1679, 4to):—*Fax veritatis* (Leidæ, 1677, 4to). When yet a youthful student at the university Leydecker had paid special attention to Biblical studies, and, guided by a learned rabbi, made rapid strides in the exploration of Biblical lore. In after life, when, tired of polemical and clerical pursuits, he looked about for a field on which he might profitably venture, this department of theological study allured him anew. Attempting to fit the works of Godwin (*Moses and Aaron*) and Cunæus (*De Republica Hebræor.*) to his academical purposes, he soon discovered their insufficiency, and set about to prepare himself a more copious treatise, which is everywhere marked by a vigorous and independent judgment. While he conceals not his aversion to the "futilities" of the Talmud, he quotes the great rabbins with respect. He, moreover, keeps a sharp eye on the extravagancies of Christian writers, and his work censures with even-handed justice the well-known rabbinism of the Buxtorfs and the *Egyptism* of Spencer (*De Legibus Hebr.*). It is only characteristic of this unsparing criticism of the orthodox author that he adds an appendix of severe animadversion against the cosmogony of Thomas Burnet, to whose *Theoria telluris* he prefixes the predicate *profana*. The six dissertations of this appendix, whatever may be thought of the author's views, are valuable for their learning, and interesting as closely bearing on the questions now raised on the Mosaic cosmogony.

Especial mention among his Biblical works is due to his archæological treatise entitled *De Republica Hebræorum* (Amst. 1704, thick fol. vol.), which is one of the largest repertories ever written on the wide subject of Hebrew antiquities, and exhibits in an eminent degree vast stores of scriptural, rabbinical, and historical learning. Added to the interest of the subject are dissertations on the Hebrew laws and customs, both political and religious, interwoven in a historical narrative, in which the sacred history is developed, by epochs, from the earliest period to the latest. The author, in his progress, learnedly investigates the history, *pari passu*, of the leading Gentile nations, very much after the manner of Shuckford and Russell in their *Connections*. This valuable work, on which Leydecker's fame deserves mainly to depend, is singularly enough ignored in Schweizer's sketch of the author in Herzog (see below). A complete list of his works is to be found in the *Unpartheiische Kirchen-Hist. A. u. N. Test.*, etc., ii, 625.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 360; Gass, *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i–iii; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Leyden, John of. See Bockhold.

Leyden, Lucas van, one of the most celebrated painters of the early Dutch school, noted for his success in sacred art, was born in Leyden in 1494. His talents were early developed in the school of Cornelius Engelbrechsten, an artist of repute in his day. He commenced engraving when scarcely nine years of age. His picture of St. Hubert, painted when he was only twelve, brought him very high commendation; and the celebrated print, so well known to collectors by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1508, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded, like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1533.

Leyden, School of, Theologians of the, is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575), and of whom J. H. Scholten (in 1840 professor in Franeker, since 1843 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1856) even went forth to battle against the negative criticism of Baur and his Tübingen confrères; but in 1864 he came out boldly in defence of the very man and principles he had previously warred against, and in a short time became the principal leader in the movement of modern Dutch theologians "to establish a connection between the faith of the Reformers and our own . . . to unite the old traditions with the new opinions" (the Rationalism of the Tübingen theologians). "Man," the Leyden school teaches, "arrives at a knowledge of the truth by the holy Scriptures, but they must not be understood as containing the only revelation from God; he also reveals himself to the world through the hearts of all believers. The Bible is the source of the original religion. There is a difference between the Scriptures and the word of God. The latter is what God reveals in the human spirit concerning his will and himself. The writing down of the communication is purely human; therefore the Bible cannot be called a revelation. . . . To prove the certainty of the facts of revelation historical criticism must be called in." Unfortunately, however, with them "historical criticism" means nothing else than the application of that negative criticism of the German Rationalists De Wette, Ewald, and Hitzig, and they dispose of the "historical" by asserting (e. g. Kuenen) that we cannot go further back than the middle of the 8th century before Christ, or the time of Hosea and Amos; that "all the preceding times are enveloped in hopeless myth. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the founders of Israel, are not persons, but personifications. They are purely ideal figures, for modern 'historical' inquiry teaches us that races are not derived from one progenitor, but many. The development and preservation of Israel—its whole history—were the result of purely national causes." Christianity itself, they came naturally enough, from such grounds, to regard as "neither superhuman nor supernatural. It is the highest point of the development of human nature itself, and in this sense it is natural and human in the highest acceptation of those terms. It is the mission of science to put man in a condition to comprehend the divine volume presented by Christianity." But what the idea of the modern theologians of Holland is on the relation of science to faith we may well learn from Prof. Opzoomer, of Utrecht University (*The Truth and its Sources of Knowledge*, p. 43): "Science is not to appear before the bar of faith, but faith before that of science; for it is not the credibility of knowledge, but of faith, that is to be proved. . . . Science needs no justification. . . . The believer, on the contrary, must justify his faith, and that before the bar of science. Thus, as a matter of course, the final decision and the supreme power rest with science." Great indeed is the science of Opzoomer, and in like ratio is the insignificance of the thing he calls faith. His manner of rejecting miracles is the old threadbare argument of Hume. "Modern science is established on the experience acquired by the observance of nature. What experience teaches is the touchstone for testing the historical value of the accounts that reach us from past ages." Again, and more positively: "It is the duty of the historian to reject every narrative which is in manifest contradiction with everything known to him concerning the time of its alleged occurrence. . . . Nothing in all nature gives probability to the supposition that moral and religious greatness can be established by dominion over natural phenomena" (*The Nature of Knowledge*, p. 31, 33). "We know nothing of the supernatural; to us there is not a single miracle" (*The Spirit of the new Tendency*, p. 28). "Experience—it, and it alone! What is beyond it is from an evil source. For our knowledge there is but one way—the way of observation" (*Free Science*, p. 26). Perhaps we can do no better than insert here a resumé by Dr. Hurst of the object of the Dutch modern theologians, as follows: "1. History must be reconstructed; for every miracle must disappear from the Biblical narrative, since philosophy teaches that there can be no miracles. 2. Philosophy must be liberated from the so-called divine revelation, because the history of the present time, or experience, teaches that there can be nothing supernatural; hence there never was. Thus the argument whirls in a hopeless circle; history demonstrates from (untrue) philosophy, and philosophy from (untrue) history, that there is no such thing as miracle, nor even anything supernatural! Can we wonder at the sorry plight of the modern theologians which Pierson (formerly pastor of the Walloon Church in Rotterdam, now professor at Heidelberg University) divulges on the very first page of his *Mirror of the Times:* We do not conceal the fact that our theology is involved in ceaseless vacillation?" Besides Scholten we have Kuenen, the great exegetical scholar, and Ravenhoff, the ecclesiastical historian, both professors at Leyden, actively engaged in promoting the interests of these Rationalistic opinions, and, unfortunately enough for Christianity in Holland, it must be confessed that at present no Dutch theologians exert more influence over the young theologians of that country than professor Scholten and his associates just mentioned. See Dr. Hurst in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1871 (April), p. 250 sq.; and

his *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 368 sq.; Scholten, *De Leer der Hervormde Kerk in hare grondbeginselen uit de bronnen voorgesteld en beordeeld.* (1848; 2d ed. 1850; 4th ed. 1861); and his article on "Modern Materialism and its Causes" in *Progress of Religious Thought in the Protest. Ch. of France* (Lond. 1861), p. 10 sq. See Reformed (Dutch) Church. (J. H. W.)

Leydt, Johannes, a prominent minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, was born in Holland in 1718, and came early to America. He studied theology under the Rev. John Frelinghuysen and J. H. Goetschius, was licensed in 1748, and became pastor of the united churches of New Brunswick and Six-mile Run, New Jersey. In the great Coetus and Conferentic conflict he was actively identified with the former, which insisted upon the education of ministers in this country, and upon an independent Church organization separate from the Reformed Church of the mother country. In this "liberal and progressive" movement Mr. Leydt was a powerful leader. He published several pamphlets in its favor, and was one of the most prominent men in the establishment of Queen's College (now Rutgers) in 1770. He was one of its first trustees. He was president of the General Synod in 1778. An ardent patriot of the Revolutionary War, he preached boldly on the great questions of the time, arousing much enthusiasm among the people, "and counselling the young men to join the army of freedom." His active and useful ministry closed only with his life in 1783. He is represented to have been an instructive, laborious, and faithful minister, an impressive preacher, a favorite at installations of pastors, organization of churches, and other public services. He was a healer of the breaches of Zion, as well as an intrepid leader in an important crisis of the Church and of the country.—*Historical Sermon* by R. H. Steele, D.D.; Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*, s. v. (W. J. R. T.)

Leyser. See Lyser.

L'Hopital. See Hopital.

Liar. See Lie.

Libanius, a celebrated sophist of the 4th century, noted as a friend of the emperor Julian, was born about A.D. 314 at Antioch, where he studied in early youth, devoting his attention to the purest classic models. After a stay of four years at Athens, where he attracted much attention, he pursued his studies at Constantinople, and here entered upon a brilliant career as teacher, which excited the envy of others, especially of the sophist Bemarchius, his former instructor. The latter falsely charged him with the practice of sorcery and many vices, so that the prefect was persuaded to expel him from the city, A.D. 346. He went to Nice, and shortly after to Nicomedia, and there pleasantly passed five years with great success as an instructor, and returned, by invitation of emperor Julian, who had frequently attended his lectures, to Constantinople, only to leave it, however, shortly after, on account of the opposition still existing. He retired, by permission of Cæsar Gallus, to his native city. Here he continued to reside till his death, which is supposed to have occurred after the accession of Arcadius, A.D. 395. In the death of Julian, Libanius lost much of his hope for the restoration of paganism. He complains to the gods that they had granted so long a life to Constantius, and only so brief a career to Julian. He interchanged many letters with Julian. Under Valens he defended himself successfully against a charge of treason, and seems to have obtained the emperor's favor. He besought from him a law, in which Libanius himself, on account of his own natural offspring by a mistress, was personally interested, granting to natural children a share in their father's property at his death. Libanius was the preceptor of Basil and Chrysostom; and, although himself a pagan to the end, always maintained friendly relations with these Christian fathers. He was a warm advocate for tolerance, and sought to defend the Manichæans of the East from the violent measures directed against them. He addressed Theodosius in one of his *Discourses* in defence of the heathen temples, which the monks were eager to despoil. He lived long enough to see Christianity everywhere triumphant, and his personal efforts no longer applauded. Separate works of Libanius have from time to time been discovered and edited, but many yet lie in MS. only in different libraries. His style is rhetorically correct, but, in accordance with the spirit of his times, highly artificial. Gibbon's criticism may be considered too severe (*Decline and Fall*, ch. xxiv). Among the writings of Libanius are his *Progymnasmata*, or Examples of Rhetorical Exercises, divided into thirteen sections; and *Discourses*, many of which were never pronounced, nor designed for that purpose. Some of the latter are moral dissertations, after the fashion of the times, on such subjects as Friendship, Riches, Poverty. One is entitled Μονῳδία, a lament on the death of Julian. Another, the most interesting of all his writings, is his autobiography, which he first wrote at the age of sixty years, entitled Βίος ἢ λόγος περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τυχῆς. A fragment of his *Discourses*, addressed to Theodosius in defense of the heathen temples, was discovered by Mai in 1823 in the Vatican. The *Declamations*, exceeding forty in number, are exercises on imaginary subjects. There are not less than 2000 *Letters* addressed to over 500 persons, among whom are Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom. He wrote also a *Life of Demosthenes*, and *Arguments to the Orations of Demosthenes*. There is no complete edition of Libanius. His *Discourses* and *Declamations* were edited by Reiske (Lips. 1791–97, 4 vols. 8vo). The most copious edition of his *Letters* (1605 in the Greek, and 522 translated into Latin) is that by J. C. Wolf (Amsterd. 1738, fol.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. viii, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s. v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxiii, xxiv; Sievers, *Leben des Libanius* (Berl. 1868).

Lib'anus (Λίβανος), the Græcized form of the name of Mount Lebanon (q. v.), used in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. iv, 48; v, 55; 2 Esdr. xv, 20; Judith i, 7; Ecclus. xxiv, 13; l, 12) and by classical writers. See also Antilibanus.

Libation (Lat. *libatio*, from *libare*, "to pour out;" literally any thing *poured out*) is used, in the sacrificial language of the ancients, to express an affusion of liquors poured upon victims to be sacrificed to a deity. The quantity of wine for a libation among the Hebrews was the fourth part of a hin, rather more than two pints. Libations were poured on the victim after it was killed, and the several pieces of it were laid on the altar, ready to be consumed by the flames (Lev. vi, 20; viii, 25, 26; ix, 4; xvi, 12, 20). These libations usually consisted of unmixed wine (ἔνσπονδος, *merum*), but sometimes also of milk, honey, and other fluids, either pure or diluted with water. The libations offered to the Furies were always without wine. The Greeks and Latins offered libations with the sacrifices, but they were poured on the victim's head while it was living. So Sinon, relating the manner in which he was to be sacrificed, says, he was in the priest's hands ready to be slain, was loaded with bands and garlands; that they were preparing to pour upon him the libations of grain and salted meal (*Æn.* ii, 130, 131). Likewise Dido, beginning to sacrifice, pours wine between the horns of the victim (*Æn.* iv). The wine was usually poured out in three separate streams. Libations always accompanied a sacrifice which was offered in concluding a treaty with a foreign nation, and that here they formed a prominent part of the solemnity is clear from the fact that the treaty itself was called σπονδαί. But libations were also made independent of any other sacrifice, as in solemn prayers, and on many other occasions of public and private life, as before drinking at meals, and the like. St. Paul describes himself, as it were, a victim about to be sacrificed, and that the accustomed libations of meal and wine were already, in

a measure, poured upon him: "For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand" (2 Tim. iv, 6). The same expressive sacrificial term occurs in Phil. ii, 17, where the apostle represents the faith of the Philippians as a sacrifice, and his own blood as a libation poured forth to hallow and consecrate it: "Yea, and if I be offered, σπένδομαι, upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ, I joy and rejoice with you all." The word libation was frequently extended in its signification, however, to the whole offering of unbloody sacrifices of which this formed a part, and which consisted not only in the pouring of a little wine upon the altar, but were accompanied by the presentation of fruit and cakes. Cakes in particular were peculiar to the worship of certain deities, as to that of Apollo. They were either simple cakes of flour, sometimes also of wax, or they were made in the shape of some animal, and were then offered as symbolical sacrifices in the place of real animals, either because they could not easily be procured, or were too expensive for the sacrificer. This custom prevailed even in the houses of the Romans, who at their meals made an offering to the Lares in the fire which burned upon the hearth. The libation was thus a sort of heathen "grace before meat." See Watson, *Bibl. and Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Libel is the technical name of the document which contains the accusation framed against a minister before ecclesiastical courts. See Fama Clamosa. In England, libel, in the ecclesiastical courts, is the name given to the formal written statement of the complainant's ground of complaint against the defendant. It is the first stage in the pleadings after the defendant has been cited to appear. The defendant is entitled to a copy of it, and must answer the allegations contained in it upon oath. In Scotland, the libel is a document drawn up, as usual, in the form of a syllogism, the major proposition stating the name and nature of the crime, as condemned by the Word of God and the laws of the Church; the minor proposition averring that the party accused is guilty, specifying facts, dates, and places; and then follows the conclusion deducing the justice of the sentence, if the accusation should be proven. By the term *relevancy* is meant whether the charge is one really deserving censure, or whether the facts alleged, if proved, would afford sufficient evidence of the charge. A list of witnesses is appended to the copy of the libel served in due time and form on the person accused. One of the forms is as follows: "Unto the Rev. the Moderator and Remanent Members of the ——— Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church, The Complaint of A and B, a committee appointed to prosecute the matter after-mentioned (or of Mr. A. B., merchant in ———, a member of said Church); Sheweth, That the Rev. C. D., minister of the ——— Congregation of ———, has been guilty of the sin of (*here state the denomination of the offence, such as "drunkenness," "fornication," or such like*). In so far as, upon the ——— day of ———, 1800, or about that time, and within the house of ———, situated in ——— street, ———, he, the said C. D. (*here the circumstances attending the offence charged are described, as, for example, "did drink whiskey or some other spirituous liquor to excess, whereby he became intoxicated*"), to the great scandal of religion and disgrace of his sacred profession; may it therefore please your reverend court to appoint service of this libel to be made on the said Rev. C. D., and him to appear before you to answer to the same; and on his admitting the charge, or on the same being proved against him, to visit him with such censure as the Word of God and the rules and discipline of the Church in such cases prescribe, in order that he and all others may be deterred from committing the like offences in all time coming, or to do otherwise in the premises as to you may appear expedient and proper. According to justice, etc. List of witnesses."—Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Libellatĭci is the name of that class of the lapsed who received from the heathen magistrate a written certificate (*libellum*) as a warrant for their security; either testifying that they were not Christians, or containing a dispensation from the necessity of sacrificing to the gods in confirmation of their adherence to heathenism. Another class of the lapsed were the *sacrificati*—that is, those who had offered sacrifice to the heathen gods in testimony of their renunciation of the faith; another the *traditores*, because they had delivered up into the hands of the heathen either copies of the sacred writings, baptismal registers, or any other property of the Church. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i (see Index); Mosheim, *Commentary* (see Index). See Lapsed.

Libelli Pacis, or Letters of Peace. In Egypt and Africa many of those who had fallen away in time of persecution, in order the more readily to obtain pardon for their offences, resorted to the intercession of persons destined to suffer martyrdom by securing from them *libelli pacis*, letters of peace; papers in which these returning apostates were commended as worthy of communion and Church membership. In this way they were again taken into communion sooner than the rules of the Church otherwise allowed. From this practice the pope claims a precedent for the exercise of his pretended power to grant spiritual indulgences, which seem to have been used first about the middle of the second century. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Mosheim, *Commentary* (see Index). See Indulgences; Lapsed.

Liberalism. See Rationalism.

Liberality is a term denoting a generous disposition of mind, exerting itself in giving largely. It is thus distinguished from its synonymes generosity and bounty. Liberality implies acts of mere giving or spending; generosity, acts of greatness; bounty, acts of kindness. Liberality is a natural disposition; generosity proceeds from elevation of sentiment; bounty from religious motives. Liberality denotes freedom of spirit; generosity, greatness of soul; bounty, openness of heart.

LIBERALITY OF SENTIMENT, a generous disposition a man feels towards another who is of a different opinion from himself; or, as one defines it, "that generous expansion of mind which enables it to look beyond all petty distinctions of party and system, and, in the estimate of men and things, to rise superior to narrow prejudices." Unfortunately, liberality of sentiment is often a cover for error and scepticism on the one hand, and is most generally too little attended to by the ignorant and bigoted on the other. "A man of liberal sentiments," says an eminent English writer, "must be distinguished from him who has no religious sentiments at all. He is one who has seriously and effectually investigated, both in his Bible and on his knees, in public assemblies and in private conversations, the important articles of religion. He has laid down principles, he has inferred consequences; in a word, he has adopted sentiments of his own. He must be distinguished also from that tame, undiscerning domestic among good people, who, though he has sentiments of his own, yet has not judgment to estimate the worth and value of one sentiment beyond another. Now a generous believer of the Christian religion is one who will not allow himself to try to propagate his sentiments by the commission of sin. No collusion, no bitterness, no wrath, no undue influence of any kind, will he apply to make his sentiments receivable; and no living thing will be less happy for his being a Christian. He will exercise his liberality by allowing to those who differ from him as much virtue and integrity as he possibly can."

There are, among a multitude of arguments to enforce such a disposition, the following worthy of our attention: "1. We should exercise liberality in union with sentiment because of the different capacities, advantages, and tasks of mankind. Religion employs the capacities of mankind just as the air employs their lungs

and their organs of speech. The fancy of one is lively, of another dull. The judgment of one is elastic, of another feeble, a damaged spring. The memory of one is retentive, that of another is treacherous as the wind. The passions of this man are lofty, vigorous, rapid; those of that man crawl, and hum, and buzz, and, when on wing, sail only round the circumference of a tulip. Is it conceivable that capability, so different in everything else, should be all alike in religion? The advantages of mankind differ. How should he who has no parents, no books, no tutor, no companions, equal him whom Providence has gratified with them all; who, when he looks over the treasures of his own knowledge, can say, this I had of a Greek, that I learned of a Roman; this information I acquired of my tutor, that was a present of my father; a friend gave me this branch of knowledge, an acquaintance bequeathed me that? The tasks of mankind differ; so I call the employments and exercises of life. In my opinion, circumstances make great men; and if we have not Cæsars in the State, and Pauls in the Church, it is because neither Church nor State are in the circumstances in which they were in the days of those great men. Push a dull man into a river, and endanger his life, and suddenly he will discover invention, and make efforts beyond himself. The world is a fine school of instruction. Poverty, sickness, pain, loss of children, treachery of friends, malice of enemies, and a thousand other things, drive the man of sentiment to his Bible, and, so to speak, bring him home to a repast with his benefactor, God. Is it conceivable that he whose young and tender heart is yet unpracticed in trials of this kind can have ascertained and tasted so many religious truths as the sufferer has? 2. We should believe the Christian religion with liberality, because every part of the Christian religion inculcates generosity. Christianity gives us a character of God; but what a character does it give! GOD IS LOVE. Christianity teaches the doctrine of Providence; but what a providence! Upon whom doth not its light arise? Is there an animalcule so little, or a wretch so forlorn, as to be forsaken and forgotten of his God? Christianity teaches the doctrine of redemption; but the redemption of whom? — of all tongues, kindred, nations, and people; of the infant of a span, and the sinner of a hundred years old: a redemption generous in its principle, generous in its price, generous in its effects; fixed sentiments of divine munificence, and revealed with a liberality for which we have no name. In a word, the illiberal Christian always acts contrary to the spirit of his religion: the liberal man alone thoroughly understands it. 3. We should be liberal, because no other spirit is *exemplified* in the infallible guides whom we profess to follow. I set one Paul against a whole army of uninspired men: 'Some preach Christ of good-will, and some of envy and strife. What then? Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. One eateth all things, another eateth herbs; but why dost THOU judge thy brother? We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.' We often inquire, What was the doctrine of Christ, and what was the practice of Christ? Suppose we were to institute a third question, Of what TEMPER was Christ? 4. We should be liberal as well as orthodox, because truths, especially the truths of Christianity, do not want any support from our illiberality. Let the little bee guard its little honey with its little sting; perhaps its little life may depend a little while on that little nourishment. Let the fierce bull shake his head, and nod his horn, and threaten his enemy, who seeks to eat his flesh, and wear his coat, and live by his death: poor fellow! his life is in danger; I forgive his bellowing and his rage. But the Christian religion—is that in danger? And what human efforts can render that false which is true, that odious which is lovely? Christianity is in no danger, and therefore it gives its professors life and breath, and all things except a power of injuring others. 5. Liberality in the profession of religion is a wise and innocent policy. The bigot lives at home; a reptile he crawled into existence, and there in his hole he lurks a reptile still. A generous Christian goes out of his own party, associates with others, and gains improvement by all. It is a Persian proverb, 'A liberal hand is better than a strong arm.' The dignity of Christianity is better supported by acts of liberality than by accuracy of reasoning; but when both go together, when a man of sentiment can clearly state and ably defend his religious principles, and when his heart is as generous as his principles are inflexible, he possesses strength and beauty in an eminent degree." See *Theol. Miscellany*, i, 39; Draper, *On Bigotry;* Newton, Cecil, and Fuller's *Works;* Wayland, *Discourses*.

Liberātus, a deacon of the Church of Carthage, flourished in the 6th century. He was in Rome A.D. 533, when pope John II received the bishops sent by the emperor Justinian I to consult him on the heresies broached by the monks, designated Acœmetæ (or, as Liberatus terms them, Acumici), who had imbibed Nestorian opinions. He was again at Rome in 535, having been sent the previous year, together with the bishops Caius and Petrus, by the synod held at Carthage under Reparatus, bishop of that see, to consult pope John II on the reception into the Church of those Arians who recanted their heresies. John was dead before the arrival of the African delegates; but they were received by pope Agapetus, his successor. When, in 552, Reparatus was banished by Justinian to Euchaida, or Eucayda, Liberatus accompanied him, and probably remained with him till the bishop's death in 563. Nothing further is known of him. Liberatus is the author of a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, entitled *Breviarium Caussæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* (from the ordination of Nestorius, A.D. 428, to the time of the fifth œcumenical [or second Constantinopolitan] council, A.D. 553). In this work he is charged with partiality to the Nestorians, or with following the Nestorians too implicitly. It is contained in most editions of the *Concilia* (vol. v, edit. Labbe; vol. vi, edit. Coleti; vol. ix, edit. Mansi). In those of Crabbe (vol. ii, fol., Cologn., 1538 and 1551) are some subjoined passages derived from various extant sources illustrative of the history, which are omitted by subsequent editors. Hardouin omitted the *Breviarium*. It was separately published, with a revised text, and a learned preface and notes, and a dissertation, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, vol. xii (Venice, 1778, fol.).—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 777.

Liber Diurnus ROMANŌRUM PONTIFĪCUM is the name given by the see of Rome to a collection of formulas used in its correspondence and other business transactions. These formulas are very like those written for secular affairs by the monk Marculph (about 660) and others, and received from the compiler the name of *Liber Diurnus* because they relate to *negotia diurna* (see Marino Marini, *Diplomatica pontificia*, ed. nov. Rom. 1852 sq., p. 64). They are interesting as scientific and historical monuments as well as for their practical use; and this is specially the case with the *Liber Diurnus Pontificalis*, which contains copies of the letters addressed by the Roman bishops to the emperor, the empress, consuls, kings, patriarchs, bishops, and other members of the clergy, and in general to all who were in any way concerned in the nomination of the Roman bishops; the *professio pontificia*, the exemptions granted on the occasion of nominating neighboring bishops, on bestowing the pallium (q. v.), conferring privileges and immunities, etc. On all these points, and the manner in which these things were practiced from the 6th to the 8th century, the *Liber Diurnus* contains more or less complete information, particularly on the relations existing between the see of Rome and the emperor, the mode of election of the Roman bishops, the ritual, etc. To judge from its contents, this collection was probably written before the year 752, for it speaks of the relation between the see of Rome and the eparchs, who were

abolished in that year; but, on the other hand, it must be posterior to 685, for in caput ii, tit. ix, the emperor Constantine (Pogonatus) is spoken of as being already dead. It must also have been written under some successor of Agatho († 682), as this Roman bishop is also mentioned as dead. Garnerius supposed it to have been composed in the time of Gregory II, somewhat after 714, on the ground that in the second *professio fidei pontificis*, given in the *Liber Diurnus*, there are expressions and views which correspond exactly to those we find in the letters of that pope to the emperor Leo. It is likely, though, that the *Liber Diurnus* existed originally in a more elementary form before it assumed that under which it is known at present, for the different MS. copies of it differ somewhat from each other. The *Liber Diurnus* was frequently consulted by all writers on canon law, such as Ino of Chartres, Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, Gratian (c. 8, dist. xvi). As the ritual and various points of law underwent modifications in the course of time, it was less used, and its existence even came to be concealed by the popes for fear lest it might recall their former dependence upon the emperors and eparchs. Still there were copies of it in existence, and a codex contained in the library of the Vatican was published in 1660 by the care of Lucas Holstenius; it was, however, at once suppressed by the Roman see. Hoffmann (*Nova collectio scriptorum ac monumentorum*, Lipsiæ, 1733, 4to, i, 389) attributes to Baluze (in the remarks on Petrus de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii ac imperii*, lib. i, cap. ix, No. viii) the statement that at the time of Holstenius the Vatican library possessed no codex of the *Liber Diurnus*, and that his publication was based upon a MS. intrusted to him by the Cistercian monk Hilarius Rancatus. But as both editions of the works of P. de Marca, published at Paris by Baluze, state only (lib. ii, cap. xvi, No. viii) that Holstenius's publication of the *Liber Diurnus* was suppressed, and Baluze again, in his notes appended to Anton. Augustinus, *De emendatione Gratiani*, lib. i, dialogus xx, § 13 (ed. Par. 1760, p. 433), says that there were various copies of the *Liber Diurnus* in existence, from one of which, that in the Vatican library, Holstenius published his edition, it seems reasonable to suppose that Hoffmann's statement lacks support. As for Rancatus, Mabillon names Leo Allatius, and not Holstenius, as the party to whom he imparted the MS. (see also Cave, *Scriptorum eccl. hist. literaria*, Basle, 1741, i, 621). The MS. of the Vatican has actually been described by Pertz (*Italienische Reise*, in *Archiv. f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, v, 27). He says that it is an 8vo vol. of parchment, and that, according to the statement found on its first pages, it dates from the 8th century. The Jesuit Joannes Garnerius, with the aid of a similar codex and a MS. found in Paris, published in 1680 another edition of the *Liber Diurnus*, "cum privilegio regis Christianissimi." Mabillon, in the *Museum Italicum* (folio II, ii, 32 sq.), published additions to it by means of the MS. which had been used by Leo Allatius. With the aid of all these works, Hoffmann published a new edition of it in the *Nova collectio cit.* (vol. ii), which was subsequently done also by Riegger (Vienna, 1762, 8vo). All this gave rise afterwards to collections of formulas to replace the obsolete *Liber Diurnus*. There are several such collections still extant in MS. Among them the *Formularium et stylus scriptorum curiæ Romanæ*, from John XXII to Gregory XII and John XXIII, in *Summa cancellaria Joannis XXII*. We may also consider as belonging to this class of works the *Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive ceremoniarum libri tres* of bishop Augustinus Patricius Piccolomini, printed by Hoffmann (ii, 269 sq.), and containing a description of the rites accompanying the election of the popes in the 14th century. Collections of formulas similar to the *Liber Diurnus* were also made for the use of bishops, abbots, etc. See Rockinger, *Nachweisungen über Formelbücher v. xiii–xvi Jahrhund.* (Munich, 1855, p. 64, 126, 173, 183, etc.); Palacky, *Ueber Formelbücher* (Prague, 1842); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 366; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol. v, s. v.

Liberia, or the United States of Liberia, a negro republic in Western Africa, on the upper coast of Upper Guinea. The boundaries are not definitely fixed, but provisionally the River Thebar has been adopted as the north-western, and the San Pedro as the eastern frontier. The republic has a coast-line of 600 miles, and extends back 100 miles, on an average, but with the probability of a vast extension into the interior as the tribes near the frontier desire to conclude treaties providing for the incorporation of their territories with Liberia. The present area is estimated at 9700 square miles. The republic owes its origin to the "American Colonization Society," which was established in December, 1816, for the purpose of removing the negroes of the United States from the cramping influences of American slavery, and placing them in their own fatherland. There, it was hoped, they would be able to refute, by practical demonstration, the views of those American politicians who contended that the institution of American slavery was essentially righteous and signally beneficent. The society, in November, 1817, sent two agents to Western Africa, the Rev. Dr. Ebenezer Burgess and Samuel J. Mills, to select a favorable location for a colony of American negroes. After visiting Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro, they fixed upon the last-named place. The first expedition of emigrants, 86 in number, was sent out in February, 1820. After various disappointments, the emigrants succeeded in obtaining a foothold on Cape Mesurado, in lat. 6° 19′ N., long. 10° 49′ W., where now stands Monrovia, the capital of the republic of Liberia. The purchase of the Mesurado territory, including Cape Mesurado and the lands, forming nearly a peninsula, between the Mesurado and the Junk rivers, about 36 miles along the coast, with an average breadth of about two miles, was effected in December, 1821. For a hundred years the principal powers of Europe, in particular France and England, had repeatedly tried to gain possession of this territory, but the native chiefs had invariably refused to part with even one acre, and were known to be extremely hostile to the whites. On January 7, 1822, the smaller of the two islands lying near the mouth of the Mesurado River was occupied by the colonists, who called it Perseverance Island. They remained here until April 25, when they removed to Mesurado Heights, and raised the American flag. The colony henceforth grew, and expanded in territory and influence, taking under its jurisdiction from time to time the large tribes contiguous. In 1846 the board of directors of the American Colonization Society invited the colony to proclaim their independent sovereignty, as a means of protection against the oppressive interference of foreigners, and a special fund of $15,000 was raised to buy up the national title to all the coast from Sherbro to Cape Palmas, in order to secure to the new nationality continuity of coast. In July, 1847, the declaration of independence, prepared by Hilary Teoge, was published. Representatives of the people met in convention, and promulgated a constitution similar to that of the United States. Soon after the new republic was recognised by England and France; in 1852 it was in treaty stipulations with England, France, Belgium, Prussia, Italy, the United States, Denmark, Holland, Hayti, Portugal, and Austria.

The constitution of Liberia, like that of the United States, establishes an entire separation of the Church from the State, and places all religious denominations on an equal footing, but all citizens of the republic must belong to the negro race. In 1885 the total population of Liberia was estimated to number 750,000, of which number about 20,000 were Americo-Liberians, and the remainder were aboriginal inhabitants. The most important tribes within and near the limits of the republic are the following: 1. The Veys, extending from Gallinas, their northern boundary, southward to Little Cape Mount; they stretch inland about two days' journey. They in-

vented, some 20 years ago, an alphabet for writing their own language, and, next to the Mandingoes, they are regarded as the most intelligent of the aboriginal tribes. As they hold constant intercourse with the Mandingoes and other Mohammedan tribes in the far interior, Mohammedanism is making rapid progress among them. The Anglican missionary, bishop Payne, has recently suggested a plan of occupying the country of the Veys with an extensive and vigorous mission, and the mission-school opened by the Episcopalians at Totocorch, which is nearer to Cape Mount than to Monrovia, is regarded as the first outpost towards the vast interior. 2. The Pessehs, who are located about seventy miles from the coast, and extend about one hundred miles from north to south, are entirely pagan. They may be called the peasants of West Africa, and supply most of the domestic slaves for the Veys, Bassas, Mandingoes, and Kroos. A missionary effort was attempted among them about fifteen years ago by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, but it was abandoned in consequence of the death of the first missionary, George L. Seymour. 3. The Barline tribe, living about eight days' journey north-east from Monrovia, and next interior to the Pessehs, has recently been brought into treaty relations with Liberia. According to a report of 1858, half the population of their capital, Palaka, consisted of Mohammedans who had come from the Manni country, but the latest explorer, W. Spencer Anderson, states that there are at present no Mohammedans in the Barline country. 4. The Bassas occupy a coast-line of over sixty miles, and extend about the same distance inland. They are the great producers of palm-oil and canewood, which are sold to foreigners by thousands of tons annually. In 1835 a mission was begun among these people by the American Baptist Missionary Union, whose missionaries studied the language, organized three schools, embracing in all nearly a hundred pupils, maintained preaching statedly at three places, and occasionally at a great many more, and translated large portions of the New Testament into the Bassa language. Notwithstanding this promising commencement, the mission has been now (1872) for several years suspended. But the Southern Baptist Convention has lately resumed missionary operations among the Bassas. Great results for the spreading of Christianity are expected from the missionary labors of Mr. Jacob W. Vonbrunn, a son of a subordinate king of the Grand Bassa people. 5. The Kroo, who occupy the region south of the Bassa, extend about seventy miles along the coast, and only a few miles inland. They are the sailors of West Africa, and never enslave or sell each other. About thirty years ago a mission was established among them by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions at Settra Kroo, but it has long since ceased operations. 6. The Greboes, who border upon the south-eastern boundaries of the Kroos, extend from Grand Sesters to the Cavalla River, a distance of about seventy miles. In 1834 a mission was established among them by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which continued in operation for seven years. A Church was organized, the language reduced to writing, and parts of the New Testament and other religious books translated into it; but in 1842 the mission was transferred to Gabun. A mission established by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation, and has recently established at Bohlen a missionary station, about seventy miles from the coast. 7. The Mandingoes, who are found on the whole eastern frontier of the republic, and extend back to the heart of Soudan, are the most intelligent tribe within the limits of Liberia. They have schools and mosques in every large town, and, by their great influence upon the neighboring tribes, they have contributed in no little degree to abate the ignorance and soften the manners of the native population of Liberia. One of the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christian missions among the aboriginal tribes is the climate, and the difficulty of acclimatization. Thus the Basle Missionary Society, which in 1827 established a promising mission, was in 1831 compelled to abandon it when four of the eight missionaries had succumbed to the climate.

At the close of the year 1871 the churches among the Americo-Liberians and the missions among the natives were all more or less connected with the Protestant churches of the United States. The Methodist Episcopal Church, which sent her first missionary to Liberia in 1832, has subsequently organized the Liberia Mission into an Annual Conference, with a missionary bishop (since 1884 William Taylor) at its head. In 1888 the mission had 24 missionaries, including supernumeraries, 60 local preachers, 2342 Sunday-school scholars, 38 churches, of an aggregate value of $31,044. There were 127 baptisms and 60 deaths. In 1889 the number of members was 2755, probationers 244, local preachers 54. The intense interest which has been aroused among civilized nations by the explorations of Livingstone, and still later of Stanley, in the heart of Africa, has been heroically followed up by Bishop Taylor and the missionary band led by him, especially along the Congo River; and the native chiefs have granted lands and subsidies for the purpose of establishing churches and building schools at very many of the prominent points. The impetus thus given to commerce and improvements in Africa, has, to some degree, extended to Liberia likewise, and the country is gradually advancing to an independent position, both politically and ecclesiastically, especially as the evangelistic labors of Bishop Taylor and his coadjutors are conducted on the plan of "self support," by means of agricultural pursuits on the part of the missionaries, whose first expenses in outfit and travel only are met by direct contributions. A new æra may therefore be now said to have dawned upon the "Dark Continent," in a religious, as well as secular point of view, and Liberia, which is the oldest of the modern mission fields there, will doubtless still continue to be the centre of missionary action, at least for the immense and densely populated middle region of that quarter of the globe. The Protestant Episcopal Church likewise has a bishop there, and its mission in 1889 had 60 stations, 17 clergy, 17 candidates for orders (8 Liberians), 6 postulants (3 Liberian and 3 native), confirmations 106, communicants 612, marriages 12, burials 32, Sunday-school scholars 908, boarding and day-scholars 877, total contributions, $1,416,56. There are 22 day-schools, 11 boarding-schools, and 29 Sunday-schools in all connected with the mission. The Baptist churches in Liberia have mostly been organized by the Southern Board of American Baptists. Their work was suspended during the war, and the American Baptist Missionary Union commenced their work in Liberia with the understanding that the Southern Board would not resume the work; but in 1870 the Southern Baptists sent an agent to Africa with a view of renewing their labors there. The Missionary Union continued, however, to give a partial support to several pastors. In March, 1868, the Baptist churches of Liberia organized the "Liberian Baptist Missionary Union" for "the evangelization of the heathen" within the borders of the Republic of Liberia, "and contiguous thereto." At this first meeting of the union ten Baptist churches were represented, and twelve fields of missionary labor were designated and commended to the care of the nearest churches. The Baptist churches have a training-school for preachers and teachers at Virginia. The Presbyterian Church of the United States has congregations at Monrovia, Kentucky, Harrisburg, Greenville or Sinou, Marshall, Robertsport, and a few other places, with an aggregate membership of about 280. The Liberian churches in union with those of Gaboon and Corisco form the presbytery of Western Africa. The Alexander High-school is intended to be an academy of high grade, conducted under the supervision of the Presbytery, and designed especially to aid young men preparing for the ministry. It is situated on a farm of

about twenty acres, eighteen miles from Monrovia, near the St. Paul's River. The American Lutherans have three stations in Liberia. See Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions; Annual Reports of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; Baptist Missionary Magazine*, July, 1872; *Proceedings of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, October, 1871; *Annual Reports of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church;* Grundemann, *Missionsatlas;* Stockwell, *The Republic of Liberia* (New York, 1868); Blyden (professor in Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone, W. A.), *The Republic of Liberia, its Status and its Field* (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1872, art. vi). (A. J. S.)

Liberius, St., pope of Rome, was a native of the Eternal City. He succeeded Julius I May 22, 353. The Semi-Arians, countenanced by the emperor Constantius, had then the ascendency; and both the Council of Arles (353) and that of Milan (355) condemned Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. As Liberius, together with some other Western bishops, refused to subscribe to this condemnation, he was arrested by order of the emperor, and taken to Milan, where he held a conference with Constantius, which terminated in a sentence from the emperor deposing Liberius from his office, and banishing him to Berœa, in Thrace. Felix, a deacon at Rome, was consecrated bishop. A petition was presented to the emperor by the principal ladies of Rome in favor of Liberius, but it was not till 358 that Liberius was restored to his see. The assertion that Liberius, during his confinement at Berœa, approved in several letters of the deposition of Athanasius, and subscribed to the confession of faith drawn up by the court party at the Council of Sirmium, is a matter of great improbability, and depends chiefly upon the genuineness of his correspondence with Athanasius. The dependence of Liberius on the emperor had a mischievous influence upon many of the Italian bishops, and we need not wonder that at the Council of Rimini Arianism was openly countenanced. It is not true, as asserted by some, that Liberius subscribed the Rimini confession of faith. He ended his career in orthodoxy, and died in 366. He was succeeded by Damasus I. Liberius is said to have built the Basilica on the Esquiline Mount, which has been called Liberiana, from his name, and is now known by the name of Santa Maria Maggiore. He is commemorated in the Romish Church Aug. 27, and in the Greek Church Sept. 23. See Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* II, i, 254–285; Hefele, *P. Liberius*, in the *Tüb. theol. Quartalschr.* (1853), ii, 261 sq.; and *Conciliengesch.* i, 626–714; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 372.

Liber Pontificālis *de vitis Romanorum Pontificum*, Gesta Romanorum Pontificum, Liber gestorum pontificalium, are the names of a history of the bishops of Rome from the apostle Peter down to Nicolas I († 867), to which those of Adrian II and of Stephen VI († 891) were subsequently added. On the authority of Onuphrio Pavini, the first editors of this *Liber Pontificalis* considered as its author Anastasius, abbot of a convent at Rome, and librarian of the church under Nicolas I; but more thorough researches have proved this *liber* to vary greatly in style, and even in views manifested in the different biographies, and therefore led to the supposition that the work is not all by the same author. This belief is further strengthened by the fact that already Anastasius, on some occasions, made use of passages from the *Liber Pontificalis*, and that there are MSS. extant which can with certainty be ascribed to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century, and which contain extracts from the *Liber Pontificalis*. In the early part of the 17th century, several writers put forth arguments in favor of the last-mentioned views. Among them are Emanuel of Schelstrate, librarian of the Vatican (*Dissertatio de antiquis Romanorum Pontificum catalogis, ex quibus Liber Pontificalis concinnatus sit, et de Libri Pontificalis auctore ac præstantia* [Romæ, 1692, fol.; reprinted in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, iii, 1 sq.]), Joannes Ciampini (magister brevium gratiæ: *Examen Libri Pontificalis sive vitarum Romanorum Pontificum, quæ sub nomine Anastasii bibliothecarii circumferuntur* [Rom. 1688, 4to; reprinted in Muratori, p. 33 sq.]), and others. The supposition that the codex was compiled by pope Damasus, the successor of Liberius, as maintained by the authors of the *Origines*, is untenable. The correspondence between Damasus and Jerome which is adduced in support of this view is evidently spurious (see Schelstrate, *Dissertatio*, etc.). The author or authors are unknown, but the information it contains is valuable. It is now generally thought to have been written about the 4th century.

The oldest source known at present of the *liber* is generally considered to have been a list of the popes down to Liberius, and probably written during his life (352–366), as it makes no mention of his death (see Schelstrate, *Dissertatio*, etc., ch. ii, iii; Hefele, *Tübinger theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1845, p. 312 sq.). The original MS. of this so-called *Codex Liberii* is now lost. In 1634 a copy was made of it from an Antwerp MS. by Bucher, the Bollandists give one in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April, vol. i, 1675, and Schelstrate another from a Vienna codex. These three texts are given side by side in the *Origines de l'église Romaine, par les membres de la communauté de Solermes* (Paris, 1826), vol. i.

Another list of the popes extends down to Felix IV († 530). It was first published in a codex of the Vatican Library by Christine of Sweden, afterwards by Sylvester of Henschen and Papebroch, and is also found in the introduction of the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* for April, in Schelstrate, and in the above-mentioned *Origines*, p. 212. There are transcripts of French origin, and the original MS. of this so-called *Catalogus Felicis IV* is lost, but the two at present in existence are evidently copies of the same original, as results from a careful comparison of them by Schelstrate. That the author of it must have consulted the *Catalogus Liberii* is evident from the fact that its errors are repeated in it. They both omit the names of the consuls and emperors between Liberius and John I (523), and commence again at the reign of the latter, and of his successor, Felix IV (al. III). Schelstrate already correctly surmised from this fact that the author lived in the time of these two popes, which view is also supported by the completeness and thoroughness with which their history, in particular, is treated. Still, as to the author, there is no definite information. The numerous references to the archives of the Roman Church, in which, moreover, the first MS. was discovered, would make it probable that the author was himself a librarian of the archives, if the confusion and even incorrectness of some parts did not militate against this view. Aside from the similarity of this collection with the *Catalogus Liberii*, which extends so far that whole passages are copied literally, or nearly so, from the one into the other, the *Catalogus Felicis IV* differs from the *Liberii* principally by its full particulars on the ordination, by its mention of the birthplace of the popes, and their funerals, which the author may have derived from tradition and other similar sources, pseudo-decretals and canons, martyrologies, etc. The only parts which have heretofore been considered worthy of full confidence are those which coincide with the *Catalogus Liberii*, and those which refer to the times of John and Felix, when the author would be better acquainted with the facts than with those of preceding periods.

Both lists were subsequently continued, and this is what produced the *Liber Pontificalis*. This filiation, however, can only be traced by the aid of MSS. The oldest copy known belongs to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century. It ends at the death of Conon (686–687). A rather incomplete Codex rescriptus, discovered by Pertz (*Archiv.* p. 50 sq.) at Naples, gives the list of the popes down to Conon; it must have been written, at the latest, in the early part of the 8th century. Another is found in a codex of the cathedral

chapter of Verona, ending also with Conon, but to it was added afterwards a list of the names of the popes down to Paul I († 767). This MS. was published in the fourth volume of Bianchini's collection, but, unfortunately, we have no description of this codex; it was to have been given in the fifth volume, which never appeared (see Röstell, *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.* i, 209, 210), so that it is impossible clearly to establish its relation to the Neapolitan MS. A continuation of this first work goes down to Gregory II (from 714), and is to be found in the Codex of the Vatican, No. 5269, which must be a copy of an older MS. (Schelstrate, ch. v, § 3). Then there is another continuation from the second part of the 8th century, contained in a codex of the Ambrosian Library of Milan (M. no. 77, 4to), which is of the same date. The biographies close with Stephen III († 757), and at the end is simply remarked, "xcv Paulus sedit annis x, mensibus ii, diebus v" (Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Scriptores*, iii, 7). The variations on this MS. are given by Muratori under the letter A. It belonged originally to the convent of Bobbio. According to a very plausible supposition of Niebuhr, the above-mentioned Neapolitan Codex came also from that convent. It will probably be possible, when the subject shall have been more thoroughly studied, to trace a connection between the two, and the *Liber Pontificalis* also. After the middle of the 8th century there appeared several continuations, as is shown by the numerous MSS. of them in existence (see, in Muratori, B, C, D; and Pertz, who gives notices of several MSS. of the kind). Some of these codices extend down to Nicolas I († 867), others to Stephen VI († 891), which is as far as the so-called *Liber Pontificalis* extends.

If from what we have stated it is concluded that the work dates back as far as the 7th century, it is clearly impossible that the librarian Anastasius should have been its author. He could at best only have continued it. Schelstrate thinks that the biography of Nicolas I can alone be ascribed to him (c. viii, § 10); while Ciampini is induced by some peculiarities of the style to consider him also as the author of the four preceding ones (*l. c.* sect. v, vi). In the present state of the question it is impossible to decide between the two opinions. But it is clearly a mistake to attribute the biographies of Adrian II and Stephen IV to a certain *Bibliothecarius Gulielmus*, as is generally done (Ciampini names the librarian Zachary, sect. iv, vii, viii). This error originated in an inscription in the Vatican Codex (3762, fol. 90 b–96), which, however, states only that a certain Peter Guillermus of Genoa, librarian of the convent of S. Ægidius, wrote this Vatican Codex in the year 1142 (see Giesebrecht, in the *Kieler Allgem. Monatsschrift*, etc., April, 1852, p. 266, 267; *Monumenta Germaniæ*, xi, 318).

The sources of the *Liber Pontificalis*, besides those above mentioned, consist partly in traditions, partly in MS. documents, and remaining monuments, such as buildings, inscriptions, etc. The collection of canon law of the 7th or 8th century, published by Zachary from a codex of Modena, stands in close connection with the *Liber Pontificalis* (see Zaccaria, *Dissertazioni varie Italiane a storia ecclesiastica appartenenti*, Rom. 1780, vol. ii, diss. iv; reproduced by Galland, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge*, Mogunt. 1770, 4to, ii, 679 sq.); yet it is not to be considered as one of its sources, but rather appears to have been based on the *Liber Pontificalis*. The *Liber Pontificalis* has become particularly valuable for the correctness of the information since the latter part of the 7th century, when the Roman archives were regularly organized, and the continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* could only be intrusted to the librarians or other members of the clergy having free access to the archives. The *Liber Pontificalis* is especially useful for the history of particular churches, ecclesiastical institutions, the discipline, etc. Schelstrate names as its first edition Peter Crabbe's *Concilien* (Cologne, 1538); but this is neither complete nor well connected. It only contains extracts on each pope, like Baronius's *Annales* and subsequent collections of canons, and as the "editio princeps," the edition of J. Busäus (Mayence, 1602, 4to) is generally accepted, which is based on a MS. of Marcus Welser, of Augsburg. It was followed by the edition of Hannibal Fabrotti (Par. 1649), for which several codices were consulted. Lucas Holstenius prepared another by collating Busäus's with a number of MSS., and, although never published, it was greatly used by Schelstrate and others (see Schelstrate, cap. v, No. 3 sq.). From the hands of Schelstrate the MS. of Holstenius passed into the library of the Vatican in 1734 (see Dudik, *Iter Romanum*, pt. i [Vienna, 1855, p. 169]). The next edition was published by Francis Bianchini (Rom. 1718, folio), and this served as a basis for Muratori's, contained in the 3d volume of his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum* (1723); Bianchini's work was continued by his nephew, Joseph Bianchini (vols. ii–iv, Rom. 1735; there was to have been a 5th volume, but it never appeared). There also appeared at Rome an edition by John and Peter Joseph Vignoli (1724, 1752, 1755, 3 vols. 4to). Röstell recently undertook another for the *Monumenta Germaniæ*, while Giesebrecht announced for the same work a continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* (see Giesebrecht, *Ueber die Quellen d. früheren Papstgesch.*, art. ii in the *Kieler Allgem. Monatsschrift f. Wissenschaft u. Literatur*, April, 1852, p. 257–274).

The investigations made on this subject permit us to distinguish three continuations of the *Liber Pontificalis*. 1. From an unknown source have been composed three histories of the popes: (*a*) one is contained in the Vatican Codex, 3764, extending from Laudo (912) to Gregory VII, and belonging to the end of the 11th century. It is reproduced in the first volume of Vignoli's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*. (*b*) The second, in the codex of the library of Este, vi, 5, and extending as far down, was written during Gregory's lifetime. (*c*) The third, dating from the time of Paschal II, in the early part of the 12th century (in the library of *Maria sopra Minerva* at Rome). 2. Another continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis*, composed in the 12th century, extends from Gregory VII to Honorius II (1124–1129). Onuphrius Panvini and Baronius name as its author either the subdeacon Pandulph of Pisa or a Roman librarian named Peter Constant. Gaetani published in 1638 a biography of Gelasius II alone, and asserted that the continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* down to Innocent III was due to cardinal Pandulph Masca of Pisa, and was written in the time of Innocent III. But Papebroch brings forth very plausible arguments to prove that the subdeacon Peter of Pisa wrote only the biography of Paschal II, and that the subsequent ones are due to the subdeacon Peter of Alatri, still Muratori, in the 3d vol. of the *Scriptores*, gives this collection of biographies under the name of Pandulph of Pisa, and the question of authorship has not been further inquired into since. Giesebrecht (p. 262 sq.) maintains that the Codex Vaticanus 3762, of the 12th century, is the original from which all the other MSS. were copied (also the codex No. 2017, of the 14th century, in the Barberini Library at Rome; comp. Vignoli, *Liber Pontif.* vol. iii; Pertz, *Archiv.* p. 54), and also that the author of the life of Paschal I was the cardinal-deacon Peter. The life of Gelasius II and that of Calixtus II were written by Pandulph after 1130, as is shown by his own statement (Muratori, iii, 389, 419). The similarity of style shows that he wrote also the life of Honorius II. But it is highly probable that Pandulph is the same person afterwards designated as the cardinal-deacon of the church of St. Cosmas and Damianus, a nephew of Hugo of Alatri, cardinal-priest and for a long time governor of Benevento. Peter and Pandulph were partisans of Anacletus II, and were afterwards declared schismatics by the adherents of Innocent II; this put an end to their work. 3. Another continuation originated at the close of the 12th century. Baronius designates it as

the *Acta Vaticana*, but Muratori published it under the name of the cardinal of Aragon. Nicolas Roselli (a Dominican, made cardinal in 1351, † in 1362) caused a collection of old historical documents to be prepared, which contained the lives of the popes from Leo IX to Alexander III (omitting Victor III and Urban II), and also the biography of Gregory IX. Pertz (*Archiv.* p. 97) says that these biographies are borrowed from the *Liber censuum camerœ apostolicæ* of Cencius Camerarius, who in 1216 became pope under the name of Honorius III. But these also are not the work of Cencius himself, but of some anterior writer. The life of Adrian IV was written by his relative, cardinal Boso, from materials furnished by himself, during the reign of Alexander III. The life of Alexander III was written at the same time, and most likely also by Boso, who probably wrote most of the whole collection. The introduction is taken from Bonizo's collection of canons, the biographies of John XII, and from Leo IX down to Gregory VII are adapted from the *ad Amicum* of the same writer; subsequent ones down to Eugenius III are based on the records, but after that they become more complete, resting on Boso's own experience, as he then lived at Rome. For subsequent biographies the sources are much more numerous. We might also mention, as a compendium of the whole, the *Actus Pontificum Romanorum* of the Augustinian monk Amalricus Angerii, written in 1365, and extending from St. Peter to John XII (1321), which is to be found in Eccard, *Corpus hist. medii ævi*, ii, 1641 sq., and in Muratori, vol. iii, pt. ii. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 367 sq. See Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste* (Elberfeld, 1868), vol. i (see Index); Watterich, *Vitæ Romanorum Pontificum* (Lpz. 1862); Piper, *Einleit. in die monumentale Theologie* (Gotha, 1867); De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea* (1857).

Liber Sextus and Septimus. See CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF.

Lib'ertine (Λιβερτῖνος, for the Latin *libertinus*, a *freed-man*) occurs but once in the N. T., "Certain of the synagogue, which is called (the synagogue) of the *Libertines*, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians," etc. (Acts vi, 9). There has been much diversity in the interpretation of this word. The structure of the passage leaves it doubtful how many synagogues are implied in it. Some (Calvin, Beza, Bengel) have taken it as if there were but one synagogue, including men from all the different cities that are named. Winer (*N. T. Gramm.* p. 179), on grammatical grounds, takes the repetition of the article as indicating a fresh group, and finds accordingly two synagogues, one including Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians; the other those of Cilicia and Asia. Meyer (*Comment.* ad loc.) thinks it unlikely that out of 480 synagogues at Jerusalem (the number given by rabbinic writers, *Megill.* lxxiii, 4; *Ketub.* cv, 1) there should have been one, or even two only, for natives of cities and districts in which the Jewish population was so numerous (in Cyrene one fourth, in Alexandria two fifths of the whole [Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 2; xiv, 10, 1; xix, 5, 2; *War*, ii, 13, 7; *Ap.* 2, 4]), and on that ground assigns a separate synagogue to each of the proper names. Of the name itself there have been several explanations.

1. The other names being local, this also has been referred to a town called *Libertum*, in the proconsular province of Africa. This, it is said, would explain the close juxtaposition with Cyrene. Suidas recognises Λιβερτῖνοι as ὄνομα ἔθνους, and in the Council of Carthage in 411 (Mansi, iv, 265–274, quoted in Wiltsch, *Handbuch der Kirchlich. Geogr.* § 96) we find an *Episcopus Libertinensis* (Simon. *Onomasticon N. Test.* p. 99). Against this hypothesis it has been urged (1) that the existence of a *town* Libertum, in the 1st century, is not established; and (2) that if it existed, it can hardly have been important enough either to have a synagogue at Jerusalem for the Jews belonging to it, or to take precedence of Cyrene and Alexandria in a synagogue common to the three.

2. Conjectural readings have been proposed, especially *Libyans*, either in the form Λιβοστίνων (Œcumen., Beza, Clericus, Valckenaer), or Λιβύων (Schultness, *De Char. Sp. S.* p. 162, in Meyer, ad loc.); inasmuch as Libertini here occurs among the names of nations, and Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 1, and *Apion*, ii, 4) has told us that many Jews were removed by Ptolemy, and placed in the cities of Libya. The difficulty is thus removed, but every rule of textual criticism is against the reception of a reading unsupported by a single MS. or version.

3. Taking the word in its received meaning as = *freedmen*, Lightfoot finds in it a description of natives of Palestine, who, having fallen into slavery, had been manumitted by Jewish masters (*Exc. on Acts* vi, 9). In this case, however, it is hardly likely that a body of men so circumstanced would have received a Roman name.

4. Grotius and Vitringa explain the word as describing Italian freedmen who had become converts to Judaism. In this case, however, the word "proselytes" would most probably have been used; and it is at least unlikely that a body of converts would have had a synagogue to themselves, or that proselytes from Italy would have been united with Jews from Cyrene and Alexandria.

5. The earliest explanation of the word (Chrysostom) is also that which has been adopted by the most recent authorities. The *Libertini* are Jews who, having been taken prisoners by Pompey and other Roman generals in the Syrian wars, had been reduced to slavery, and had afterwards been emancipated, and returned, permanently or for a time, to the country of their fathers. Of the existence of a large body of Jews in this position at Rome we have abundant evidence. Under Tiberius, the *Senatus-Consultum* for the suppression of Egyptian and Jewish mysteries led to the banishment of 4000 "libertini generis" to Sardinia, under the pretence of military or police duty, but really in the hope that the malaria of the island might be fatal to them. Others were to leave Italy unless they abandoned their religion (Tacitus, *Anal.* ii, 85; comp. Sueton. *Tiber.* c. 36). Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 3, 5), narrating the same fact, speaks of the 4000 who were sent to Sardinia as Jews, and thus identifies them with the "libertinum genus" of Tacitus. Philo (*Legat. ad Caium*, p. 1014, C) in like manner says that the greater part of the Jews of Rome were in the position of freedmen (ἀπελευθερωθέντες), and had been allowed by Augustus to settle in the Trans-Tiberine part of the city, and to follow their own religious customs unmolested (comp. Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 143; i, 9, 70). The expulsion from Rome took place A.D. 19; and it is an ingenious conjecture of Mr. Humphreys (*Comm. on Acts*, ad loc.) that those who were thus banished from Italy may have found their way to Jerusalem, and that, as having suffered for the sake of their religion, they were likely to be foremost in the opposition to a teacher like Stephen, whom they looked on as impugning the sacredness of all that they most revered. The synagogue in question had doubtless been built at the expense of these manumitted Jews, and was occupied by them. Libertini is thus to be regarded as a word of Roman origin, and to be explained with reference to Roman customs. Among the Romans this term was employed to denote those who had once been slaves, but had been set at liberty, or the children of such persons (see Adam's *Rom. Ant.* p. 34, 41 sq.; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Ingenui, Libertus). This view is further confirmed by the fact that the word συναγωγῆς does not occur in the middle of the national names, but stands first, and is followed by τῆς λεγομένης, whence it clearly appears that Λιβερτῖνοι is at least not the name of a country or region. On this subject, see further in Bloomfield, Kuinöl, Wetstein, etc., on Acts vi, 9; and comp. D. Gerdes, *De Synag. Libertinorum* (Grön. 1736); J. F. Scherer, *De Synag. Libertin.* (Argent. 1754); Bräm, *De Libertinis* (Hafn. 1698); Cademann, *De schola Libertinorum* (Lips. 1704); Lösner,

Obs. in N. Test. p. 180; Deyling, *Observ.* ii, 437 sq.; K. Döring, *Ep. qua synagogam Libert. scholam Latinam fuisse conjicit* (Laubæ, 1755). See DISPERSED; SLAVERY.

Libertines, THE, or, as they called themselves, *Spiritualists*, were a Pantheistic and Antinomian sect of the Reformation days. They appeared first in the Netherlands as an ultra division of the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." They spread into France, and, by the interest they manifested in political affairs, gained considerable influence also in Switzerland, especially in Geneva. The impulse given to thought by the Reformation gave rise also to many errors, which flourished by the side of evangelical truth. "Lofty as our ideas of the Reformation should be, we must not be blind to the fact that .... Protestantism [referring especially to the Continent] bears sad evidence of early mismanagement" (Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 37). Foremost among the heretics of this period were the Brethren of the Free Spirit, who, although hotly persecuted, had never been entirely exterminated, and who were yet numerous in Germany and the Netherlands. They now suddenly emerged from the secrecy in which they had lately hidden themselves, as soon as the power of the Church began to wane. Luther clearly saw, however, that not to Romanism, but to Protestantism as well, the influence of the Libertines must be baneful, and he took an early opportunity to warn the Christians of those countries against them (Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* iii [1], 557). Calvin also had to contend against the influence of these Rationalists, and, in speaking of them, mentions a certain Coppin, of Lille, as the first who attempted to introduce, as early as 1529, the doctrines of the Free Spirit in his native city. This Coppin was soon eclipsed by his disciple Quintin, of Hennegau, who, with his companion Bertrand, became the leader of the sect in France in 1534, and with whom a priest called Pocquet (Pocques) connected himself. These two, for Bertrand soon died, are represented as uneducated but shrewd men, who made religion a means of securing earthly goods, and who were very successful in the attempt. They openly professed to have found the principle of "moral falsehood" (or mental reservation) inculcated in the Scriptures, and, in consequence, thought it but right to profess Roman Catholicism when among Roman Catholics, and Protestantism when with Protestants. They are said to have made 4000 proselytes in France alone. They did not, moreover, confine their attempts at deceit to the lower classes, but, on the contrary, endeavored to gain proselytes among the learned and in the higher walks of society; they succeeded even in gaining the ear of the queen Margaret of Navarre, sister of Francis I, who received them, as also a certain Lefèvre d'Etaples and others, at her court, and daily consulted with them. They made great use of allegory, figures of speech, etc., taking their authority from the precept, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

We have said above that the system of the Libertines was pantheistic; it was, in fact, pure pantheism. They held that there is one universal spirit, which is found in every creature, and is the Spirit of God. This one spirit and God is distinguished from itself according as it is considered in heaven or on earth. "Deum a se ipso diversum esse, quod alius omnino in hoc mundo sit quam in cœlo" (Calvin, *Instr. adv. Libert.* c. 11). All creatures, angels, etc., are nothing in themselves, and have no real existence aside from God. Man is preserved only by the Spirit of God, which is in him, and exists only until that spirit again departs from him; instead of a soul, it is God himself who dwells in man, and all his actions, all that takes place in the world, is direct from him, is the immediate work of God ("Quidquid in mundo fit, opus ipsius [Dei] directo censendum esse," c. 13). Everything else, the world, the flesh, the devil, souls, etc., are by this system considered as illusions, mere suppositions (*opinatio*). Even sin is not a mere negation of right, but, since God is the active agent of all actions, it can be but an illusion also, and will disappear as soon as this principle is recognised ("Peccatum—non solum aiunt boni privationem esse, sed est illis opinatio, quæ evanescit et aboletur, cum nulla habetur ejus ratio," c. 12. Pocquet says, in regard to that, "Et quia omnia quæ fiunt extra Deum, nihil sunt quam vanitas," c. 23). There is, therefore, but one evil, and that evil is this very illusion, this imagination of evil, of a distinction between it and the right. Thus the original fall or sin was nothing else than a separation of man from God, or rather the result of man's desire to be something by himself, separating himself from union and identity with God. Thus unintentionally man subjected himself to the world and to Satan, and became himself an illusion, a smoke which passes away and leaves nothing behind. So Pocquet says, "Ideo scriptum est (?), 'Qui videt peccatum, peccatum ei manet et veritas in ipso non est'" (in Calvin, c. 23). From the Libertine point of view the nature of Christ did not materially differ from ours; he consisted, like other human beings, in divine spirit, such as dwells in us all, and in the sacrifice only the illusionary, or worldly part, was lost. However considered, the whole history of Christ, and especially his crucifixion, death, and resurrection, had for them but a symbolical significance; his passion, etc., was, according to Calvin's strong expression, only "une farce ou moralité jouée pour nous figurer le mystère de notre salut"—only a type of the idea that sin was effaced and atoned for, while in reality, and in God's view, it was of no account in itself ("Chr. solum velut typus fuit, in quo contemplamur ea, quæ ad salutem nostram requirit scriptura; e. g. cum aiunt, Christum abolevisse peccatum, sensus eorum est, Christum abolitionem illam in persona sua repræsentasse," c. 17). But in so far as we are one in spirit with Christ, all that he underwent is as if we had undergone it; his exclamation, "It is finished," is true as well for us as for himself; sin has lost all significance so far as we are concerned, and the fight against sin, repentance, mortification of the flesh, etc., are no longer necessary. Neither can nor should the spiritualist be any longer subject to suffering, since Christ has suffered all. Here the idea and the reality, however, are in conflict ("Nam scriptum est: Factus sum totus homo. Cum factus sit totus homo [*tout homme*, in a twofold sense], accipiens naturam humanam, ac mortuus sit, potestne adhuc in his inferioribus locis mori? Magni esset erroris hoc credere," etc., *ibidem*, c. 23). Of course man should be born anew, but this new birth is secured when he regains the state of innocence of Adam before the fall; when in absolute filial unity with God, he neither sees nor knows sin, or, in other words, when he is no longer able to distinguish it from righteousness (modo ne amplius opinemur), and when able to follow the dictates of God's Spirit by virtue of natural impulse ("Sed si adhuc committamus delictum et ingrediamur hortum voluptatis, qui adhuc nobis prohibitus est, ne quid velimus facere, sed sinamus nos duci a voluntate Dei. Alioqui non essemus exuti veteri serpente, qui est primus parens noster Adam, et videremus peccatum, sicut ipse et uxor ejus, etc. Nunc vivificati sumus cum secundo Adamo; qui est Christus, non cernendo amplius peccatum, quia est mortuum," etc.: *ibidem;* compare c. 18). Such a twice-born one is Christ, is God himself, to whom the Libertine returns after death, to be absorbed in him ("Hoc enim imaginantur, animam hominis, quæ est Deus, ad seipsam redire, cum ad mortem ventum est, non ut tanquam anima humana, sed tanquam Deus ipse vivat, sicuti ab initio," c. 3 and 22).

The consequences of such principles are obvious: they lead naturally to sensuality, to the emancipation of the flesh and the laying aside of all restrictions; make men look upon propriety or ownership as a wrong, as opposed to the principles of love, and, in fact, a theft, though this principle was not carried into practice. Calvin called its principal advocates "doctores *passivæ* caritatis." Ordinary or legal marriage comes to be looked upon as a mere carnal bond, and therefore dissoluble; true mar-

riage, such as satisfies both body and mind, being a union of each to each; communion of saints extended not merely to the worldly possessions, but also to the very bodies of the saints. In short, spiritualism soon degenerated into open and avowed sensualism and materialism. But this is the very feature which gave it its influence with some classes in Geneva. The example of their bishops and of the cathedral canons had excited their imagination by inclining them to self-indulgence and licentiousness, and political circumstances operated in favor of the same result. Soon, however, the real principles of the Libertines appeared in their full light, and created a reaction, some women having gone so far as to quote Scripture to authorize their excesses, insisting especially on the fact of God's first command to our first parents having been "to increase and multiply" ("Crescite et multiplicamini super terram. En prima lex, quam ordinavit Deus, quæ vocabatur lex naturæ," c. 23). See COMMUNISM; "Free Love" in the article MARRIAGE. As Calvin had favored political libertinism, those who considered themselves aggrieved by the practice of the spiritualists turned also against him, and this politico-religious reaction went as far as irreligion and atheism, as in the case of Jacob Gruet, whose ultra-radical principles in politics and rationalism in religion led to his trial before the courts of Geneva July 27, 1547. Yet no one really did more to counteract the principles of the Libertines than did Calvin himself. First, in 1544, he brought all their secret principles to light in one of his works (see *Instit.* iii, 3, § 14). Afterwards, in 1547, he warned the faithful of Rouen against an ex-Franciscan monk who was inculcating libertine doctrines, and who met with some success, especially among women of the higher classes. Under Calvin's influence Farel also took up the pen against the Libertines (*Le glaive de la parole véritable, tiré contre le bouclier de défense, duquel un cordelier s'est voulu servir pour approuver ses fausses et damnables opinions* [Geneva, 1550; see Kirchhofer, *Theol. Studien und Krit.* 1831]). The queen of Navarre was highly offended at Calvin for denouncing the leaders of the Libertines who were then at her court; he therefore wrote to her a letter which is a remarkable specimen of respectful remonstrance (Aug. 28, 1545; in French, see J. Bonnet, *Lettres de J. Calvin*, i, 111 sq.; Latin, *Epist. et Resp.* ed. Amst. p. 33). It is, in fact, due to his efforts that this sect, this baneful curse, left France to take refuge in its native country, Belgium, and that it finally disappeared altogether. Against the Libertines of Geneva the attacks were for a long time unavailing; they cannot be considered to have been successfully ended until after the insurrection of May 15, 1555, when the principal leaders were either exiled or imprisoned. See Calvin, *Aux ministres de l'église de Neufchastel contre la secte fanatique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment Spirituels* (Gen. 1544, 8vo; 1545, and other editions); *Contre un Franciscain, sectateur des erreurs des Libertins, adressé à l'église de Rouen* (20 Août, 1547 [both these have been published together in 1547, in the *Opuscules*, p. 817 sq., and by P. Jacob, p. 293 sq.; Lat. by Des Gallars, in *Opusc. omn.* Gen. 1552; *Opp.* ed. Amst. viii, 374 sq.]); Picot, *Hist. de Genève;* Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* iii, 1, p. 385; Hundeshagen, in the *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* (1845); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 374–380. (J. H. W.)

Liberty. "The idea of liberty," says Locke, "is the idea of a power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action, according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other. When either of them is not in the power of the agent, to be produced by him according to his volition, then he is not at liberty, but under necessity." From this, and the extract which follows, it will be seen that Locke's ideas of *liberty* and of *power* are very nearly the same. "Every one," he observes, "finds in himself a power to begin or forbear, continue or put an end to, several actions in himself. From the consideration of the extent of this power of the mind over the actions of the man, which every one finds in himself, arise the ideas of liberty and necessity." These definitions, however, merely extend to the ability of the individual to execute his own purposes without obstruction; whereas Locke, in order to do justice to his own decided opinion on the subject, ought to have included also in his idea of liberty a power over the determinations of the will. "By the liberty of a moral agent," says Dr. Reid, "I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. If, in any action, he had power to will what he did, or not to will it, in that action he is free. But if, in every voluntary action, the determination of his will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, or of something in his external circumstances, he is not free; he has not what I call the *liberty* of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity." On the other hand, some affirm that necessity is perfectly consistent with human liberty; that is, that the most strict and inviolable connection of cause and effect does not prevent the full, free, and unrestrained development of certain powers in the agent, or take away the distinction between the nature of virtue and vice, praise and blame, reward and punishment, but is the foundation of all moral reasoning. "I conceive," says Hobbes, "that nothing taketh beginning from itself, but from the action of some other immediate agent without itself; and that therefore, when first a man hath an appetite or will to do something to which immediately before he had no appetite nor will, the cause of his will is not the will itself, but something else not in his own disposing; so that whereas it is out of controversy that of voluntary action the will is the necessary cause, and by this which is said the will is also caused by other things whereof it disposeth not, it followeth that voluntary actions have all of them necessary causes, and therefore are necessitated. I hold that to be a sufficient cause to which nothing is wanting that is needful to the producing of the effect. The same is also a necessary cause. For if it be possible that a sufficient cause shall not bring forth the effect, then there wanteth somewhat which was needful to the producing of it, and so the cause was not sufficient; but if it be impossible that a sufficient cause should not produce the effect, then is a sufficient cause a necessary cause (for that is said to produce an effect necessarily that cannot but produce it). Hence it is manifest that whatsoever is produced hath had a sufficient cause to produce it, or else it had not been, and therefore also voluntary actions are necessitated." "I conceive liberty," he observes, "to be rightly defined in this manner: Liberty is the absence of all impediments to action that are not contained in the nature and intrinsical quality of the agent: as, for example, the water is said to descend freely, or to have liberty to descend by the channel of the river, because there is no impediment that way, but not across, because the banks are impediments; and, though the water cannot ascend, yet men never say it wants the liberty to ascend, but the faculty or power, because the impediment is in the nature of the water, and intrinsical. So also we say, he that is tied wants the liberty to go, because the impediment is not in him, but in his bands; whereas we say not so of him that is sick or lame, because the impediment is in himself. I hold that the ordinary definition of a free agent—namely, that a free agent is that which, when all things are present that are needful to produce the effect, can nevertheless not produce it—implies a contradiction, and is nonsense; being as much as to say the cause may be sufficient, that is to say, necessary, and yet the effect shall not follow." He afterwards defines a moral agent to be one that acts from deliberation, choice, or will, not from indifference; and, speaking of the supposed inconsistency between choice and necessity, he adds: "Commonly, when we see and know the strength that moves us, we acknowledge necessity; but when we do not, or mark not the force that moves us, we then think there is none, and thus conclude that it is not cause, but lib-

erty, that produceth the action. Hence it is that we are apt to think that one doth not choose this or that who of necessity chooses it; but we might as well say fire doth not burn because it burns of necessity." The general question is thus stated by Hobbes in the beginning of his treatise: the point is not, he says, "whether a man can be a free agent; that is to say, whether he can write or forbear, speak or be silent, according to his will, but whether the will to write or the will to forbear come upon him according to his will, or according to anything else in his power. I acknowledge this liberty, that I can do if I will; but to say I can will if I will, I take to be an absurd speech. In fine, that freedom which men commonly find in books, that which the poets chant in the theatres and the shepherds on the mountains, that which the pastors teach in the pulpits and the doctors in the universities, and that which the common people in the markets, and all mankind in the whole world, do assent unto, is the same that I assent unto, namely, that a man hath freedom to do if he will; but whether he hath freedom to will is a question neither the bishop nor they ever thought on." Thus it will readily be perceived that Hobbes entirely denies the main point at issue, namely, the *freedom of the will* itself, and confines the subject—as his definition—purely to *liberty of action*. This latter is simply a *physical* question, and applies to all agents, whether human, animal, or even material; that liberty which concerns, and indeed constitutes, a being as a *moral* agent, is quite a different thing. Hobbes as a materialist, and therefore a necessitarian, of course finds no room for this kind of moral or self-determining power.

It is unquestionable that the source of most of the confusion on the subject is in the ambiguity lurking under the term *necessity*, which includes both kinds of necessity, moral and physical. The double meaning of the word has been the chief reason why persons who were guided more by their own feelings and the customary associations of language than by formal definitions have altogether rejected the doctrine, while persons of a more logical turn, who could not deny the truth of the abstract principle, have yet, in their explanation of it and inference from it, fallen into the same error as their opponents. The partisans of necessity have given up their common sense, as they supposed, to their reason, while the advocates of liberty rejected a demonstrable truth from a dread of its consequences, and both have been the dupes of a word. The obnoxiousness of the name unquestionably has been the cause of nearly all the difficulty and repugnance which many who really hold the doctrine find in admitting it. It was to remove this prejudice that Dr. Jonathan Edwards was induced to write his celebrated treatise on the Will. In a letter written expressly to vindicate himself from the charge of having, in his great work, confounded moral with physical necessity, he says: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which take place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as *must, cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, invincible*, etc., when applied here, are not employed in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called *certainty* than *necessity*." The well-known definition of Edwards on this subject is in the following words: "The plain and obvious meaning of the words *freedom* and *liberty*, in common speech, is *power, opportunity*, or *advantage that any one has to do as he pleases*, or, in other words, his being free from hinderance or impediment in the way of doing or conducting in any respect as he wills. I say not only doing, but conducting, because a voluntary forbearing to do, sitting still, keeping silence, etc., are instances of persons' conduct about which liberty is exercised, though they are not so properly called doing. And the contrary to liberty, whatever name we call that by, is a person's being hindered or unable to conduct as he will, or being necessitated to do otherwise." The radical defect in this definition as to the question in hand is that liberty, as thus defined, relates solely to *action* (or non-action, as the case may be), and not to the will at all. Thus, by a singular method of *petitio principii*, the very possibility of all freedom of will is excluded. The real point at issue is but casually named, and arbitrarily dismissed as a contradiction. That point is not whether a man may act as he wills (this, again, is mere physical liberty), but whether the will has a self-determining power; whether, in other words, a man may *will* in opposition to external influences, usually called motives. This question the universal experience of mankind has determined in the affirmative. On these two grounds, 1, the essential fallacy as to the point in dispute, and, 2, the unanimous testimony of consciousness as to the spontaneity of volition, the fundamental position of Edwards has been so successfully attacked, as, for instance (to name only Calvinistic writers), by Tappan and Bledsoe, that it may now be regarded as failing to meet the present theological status of the question. See WILL.

True liberty evidently consists simply in *freedom from external constraint*. That God is free in this sense, at least in his acts, all must admit, inasmuch as there is no conceivable power that could coerce him. It is likewise obvious that he is equally free in his volitions, unless we suppose a system of arbitrary *laws* or absolute line of *policy* which shuts him up to a certain line of conduct. So far as these may be the resultant or expression of his own nature, they might perhaps be admitted without essentially impairing our notions of his freedom. So, again, of man; if the motives, by which alone, if at all, it is claimed that his volitions are governed, are self-originated, or derive their governing weight from the influence which his own mind imparts to them, he may still be said to be free in at least the strict sense of the definition. If, however, these preponderating elements consist in his own *desires*, and if, further, these desires are beyond his own control (whether by reason of natural predisposition, inveterate habit, or the divine or satanic interposition), then it must still remain dubious if his liberty amounts to the measure of a rational, moral, and accountable agent. In the human sphere this is precisely the point of difficulty, but its determination as a matter of fact, if indeed possible, belongs properly under another head. See MOTIVE. In the divine sphere, on the other hand, the difficulty arises from the so-called system of fore-ordination, which is tenaciously held by Calvinistic divines, being either assumed as a metaphysical dogma, or inferred from certain scriptural statements, and as strenuously denied by others. See PREDESTINATION.

The ground assumed on this vexed question by Sir William Hamilton and Mansell is that liberty and necessity are both incomprehensible, both being beyond the limits of legitimate thought; that they are among those questions which admit of no certain answer, the very inability to answer them proving that dogmatic decisions on either side are the decisions of ignorance, not of knowledge. "*How* the will can possibly be free," says Hamilton, "must remain to us, under the present limitation of our faculties, wholly incomprehensible. We are unable to conceive an absolute commencement; we cannot, therefore, conceive a free volition. A determination by motives cannot, to our understanding, escape from necessitation—nay, were we even to admit as true what we cannot think as possible, still the doctrine of a motiveless volition would be only casualistic, and the free acts of an indifferent are morally and rationally as worthless as the fore-ordained passions of a determined will. *How*, therefore, I repeat, moral liberty is possible in man or God we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically *the fact*

that we are free is given to us in the consciousness of our moral accountability; and this fact of liberty cannot be reargued on the ground that it is incomprehensible, for the philosophy of the conditions proves, against the necessitarian, that things there are which *may*, nay, *must* be true, of which the understanding is wholly unable to construe to itself the possibility. But this philosophy is not only competent to defend the fact of our moral liberty, possible, though inconceivable, against the assault of the fatalist; it retorts against himself the very objection of inconceivability by which the fatalist had thought to triumph over the libertarian. It shows that the scheme of freedom is not more inconceivable than the scheme of necessity; for, whilst fatalism is a recoil from the more obtrusive inconceivability of an absolute commencement, on the fact of which commencement the doctrine of liberty proceeds, the fatalist is shown to overlook the equal but less obtrusive inconceivability of an infinite non-commencement, on the assertion of which non-commencement his own doctrine of necessity must ultimately rest. As equally unthinkable, the two counter, the two one-sided schemes, are thus theoretically balanced." Sir William, however, as it seems to us, in this extract does not closely adhere to the conditions of the problem. According to his own admission, it is not the *fact* of a self-determining power in the will that is "inconceivable," but only the mode (the *how*) of its exercise. This, like many other well-known processes, is a mystery. Again, it is not claimed that the will acts *without motive*, but only that it is not *controlled by* external motive; that it has the power of itself choosing what motive shall be strongest with it, irrespective of the intrinsic force of that motive. It is this distinction that preserves—as no other can—the truly *moral* character of the agent.

"The endless controversy concerning predestination and free-will," says Mansell, "whether viewed in its speculative or in its moral aspect, is but another example of the hardihood of human ignorance. The question has its philosophical as well as its theological aspect: it has no difficulties peculiar to itself; it is but a special form of the fundamental mystery of the co-existence of the infinite and the finite." "The vexed question of liberty and necessity, whose counter arguments become a by-word for endless and unprofitable wrangling, is but one of a large class of problems, some of which meet us at every turn of our daily life and conduct, whenever we attempt to justify in theory that which we are compelled to carry out in practice. Such problems arise inevitably whenever we attempt to pass from the sensible to the intelligible world, from the sphere of action to that of thought, from that which appears to us to that which is in itself. In religion, in morals, in our daily business, in the care of our lives, in the exercise of our senses, the rules which guide our practice cannot be reduced to principles which satisfy our reason." Those theologians, on the other hand, who deny that the divine predestination extends to the individual acts of men in general, think that they thus more effectually obviate the whole difficulty. In the divine foreknowledge of all human actions they admit the *certainty* of their occurrence, but find no *causative* power, such as seems to enter essentially into the predeterminations of an Almighty will. As to the argument that such foreknowledge rests upon, and therefore implies fore-ordination, they contend that this is a reversal of the true order (comp. Rom. viii, 29), and that God's prescience is a simple knowing beforehand by his peculiar power of intuition, not any conclusion or inference from what he may or may not determine. See PRESCIENCE.

See Hobbes's treatise *Of Liberty and Necessity;* also his *Opinion about Liberty and Necessity;* also *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance clearly stated and debated between Dr. Bramhall and Thomas Hobbes;* Leibnitz's *Essais de Théodicée*, a collection of papers which passed between Mr. Leibnitz and Dr. Clarke; Collins's *Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty;* Clarke's *Remarks upon a Book entitled "A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty;"* Edwards's *Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will; Essay on the Genius and Writings of Edwards*, prefixed to the London edition of his works, 1834, by H. Rogers; J. Taylor's introduction to his edition of Edwards *On the Will;* Hartley's *Observations on Man;* Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind;* Cousin's *Elements of Psychology* (Prof. Henry's translation); Sir William Hamilton's *Philosophy, and Lectures on Metaphysics;* Mansell's *Limits of Religious Thought;* Herbert Spencer's *First Principles;* Stewart's *Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man;* Tappan's *Review of Edwards's Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will;* Mill's *System of Logic;* Jouffroy's *Introduction to Ethics;* Blakey's *History of the Philosophy of Mind;* Hazard, *On the Will;* Bledsoe, *On the Will;* Whedon, *On the Will.* See NECESSITARIANS

Lib'nah (Heb. *Libnah'*, לִבְנָה, *transparency*, as in Exod. xxiv, 10), the name of two places. See also SHIHOR-LIBNATH.

1. (Sept. Λεβωνᾶ v. r. Λεμωνᾶ.) The twenty-first station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rimmon-parez and Rissah (Numb. xxxiii, 20, 21); probably identical with LABAN (Deut. i, 1), and perhaps situated near wady *el-Ain*, west of Kadesh-Barnea. See EXODE.

2. (Sept. Λεβνά, sometimes Λοβνά, occasionally Λοβνάν, and even Λεβονά.) One of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Josh. xii, 15), taken and destroyed by Joshua immediately after Makkedah and before Lachish (Josh. x, 29–32, 39). It lay in the plain within the territory assigned to Judah (Josh. xv, 42), and became one of the Levitical towns in that tribe, as well as an asylum (Josh. xxi, 13; 1 Chron. vi, 57). In the reign of king Jehoram, Libnah is said to have revolted from him (2 Kings viii, 22; 2 Chron. xxi, 10). From the circumstance of this revolt having happened at the same time with that of the Edomites, it has been supposed by some to have reference to another town of the same name situated in that country. But such a conjecture is unnecessary and improbable, for it appears that the Philistines and Arabians revolted at the same time (2 Chron. xxi, 16). Libnah of Judah rebelled because it refused to admit the idolatries of Jehoram; and it is not said in either of the passages in which this act is recorded, as of Edom, that it continued in revolt "unto this day." It may be inferred either that it was speedily reduced to obedience, or that, on the re-establishment of the true worship, it spontaneously returned to its allegiance, for we find it was the native place of the grandfather of two of the last kings of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 31; xxiv, 18; Jer. lii, 1). It appears to have been a strongly fortified place, for the Assyrian king Sennacherib was detained some time before it when he invaded Judæa in the time of Hezekiah. See HEZEKIAH. On completing or relinquishing the siege of Lachish—which of the two is not quite certain—Sennacherib laid siege to Libnah (2 Kings xix, 8; Isa. xxxvii, 8). While there he was joined by Rabshakeh and the part of the army which had visited Jerusalem (2 Kings xix, 8; Isa. xxxvii, 8), and received the intelligence of Tirhakah's approach; and it would appear that at Libnah the destruction of the Assyrian army took place, though the statements of Herodotus (ii, 141) and of Josephus (*Ant.* x, 1, 4) place it at Pelusium (see Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 480). Libnah was the native place of Hamutal or Hamital, the queen of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii, 31) and Zedekiah (xxiv, 18; Jer. lii, 1). It is in this connection that its name appears for the last time in the Bible. It existed as a village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, and is placed by them in the district of Eleutheropolis (*Onomast.* s. v. Λοβανά; compare Josephus, *Ant.* x, 5, 2). Dr. Robinson was unable to discover the least trace of its site (*Bib. Res.* ii, 389). Stanley inclines to find the site at *Tell es-Safieh* (*Sinai*

and Pal. p. 207, 258); but this is probably Gath. Van de Velde suggests *Arak el-Menshiyeh*, a hill about four miles west of Beit-jebrin (*Memoir*, p. 330), which seems to answer to the requirements of location. It stood near Lachish, west of Makkedah, and probably also west of Eleutheropolis (Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* x, 29), and was situated in the district immediately west of the hill region, in the vicinity of Ether, Ashan, etc. (Josh. xv, 42).

Libnath. See SHIHOR-LIBNATH.

Libneh. See POPLAR.

Lib'ni (Heb. *Libni'*, לִבְנִי, *white;* Sept. Λοβενεί, Λοβενί), the first-named of the two sons of Gershon, the son of Levi (Exod. vi, 17; Numb. iii, 18, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 17; comp. Numb. xxvi, 58); elsewhere called LAADAN (1 Chron. xxiii, 7; xxvi, 21). B.C. post. 1856. His son is called Jahath (1 Chron. vi, 20, 43), and his descendants were named LIBNITES (Numb. iii, 21; xxvi, 58). In 1 Chron. vi, 29, by some error he is called the son of Mahli and the father of Shimei.

Lib'nite (Heb. *Libni'*, לִבְנִי, being a patronymic of the same form from *Libni;* Sept. Λοβενί), a descendant of Libni the Levite (Numb. iii, 21; xxvi, 58).

Liborius, ST., fourth bishop of Mans, a disciple of St. Pavacius, flourished from the middle to the close of the 4th century. The existing documents on his life are quite untrustworthy, and relate only that he was a pious man, performed sundry miracles, and that he was a fast friend of St. Martin of Tours. See the Bollandists for July 23; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x, 307; Mabillon, *De Pontif. Cenomannensibus.* His body was transferred in the 9th century from Mans to Paderborn by order of Biso, bishop of the latter place. See Pertz, *Script.* iv (vi), 149 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 380.

Libra (*pound*), the name sometimes given to the seventy suffragans of the bishop of Rome, from the circumstance that there were seventy solidi or parts in the Roman libra.

Libraries. In the early Church, as soon as churches began to be erected, it was customary to attach libraries to them. In these were included not only the liturgical and other Church books, and MS. copies of the holy Scriptures in the original languages, but also homilies and other theological works. That they were of some importance is evident from the manner in which they are referred to by Eusebius and Jerome, who mention having made use of the libraries at Jerusalem and Cæsarea. Eusebius says he found the principal part of the materials for his Ecclesiastical History in the library at Jerusalem. One of the most famous was that attached to the church of St. Sophia, which is supposed to have been commenced by Constantine, but was afterwards greatly augmented by Theodosius the Younger, in whose time there were not fewer than one hundred thousand books in it, and a hundred and twenty thousand in the time of Basilicus and Zeno. No doubt a particular reason for thus collecting books was their great expense and rarity before the art of printing enabled men to possess themselves the works they needed for thorough research. In churches where the itinerant system prevailed libraries possessed by churches would even in our very day prove a source of pleasure, and timesaving as well. Indeed, in some of the larger cities here and there, congregations are already advocating this plan.

Libri Carolini. See CAROLINE BOOKS.

Lib'ya (Λιβύα or Λιβύη), a name which, in its largest acceptation, was used by the Greeks to denote the whole of Africa (Strabo, ii, 131); but *Libya Proper*, which is the Libya of the New Testament (Acts ii, 10), and the country of the *Lubim* in the Old, was a large tract lying along the Mediterranean, to the west of Egypt (Strabo, xvii, 824). It is called *Pentapolitana Regio* by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 5), from its five cities, Berenice, Arsinoë, Ptolemais, Apollonia, and Cyrene; and *Libya Cyrenaica* by Ptolemy (*Geog.* iv, 5), from Cyrene, its capital. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s. v. The name of Libya occurs in Acts ii, 10, where "the dwellers in the parts of Libya about Cyrene" are mentioned among the stranger Jews who came up to Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost. This obviously means the Cyrenaica. Similar expressions are used by Dion Cassius (Λιβύη ἡ περὶ Κυρήνην, liii, 12) and Josephus (ἡ πρὸς Κυρήνην Λιβύη, *Ant.* xvi, 6, 1). See CYRENE. In the Old Test. it is the rendering sometimes adopted of פּוּט (Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxx, 5; xxxviii, 5), elsewhere rendered PHUT (Gen. x, 6; Ezek. xxvii, 10).

Libya is supposed to have been first peopled by, and to have derived its name from, the *Lehabim* or *Lubim* (Gen. x, 13; Nah. iii, 9; see Gesenius, *Monum. Phœn.* p. 211; comp. Michaelis, *Spicil.* i, 262 sq.; Vater, *Comment.* i, 132). These, its earliest inhabitants, appear, in the time of the Old Testament, to have consisted of wandering tribes, who were sometimes in alliance with Egypt (compare Herod. iv, 159), and at others with the Ethiopians, as they are said to have assisted both Shishak, king of Egypt, and Zerah the Ethiopian in their expeditions against Judæa (2 Chron. xii, 4; xiv, 8; xvi, 9). In the time of Cambyses they appear to have formed part of the Persian empire (Herod. iii, 13), and Libyans formed part of the immense army of Xerxes (Herod. vii, 71, 86). They are mentioned by Daniel (xi, 43) in connection with the Ethiopians and Cushites. "They were eventually subdued by the Carthaginians; and it was the policy of that people to bring the nomade tribes of Northern Africa which they mastered into the condition of cultivators, that by the produce of their industry they might be able to raise and maintain the numerous armies with which they made their foreign conquests. But Herodotus assures us that none of the Libyans beyond the Carthaginian territory were tillers of the ground (Herod. iv, 186, 187; compare Polybius, i, 161, 167, 168, 177, ed. Schweighaeuser). Since the time of the Carthaginian supremacy, the country, with the rest of the East, has successively passed into the hands of the Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks." See AFRICA.

Lib'yan (only in the plur.), the rendering adopted in the A. V. of two Heb. names, לוּבִים (*Lubbim'*, Sept. Λίβυες), Dan. xi, 43 (elsewhere written לוּבִים, "*Lubim,*" 2 Chron. xii, 3; xvi, 8; Nah. iii, 9; prob. i. q. לְהָבִים, "*Lebabim,*" Gen. x, 13; 1 Chron. i, 11) and פּוּט (*Put*, Jer. xlvi, 9; Sept. Λίβυες; elsewhere rendered "Libya," Ezek. xxx, 5; xxxviii, 5; "Phut," or "Put"). See LIBYA.

Lice (כֵּן, *ken*, perh. from כָּנַן, to *nip;* only once in the sing. used collectively, Isa. li, 6, and there doubtful, where the Sept., Vulg., and Engl. Vers. confound with כֵּן, *so*, and render *ταῦτα, hæc*, "in like manner;" elsewhere plural, כִּנִּים, Exod. viii, 16, 17, 18; Psa. cv, 31; Sept. σκνῖφες, ver. 17 σκνίψ, v. r. σκνῖπες; Vulg. *sciniphes*, in Psa. *cinifes;* also the cognate sing. collective כִּנָּם, *kinnam*, Exod. viii, 17, 18, Sept. and Vulg. σκνῖφες, *sciniphes*), the name of the creature employed in the third plague upon Egypt, miraculously produced from the dust of the land. Its exact nature has been much disputed. Dr. A. Clarke has inferred, from the words "*in* man and *in* beast," that it was the *acarus sanguisugus*, or "tick" (*Comment. on Exod.* viii, 16). Michaelis remarks (*Suppl. ad Lex.* 1174) that if it be a Hebrew word for *lice* it is strange that it should have disappeared from the cognate tongues, the Aramaic, Samaritan, and Ethiopic. The rendering of the Sept. seems highly valuable when it is considered that it was given by learned Jews resident in Egypt, that it occurs in the most ancient and best executed portion of that version, and that it can be elucidated by the writings of ancient Greek naturalists, etc. Thus Aristotle, who was nearly contemporary with

the Sept. translators of Exodus, mentions the κνῖπες (the σκνῖφες of the Sept.) among insects able to distinguish the smell of honey (*Hist. Animal.* iv, 8), and refers to species of birds which he calls σκνιποφάγα, that live by hunting σκνῖπες (viii, 6). His pupil Theophrastus says, "The κνῖπες are born in certain trees, as the oak, the fig-tree, and they seem to subsist upon the sweet moisture which is collected under the bark. They are also produced on some vegetables" (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 17, and ii, ult.). This description applies to *aphides*, or rather to the various species of "gall-flies" (*Cynips*, Linn.). Hesychius, in the beginning of the third century, explains σκνίψ as "a green four-winged creature," and quotes Phrynichus as applying the name to a sordid wretch, and adds, "From the little creature among trees, which speedily devours them." Philo (A.D. 40) and Origen, in the second century, who both lived in Egypt, describe it in terms suitable to the gnat or mosquito (Philo, *Vita Mosis*, i, 97, 2, ed. Mangey; Origen, *Homilia tertia in Exod.*), as does also Augustine in the third or fourth century (*De Convenientia*, etc.). But Theodoret, in the same age, distinguishes between σκνῖπες and κώνωπες (*Vita Jacobi*). Suidas (A.D. 1100) says σκνίψ, "resembling gnats," and adds, "a little creature that eats wood." These Christian fathers, however, give no authority for their explanations, and Bochart remarks that they seem to be speaking of gnats under the name σκνῖπες, which word, he conjectures, biased them from its resemblance to the Hebrew. Schleusner adds (*Glossema in Octateuch*) σκνῖφες, "less than gnats," and (*Lex. Cyrilli*, MS. Brem.), "very small creatures like gnats." From this concurrence of testimony it would appear that not lice, but some species of gnats, is the proper rendering, though the ancients, no doubt, included other species of insects under the name. Mr. Bryant, however, gives a curious turn to the evidence derived from ancient naturalists. He quotes Theophrastus, and admits that a Greek must be the best judge of the meaning of the Greek word, but urges that the Sept. translators concealed the meaning of the Hebrew word, which he labors to prove is *lice*, for fear of offending the Ptolemies, under whose inspection they translated, and the Egyptians in general, whose detestation of lice was as ancient as the time of Herodotus (ii, 37) (but who includes "any *other* foul creature"), and whose disgust, he thinks, would have been too much excited by reading that their nation once swarmed with those creatures through the instrumentality of the servants of the God of the Jews (*Plagues of Egypt*, Lond. 1794, p. 56, etc.). This suspicion, if admitted, upsets all the previous reasoning. But a plague of lice, upon Bryant's own principles, could not have been more offensive to the Egyptians than the plague on the River Nile, the frogs, etc., which the Sept. translators have not mitigated. Might it not be suggested with equal probability that the Jews in later ages had been led to interpret the word lice as being peculiarly humiliating to the Egyptians (see Josephus, ii, 14, 3, who, however, makes the Egyptians to be afflicted with *phthiriasis*). The rendering of the Vulg. affords us no assistance, being evidently formed from that of the Sept., and not being illustrated by any Roman naturalist, but found only in Christian Latin writers (see Facciolati, s. v.). The other ancient versions, etc., are of no value in this inquiry. They adopt the popular notion of the times, and Bochart's reasonings upon them involve, as Rosenmüller (apud Bochart) justly complains, many unsafe permutations of letters. If, then, the Sept. be discarded, we are deprived of the highest source of information. Bochart's reasoning upon the form of the word (*Hieroz.* iii, 518) is unsound, as, indeed, that of all others who have relied upon etymology to furnish a clew to the insect intended. It is strange that it did not occur to Bochart that if the plague had been lice it would have been easily imitated by the magicians, which was attempted by them, but in vain (Exod. viii, 18). Nor is the objection valid that if this plague were gnats, etc., the plague of flies would be anticipated, since the latter most likely consisted of one particular species having a different destination [see FLY], whereas this may have consisted not only of mosquitoes or gnats, but of some other species which also attack domestic cattle, as the *œstrus*, or *tabanus*, or *zimb* (Bruce, *Travels*, ii, 315, 8vo), on which supposition these two plagues would be sufficiently distinct. See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. But, since mosquitoes, gnats, etc., have ever been one of the evils of Egypt, there must have been some peculiarity attending them on this occasion which proved the plague to be "the finger of God." From the next chapter, ver. 31, it appears that the flax and the barley were smitten by the hail; that the former was beginning to grow, and that the latter was in the ear, which, according to Shaw, takes place in Egypt in March. Hence the *kinnim* would be sent about February, i. e. before the increase of the Nile, which takes place at the end of May or beginning of June. Since, then, the innumerable swarms of mosquitoes, gnats, etc., which every year affect the Egyptians, come, according to Hasselquist, at the increase of the Nile, the appearance of them in February would be as much a variation of the course of nature as the appearance of the *œstrus* in January would be in England. They were also probably numerous and fierce beyond example on this occasion, and, as the Egyptians would be utterly unprepared for them (for it seems that this plague was not announced), the effects would be signally distressing. Bochart adduces instances in which both mankind and cattle, and even wild beasts, have been driven by gnats from their localities. It may be added that the proper Greek name for the gnat is ἐμπίς, and that probably the word κώνωψ, which much resembles κνίψ, is appropriate to the mosquito. Hardouin observes that the κνῖπες of Aristotle are not the ἐμπίδες, which latter is by Pliny always rendered *culices*, a word which he employs with great latitude. See GNAT. For a description of the evils inflicted by these insects upon man, see Kirby and Spence, *Introduction to Entomology*, Lond. 1828, i, 115, etc.; and for the annoyance they cause in Egypt, Maillet, *Descript. de l'Egypte* par l'Abbé Mascrier (Paris, 1755), xc, 37; Forskal, *Descr. Animal.* p. 85. Michaelis proposed an inquiry into the meaning of the word σκνῖφες to the Société des Savants, with a full description of the qualities ascribed to them by Philo, Origen, and Augustine (*Recueil*, etc. Amst. 1744). Niebuhr inquired after it of the Greek patriarch, and also of the metropolitan at Cairo, who thought it to be a species of gnat found in great quantities in the gardens there, and whose bite was extremely painful. A merchant who was present at the inquiry called it *dubâb-el-keb*, or the *dog-fly* (*Description de l'Arabie*, Pref. p. 39, 40). Besides the references already made, see Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Exod.*; Michaelis, *Suppl. ad Lex. Hebraic.* 1203 sq.; Oedmann, *Verm. Samml. aus der Naturkunde*, i, 6, 74–91; Bakerus, *Annotat. in Et. M.* ii, 1090;

Egyptian Gnat magnified.

Harenberg, *Observ. Crit. de Insectis Ægypt. infestantibus*, in *Miscell. Lips. Nov.* ii, 4, 617–20; Geddes, *Crit. Rem.* on Exod. viii, 17; Montanus, *Critic. Sac.* on Exod. viii, 12; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 572. See GNAT.

"The advocates of the other theory, that *lice* are the animals meant by *kinnim*, and not *gnats*, base their arguments upon these facts: (1) because the *kinnim* sprang from the dust, whereas gnats come from the waters; (2) because *gnats*, though they may greatly irritate men and beasts, cannot properly be said to be 'in' them; (3) because their name is derived from a root (כּוּן) which signifies to 'establish,' or to 'fix,' which cannot be said of *gnats;* (4) because, if *gnats* are intended, then the fourth plague of flies would be unduly anticipated; (5) because the Talmudists use the word *kinnah* in the singular number to mean a *louse;* as it is said (*Shab.* xiv, 107, b), 'As is the man who slays a camel on the Sabbath, so is he who slays a *louse* on the Sabbath'" (Smith). "The entomologists, Kirby and Spence, place these minute but disgusting insects in the very front rank of those which inflict direct injury upon man. A terrible list of examples they have collected of the ravages of this and closely allied parasitic pests. They remark that, 'for the quelling of human pride, and to pull down the high conceits of mortal man, this most loathsome of all maladies, or one equally disgusting, has been the inheritance of the rich, the wise, the noble, and the mighty; and in the list of those that have fallen victims to it, you will find poets, philosophers, prelates, princes, kings, and emperors. It seems more particularly to have been a judgment of God upon oppression and tyranny, whether civil or religious. Thus the inhuman Pheretima mentioned by Herodotus, Antiochus Epiphanes, the dictator Sylla, the two Herods, the emperor Maximin, and, not to mention more, the persecutor of the Protestants, Philip the Second, were carried off by it' (*Introd. to Entomol.* vol. iv). The Egyptian plague may have been somewhat like that dreadful disease common in Poland, and known as *plica Polonica*, in which the hair becomes matted together in the most disgusting manner, and is infested with swarms of vermin. Each hair is highly sensitive, bleeds at the root on the least violence, and if but slightly pulled feels exquisite pain. Lafontaine, whom Hermann calls a very exact describer, affirms that millions of lice appear on the wretched patient on the third day of this disease (*Mem. Apterol.* p. 78). These insects form the order *Anoplura* of Leach, and *Parasita* of Latreille. Most mammalia, if not all, and probably all birds, are infested by them; each beast and bird, as is stated, having its own proper species of louse, and sometimes two or more. Three distinct species make the human body their abode." See INSECT.

License, the name given to the liberty and *warrant to preach.*

(1.) In the Presbyterian Church it is regularly conferred by the Presbytery on those who have passed satisfactorily through the prescribed curriculum of study. When a student has fully completed his course of study at the theological hall, he is taken on trials for license by the Presbytery to which he belongs. These trials consist of an examination on the different subjects taught in the theological hall, his personal religion, and his motives for seeking to enter the ministerial office. He also delivers a lecture on a passage of Scripture, a homily, an exercise and additions, a popular sermon, and an exegesis; and, lastly, he is examined on Church History, Hebrew and Greek, and on divinity generally. It is the duty of the presbytery to criticise each of these by itself, and sustain or reject it separately, as a part of the series of trials, and then, when the trials are completed, to pass a judgment on the whole by a regular vote. If the trials are sustained, the candidate is required to answer the questions in the formula, and, after prayer, is licensed and authorized to preach the Gospel of Christ, and exercise his gifts as a probationer for the holy ministry, of which license a regular certificate is given if required. He is simply a layman or lay candidate for the clerical office, preaching, but not dispensing the sacraments. See ORDINATION.

(2.) In the Methodist churches it is conferred on laymen who are believed to be competent for this office, and it is from persons thus brought into the ministry [see LAY PREACHING] that the Church is supplied with ministers. See LOCAL PREACHERS; LICENTIATE.

(3.) In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the word license is used to designate the grant given by the bishop to a candidate for orders, authorizing him to read services and sermons in a church in the absence of a minister; also the liberty to preach, which the bishop may give to those who have been ordained deacons if he judge them to be qualified. See the Ordering of Deacons in the Prayer-book, where the bishop says to those he is ordaining, "Take thou the authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to *preach* the same, if thou be thereto licensed by the bishop himself."

See Staunton's *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s. v.; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s. v. See PREACHING.

Licentiate (from Lat. *licet*, it is lawful), one of the four ancient university degrees. It is no longer in use in England, except at Cambridge as a degree of medicine. In France and Germany, however, where it is more general, a licentiate is a person who, having undergone the prescribed examination, has received permission to deliver lectures in the university. When the degree is given as an honor, it is intermediate between *Bachelor of Arts* and *Doctor.*

LICENTIATE is a person authorized by the Church authorities to preach, and who thus becomes eligible to a pastoral charge. See LICENSE.

Licinius. See CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Lichtenberg, JOHANN CONRAD, a German theologian, was born at Darmstadt Dec. 9, 1689. In 1707 he entered the University of Giessen, and then attended successively those of Jena, Leipsic, and Halle; in the latter he finished his academical course in 1711. Soon after he accepted a call as vicar to Neun-Kirchen, in the grand-duchy of Hesse; in 1716 he became pastor of the same place; in 1719, pastor of Upper Ramstadt; in 1733, metropolitan of the diocese of the bailiwick Lichtenberg; in 1745, town pastor at Darmstadt, and examiner of teachers; and in 1749, superintendent. He died July 17, 1751. His knowledge was extensive, embracing not only theology, but also mathematics and physics. Astronomical studies, especially, had a lasting interest for him; the latter he knew skilfully how to weave into his sermons in a simple and popular manner, thus captivating the attention of the audience. He contributed largely to Church music. The various books which he composed are all of an ascetical character; we only mention *Texte zur Kirchenmusik* (Darmst. 1719, 1720, 8vo); *Ermunternde Stimmen aus Zion* (ibid. 1722, 8vo); *Geistliche Betrachtungen über gewisse in den Evangeliis enthaltene Materien* (ibid. 1721, 8vo). — Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 296 sq.

Lidbir. See LO-DEBAR.

Lie (prop. כָּזָב, ψεῦδος), an intentional violation of truth. In Scripture we find the word used to designate all the ways in which mankind denies or alters truth in word or deed, as also evil in general. In general the good is in it designated as the truth, evil as its opposite, or lie, and consequently the devil (being the contrary to God) as the father of lies, and liars or impious persons as children of the devil. Hence the Scriptures most expressly condemn lies (John viii, 44; 1 Tim. i, 9, 10; Rev. xxi, 27; xxii, 15). When, in Rom. iii, 4, it is said that all men are liars, it is synonymous with saying that all are bad. The Bible nowhere admits of permitted, praiseworthy, or pious lies, yet it recommends not to *proclaim* the truth when its proclamation might prove injurious. Hence Christ commands (Matt. vii, 6)

not to present the truth of the Gospel to those who are unworthy when he recommends, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine." In John xvi, 12 we see that he could not tell his disciples all that he would have wished to tell them on account of their weakness. He did not answer the inquiries of Pilate (John xix, 9), nor of Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi, 63). But we nowhere find that either in levity, or to do others good, or to glorify God, Christ ever spoke an untruth. Peter, on the contrary, denied both Christ by word in the moment of danger (Matt. xxvi, 69 sq.; Mark xiv, 66 sq.; Luke xxii, 56 sq.; John xviii, 17 sq.) and the evangelical truth by his actions (Gal. ii, 12, 14). But Paul, in Acts xxiii, 5, made use of an implication to clear himself, or, at any rate, concealed part of the truth in order to create dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and thus save himself. Strict truthfulness requires that we should never alter the truth, either in words or actions, so as to deceive others, whether it be for pleasure, or to benefit others or ourselves, or even for the best cause. Yet, although there can, absolutely considered, be no injurious truth, it is not expedient to tell all truth to those who are not able to receive or comprehend it. Thus evil might result from telling everything to children, fools, mischief-makers, spies, etc. But this does not imply that we may tell them that which is not true, only that we are to remain silent when we perceive that the truth would be useless, or might result in inflicting injury on ourselves or others. This, of course, does not apply to perjury, as this is positive lying, and indeed, by its calling on God, becomes diabolical lying, the Father of truth being invoked to confirm a lie, and the highest attribute of man, his consciousness of God, is made use of to deceive others, and to gain an advantage. See Oath. But there are varieties of untruthfulness which do not belong to the domain of ethics, but to æsthetics. Such are parables, jests in word or deed, tales and fables, the usual formulas of politeness, mimicry (ὑπόχρισις), etc., which are not calculated to deceive. But the æsthetic untruthfulness or suppression of the truth can also be abused. In morals, however, all depends on the improvement of conscience, and a correct, firm consciousness of God's presence and knowledge. These cannot be obtained by mere commandments or moral formulas, but by strengthening the moral sense, fortifying the will — in fact, by awakening and strengthening the moral power. Morality is an inner life; those only can be called liars who wilfully oppose the truth by word or deed, or by conscious untruthfulness seek to lead others into error or sin; in short, to injure them physically or spiritually. As regards so-called "necessary" lies, they also are condemned by the God of all truth; nor even in this world of imperfection, where there are so many ingenious illusions, is there any just occasion for their use. That truthfulness is a limited duty must necessarily be conceded, since the non-expression of the truth is in itself a limitation of it. The Bible mentions instances of lies in good men, but without approving them, as that of Abraham (Gen. xii, 12; xx, 2), Isaac (Gen. xxvi), Jacob (Gen. xxvii), the Hebrew midwives (Exod. i, 15–19), Michal (1 Sam. xix, 14 sq.), David (1 Sam. xx), etc.—Krehl, *Neutest. Wörterbuch.*

There are various kinds of lies. 1. The pernicious lie, uttered for the hurt or disadvantage of our neighbor. 2. The officious lie, uttered for our own or our neighbor's advantage. 3. The ludicrous and jocose lie, uttered by way of jest, and only for mirth's sake in common converse. 4. Pious frauds, as they are improperly called, pretended inspirations, forged books, counterfeit miracles, are species of lies. 5. Lies of the conduct, for a lie may be told in gestures as well as in words; as when a tradesman shuts up his windows to induce his creditors to believe that he is abroad. 6. Lies of omission, as when an author wilfully omits what ought to be related; and may we not add, 7. That all equivocation and mental reservation come under the guilt of lying?

The evil and injustice of lying appear, 1. From its being a breach of the natural and universal right of mankind to truth in the intercourse of speech. 2. From its being a violation of God's sacred law (Phil. iv, 8; Lev. xix, 11; Col. iii, 9). 3. The faculty of speech was bestowed as an instrument of knowledge, not of deceit; to communicate our thoughts, not to hide them. 4. It is esteemed a reproach of so heinous and hateful a nature for a man to be called a liar that sometimes the life and blood of the slanderer have paid for it. 5. It has a tendency to dissolve all society, and to indispose the mind to religious impressions. 6. The punishment of it is very severe: the loss of credit, the hatred of those whom we have deceived, and an eternal separation from God in the world to come (Rev. xxi, 8; xxii, 15: Psa. ci, 7). See Grove's *Moral Philos.* vol. i, ch. xi; Paley's *Moral Philos.* vol. i, ch. xv; Doddridge's *Lect.* lect. 68; Watts's *Sermons*, vol. i, serm. 22; Evans's *Serm.* vol. ii, serm. 13; South's *Serm.* vol. i, serm. 12; Dr. Lamont's *Serm.* vol. i, serm. 11 and 12. See Truth.

Liebknecht, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born at Wasungen April 23, 1679. In 1699 he entered the University of Jena. Besides pursuing the common course, he was led by Dr. Danz into a thorough study of the Talmud and Rabbinical literature. He also gave especial attention to the science of mathematics. On the latter he gave lectures after he was graduated A.M. in 1703. These were highly approved by many scholars, e. g. by the philosopher Leibnitz, with whom he corresponded. His devotion to mathematics, however, did not cause him to neglect his theological studies, for he afterwards lectured with success on exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. In 1706 he was called as professor of mathematics to the University of Halle, but was obliged to decline this, as well as the call of tutor to two princes, in 1707, because his health failed him. In the same year, however, he accepted a call as professor of mathematics to the University of Giessen. In 1715 he became a member of the Imperial Leopold Society, and in 1716 of the Royal Prussian Society of Sciences. In 1719 he became doctor of divinity, in 1721 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1725 was advanced to the ordinary or full professorship; and was also made assessor of the consistory and superintendent at Giessen. He died Sept. 17, 1749. Although many of his numerous productions are in the department of mathematics, yet his dissertations on exegesis, Church history, and dogmatical theology prove him to have been a profound, acute, and investigating theologian. Besides his contributions to the *Acta Eruditorum*, we mention *Progr. pentecostale, effusæ Spiritus S. caritatis immemorem hæretificem*, etc. (Gissæ, 1717, 4to):—*Diss. hist. theol. de evangelicæ veritatis ante reformationem in Hassia confessionibus* (ibid. 1727, 4to):—*Von dem Tode u. dessen eingebildete Bitterkeit* (ibid. 1733, 8vo):—*Diss. theol. de Deo et attributis divinis, in qua Art. I Aug. Conf.* etc. (ibid. 1736, 4to):—*Adscensio Christi ante adscensionem in cælos nulla, Diss. theol. qua Socinianorum commenta*, etc. (ibid. 1737, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lieutenant (only in the plur. אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנִים, *achashdarpenim'*, from the Sanscrit *ksatrapa*, whence the Greek ἐξατράπης, and finally σατράπης, a *satrap*, see *Götting. Gel. Anz.* 1839, p. 805; Lassen, *Zeitschr. fur d. Morgenl.* iii, 161; Böckh, *Corpus Inscr.* No. 2691, c) occurs in Esth. iii, 12; viii, 9; ix, 3; Ezra viii, 36; so in the Chald. form (rendered "princes," Dan. iii, 2, 3, 27; vi, 1–7) a *satrap*, i. e. governor or viceroy of the large provinces among the ancient Persians, possessing both civil and military power, and being in the provinces the representatives of the sovereign, whose state and splendor they also rivalled (see Brisson, *De regio Pers. principatu*, i, § 168; Heeren, *Ideen*, i, 489 sq.). See Satrap.

Life (properly חַי, usually in the plur. with a sing. meaning, חַיִּים; Gr. ζωή), generally of physical life and

existence, as opposed to death and non-existence (Gen. ii, 7; xxv, 7; Luke xvi, 25; Acts xvii, 25; 1 Cor. iii, 22; xv, 19; Heb. vii, 3; James iv, 14; Rev. xi, 11; xvi, 3). See LONGEVITY. The ancients generally entertained the idea that the vital principle (which they appear to have denoted by the term *spirit*, in distinction from the soul itself, comp. 1 Thess. v, 23) resided particularly in the blood, which, on that account, the Jews were forbidden to use as food (Lev. xvii, 11). See BLOOD. Other terms occasionally rendered "life" in the Scriptures are נֶפֶשׁ (*ne'phesh*, a *living* creature), יוֹם (*yom*, a *day*, i. e. a lifetime), βίος (*life*time), πνεῦμα (*breath*, i. e. spirit), ψυχή (*soul*, or animating principle).

The term life is also used more or less figuratively in the following acceptations in Scripture: (1.) For existence, life, absolutely and without end, immortality (Heb. vii, 16). So also "tree of life," or of immortality, which preserves from death (Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2, 14; Gen. ii, 9; iii, 22); "bread of life" (John vi, 35, 51); "way of life" (Psa. xvi, 11; Acts ii, 28); "water of life," i. e. living fountains of water, perennial (Rev. vii, 17); crown of life, the reward of eternal life (James i, 12; Rev. ii, 10). See BOOK; BREAD; CROWN; FOUNTAIN; TREE, etc. (2.) The manner of life, conduct, in a moral respect; "newness of life" (Rom. vi, 4); "the life of God," i. e. the life which God requires, a godly life (Eph. iv, 18; 2 Pet. i, 3). (3.) The term "*life*" is also used for spiritual life, or the holiness and happiness of salvation procured by the Saviour's death. In this sense, *life* or *eternal life* is the antithesis of *death* or *condemnation*. Life is the image of all good, and is therefore employed to express it (Deut. xxx, 15; John iii, 16, 17, 18, 36; v, 24, 39, 40; vi, 47; viii, 51; xi, 26; Rom. v, 12, 18; 1 John v, 11); *death* is the consummation of evil, and so it is frequently used as a strong expression in order to designate every kind of evil, whether temporal or spiritual (Jer. xxi, 8; Ezek. xviii, 28; xxxiii, 11; Rom. i, 32; vi, 21; vii, 5, 10, 13, 24; John vi, 50, viii, 21). (4.) *Life* is also used for *eternal life*, i. e. the life of bliss and glory in the kingdom of God which awaits the true disciples of Christ (Matt. xix, 16, 17; John iii, 15; 1 Tim. iv, 8; Acts v, 20; Rom. v, 17; 1 Pet. iii, 7; 2 Tim. i, 1). (5.) The term *life* is also used of God and Christ or the Word, as the absolute source and cause of all life (John i, 4; v, 26, 39; xi, 25; xii, 50; xiv, 6; xvii, 3; Col. iii, 4; 1 John i, 1, 2; v, 20). See DEATH.

LIFE EVERLASTING. See ETERNAL LIFE; FUTURE LIFE.

Lift (prop. נָשָׂא, *αἴρω*), besides having the general sense of raising, is used in several peculiar phrases in Scripture. *To lift up the* HANDS is, among the Orientals, a common part of the ceremony of taking an oath: "I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord," says Abraham (Gen. xiv, 22); "I will bring you into the land concerning which I lift up my hand" (Exod. vi, 8), which I promised with an oath. *To lift up one's hand against any one* is to attack him, to fight him (2 Sam. xviii, 28; 1 Kings xi, 26). *To lift up one's face* in the presence of any one is to appear boldly in his presence (2 Sam. ii, 22; Ezra ix, 6. (See also Job x, 15; xi, 15.) *To lift up one's hands, eyes, soul*, or *heart unto the Lord* are expressions describing the sentiments and emotion of one who prays earnestly or desires a thing with ardor.

Lifters and ANTILIFTERS, a name given about the opening of the 18th century to the congregations at Killmarnock, in the west of Scotland, who, according to Sir John Sinclair, differed on the paltry question whether it was necessary for the minister to *lift* in his hand the plate of bread before its distribution in the Lord's Supper, the Lifters holding this to be essential, the others regarding it as a matter of no moment. They were also called *New Lights*, and the others *Old Lights*, terms that have been applied in other cases somewhat similar.—Grégoire, *Hist.* i, 61; quoted from Sinclair, *Works*, ix, 375-6; Williams, *Religious Encyclop.* s. v.

Light (properly אוֹר, *ôr*, *φῶς*, from its *shining*) is represented in the Scriptures as the immediate result and offspring of a divine command (Gen. i, 3), where doubtless we are to understand a reappearance of the celestial luminaries, still partially obscured by the haze that settled as a pall over the grave of nature at some tremendous cataclysm which well-nigh reduced the globe to its pristine chaos, rather than their actual formation, although they are subsequently introduced (Gen, i, 14 sq.). In consequence of the intense brilliancy and beneficial influence of light in an Eastern climate, it easily and naturally became, with Orientals, a representative of the highest human good. From this idea the transition was an easy one, in corrupt and superstitious minds, to deify the great sources of light. See SUN; MOON. When "Eastern nations beheld the sun shining in his strength, or the moon walking in her brightness, their hearts were secretly enticed, and their mouth kissed their hand in token of adoration (Job xxxi, 26, 27). See ADORATION. This 'iniquity' the Hebrews not only avoided, but when they considered the heavens they recognised the work of God's fingers, and learnt a lesson of humility as well as of reverence (Psa. viii, 3 sq.). On the contrary, the entire residue of the East, with scarcely any exception, worshipped the sun and the light, primarily, perhaps, as symbols of divine power and goodness, but, in a more degenerate state, as themselves divine; whence, in conjunction with darkness, the negation of light, arose the doctrine of dualism, two principles, the one of light, the good power, the other of darkness, the evil power, a corruption which rose and spread the more easily because the whole of human life, being a checkered scene, seems divided as between two conflicting agencies, the bright and the dark, the joyous and the sorrowful, what is called prosperous and what is called adverse." But in the Scriptures the purer symbolism is everywhere maintained (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s. v.). "All the more joyous emotions of the mind, all the pleasing sensations of the frame, all the happy hours of domestic intercourse, were habitually described among the Hebrews under imagery derived from light (1 Kings xi, 36; Isa. lviii, 8, Esth. viii, 16; Psa. xcvii, 11). The transition was natural from earthly to heavenly, from corporeal to spiritual things, and so light came to typify true religion and the felicity which it imparts. But as light not only came from God, but also makes man's way clear before him, so it was employed to signify moral truth, and pre-eminently that divine system of truth which is set forth in the Bible, from its earliest gleamings onward to the perfect day of the great sun of righteousness. The application of the term to religious topics had the greater propriety because the light in the world, being accompanied by heat, purifies, quickens, enriches, which efforts it is the peculiar province of true religion to produce in the human soul (Isa. viii, 20, Matt. iv, 16; Psa. cxix, 105; 2 Pet. i, 19; Eph. v, 8; 2 Tim. i, 10; 1 Pet. ii, 9)."

Besides its physical sense (Matt. xvii, 2; Acts ix, 3, xii, 7; 2 Cor. iv, 6), the term *light* is used by metonymy for a fire giving light (Mark xiv, 54; Luke xxii, 56); for a torch, candle, or lamp (Acts xvi, 29); for the material light of heaven, as the sun, moon, or stars (Psa. cxxxvi, 7; James i, 17). In figurative language it signifies a manifest or open state of things (Matt. x, 27; Luke xii, 3), and in a higher sense the eternal source of truth, purity, and joy (1 John i, 5). God is said to dwell in light inaccessible (1 Tim. vi, 16), which seems to contain a reference to the glory and splendor that shone in the holy of holies, where Jehovah appeared in the luminous cloud above the mercy seat, and which none but the high-priest, and he only once a year, was permitted to approach (Lev. xvi, 2; Ezek. i, 22, 26, 28). This light was typical of the glory of the celestial world. See SHEKINAH. Light itself is employed to signify the edicts, laws, rules, or directions that proceed from ruling powers for the good of their subjects. Thus of the great

king of all the earth the Psalmist says, "Thy word is a light unto my path" (Psa. cxix, 105), and "Thy judgments are as the light" (Hos. vi, 5). Agreeably to the notion of lights being the symbols of good government, light also signifies protection, deliverance, and joy. Light also frequently signifies instruction both by doctrine and example (Matt. v, 16; John v, 35), or persons considered as giving such light (Matt. v, 14; Rom. ii, 19). It is applied in the highest sense to Christ, the true light, the sun of righteousness, who is that in the spiritual which the material light is in the natural world, the great author not only of illumination and knowledge, but of spiritual life, health, and joy to the souls of men (Isa. lx, 1). "Among the personifications on this point which Scripture presents we may specify, (1.) God. The apostle James (i, 17) declares that 'every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,' obviously referring to the faithfulness of God and the constancy of his goodness, which shine on undimmed and unshadowed. So Paul (1 Tim. vi, 16), 'God who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto.' Here the idea intended by the imagery is the incomprehensibleness of the self-existent and eternal God. (2.) Light is also applied to Christ: 'The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light' (Matt. iv, 16; Luke ii, 32; John i, 4 sq.). 'He was the true light;' 'I am the light of the world' (John viii, 12; xii, 35, 36). (3.) It is further used of angels, as in 2 Cor. xi, 14; 'Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.' (4.) Light is moreover employed of men: John the Baptist 'was a burning and a shining light' (John v, 35); 'Ye are the light of the world' (Matt. v, 14; see also Acts xiii, 47; Eph. v, 8)." See LIGHTS.

LIGHT, DIVINE. See KNOWLEDGE; RELIGION.

LIGHT, INWARD. See QUAKERS.

LIGHT OF NATURE. See NATURE.

Light, Friends of. See FREE CONGREGATIONS.

Light, GEORGE C., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Va., Feb. 28, 1785. In 1792 his father removed to Kentucky, and in 1799 to Ohio, where in 1803 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1804 the son was converted at a camp-meeting; in 1806 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Western Conference, and in 1807 he was ordained deacon. Locating after his marriage in 1808, he was employed as a surveyor till 1822, when he entered the Kentucky Conference. From this time until 1859 he labored actively as an itinerant preacher, filling the most important stations in Kentucky, Missouri, and Mississippi. He died Feb. 27, 1859. Mr. Light was held to be one of the most eloquent and useful ministers in the West during many years. No man of his day, it is thought, had greater control over the popular mind.—Camp, *Sketch of the Rev. G. C. Light* (Nashville, 1860).

Light, Old and New. See UNITED PRESBYTERIANS.

Lightfoot, John (1), D.D., a noted English divine and Hebraist, was born at Stoke-upon-Trent in 1602. He was educated first at a grammar-school at Morton Green, in Cheshire, and afterwards at Cambridge. He was remarkable, at Cambridge and afterwards, for his eloquence and his proficiency in Latin and Greek. Quitting the university, he became assistant at the well-known school of Repton, in Derbyshire. A year or two after he entered into orders, and settled at Norton-under-Hales, in Shropshire, where he began the study of the Hebrew, which ripened into the most familiar and consummate knowledge of the whole range of Biblical and Rabbinical literature. In 1627 he accepted the cure of Stone, in Staffordshire. Two years later he removed to Hornsey, in order to be near the library of Sion College, and later accepted the rectory of Ashford, in Staffordshire. Here he remained during the turbulent years which led to the death of Charles I, the establishment of the Commonwealth, and the temporary subversion of the Church of England. During the civil war he was identified with the Presbyterians, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, where he displayed great courage and learning in opposing many of those tenets which the divines were endeavoring to establish. While in London he was minister of St. Bartholomew's. In 1653 he was presented by Parliament with the living of Great Munden, in Hertfordshire. In 1655 he entered upon the office of vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to which he was chosen that year, having taken the degree of doctor in divinity in 1652. The living of Great Munden was given to Dr. Lightfoot by Parliament, and upon the restoration of Charles II it was bestowed upon another person. Through the influence of Sheldon, then bishop of London, Lightfoot was, however, reinstated in his living, as well as confirmed in the mastership of Catharine Hall, which he had offered to resign, he having previously complied with the terms of the Act of Uniformity. Through the influence of Sir Orlando Bridgeman he was appointed to a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Ely, where he died peaceably, Dec. 6, 1675. "Lightfoot was a very learned Hebraist for his time, but he was not free from the unscientific crotchets of the period, holding, for example, the inspiration of the vowel-points, etc. He has done good service to theology by pointing out and insisting upon the close connection between the Talmudical and Midrashic writings and the New Testament, which, to a certain extent, is only to be understood by illustrations from the anterior and contemporaneous religious literature" (Chambers). His object at first was "to produce one great and perfect work—a harmony of the four evangelists, with a commentary and prolegomena. But the little probability of his being able to publish at once so vast a work as he saw it would become were he to carry out the idea in its completeness—in an age when brevity was essential to everything which issued from the press—determined him to give to the world from time to time the result of his labors in separate treatises. The subject-matter of these treatises may be classed under the general heads of chronology, chorography, investigation of original texts and versions, examination of Rabbinical comments and paraphrases" (Kitto). Lightfoot's works are: *Erubhin, or Miscellanies, Christian and Judaical* (1629):—*A few and new Observations upon the Book of Genesis* (1642):—*A Handful of Gleanings out of the Book of Exodus* (1643):—*The Harmony of the four Evangelists among themselves and with the O. T.* (1644):—*A Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles*, 1st part (1645):—*The Harmony*, 2d part (no date):—*The Temple Service in the Days of our Saviour* (1649):—*The Harmony*, 3d part (1649):—*The Temple* (1650):—*Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* (1658):—*Horæ*, etc., *upon the Gospel of St. Mark* (1661; new ed. by Rev. R. Gandell, Oxf. 1859, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Jewish and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Luke*:—*Jewish*, etc., *upon St. John*:—*Horæ Hebraicæ*, etc., *Acts of the Apostles*:—*Horæ*, etc., *upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians.* During the latter years of his life he contributed the most valuable assistance to the authors of Walton's *Polyglot Bible*, Castell's *Heptaglot Lexicon*, and Pool's *Synopsis Criticorum.* His works were published entire, (1) with a preface by Dr. Bright and a life by the editor, John Strype, at London in 1684 (2 vols. fol.); (2) at Amsterdam in 1686 (2 vols. fol.); (3) at Utrecht, by John Leusden, in 1699 (3 vols. fol.); and (4) by Pitman, at London, in from 1822–25 (13 vols. 8vo), which is the best edition, and contains a very elaborate biography of Lightfoot. Dr. Adam Clarke says: "In Biblical criticism I consider Lightfoot the first of all English writers; and in this I include his learning, his judgment, and his usefulness." See, besides the biographies connected with the various collections of his works, *Brevis Descriptio Vitæ J. Lightfooti* (1699); Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. viii, s. v.

Lightfoot, John (2), an English divine and botanist, was born in Gloucestershire in 1735. He was educated for the Church, became chaplain to the duchess of Portland, and obtained the livings of Sheldon and Gotham. He also devoted himself specially to the study of botany, and, in company with Pennant, explored the Hebrides about 1772, and published in 1777 a valuable "Flora of Scotland" (*Flora Scotica*, 2 vols.), with excellent figures. He died in 1788.—Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1425.

Lightning (properly בָּרָק, *barak'*, Dan. x, 6; collectively *lightnings*, Psa. cxliv, 6; 2 Sam. xxii, 15; Ezra i, 13; plur. Job xxxviii, 35; Psa. xviii, 15; lxxvii, 19, etc.; trop. *brightness* of a glittering sword, Ezek. xxi, 15, 33; Deut. xxxii, 41, etc.; ἀστραπή, Matt. xxiv, 27; xxviii, 3; Luke x, 18; xi, 36; xvii, 24; Rev. iv, 5; viii, 5; xi, 19; xvi, 18; once בָּזָק, *bazak'*, a *flash* of lightning, Ezek. i, 14; less properly אוֹר, *ôr*, *light*, Job xxxvii, 3, 11, 25; לַפִּיד, *lappid'*, a burning *torch*, Exod. xx, 18; fig. חֵזִיז, *chaziz'*, an *arrow*, i. e. thunder-*flash*, Zech. x, 1; comp. Job xxviii, 26; xxxviii, 25). Travellers state that in Syria lightnings are frequent in the autumnal months. Seldom a night passes without a great deal of lightning, which is sometimes accompanied by thunder and sometimes not. A squall of wind and clouds of dust are the usual forerunners of the first rains. See PALESTINE. To these natural phenomena the sacred writers frequently allude. In directing their energies, "the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet; the mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence; his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him" (Nah. i, 3–6). The terrors of the divine wrath are often represented by thunder and lightning; and thunder, on account of its awful impression on the minds of mortals, is also spoken of in Scripture as the "voice of the Lord" (Psa. cxxxv, 7; cxliv, 6; 2 Sam. xxii, 15; Job xxviii, 26; xxxvii, 4, 5; xxxviii, 25; xl, 9; Zech. ix, 14; Rev. iv, 5; xvi, 18–21). On account of the *fire* attending their *light*, they are the symbols of edicts enforced with destruction to those who oppose them, or who hinder others from giving obedience to them (Psa. cxliv, 6; Zech. ix, 14; Psa. xviii, 14; Rev. iv, 5; xvi, 18). Thunders and lightnings, when they proceed from the throne of God (as in Rev. iv, 5), are fit representations of God's glorious and awful majesty; but when *fire* comes down from heaven upon the earth, it expresses some judgment of God on the world (as in Rev. xx, 9). The voices, thunders, lightnings, and great hail, in Rev. xvi, 18–21, are interpreted expressly of an exceeding great plague, so that men blasphemed on account of it (see Wemyss, *Symb. Dict.* s. v.). See THUNDER.

Lights. I. The use of artificial light in baptism was practiced in the Church at an early day, although it was opposed in this instance as in its use for communion service, etc. But where it was used it was the practice, in addition to the ceremony of putting on white garments at baptism, to place lighted tapers in the hands of the baptized. Gregory Nazianzen says: "The station where, immediately after baptism, thou shalt be placed before the altar, is an emblem of the glory of the life to come; the psalmody with which thou shalt be received is a foretaste of those hymns and songs of a better life; and the lamps which thou shalt light are a figure of those lamps of faith wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet the Bridegroom." Others say that the lamp was designed to be a symbol of their own illumination, and to remind the candidates of the words of Christ, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." In some baptisms the attendants were clothed in white, and carried tapers. At the baptism of the younger Theodosius, the leaders of the people were all clothed in white, and all the senators and men of quality carried lamps.

Lighted candles were, according to St. Jerome (*Epist. cont. Vigilant.* cap. 3; comp. also Cave, *Prim. Christ.* lib. i, c. 7, p. 203), sometimes used in the Eastern churches when the Gospel was read, and were designed to show the joy of those who received the glad tidings, and also to be a symbol of the light of truth. The lighting of candles on the communion table is observed only in the Romish Church. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s. v.; Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christ. Church*, bk. xii, ch. iv, sect. 4; Alt, *Christlich. Cultus* (1851), p. 95; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 517 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 769 (Kerzen). See CANDLES.

II. Lights were employed by the Apostolic Church, but for no other purpose than to obviate the inconvenience of assembling for worship in the dark. Their use as a matter of religion, or, rather, of superstition, is of far less ancient date, although it has been defended as a primitive custom, and might, of course, be traced even to Jewish antiquity, if such a precedent were esteemed of any value. In all probability, artificial light was used during the daytime, and for a symbolical purpose, about the 4th century, if we accept the statement of St. Paulinus, bishop of Sola (A.D. 353–431), who, speaking of the great numbers of wax-lights which burned about the altars, making the night more splendid than the day, adds that the light of the day itself was made more glorious by the same means:

> "Nocte dieque micant. Sic nox splendore dici
> Fulget: et ipsa dies cœlesti illustris honore
> Plus micat innumeris lucem geminata lucernis."
> (Paulin. *Nat.* iii, *S. Felicis.*)

(Compare also Isidore, *Origin.* vii, 12.) But this custom was severely condemned by many. Comp. LAMPS.

III. The practice of lighting candles on the altar, which prevailed, and still prevails, in the Romish Church, was abolished in England at the Reformation.

Those candles which (according to one of the Injunctions of Edward VI, set forth in 1547) have been suffered to remain upon the Lord's table are sometimes designated as "lights on the communion table." But it is to be noticed that no *lights* are ever used in the English churches, only candles, which are never lighted, the lighting of any such candles at an evening service being merely for a necessary purpose. See ALTAR.

Lights, Feast of. See EPIPHANY.

Lign-aloe (only in the plur. אֲהָלִים, *ahalim'*, Numb. xxiv, 6, Sept. σκηναί, Vulg. *tabernacula;* Prov. vii, 17, Sept. οἶκον, Vulg. *aloe*, A. V. "aloes;" or fem. אֲהָלוֹת, *ahaloth'*, Psa. xlv, 8, Sept. στακτή, Vulg. *gutta*, A. V. "aloes;" Cant. iv, 14, ἀλώη, *aloe*, "aloes"), a kind of perfume which interpreters have by common consent regarded as derived from some Oriental tree, and compared with the *agallochum* (ἀγάλλοχον) or *aloe-wood* (ξυλαλόη), described by Dioscorides (i, 21) in the following terms: "It is a wood brought from India and Arabia, resembling thyine-wood, compact, fragrant, astringent to the taste, with great bitterness; having a skin-like bark. . . . . It is burned for frankincense." Pliny likewise speaks of it as being derived from the same region (*Nat. Hist.* xxvii, 5). Later writers, as Orobasius, Ætius, and P. Ægineta, mention it, but give no further description. Arabic authors, however, as Rhases, Serapion, and others, were well acquainted with the substance, of which they describe several varieties; and the Latin translator of Avicenna (lii, 132) gives "agallochum," "xylaloe," and "lignum aloes" as equivalent to the *aghlajûn*, *aghalûkhi*, and *ûd* of the text. Royle (*Illustr. of Himal. Bot.* p. 171) has traced the same substance in the *aggur*, a famous aromatic wood obtained in the bazaars of Northern India under three names: 1, *aod-i-hindi;* 2, a variety procured from Surat, but not differing essentially from 3, *aod-i-kimari*, said to come from China, doubtless the *alcamerium* of Avicenna. Garcias ab Hosto (Clusius, *Exot. Hist.*), writing on this subject near Surat, says that "it is called in Malacca *garo*, but the choicest sort *calambac*." Paul à

Bartholin (in Vyacarana, p. 205) likewise distinguishes three sorts, "one common, very odorous, and of great price, called *aghil;* the black, which is termed *kár-aghhil* or *kal-agam;* the third, producing a flower, named *mogarim*, properly *mangalyam* or *malliyandhiyal*."

There is considerable confusion among naturalists in their attempts to identify the exact tree which yields the far-famed wood. "Dr. Roxburgh states that *agúrú* is the Sanscrit name of the incense or aloe-wood, which in Hindostanee is called *agur*, and in Persian *aod-hindi*, and that there is little doubt that the real *calambac*, or *agallochum* of the ancients, is yielded by an immense tree, a native of the mountainous tracts east of and southeast from Silhet, in about 24° of N. latitude. This plant, he says, cannot be distinguished from thriving plants, exactly of the same age, of the *Garo de Malacca*, received from that place, and growing in the garden of Calcutta. He further states that small quantities of *agallochum* are sometimes imported into Calcutta by sea from the eastward, but that such is always deemed inferior to that of Silhet (*Flora Ind.* ii, 423). The *Garo de Malacca* was first described by Lamarck (*Encyclopédie Methodique*, i, 47 sq.), from a specimen presented to him by Sonnerat as that of the tree which yielded the *bois d'aigle* of commerce. Lamarck named this tree *Aquilaria Malaccensis*, which Cavanilles afterwards changed unnecessarily to *Aquilaria ovata*. As Dr. Roxburgh found that his plant belonged to the same genus, he named it *Aquilaria agallochum*, but it is printed *Agallocha* in his *Flora Indica*, probably by an oversight. He is of opinion that the *Agallochum secundarium* of Rumphius (*Herb. Amb.* ii, 34, t. 10), which that author received under the name of *Agallochum Malaccense*, also belongs to the same genus, as well as the *Sinfú* of Kæmpfer (*Amœn. Exot.* p. 903), and the *Ophispermum sinense* of Loureiro. This last-named missionary describes a third plant, which he names *Aloexylum agallochum*, representing it as a large tree growing in the lofty mountains of Champava, belonging to Cochin China, about 13° of N. lat., near the great river Lavum, and producing *calambac* (*Flora Cochin Chinensis*, edit. Wildenow, i, 327). This tree, belonging to the class and order *Decandria monogynia* of Linnæus, and the natural family of *Leguminosæ*, has always been admitted as one of the trees yielding *agallochum*. But, as Loureiro himself confesses that he had only once seen a mutilated branch of the tree in flower, which, by long carriage, had the petals, anthers, and stigma much bruised and torn, it is not impossible that this may also belong to the genus Aquilaria, especially as his tree agrees in so many points with that described by Dr. Roxburgh. Rumphius has described and figured a third plant, which he named *Arbor excæcans*, from 'Blindhout,' in consequence of its acrid juice destroying sight, whence the generic name of *Excæcaria;* the specific one of *agallochum* he applied because its wood is similar to, and often substituted for *agallochum*, and he states that it was sometimes exported as such to Europe, and even to China. This tree, the *Excæcaria agallochum*, of the Linnæan class and order *Diœcia triandria*, and the natural family of *Euphorbiaceæ*, is also very common in the delta of the Ganges, where it is called *Geria;* 'but the wood-cutters of the Sunderbunds,' Dr. Roxburgh says, 'who are the people best acquainted with the nature of this tree, report the pale, white, milky juice thereof to be highly acrid and very dangerous.' The only use made of the tree, as far as Dr. Roxburgh could learn, was for charcoal and firewood. Agallochum of any sort is, he believed, never found in this tree, which is often the only one quoted as that yielding agila-wood; but, notwithstanding the negative testimony of Dr. Roxburgh, it may, in particular situations, as stated by Rumphius, yield a substitute for that fragrant and long-famed wood. In Arabian authors numerous varieties of agallochum are mentioned (Celsus, *Hierobot.* p. 143). Persian authors mention only three: 1. *Aod-i-hindi;* that is, the Indian; 2. *Aod-i-chini*, or Chinese kind (probably that from Cochin China); 3. *Sumunduri*, a term generally applied to things brought from sea, which may have reference to the inferior variety from the Indian islands. In old works, such as those of Bauhin and Ray, three kinds are also mentioned: 1. *Agallochum præstantissimum*, also called *Calambac;* 2. *A. Officinarum*, or *Palo de Aguilla* of Linschoten; 3. *A. sylvestre*, or *Aguilla brava*. But, besides these varieties, obtained from different localities, perhaps from different plants, there are also distinct varieties, obtainable from the same plant. Thus, in a MS. account by Dr. Roxburgh, to which Dr. Royle had access, it is stated, in a letter from R. K. Dick, at Silhet, that four different qualities may be obtained from the same tree: 1st, *Ghurki*, which sinks in water, and sells from 12 to 16 rupees per seer of 2 lbs.; 2d, *Doim*, 6 to 8 rupees per seer; 3d, *Siniula*, which floats in water, 3 to 4 rupees; and, 4th, *Chúrum*, which is in small pieces, and also floats in water, from 1 to 1½ rupees per seer, and that sometimes 80 lbs. of these four kinds may be obtained from one tree. All these *tuggur*-trees, as they are called, do not produce the *aggur*, nor does every part of even the most productive tree. The natives cut into the wood until they observe dark-colored veins yielding the perfume; these guide them to the place containing the *aggur*, which generally extends but a short way through the centre of the trunk or branch. An essence, or *attur*, is obtained by bruising the wood in a mortar, and then infusing it in boiling water, when the *attur* floats on the surface. Early decay does not seem incident to all kinds of *agallochum*, for we possess specimens of the wood gorged with fragrant resin (*Illustr. Him. Bot.* p. 173) which show no symptoms of it, but still it is stated that the wood is sometimes buried in the earth. This may be for the purpose of increasing its specific gravity. A large specimen in the museum of the East-India House displays a cancellated structure in which the resinous parts remain, the rest of the wood having been removed, apparently by decay." Notwithstanding the uncertainty respecting the identity of some of the above-described varieties, we have, at all events, two trees ascertained as yielding this fragrant wood—one, *Aquilaria agallochum*, a native of Silhet, and the other *A. ovata* or *Malaccensis*, a native of Malacca, although it is still not clear that they are anything more than local variations of the same species. The former is described as a magnificent tree, growing to the height of 120 feet, being 12 feet in girth. "The bark of the trunk is smooth and ash-colored, that of the branches gray and lightly striped with brown. The wood is white, and very light and soft. It is totally without smell, and the leaves, bark, and flowers are equally inodorous" (*Script. Herb.* p. 238). The fra-

Aquilaria Agallochum.

grance appears to reside wholly in the resin deposited in the pores, and is developed by heat. Both plants belong to the Linnæan class and order *Decandria monogynia*, and the natural family of *Aquilarineæ*.

"It is extremely interesting to find that the Malay name of the substance in question, which is *agila*, is so little different from the *ahalim* of the Hebrew; not more, indeed, than may be observed in many well-known words, where the hard *g* of one language is turned into the aspirate in another. It is therefore probable that it was by the name *agila* (*aghil* in Rosenmüller, *Biblic. Bot.* p. 234) that this wood was first known in commerce, being conveyed across the bay of Bengal to the island of Ceylon or the peninsula of India, which the Arab or Phœnician traders visited at very remote periods, and where they obtained the early-known spices and precious stones of India. It is not a little curious that captain Hamilton (*Account of the East Indies*, i, 68) mentions it by the name of *agala*, an odoriferous wood at Muscat. We know that the Portuguese, when they reached the eastern coast from the peninsula, obtained it under this name, whence they called it *pao d'aguila*, or *eagle-wood*, which is the origin of the generic name *Aquilaria*.

"It must be confessed, however, that, notwithstanding all that has been written to prove the identity of the *ahalim*-trees with the *aloes-wood* of commerce, and notwithstanding the apparent connection of the Hebrew word with the Arabic *aghlagún* and the Greek *agallochon*, the opinion is not clear of difficulties. In the first place, the passage in Numb. xxiv, 6, 'as the *ahalim* which Jehovah hath planted,' is an argument against the identification with the *Aquilaria agallochum*. The Sept. seem to have read אֳהָלִים, *ohalim'*, *tents;* and they are followed by the Vulg., the Syriac, the Arabic, and some other versions. If this is not the true reading—and the context is against it—then if *ahalim* be the *Aq. agallochum*, we must suppose that Balaam is speaking of trees concerning which, in their growing state, he could have known nothing at all. Rosenmüller (*Schol. in V. T.* ad Numb. xxiv, 6) allows that this tree is not found in Arabia, but thinks that Balaam might have become acquainted with it from the merchants. Perhaps the prophet might have seen the wood. But the passage in Numbers manifestly implies that he had seen the *ahalim growing*, and that in all probability they were some kind of trees sufficiently known to the Israelites to enable them to understand the allusion in its full force. But if the *ahalim* be the *agallochum*, then much of the illustration would have been lost to the people who were the subject of the prophecy; for the *Aq. agallochum* is found neither on the banks of the Euphrates, where Balaam lived, nor in Moab, where the blessing was enunciated. Michaelis (*Supp.* p. 34, 35) believes the Sept. reading to be the correct one, though he sees no difficulty, but rather a beauty, in supposing that Balaam was drawing a similitude from a tree of foreign growth. He confesses that the parallelism of the verse is more in favor of the *tree* than the *tent;* but he objects that the lign-aloes should be mentioned before the cedars, the parallelism requiring, he thinks, the inverse order. But this is hardly a valid objection, for what tree was held in greater estimation than the cedar? And even if *ahalim* be the *Aq. agallochum*, yet the latter clause of the verse does no violence to the law of parallelism, for of the two trees the cedar 'is greater and more august.' Again, the passage in Psa. xlv, 8 would perhaps be more correctly translated thus: 'The myrrh, aloes, and cassia, perfuming all thy garments, brought from the ivory palaces of the *Minni*, shall make thee glad.' The Minni, or Minæi, were inhabitants of spicy Arabia, and carried on a great trade in the exportation of spices and perfumes (Pliny, xii, 14, 16; Bochart, *Phaleg*, ii, 22, 135). As the *myrrh* and *cassia* are mentioned as coming from the Minni, and were doubtless natural productions of the country, the inference is that *aloes*, being named with them, *were* also a production of the same region." But see Minni.

See generally Abulfeda, in Büsching's *Magazin*, iv, 277; Bokin, in *Notices et Extraits de la Biblioth. du Roi*, ii, 397; Linnæus, *Pflanzensystem nach Houttyn* (Nounb. 1777), ii, 422 sq.; Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 32; Wahl, *Ostindien*, ii, 772; the *Fundgruben des Orients.* v, 372; Bondi, *Or-Esther*, p. 13; Sylv. de Saez, *ad* Abdollatiphi *Descrip. Æg.* p. 320. Compare Aloe.

Liguori, Alfonzo Maria de, a Roman Catholic bishop, and founder of the Order of Redemptorists, was born Sept. 27, 1696, at Naples. He was descended from a noble family, and the son of a royal officer; from his mother, who was a fervid Catholic, he imbibed in early childhood a glowing devotedness to the Church of Rome. Educated in an institution of the priests of the Oratory, he made such rapid progress that he obtained in the sixteenth year of his life the degree of LL.D. In accordance with the wish of his parents he became a lawyer, but the loss of an important lawsuit so mortified him that he resolved to enter the priesthood. He overcame the violent opposition of his father, and took orders in 1725. Soon after he entered the Congregation of the Propaganda at Naples, and began to labor with great zeal for the religious awakening of the lowest classes in Naples and the neighboring provinces. In order to enlarge the sphere of his labors he concluded to establish a new religious congregation. The first house of the new congregation was established with the assistance of twelve companions at Scala; the chief task of the members was declared to be "to devote themselves to the service of the poorest and most abandoned souls." Three years later the second house was established at Cionani, in the diocese of Salerno. The rule of the new congregation, which Liguori had drawn up with the assistance of several prominent men, was confirmed by a brief of pope Benedict XIV, dated Feb. 22, 1749, and Liguori was elected superior general for his lifetime. The archbishopric of Palermo, which king Charles III of Naples offered to him, Liguori declined, but in 1762 he had, at the request of pope Clement XIII, to accept the bishopric of Sta. Agata de' Goti. A general chapter of the congregation unanimously declared that no new superior general should be elected in place of Liguori, but that the latter should appoint a vicar general to preside over the congregation in his place. The feeble state of his health repeatedly induced him to ask the pope to accept his resignation, but his wish was not granted until 1775. He retired to the house of his congregation at Nocera de' Pagani, where he spent the remainder of his life in composing theological and, in particular, ascetical works. In consequence of the intrigues of several prominent members of his order, and the government of Naples, which, against his will, caused the rules of his order to be changed, he was compelled to resign its supreme management. He died August 1, 1787. In 1796 he received from Pius VI the title "Venerable," in 1816 he was beatified, and on May 26, 1839, was canonized by pope Gregory XVI. In 1871 Pius IX conferred upon him the title and rank of a "Doctor Ecclesiæ." Liguori was a very prolific writer, the best known among his works being the *Theologia Moralis* (Naples, 3 vols.): — *Homo Apostolicus* (Venice, 1782, 3 vols.) :—*Institutio Catechetica* (Bassano, 1768) :—*Praxis Confessarii.* Complete editions of his works have been published at Paris (1835 sq., in 16 vols.), at Monza (70 vols.), and other places. His works have been translated into French and German, and, in great part, into English, Spanish, Polish, and other European languages. The principles of casuistry explained by Liguori have been received with much favor by the Ultramontane school of the Roman Catholic theologians, and his moral theology, which is a modification of the so-called "probabilistic system" of the age immediately before his own, is largely used in the direction of consciences. Few writers in modern times have gone so far in the defence of the extremest ultra-papal theories and practices as

Liguori, and, while his honesty and zeal are undoubted, he stands forth in the recent history of the Roman Church as a representative of the very worst tendencies of casuists. In the ordinary concerns of life, where there is no suspicion and no warning, he elaborately teaches how falsehood and trickery between man and man may be most advantageously practiced, and how far cheating and stealing on the part of tradesmen and servants may be venially carried on, and without incurring mortal sin. See Connelly, *Reasons for abjuring Allegiance to the See of Rome* (Lond. 1852); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1856, p. 396; *Christian Remembr.* 1854 (Jan.), p. 38; 1855 (Oct.), p. 407. Biographies of Liguori have been written by Giatini (*Vita del beato Alfons. Liguori*, Rome, 1815), Jeancard (*Vie du C. A. Liguori*, Louvain, 1829), Klotts (Aix-la-Chapelle, 1835), Schick (Schaffhausen, 1853), and others. In English we have a very good biographical *Life of St. A. M. de Liguori* (London, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo). For an account of the religious order founded by Liguori, see REDEMPTORISTS. (A. J. S.)

Liguorians. See REDEMPTORISTS.

Li'gure (לֶשֶׁם, *le'shem*, supposed to be from an old root preserved in the Arab., and signifying *to taste*) occurs but twice (Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12) as the name of the first stone in the third row on the high-priest's breastplate, where the Sept. renders λιγύριον (apparently alluding to the above derivation), and is followed by the Vulg. *ligurius*, as well as the A.V. So also Josephus (*War*, v, 5, 7). "The word *ligure* is unknown in modern mineralogy. Phillips (*Mineralogy*, p. 87) mentions *ligurite*, the fragments of which are uneven and transparent, with a vitreous lustre. It occurs in a sort of talcose rock in the banks of a river in the Apennines" (Smith). The classical ligure (or λυγκούριον) was thought to be a species of amber (see Moore, *Anc. Min.* p. 106), although ancient authors speak uncertainly respecting it (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvii, 11, 13; Theophrastus, *De lapid.* c. 50), and assign a false derivation to the name (see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 763). The Hebrew word has been thought to designate the same stone as the JACINTH (Braunius, *De vestitu sacerd.* ii, 14), although others adhere to the *opal* as corresponding better with the ancient ligure (Rosenmüller, *Sch. in Exod.* xxviii, 19). "Dr. Woodward and some old commentators have supposed that it was some kind of *belemnite*, because, as these fossils contain bituminous particles, they have thought that they have been able to detect, upon heating or rubbing pieces of them, the absurd origin which Theophrastus (*Frag.* ii, 28, 31; xv, 2, edit. Schneider) and Pliny (*H. N.* xxxvii, iii) ascribe to the *lyncyrium*. As to the belief that *amber* is denoted by this word, Theophrastus, in the passage cited above, has given a detailed description of the stone, and clearly distinguishes it from *electron*, or amber. Amber, moreover, is too soft for engraving upon, while the *lyncyrium* was a hard stone, out of which seals were made." See GEM. Beckmann (*Hist. Invent.* i, 87, Bohn) believes, with Braun, Epiphanius, and J. de Laet, that the description of the *lyncyrium* agrees well with the *hyacinth-stone* of modern mineralogists, especially that species which is described as being of an orange-yellow color, passing on into a reddish-brown (see Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* IV, i, 28). The hyacinth is a variety of crystallized zircon, containing also iron, which usually gives it a reddish or brown color. It generally occurs in four-sided prisms, terminated by four rhombic planes. It is diaphanous, glossy, and hard. It occurs in the beds of rivers, the best being brought from the West Indies, but is now little esteemed as a gem, although the ancients used it for engraving. "With this supposition (that the *lyncyrium* is identical with the jacinth or hyacinth) Hill (*Notes on Theophrastus on Stones*, § 50, p. 166) and Rosenmüller (*Mineral. of Bible*, p. 36; *Bib. Cab.*) agree. It must be confessed, however, that this opinion is far from satisfactory; for Theophrastus, speaking of the properties of the *lyncyrium*, says that it attracts not only light particles of wood, but fragments of iron and brass. Now there is no peculiar attractive power in the hyacinth; nor is Beckmann's explanation of this point sufficient. He says: 'If we consider its (the *lyncyrium's*) attracting of small bodies in the same light which our hyacinth has in common with all stones of the glassy species, I cannot see anything to controvert this opinion, and to induce us to believe the *lyncyrium* and the tourmaline to be the same.' But surely the *lyncyrium*, whatever it be, had in a marked manner *magnetic properties;* indeed, the term was applied to the stone on this very account, for the Greek name *ligurion* appears to be derived from λείχειν, 'to lick,' 'to attract,' and doubtless was selected by the Sept. for this reason to express the Hebrew word, which has a similar derivation. Hence Dr. Watson (*Philos. Trans.* li, 394) identifies the Greek *lyncyrium* with the *tourmaline*, or, more definitely, with the red variety known as *rubellite*, which is a hard stone, and used as a gem, and sometimes sold for *red sapphire*. Tourmaline becomes, as is well known, electrically polar when heated. Beckmann's objection, that, 'had Theophrastus been acquainted with the tourmaline, he would have remarked that it did not acquire its attractive power till it was heated,' is answered by his own admission on the passage, quoted from the *Hist. de l'Académie* for 1717, p. 7 (see Beckmann, i, 91). Tourmaline is a mineral found in many parts of the world. The duke de Noya purchased two of these stones in Holland, which are there called *aschentrikker*. Linnæus, in his preface to the *Flora Zeylandica*, mentions the stone under the name of *lapis electricus* from Ceylon. The natives call it *tournamal* (*Phil. Trans.* l. c.). Many of the precious stones which were in the possession of the Israelites during their wanderings were no doubt obtained from the Egyptians, who might have procured from the Tyrian merchants specimens from even India and Ceylon, etc. The fine specimen of rubellite now in the British Museum belonged formerly to the king of Ava."

Lik'hi (Heb. *Likchi'*, לִקְחִי, *learned*, otherwise *captivator;* Sept. Λακειά v. r. Λακίμ, Vulg. *Leci*), the third named of the four sons of Shemidah or Shemida, son of Manasseh (1 Chron. vii, 19; comp. Josh. xvii, 2). He does not appear to have had a numerous if any progeny, as his name does not occur in the account of the Manassite families (Numb. xxvi, 32). B.C. post 1856.

Lilburne, JOHN, a Quaker preacher, noted for his republicanism, was born of an old family in Durham County in 1618. In his early youth he was a clothier. He entered the ministry after he had suffered greatly by prosecution for his opposition to the government. His intrepid defence of his rights as a free-born Englishman before the dreaded bar of the High-Church party gained for him the familiar appellation of "free-born John." He was condemned to receive five hundred lashes at the cart-tail, and to stand in the pillory; but his spirit was only aroused by this disgraceful punishment. His name became the watchword of the party known as *Levellers*. During the Revolution he fought bravely against the king at Edge Hill and Marston Moor, where he led a regiment. Lilburne's chief fault was the want of a more statesmanlike spirit, so that he was continually sinking from the leading position he might have held, in virtue of his integrity and intrepidity, to that of a demagogue. He boldly accused Cromwell and Ireton of treason, and the former tried in vain to make him comprehend the real situation of affairs, and seems at last to have given him up in despair, and to have prosecuted him from necessity, while he valued his steady qualities and incorruptible nature. Reduced to quiescence under the iron hand of the protector, his political enthusiasm subsided into the religious, and the famous John Lilburne became a preacher among the Quakers. He died Aug. 29, 1657.—Appleton's *Cyclop. of Biography*, p. 497.

Lilienthal, Michael, a German theologian, was born at Liebstadt, in Prussia, Sept. 8, 1686. He studied

theology at Königsberg and Jena, and became professor in the University of Rostock. He afterwards visited Holland, where he studied philology and archæology, and after his return was for some years professor at Königsberg. In 1714 he became assistant librarian of that university, and in 1719 was appointed deacon of one of the churches at Heidelberg. He was made member of the Academy of Berlin in 1711, and of that of Strasburg in 1733. He died at Königsberg Jan. 23, 1750. His principal works are *Biblisch-exegetische Bibliothek* (Königsb. 1740–1744, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Biblischer Archivarius d. Heiligen Schrift* (Königsb. 1745–1746, 2 vols. 4to: it contains a list of Biblical commentators, arranged in the order of the difficult passages):—*Theologisch-homelit. Archivarius* (Königsberg, 1749, 4to). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 413; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 225. (J. N. P.)

Lilienthal, Theodor Christopher, an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Königsberg Oct. 8, 1711. He studied at the university of his native place, and afterwards at Jena and Tübingen, and, after making a journey through Holland and England, spent some time in the University of Halle. He was soon after appointed adjunct professor at Königsberg, and in 1744 became extraordinary professor and doctor of theology. In 1746 he was made pastor of the community of Neu-Rossgärten, and subsequently became ordinary professor of theology, and church and school counsellor. He died March 17, 1782. Among his works we notice *Die gute Sache der göttlichen Offenbarung wider die Feinde derselben erwiesen u. gerettet* (Königsberg, 1750–82, 16 vols.: additions and variations to the first four parts appeared in 1778, and also an augmented addition in the same year). It gives a full collection of the divers objections that have been urged against Christianity, and answers every one. It is consequently useful as a book of reference on this subject, like Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, although, on account of its bulk and its antiquated apologetic stand-point, it is less fit to be in itself used as a weapon against incredulity. He wrote also *De Canone Missæ Gregoriano* (Leyden, 1739, 8vo):—*Historia beatæ Dorotheæ, Prussiæ patronæ, fabulis variis maculata* (Dantzig, 1743, 4to):—*Commentatio critica duorum codicum Biblia Hebraica continentium* (Dantzig, 1769, 4to), and a large number of sermons, dissertations, etc. See Schröckh, *K. Gesch. seit d. Reformation*, vi, 291; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, viii, 413; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 226. (J. N. P.)

Lilith. See Screech-owl.

Lillie, John, D.D., a minister originally of the Reformed (Dutch), but afterwards of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Kelso, Scotland, Dec. 16, 1812; graduated with the highest honors at the University of Edinburgh at the age of twenty-one years, prosecuted his theological studies for two years at Edinburgh, then came to America, and completed his course at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, New Brunswick, N. J. In 1835 he was installed pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Kingston, N. Y. In 1841 he took charge of the grammar-school of the New York University, and in 1843 of a congregation which had gathered about him in the University Chapel, and afterwards (1846) occupied their new church in Stanton Street. From 1844 until 1848 he was the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*. He was employed by the American (Baptist) Bible Union as one of its translators from 1851 to 1857. In 1855 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh. In 1858 he accepted the call offered to him by the Presbyterian Church, Kingston, N. Y., and he there labored until his death, Feb. 23, 1867. Dr. Lillie's published productions are not numerous, but highly creditable. His revision and translation of the *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, the *Second Epistle of Peter*, those of *John* and *Jude*, and the *Revelation*, for the Anglo-American edition of "Lange's Commentary," have won the highest encomiums. He was also the author of a small work on *The Perpetuity of the Earth*, in which he developed his premillennial views. Dr. Lillie was an earnest Christian, a ripe scholar, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1868, p. 117; *Kingston Argus and Journal*, Feb. 1867; *Mem. Sermon* by Rev. W. Irvin; *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, lxix, 619.

Lily (שׁוֹשַׁן, *shushan'*, from its *whiteness*, 1 Kings vii, 19; also שֹׁשָׁן, *shoshan'*, 1 Kings vii, 22, 26; Cant. ii, 16; iv, 5; v, 13; vi, 2, 3; vii, 2; and שׁוֹשַׁנָּה, *shoshannah'*, 2 Chron. iv, 5; Cant. ii, 1, 2; Hos. xiv, 5 [see Shushan; Shoshannim]; Sept. and N. T. κρίνον, Matt. vi, 28; Luke xii, 27). "There are, no doubt, several plants indigenous in Syria which might come under the denomination of lily, when that name is used in a general sense, as it often is by travellers and others. The term *shoshan* or *sosun* seems also to have been employed in this sense. It was known to the Greeks (σοῦσον), for Dioscorides (iii, 116) describes the mode of preparing an ointment called *susinon*, which others, he says, call κρινινόν, that is, *lilinum*. So Athenæus (xii, 513) identifies the Persian *suson* with the Greek *krinon*. The Arabic authors also use the word in a general sense, several varieties being described under the head *sosun*. The name is applied even to kinds of *Iris*, of which several species, with various colored flowers, are distinguished. But it appears to us that none but a plant which was well known and highly esteemed would be found occurring in so many different passages. Thus, in 1 Kings vii, 19–26, and 2 Chron. iv, 5, it is mentioned as forming the ornamental work of the pillars and of the brazen sea, made of molten brass, for the house of Solomon, by Hiram of Tyre. In Canticles the word is frequently mentioned; and it is curious that in five passages, Cant. ii, 2 and 16; iv, 5; vi, 2 and 3, there is a reference to feeding among lilies, which appears unaccountable when we consider that the allusion is made simply to an ornamental or sweet-smelling plant; and this the *shushan* appears to have been from the other passages in which it is mentioned. Thus, in Cant. ii, 1, 'I am the rose of Sharon and the *lily* of the valleys;' verse 2, 'as the *lily* among thorns, so is my love among the daughters;' v, 13, 'his lips like *lilies*, dropping sweet-smelling myrrh;' vii, 2, 'thy belly is like an heap of wheat set about with *lilies*.' If we consider that the book of Canticles is supposed to have been written on the occasion of the marriage of Solomon with a princess of Egypt, it is natural to suppose that some of the imagery may have been derived from her native country, and that the above lily may be a plant of Egypt rather than of Palestine. Especially does the water-lily, or lotus of the Nile, seem suitable to most of the above passages. Thus Herodotus (ii, 92) says. 'When the waters have risen to their extremest height, and all the fields are overflowed, there appears above the surface an immense quantity of plants of the lily species, which the Egyptians call the lotus; having cut down these, they dry them in the sun. The seed of the flowers, which resembles that of the poppy, they bake, and make into a kind of bread: they also eat the root of this plant, which is round, of an agreeable flavor, and about the size of an apple. There is a second species of the lotus, which grows in the Nile, and which is not unlike a rose. The fruit, which grows from the bottom of the root, resembles a wasp's nest: it is found to contain a number of kernels of the size of an olive-stone, which are very grateful either fresh or dried.' All this exists even to the present day. Both the roots and the stalks form articles of diet in Eastern countries, and the large farinaceous seeds of both the nymphæa and nelumbium are roasted and eaten. Hence possibly the reference to feeding among lilies in the above-quoted passages" This flower (the *Nymphæa Lotus* of Linnæus, and the *beshnin* of the modern Arabs) grows plentifully in Lower Egypt, flowering during the period of the annual inundation. There can be little doubt the "lily-

work" spoken of in 1 Kings vii, 19, 22, was an ornament in the form of the Egyptian lotus. There were formerly three descriptions of water-lily in Egypt, but one (the red-flowered lotus) has disappeared. "The flower," says Burckhardt, speaking of the white variety, or *Nymphæa lotus*, "generally stands on the stalk from

The Water-lily (*Nymphæa Lotus*).

one to two feet above the surface of the water. When the flowers open completely, the leaves form a horizontal disk, with the isolated seed-vessel in the midst, which bends down the stalk by its weight, and swims upon the surface of the water for several days until it is ingulfed. This plant grows at Cairo, in a tank called Birket el-Rotoli, near one of the northern suburbs where I happen to reside. It is not found in Upper Egypt, I believe, but abounds in the Delta, and attains maturity at the time when the Nile reaches its full height. I saw it in great abundance and in full flower, covering the whole inundated plain, on October 12, 1815, near the ruins of Tiney, about twelve miles south-east from Mansoura, on the Damietta branch. It dies when the water retires." Among the ancient Egyptians the lotus was introduced into all subjects as an ornament, and as the favorite flower of the country, but not with the holy character usually attributed to it, though adopted as an emblem of the god Nophre-Atmû (Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, i, 57, 256). As the Hebrew architecture was of the Phœnico-Egyptian style, nothing was more natural than the introduction of this ornament by Solomon into the Temple. It was in like manner borrowed by the Assyrians in their later structures (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 356). Mr. Bardwell, the architect, in his work entitled *Temples, Ancient and Modern* (1837), says, "The two great columns of the pronaos in Solomon's Temple were of the usual proportions of Egyptian columns, being five and a half diameters high; and as these gave the great characteristic feature to the building, Solomon sent an embassy to fetch the architect from Tyre to superintend the moulding and casting of these columns, which were intended to be of brass. Observe how conspicuous is the idea of the vase (the 'bowl' of our translation), rising from a cylinder ornamented with lotus-flowers; the bottom of the vase was partly hidden by the flowers, the belly of it was overlaid with net-work, ornamented by seven wreaths, the Hebrew number of happiness, and beneath the lip of the vase were two rows of pomegranates, one hundred in each row. These superb pillars were eight feet in diameter and forty-four feet high, supporting a noble entablature fourteen feet high." See JACHIN AND BOAZ. "In confirmation of the above identification of the lily of the O. T. with the lotus-flower, we may adduce also the remarks of Dr. W. C. Taylor in his *Bible Illustrated by Egyptian Monuments*, where he says that the lilies of the 45th and 59th Psalms have puzzled all Biblical critics. The title, 'To the chief musician upon *Shoshannim*,' has been supposed to be the name of some unknown tune to which the psalm was to be sung. But Dr. Taylor says 'the word *shoshannim* is universally acknowledged to signify lilies, and lilies have nothing to do with the subject of the ode. But this hymeneal ode was intended to be sung by the female attendants of the Egyptian princess, and they are called "the lilies," not only by a poetic reference to the lotus lilies of the Nile, but by a direct allusion to their custom of making the lotus lily a conspicuous ornament of their head-dress.' Thus, therefore, all the passages of O.-T. Scripture in which *shushan* occurs appear to be explained by considering it to refer to the lotus lily of the Nile" (Kitto). "Lynch enumerates the 'lily' as among the plants seen by him on the shores of the Dead Sea, but gives no details which could lead to its identification (*Exped. to the Jordan*, p. 286). He had previously observed the water-lily on the Jordan (p. 173), but omits to mention whether it was the yellow (*Nuphar lutea*) or the white (*Nymphæa alba*). 'The only "lilies" which I saw in Palestine,' says Prof. Stanley, 'in the months of March and April, were large yellow water-lilies, in the clear spring of 'Ain Mellahah, near the lake of Merom' (*S. and Pal.* p. 429). He suggests that the name 'lily' 'may include the numerous flowers of the tulip or amaryllis kind which appear in the early summer or the autumn of Palestine.' The following description of the Hûleh-lily by Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, i, 394), were it more precise, would perhaps have enabled botanists to identify it: 'This Hûleh-lily is very large, and the three inner petals meet above and form a gorgeous canopy, such as art never approached, and king never sat under, even in his utmost glory. . . . We call it Hûleh-lily because it was here that it was first discovered. Its botanical name, if it have one, I am unacquainted with. . . . Our flower delights most in the valleys, but is also found on the mountains. It grows among thorns, and I have sadly lacerated my hands in extricating it from them. Nothing can be in higher contrast than the luxuriant velvety softness of this lily, and the crabbed, tangled hedge of thorns about it. Gazelles still delight to feed among them; and you can scarcely ride through the woods north of Tabor, where these lilies abound, without frightening them from their flowery pasture.'"

On the other hand, some of the passages in which *shoshan* occurs evidently refer to a *field* variety, as Cant. ii, 1, 2, and the tubular shape of the trumpet is sufficient to explain the transfer of the word to that musical instrument. See SHOSHANNIM. "The Hebrew word is rendered 'rose' in the Chaldee Targum, and by Maimonides and other Rabbinical writers, with the exception of Kimchi and Ben-Melech, who in 1 Kings vii, 19 translated it by 'violet.' In the Judæo-Spanish version of the Canticles *shôshân* and *shôshannâh* are always translated by *rosa*, but in Hos. xiv, 5 the latter is rendered *lirio*. But κρίνον, or 'lily,' is the uniform rendering of the Sept., and is, in all probability, the true one, as it is supported by the analogy of the Arabic and Persian *susan*, which has the same meaning to this day, and by the existence of the same word in Syriac and Coptic. The Spanish *azuçena*, 'a white lily,' is merely a modification of the Arabic, but, although there is little doubt that the word denotes some plant of the lily species, it is by no means certain what individual of this class it especially designates. Father Souciet (*Recueil de diss. Crit.* 1715) labored to prove that the lily of Scripture is the 'crown imperial,' the Persian *tusaï*, the κρίνον βασιλικόν of the Greeks, and the *Fritillaria imperialis* of Linnæus. So common was this plant in Persia that it is supposed to have given its name to Susa, the capital (Athen. xii, 1; Bochart, *Phaleg*, ii, 14); but there is no proof that it was at any time common in Palestine, and '*the* lily' *par excellence* of Persia would not of necessity be 'the lily' of the Holy Land. Dioscorides (i, 62) bears witness to the beauty of the lilies of Syria and Pisidia, from which the best perfume was made. He says (iii, 106 [116]) of the κρίνον βασιλικόν that the Syrians call it σασᾶ (=*shushan*), and the Africans ἀβίβλαβον, which Bochart renders in Hebrew characters אביב לבן, 'white shoot.' Kühn, in his note on the passage, iden-

tifies the plant in question with the *Lilium candidum* of Linnæus. It is probably the same as that called in the Mishna 'king's lily' (*Kilaim*, v, 8). Pliny (xxi, 5) defines *κρίνον* as 'rubens lilium;' and Dioscorides, in another passage, mentions the fact that there are lilies with purple flowers, but whether by this he intended the *Lilium martagon* or *Chalcedonicum*, Kühn leaves undecided. Now in the passage of Athenæus above quoted it is said, *Σοῦσον γὰρ εἶναι τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ τὸ κρίνον*. But in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s. v. Σοῦσα) we find *τὰ γὰρ λείρια ὑπὸ τῶν Φοινίκων σοῦσα λέγεται*. As the *shushan* is thus identified both with *κρίνον*, the red or purple lily, and with *λείριον*, the white lily, it is evidently impossible, from the word itself, to ascertain exactly the kind of lily which is referred to. If the *shushan* or *shoshannah* of the O. T. and the *κρίνον* of the Sermon on the Mount be identical, which there seems no reason to doubt, the plant designated by these terms must have been a conspicuous object on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. vi, 28; Luke xii, 27); it must have flourished in the deep, broad valleys of Palestine (Cant. ii, 1), among the thorny shrubs (*ib.* ii, 2) and pastures of the desert (*ib.* ii, 16; iv, 5; vi, 3), and must have been remarkable for its rapid and luxuriant growth (Hos. xiv, 5; Ecclus. xxxix, 14). The purple flowers of the *khob*, or wild artichoke, which abounds in the plain north of Tabor and in the valley of Esdraelon, have been thought by some to be the 'lilies of the field' alluded to in Matt. vi, 28 (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 110). A recent traveller mentions a plant, with lilac flowers like the hyacinth, and called by the Arabs *usweih*, which he considered to be of the species denominated lily in Scripture (Bonar, *Desert of Sinai*, p. 329)." Tristram strongly inclines to identify the scarlet anemone (*Anemone coronaria*) with the Scripture "lily" (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 464).

In the N. Test. the word "lily" occurs "in the well-known and beautiful passage (Matt. vi, 26), 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these;' so also in Luke xii, 27. Here it is evident that the plant alluded to must have been indigenous or grown wild in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee, must have been of an ornamental character, and, from the Greek term *κρίνον* being applied to it, of a liliaceous nature. The name *κρίνον* occurs in all the old Greek writers (see Dioscor. iii, 116: compare Claudian. *Epithal. seren.* 126; Martial, v, 37, 6 sq.; Calpurn. vi, 33; Athen. xv, 677, 680; Virgil, *Ecl.* x, 25; Pliny, xv, 7; xxi, 11). Theophrastus first uses it, and is supposed by Sprengel to apply it to species of *Narcissus* and to *Lilium candidum*. Dioscorides indicates two species, but very imperfectly: one of them is supposed to be the *Lilium candidum*, and the other, with a reddish flower, may be *L. martagon* or *L. Chalcedonicum*. He alludes more particularly to the lilies of Syria and of Pamphylia being well suited for making the ointment of lily. Pliny enumerates three kinds, a white, a red, and a purple-colored lily. Travellers in Palestine mention that in the month of January the fields and groves everywhere abound in various species of lily, tulip, and narcissus. Benard noticed, near Acre, on Jan. 18th, and about Jaffa on the 23d, tulips, white, red, blue, etc. Gumpenberg saw the meadows of Galilee covered with the same flowers on the 31st. Tulips figure conspicuously among the flowers of Palestine, varieties probably of *Tulipa Gesneriana* (Kitto's *Palestine*, p. ccxv). So Pococke says, 'I saw many tulips growing wild in the fields (in March), and any one who considers how beautiful those flowers are to the eye would be apt to conjecture that these are the lilies to which Solomon in all his glory was not to be compared.' This is much more likely to be the plant intended than some others which have been adduced, as, for instance, the scarlet *amaryllis*, having white flowers with bright purple streaks, found by Salt at Adowa. Others have preferred the *Crown imperial*, which is a native of Persia and Cashmere. Most authors have united in considering the white lily, *Lilium candidum*, to be the plant to which our Saviour referred;

White Lily (*Lilium Candidum*).

but it is doubtful whether it has ever been found in a wild state in Palestine. Some, indeed, have thought it to be a native of the New World. Dr. Lindley, however, in the *Gardeners' Chronicle* (ii, 744), says, 'This notion cannot be sustained, because the white lily occurs in an engraving of the annunciation, executed somewhere about 1480 by Martin Schongauer; and the first voyage of Columbus did not take place till 1492. In this very rare print the lily is represented as growing in an ornamental vase, as if it were cultivated as a curious object.' This opinion is confirmed by a correspondent at Aleppo (*Gardeners' Chronicle*, iii, 429), who has resided long in Syria, but is acquainted only with the botany of Aleppo and Antioch: 'I never saw the white lily in a wild state, nor have I heard of its being so in Syria. It is cultivated here on the roofs of the houses in pots as an exotic bulb, like the daffodil.' In consequence of this difficulty, the late Sir J. E. Smith was of opinion that the plant alluded to under the name of lily was the *Amaryllis lutea* (now *Oporanthus luteus*), 'whose golden liliaceous flowers in autumn afford one of the most brilliant and gorgeous objects in nature, as the fields of the Levant are overrun with them; to them the expression of Solomon, in all his glory, not being arrayed like one of them, is peculiarly appropriate.' Dr. Lindley conceives 'it to be much more probable that the plant intended by our Saviour was the *Ixiolirion montanum*, a plant allied to the *amaryllis*, of very great beauty, with a slender stem, and clusters of the most delicate violet flowers, abounding in Palestine, where colonel Chesney found it in the most brilliant profusion' (*l. c.* p. 744). In reply to this, a correspondent furnishes an extract of a letter from Dr. Bowring, which throws a new light upon the subject: 'I cannot describe to you with botanical accuracy the lily of Palestine. I heard it called by the title of *Lilia Syriaca*, and I imagine under this title its botanical characteristics may be hunted out. Its color is a brilliant red; its size about half that of the common tiger lily. The white lily I do not remember to have seen in any part of Syria. It was in April and May that I observed my flower, and it was most abundant in the district of Galilee, where it and the *Rhododendron* (which grew in rich abundance round the paths) most

strongly excited my attention.' On this Dr. Lindley observes, 'It is clear that neither the white lily, nor the *Oporanthus luteus*, nor *Ixiolirion*, will answer to Dr. Bowring's description, which seems to point to the Chalcedonian or scarlet *martagon* lily, formerly called the lily of Byzantium, found from the Adriatic to the Levant, and which, with its scarlet turban-like flowers, is indeed a most stately and striking object' (*Gardeners' Chronicle*, ii, 854)" (Kitto). As this lily (the *Lilium Chalcedonicum* of botanists) is in flower at the season of

Scarlet Martagon (*Lilium Chalcedonicum*).

the year when the Sermon on the Mount is supposed to have been spoken (May; but it is probable that our Saviour's discourse on Providence, containing the allusion to the lily, occurred on a different occasion, apparently about October; see Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels*, § 52), is indigenous in the very locality, and is conspicuous, even in the garden, for its remarkable showy flowers, there can now be little doubt that it is the plant alluded to by our Saviour. "Strand (*Flor. Palæst.*) mentions it as growing near Joppa, and Kitto (*Phys. Hist. of Palest.* p. 219) makes especial mention of the *L. candidum* growing in Palestine; and, in connection with the habitat given by Strand, it is worth observing that the Lily is mentioned (Cant. ii, 1) with the rose of *Sharon*."

By some the lily is supposed to be meant by the term חֲבַצֶּלֶת (*chabatstse'leth*, "rose"), in Isa. xxxv, 1; Cant. ii, 1. For further details, consult Oken, *Lehrb. d. Naturgesch.* II, i, 757; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* iv, 138; Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 383 sq.; Billerbeck, *Flora Class.* p. 90 sq.; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1385; *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Lotus.

Limbo or **Limbus**, meaning *a border* or *department*, is used by Romanists as the name of the place of some of the departed, which the schoolmen who first held this doctrine (see below) believed to be situated on the limb, i. e. the edge or border of hell. See Intermediate State. There are five places to which the Church of Rome consigns departed spirits. Heaven is the residence of the holy, and hell of the finally damned. Besides these she enumerates *limbus infantum*, the department for infants; *limbus patrum*, the department of the fathers; and *purgatory*. Hell is placed lowest, purgatory next, then *limbus* for infants; and finally is enumerated a place for those who died before the advent of Christ. According to the Roman Catholic view, until Christ's death and resurrection, which constituted the decisive moments of the work of redemption, the doors of heaven were closed to all (*Catech. Rom.* i, 2, 7); since then they have been permanently open to all *perfect* saints. This doctrine was first advanced by pope Benedict XII, and afterwards sanctioned by the Council of Florence (Perrone, v, 213). According to this theory, until the coming of Christ, the souls of all departed were, without exception, sent into the place of punishment, or *infernus*, as is (according to Romish views) still the case with those who die without having arrived at perfection, or with some penance still to be performed for sin. At present they use the word *infernus* to convey the idea that all sinners are in some place outside of heaven, and that, on account of their different personal qualities, they are divided into different classes, which have nothing in common except their exclusion from the happiness of heaven, and therefore divide these *abdita receptacula* (Augustine, *Enchiridion ad Laurent.* § 109), of which the place of punishment consists, into, 1, hell, in its fullest sense, that terrible, immense prison in which the damned, who died in a state of mortal sin, are to remain forever (*Cat. Rom.* i, 6, 3, 5); 2, purgatory, in which the souls of believers, and of those who are justified, suffer until they are entirely free from sin; 3, the bosom of Abraham, where the saints who died before the coming of Christ were received, and where, while free from torments, they were nevertheless, on account of original sin, prevented by the dæmons from beholding the glory of God until the coming of the Redeemer, whose merits freed them from these bonds, and opened to them the doors of heaven. Compare here the statement of the early English reformers in "the *Institution of a Christian Man*," on the fifth article of their creed: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, at his entry into hell, first conquered and oppressed both the devil and hell, and also death itself . . . afterwards he spoiled hell, and delivered and brought with him from thence all the souls of those righteous and good men which, from the fall of Adam, died in the favor of God, and in the faith and belief of this our Saviour, which was then to come." The doctrine of the Church, as expressed in the symbols, names no other divisions. The third place which, in ecclesiastical phraseology, is usually called *Limbus patrum*, is even represented sometimes as a quiet habitation, and at other times as an unpleasant prison (*misera illius custodiæ molestia*), which two views, being difficult to conciliate, gave rise to many intricate questions unavoidable as soon as an attempt is made to establish such a detailed topography of the places of future life. The limbo of Dante is placed in the outermost of the nine circles of his *Inferno*. No weeping is heard within it, but perpetual sighs tremble on the air, breathed by an infinite crowd of women, men, and children, afflicted, but not tormented. These inhabitants are not condemned on account of sin, but solely because it was their fortune to live before the birth of Christ, or to die unbaptized. The poet was grieved at heart, as well he might be, when he recognised in this sad company many persons of great worth (comp. Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. xiv, chap. ii).

From the authorities of the Church, we find that the admission of the belief in a purgatory had in the West great influence on the ideas concerning the future. The scholastics, in the course of time, erected these views into a system. Besides the above-named three places of abode for departed spirits deprived of heavenly felicity recognised in the Roman Catholic Catechism, they asserted the existence of a fourth, intended for children who died previous to baptism. Bellarmine (*Purg.* ii, 7) considers it a very difficult question to decide whether there may not be a fifth, in which the purified souls remain until their final admittance into the kingdom of heaven, and which must consequently be situated somewhere between purgatory and heaven (Beda, *Hist.* v, 13; Dionysius Carthusianus, *Dial. de jud. particul.* 31; Lud. Blo-

sius, *Monil. Spirit.* 13). The necessity of ascribing to each of these *loca pœnalia* its special position accounts sufficiently for the fact that the word *limbus* is made to answer both for the place where the saints who lived before Christ remain, and for the abode of children who died without baptism. It appears to have been first set forth by Thomas Aquinas, and to have been at once adopted by the Church. Hell is considered as situated in the centre of the earth; next comes purgatory, which surrounds hell; then the *Limbus infantum*, or *puerorum*; and finally, as the central point between hell and heaven, the *Limbus patrum*, or *Sinus Abrahæ*. Of course each different place has its own special punishments: in hell it is *pœna æterna damni et sensus*; in purgatory, *pœna temporalis damni et sensus*; in the Limbus infantum, *pœna damni æterna*; and in the Limbus patrum, *pœna damni temporalis* (Thom. Aq. iii, d. 22, q. 2, a. 1, q. 2, 4; d. 21, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2; d. 45, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2, 3, 3, q. 52, 2, 4, 4; d. 45, q. 1, a. q. 2, etc., *Eleucidar.* 64; Dante, *Inf.* 4; comp. 31 sq.; Durand, *De S. Port. Sentt.* 3, d. 22, q. 4; Sonnius, *Demonstr. rel. Chr.* ii, 3, 15, and ii, 4, 1; Bellarmine, *Purg.* ii, 6; Andradius, *Defens. Trid. Synod.* ii, 299).

The *Limbus patrum* is exclusively reserved to the saints of the Mosaic dispensation. They suffer only by the consciousness that they are deprived, in consequence of original sin, from beholding God, and by an ardent longing for the coming of their Messiah. Since Christ has atoned for original sin, and freed them from imprisonment, this limbo is empty, and no longer of any importance in a religious sense. It is called *Limbus inferni*, "quia erat pœna carentiæ," *Sinus Abrahæ* "propter requiem, quia erat exspectatio gloriæ" (Bellarmine, *De Christo*, iv, 10; Becanus, *Append. purg. Calv.*). This view is defended partly by means of some passages in Scripture (such as Gen. xxxvii, 35; 1 Sam. xxviii; Zech. ix, 11; Luke xvi, 23; xx, 37; xxiii, 43; John viii, 56; Heb. xi, 5; 1 Peter iii, 19); but especially by oral tradition. This last is the more available because, with the exception of the later attempts at locating the different places, the Western Church has always taught the same things on this point, at least since St. Augustine (*De civ. Dei*, xx, 15), that the limbus in general was only the *caput mortuum* which the doctrine of the purgatory had yet left to the old Church. The Greek Church, on the other hand, holds no such views (Smith, *De Eccles. Græc. statu*, 1678, p. 103; Heineccius, *Abbildung d. alten u. neuen griech. Kirche*, 1711, ii, 103).

The doctrine of the *Limbus infantum*, or, rather, of the fate of unbaptized children, is insisted on with much greater force. On this point, however, the consequences of the system and the natural feelings of humanity come into conflict, and therefore the Church has never officially proclaimed its views as to the exact nature of it, so that a certain latitude is given for different opinions concerning it. The fathers early held different opinions on this point. Ambrosius (*Orat.* 40) does not venture to give any view concerning unbaptized children. Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat. in s. Bapt.* xl, 21) claims that *τοὺς μήτε δοξασθήσεσθαι, μήτε κολασθήσεσθαι περὶ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ*; and Gregory of Nyssa (ed. Paris, 1615, ii, 770) only denies in the very mildest manner their being *ἐν ἀλγεινοῖς*. Pelagius knew better where they do not go to than where they do go. In accordance with his general theory, St. Augustine consigns them "ad ignem æternum damnaturum iri;" but at the same time he admits that theirs is the slightest punishment consequent to original sin; their damnation is even so very slight that he expresses the doubt, "an eis, ut nulli essent, quam ut ibi essent, potius expediret," and declares "definire se non posse, quæ, qualis et quanta erit" (*Sermo* 294, n. 3 sq.; *Enchirid.* c. 93; *De pecc. merit.* i, c. 16, n. 2; *Contra Julian.* v, 44; *Epist. ad Hieron.* 131). This is the view most generally held in the Roman Catholic Church. General councils held at Lyons and at Florence decided that both those who died in mortal sin and those who were only tainted by original sin went down to the *infernus*, but that their punishments were different. In this respect the damnation of unbaptized children became *de fide*, as it had to be in some way distinguished from that of adults. Carrying out this view, the most distinguished scholastics, such as Peter Lombard (*Sent.* 2, d. 33), Thomas Bonaventura, and Scotus, assign to them only *pœna damni*, in contradistinction from *pœna sensus*. The contrary assertion of Petavius (*De Deo*, ix, 10, 10) is based on an error. Gregory of Rimini alone makes an exception, and for this reason received the name of *tortor infantum* (Sarpi, *Storia del Conc. di Trento*, ii; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 142, n. 128).

Now, although the essential nature of the *pœna damni* consists in the deprivation of the happiness of seeing God, there exists a difference in the manner of applying the idea to children and their inheritance of original sin. In the fifth session of the Council of Trent the Dominicans advocated the stricter view, making of the *limbus infantum* a dark, underground prison, while the Franciscans placed it above in a region of light. Others made the condition of these children still better: they supposed them occupied with studying nature, philosophizing on it, and receiving occasional visits from angels and saints. As the council thought it best not to decide this point, theologians have since been free to embrace either view. Bellarmine (*De amiss. grat.* vi, 6) considers their state, like Lombard, as one of sorrow. On the contrary, cardinal Sfondrani (*Nodus prædest. dissol.* i, 1, 23, and i, 2, 16) and Peter Godoy (compare Thomas, *Quæst.* 5 *de malo*, a. 2) consider them as enjoying all the natural happiness of which they are capable. They do not even know that supernatural happiness consists in the *visio clara Dei*, and can feel no pain from this, to them unknown, exclusion. Finally, Perrone (v, 275), who takes *Concil. Tr.* sess. v, c. 4, as including in *de fide* only the want of the *supernaturalis beatitudo*, says: "Si spectetur *relative* ad supernaturalem beatitudinem habet talis status rationem pœnæ et damnationis; si vero spectetur idem status in se sive *absolute*, cum per peccatum de naturalibus nihil amiserint, talis erit ipsorum conditio, qualis fuisset, si Adam neque peccasset neque elevatus ad supernaturalem statum fuisset, i. e. in conditione puræ naturæ." This attempt at conciliation agrees so well with the Roman Catholic view of original sin, that on this account it has been admitted (*Conc. Tr.* sess. v, 2, 3, 5, and sess. vi; Bellarmine, *De grat. prim. hom.* v). Moreover, it is well known that Roman Catholic principles are of great elasticity in their application, so that there is always some way for the Church of getting out of difficulties. Thus, while the Catechism (ii, 2, 28) continues to assert that, aside from baptism, there is "nulla alia salutis comparandæ ratio," we learn from the theologians, from Duns Scotus down to Klee (*Dogm.* iii, 119), that the mere *desiderium baptismi* can be considered as valid for the children while yet in the mothers' womb, and is equivalent to the actual performance of the rite of baptism on the child. What becomes of the children who, though baptized, die soon after baptism, and who thus lose the *meritum e congruo* necessary for justification, cannot here be taken into consideration.

Protestantism has taken but little notice of all these views. It was considered by many that these theories were too unimportant. The old Protestant Church, on the contrary, tried to prove the untenability on Biblical or philosophical grounds of this changeable doctrine, its late origin, and its inner contradictions. Neither did it forget the impossibility of separating the *pœna damni* and *pœna sensus* (Calvin, iii, 16, 9; Aretius, *Loci*, 17; Ryssenius, *Summa*, xviii, 3, 4; B. Pictet, ii, 265; Gerhard, xxvii, 8, 3; S. Niemann, *De distinct. Pontif. in interno classib.* 1689). The old Protestant theologians considered it as an undeniable truth that there exist no other divisions than heaven and hell in the, to us, unknown world; also that there can be no further distinction between the souls of the departed than that based on belief and unbelief, causing the former to be blessed and

the latter to be damned. Still there arose questions which it was difficult for them to settle: the Reformed theologians disposed of them in a comparatively easy manner, for, as they admitted only of a gradual difference between the two dispensations, and upheld the identity of the action of grace and faith possible to both, they found no difficulty in ascribing blessedness to the saints of the old dispensation. It is well known that Zwingle went even further. Thus they also disposed of the doctrine of predestination, at least in regard to elect children, in which the *fides seminalis* was presupposed, and no one could deny, in view of Matt. xix, 14, that children dying in infancy can also be among the elect. The Lutherans solved the two questions in a different manner: in order to justify the qualitative equality of the Jewish and Christian faith, they were obliged to assert the retrospective power of Christ's merits. With regard to children, they found a still greater difficulty on account of their stricter conception of original sin and their doctrine concerning baptism, which bears such close resemblance to that of the Roman Catholic Church. The only way in which they could dispose of it was to have recourse to the free power of God, who can give salvation in other than the general way. Thus reasons Gerhard when he says, "Quasi non possit Deus extraordinarie cum infantibus Christianorum parentum per preces ecclesiæ et parentum sibi oblatis agere" (ix, 282). Also Buddeus (v, 1, 6): "In infantibus parentum Christianorum, qui ante baptismum moriuntur per gratiam quamdam extraordinariam fidem produci; ad infidelium autem infantes quod attinet, salutem æternam iis tribuere non audemus." See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 415; *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1863, i. See Life, Eternal; Predestination; Election; Salvation; Grace; Sin; Infants; Baptism (of Infants).

Limborch, Philip van, an eminent Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam June 19, 1633. He first studied ethics, history, and philosophy at his native place, and then applied himself to divinity under the Remonstrants. From Amsterdam he went to Utrecht, and attended the lectures of Voetius, and other divines of the Reformed religion. In 1657 he became pastor of the Remonstrants at Gonda, and remained there until 1667, when he removed to Amsterdam as pastor. The following year he was called to the chair of divinity in the Remonstrant college at the latter place, which position he held until his death, April 30, 1712. Limborch was on intimate terms with Locke, and corresponded with him regularly for several years on the nature of human liberty (see Locke's *Letters*, Lond. 1727, 3 vols. fol.). Limborch was gentle in his disposition, tolerant of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and, above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators. Next to Arminius himself, and Simon Episcopius, Limborch was one of the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians, "who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments" (Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, ii, 214). In 1660, having found among the papers of Episcopius, his maternal uncle, several letters relating to ecclesiastical affairs, he arranged a collection with Hartsocker, *Epistolæ præstantium et eruditorum Virorum* (8vo). Limborch was specially noted for his doctrinal works. His principal work is *Theologia Christiana* (1686; 4th ed. Amst. 1715, 4to), translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Tillotson, Scott, and others, by William Jones, under the title, *A complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative and practical, founded on Scripture and Reason* (Lond. 1702, 2 vols. 8vo). This was the first and most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of material. The preparation of the work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants (q. v.). His other works are, *De veritate religionis Christianæ* (1687), the result of a conference with the learned Jew, Dr. Orobius: — *Historia Inquisitionis* (1692, fol.; translated by Samuel Chandler, under the title *The History of the Inquisition*, to which is prefixed a large introduction concerning the rise and progress of persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it, London, 1731, 2 vols. 4to). He is also the author of an exegetical work, *Commentarius in Acta Apos. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebræos* (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and acute reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Arminian theologians. See Nicéron, *Hist. des Hommes illustres*, xi, 39-53; Abrah. des Armorie van der Hoeven, *De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limborch.* (Amstelod. 1845, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxxi, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, s. v.; Farrar, *Crit. History of Free Thought*, p. 386, 392; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1864, p. 513.

Limbus. See Limbo.

Lime (שִׂיד, *sid*, perh. from its *boiling* or effervescing when slaked; Isa. xxxiii, 12; Amos ii, 1; rendered "plaster" in Deut. ii, 2, 4; the same word is used for lime in Arab. and Syr.), a well-known mineral substance, which is a very prevalent ingredient in rocks, and, combined with carbonic acid, forms marble, chalk, and limestone, of various degrees of hardness and every variety of color. Limestone is the prevailing constituent of the mountains of Syria; it occurs under various modifications of texture, color, form, and intermixture in different parts of the country. The purest carbonate of lime is found in calcareous spar, whose crystals assume a variety of forms, all, however, resulting from a primary rhomboid. Under the action of fire, carbonate of lime loses its carbonic acid and becomes caustic lime, which has a hot, pungent taste. See Chalk. If lime be subjected to an intense heat, it fuses into transparent glass. When heated under great pressure, it melts, but retains its carbonic acid. The modern mode of manufacturing common or "quick" lime was known in ancient times. Lime is obtained by calcining or burning marble, limestone, chalk, shells, bones, and other substances to drive off the carbonic acid. From Isa. xxxii, 12 it appears that lime was made in a kiln lighted with thorn-bushes. Dr. Thomson remarks, "It is a curious fidelity to real life that, when the thorns are merely to be destroyed, they are never cut up, but are set on fire where they grow. They are only *cut up* for the lime-kiln" (*Land and Book*, i, 81). See Furnace. In Amos ii, 1 it is said that the king of Moab "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." The interpretation of the Targum and some of the rabbins is that the burnt bones were made into lime and used by the conqueror for plastering his palace. The same Hebrew word occurs in Deut. xxvii, 2-4: "Thou shalt set thee up great stones, and *plaister* them with *plaister;* and thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law." It is probable that the same mode of perpetuating inscriptions was followed as we know was customary in Egypt. In that country we find paintings and hieroglyphic writing upon plaster, which is frequently laid upon the natural rock, and, after the lapse of perhaps more than three thousand years, we find the plaster still firm, and the colors of the figures painted on it still remarkably fresh. The process of covering the rock with plaster is thus described: "The ground was covered with a thick layer of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, which was carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this a thin coat of lime white-wash was laid, and on it the colors were painted, which were bound fast either with animal glue or occasionally with wax" (*Egyptian Antiq.*, in *Lib. of Entertaining Knowl.*). See Plaster. If it be insisted that the words of the law were actually cut in the rock, it would seem best to understand that the Hebrew word

sid does not here mean a "plaister," but indicates that the stones, after they had been engraved, were covered with a coat of tenacious lime white-wash, employed for similar purposes by the Egyptians, who, when the face of a rock had been sculptured in relievo, covered the whole with a coat of this wash, and then painted their sculptured figures (Kitto's *Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). See MORTAR.

Limĭna Martўrum (*the houses of the martyrs*), a phrase sometimes used in ancient writers to designate *churches*.

Limiter (*limitour*), the name given to an itinerant and begging friar employed by a convent to collect its dues and promote its temporal interests within certain *limits*, though under the direction of the brotherhood who employed him. Occasionally the limiter is a person of considerable importance. See Russell's *Notes; Works of the English and Scottish Reformers*, ii, 536, 542.

Lincoln, ENSIGN, a noted philanthropist and lay minister in the Baptist Church, was born at Hingham, Mass., Jan. 8, 1779. He was brought into the Church when about nineteen years old, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baldwin. He had been apprenticed to a printer, and in 1800 he commenced business on his own account. He also advanced the interests of Christian truth by preaching, for which he was licensed about 1801, and, though he was not ordained, and therefore never relinquished his secular profession, he preached, and prayed, and performed the ordinary offices of a minister of the Gospel with all the holy fervor of an apostle. He won the unaffected respect of all men, as a generous neighbor, an honest friend, and a virtuous citizen. He died Dec. 2, 1832. "If I should live to the age of Methuselah," he remarked, "I could find no better time to die." Mr. Lincoln was prominent in the organization of the Evangelical Tract Society, the Howard Benevolent Society, the Boston Baptist Foreign Mission Society, the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, and other institutions of a similar character. He edited Winchell's Watts, the *Pronouncing Bible*, and the series of beautiful volumes styled *The Christian Library*. His own *Scripture Questions* and *Sabbath-school Class-book* are well known. See Dr. Sharp's *Funeral Sermon; American Baptist Magazine*, April, 1833. (J. H. W.)

Linda or **Lindanus,** WILLIAM DAMASUS VAN, a Roman Catholic prelate, noted as a controversialist, born at Dordrecht, Holland, in 1525, was professor of Romish theology at Louvain and Dillingen; later, dean in the Hague, and then bishop of Ghent. He is remarkable for the severity which characterized his acts as inquisitor. In 1562 he was appointed by Philip II bishop of Rusemond. He died in 1568 or 1588. His most popular work was *Panoplia Evangelica* (1563). See A. Havensius, *Vita G. Lindani* (1609).—Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.* p. 1433; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. xii, s. v.

Lindblom, JACOB AXEL, a Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogothia in 1747. He was professor of belles-lettres in the University of Upsal, became bishop of Linköping in 1789, and was afterwards chosen archbishop of Upsal. He died in 1819.—Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1433.

Linde, CHRISTOPH LUDWIG, a German theologian, was born at Schmalkalden June 5, 1676. In 1698 he attended the University of Erfurt, and the following year that of Leipsic. After he was graduated he became tutor, first at Leipsic, in order to develop his knowledge more fully, and in 1705 at his native place. In 1706 he accepted a call as preacher to Farnbach, in 1729 he returned to Schmalkalden as subdean, and in 1736 was chosen pastor. He died Aug. 27, 1753. His productions are mostly dedicated to the youth and school-teachers of the Lutheran Church; we mention only his *Theologia in Hymnis* (Schmalkalden, 1712, 8vo). —Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lindewood, Lindwood, or **Lyndewood,** WILLIAM, an English prelate who flourished in the 15th century, was divinity professor at Oxford in the time of Henry V, and bishop of St. David's in 1434. He died in 1446. He wrote *Constitutiones Provinciales Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (Oxon. 1679, fol.).—Lowndes's *Bibl. Man.* p. 1135; Marvin's *Leg. Bibl.* p. 482; Allibone's *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, ii, 1101.

Lindgerus (LUDGERUS), ST., a noted theologian, was born about the year 743 in Friesland. He became a disciple of St. Boniface, who admitted him to holy orders, and afterwards he went for four years and a half to England to perfect himself under the renowned Alcuin, then at the head of the school of York. He returned in 773, and in 776 was ordained priest by Alberic, successor of St. Gregory. He preached the Gospel with great success in Friesland, converted large numbers, and founded several convents, but was obliged to quit the country in consequence of the invasion of the Saxons. He then went to Rome to consult with the pope, Adrian II, and withdrew for three years to the monastery of Mount Cassin. Charlemagne having repulsed the Saxons and liberated Friesland, Lindgerus returned, preached the Gospel to the Saxons with great success, as also in Westphalia, and founded the convent of Werden. In 802 he was, against his wishes, appointed bishop of Mimigardeford, which was afterwards called Münster. He always enjoyed the favor of Charlemagne, notwithstanding the intrigues of enemies jealous of his usefulness. He died in A.D. 809.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. xix, s. v.

Lindsay, John (1), a learned English divine, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and for many years officiated as a minister of the nonjuring society in Trinity Chapel, Aldersgate Street, and is said to have been their last minister. He was also for some time a corrector of the press for Mr. Bowyer, the printer. He finished a long and useful life June 21, 1768. Mr. Lindsay published a *Short History of the Regal Succession*, etc., *with Remarks on Whiston's Scripture Politics*, etc. (1720, 8vo); a translation of Mason's *Vindication of the Church of England* (1726, reprinted in 1728), which has a large and elaborate preface, containing "a full and particular series of the succession of our bishops, through the several reigns since the Reformation," etc. In 1747 he published Mason's *Two Sermons preached at Court in* 1620. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Lindsay, John (2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lynn, Mass., July 18, 1788; was converted in 1807; entered the New England Conference in 1809; was agent for the Wesleyan University in 1835–6; in 1837 was transferred to the New York Conference, and made presiding elder on New Haven District; next he filled two stations in New York City; in 1842 he was agent for the American Bible Society; was transferred in 1845 to the Troy Conference; was appointed to the Albany District in 1846; and died at Schenectady Feb. 10, 1850. Mr. Lindsay was an impressive and successful preacher, and a man of noble benevolence. He was very active in the founding of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, and the Wesleyan University.—*Minutes of Conf.* iv, 460; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, vol. ii, ch. xli. (G. L. T.)

Lindsey, THEOPHILUS, an eminent English Unitarian minister, was born at Middlewich, in Cheshire, June 20, 1723 (O. S.). He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1741, and, after taking his degrees, was elected fellow in 1747. About this time he commenced his clerical duties at an Episcopal chapel in Spital Square, London. Later he became domestic chaplain to Algernon, duke of Somerset, after whose death he travelled two years on the Continent with Algernon's son. On his return, about 1753, he was presented to the living of Kirkby Wiske, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and in 1756 he removed to that of Piddletown, in Dor-

setshire. In 1760 he married a step-daughter of his intimate friend archdeacon Blackburne, and in 1763, chiefly for the sake of enjoying his society, took the living of Catterick. Lindsey, who had felt some scruples respecting subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles even while at Cambridge, began now to entertain serious doubts concerning the Trinitarian doctrines, and by 1769 his association with the Rev. William Turner, a Presbyterian minister at Wakefield, and Dr. Priestley, then a Unitarian minister at Leeds, gave a more decided coloring to his Antitrinitarian views, and he actually began to contemplate the duty of resigning his living. He was induced to defer that step by an attempt which was made in 1771, by several clergymen and gentlemen of the learned professions, to obtain relief from Parliament in the matter of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and in which he joined heartily, travelling upwards of 2000 miles in the winter of that year to obtain signatures to the petition which was prepared. The petition was presented on the 6th of February, 1772, with nearly 250 signatures, but, after a spirited debate, its reception was negatived by 217 to 71. It being intended to renew the application to Parliament at the next session, Lindsey still deferred his resignation, but when the intention was abandoned he began to prepare for that important step. He drew up, in July, 1773, a copious and learned "Apology," and, notwithstanding the attempts of his diocesan and others to dissuade him from the step, he formally resigned his connection with the Established Church, and, selling the greatest part of his library to meet his pecuniary exigencies, he proceeded to London, and on the 17th of April, 1774, began to officiate in a room in Essex Street, Strand, which, by the help of friends, he had been enabled to convert into a temporary chapel. His desire being to deviate as little as possible from the mode of worship adopted in the Church of England, he used a liturgy very slightly altered from that modification of the national church-service which had been previously published by Dr. Samuel Clarke. This modified liturgy, as well as his opening sermon, Lindsey published. His efforts to raise a Unitarian congregation proving successful, he commenced shortly afterwards the erection of a more permanent chapel in Essex Street, which was opened in 1778. His published "Apology" having been attacked in print by Mr. Burgh, an Irish M.P., by Mr. Bingham, and by Dr. Randolph, Lindsey published a "Sequel" to it in 1776, in which he answered those writers. In 1781 he published *The Catechist, or an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the only True God and Object of Religious Worship;* in 1783, *A Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship from the Reformation to our own Times*, an elaborate work, which had been several years in preparation; and in 1785, anonymously, *An Examination of Mr. Robinson of Cambridge's Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, by a late Member of the University.* In 1788 he published *Vindiciæ Priestleianæ*, a defence of his friend Dr. Priestley, in the form of an address to the students of Oxford and Cambridge; and this was followed, in 1790, by a *Second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge relating to Jesus Christ and the Origin of the great Errors concerning him.* In 1782 he invited Dr. Disney, who then left the Established Church for the same reasons as himself, to become his colleague in the ministry at Essex Street; and in 1793, on account of age and growing infirmities, he resigned the pastorate entirely into his hands, publishing on the occasion a farewell discourse (which he felt himself unable to preach) and a revised edition, being the fourth, of his liturgy. In 1795 he reprinted, with an original preface, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* which Dr. Priestley had recently published in America in reply to Paine's *Age of Reason;* and in 1800 he republished in like manner another of Priestley's works, on the knowledge which the Hebrews had of a future state. Lindsey's last work was published in 1802, entitled *Conversations on the Divine Government, showing that everything is from God and for good to all.* He died on the 3d of November, 1808. Besides copious biographical notices of Lindsey, which were published in the *Monthly Repository* and *Monthly Magazine* of Dec., 1808, the Rev. Thomas Belsham published, in 1812, a thick octavo volume of *Memoirs*, in which he gives a full analysis of Lindsey's works and extracts from his correspondence, together with a complete list of his publications. Two volumes of his sermons were printed shortly after his death. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Robert Hall, in his *Works* (11th ed. 1853), iv, 188 sq.; *London Quarterly Review*, viii, 422 sq.

Lindsley, James Harvey, a Baptist preacher, was born in North Branford, Connecticut, May 5, 1787. Brought to consider his spiritual condition through a severe illness, he sought and found pardon in December, 1810. Shortly after he began a course of study with the view of entering the ministry, and graduated at Yale College in 1817. For a number of years his health was so poor as to forbid his preaching, and he was engaged in teaching. He introduced into the Baptist denomination the religious meetings styled "Conference of the Churches," and was chairman of the first two. His first regular preaching was in Stratford, in a store hired by himself in 1831, and in the same year he received a regular license to preach. For five years he had charge of the churches in Milford and Stratfield. In 1836 his health became impaired. He ceased preaching, and for a part of the year assisted in the compilation of the *Baptist Select Hymns.* He died Dec. 29, 1843. Mr. Lindsley was a ready writer, and a large contributor to several of the periodicals of the day. His articles took a wide range, including politics, religion, moral reform, literature, and especially natural science.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. vi.

Lindsley, Philip, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Morristown, N. J., Dec. 21, 1786, and graduated in the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1804. After teaching for some time, and completing his theological course, he was licensed in 1810, and went to Newtown, L. I., where he preached as a stated supply. In 1812 he became senior tutor in Princeton College, and in 1813 was appointed to the professorship of languages, and chosen secretary of the board of trustees. To these offices were added those of librarian and inspector of the college, and in 1817, when he was ordained, that of vice-president. In 1824 he agreed to go to Nashville, solely induced thereto by the new and wide field of exertion which lay before him there. He continued more than a quarter of a century at Nashville, and his reputation as a teacher was so high in the South and West that it was said that every university in those regions had solicited him to accept its headship. He was twice invited to preside over Dickinson College, in Pennsylvania, and was actually elected provost of the University of Pennsylvania in 1834. From this period he was successively moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, member of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries at Copenhagen, professor of ecclesiastical polity and Biblical archæology in the New Albany Seminary (Indiana), 1850. He removed from New Albany in April, 1853, and returned to Nashville, where he died May 23, 1855. Dr. Lindsley's works have been published entire, with an introductory notice of his life and labors by Leroy J. Halsey (Philadel. 1865, 3 vols. 8vo). Their contents are as follows: vol. i, *Educational Discourses;* vol. ii, *Sermons and Religious Discourses;* vol. iii, *Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays.*—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 465.

Lindwood. See LINDEWOOD.

Line (represented by the following terms in the original: חֶבֶל, *che'bel*, a *measuring-line*, 2 Sam. viii, 2; Amos vii, 17; hence a *portion* as divided out by a line, Psa. xvi, 6; elsewhere "cord," "portion," etc. קָו or קַו, *kav*, a *measuring-line*, Isa. xxxiv, 17; Ezek. xlvii,

3; either for construction, Job xxxviii, 5; Isa. xliv, 13; Jer. xxxi, 39; Zech. i, 16, or for destruction, 2 Kings xxi, 13; Lam. ii, 8; Isa. xxxiv, 11; metaph., a *rule* or norm, Isa. xxviii, 17, 10, 13; like the Gr. *κανών*, 2 Cor. x, 13, 15, 16; Gal. vi, 16; Phil. iii, 16; also the *rim*, e. g. of a laver, 1 Kings vii, 23; 2 Chron. iv, 2; or *string* of a musical instrument, put for *sound*, q. d. accord, Psa. xix, 4; where Sept. ὁ φθόγγος, and so Rom. x, 18, Vulg. *sonus;* once, *strength*, Isa. xviii, 2, where "a nation meted out" should be rendered a *most mighty* nation: in three of the above passages, 1 Kings vii, 23; Jer. xxxi, 39; Zech. i, 16, the text reads קָוֶה, *ke'veh*, of the same import; and in Josh. ii, 18, 21, occurs תִּקְוָה, *tikvah'*, a *cord*, from the same root. Other terms less proper are: חוּט, *chut*, a *thread*, for measuring a circumference, 1 Kings vii, 15; "fillets," Jer. lii, 21; elsewhere generally a "thread." פָּתִיל, *pathil'*, a *cord*, for measuring length, Ezek. xl, 3; elsewhere a "thread," "lace," etc., especially the string for suspending the signet-ring in the bosom, rendered "bracelets" in Gen. xxxviii, 18, 25. שֶׂרֶד, *se'red*, the *awl* or stylus with which an artist graves the sketch of a figure in outline, to be afterwards sculptured in full, Isa. xliv, 13). There can be little doubt that the Hebrews acquired the art of measuring land from the ancient Egyptians, with whom it was early prevalent (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 256). In Josh. xviii, 9 we read, "And the men went out and passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh." These circumstances clearly indicate that a survey of the whole country was made, and the results entered carefully in a book (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). This appears to be the earliest example of a topographical survey on record, and it proves that there must have been some knowledge of mensuration among the Hebrews, as is moreover evinced by the other topographical details in the book of Joshua.

Lineage (*πατριά*, paternal *descent*, "kindred," Acts iii, 25; "family," Eph. iii, 15), a family or race (Luke ii, 4). See GENEALOGY.

Linen has been made in the A. Version or elsewhere the representative of a considerable number of Heb. and Greek terms, to most of which it more or less nearly corresponds. The *material* designated by them in general is no doubt principally, and perhaps by some of them exclusively, the product of the flax-plant; but there is another plant which, as being a probable rival to it, may be most conveniently considered here, namely, HEMP. See also SILK; WOOL.

Hemp is a plant which in the present day is extensively distributed, being cultivated in Europe, and extending through Persia to the southernmost parts of India. In the plains of that country it is cultivated on account of its intoxicating product, so well known as *bang;* in the Himalayas both on this account and for its yielding the ligneous fibre which is used for sack and rope making. Its European names are no doubt derived from the Arabic *kinnab*, which is supposed to be connected with the Sanscrit *shanapee*. There is no doubt, therefore, that it might easily have been cultivated in Egypt. Herodotus mentions it as being employed by the Thracians for making garments. "These were so like linen that none but a very experienced person could tell whether they were of hemp or flax; one who had never seen hemp would certainly suppose them to be linen." Hemp is used in the present day for smock-frocks and tunics; and Russia sheeting and Russia duck are well known. *Cannabis* is mentioned in the works of Hippocrates on account of its medical properties. Dioscorides describes it as being employed for making ropes, and it was a good deal cultivated by the Greeks for this purpose. Though we are unable at present to prove that it was cultivated in Egypt at an early period, and used for making garments, yet there is nothing improbable in its having been so. Indeed, as it was known to various Asiatic nations, it could hardly have been unknown to the Egyptians, and the similarity of the word *husheesh* to the Arabic *shesh* would lead to a belief that they were acquainted with it, especially as in a language like the Hebrew it is more probable that different names were applied to totally different things, than that the same thing had two or three different names. Hemp might thus have been used at an early period, along with flax and wool, for making cloth for garments and for hangings, and would be much valued until cotton and the finer kinds of linen came to be known.

1. PISHTEH' (פִּשְׁתָּה, or, rather, according to Gesenius, פֶּשֶׁת, *pe'sheth*, from פָּשַׁשׁ, to *card*) is rendered "linen" in Lev. xiii, 47, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxii, 11; Jer. xiii, 1; Ezek. xliv, 17, 18; and "flax" in Josh. ii, 6; Judg. xv, 14; Prov. xxxi, 13; Isa. xix, 9; Ezek. xl, 3, Hos. ii, 5, 9. It signifies (1.) *flax*, i. e. the material of linen, Isa. xix, 9; Deut. xxii, 11; Prov. xxxi, 13, where its manufacture is spoken of; also a line or rope made of it, Ezek. xl, 3; Judg. xiv, 4; so "stalks of flax," i. e. woody flax, Josh. ii, 6 (where the Sept. has λινοκαλάμη, Vulg. *stipulæ lini*, but the Arabic Vers. stalks of *cotton*); and (2.) wrought flax, i. e. *linen* cloth, as made into garments, e. g. generally, Lev. xiii, 47, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxii, 11; Ezek. xliv, 17; a girdle, Jer. xiii, 1; a mitre, a pair of drawers worn by the priests, Ezek. xliv, 18. A cognate term is פִּשְׁתָּח, *pistah'*, the plant "flax" as growing, Exod. ix, 31; spec. a *wick*, made of linen, i. e. of "flax," Isa. xlii, 3, or "tow," Isa. xliii, 17. To this exactly corresponds the Greek λίνον (whence English *linen*), which, indeed, stands for *pishteh* or *pishtah* in the Sept. (at Exod. ix, 31; Isa. xix, 9; xliii, 3). It signifies properly the *flax*-plant (Xenophon, *Ath.* ii, 11, 12), but in the N. T. is only used of *linen* raiment (Rev. xv, 6; comp. Homer, *Il.* ix, 661; *Od.* xiii, 73), also the *wick* of a lamp, as being composed of a strip or ravellings of linen (Matt. xii, 20), where the half-expiring flame is made the symbol of an almost despairing heart, which will be cheered instead of having its religious hopes extinguished by the Redeemer. In John xiii, 4, 5 occurs the Latin term *linteum*, in its Greek form λέντιον, literally a *linen* cloth, hence a "towel" or *apron* (comp. Galen, *Comp. Med.* 9; Suetonius, *Calig.* xxvi).

This well-known plant was early cultivated in Egypt (Exod. ix, 31; Isa. xix, 9; comp. Pliny, xix, 2; Herod. ii, 105; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 500), namely, in the Delta around Pelusium ("linum Pelusiacum," Sil. Ital. iii, 25, 375; "linteum Pelusium," Phædr. ii, 6, 12); but also in Palestine (Josh. ii, 6, Hos. ii, 7; compare Pococke, *East*, i, 260), the stalk attaining a height of several feet (see Josh. ii, 6; compare Hartmann, *Hebr.* i, 116). Linen or tow was employed by the Hebrews, especially as a branch of female domestic manufacture (Prov. xxxi, 13), for garments (2 Sam. vi, 14; Ezek. xliv, 17; Lev. xiii, 47; Rev. xv, 6; comp. Philo, ii, 225), girdles (Jer. xxxi, 1), thread and ropes (Ezek. xl, 3; Judg. xv, 13), napkins (Luke xxiv, 12; John xix, 40), turbans (Ezek. xliv, 18), and lamp-wick (Isa. xl, 3; xliii, 17; Matt. xii, 20). For clothing they used the "fine linen" (בַּד, ὀθόνη, 1 Chron. xv, 27, where the Sept. has βύσσινος: see Hartmann, iii, 38; compare Lev. xvi, 4, 23; Ezek. xliv, 17), perhaps the Pelusiac linen of Egypt (see Mishna, *Joma*, iii, 7), of remarkable whiteness (comp. Dan. xii, 6; Rev. xv, 6; see Plutarch, *Isis*, c. 4), with which the fine Babylon linen manufactured at Borsippa doubtless corresponded (Strabo, xvi, 739), being the material of the splendid robes of the Persian monarchs (Strabo, xiv, 719; Curt. viii, 9), doubtless the *karpas*, כַּרְפַּס, of Esth. i, 6 (see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 715). Very poor persons wore garments of unbleached flax (*ὠμόλινον, linum crudum*, i. q. *tow-cloth*, Ecclus. xl, 4). The refuse of flax or *tow* is called in Heb. נְעֹרֶת, *neö'reth* (Judg. xvi, 9; Isa. xxxi, 31). (See, generally, Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 283 sq.) See FLAX.

2. Bûts (בּוּץ, from a root signifying *whiteness*) occurs in 1 Chron. iv, 21; xv, 27; 2 Chron. ii, 14; iii, 14; v, 12; Esth. i, 6; viii, 15; Ezek. xxvii, 16, in all which passages the A.V. renders it "fine linen," except in 2 Chron. v, 12, where it translates "white linen." The word is of Aramæan origin, being found in substantially the same form in all the cognate dialects. It is spoken of the finest and most precious stuffs, as worn by kings (1 Chron. xv, 27), by priests (2 Chron. v, 12), and by other persons of high rank or honor (Esth. i, 6, 8, 15). It is used of the Syrian *byssus* (Ezek. xxvii, 16), which seems there to be distinguished from the Egyptian *byssus* or שֵׁשׁ, *shesh* (ver. 7). Elsewhere it seems not to differ from this last, and is often put for it in late Hebrew (e. g. 1 Chron. iv, 21; 2 Chron. iii, 14; comp. Exod. xxvi, 31; so the Syr. and Chald. equivalents of *buts* occur in the O. and N. T. for the Heb. שֵׁשׁ and Gr. *βύσσος*). That the Heb. garments made of this material were *white* may not only be certainly concluded from the etymology (which that of שֵׁשׁ confirms), but from the express language of Rev. xix, 4, where the white and shining raiment of the saints is emblematical of their purity. Yet we should not rashly reject the testimony of Pausanias (v, 5), who states that the Hebrew *byssus* was *yellow*, for cotton of this color is found as well in Guinea and India (*Gossypium religiosum*) as in Greece at this day (comp. Vossius, *ad. Virg. Geo.* ii, 220), although white was doubtless the prevailing color, as of linen with us. J. E. Faber (in Harmar, *Observ.* ii, 382 sq.) suspects that the *buts* was a cotton-plant common in Syria, and different from the *shesh* or tree-cotton. It has long been disputed whether the cloths of *byssus* were of linen or cotton (see Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 167 sq.; Forster, *De bysso antiquor.* London, 1776), and recent microscopic experiments upon the mummy-cloths brought to London from Egypt have been claimed as determining the controversy by discovering that the threads of these are linen (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 115). But this is not decisive, as there may have existed religious reasons for employing linen for this particular purpose, and the cloths used for bandaging the bodies are not clearly stated to have been of *byssus*. On the contrary, the characteristics ascribed to this latter are such as much better agree with the qualities of cotton (see Forster, *De bysso*, ut sup.). "The corresponding Greek word *βύσσος* occurs in Luke xvi, 19, where the rich man is described as being clothed in purple and *fine linen*, and also in Rev. xviii, 12, 16, and xix, 8, 14, among the merchandise the loss of which would be mourned for by the merchants trading with the mystical Babylon. But it is by many authors still considered uncertain whether this byssus was of *flax* or *cotton;* for, as Rosenmüller says, 'The Heb. word *shesh*, which occurs thirty times in the two first books of the Pentateuch (see Celsius, ii, 259), is in these places, as well as in Prov. xxxi, 22, by the Greek Alexandrian translators interpreted *byssus*, which denotes Egyptian cotton, and also the cotton cloth made from it. In the later writings of the O. T., as, for example, in the Chronicles, the book of Esther, and Ezekiel, *buts* is commonly used instead of *shesh* as an expression for cotton cloth.' This, however, seems to be inferred rather than proved, and it is just as likely that improved civilization may have introduced a substance, such as cotton, which was unknown at the times when *shesh* was spoken of and employed, in the same manner as we know that in Europe woollen, hempen, linen, and cotton clothes have at one period of society been more extensively worn than at another."

Cotton is the product of a plant apparently cultivated in the earliest ages not only in India, Cyprus, and other well-known localities, but also in Egypt (Pliny, xix, 2; comp. *Descript. de l'Egypte*, xvii, 104 sq.), and even in Syria (Ezek. xxvii, 16) and Palestine (1 Chron. iv, 21; Pausan. v, 5, 2; Pococke, *East*, ii, 88; Arvieux, i, 306). Two kinds of cotton are usually distinguished, the *plant* (*Gossypium herbaceum*) and the *tree* (*Gossyp. arboreum*), although the latest investigations appear to make them essentially one. The former, which in Western Asia is found growing in fields (Olearius, *Travels*, p. 297; Korte, *Reis.* p. 437), is an annual shrub two or three feet high, but when cultivated (Olivier, *Trav.* ii, 461) it becomes a bush from three to five feet in height. The stalks are reddish at the bottom, the branches short, furzy, and speckled with black spots; the leaves are dark green, large, five-lobed, and weak. The flowers spring from the junction of the leaves with the stem; they are bell-shaped, pale yellow, but purplish beneath. They are succeeded by oval capsules of the size of a hazel-nut, which swell to the size of a walnut, and (in October) burst spontaneously. They contain a little ball of white filaments, which in warm situations attains the size of an apple. Imbedded in this are seven little egg-shaped, woolly seeds, of a brown or black-gray color, which contain an oily kernel. The *Gossypium arboreum* (*δένδρον ἐριοφόριον* of Theophrastus) was anciently (see Theoph. *Plant.* iv, 9, p. 144, ed. Schneider), and still is indigenous in Asia (i. e. India), and attains a height of about twelve feet, but differs very little as to the leaves, blossoms, or fruit from the herbaceous cotton. See generally Belon, in Paulus's *Samml.* i, 214 sq.; Kurrer, in the *Hall. Encykl.* viii, 209 sq.; Oken, *Lehrb. d. Naturgesch.* II, ii, 1262 sq.; Ainslie, *Mater. Ind.* p. 282 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* vii, 1058 sq.

Cotton (שֵׁשׁ, *shesh*, according to Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, i, 175; comp. Tuch, *Gen.* p. 520 sq.; later בּוּץ, *buts*, see Faber, in Harmar, ii, 383; comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 190) was not only manufactured in Egypt into state apparel (Gen. xli, 42; comp. Pliny, xix, 2), and in Persia into cords (Esth. i, 6), but the Israelites even made use of *byssus* cloth (Exod. xxvi, 1; xxvii, 9) and clothing (Exod. xxviii, 39), and the Hebrew women were accustomed to similar fabrics (Prov. xxxi, 32). It has also been regarded as the sumptuous apparel which only the rich were able to afford (Luke xvi, 19; on the *byssus* of the Greeks and Romans, see Celsius, ii, 170, 177, and Wetstein, ii, 767). Nevertheless, the Hebrew *shesh* does not designate exclusively cotton, but also stands sometimes, like the Gr. *byssus* often (as the product of a tree, Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 20; comp. Pollux, *Onom.* vii, 17; Strabo, xv, 693; Arrian, *Indic.* vii), for the finest (Egyptian) white linen (certainly in Exod. xxxix, 28; comp. xxviii, 42; Lev. xvi, 4; see Pliny, xix, 2, 3), which in softness compared with cotton (Hartmann, *Hebr.* iii, 37 sq.). Indeed, the Jewish tradition of the use of linen for sacred purposes (Bähr, *Symbol.* i, 264) is based altogether upon the custom of the Egyptians, whose priests were exclusively clothed in linen (Pliny, xix, 1, 2; comp. Philostr. *Apoll.* ii, 20), which it has likewise been contended was the ancient *byssus* (Rosellini, *Mon. civ.* 1, 341; comp. Becker, *Charikl.* 233 sq.). In fine, the Orientals often employed a single term to designate both cotton and linen, but Celsius was wrong when he insisted (*Hierobot.* ii, 259 sq., 167 sq.) that *shesh* stands only for (fine) linen (see Faber, in Harmar, ii, 380 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebr.* iii, 34 sq.). The same ambiguity that thus applies to *βύσσος* is also found in the use of חוּר (*chur*, Esth. i, 6; viii, 15; Sept. *βύσσος*), by which perhaps cotton is, after all, intended. See generally J. R. Forster, *De bysso antiquor.* (Lond. 1776); Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Byssus; *Egypt. Antiq.* in the *Lib. of Entertaining Knowl.* ii, 182–192; *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Cotton, Gossypium. See Cotton.

3. Bad (בַּד, perhaps from its *separation* for sacred uses) occurs Exod. xxviii, 42; xxxix, 28; Lev. vi, 10; xvi, 4, 23, 32; 1 Sam. ii, 18; xxxii, 18; 2 Sam. vi, 14; 1 Chron. xv, 27, Ezek. ix, 2, 3, 11; x, 2, 6, 7; Dan. x, 5; xii, 6, 7, in all which passages it is rendered "linen" in the Auth. Vers. It is uniformly applied to the sacred vestments (e. g. drawers, mitre, ephod, etc.) of the priests, or (in the passages in Ezekiel and Daniel) of an angel (comp. John xx, 12; Acts i, 20). In these last instances it is in the plural, בַּדִּים, *baddim'*, in the concrete sense of *clothes* of this material, Sept. in the Pent. invariably

λίνεος, but in 1 Chron. βύσσινος. It is well known that the official garments of the Egyptian (as of the Brahmin) priests were always of linen (Rosenmüller, *Bot. of the Bible*, p. 175), and hence the custom among the Hebrews (compare Ezek. xliv, 17, where the sacred apparel is expressly described as the product of flax, פִּשְׁתִּים). Celsius, however, is of opinion (*Hierobot.* ii, 509) that *bad* does not signify the common linen, as some have imagined, but the finest and best *Egyptian* linen; and he quotes (p. 510) Aben-Ezra as asserting that *bad* is the same as *buts*, namely, a species of linen in Egypt. With this view Gesenius concurs (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 179). The Talmudists appear to have been of the same opinion, from their fanciful etymology of the term *bad* as of a plant with a single stem springing upright from the earth from one seed (Braun, *De vest. sacerd.* p. 101). This interpretation is finally confirmed by the Arabic versions, which have a term equivalent to *byssus*. See No. 1 above. Perhaps, however, the requirement of the material in question for priestly garments may only signify that no *wool* should be employed in them, and they may therefore have consisted indifferently of either linen or cotton, provided it was entirely *pure*, and thus be represented by the equivocal term *byssus*. See No. 2 above.

4. Shesh (שֵׁשׁ, prob. from the Egyptian *sheush*, in ancient Egyptian *cheuti*, i. e. linen, Bunsen, *Æg.* i, 606, which the Hebrews appear to have imitated as if from שׁוּשׁ, to *be white;* Sept. everywhere βύσσος) occurs Gen. xli, 42; Exod. xxv, 4; xxvi, 1, 31, 36; xxvii, 9, 16, 18; xxviii, 5, 6, 8, 15, 39; xxxv, 6, 23, 25, 35; xxxvi, 8, 35, 37; xxxviii, 9, 16, 18, 23; xxxix, 2, 3, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29; Prov. xxxi, 22; Ezek. xvi, 10, 13; xxvii, 7; in all which passages it is rendered "fine linen" in the Auth. Vers. (except Prov. xxxi, 22, where it is rendered "silk;" in Esth. i, 6; Cant. v, 15, the same term occurs, but is rendered, as it there signifies, "*marble*"); once shesh' (שֵׁשׁ, from the same), Ezek. xvi, 13, text, "fine linen." This word appears to designate Egyptian linen of peculiar whiteness and fineness, and as such it is stated to have been imported from Egypt by way of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii, 7), in distinction from the Syrian linen or *buts* (בּוּץ, verse 16). In the Pentateuch it is several times applied to *byssus*, of which, both as material spontaneously offered (Exod. xxv, 4; xxxv, 6, 23) and as woven fabrics (Exod. xxxv, 25, 35; xxxviii, 23), were made both the curtains and veils of the sacred tabernacle (Exod. xxvi, 1, 31, 36; xxvii, 9, 16, 18; xxxvi, 8, 35, 37; xxxviii, 9, 16, 18), and the priestly garments, especially the high-priest's ephod or shoulder-piece (Exod. xxviii, 5, 6, 8, 15, 39; xxix, 2, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29). Raiment of this description is stated to have been worn by noble persons besides priests, e. g. by Joseph as prefect of Egypt (Gen. xli, 42), and women of eminence (Prov. xxxi, 22). But that *shesh* is also spoken of *linen* articles is apparent from Exod. xxxix, 28, where the "linen breeches" (מִכְנְסֵי חָבַד) are said to have been made "of fine-twined linen" (שֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר), as well as from the fact that פִּשְׁתִּים, *pishtim*, linen garments, are sometimes (e. g. Isa. xliii, 17; Ezek. xliv, 18) rendered by the Chaldee interpreter by בּוּץ, *buts*. It thus appears that *shesh* is equivalent in general to *byssus*. See No. 2 above. See generally Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 259; J. R. Forster, *Liber singularis de bysso antiquorum* (London, 1776); J. E. Faber, *Observat.* ii, 282 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebräerin*, iii, 34 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* IV, i, 175 sq.

5. Chûr (חוּר, from its *whiteness*) occurs Esth. i, 6; viii, 15, where the Auth. Version renders "white," Sept. βύσσος, besides other passages where it signifies a "hole" (Isa. xi, 8; xlii, 22, etc.); once חוֹר, *chor*, plural poet. חוֹרֵי, Isa. xix, 9 (Auth. Vers. "net-works," Sept. βύσσος, Vulg. *subtilia*, Kimchi *white garments*). This term likewise appears to designate fine and white *linen*, or in general *byssus*, although Saadias and other interpreters understand *silk* (see Schröder, *De Vest. Mul. Heb.* p. 40, 245). See No. 2 above.

6. Etun' (אֶטוּן, from an obsolete root perhaps signifying to *bind*, referring to the use of the material for ropes) occurs only in Prov. vii, 16, as a product of Egypt, "I have decked my bed with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with *fine linen* of Egypt." As Egypt was from very early times celebrated for its cultivation of flax and manufactures of linen, there can be little doubt that *etun* is correctly rendered, though some have thought that it may signify rope or string of Egypt, "funis Ægyptius," "funis salignus v. intubaceus;" a sense that it bears in Chaldee, for the Targums employ אֶטוּן in the sense of *rope* for the Heb. חֶבֶל and מֵיתָר (Josh. ii, 15, Numb. iv, 32; 1 Kings xx, 32; Esth. i, 6, etc.). But, following the suggestion of Alb. Schultens, Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, p. 89) observes that *etun* designates not a rope, but flax and linen, as even the Greek ὀθόνη and ὀθόνιον, derived from it, sufficiently demonstrate. "So Mr. Yates, in his *Textrinum Antiquorum*, p. 265, says of ὀθόνη that 'it was in all probability an Egyptian word, adopted by the Greeks to denote the commodity to which the Egyptians themselves applied it.' For אֶטוּן, put into Greek letters and with Greek terminations, becomes ὀθόνη and ὀθόνιον. Hesychius states, no doubt correctly, 'that ὀθόνη was applied by the Greeks to any fine and thin cloth, though not of linen.' Mr. Yates further adduces from ancient scholia that ὀθόναι were made both of flax and of wool, and also that the silks of India are called ὀθόναι σηρικαί by the author of the *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea*. It also appears that the name ὀθόνιον was applied to cloths exported from Cutch, Ougein, and Baroach, and which must have been made of cotton. Mr. Yates moreover observes that, though ὀθόνη, like σινδών, originally denoted linen, yet we find them both applied to cotton cloth. As the manufacture of linen extended itself into other countries, and as the exports of India became added to those of Egypt, all varieties, either of linen or cotton cloth, wherever woven, came to be designated by the originally Egyptian names Ὀθόνη and Σινδών." Forster (*De bysso antiquor.* p. 75) endeavors to trace the Egyptian form of the word, and Ludolf (*Comment. ad hist. Æthiop.* p. 204) renders it by the Ethiopic term for *frankincense*. But these efforts, as Gesenius remarks (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 77), are wide of the mark. Among the Hebrews the term "thread of Egypt" (אֶטוּן מִצְרַיִם) may properly have designated a linen or even cotton material, similar to silk or *byssus* in fineness, such as we know was manufactured in Egypt (Isa. xix, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 7; Barhebr. p. 218), q. d. *Egyptian yarn*, not less famous among the ancients than "Turkish yarn" has been among moderns. Kimchi, the Venetian Greek, and others understand *funiculum*, and apply it to cords hanging from the side of a bed, or something of that sort; rabbi Parchon, a *girdle* woven in Egypt—evidently mere conjectures.

"In the N. T. the word ὀθόνιον occurs in John xix, 40: 'Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in *linen clothes*' (ὀθονίοις); in the parallel passage (Matt. xxvii, 59) the term used is σινδόνι, as also in Mark xv, 46, and in Luke xxiii, 53. We meet with it again in John xx, 5, 'and he, stooping down, saw the *linen clothes* lying.' It is generally used in the plural to denote 'linen bandages.' Ὀθόνη, its primitive, occurs in Acts x, 11, 'and (Peter) saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great *sheet* knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth,' and also in xi, 5, where this passage is repeated." In Homer it signifies either the matriæ (*Odys.* vii, 107), or wrought veils and under-garments for women (*Il.* iii, 141; xviii, 195); in later writers linen cloths (Lucilius, *Dial. Mort.* iii, 2), especially for sails (Mel. 80; Auth. x, 5; Luc. Jup. *Trag.* 46). From the preceding observations it is evident that ὀθόνιον, whether answering to

the Heb. *etun* or not, may signify cloth made either of linen or cotton, but most probably the former, as it was more common than cotton in Syria and Egypt. In classical writers the word signifies linen bandages (Luc. *Philops.* 34), espec. lint for wounds (Hipp. p. 772, etc.; Ar. *Ach.* 1176); also sail-cloth (Polybius, v, 89, 2; Dem. 1145, 6). See COTTON; also Nos. 7 and 10 below.

7. SADIN' (סָדִין, from an obsolete root signifying to *loosen* or let down a garment, as a *veil*) occurs in Judg. xiv, 12, 13 (where the Auth. Vers. has "sheets," margin "shirts"), and Prov. xxxi, 24; Isa. iii, 23 (A. Vers. "fine linen"). From these passages it appears to have been an ample garment, probably of linen, worn under the other clothing in the manner of a shirt by men (Judg. xiv, 12, 13), or as a thin chemise by women (Isa. iii, 23). The Talmud describes it as made of the finest linen ("the *sindon* is suitable for summer," *Menach.* xli, 1). The Targums similarly explain Psa. civ, 2; Lam. ii, 20. The corresponding Syriac is employed in the Peshito for σουδάριον, Luke xix, 20; λέντιον, John xiii, 4. The Sept. has σινδών, Vulgate *sindo;* but in Isa. iii, 23 the Sept. appears to have a paraphrase τὴν βύσσον σὺν χρυσίῳ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ συγκαθυφασμένην. The passage in Prov. seems to refer to the manufacture of the *cloth* or material, probably linen, but possibly sometimes of cotton; in Judges *shirts* or male under-apparel are evidently referred to; and in Isaiah we may infer that female under-clothing is in like manner alluded to.

From this Heb. term many have thought is derived the Greek word σινδών, which occurs of linen or muslin cloth, e. g. a loose garment worn at night instead of the day-clothes, q. d. night-gown (Mark xiv, 51, 52, "linen cloth"); used also for wrapping around dead bodies, q. d. grave-clothes, cerements ("fine linen," Mark xv, 46; "linen cloth," Matt. xxvii, 59; "linen," Mark xv, 46; Luke xxiii, 53). This appears to have been a fine fabric (probably usually, but not necessarily of linen), either the Egyptian (Pollux, vii, 16, 72) or Indian; called in Egypt *senter* (Peyron, p. 299), the Sanscrit *sindhu* (Jablonski, *Opusc.* i, 297 sq.). Others trace a connection with Ἰνδός, *Sind* (Passow, *Lex.* s. v.); some (as *Etymol. Mag.*) from the city *Sidon*, etc. It appears to have specially denoted a fine cotton cloth from India (Herod. i, 200; ii, 95; iii, 86; vii, 181); also generally a linen cloth, used as a signal (Polyb. ii, 66, 10), for surgeons' bandages (Herod. vii, 181), for mummy-cloth (Herod. ii, 86), or other purposes (Sophocles, *Ant.* 1222; Thuc. ii, 49). This word is therefore not decisive as to the material. See Schröder, *De Vest. Mul.* p. 339; Michaelis, *Suppl.* 1720; Wetstein, *N. T.* i, 631.—Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* s. v.

8. KARPAS' (כַּרְפַּס, Sept. καρπάσινος, Vulg. *carbasinus*) "occurs in the book of Esther (i, 6), in the description of the hangings 'in the court of the garden of the king's palace,' at the time of the great feast given in the city Shushan, or Susan, by Ahasuerus, who 'reigned from India even unto Ethiopia.' We are told that there were white, *green*, and blue hangings fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble. *Karpas* is translated *green* in our version, on the authority, it is said, 'of the Chaldee paraphrase,' where it is interpreted *leek-green*. Rosenmüller and others derive the Hebrew word from the Arabic *kurufs*, which signifies 'garden parsley,' *Apium petroselinum*, as if it alluded to the green color of this plant; at the same time arguing that as 'the word *karpas* is placed before two other words which undoubtedly denote colors, viz. the *white* and the *purple-blue*, it probably also does the same.' But if two of the words denote colors, it would appear a good reason why the third should refer to the substance which was colored. This, there is little doubt, is what was intended. If we consider that the occurrences related took place at the Persian court at a time when it held sway as far as India, and that the account is by some supposed to have been originally written in the ancient language of Persia, we may suppose that some foreign words may have been introduced to indicate even an already well-known substance; but more especially so if the substance itself was then first made known to the Hebrews. The Hebrew *karpas* is very similar to the Sanscrit *karpasum*, *karpasa*, or *karpase*, signifying the cotton-plant, whence the Armen. *kierbas*, and the Greek κυρβασία, κυρβάσις, etc. (*Asiat. Researches*, iv, 231, Calcutta). Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 159) states that the Arabs and Persians have *karphas* and *kirbas* as names for cotton. These must no doubt be derived from the Sanscrit, while the word *karpas* is now applied throughout India to cotton with the seed, and may even be seen in English prices-current. Κάρπασος occurs in the *Periplus* of Arrian, who states (p. 165) that the region about the Gulf of Barygaze, in India, was productive of *carpasus*, and of the fine Indian muslins made of it. The word is no doubt derived from the Sanscrit *karpasa*, and, though it has been translated *fine muslin* by Dr. Vincent, it may mean cotton cloths, or calico in general. Mr. Yates, in his recently published and valuable work, *Textrinum Antiquorum*, states that the earliest notice of this Oriental name in any classical author which he has met with is the line '*Carbasina*, molochina, ampelina' of Cæcilius Statius, who died B.C. 169. Mr. Yates infers that as this poet translated from the Greek, so the Greeks must have made use of muslins or calicoes, etc., which were brought from India as early as 200 years B.C. See his work, as well as that of Celsius, for numerous quotations from classical authors, where *carbasus* occurs; proving that not only the word, but the substance which it indicated, was known to the ancients subsequent to this period. It might, indeed must, have been known long before to the Persians, as constant communication took place by caravans between the north of India and Persia, as has been clearly shown by Heeren. Cotton was known to Ctesias, who lived so long at the Persian court. Pliny describes it as a Spanish article (*Nat. H.* xix, 1), but other ancient writers call it a product of India and the East (Strabo, xiv, 719; Curtius, viii, 9). Nothing can be more suitable than cotton, white and blue, in the above passage of Esther, as J. F. Royle long since (1837) remarked in a note in his *Essay on the Antiquity of Hindoo Medicine*, p. 145: 'Hanging curtains made with calico, usually in stripes of different colors and padded with cotton, called purdahs, are employed throughout India as a substitute for doors.' They may be seen used for the very purposes mentioned in the text in the court of the king of Delhi's palace, where, on a paved mosaic terrace, rows of slender pillars support a light roof, from which hang by rings immense padded and striped curtains, which may be rolled up or removed at pleasure. These either increase light or ventilation, and form, in fact, a kind of movable wall to the building, which is used as one of the halls of audience. This kind of structure was probably introduced by the Persian conquerors of India, and therefore may serve to explain the object of the colonnade in front of the palace in the ruins of Persepolis." See Abulpharag. *Hist. dynast.* p. 433; Salmasius, *Homonym.* c. 81; Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 157; Schröder, *De. Vest. Mul.* p. 108 sq. See COTTON.

9. SHAATNEZ' (שַׁעַטְנֵז), a kind of garments woven of two sorts of thread, linen and wool, like the Greek ὕφασμα ἀμφίμιτον, Eng. *linsey-woolsey*, which the Hebrews were forbidden to use, as appears from the two passages in the Mosaic law where the word occurs: Lev. xix, 19, "Neither shall a garment mingled of *linen and woolen* come upon thee;" Deut. xxii, 11, "Thou shalt not wear a garment of *divers sorts*, as of linen and woolen together." In the former of these passages the term *Shaatnez* is interpreted by בֶּגֶד כִּלְאַיִם, a *garment of two different kinds*, i. e. of heterogeneous materials; and in the latter by the explicit definition, צֶמֶר וּפִשְׁתִּים יַחְדָּיו, *of wool and flax* threads *together*. The Sept. renders κίβδηλον, i. e. adulterated; Aquila, ἀντιδιακείμενον, i. e. various, of different sorts; the Peshito and

Samaritan, *variegated*. Other ancient interpreters have either retained the original word, as Onkelos, or have entirely neglected it, as the Vulg., usually introducing the interpretation from Deut. into Levit., as the Venetian Greek (ἐριόλινον), Saadias, the Armenian, Erpenius, and the Persic. The derivation is uncertain. The early etymologists have sought in vain a Samar. origin for the word, as Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 545). The Talmud gives only fanciful derivations (Mishna, *Kilaim*, ix, 8; comp. *Nidda*, 61 b; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s. v.; Abr. Geiger, *Lehrbuch d. Mischnah*, ii, 75); and the Targums are little better (see Pseudojon. *in Deut.* ad loc.). Ernest Meyer proposes the signification *gradually formed*, from a transposition of the letters and comparison with the Arabic and Ethiopic (*Lex rad. Heb.* p. 686). The word is prob. of Egyptian origin, although Forster (*De bysso antiquorum*, p. 95) and Jablonski (*Opusc.* i, 294 sq.) have not fully succeeded in tracing its original in the Coptic, which language, however, furnishes the nearest etymon (see Peyron, *Lexicon*, s. v. κίβδηλος). See Woollen.

10. Mikveh' (מִקְוֶה, a *collection*, as often) occurs only in connection with this subject in 1 Kings x, 28, "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and *linen yarn;* the king's merchants received the *linen yarn* at a price;" also 2 Chron. i, 16, where the same language occurs. In these passages it evidently signifies a *company* of horses, i. e. a drove or string, as brought from Egypt at a fixed valuation. The Sept. in most copies renders ἐκ Θεκουέ or ἐξ Ἐκουέ, otherwise ἔξοδος, as in 2 Chron.; the Vulg. has *Coa* in both places, as a proper name, referring, as some have thought, to *Michoë* (Pliny, vi, 29), the country of the Troglodytes (see Calmet, *Dict.* s. v. Coa). Others have sought less direct elucidations (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 171, 172; Lud. de Dieu, ad loc.; Clericus and Dathe *On Kings*, ad loc.; Becke, *Paraphr. Chald. ad Chron.*, ad loc., p. 7; Michaelis, *Supplem.* 1271, and *In Jure Mosaico*, iii, 332; Böttcher, *Specim.* p. 170). But of these far-fetched explanations there is no occasion; the passages simply refer to a *caravan* of horse-merchants carrying on the commerce of Solomon with Egypt (see Taylor, *Fragments*, No. 190).

Linga (a Sanscrit word which literally means a *sign* or *symbol*) denotes, in the sectarian worship of the Hindus, the *phallus*, as an emblem of the male or generative power of nature. The Linga-worship prevails with the Saivas, or adorers of Siva. See Hinduism. Originally of an ideal and mystical nature, it has degenerated into practices of the grossest description, thus taking the same course as the similar worship of the Chaldæans, Greeks, and other nations of the East and West. The accounts how Linga became a representative of Siva vary greatly, but coincide in the main in that Siva, having scandalized the penitent saints by his amour with Parwati, was cursed by them to be changed into what occupied so much his being, and to lose his genitals, by which he had given offence; later, when finding the punishment not in proportion to the result, they resolved to hold that very sign in reverence. It is most probable that the organ of generation was here considered in the same light as Phallos and Priapus in Egypt and Greece. The manner in which the Linga is represented is generally inoffensive—the pistil of a flower, a pillar of stone, or other erect and cylindrical objects being held as appropriate symbols of the generative power of Siva. Its counterpart is *Yoni*, or the symbol of female nature as fructified and productive. The Siva-Purâna names twelve Lingas which seem to have been the chief objects of this worship in India. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s. v.

Lingard, John, D.D., LL.D., a Roman Catholic priest, and one of the most eminent of modern historians, was born at Winchester, England, Feb. 5, 1771. He studied at the Roman Catholic College of Douai, France, and remained there until obliged by the horrors of the French Revolution to return to England. The college was finally settled at Ushaw, near the city of Durham, and Mr. Lingard there performed the duties of some of its offices. He revisited France for a short time during the dangerous period of the Revolution, and on one occasion barely escaped being mobbed as a priest. In 1805 he wrote for the *Newcastle Courant* a series of letters, which were collected and published under the title of *Catholic Loyalty vindicated* (12mo). He afterwards wrote several controversial pamphlets, which in 1813 were published in a volume having the title of *Tracts on several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of the Catholics* (reprinted by F. Lucas, Jr., at Baltimore, 1823, 12mo, and often). Dr. Lingard's great work, however, is his *History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in* 1688 (London, 1819–25, 6 vols. 4to; 2d edit. 1823–31, 14 vols. 8vo; 4th edit. 1837, 13 vols. 12mo; 5th ed. 1849–50, 10 vols. 8vo; 6th ed. 1854–55, 10 vols. 8vo; American editions, published by Dunigan, N. Y., 13 vols. 12mo; by Sampson & Co., of Boston, 1853–54, 13 vols. 12mo, of which the last is the best). It is a work of great research, founded on ancient writers and original documents, displaying much erudition and acuteness, and opening fields of inquiry previously unexplored. The narrative is clear, the dates are accurately given, and the authorities referred to distinctly. The style is perspicuous, terse, and unostentatious. The work, perhaps, exhibits too exclusively the great facts and circumstances, military, civil, and ecclesiastical, and enters less than might be desirable into the manners, customs, arts, and condition of the people. In all matters connected with the Romish Church the work is, as might have been expected, colored by the very decided religious opinions of the author, but these are not offensively set forth. Dr. Lingard, after the completion of his "History of England," paid a visit to Rome, where pope Leo XII offered to make him cardinal, but he refused the dignity, partly because he did not feel qualified for the office, and partly because it would have interfered with his favorite studies. He spent the last forty years of his life in the small preferment belonging to the Roman Catholic church at the village of Hornby, near Lancaster, enjoying the esteem and friendship of all, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. He died July 13, 1851, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Cuthbert's College, at Ushaw, to which institution he bequeathed his library. Lingard was also the author of *Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church* (2d edit. Lond. 1840, 12mo; 3d edit. 1844, 18mo):—*A Review of certain Anti-Catholic Publications* (Lond. 1813, 8vo):—*Examination of certain Opinions advanced by Bishop Burgess* (anon.) (Manchester, 1813, 8vo):—*Strictures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome* (Lond. 1815, 8vo):—*Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States relative to the Religious Concerns of their Roman Catholic Subjects* (anon.) (Lond. 1817, 8vo):—*Documents to ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former Ages respecting the Power of the Popes* (Lond. 1819, 8vo):—*The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (Lond. 1806; 1845, 2 vols. 8vo; Phil. 1841, 12mo). In 1836 he published anonymously an English translation of the N. T., which is said to be accurate and faithful in several passages where the Douai translation is faulty. See *Engl. Cycl.* s. v.; the London *Times* (July 25, 1851); *Gentleman's Magazine* (Sept. 1851, p. 323 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. viii, s. v.; Lowndes, *Brit. Lib.* p. 1096 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 374 sq.; and the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1102–1105. (J. H. W.)

Lingendes, Claude de, a noted French pulpit orator of the Jesuits, was born at Moulins in 1591. He entered the order, and soon rose to high distinction. He was intrusted with several important missions. He died at Paris, where he was superior of his order, April

12, 1660. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxxi, 278.

Lingendes, Jean de, a French pulpit orator, a relative of the preceding, was born at Moulins in 1595. As chaplain to Louis XIII, he became quite eminent for his great talents in the pulpit. He was made bishop of Macon in 1650. He died in 1665. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxi, 278.

Link, Johann Wolfgang Conrad, a German theologian, was born at Pirmasens April 23, 1753. In 1771 he entered the University of Giessen, and in 1774 was graduated A.M. In 1775 he obtained the chair of philosophy at that university as professor extraordinary, and in 1778 he became pastor at Bischofsheim, near Darmstadt. He died suddenly Dec. 23, 1788. In addition to his theological researches, his extensive knowledge of modern languages enabled him to translate English works into German and German productions into English, the latter for the "Universal English Library." Of his own compositions we mention *Ueber das hebräische Sprachstudium* (Giess. 1777, 8vo):—*Diss. de Schilo a Jacobo predicto Genes.* 49, 10 (ibid, 1774, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. ii, s. v.

Link, Wenceslaus, a German theologian, noted for his efforts in behalf of Martin Luther and the cause of the reformatory movement, was born at Colditz, near Meissen, Saxony, about 1483. He was an Augustinian monk of the convent Waldheim when he went to the Wittenberg University to pursue theological studies, and, after attaining to the distinction of doctor of theology, became successively prior of the convents at Wittenberg, Munich, Nuremberg, etc. He enjoyed great notoriety and popularity when the Reformation was first assuming shape, but his leaning towards it made him unpopular with Romanists, and he gradually went over to the new cause. In 1523 he married, and two years later appeared as Protestant preacher at Nuremberg. He died there March 11, 1547. His works are not of any special merit. A list of them is given in Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, ii, 2442 sq.

Linn, John Blair, D.D., son of the succeeding, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Shippensburg, Pa., March 14, 1777, and graduated in 1795 at Columbia College, where he distinguished himself by his proficiency in polite literature. Having abandoned the study of law, he removed to Schenectady, where he studied theology, and was licensed in 1798. He was ordained in 1799, and installed in the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he continued until his sudden death, August 30, 1804. Linn was quite a poet, and most of his publications are of a poetical nature. His best works are, *Pieces in Prose and Poetry*:—*A Sermon on the Death of Dr. Ewing* (1802):—*A Poem on the Influence of Christianity*:—a narrative poem, entitled *Valerian*, with a sketch of his life by Charles Brockden Brown (1805, 8vo); and two tracts against the doctrine of Dr. Priestley. See Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 210; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Linn, William, D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., Feb. 27, 1752. He graduated from Princeton College in 1772 with honor, studied divinity with Rev. Dr. Robert Cooper, of Middle Spring, Pa., and in 1775 was licensed to preach by Donegal Presbytery. Fired with the patriotism of the Revolution, he became a chaplain in Gen. Thompson's regiment, and was ordained to the ministry at this period. His regiment being soon ordered to Canada, for domestic reasons he resigned his chaplaincy. After a brief settlement at Big Spring, he taught an academy in Somerset County, Md., with success, until in 1786 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church at Elizabethtown, N. J., from whence he removed to New York in the same year as one of the pastors of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. He was full of genius and power. His sermons were written, and committed to memory. His delivery was graceful, natural, animated, and accompanied by that electric power which thrills and sways an audience. His imagination was vivid, his language choice and classical, and his pictorial ability remarkable. He was celebrated for his missionary and charitable discourses. "Earnest, pathetic, persuasive, and alarming in his addresses, he peculiarly excelled in awakening sinners and urging them to the refuge of the Gospel. On special occasions he shone with conspicuous lustre, and rose above himself." In consequence of the failure of his health, he retired from the active ministry in 1805, and died at Albany Jan. 8, 1808. Among his published addresses are some of his celebrated missionary and charity sermons, historical discourses, controversial sermons, a eulogy on Washington, delivered before the New York State Society of the Cincinnati, and a sermon preached in 1776 to a regiment of soldiers who were about to join the army.—Sprague, *Annals*, vol. ix; Dr. De Witt's *Historical Discourse;* Dr. Bradford's *Funeral Sermon*, etc. (W. J. R. T.)

Lintel (prop. מַשְׁקוֹף, *mashkoph'*, lit. a projecting *cover;* Exod. xii, 22, 33; "upper door-post," ver. 7; also כַּפְתֹּר, *kaphtor'*, a *chaplet*, i.e. capital of a column, Amos ix, 1; Zeph. ii, 14; elsewhere a "knop" of the candelabrum; and אַיִל, *a'yil*, a "*ram*," as often; hence a *pilaster* or pillar in a wall, 1 Kings vi, 31, elsewhere "post"), the head-piece of a door, or the horizontal beam covering the side-posts or jambs. See Post. This the Israelites were commanded to mark with the blood of the paschal lamb on the memorable occasion when the Passover was instituted. See Passover.

Li'nus (usually Λῖνος, but prop. Λίνος, the name originally of a mythological and musical personage, perhaps from λίνον, *linen*), one of the Christians at Rome whose salutations Paul sent to Timothy (2 Tim. iv, 21). A.D. 64. He is said to have been the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul (Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* iii, 3; Eusebius. *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 2, 4, 13, 14, 31; v, 6; comp. Jerome, *De Viris. Illust.* 15; Augustine, *Epist.* liii, 2; Theodoret, *ad 2 Tim.* iv, 21), but there is some discrepancy in the early statement respecting his date (see Heinichen *ad Euseb.* iii, 187; Burton, *Hist. of the Christ. Church;* Lardner, *Works*, ii, 31, 32, 176, 187). "Eusebius and Theodoret, followed by Baronius and Tillemont (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 165, 591), state that he became bishop of Rome after the death of St. Peter. On the other hand, the words of Irenæus, '[Peter and Paul] when they founded and built up the Church [of Rome], committed the office of its episcopate to Linus,' certainly admit, or rather imply the meaning that he held that office before the death of St. Peter; as if the two great apostles, having, in the discharge of their own peculiar office, completed the organization of the Church at Rome, left it under the government of Linus, and passed on to preach and teach in some new region. This proceeding would be in accordance with the practice of the apostles in other places. The earlier appointment of Linus is asserted as a fact by Ruffinus (*Præf. in Clem. Recogn.*), and by the author of ch. xlvi, bk. vii of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. It is accepted as the true statement of the case by bishop Pearson (*De Serie et Successione Priorum Romæ Episcoporum*, ii, 5, § 1) and by Fleury (*Hist. Eccl.* ii, 26). Some persons have objected that the undistinguished mention of the name of Linus between the names of two other Roman Christians in 2 Tim. iv, 21 is a proof that he was not at that time bishop of Rome. But even Tillemont admits that such a way of introducing the bishop's name is in accordance with the simplicity of that early age. No lofty pre-eminence was attributed to the episcopal office in the apostolic times."

According to the Roman Breviary, Linus was born at Volterra, but an old papal catalogue represents him as an Etrurian. According to tradition, he went to Rome when 22 years of age, made there the acquaintance of Peter, and was sent by him to Besançon, in France, to preach the Gospel. After his return to Rome Peter ap-

pointed him his coadjutor; but, according to the Breviary, he was the one who *primus post Petrum gubernavit ecclesiam.* He is said to have enacted, on his accession to the bishopric, that, in accordance with 1 Cor. xi, 5, women should never enter the church with their heads uncovered.

The duration of his episcopate is given by Eusebius (whose *H. E.* iii, 16, and *Chronicon* give inconsistent evidence) as A.D. 68–80; by Tillemont, who, however, reproaches Pearson with departing from the chronology of Eusebius, as 66–78; by Baronius as 67–78; and by Pearson as 55–67. Pearson, in the treatise already quoted (i, 10), gives weighty reasons for distrusting the chronology of Eusebius as regards the years of the early bishops of Rome, and he derives his own opinion from certain very ancient (but interpolated) lists of those bishops (see i, 13, and ii, 5). This point has been subsequently considered by Baraterius (*De Successione Antiquissima Episc. Rom.* 1740), who gives A.D. 56–67 as the date of the episcopate of Linus.

"The statement of Ruffinus, that Linus and Cletus were bishops in Rome while St. Peter was alive, has been quoted in support of a theory which sprang up in the 17th century, received the sanction even of Hammond in his controversy with Blondel (*Works*, ed. 1684, iv, 825; *Episcopatûs Jura*, v. 1, § 11), was held with some slight modification by Baraterius, and has recently been revived. It is supposed that Linus was bishop in Rome only of the Christians of Gentile origin, while at the same time another bishop exercised the same authority over the Jewish Christians there. Tertullian's assertion (*De Præscr. Hæret.* § 32) that Clement [the third bishop] of Rome was consecrated by St. Peter has been quoted also as corroborating this theory, but it does not follow from the words of Tertullian that Clement's consecration took place immediately before he became bishop of Rome; and the statement of Ruffinus, so far as it lends any support to the above-named theory, is shown to be without foundation by Pearson (ii, 3, 4). Tillemont's observations (p. 590) in reply to Pearson only show that the establishment of two contemporary bishops in one city was contemplated in ancient times as a possible provisional arrangement to meet certain temporary difficulties. The actual limitation of the authority of Linus to a section of the Church in Rome remains to be proved. Ruffinus's statement ought, doubtless, to be interpreted in accordance with that of his contemporary Epiphanius (*Adv. Hær.* xxvii, 6, p. 107), to the effect that Linus and Cletus were bishops of Rome in succession, not contemporaneously. The facts were, however, differently viewed, (1) by an interpolator of the *Gesta Pontificum Damasi*, quoted by J. Voss in his second epistle to A. Rivet (App. to Pearson's *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*); (2) by Bede (*Vita S. Benedicti*, § 7, p. 146, edit. Stevenson), when he was seeking a precedent for two contemporaneous abbots presiding in one monastery, and (3) by Rabanus Maurus (*De Chorepiscopis*, in *Opp.* ed. Migne, iv, 1197), who ingeniously claims primitive authority for the institution of chorepiscopi on the supposition that Linus and Cletus were never bishops with full powers, but were contemporaneous chorepiscopi employed by St. Peter in his absence from Rome, and at his request, to ordain clergymen for the Church at Rome."

Linus is reckoned by Pseudo-Hippolytus, and in the Greek *Menæa*, among the seventy disciples. According to the Breviary, he cured the possessed, raised the dead, and was beheaded at the instigation of the consul Saturninus, although he had restored the latter's daughter from a dangerous illness. He was buried in the Vatican, by the side of St. Peter. Various days are stated by different authorities in the Western Church, and by the Eastern Church, as the day of his death. According to the most generally received tradition, he died on Sept. 23. A narrative of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Paris, 1644, vol. viii), and certain pontifical decrees, are incorrectly ascribed to Linus, but he is generally considered as the author of a history of Peter's dispute with Simon Magus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 421; Lipsius, *Die Papst Kataloge des Eusebius* (Kiel, 1868, 8vo).

Linz or **Lintz**, The Peace of, so named after the place where it was concluded, Dec. 13, 1645, between Rakoczy, prince of Transylvania, and the emperor Ferdinand III, as king of Hungary, was an event of great importance for the legal existence of the Evangelical Church in Hungary. Rakoczy, who aimed at the crown of that country, and relied on the Protestant party for support, had concluded in April, 1643, with Sweden and France, a defensive and offensive alliance against Ferdinand. In an address to the Hungarians, in which he enumerated their various grievances, he laid great stress on the oppression of the evangelical party. He succeeded in assembling an army, and in obtaining John Kemenyi, an experienced general, to command it. Sweden sent him soldiers under the renowned Dugloss, and France furnished him with large amounts of money. His troops obtained some unimportant advantages over those of Frederick, and the Swedish soldiers succeeded in driving the Imperialists out of several towns. This, however, did not continue, and in October, 1644, Rakoczy began negotiations for peace with Ferdinand. The advantages he asked, namely, the absolute religious liberty of Hungary, etc., were approved at Vienna August 8, 1645, and the peace finally signed as above. The most important feature of the treaty is the grant of religious liberty to the Hungarians. It gave permission to all to attend whatever Church they might choose; ministers and preachers of all the different confessions were to be left undisturbed, and such as had previously been persecuted and driven away on account of their religious principles were allowed to return, or to be recalled by their congregations. The churches and Church property taken from the evangelical party were restored to their previous owners. The eighth article of the sixth decree of king Wladislaus VI was re-enacted against those who infringed these regulations, and made them subject to a trial and punishment at the next session of the Diet. These regulations, however, so favorable to the Protestants, met with great opposition at the Diet of Presburg in 1647, and were most violently opposed by the Jesuits. The Roman Catholics refused to surrender to the Protestants the churches they had taken from them, and the evangelical party finally agreed to accept, instead of some 400 churches which had been taken from it, the small number of 90, which had been assured to it by a royal edict, under date of Feb. 10, 1647. See Steph. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungaricorum*, xxii, 332 sq.; Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens*, vi, 1 sq.; J. A. Fessler, *Die Gesch. d. Ungarn*, etc., ix, 25 sq.; Johann Mailath, *D. Religionswirren in Ungarn* (Regensb. 1845), pt. i, p. 30 sq.; *Gesch. d. Evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn* (Berlin, 1854), p. 199 sq.; *History of the Protestant Church in Hungary*, transl. by J. Craig (Boston and New York, 1856, 12mo). See Hungary.

Lion (prop. אַרְיֵה, *ari'*, or אַרְיֵה, *aryeh'*; Sept. and N. T. λέων), the most powerful, daring, and impressive of all carnivorous animals, the most magnificent in aspect and awful in voice. Being very common in Syria in early times, the lion naturally supplied many forcible images to the poetical language of Scripture, and not a few historical incidents in its narratives. This is shown by the great number of passages where this animal, in all the stages of existence—as the whelp, the young adult, the fully mature, the lioness—occurs under different names, exhibiting that multiplicity of denominations which always results when some great image is constantly present to the popular mind. Thus we have, 1. גּוֹר, *gor*, or גּוּר, *gur* (a *suckling*), a lion's "whelp," a very young lion (Gen. xlix, 9; Deut. xxxiii, 20; Jer. li, 38; Ezek. xix, 2, 3, 5; Nahum ii, 11, 12). 2. כְּפִיר, *kephir'* (the *shaggy*), a "young lion," when first leaving

the protection of the old pair to hunt independently (Ezek. xix, 2, 3, 5, 6; xli, 19; Psa. xci, 13; Prov. xix, 12; xx, 2; xxviii, 1; Isa. xxxi, 4; Jer. xli, 38; Hos. v, 14; Nah. ii, 11; Zech. xi, 3); old enough to roar (Judg. xiv, 5; Psa. civ, 21; Prov. xix, 12; Jer. ii, 15; Amos iii, 4); beginning to seek prey for itself (Job iv, 10; xxxviii, 39; Isa. v, 29; Jer. xxv, 38; Ezek. xix, 3; Mic. v, 8); and ferocious and blood-thirsty in his youthful strength (Psa. xvii, 12; xci, 13; Isa. xi, 6). This term is also used tropically for cruel and blood-thirsty enemies (Psa. xxxiv, 10; xxxv, 17; lviii, 6; Jer. ii, 15); Pharaoh, king of Egypt, is called a "young lion of the nations," i. e. an enemy prowling among them (Ezek. xxxii, 2); it is also used of the young princes or warriors of a state (Ezek. xxxviii, 13; Nah. ii, 13). 3. אָרִי, *ari'* (the *puller* in pieces, plur. masc. in 1 Kings x, 20, elsewhere fem.), or אַרְיֵה, *aryeh'* (the same with ה paragogic, also Chald.), an adult and vigorous lion, a lion having paired, vigilant and enterprising in search of prey (Nah. ii, 12; 2 Sam. xvii, 10; Numb. xxiii, 24, etc.). This is the common name of the animal. 4. שַׁחַל, *sha'chal* (the *roarer*), a mature lion in full strength (Job iv, 10; x, 16; xxviii, 8; Psa. xci, 13; Prov. xxvi, 13; Hos. v, 14; xiii, 7). Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 717) understands the *swarthy* lion of Syria (Pliny, *H. N.* viii, 17), deriving the name from שָׁחַר, *black*, by an interchange of liquids. This denomination may very possibly refer to a distinct variety of lion, and not to a black species or race, because neither black nor white lions are recorded, excepting in Oppian (*De Venat.* iii, 43); but the term may be safely referred to the color of the skin, not of the fur; for some lions have the former fair, and even rosy, while in other races it is perfectly black. An Asiatic lioness, formerly at Exeter Change, had the naked part of the nose, the roof of the mouth, and the bare soles of all the feet pure black, though the fur itself was very pale buff. Yet albinism and melanism are not uncommon in the felinæ; the former occurs in tigers, and the latter is frequent in leopards, panthers, and jaguars. 5. לַיִשׁ, *la'yish* (the *strong*), a fierce lion, one in a state of fury, or rather, perhaps, a poetical term for a lion that has reached the utmost growth and effectiveness (Job iv, 11; Prov. xxx, 30; Isa. xxx, 6). 6. לְבִיא, *lebia'*, or לְבִי, *lebi'* (*lowing, roaring*), hence a *lion, lioness* (Numb. xxiv, 9; Hos. xiii, 8; Joel i, 6; Deut. xxxiii, 20; Psa. lvii, 4; Isa. v, 29). Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 719) supposes this word not to denote the male *lion*, but the *lioness;* and Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 738) says this rests on good grounds, as it is coupled with other nouns denoting a lion, where it can hardly be a mere synonyme (Gen. xlix, 9; Numb. xxiv, 9; Isa. xxx, 6; Nah. ii, 11); and the passages in Job iv, 11; xxxviii, 39; Ezek. xix, 2, accord much better with a *lioness* than with a lion. 7. In Job xxviii, 8, the Heb. words בְּנֵי שַׁחַץ, *beney sha'chats*, are rendered "*the lion's whelps.*" The terms properly signify "*sons of pride*," and are applied to the larger beasts of prey, as the *lion, leviathan*, so called from their proud gait, boldness, and courage. The lion is often spoken of as "the king of the forest," or "the king of beasts;" and in a similar sense, in Job xli, 34, the leviathan or crocodile is called the "king over all the *children of pride*," that is, the head of the animal creation (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 718). See WHELP.

As "king of beasts," "the lion is the largest and most formidably armed of all carnassier animals, the Indian tiger alone claiming to be his equal. One full grown, of Asiatic race, weighs above 450 pounds, and those of Africa often above 500 pounds. The fall of a fore-paw in striking has been estimated to be equal to twenty-five pounds' weight, and this, with the grasp of the claws, cutting four inches in depth, is sufficiently powerful to break the vertebræ of an ox. The huge laniary teeth and jagged molars, worked by powerful jaws, and the tongue entirely covered with horny papillæ, hard as a rasp, so as to crush the frame of the victim and clean its bones of the flesh, are all subservient to an otherwise immensely strong, muscular structure, capable

African Lion.

of prodigious exertion, and minister to the self-confidence which these means of attack inspire. In Asia the lion rarely measures more than nine feet and a half from the nose to the end of the tail, though a tiger-skin has been known of the dimensions but a trifle less than thirteen feet. In Africa they are considerably larger, and supplied with a much greater quantity of mane. Both lion and tiger are furnished with a small horny apex to the tail—a fact noted by the ancients, but only verified of late years (see the *Proceedings of the Council of the Zoological Society of London*, 1832, p. 146), because this object lies concealed in the hair of the tip, and is very liable to drop off." Yet this singular circumstance has not escaped the attention of the Assyrians, and it is found represented on the ruined inscriptions of Nineveh (Bonomi's *Nineveh*, p. 245, 246).

Claw in Lion's Tail.

"All the varieties of the lion are spotted when whelps, but they become gradually buff or pale. One African variety, very large in size, perhaps a distinct species, has a peculiar and most ferocious physiognomy, a dense black mane extending half way down the back, and a black fringe along the abdomen and tip of the tail, while those of Southern Persia and the Dekkan are nearly destitute of that defensive ornament. The roaring voice of the species is notorious to a proverb, but the warning cry of attack is short, snappish, and sharp" (Kitto). This is always excited by opposition, and upon those occasions when the lion summons up all its terrors for the combat, nothing can be more formidable. It then lashes its sides with its long tail, its mane seems to rise and stand like bristles round its head, the skin and muscles of its face are all in agitation, its huge eyebrows half cover its glaring eyeballs, it discovers its formidable teeth and tongue, and extends its powerful claws. When it is thus prepared for war, even the boldest of the human kind are daunted at its approach, and there are few animals that will venture singly to engage it. Like all the felinæ, it is more or less nocturnal, and seldom goes abroad to pursue its prey till after sunset. When not pressed by hunger it is naturally indolent, and, from its habits of uncontrolled superiority, per-

haps capricious, but often less sanguinary and vindictive than is expected. In those regions where it has not experienced the dangerous arts and combinations of man it has no apprehensions from his power. It boldly faces him, and seems to brave the force of his arms. Wounds rather serve to provoke its rage than to repress its ardor. Nor is it daunted by the opposition of numbers; a single lion of the desert often attacks an entire caravan, and after an obstinate combat, when it finds itself overpowered, instead of flying, it still continues to combat, retreating and still facing the enemy until it dies.

"Lions are monogamous, the male living constantly with the lioness, both hunting together, or for each other when there is a litter of whelps, and the mutual affection and care for their offspring which they display are remarkable in animals doomed by nature to live by blood and slaughter. It is while seeking prey for their young that they are most dangerous; at other times they bear abstinence, and when pressed by hunger will sometimes feed on carcasses found dead. They live to more than fifty years; consequently, having annual litters of from three to five cubs, they multiply rapidly when not seriously opposed. Zoologists consider Africa the primitive abode of lions, their progress towards the north and west having at one time extended to the forests of Macedonia and Greece, but in Asia never to the south of the Nerbudda nor east of the Lower Ganges. Since the invention of gunpowder, and even since the havoc which the ostentatious barbarism of Roman grandees made among them, they have diminished in number exceedingly, although at the present day individuals are not unfrequently seen in Barbary, within a short distance of Ceuta" (Kitto). "At present lions do not exist in Palestine, though they are said to be found in the desert on the road to Egypt (Schwarz, *Desc. of Pal.*; see Isa. xxx, 6). They abound on the banks of the Euphrates, between Bussorah and Bagdad (Russell, *Aleppo*, p. 61), and in the marshes and jungles near the rivers of Babylonia (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 566). This species, according to Layard, is without the dark and shaggy mane of the African lion (*ibid.* 487), though he adds in a note that he had seen lions on the River Karûn with a long black mane. But, though lions have now disappeared from Palestine, they must in ancient times have been numerous. The names Lebaoth (Josh. xv, 32), Beth-Lebaoth (Josh. xix, 6), Arieh (2 Kings xv, 25), and Laish (Judg. xviii, 7; 1 Sam. xxv, 44) were probably derived from the presence of, or connection with lions, and point to the fact that they were at one time common. They had their lairs in the forests which have vanished with them (Jer. v, 6; xii, 8; Amos iii, 4), in the tangled brushwood (Jer. iv, 7; xxv, 38; Job xxxviii, 40), and in the caves of the mountains (Cant. iv, 8; Ezek. xix, 9; Nah. ii, 12). The canebrake on the banks of the Jordan, the 'pride' of the river, was their favorite haunt (Jer. xlix, 19; l, 44; Zech. xi, 3), and in this reedy covert (Lam. iii, 10) they were to be found at a comparatively recent period, as we learn from a passage of Johannes Phocas, who travelled in Palestine towards the end of the 12th century (Reland, *Pal.* i, 274). They abounded in the jungles which skirt the rivers of Mesopotamia (Ammian. Marc. xviii, 7, 5), and in the time of Xenophon (*De Venat.* xi) were found in Nysa."



Persian Lion.

"Naturalists are disposed to consider the lion as a genus, consisting of some three or four species. Two of these are found in Asia, the one called, from the scantiness of its mane, the maneless lion (*Leo Goozeratensis*), found only in Western India, and the other furnished with that appendage in its ordinary profusion (*L. Asiaticus*), which is spread over Bengal, Persia, the Euphratean Valley, and some parts of Arabia. This is smaller, and more slightly built than the African lions, with a fur of a lighter yellow. It is doubtful, however, whether it is really more than variety."

"The lion of Palestine was in all probability the Asiatic variety, described by Aristotle (*H. A.* ix, 44) and Pliny (viii, 18) as distinguished by its short curly mane, and by being shorter and rounder in shape, like the sculptured lion found at Arban (Layard, *Nineveh and*

Lion at Arban.

Babylon, p. 278). It was less daring than the longer-maned species, but when driven by hunger it not only ventured to attack the flocks in the desert in presence of the shepherd (Isa. xxxi, 4; 1 Sam. xvii, 34), but laid waste towns and villages (2 Kings xvii, 25, 26; Prov. xxii, 13; xxvi, 13), and devoured men (1 Kings xiii, 24; xx, 36; 2 Kings xvii, 25; Ezek. xix, 3, 6). The shepherds sometimes ventured to encounter the lion single-handed (1 Sam. xvii, 34), and the vivid figure employed by Amos (iii, 12), the herdsman of Tekoa, was but the transcript of a scene which he must have often witnessed. At other times they pursued the animal in large bands, raising loud shouts to intimidate him (Isa. xxxi, 4) and drive him into the net or pit they had prepared to catch him (Ezek. xix, 4, 8). This method of capturing wild beasts is described by Xenophon (*De Ven.* xi, 4) and by Shaw, who says, 'The Arabs dig a pit where they are observed to enter, and, covering it over lightly with reeds or small branches of trees, they frequently decoy and catch them' (*Travels*, 2d ed. p. 172). Benaiah, one of David's heroic body-guard, had distinguished himself by slaying a lion in his den (2 Sam. xxiii, 20). The kings of Persia had a menagerie of lions (כְּפִיר, *gôb*, Dan. vi, 7, etc.). When captured alive they were put in a cage (Ezek. xix, 9), but it does not appear that they were tamed. In the hunting scenes at



Lion-hunting—Lion being let out of a Cage. (From the bas-relief of Sardanapalus III, British Museum.)

Beni-Hassan tame lions are represented as used in hunting (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 17). On the bas-reliefs



Hunting with a Lion, which has seized an Ibex.

at Kouyunjik a lion led by a chain is among the presents brought by the conquered to their victors (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 138)." Wilkinson says: "The worship of the lion was particularly regarded in the city of Leontopolis, and other cities adored this animal as the emblem of more than one deity." It was the symbol of strength, and therefore typical of the Egyptian Hercules (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* v, 169). In Babylon it appears to have been the custom to throw offenders to be devoured by lions kept in dens for that purpose (Dan. vi, 7–28). This is thought to be confirmed by the evidence of several ancient monuments, brought to light by the researches of recent travellers, on the sites of Babylon and Susa, which represent lions destroying and preying upon human beings. See DEN. The

Supposed representation of a Lion devouring a Man. (From the Babylonian Remains.)

Assyrian monuments abound in illustrations of lion-hunting, which appears to have been a favorite pastime, especially with royalty (Layard, *Nineveh*, i, 120). See HUNTING.

"The terrible roar of the lion is expressed in Hebrew by four different words, between which the following distinction appears to be maintained: שָׁאַג, *shâag'* (Judg. xiv, 5; Psa. xxii, 13; civ, 21; Amos iii, 4), also used of the thunder (Job xxxvii, 4), denotes the roar of the lion while seeking his prey; נָהַם, *nâham'* (Isa. v, 29), expresses the cry which he utters when he seizes his victim; הָגָה, *hâgâh'* (Isa. xxxi, 4), the growl with which he defies any attempt to snatch the prey from his teeth; while נָעַר, *nâ'ar'* (Jer. li, 38), which in Syriac is applied to the braying of the ass and camel, is descriptive of the cry of the young lions. If this distinction be correct, the meaning attached to *nâham* will give force to Prov. xix, 12. The terms which describe the movements of the animal are equally distinct: רָבַץ, *râbats'* (Gen. xlix, 9; Ezek. xix, 2), is applied to the crouching of the lion, as well as of any wild beast, in his lair; שָׁחָה, *shâchâh'*, יָשַׁב, *yâshab'* (Job xxxviii, 40), and אָרַב, *ârab'* (Psa. x, 9), to his lying in wait in his den, the two former denoting the position of the animal, and the latter the secrecy of the act; רָמַשׂ, *râmas'* (Psa. civ, 20), is used of the stealthy creeping of the lion after his prey; and זָנַק, *zinnêk'* (Deut. xxxiii, 22), of the leap with which he hurls himself upon it" (Smith). "The Scriptures present many striking pictures of lions, touched with wonderful force and fidelity; even where the animal is a direct instrument of the Almighty, while true to his mission, he still remains so to his nature. Thus nothing can be more graphic than the record of the man of God (1 Kings xiii, 28), disobedient to his charge, struck down from his ass, and lying dead, while the lion stands by him, without touching the lifeless body or attacking the living animal, usually a favorite prey. (See also Gen. xlix, 9; Job iv, 10, 11; Nah. ii, 11, 12.) Samson's adventure also with the young lion (Judg. xiv, 5, 6), and the picture of the young lion coming up from the underwood cover on the banks of the Jordan, all attest a perfect knowledge of the animal and its habits. Finally, the lions in the den with Daniel, miraculously leaving him unmolested, still retain, in all other respects, the real characteristics of their nature."

"The strength (Judg. xiv, 18, Prov. xxx, 30; 2 Sam. i, 23), courage (2 Sam. xvii, 10; Prov. xxviii, 1; Isa. xxxi, 4; Nah. ii, 11), and ferocity (Gen. xlix, 9; Numb. xxiv, 9) of the lion were proverbial. The 'lion-faced' warriors of Gad were among David's most valiant troops (1 Chron. xii, 8); and the hero Judas Maccabæus is described as 'like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey' (1 Macc. iii, 4)." Hence the lion, as an emblem of power, was symbolical of the tribe of Judah (Gen. xlix, 9). Grotius thinks the passage in Ezek. xix, 2, 3, alludes to this fact that Judæa was among the nations like a lioness among the beasts of the forest; she had strength and sovereignty. The same type of sovereignty recurs in the prophetical visions, and the figure of this animal was among the few which the Hebrews admitted in sculpture or in cast metal, as exemplified in the throne of Solomon (1 Kings x, 19, 20) and the brazen sea (1 Kings vii, 29, 36). The heathen assumed the lion as an emblem of the sun, of the god of war, of Ares, Ariel, Arioth, Re, the Indian Siva, of dominion in general, of valor, etc.; and it occurs in the names and standards of many nations. This illustrates Dan. vii, 4, "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings." The Chaldæan or Babylonian empire is here represented (see Jer. iv, 7). Its progress to what was then deemed universal empire was rapid, and therefore it has the wings of an eagle (see Jer. xlviii, 40, and Ezek. xvii, 3). It is said by Megasthenes and Strabo that this power advanced as far as Spain. When its wings were plucked or torn out, that is, when it was checked in its progress by frequent defeats, it became more peaceable and humane, agreeably to that idea of Psa. ix, 20. A remarkable coincidence between the symbolical figure of Daniel's vision and the creations of ancient Assyrian art has lately been brought to light by the researches of Layard and Botta on the sites of Babylon and Nineveh. See CHERUB. In Isa. xxix, 1, "Woe to the lion of God, the city where David dwelt," Jerusalem is denoted, and the terms used appear to signify the strength of the place, by which it was enabled to resist and overcome all its enemies. See ARIEL. The apostle Paul says (2 Tim. iv, 17), "I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." The general opinion is that Nero is here meant, or, rather, his prefect Ælius Cæsarianus, to whom Nero committed the government of the city of Rome during his absence, with power to put to death whomsoever he pleased. See PAUL. So, when Tiberius died, Marsyas said to Agrippa, "The lion is dead." So likewise speaks Esther of Artaxerxes, in the apocryphal chapters of that book (ch. xiv, 13), "Put a word into my mouth before the lion." There are some commentators who regard the apostle's expression as a proverbial one for a deliverance from any great or imminent danger, but others conclude that he had been actually delivered from a lion let loose against him in the amphitheatre. That the same symbol should sometimes be applied to opposite characters is not at all surprising or inconsistent, since different qualities may reside in the symbol, of which the good may be referred to the one, the bad to another. Thus in the lion reside courage and victory over antagonists. In these respects it may be and is employed as a symbol of Christ, called the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev. v, 5), as being the

illustrious descendant of that tribe, whose emblem was the lion. In the lion also reside fierceness and rapacity. In this point of view it is used as a fit emblem of Satan: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Peter v, 8). On the subject generally, see Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 1 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, ii, 111 sq.; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*, s. v.; *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 18 sq.; Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 115 sq.

Lioness. See Lion.

Lip (שָׂפָה, *saphah'*, usually in the dual; Gr. χείλος), besides its literal sense (e. g. Isa. xxxvii, 29; Cant. iv, 3, 11; v, 13; Prov. xxiv, 28), and (in the original) metaphorically for an *edge* or border, as of a cup (1 Kings vii, 26), of a garment (Exod. xxvii, 32), of a curtain (Exod. xxvi, 4; xxxvi, 11), of the sea (Gen. xxii, 17; Exod. ii, 3; Heb. xi, 12), of the Jordan (2 Kings ii, 13; Judg. vii, 22), is often put as an organ of speech, e. g. to "open the lips," i. e. to begin to speak (Job xi, 5; xxxii, 20), also to "open the lips" of another, i. e. cause him to speak (Psa. li, 17), and to "refrain the lips," i. e. to keep silence (Psa. xl, 10; Prov. x, 19). So speech or discourse is said to be "upon the lips" (Prov. xvi, 10; Psa. xvi, 4), once "under the lips" (Psa. cxl, 4; Rom. iii, 13; comp. Ezek. xxxvi, 3), and likewise "sinning with lips" (Job ii, 10; xii, 20; Psa. xlv, 3), and "uncircumcised of lips," i. e. not of ready speech (Exod. vi, 12), also "fruit of the lips," i. e. praise (Heb. xiii, 15; 1 Pet. iii, 5), and, by a bolder figure, "the calves of the lips," i. e. thank-offering (Hos. xiv, 2); finally, the motion of the lips in speaking (Matt. xv, 8; Mark vii, 6; from Isa. xxix, 13). By metonomy, "lip" stands in Scripture for a manner of speech, e. g. in nations, a *dialect* (Gen. xi, 1, 6, 7, 9; Isa. xix, 18; Ezek. iii, 5, 6; 1 Cor. xiv, 21, alluding to Isa. xxviii, 11), or, in individuals, the moral quality of language, as "lying lips," etc., i. e. *falsehood* (Prov. x, 18; comp. xvii, 4, 7) or *wickedness* (Psa. cxx, 2), *truth* (Prov. xii, 19); "burning lips," i. e. ardent professions (Prov. xxvi, 23); "sweetness of lips," i. e. pleasant discourse (Prov. xvi, 22; so Zeph. iii, 9; Isa. vi, 5; Psa. xii, 3, 4). To "shoot out the lip" at any one, i. q. to *make mouths*, has always been an expression of the utmost scorn and defiance (Psa. xxii, 8). In like manner, "unclean lips" are put as a representation of unfitness to impart or receive the divine communications (Isa. vi, 5, 7). Also the "word of one's lips," i. e. communication, e. g. Jehovah's precepts (Psa. xvii, 4; comp. Prov. xxiii, 16: spoken of as something before unknown, Psa. lxxxi, 6); elsewhere in a bad sense, i. q. lip-talk, i. e. vain and empty words (Isa. xxxvi, 5; Prov. xiv. 23), and so of the person uttering them, e. g. a man of talk, i. e. an idle talker (Job xi, 2), a prating fool (Prov. x, 8; comp. Lev. v, 4; Psa. cvi, 33). See Tongue.

The "upper lip" (שָׂפָם, *sapham'*, a derivative of the above), which the leper was required to cover (Lev. xlii, 45), refers to the lip-beard or *mustachios*, as the Venet. Greek (μύστακ) there and the Sept. in 2 Sam. xix, 24, render it, being the beard (in the latter passage), which Mephibosheth neglected to trim during David's absence in token of grief. The same practice of "covering the lip" with a corner of one's garment, as if polluted (comp. "unclean lips"), as a sign of mourning, is alluded to in Ezek. xxiv, 17, 22; Mic. iii, 7, where the Sept. has στόμα, χείλη. See Mouth.

Lipmann, Jomtob (of Mühlhausen), also called *Tab-Jomi* (יום טוב = טבְרומי), a Jewish writer and rabbi of the Middle Ages, was born, according to some, at Cracow, Poland, but most authorities are now agreed that he flourished at Prague about the middle of the 14th century. While a resident of the Bohemian capital he brought forward his *Nitsachon* (נצחון, Victory), an important polemical work. It consists of seven parts, divided, he tells us himself in his preface, "according to the seven days of the week," and of 354 sections, "according to the number of days in the lunar year, which is the Jewish mode of calculation to indicate that every Israelite is bound to study his religion every day of his life, and to remove every obstruction from the boundaries of his faith." In his treatment of the subject, the denial of the authenticity of the Christian religion, Lipmann does not adopt any systematic plan, but discusses and explains every passage of the Hebrew Bible which is either adduced by Christians as a Messianic prophecy referring to Christ, or is used by sceptics and blasphemers to support their scepticism and contempt for revelations, or is appealed to by rationalistic Jews to corroborate their rejection of the doctrine of creation out of nothing, the resurrection of the body, etc., beginning with Genesis and ending with Chronicles, according to the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible, so that any passage in dispute might easily be found. The work, which, as we have seen from its divisions, partook both of the character of a Jewish polemic and an O.-T. apologetic, was, until near the middle of the 16th century, entirely controlled by Jews. They largely transcribed and circulated it in MS. form among their people throughout the world; and in the numerous attacks which they had to sustain both from Christians and rationalists during the time of the Reformation, this book constituted their chief arsenal, supplying them with weapons to defend themselves. About 1642 the learned Hascapan, then professor in the Bavarian University at Altdorf, was engaged in a controversy on the questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity with a neighboring rabbi residing in Schneitach, who in his dissertations frequently referred to this *Nitsachon* (a MS. copy made in 1589), which Hascapan asked the privilege to examine. Refused again and again, he at last called with three of his students on the rabbi, when he pressed him in such a manner to produce the MS. that he could not refuse. He pretended to examine it, and when the students had fairly surrounded the rabbi, the professor made his way to the door, got into a conveyance which was waiting for him, had the MS. speedily transcribed, and only returned it to the rabbi after much earnest solicitation. The professor enriched it by valuable notes and an index, and then presented the work procured in such a dastardly manner to the Christian world (Altdorf, 1644). It was rapidly reprinted, translated into Latin, corrected and refuted by Blendinger, *Lipmanni Nizzachon in Christianos*, etc., *Latine conversum* (Altdorf, 1645); Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Satanæ* (Altdorf, 1681); *Sota, Liber Mischnicus de Uxore Adulterii Suspecta* (Altdorf, 1674), Appendix, and others (see Wolf, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 347 sq.). Lipmann's personal history is to our day very obscure. Jewish historians represent him as having been among the prisoners arrested at Prague (Aug. 3, 1399) for irreverent mention, etc., of the name of Jesus. What punishment he suffered is not known; certain it is that he was not one of the seventy-seven Jews who were executed on the day of the dethronement of king Wenceslaus (Aug. 22, 1400), for he mentions the fact himself in the *Nitsachon*. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, viii, 76 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 403 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, col. 1410–1414; Geiger, *Proben Jüd. Vertheidigung gegen Christliche Angriffe im Mittelalter in Liebermann's Deutscher Volks-Kalender* (Brieg, 1854), p. 9 sq., 47 sq.; Kitto, *Cycl. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lippe, sometimes also (but less properly) Lippe-Detmold, a small principality of Northern Germany, surrounded on the W. and S. by Westphalia, and on the E. and N. by Hanover, Brunswick, Waldeck, and a detached portion of Hesse-Cassel, extends over an area of 438 square miles, and has a population (1885) of 123,250, mainly belonging to the Reformed Church. The earliest inhabitants were the Cherusci; subsequently it was a part of the country of the Saxons. The first establishment of Christianity in that province dates back to

Charlemagne. In the very beginning of his war against the Saxons, in 772, he took the *castrum Æresburgum* (probably Radtberg, on the Diemel, near the southern frontier of the principality), and there destroyed the statue of the idol Irmansaul. In 776 he went to Lippspringe, and the following year to Padrabrun (Paderborn), both on the southern frontier of the province, obliging whole tribes of the conquered Saxons to receive baptism. In 783 Charlemagne again vanquished the Saxons in the great battle of Theotmelli (Detmold), in the very heart of the present principality. The Saxon army was entirely destroyed, and Charlemagne, in commemoration of this event, erected a church which is still in existence. The next Christmas he spent at Skidroburg-supra-Ambram, now Schieder, on the Emmer, where it is said he also erected a church. But his most important measure for Christianizing the country was his establishment of the bishopric of Paderborn, embracing the district of Lippe within its diocese, for which the house of the princes of Lippe furnished many a bishop.

The Reformation early found strong supporters in Lippe. The first city of the province to adopt it was Lemgo, moved to such a course by Luther's theses against indulgences. By 1524 the Reformation was further advanced in this part of Germany by the adherents it had gained in the town of Herford, adjoining Lemgo, where the works of Luther and Melancthon had been circulated freely. Foremost among Luther's supporters there were his colleagues the Augustine monks. One of them, Dr. John Dreyer, a native of Lemgo and a personal friend of Luther, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the first to preach the Gospel in Herford. In spite of the priests, the people introduced the singing of the German hymns of Luther into their churches, and all attempts to put an end to this by violence gave way before the unanimous will of the people. The first to take the decided step of separation was Moriz Piderit, a priest, and formerly one of the most determined adversaries of the evangelical doctrines, and by his influence the city was carried for Luther's doctrines. Lippstadt embraced them nearly at the same time. The monks of the Augustine convent in that city, who had sent two of their number to Wittemberg to be instructed by Luther, on their return preached the Gospel with great success to the people of Lippe and of neighboring places; and they so quickly advanced the cause of the Reformers, that when an inquisitor was sent to Lippe from Cologne in 1526 to stay the heresy, he found the evangelical party so strong that he gave up all attempts to control it, and returned to his home. In 1533 the town was besieged by the dukes of Cleves and Juliers, and the count of Lippe forced to surrender. The evangelical ministers were of course driven away, but it was not long before permission was granted for the preaching by Lutheran ministers again. After the death of the zealous Roman Catholic count Simon V, in 1536, the Reformation made more rapid progress in the province. The landgrave Philip of Hessia and count Jobst von Hoya, two determined partisans of the Reformation, became guardians of the children of the deceased count, and caused them to be diligently instructed in the Protestant doctrines; and when, in 1538, both the nobility and the people loudly demanded a reform in the Church of the count de Hoya, John Timann, surnamed Amstelrodamus, and Adrian Buxschoten, both of Bremen, were called and sent to Lippe to frame a plan of evangelical church organization, which was submitted to the States and to Luther, and, upon approval (1538), it was promulgated throughout the principality, and Protestant ministers were everywhere appointed. Under John von Eyter, of Wittemberg, then general superintendent of Lippe, a new church organization was drawn up and printed in 1571, with the authorization of the authorities, and it is still in our day in force among the Lutheran communities of the country.

In 1600, during the reign of count Simon VI (ruled 1583–1613), who had imbibed Calvinistic views at the court of Cassel, Calvinism found an entrance in Lippe. It commenced by the appointment of a Calvinistic minister to preach at Horn in 1602. This preacher at once forbade the use of the Lutheran Catechism in the schools, administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in strict Calvinistic form, and established the Reformed mode of worship in spite of the local authorities and of the people. In 1605 the same step was taken at Detmold, and was supported by the government, notwithstanding the opposition of the people and city authorities. In this manner Calvinism was established throughout the country, the nobility alone and the city of Lemgo remaining Lutheran. It was not, however, until 1684 that Calvinism was sanctioned as the state religion. In that year count Simon Henrich promulgated the Reformed ecclesiastical organization, which recognises as its formula of confession the Catechism of Heidelberg, and is in force in our day. The city of Lemgo resisted these measures, and succeeded in obtaining in 1717 an edict assuring its inhabitants the fullest religious liberty, the right of appointing their own ministers, etc. But as Rationalism had obtained full control of the Reformed Church of Lippe in the 18th century, upon reaction towards the middle of the 19th century the whole country, including Lemgo, was subjected to the Reformed consistory, which, however, by the admission of one Lutheran member, became a mixed consistory. As an outline of doctrine, the Heidelberg Catechism was introduced.

In 1885 the principality numbered about 2700 Roman Catholics, 6500 Lutherans, 1150 Israelites; the remainder belonged to the Reformed Church. The latter is divided into three classes, at the head of each of which is a superintendent; at the head of the whole clergy is a superintendent general at Detmold. The supreme ecclesiastical board for both Reformed and Lutherans is the consistory at Detmold. The principality has 43 Reformed, 5 Lutheran, and 6 Catholic parishes; the Catholics belong to the diocese of Paderborn, in Westphalia. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 423; Falkmann und Preuss, *Lippesche Regesten* (Lemgo, 1860–63, 2 vols. 8vo); Falkmann, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Fürstenth.* (ibid. 1847–56); and his *Graf Simon VI zur Lippe* (Detm. 1869, vol. i). (A. J. S.)

Lippomani, Aloysius (or *Ludovicus*), born in Venice in 1500, was alike renowned for his historical and linguistic learning and for the purity of his life. He was in turn bishop of Modena, Verona, and Bergamo. He was active in securing the pope's assent to the transfer of the Tridentine Council to Bologna; was for two years after the interruption of the council papal nuncio in Germany, and in 1549 one of the three presidents of the council. In Poland the Reformation had made great advances through the influence of the Hussites and of the Bohemian Brethren, as also through the Socinian movement. At the national Diet of Petrikau in 1550, 1551, and especially 1555, the prerogatives of the Catholic bishops were, through special influence of the king, Sigismund II, greatly diminished, and the Protestant theologians — such as Calvin, Melancthon, Beza—were recognised as important authorities in matters of faith. The Confession of Hosius, adopted in a provincial synod at Petrikau, obtained great acceptance with the people. Lippomani was specially commissioned by pope Paul IV, in 1556, as nuncio in Poland, to exert himself against this rapid progress of reform. His efforts made him peculiarly obnoxious to the adherents of Protestantism, but were without marked success. He died as bishop of Bergamo in August, 1559. He wrote commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, and the Psalms, but they are of no special value to the exegetist of to-day. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.; Krasinski, *Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland*, vol. i, chap. vi. (E. B. O.)

Lipscomb, Philip D., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Georgetown, D. C., in October, 1798.

He was converted probably in early life, and joined the Baltimore Conference in 1822. Among his brethren in Conference assembled he was pleasant, attentive to business, safe in council. He was many years one of the stewards of the Conference. He was also for a time treasurer of the Preachers' Fund Society. A number of the years of his ministry were given to the service of the American Colonization Society, and from that work he retired in 1863 to a place on the superannuated list. A minister of this Conference, who knew him long and intimately, says, "His life was beautiful in its consistency." He died in January, 1870.—*Conf. Minutes*, 1871.

Lipsius, Justus, a Roman Catholic, renowned as a scholar in the 16th century, was born near Brussels in 1547. His talent was precocious, and he edited his *Variæ lectiones* at the age of 19. He was secretary to cardinal Granville about this time (1572–74). Later, as professor of history at Jena, he became a Protestant, and remained such for 13 years while professor of ancient languages at Leyden, but subsequently he returned to the Roman Catholic Church, and was made professor at Louvain (1602). He died March 23, 1606, holding at that time the appointment of historiographer to the king of Spain. His scholarship was honored by the pope and at several European courts. He distinguished himself especially by his commentary upon Tacitus, whose works he could repeat word for word, and by his enthusiastic regard for the stoical philosophy. He wrote *De Constantia manuductia ad philosophiam Stoicam:—Physiologiæ Stoicorum libri tres* (new edit. Antv. 1605, fol.): —also *De una religione*, etc. His works were collected under the title *Opera Omnia* (Antv. 1585; 2d edit. 1637). See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. ii, s. v.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* (Elberf. 1869), vol. i, s. v.

Liptines or **Lestines**, Synod of (*Concilium Liptinense*). This synod was held at Liptinä or Lestines, near the convent of Laubes, in Hennegau, in 743, by order of Carloman, Bonifacius presiding. Four canons were published. The bishops, earls, and governors promised in this council to observe the decrees of the Council of Germany (A.D. 742). All the clergy, moreover, promised obedience to the ancient canons; the abbots and monks received the order of St. Benedict, and a part of the revenue of the Church was assigned for a time to the prince, to enable him to carry on the wars then raging. (J. N. P.)

Liquor (דֶּמַע, *de'ma*, a *tear*, fig. of the juice of olives and grapes, Exod. xxii, 29; מֶזֶג, *me'zeg*, *mixed*, i. e. highly flavored wine, Cant. vii, 3; מִשְׁרָה, *mishrah'*, *maceration*, i. e. drink prepared by steeping grapes, Numb. vi, 3). See Wine.

Lismanini, Francis, a Socinian theologian, was born at Corfu in the beginning of the 16th century. He studied in Italy, joined the Franciscans, and a few years after became doctor of theology; removed to Poland, and was appointed by queen Bona, wife of Sigismund I, her preacher and confessor. He became also superior of the Franciscans of Poland, director of all the convents of the nuns of St. Clara, etc. The society of Andrew Fricesio and the reading of Ochin's works led him to question the authority of the Roman Church, yet he was not displaced on account of it, but continued in favor with the queen, and was sent by her to Rome, in 1549, to congratulate Julius III on his election as pope. On his return to Poland in 1551, Lismanini became acquainted with Socinius, and it is this association that no doubt gave rise to the mission with which he was intrusted by the king of Poland, ostensibly for the purpose of collecting works for the royal library, but in reality to study the position of the Reformation, and to report concerning it. Lismanini accordingly visited Padua, Milan, and Switzerland, where he finally left his order, embraced the Helvetic confession, and married. The king, fearing to be compromised by this overt act, broke all connection with him, ceased to supply him with funds, and Calvin, Bullinger, and Gesner in vain sought to obtain for Lismanini leave to return to Poland. It was not until 1556 that he was permitted to return, but the king's favor he never regained, notwithstanding the efforts of a large number of the Polish nobility in his behalf. His Socinian views on the doctrine of the Trinity served still more to bring him into discredit. As he attempted to make converts he was exiled from Poland. He retired to Königsberg, where he became counsellor of duke Albrecht. About 1563 he became distracted on account of family difficulties, and committed suicide by drowning. His chief production is *Brevis Explicatio doctrinæ de sanctissima Trinitate, quam Stancaro et aliis quibusdam opposuit* (1565, 8vo). See *Bibl. antitrinitariorum*, p. 34; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.*; Friese, *Beiträge z. Ref.-Gesch. in Polen*, ii, 1, p. 247 sq.; Fock, *Der Socinianismus*, i, 145; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, x, 426; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxi, 356. (J. H. W.)

List, Carl Benjamin, a German theologian, was born at Mannheim, in the grand-duchy of Baden, Feb. 5, 1725. He attended the universities of Jena and Strasburg, and afterwards spent some time in Neufchatel to acquire French. About 1749 he was appointed court dean, in 1753 third pastor of his native city, and in 1756 first pastor of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church, together with the dignity of counsellor of the Consistory. He died Jan. 16, 1801. He possessed a pure, liberal, and reforming character, and to him is due the honor of having abrogated the custom of paying for confession in the Evangelical-Lutheran Church. His productions, mostly of a corrective character in liturgy and hymns, were of great service to the Church to which he belonged. We mention *Die Geschichte der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinde zu Mannheim* (Mannheim, 1767, 8vo):—*Neue Liturgie für die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in der Churpfalz* (ibid. 1783, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Litany (λιτανεία, *entreaty*), a word the specific meaning of which has varied considerably at different times, is used in the liturgical services of some churches to designate a solemn act of supplication addressed with the object of averting the divine anger, and especially on occasions of public calamity. Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* (book v, p. 265), has the following: "As things invented for one purpose are by use easily converted to more, it grew that supplications with this solemnity for the appeasing of God's wrath and the averting of public evils were of the Greek Church termed *litanies*; rogations, of the Latins."

The term litany for a supplicatory form of worship among the pagans was early adopted by Christian writers. In the fourth century we find such occasions as litanies connected with processions, the clergy and people in solemn procession using certain forms of supplication and making special entreaty for deliverance. Whether anything of this kind would have been ventured before Christianity became a "religio licita" (A.D. 270) may be doubted. The predominance of a Christian population, however, in certain localities, and the intervals of repose between persecutions, admit of their possibility at an earlier period. In these earliest developments, moreover, of the processional litany, whether before or during the fourth century, they rested, doubtless, upon an earlier Christian habit and custom —that of special seasons of prayer and supplication. These, in some cases, would be by the assembled body of believers in their houses or places of assembling; in others, for purposes of safety from the fury of their enemies, in their individual homes and places of abode. Certainly the Church was not wanting in such occasions during the first centuries of her existence, when the course pursued by the disciples at Jerusalem (Acts xii, 5), and for similar reasons, would need to be repeated. Occasions of this particular kind would of course pass away with the passing away of persecution. But

others of a different character would take their place. As early, indeed, as the times of Tertullian and Cyprian we find allusions to Christian prayers, and fastings, and supplications for the removal of drought, the repelling of enemies, the moderation of calamities; and later, in the fourth and fifth centuries, we find the same thing, on a larger scale and in a more formal manner. Theodosius, preliminary to a battle, spent the whole night in fasting and prayer, and in sackcloth went with the priests and people to make supplication in all the churches. So, again, in the reign of one of his successors, a solemn litany or supplication on account of a great earthquake was made at Constantinople. In these last cases, the element, to which allusion has been made, that of the procession, was undoubtedly present, and so continued until the time of the Reformation; the name litany, indeed, being sometimes used simply to describe this part of it, as where seven litanies are directed by Gregory the Great to proceed from seven different churches (see below). The processions of the Arians in the times of Chrysostom, and the counter movement, on his part, by more splendid and imposing ones, to detract from any popularity which the Arians may have attained in this way, are described by Socrates. It is not at all improbable that in somewhat the same manner the hymns of Arius became circulated in Alexandria in the early part of the fourth century, and found lodgment in the minds of the populace.

The prevalence of litanies in the Western Church may be recognised after the beginning of the fifth century; and during the time of Charlemagne we find allusion to large numbers of them, to be attended to as a matter of special appointment. The Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, expressly recognises litanies as peculiarly solemn supplications, and enjoins their use preparatory to the celebration of a high festival. In the Spanish Church, in like manner, they were observed in the week after Pentecost. Other councils subsequently appointed them at a variety of other seasons, till, in the seventeenth Council of Toledo, A.D. 694, it was decreed that they should be used once in each month. By degrees they were extended to two days in each week, and Wednesday and Friday, being the ancient *stationary* days, were set apart for the purpose. Gregory the Great instituted a service at Rome for the 25th of April, which was named *Litania Septiformis*, because a procession was formed in it of seven different classes. This service is distinguished as *Litania Major*, from its extraordinary solemnity. The *Litaniæ Minores*, on the other hand, are supposed by Bingham to consist only of a repetition of Κύριε ἐλέησον, the customary response in the larger supplications. "It was a short form of supplication, used one way or other in all churches, and that as a part of all their daily offices, whence it borrowed the name of the Lesser Litany, in opposition to the greater litanies, which were distinct, complete, and solemn services, adapted to particular times or extraordinary occasions. I must note, further, that the greater litanies are sometimes termed '*exomologeses*'—confessions—because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins were usually enjoined with supplication, to avert God's wrath, and reconcile him to a sinful people." Du Cange cites a passage from the acts of the *Conc. Cloveshoviense*, A.D. 747, confirming the identity of *litania* and *rogatio*, but showing that originally there was a distinction between *litania* and *exomologesis*. Johannes de Janua terms litany, properly, a service for the dead. But Du Cange, by the authorities he cites for the early litanies, hazards the assertion that they differ but little from those in modern usage. In the Western litanies two features are to be found not prevalent in the Eastern—the invocation of saints, and the appointment of stated annual seasons for their use, as the rogation days of the Romish, and the tri-weekly usage of the English Church. There is, indeed, mention made of an annual litany in commemoration of the great earthquake in the reign of Justinian. But the general and present habit of the patriarchate of Constantinople has been and is to confine such services to their original purpose—extraordinary occasions.

Freeman (*Principles of Divine Service*, ii, 325) insists that in its origin the litany is distinctly a "eucharistic feature," a series of intercessions closely associated with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and so it was originally in the West also, one most notable feature being the pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church. In a Syriac form given by Renaudot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right and left hand, commemorates (1) the annunciation; (2) the nativity; (3) the baptism; (4) the passion; (5) the lifting up on the cross; (6) the life-giving death; (7) the burial; (8) the resurrection; (9) the session. Then follows the remembrance of the departed, and then supplication for all, both living and departed, ending with three kyries and the Lord's Prayer. This extended eucharistic intercession St. Ephraem the Syrian rendered into a very solemn hymn (comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* p. 417).

As to the peculiar structure of litanies, which are prayers, certain features may be mentioned that distinguish them from other prayers (the collects and the so-called common prayers), for in the litany the priest or minister does not pray alone, the people responding after each separate petition. It is even not absolutely necessary that the minister should lead, as the whole may be divided between two choirs; for we must also notice that the litany, occupying a medium position between prayer and singing, may be sung or spoken, according to the custom of the place where it is used. Some compositors even—Mozart, for instance—sometimes treated it in the same manner as the usual Church chants (the *Stabat Mater*, *Requiem*, etc.); but in this case, by losing the distinction between petitions and responses, the litany entirely changed its character. In the next place, it must be noticed that in all litanies preceding the Reformation there is great uniformity. They all begin alike—*Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, and end alike—*Agnus Dei*, *qui tollis*, etc. In this respect they resemble the mass. A form of supplication somewhat resembling a litany exists in the Apostolical Constitutions; as the deacon named the subjects of petition, the people answered to each, *Lord, have mercy*. That of the Church of England begins with an invocation of the persons of the Trinity, but uses the old invocations in its progress and close. In their original purpose litanies were connected with fasting and humiliation, and were therefore inappropriate to the festal character of the Sunday service. In this respect their usage has been changed, and they are now part of divine service not only on Sundays, but on the most joyous seasons of Christian commemoration, such as Easter and Christmas day. One of the last efforts, indeed, in this kind of composition is the litany of Zinzendorf for Easter morning. The ordinary arrangement of litany material may be described as, first, the invocations, where we find the greatest difference between Romish and Protestant litanies; these are followed by the deprecations, from which this kind of service originally took its predominant character; next come intercessions for various classes and conditions of men, the whole closing with supplications for divine audience, and blessing upon the worshippers. The litany of the Church of Rome is that of Gregory, with subsequent additions, especially in the material of invocation to the body of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and all the saints. There was an earlier form, bearing the name of Ambrose, agreeing in many respects with the Lutheran and English (see below). There was another, put in shape by Mamertius, bishop of Vienna, about the year 460, which was used by Sidonius of Arranque soon after, in connection with an invasion of the Goths, the annual usage of which the Council of Orleans enjoined. That of Gregory, however, composed during the next century, became the prevailing one, or rather the typical form of others in subsequent use.

The three different forms now in use in the Romish churches are called the "litany of the saints" (which is the most ancient), the "litany of the name of Jesus," and the "litany of Our Lady of Loretto." Of these the first alone has a place in the public service-books of the Church, on the rogation days, in the ordination service, the service for the consecration of churches, the consecration of cemeteries, and many other offices. The one called by the name of *litany of the saints* bears its name from the prayers it contains to the saints for their help and intercession in behalf of the worshippers. Almost every saint in the calendar of the Romish Church has his particular form in the litany. The people's response in the prayer is *Ora pro nobis*, "Pray for us." The *litany of Jesus* consists of a number of addresses to Christ under his various relations to men, in connection with the several details of his passion, and of adjurations of him through the memory of what he has done and suffered for the salvation of mankind. The date of this form of prayer is uncertain, but it is referred, with much probability, to the time of St. Bernardino of Siena, in the 15th century. The *litany of Loretto* [see LORETTO] resembles both the above-named litanies in its opening addresses to the Holy Trinity and in its closing petitions to the "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world;" but the main body of the petitions are addressed to the Virgin Mary under various titles, some taken from the Scriptures, some from the language of the fathers, some from the mystical writers of the mediæval Church. Neither this litany nor that of Jesus has ever formed part of any of the ritual or liturgical offices of the Catholic Church, but there can be no doubt that both have in various ways received the sanction of the highest authorities of the Romish Church. Those of the Lutheran and English churches, which are very much alike, are derived from the same source, being shorter in that these invocations are expunged.

In the Church of England it was originally a distinct service, and seems to have been used at a different time of day from the ordinary morning service, and only on certain occasions. In 1544 it was given to the people in a revised form by Henry VIII. Upon its insertion in the Prayer-book published by Edward VI, A.D. 1549, the litany was placed between the communion office and the office of baptism, under the title "The Litany and Suffrages," without any rubric for its use; but at the end of the communion office occurred the following rubric: "Upon Wednesdays and Fridays the English litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by his majesty's injunctions, or as it shall be otherwise appointed by his highness." In the revision of the Common Prayer in 1552, the litany was placed where it now stands, and the rubric was added to "be used on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the ordinary." So late as the last revision in 1661, the litany continued a distinct service by itself, used sometimes after the morning prayer (then read at a very early hour) was concluded, the people returning home between them. The rubric which inserts the litany after the third collect in morning prayer is formed from a similar rubric in the Scotch *Common Prayer-book*, with this difference, that the English rubric enjoins the omission of certain of the ordinary intercessional prayers; the Scotch rubric, on the other hand, states expressly, "without the omission of any part of the other daily service of the Church on those days."

The litany of the German and Danish Lutherans closely resembles that of the Church of England and that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and needs, therefore, no special mention here. The processional feature is still retained in the Greek and Roman litanies on special occasions, but is not their special accompaniment. Efforts towards its restoration in the English and American Episcopal Church have for the past ten years been in progress. Judging from the prevalent sentiment of the episcopate in both countries, and the tone of the last General Convention in this, the prospects of success are not very favorable. See Procter, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 246 sq.; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, i, 264 sq.; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, p. 163 sq.; Dean Stanley in *Good Words* for 1868 (June); Coleman, *Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism*, p. 392 sq.; *Christian Antiq.* p. 661; Blunt, *Dict. Doct. and Hist. Theol.* s. v.; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s. v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 353. See LITURGY.

Litĕræ Encyclĭcæ, a term used in the Roman Catholic Church to denote letters addressed by the pope to the whole Church, but primarily to the clergy at large, as representatives of the Church. They are to be distinguished from apostolical briefs and bulls as never being applicable to local or individual cases only. They relate to some general need or tendency of a moral or doctrinal kind within the Church, or to any supposed dangers from without, and contain the pope's views on the matters alluded to, with exhortations to co-operation on the part of the clergy and the Church at large in the course of conduct advised. See ENCYCLICA.

Litĕræ Formātæ, or simply FORMATÆ, are the epistles of bishops and churches to others of like character, and are so called because they are framed after certain prescribed canonical rules. There have been needless discussions over the fitness of the expression *formata*, and some would have it to be *formalis* (Suetonius, *Domitian*, 13); others will derive it from *forma*, *τύπος*, seal (hence *formata*, *τετυπωμένη*, equivalent to *sigillata*), etc. Originally they were termed *κανονικαί*, *canonicæ*, but afterwards *formatæ*. The adoption of a particular form was early necessary, in order to prevent the alteration of and tampering with letters, of which Dionysius, bishop of Corinth († c. a. 167), complained, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv, cap. 23), as also Cyprian (*Epist.* 3). From the earliest times the brotherly union of the churches was cultivated by means of a regular correspondence, of which Optatus of Mileve says in the middle of the fourth century: "Totus orbis commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat." The holy Scriptures themselves, namely, the epistles of the apostles, served as the first models. Letters of introduction and recommendation of brethren to the different churches were in the infancy of the Church the chief subject of this correspondence; these were called by the apostles *συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί* (2 Cor. iii, 1), *literæ commendatitiæ*. They are mentioned by Tertullian (*Adversus hæreses*, cap. 20), Gregory of Nazianzum (*Oratio*, iii), and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. v, cap. 16), etc. The demand for such letters of recommendation became so numerous that it was necessary to frame regulations determining who was and who was not entitled to them, and in what form they should be written. The Council of Elvira, a. 305 (? 310), c. 25, that of Arles, a. 314, c. 9, etc., decided that bishops alone should be authorized to write them. Every traveller, whether laic or clerical, was to provide himself with one. It is said, cap. 32 (al. 34): "Nullus episcopus peregrinorum aut presbyterorum aut diaconorum sine commendatitiis recipiatur epistolis; et cum scripta detulerint, discutiantur attentius, et ita suscipiantur, si prædicatores pietatis extiterint; sin minus, hæc quæ sunt necessaria subministrantur eis, et ad communionem nullatenus admittantur, quia per subreptionem multa proveniunt" (see *Conc. Antioch.* a. 341 [? 332], c. 7, in c. 9, dist. lxxi; *African.* i, a. 506, c. 2 [c. 21, dist. 1], c. 5). The defence of the right of these members of the clergy to officiate was often withdrawn, as by the *Conc. Chalcedon.* a. 451, c. 13, in c. 7, dist. lxxi, etc. The form of the writings was taken from the apostolic models. Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, stated in the Council of Chalcedon, 451, that there was a formula established by the Council of Nicæa, 325: "Nicææ .... constitutum, ut epistolæ formatæ hanc calculationis seu supputationis habeant rationem, id est, ut assumantur in supputationem prima Græca clementa Patris et Filii

et Spiritus Sancti, hoc est π. υ. α. quæ elementa octogenarium, et quadringentesimum, et primum significant numerum. Petri quoque apostoli prima litera, id est π. . . . . : ejus quoque, qui scribit, episcopi prima litera; cui scribitur secunda litera; accipientis tertia litera; civitatis quoque, de qua scribitur, quarta: et indictionis, quæcunque est illius temporis, numerus assumatur. Atque ita his omnibus Græcis literis . . . . in unum ductis, unam, quæcunque fuerit collecta, summam epistola teneat, hanc qui suscipit omni cum cautela requirat expresse. Addat præterea separatim in epistola etiam nonagenarium et nonum numerum, qui secundum Græca elementa significat *ἀμήν*." From these letters of recommendation must be distinguished the *εἰρηνικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, literæ pacificæ*, a kind of letters of dismission (hence also called *ἀπολυτικαί*), stating that the giver was privy to the bearer's intention of travelling (c. 7, 8, *Conc. Antioch.* a. 332, c. 11; *Conc. Chalced.* 451; *Conc. Trullan.* a. 672, c. 17, etc.). *Formatæ* also contained the communications of one community to another, such as the information concerning the election of bishops, etc. (*γράμματα ἐνδρονιστικά*, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii, cap. 30; Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4, cap. iv); notices of festivals, particularly Easter, etc. (*γράμματα ἑορτασικά, πασχάλια, epistolæ festales, paschales*, etc.; *Conc. Arelat.* i, a. 314, c. 1; *Carthag.* v, a. 401, c. 7; *Bracar.* ii, a. 572, c. 7; *Gratian.* c. 24–26, dist. iii, "de consecr."). The publication of ordinations was also made by *formatæ*, as circulars, *ἐγκύκλια, ἐπιστολαί, circulares, tractoriæ*. See Du Fresne, *Glossar. Lat.;* Suicer, *Thesaur. eccl.* s. v. *εἰρηνικός*; F. B. Ferrarii *De antiquo epistolarum ecclesiasticarum genere* (Meliol. 1613; and edit. G. Th. Meier, Helmstadt, 1678, 4to); Phil. Priorii *De literis canonicis diss. cum appendice de tractoriis et synodicis* (Paris, 1675); J. R. Kiesling, *De stabili primitivæ ecclesiæ ope literarum communicatoriarum connubio* (Lipsiæ, 1745, 4to); Gonzalez Tellez, *Kommentar z. d. Decretalen* (lib. ii, tit. xxii, "*De clericis peregrinis*," cap. 3); Rheinwald, *Kirchliche Archäologie* (Berlin, 1830). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Lith, Johann Wilhelm von, a German theologian, was born at Anspach, in Bavaria, Feb. 4, 1678. In 1693 he entered the University of Jena, and became in 1694 A.M. In the following year he went to the University of Altdorf to continue his studies; in 1697 he studied at the University of Halle, and in 1698 he was admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university. His health failing, he was obliged to leave for his native city. In 1707 he became dean at Wassertrüdingen. In 1710 he accepted a call to his native city as preacher of a foundation and counsellor of the Consistory; in addition to this, he became in 1714 city pastor. He died March 13, 1743. Von Lith repeatedly declined calls to far higher dignities abroad. His polemics against Catholicism prove him to have been a man of wide knowledge and great acuteness; and his repeatedly reprinted sermons, and his valuable contributions to the history of the Reformation, give evidence of his success as a great preacher and historian. We mention *Erläuterung der Reformationshistorie von* 1524–28 (Schwabach, 1733, 8vo; 2d edit. ibid. 1739, 8vo):—*Disquisitio de adoratione panis consecrati*, etc. (Suabæi, 1754, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lithuania, a grand-duchy in Eastern Europe, which formerly constituted a part of the kingdom of Poland, and which at the partition of the kingdom was partly united with Russia (the governments of Vilna, Grodno, Mohilev, Minsk, and Vitebsk), partly with Prussia (the administrative district of Gombinnen). The area of Lithuania is about 105,000 square miles. In the earliest historic times the country of the Lithuanians was subject to the neighboring tribes, in particular to the Russians of Polocz. As an independent state it appears for the first time about 1217 under Erczіwil, who threw off the yoke of Polock, and conquered Podlesia, Grodno, and Brzesk. Eberwand, about 1220, began to expel the Tartars from Lithuania, and Ringold, about 1235, was the first independent grand-duke. His son Mindore, who had to cede Podlesia, Samogitia, and Courland to the prince of Halicz Novgorod and to the Teutonic Order, was in 1245 baptized by the archbishop of Riga and crowned as king; but in 1261 he apostatized from Christianity, and in 1263 he was slain by Svintorog, the governor of Samogitia, who in 1268 obtained control of the country. In 1281 Podlesia was reunited with Lithuania. In 1282 Witen became ruler of Lithuania, after murdering his predecessor. His son Gedinim (1315–1328) conquered Samogitia and a portion of Russia, inclusive of Kiev, and founded the towns of Vilna and Troki. The son of Gedinim, Olgerd, wholly expelled the Tartars from Podolia, and conquered the prince Demetrius of Russia at Moscow, in 1333 at Mosaisk. His son Jagello was baptized on Feb. 14, 1386, at Cracow, and on this occasion received the name of Vladislav. The marriage of Jagello with the princess Hedwig of Poland led to the union of Lithuania with Poland, and made the latter country the greatest power of Eastern Europe. In 1401, and again in 1413, it was stipulated that the princes of Poland and Lithuania should only be elected with the consent of both nations. Under Witold, who in 1413 conquered Smolensk, Lithuania was a powerful state, which embraced, besides Lithuania proper, the larger portion of White and Red Russia, Samogitia, and other districts. After a brief separation from Poland in the 15th century, Lithuania and Poland were reunited in 1501, and after this time the union was not again interrupted. In 1569 even the administrative union with Poland was carried through, and the history of Lithuania fully coincides with that of Poland. For an account of the Reformation, and the subsequent conflicts of the Roman Catholic hierarchy with the Russian government, see Poland and Russia. The Lithuanians, who still number about 1,340,000 inhabitants, are divided into three branches: 1, the Lithuanians proper, about 717,000, in the Russian government; 2, the Samogitians or Shamaites, of whom about 308,000 live in the district of Samogitia, which in 1795 was incorporated with Russia, and belongs to the government of Vilna, and 184,000 in the former government of Augustovo of Poland; 3, the Prussian Lithuanians, about 137,000. Before the partition of Poland, nearly the entire population of Lithuania, which embraced Lithuanians, Poles, and Little Russians or Ruthenians, belonged to the Catholic Church: the Lithuanians and Poles to the Latin rite, and the Little Russians or Ruthenians to the Greek rite. The united Greek bishops were in 1839 prevailed upon to sever their connection with the pope and unite with the orthodox Greek Church, whereupon the Russian government officially regarded the entire population of their dioceses as being part of the Greek Church. The Catholics now constitute a majority only in the government of Vilna; they have within the boundaries of the ancient Lithuania the archdiocese of Mohilev, and the dioceses of Vilna, Samogitia, and Minsk. The Protestants belong mostly to the Reformed Church, which is divided into four districts, each of which has a superintendent and vice-superintendent at its head. It has about 30 ministers, and annually holds a synod which often lasts three or four weeks, and which has to be attended by all the lay members, and by those ministers in whose district the synod assembles. Every district must be represented either by the president or by the vice-president. The meeting of the synod takes place every year in a different district and parish, the clergyman of the latter receiving a compensation for entertaining the members of the synod. The synod rules the Reformed Church under the superintendence of the ministry of St. Petersburg. It pays the salaries of the clergymen, attends to the repairs of the churches, and has also the care of all schools and poor-houses. It has from dotations an annual revenue of 22,000 silver rubles. The Lutheran

congregations of Lithuania, which are less numerous, belong to the diocese of Courland. The orthodox Greek Church has within the limits of Lithuania the archbishop of White Russia and Lithuania, the bishop of Mohilev, the bishop of Vilna, and the bishop of Vitebsk. The dioceses of the two former belong to the eparchies of the second, those of the two latter to the eparchies of the third and fourth class. The following table of the five governments formerly belonging to Lithuania exhibits the total population, the Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Israelites; the remainder belong chiefly to the orthodox Greek Church:

Government.	Roman Catholics.	Per Cent.	Protestants.	Per Cent.	Israelites.	Per Cent.	Total.
Grodno...	357,474	29.7	9,655	0.8	133,971	11.1	1,206,946
Musk	290,328	18.5	1,569	0.1	153,796	9.8	1,569,342
Mohilev..	45,859	4.0	730	—	152,471	13.3	1,146,470
Vilna,....	734,895	61.0	2,410	0.2	139,751	11.6	1,204,746
Vitebsk...	311,483	26.6	18,736	1.6	106,470	9.1	1,170,987
Total..	1,740,039	27.7	33,100	00.5	686,459	10.8	6,298,491

See Krause, *Lithauen u. dessen Bewohner* (Halle, 1834); Glagau, *Lithauen und Lithauer, gesammelte Skizzen* (Tilsit, 1869). (A. J. S.)

Litter occurs in the Auth. Vers. as a translation of צַב (*tsab*, from צָבַב, to *move* slowly), in Isa. lxvi, 20, (Sept. λαμπήνη), where a *sedan* or palanquin for the conveyance of a princely personage, borne by hand or upon the shoulders, or perhaps on the backs of animals, is evidently referred to. The original term occurs elsewhere only in Numb. vi, 3, in the phrase עֶגְלֹת צָב (*egloth' tsab, carts of* the *litter* kind, A. V. "*covered* wagons"), where it is used of the large and commodious vehicles employed for the transportation of the materials and furniture of the tabernacle, being drawn by oxen. The term therefore signifies properly a hand-litter, and secondarily a wain or wheel-carriage. Litters or palanquins were, as we know, in use among the ancient Egyptians. They were borne upon the shoulders of men, and appear to have been used for carrying persons of consideration short distances on visits, like the sedan chairs of a former day in England (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 73). In Cant. iii, 9, we find the word אַפִּרְיוֹן, *appiryon'* (perhaps a foreign [Egyptian] word), Sept. φορεῖον, Vulg. *ferculum*, which occurs nowhere else in Scripture, and is applied to a vehicle used by king Solomon. In the immediate context it is described as consisting of a framework of cedar-wood, in which were set silver stanchions supporting a gold railing, with a purple-covered seat, and an embroidered rug, the last a present from the Jewish ladies. This word is rendered "chariot" in our Authorized Version, although unlike any other word so rendered in that version. It literally means a *moving couch*, and is usually conceived to denote a kind of sedan, litter, or rather palanquin, in which great personages and women were borne from place to place. "The name as well as the object immediately suggests that it may have been nearly the same thing as the *takht-ravan*, the *moving throne* or *seat* of the Persians. It consists of a light frame fixed

Ancient Egyptian Palanquin, containing a military chief, borne by four men, with an attendant carrying a parasol behind him.

Modern Persian covered Palanquin.

on two strong poles, like those of our sedan chair. This frame is generally covered with cloth, and has a door, sometimes of lattice-work, at each side. It is carried by two mules, one between the poles before, the other behind. These conveyances are used by great persons when disposed for retirement or ease during a journey, or when sick or feeble through age; but they are chiefly used by ladies of consideration in their journeys" (Kitto). Some readers may remember the "litter of red cloth, adorned with pearls and jewels," together with ten mules (to bear it by turns), which king Zahr-Shah prepared for the journey of his daughter (Lane's *Arabian Nights*, i, 528). This was doubtless of the kind which is borne by four mules, two behind and two before. In Arabia, or in countries where Arabian usages prevail, two camels are usually employed to bear the takht-ravan, and sometimes two horses. When borne by camels, the head of the hindmost of the animals is bent painfully down under the vehicle. This is the most



Double Palanquin of Modern Syria.

comfortable kind of litter, and two light persons may travel in it. "The *shibrieyeh* is another kind of camel-litter, resembling the Indian *howdah*, by which name (or rather *hódaj*) it is sometimes called. It is composed of a small square platform with a canopy or arched covering. It accommodates but one person, and is placed upon the back of a camel, and rests upon two square camel-chests, one on each side of the animal." See CART; CAMEL.

Camel bearing the *Hodaj*.

Little Christians is the name of a new sect, com-

posed of members lately (1868) seceded from the Russo-Greek Church at Atkarsk, in the province of Saratof, and diocese of the bishop of Tsaritzin. The seceders from the orthodox Church, or founders of this new sect, were only sixteen persons in number. "They set up a new religion, and began to preach a gospel of their own devising." They condemned saints and altar-pieces as idolatrous, and abandoned the use of bread and wine in the sacrament. Before they founded the new Church, which, they claim, Christ commanded them to do, they were immersed, and also fasted and changed their names. "They have no priests, and hardly any form of prayer. They keep no images, use no wafers, and make no sacred oil. Instead of the consecrated bread, they bake a cake, which they afterwards worship, as a special gift from God. This cake is like a penny bun in shape and size, but in the minds of these *Little Christians* it possesses a potent virtue and a mystic charm" (Dixon, *Free Russia*, p. 143, 144). The name they bear they gave themselves. Persecuted by the government, they have increased and are daily increasing in numbers. See RUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

Little Horn. See ANTICHRIST; DANIEL.

Littlejohn, JOHN, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Penrith, Cumberland Co., Eng., Dec. 7, 1756; emigrated to Maryland about 1767; received a respectable education; was converted in 1774; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1776; located on account of poor health in 1778; removed to Kentucky in 1818; re-entered the Baltimore Conference in 1831, and was the same year transferred to the Kentucky Conference as a superannuate, and died May 13, 1836. He possessed considerable mental power and much eloquence. His piety was deep and fruitful, and his ministrations were weighty and very useful.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 486. (G. L. T.)

Littleton, Adam, D.D., a learned English divine, was born Nov. 8, 1627, at Hales Owen, Shropshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later (1647) at Christ-church, Oxford, where he was ejected by the Parliamentary visitors in 1648. He was afterward usher, and taught as second master at Westminster School (1658). He became rector of Chelsea in 1674, and the same year was made prebendary of Westminster, and received a grant to succeed Dr. Busby in the mastership of that school. He had for some years been the king's chaplain, and in 1670 received his degree in divinity, which was conferred upon him without taking any in arts, on account of his extraordinary merit. He was for some time subdean of Westminster, and in 1687 was transferred to the church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, London, which he held four years. He died June 30, 1694. He was an excellent philologist and grammarian, learned in the Oriental languages and Rabbinical lore. He was the author of a *Latin Dictionary*, long popular, but finally superseded by Ainsworth's. He also published many sermons and other works.—Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.

Littleton, Edward, LL.D., an English divine, was born about the opening of the last century, and was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge, entering the latter in 1716. He early turned his attention to poetry, but he also studied philosophy. In 1720 Mr. Littleton was recalled to Eton as an assistant in the school, and in 1727 was elected a fellow, and presented to the living of Maple Derham in Oxfordshire. He was appointed June 9, 1730, chaplain in ordinary to the king, and died in 1734. He published poems and several discourses. He was an admired preacher and excellent scholar.—*General Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Liturgy (Greek λειτουργία), a function, service, or duty of a public character. These public services or duties among the Greeks were frequently, if not always, connected with religious ideas or ceremonies of some kind, even when the duties themselves were of a secular character—those, for instance, which had reference to the supervision of theatrical exhibitions or the presiding in the public assemblies. The religious meaning of the word in such case was not necessarily involved. In Isa. vii, 30 (Sept.), the idea of religious service predominates; in Rom. xiii, 6, that of the secular, as under God; and again, in Luke i, 23, and in Heb. x, 11, it refers to the priestly function. At a later period we find it used by Eusebius (*Life of Constantine*, iv, 47) in speaking of the work of the Christian ministry. By a very natural process, the word, which thus designated the public function or service performed by the ministry, became restricted in its meaning to the form itself—the form of words in which such service was rendered, and thus, certainly before the middle of the fifth century, we find in the Church, in the present sense of the word liturgies, forms for the conducting of public worship and the administration of sacraments.

I. *Jewish Liturgies.*—This subject has, of course, its connection with the question of a similar state of things under the Jewish dispensation. Were there liturgical forms among the Jews, and, if so, to what extent? We find among the Greeks and Romans certain set forms in connection with their sacrifices, passing, it would seem, from mouth to mouth of successive priestly generations, and a usual form of prayer for the civil magistrate (Döllinger's *Heathenism and Judaism*, i, 221–225); among the sacred books of India, hymns and prayers to be used on stated occasions (Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 297); and in the Roman and in the Mohammedan worship, formulæ of a similar character (Lane's *Mod. Egypt.* i, 120 sq.). How was it in this matter with the Jews? There was, of course, a ritual of form; but was there with it also a form of words? The reading of the law, although enjoined, could hardly be said to meet this demand. There are, however, special forms in the Pentateuch which are liturgical in the stricter sense of that expression. Some of these have reference to possible contingencies, and would therefore be only occasional in their employment. Instances of this class may be found in the formula (Deut. xxi, 19), where complaint should be made to the elders by parents against a rebellious and incorrigible son. Of similar character is the formula (Deut. xxv, 8, 9) connected with the refusal to take the widow of a deceased brother or nearest kinsman, and so perpetuate his name in Israel. Another, again, of the same class, was that appointed to be used by the elders and priests (Deut. xxi, 1–9) of any locality in which the body of a murdered person should be found; and still another, and more of the nature of a stated religious service, was the prescribed declaration and mode of proceeding connected with the going out to battle (Deut. xx, 1–8). These were occasional and contingent. For some of them there might never be the actual usage, as was probably the case with the first—that of the complaint against and the execution of a rebellious son. But there were others of a more stated character, having reference to regularly occurring seasons and ceremonies when they were required to be used. The priestly benediction, repeated, it would seem, upon every special gathering of the people (Numb. vi, 23–27), is an instance of this class. The form of offering of the first-fruits (Deut. xxvi, 1–15) is another: in this latter the person making the offering uses the formula, the priest receiving the offering; and still another is the appointed formula of commination by the tribes at Ebal and Gerizim, the Levites repeating the curse, the whole people following with the solemn amen. Distinct, moreover, from these were certain transactions, in which, without any specified form, the official was required to use certain words. The confession by the high-priest of the sins of the people over the head of the scape-goat is one of these; in any such case, a set form, passing from priestly father to son, not improbably came into use. The liturgical use of the Psalms in the Temple worship was, of course, a matter of much later arrangement. The fiftieth chapter

of Ecclesiasticus describes an exceptional service, and is, moreover, too indefinite in its language to justify any conclusion as to its liturgical character. During this period, however, between the captivity and the times of the New Testament, there comes to view another ecclesiastical development of Judaism which has its connection with this subject—that of the worship of the synagogue. This, which in all probability originated during the captivity, and in the effort to supply the want occasioned by the loss of the worship of the Temple, would in many respects be like that Temple worship; in others, and from the necessity of the case, it would be very different. The greatest of these diversities would be in the fact of the necessary presence of the sacrificial and priestly element in the service of the Temple, their absence in that of the synagogue. In the Temple the Levites sang psalms of praise before the altar, and the priests blessed the people. In the synagogue there were prayers connected with the reading of certain specific passages of Scripture, of which are distinctly discernible two "chief groups, around which, as time wore on, an enormous mass of liturgical poetry clustered—the one, the *Shema* ('Hear, Israel,' etc.), being a collection of the three Biblical pieces (Deut. vi, 4–9; xi, 13–21; Numb. xv, 37–41), expressive of the unity of God and the memory of his government over Israel, strung together without any extraneous addition; the second, the *Tephillah*, or Prayer, by way of eminence (adopted in the Koran as *Salavat*, Sur. ii, 40; comp. v. 15), consisting of a certain number of supplications, with a hymnal introduction and conclusion, and followed by the priestly blessing. The single portions of this prayer gradually increased to eighteen, and the prayer itself received the name *Shemonah Esreh* (eighteen; afterwards, however, increased to nineteen: the additional one is now twelfth in the prayer, and is against apostates [to Christianity] and heretics [all who refused the Talmud], including consequently the Karaites). The first addition to the *Shema* formed the introductory thanksgiving for the renewed day (in accordance with the ordinance that every supplication must be preceded by a prayer of thanks) called *Jozer* (Creator of Light, etc.), to which were joined *the three Holies* (*Ophan*), and the supplication for spiritual enlightening in the divine law (*Ahabah*). Between the Shema and the Tephillah was inserted the *Geulah* (Liberation), or praise for the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the constant watchings of providence. A *Kaddish* (Sanctification or Benediction) and certain psalms seem to have concluded the service of that period. This was the order of the *Shaharith*, or morning prayer, and very similar to this was the *Maarib*, or evening prayer; while in the *Minchah*, or afternoon prayer, the Shema was omitted. On new moons, Sabbath and feast days, the general order was the same as on week days; but since the festive joy was to overrule all individual sorrow and supplication, the intermediate portion of the Tephillah was changed according to the special significance and the memories of the day of the solemnity, and additional prayers were introduced for these extraordinary occasions, corresponding to the additional sacrifice in the Temple, and varying according to the special solemnity of the day (*Mussaph*, *Neïlah*, etc.)" (Chambers). Compare Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 367 sq.; Prideaux, ii, 160–170. It is likewise to be noted that in the Temple worship there were occasions and opportunities in which the individual worshipper might confess the plague of his own heart, make individual supplication, or offer individual thanksgiving. Thus it was at the time of the coming of Christ. The Jewish liturgies since then, under the influence of Rabbinism, and in view of the fact that the synagogue, so far as possible, supplies the absence of the Temple, have been very much enlarged, and extend to numberless particularities. It may, in fact, be said that the whole life of the modern Jew is regulated by Rabbinic forms, that there is a rubric for every moment and movement of social as of individual existence. "The first compilation of a liturgy is recorded of Amram Gaon (A.D. 870–880); the first that has survived is that of Saadja Gaon (d. A.D. 942). These early collections of prayers generally contained also compositions from the hand of the compiler, and minor additions, such as ethical tracts, almanacs, etc., and were called *Siddurim* (Orders, Rituals), embracing the whole calendar year, week-days and new moons, fasts and festivals. Later, the term was restricted to the week-day ritual, that for the festivals being called *Machzor* (Cycle). Besides these, we find the *Selichoth*, or Penitential Prayers; *Kinoth*, or Elegies; *Hoshanahs*, or Hosannahs (for the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles); and *Bakashoth*, or Special Supplications, chiefly for private devotion. The Karaites (q. v.), being harshly treated in these liturgies, especially by Saadja, have distinct compilations. The first of these was made by David ben-Hassan about A.D. 960 (compare Rule, *Karaites*, p. 88, 104 sq., 118, 135 sq., 173 note). The public prayers were for a long time only said by the public reader (*Chasan*, *Sheliach Zibbur*), the people joining in silent responses and amens. These readers by degrees—chiefly from the 10th century—introduced occasional prayers (*Piutim*) of their own, over and above those used of yore. The materials were taken from the Halachah as well as the Haggadah (q. v.); religious doctrine, history, saga, angelology, and mysticism, interspersed with Biblical verses, are thus found put together like a mosaic of the most original and fantastic, often grand and brilliant, and often obscure and feeble kind; and the pure Hebrew in many cases made room for a corrupt Chaldee. We can only point out here the two chief groups of religious poetry—viz. the Arabic on the one hand, and the French-German school on the other. The most eminent representative of the Pajtanic age (ending c. 1100) is Eleazar Biribi Kalir. Among the most celebrated poets in his manner are Meshulam b.-Kalonymos of Lucca, Solomon b.-Jehuda of Babylon, R. Gerson, Elia b.-Menahem of Mans, Benjamin b.-Serach, Jacob Zom Elem, Eliezer b.-Samuel, Kalonymos b.-Moses, Solomon Isaaki. Of exclusively Spanish poets of this period, the most brilliant are Jehuda Halevi, Solomon b.-Gabirol, Josef ibn-Abitur, Isaac ibn-Giat, Abraham Abn-Esra, Moses ben-Nachman, etc. When, however, in the beginning of the 13th century, secret doctrine and philosophy, casuistry and dialectics, became the paramount study, the cultivation of the Piut became neglected, and but few, and for the most part insignificant, are the writers of liturgical pieces from this time downwards" (Chambers). Comp. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, p. 59 sq. These liturgies, adopted by the Jews in different countries, were naturally subject to great variation, not only in their order, but also in their contents. Even in our day there exists the greatest variety imaginable in the synagogues of even one and the same country, due, in a measure, also to the influence of the reformatory movements. See JUDAISM. Particularly worthy of note are the rituals of Germany (Poland), of France, Spain, and Portugal (Sefardim), Italy (Rome), the Levant (Romagna), and even of some special towns, like Avignon, Carpentras, Montpellier. The rituals of Barbary (Algiers, Tripoli, Oran, Morocco, etc.) are of Spanish origin. The Judæo-Chinese liturgy, it may be observed by the way, consists only of pieces from the Bible. Yet, in the main body of their principal prayers, all these liturgies agree. As illustrative of these unessential diversities, we give the prayer of the Shemonah Esreh, which has been added to the number since the destruction of the second Temple, but which now stands as the twelfth, and shows its manifest reference to the followers of the Nazarene: "Let there be no hope to those who apostatize from the true religion; and let heretics, how many soever they be, all perish as in a moment; and let the kingdom of pride be speedily rooted out and broken in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroyest the wicked, and bringest down the

proud" (Prideaux). "Let slanderers have no hope, and all presumptuous apostates perish as in a moment; and may thine enemies, and those who hate thee, be suddenly cut off, and all those who act wickedly be suddenly broken, consumed, and rooted out; and humble thou them speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who destroyest the enemies and humblest the proud" (Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Prayer-book). That in the German and Polish Jews' Prayer-book is more brief, and less pointed in its application to apostates, i. e. Jews converted to Christianity. There are translations and commentaries on them in most of the modern languages. In the orthodox congregations, these forms of prayer, whether for the worship of the synagogue or for domestic and private use, are all appointed to be said in Hebrew. One of the best moves in this direction is the effort within the last century to remedy this evil by parallel translations. In this country the service-books in the synagogues are usually of this kind: either the Hebrew on one page and the English on the other, or both in parallel columns on the same page.

II. *Early Christian Liturgies.*—1. *Their Origin.*—So far as regards the primitive or apostolic age, the only trace of anything of that kind is the Lord's Prayer, and the Amen alluded to in 1 Cor. xiv, 16; this latter an undoubted importation from the synagogue. As, moreover, we find the Master, with the twelve, singing a hymn, one of the psalms probably, on the night of the last supper, it is not improbable that such portions of Old-Testament Scripture, with which the early believers had been already familiar in the synagogue, should have still found favor in the Church. Even in free prayer fragments and sentences of old devotional forms, almost spontaneous through earlier use and sacred association, would naturally find utterance. This, however, would be the exception. Christian prayer, for its own full and peculiar utterance, must find its own peculiar modes of expression; and it would baptize into a new life and meaning any of those familiar expressions, the fragments of an earlier devotion. That men, however, who had been accustomed to liturgical worship under the old system should gradually go into it under the new, is not at all surprising; and to this special inducements before very long were presented. The demand for some form of profession of faith, of a definition of the faith, as dissensions and heresies arose, would be one of these occasions. The form of prayer given by the Master, in its present usage, would become the nucleus of others. The fact, again, that the most solemn act of Christian communion, the Lord's Supper, involved in the distribution of the elements a form of action, and that this action, in its original institution, had been accompanied by words, would have a like influence. That every thing in this respect, if not purely extemporaneous, was exceedingly simple in the time of Justin Martyr, is very manifest from his own writings. The same remark is applicable to the statement of Pliny (*Ep. ad Traj.* in *Ep.* x, 97).

2. *Primitive Type.*—The earliest form in which liturgical arrangement, to any extent, is found, is that which presents itself in the Apostolical Constitutions. The following is the order of *daily service*, as given in these Constitutions: After the morning psalm (the sixty-third of our enumeration), prayers were offered for the several classes of catechumens, of persons possessed by evil spirits, and candidates for baptism, for penitents, and for the faithful or communicants, for the peace of the world, and for the whole state of Christ's Church. This was followed by a short bidding prayer for preservation in the ensuing day, and by the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, and by his imposition of hands or benediction. The morning service was much frequented by people of all sorts. The evening service was much the same with that of the morning, except that Psalm cxl (Psalm cxli of the present enumeration) introduced the service, and that a special collect seems to have been used sometimes at the setting up of the lights. See SERVICE. This work, a fabrication by an unknown author, and taking its present form about the close of the third century, contains internal evidence (see Schaff, *Church History*, i, 441) that much of its material belongs to an earlier date. It may be regarded as affording a type of the liturgical worship in use during the latter part of the ante-Nicene period. Bunsen (*Christianity and Mankind*, vol. ii) has attempted to construct, out of fragments of this and other liturgies, the probable form of worship then prevailing. Krabbe, in his prize essay on this subject, regards the eighth book as of later date than the others. Kurtz, agreeing with Bunsen, substantially finds in this work the earliest extant form of liturgical arrangement, and the type of those of a later period. While, therefore, apocryphal as to its name and claims, yet in the character of its material, in its peculiarity of structure, in the estimation which it enjoyed, and in its influence upon later forms of devotion, it is of great historical significance. Taking it as it comes to our day, the eighth book contains an order of prayer, praise, reading, and sermon, followed by the dismissal successively of the catechumens, the penitents, and the possessed. After this comes the order of the Lord's Supper for the faithful, beginning with intercessory prayer, this followed by collects and responses, the fraternal kiss, warnings against unworthy reception of communion, with suitable hymns, prayers, and doxologies. Much of this material, as already hinted, is probably of a much earlier date than that of its unknown last compiler. The hymn Gloria in Excelsis may have been the same of which Justin and Pliny speak, or an enlargement of it. This liturgy is remarkable, as contrasted with subsequent liturgies, in that it wants the Lord's Prayer. The general spirit and tone pervading all its forms afford grateful indication of the interior Christian life of that period.

3. *Classification.*—This brings us to the particular liturgies which found acceptance and usage in particular communities. One remark in connection with these needs to be made. Whatever may have been the liturgical influences of the synagogue in shaping the worship of the early Church, they had, by this time, been superseded by another of a much more objectionable character, that of the Temple. In other words, the sacerdotal idea of the Christian ministry, and the sacrificial idea of the Lord's Supper, were making themselves felt, not only in the substance, but in the minutiæ of form which the liturgies were assuming. Of these liturgies there is to be made the general division of Eastern and Western.

(*a.*) *Liturgies of the Eastern Churches.*—Chronologically those of the Oriental Church first demand examination. (1.) The earliest, perhaps, is that of Jerusalem or Antioch, ascribed to the apostle James; the first word in it, ὁ ἱερεύς—a word never used by apostolic men in speaking of the Christian ministry—puts the seal of reprobation upon every such claim. The same may be said as to another anachronism, the word ὁμοούσιος applied to the third person of the Trinity. Putting aside, therefore, such claim, as also the stranger notion that the apostle in 1 Cor. ii, 9, quotes from this liturgy rather than that the liturgist quotes from him, we may still recognise in this early form of Christian worship features of peculiar interest. It is still used on St. James's day in some of the islands of the Archipelago, and is the pattern of two others, those of Basil and Chrysostom. Portions of it may have existed at an earlier period, but in its present form it dates from the last half of the fourth century. For the distinction between the orthodox Greek and the Monophysite Syrian forms of this liturgy, see Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. The latter, the Monophysite form, it is to be observed, is still in use, and in both are portions of the material to be found in that of the Apostolical Constitutions.

(2.) The second of these liturgies is that of the Alexandrian Church, called that of St. Mark, but, quite as clearly as that of St. James, betraying its later origin. In this, as in the other two, there may be materials previously existing; but the probabilities indicate Cyril of

Alexandria as the author of it in its present shape. The effort has been made to separate in it the apostolic from the later elements, as is also attempted by Neale with that of St. James. As the object of this effort seems to be to prove the sacerdotal character of apostolic Christianity, so all sacerdotal elements become proof of apostolic authorship. The conclusion is as false as the premise. The special historical interest of this liturgy of St. Mark is its relation to those of the Coptic and Ethiopic churches, of which it forms the main constituent. The remark of Palmer as to its claim to inspired authorship is well worthy of attention. "In my opinion," says he, "this appellation of St. Mark's liturgy began about the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, after Basil had composed his liturgy, which was the first that bore the name of any man. Other churches then gave their liturgies the names of their founders, and so the Alexandrians and Egyptians gave theirs the name of Mark, while they of Jerusalem and Antioch called theirs St. James's, and early in the fifth century it appears that Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, perfected and improved the liturgy of St. Mark, from whence this improved liturgy came to be called by the Monophysites St. Cyril's, and by the orthodox St. Mark's." The peculiarity of this last, in Neale's estimation, is the difference from other liturgies in the position of the great intercession for quick and dead. That such intercession found place in any of them is evidence of their post-apostolic origin.

(3.) The third and last of these liturgies is that of Cæsarea or Byzantium, composed probably by Basil of Cæsarea, and held to have been recast and enlarged by Chrysostom; but more properly, perhaps, both these are to be regarded as elaborations of that of St. James. They, moreover, have historical and moral significance in the fact that, through the Byzantine Church, they have been received into that of Russia, and are used in its patriarchates, each for special occasions, at the present time. Such additions, of course, have been made as have been rendered necessary through peculiarities of Greek worship, and accumulation of ritualistic minutiæ coming into use since these liturgies in their original forms were introduced. They now contain expressions not to be found in the writings of Chrysostom: e. g. the appellation of Mother of God, given to the Virgin Mary, which was not heard of until after the third General Council at Ephesus [A. D. 431]—the body which condemned the doctrines of Nestorius—held 24 years after the death of Chrysostom.

From these Oriental liturgies have sprung others, variously modified to meet doctrinal and other exigencies. The largest number is from that of Jerusalem, the next from that of Basil. The most important is that of the Armenians, Monophysite, those of the Nestorians, and that of Malabar. For discussion as to the special origin of these subordinate forms, and the principles of classification, see Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i; Neale's *Primitive Liturgies*; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, bk. iv, ch. i, sec. 6.

(*b.*) *Liturgies of the Western Church.*—In the West liturgical development went on with less rapidity. (1.) That of the Roman Church, under the influence of the sort of feeling alluded to above in the quotation from Palmer, after it came into use, received the name of Peter, and was traced to his authorship. In point of fact, it probably first assumed definite shape under Leo the Great during the first half of the fifth century, was added to by Gelasius during the latter half of the same century, elaborated again by Gregory the Great not very long after, and through his influence secured its reputation and position. "His Ordo et Canon Missæ, making allowance for the unavoidable changes taking place in it during the centuries intervening, was settled under Pius V, 1570, as the Missale Romanorum. It was revised under Clement VII and Urban VIII, and forms at the present time the liturgical text of Romish worship" (Palmer, in Herzog). The *Liturgy of Milan* seems to have been very much the same as that of Rome prior to the alterations of the latter under Gregory. These differences, at the greatest, were not of an essential character. The question of the independence of the Milanese and the supremacy of the Romans was probably the great issue upon which these differences turned. As nothing less than apostolicity could enable the liturgy of Milan to sustain itself in such a conflict, its origin was traced to Barnabas; and miracles, it was believed, had been wrought for its preservation against the efforts of Gregory and Hadrian to bring it to the form of that of Rome. The severest point of this conflict was doubtless when Charlemagne abolished the Ambrosian Chant throughout the West by the establishment of singing-schools under Roman instructors to teach the Gregorian. The attachment of the people and clergy of Milan, however, to their liturgy could not be overcome, and it is still in their possession. Alexander VI established it expressly as the "Ritus Ambrosianus."

Of even greater interest than the Roman liturgy are the Gallican and the Mozarabic.

(2.) The former of these, the Gallican, claims, and it would seem justly, an antiquity greater than that of Rome. The connection of Gaulish Christianity with that of Asia, whether through the person of Irenæus or by earlier missionaries, would lead to a liturgical development of an independent character. It was displaced by the Roman liturgy during the Carolingian æra, and for a long time was almost lost sight of and forgotten. It does not seem to have been used or appealed to in the various conflicts of prerogative between the French monarchs and the pope, and no allusion to its existence is made in the Pragmatic Sanction. Public attention was again called to it during the controversies of the 16th century. Interest both of a literary and doctrinal character has been exhibited in connection with this liturgy. But there seems to be but little probability of its restoration to use. While unlike in certain specialities, its differences from the Roman liturgy are not essential. Like the others preceding, it has been traced to the hand of an apostle—to the Church at Lyons, through that of Ephesus, from the apostle John! The apex upon which this inverted historical pyramid rests is the single fact, which has been questioned, that Christianity was introduced into Gaul by missionaries from the Church at Ephesus.

(3.) The Mozarabic, that of the Spanish churches under Arabic dominion, has so many resemblances to the Gallic liturgy that it would seem probable they proceeded from the same source. It is described by Isidore Hispalensis in the 6th century. During the Middle Ages, and in the time of the cardinal Ximenes, it received an addition of several rites. As Spanish territory was reconquered from the Moors, and came more fully under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the papacy in other respects, the effort was made, and eventually succeeded, although at times warmly resisted by the people, to displace the Mozarabic, and introduce the Roman liturgy. In the beginning of the 16th century cardinal Ximenes endowed a college and chapel at Toledo for the celebration of the ancient rites, and this is now, perhaps, the only place in Spain where the primitive liturgy of that country and of Gaul is in some degree observed. The old British liturgy, which was displaced by the Gregorian after the decision of Oswy in 664, seems, like the Mozarabic, to have been essentially the same with the Gallican.

(4.) One other liturgical composition of some interest, dating from the close of the 4th century, is that of the Cathari, published by E. Kunitz (Jena, 1852). It is of interest as giving a more favorable view of the community for which it was composed than had been previously entertained. It is to be remembered in connection with all these liturgies of the West, as already remarked of those of the East, that they are the names of many subordinate offshoots in use and prevalence in different portions of the Church. The discretionary

power of the bishops, both at this and at earlier periods, to modify and adapt prevalent liturgies to peculiar exigencies of time and place, naturally produced after a time this kind of diversity. The ecclesiastical confusion of mediæval times, and clerical ignorance and carelessness, would of course increase it. The traces, however, of the parent stock in any such case would not be difficult of recognition.

TABLE SHOWING THE DESCENT OF THE PRINCIPAL LITURGIES NOW USED IN THE CHURCH.


OUR LORD'S WORDS OF INSTITUTION.
Apostolic Nucleus of a Liturgy. [See Lord's Prayer, and Lord's Supper.]
Liturgy of St. James, Antioch, or Jerusalem.
Liturgy of St. Mark, or Alexandria.
Liturgy of St. Peter, or Rome.
Liturgy of St. John, St. Paul, or Ephesus.
Liturgy of St. Basil.
Syriac Liturgy of St. James.
Present Liturgy of Egypt.
Ambrosian Liturgy.
Sacramentary of St. Leo.
Liturgy of Lyons.
Liturgy of St. Chrysostom.
Present Liturgy of Oriental and Russian Church.
[Monophysite Liturgies.]
Present Liturgy of Diocese of Milan.
Sacramentary of Gelasius.
Mozarabic, or Spanish Liturgy.
Liturgy of Britain.
= Liturgy of Tours.
Sacramentary of St. Gregory.
Augustine's revised Liturgy of Britain.
Present Liturgy of Church of Rome.
Salisbury, York, and other Missals of English Church.
Present Liturgy of the English Church.
Liturgy of Scottish Church.
Liturgy of American Church.

4. *Structure of Liturgies.*—The variations of detail which are found in the parent liturgies of the Christian world are all ingrafted on a structural arrangement which they possess in common, much as four buildings might differ in the style and form of their decorations, and yet agree in their plans and elevation, in the position of their several chambers, and in the number of their principal columns.

i. There is invariably a division of the liturgy into three portions—the office of the Prothesis, the Pro-Anaphora, and the Anaphora, the latter being the "Canon" of the Western Church, and the office of the Prothesis being a preparatory part of the service corresponding to the "Præparatio" of the Western Liturgy, and not used at the altar itself. In the Pro-Anaphora the central features are two, viz.: (1) the reading of holy Scripture, and (2) the recitation of the Creed. In the Anaphora they are four, viz.: (1) the Triumphal Hymn, or Trisagion; (2) the formula of Consecration; (3) the Lord's Prayer; and (4) the Communion. These four great acts of praise, benediction, intercession, and communion gather around our Lord's words of institution and his pattern prayer, which form, in reality, the integral germ of the Christian liturgies. They are also associated with other prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings, by which each is expanded and developed, the whole blending into a comprehensive service, by means of which the worship of the Church ascends on the wings of the eucharistic service, and her strength descends in eucharistic grace. The order in which these different portions of the liturgy are combined in the four ancient parent forms is shown by the following table:

COMPARATIVE TABLE, SHOWING THE STRUCTURE OF THE FOUR PARENT LITURGIES OF THE CHURCH.

	ST. JAMES (Palestine).	ST. MARK (Alexandria).	ST. JOHN (Gallican, Mozarabic, and Ephesian).	ST. PETER (Roman).
Pro-Anaphora.	Prefatory Prayer. Introit. The little entrance. Trisagion. *Lections from Old and New Testament.* Prayer. Expulsion of Catechumens. The great entrance. *Nicene Creed.* Kiss of peace. Prayer for all conditions. Sursum corda. *Triumphal Hymn.*	Prefatory prayer. Introit. The little entrance. Trisagion. *Epistle and Gospel.* Prayer after Gospel. Expulsion of Catechumens. The great entrance. Kiss of peace. *Creed.* Sursum corda. Prayer for Church militant. Prayer for the departed. *Triumphal Hymn.*	Prefatory prayer. Introit. Gloria in excelsis. *Epistle and Gospel.* Oblation of elements. *Nicene Creed.* Expulsion of Catechumens. Prayer for the Church. *Triumphal Hymn.* Prayer for quick and dead. Kiss of peace.	Prefatory prayer. Introit. Gloria in excelsis. *Epistle and Gospel.* *Nicene Creed.* Oblation of elements. Sursum corda. *Triumphal Hymn.* Commemoration of living ("Te igitur"). *Words of Institution.* Oblation. Commemoration of dead. Union of consecrated elements. Elevation.
Anaphora.	*Commemoration of Institution.* Oblation. Invocation. Prayer for quick and dead. *Lord's Prayer.* Embolismus. Union of consecrated elements. Elevation. Fraction. *Communion.* Thanksgiving. Dismissal with pax.	*Commemoration of Institution.* Oblation. Invocation. Union of consecrated elements. Prayer. *Lord's Prayer.* Embolismus. Prayer of intense adoration. Fraction. Confession. *Communion.* Thanksgiving. Dismissal with blessing.	*Commemoration of Institution.* Elevation and fraction of host into nine parts. Invocation. *Lord's Prayer.* Embolismus. Union of consecrated elements. *Communion.* Prayer. Dismissal by the deacons' declaration, "The mysteries are complete."	Canon. *Lord's Prayer.* Embolismus. *Communion.* Thanksgiving. Dismissal with blessing.

ii. There is also, in the second place, a substantial agreement among all the four great parent liturgies as to the formula of consecration (see Consecration; and comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* p. 425–426).

iii. Another point in which the four parent liturgies of the Church uniformly agree is in the well-defined sacerdotal character of their language. This is sufficiently illustrated by the preceding comparative view.

iv. The intercessory character of the primitive liturgies is also a very conspicuous feature common to them all. The holy Eucharist is uniformly set forth and used in them as a service offered up to God for the benefit of all classes of Christians, living and departed. "Then," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service upon that altar of propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of

the Church; for the tranquillity of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted; and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succor we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice. Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that at their prayers and intervention God would receive our petition. Afterward also on behalf of the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before us; and, in a word, of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up while that holy and most awful sacrifice is presented" (*Catech. Lect.* xxiii, 9, 10). St. Cyril was speaking thus in Jerusalem, where the liturgy used was that of St. James, and in that liturgy we find a noble intercession exactly answering to the description there given (Neale's *Translation*, p. 52; Blunt's *Annot. Book of Com. Prayer*, p. 156). A similar intercession is to be found in the other liturgies, and it is evident that its use was one of the first principles of the Church of that day.

III. *Modern Greek and Eastern Liturgies.*—Three liturgies are in use in the modern Greek or Constantinopolitan Church, viz., those of Basil and of Chrysostom, and the liturgy of the Presanctified. The liturgy bearing the name of Basil is used by the Constantinopolitan Church ten times in the year, viz., on the eve of Christmas Day; on the festival of St. Basil; on the eve of the Feast of Lights, or the Epiphany; on the several Sundays in Lent, except the Sunday before Easter; on the festival of the Virgin Mary; and on Good Friday, and the following day, which is sometimes termed the great Sabbath. The liturgy ascribed to Chrysostom is read on all those days in the year on which the liturgies of Basil and of the Presanctified are not used. The liturgy of the Presanctified is an office for the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent, with the elements which had been consecrated on the preceding Sunday. The date of this liturgy is not known, some authors ascribing it to Gregory Thaumaturgus in the third century, while others ascribe it to Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, in the eighth century. These liturgies are used in all those Greek churches which are subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, and in those countries which were originally converted by Greeks, as in Russia, Georgia, Mingrelia, and by the Melchite patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (King's *Rites of the Greek Church*, p. 131-134; Richard et Giraud's *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, xv, 222-224). The Coptic Jacobites, or Christians in Egypt, make use of the *Liturgy of Alexandria*, which formerly was called indifferently the *Liturgy of St. Mark*, the reputed founder of the Christian Church at Alexandria, or the *Liturgy of St. Cyril*, who caused it to be committed to writing. The Egyptians had twelve liturgies, which are still preserved among the Abyssinians; but the patriarchs commanded that the Egyptian churches should use only three, viz., those of Basil, of Gregory the Theologian, and of Cyril. The earliest liturgies of the Church of Alexandria were written in Greek, which was the vernacular language, until the fourth and fifth centuries; since that time they have been translated into the Coptic and Arabic languages. The Abyssinians or Ethiopians receive the twelve liturgies which were formerly in use among the Coptic Jacobites: they are commonly found in the following order, viz., 1. The liturgy of St. John the Evangelist. 2. That of the three hundred and eighteen fathers present at the Council of Nice. 3. That of Epiphanius. 4. That of St. James of Sarug or Syrug. 5. That of St. John Chrysostom. 6. That of Jesus Christ. 7. That of the Apostles. 8. That of St. Cyriac. 9. That of St. Gregory. 10. That of their patriarch Dioscurus. 11. That of St. Basil. 12. That of St. Cyril. The Armenians who were converted to Christianity by Gregory, surnamed the Illuminator, have only one liturgy, which is supposed to be that of the Church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in which city Gregory received his instruction. This liturgy is used on every occasion, even at funerals. The Syrian Catholics and Jacobites have numerous liturgies, bearing the names of St. James, St. Peter, St. John the Evangelist, St. Mark, St. Dionysius, bishop of Athens, St. Xystus, bishop of Rome, of the Twelve Apostles, of St. Ignatius, of St. Julius, bishop of Rome, of St. Eustathius, of St. Chrysostom, of St. Maruthas, etc. Of these, the liturgy of St. James is most highly esteemed, and is the standard to which are referred all the others, which are chiefly used on the festivals of the saints whose names they bear. The Maronites, who inhabit Mount Lebanon, make use of a missal printed at Rome in 1594 in the Chaldeo-Syriac language: it contains thirteen liturgies under the names of St. Xystus, St. John Chrysostom, St. John the Evangelist, St. Peter, St. Dionysius, St. Cyril, St. Matthew, St. John the Patriarch, St. Eustathius, St. Maruthas, St. James the Apostle, St. Mark the Evangelist, and a second liturgy of St. Peter. The Nestorians have three liturgies—that of the Twelve Apostles, that of Theodorus, surnamed the Interpreter, and a third under the name of Nestorius. The Indian Christians of St. Thomas are said to make use of the Nestorian liturgies (Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, xv, 221-227).

IV. *Liturgies of the Church of Rome.*—There are various liturgical books in use in the modern Church of Rome, the greater part of which are common and general to all the members in communion with that Church, while others are permitted to be used only in particular places or by particular monastic orders.

1. The *Breviary* (Latin *breviarium*) is the book containing the daily service of the Church of Rome. It is frequently, but erroneously, confounded with *Missal* and *Ritual*. The Breviary contains the matins, lauds, etc., with the several variations to be made therein, according to the several days, canonical hours, and the like. It is general, and may be used in every place; but on the model of this have been formed various others, specially appropriated to different religious orders, such as those of the Benedictines, Carthusians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and other monastic orders. The difference between these books and that which is by way of eminence designated the *Roman Breviary*, consists chiefly in the number and order of the psalms, hymns, ave-marias, pater-nosters, misereres, etc., etc. Originally the Breviary contained only the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms which were used in the divine offices. To these were subsequently added lessons out of the Scriptures, according to the institutes of the monks, in order to diversify the service of the Church. In the progress of time the legendary lives of the saints, replete with ill-attested facts, were inserted, in compliance with the opinions and superstition of the times. This gave occasion to many revisions and reformations of the Roman Breviary by the councils, particularly of Trent and Cologne, and also by several popes, as Gregory IX, Nicholas III, Pius V, Clement VIII, and Urban VIII; as likewise by some cardinals, especially cardinal Quignon, by whom various extravagances were removed, and the work was brought nearer to the simplicity of the primitive offices. In its present state the Breviary of the Church of Rome consists of the services of matins, lauds, prime, third, sixth, nones, vespers, complines, or the *post-communion*, that is of seven hours, on account of the saying of David, *Septies in die laudem dixi*—"Seven times a day do I praise thee" (Psa. cxix, 164). The obligation of reading this service-book every day, which at first was universal, was by degrees reduced to the beneficiary clergy alone, who are bound to do it on pain of being guilty of mortal sin, and of refunding their revenues in proportion to their delinquencies in discharging this duty. The Roman Breviary is recited in the Latin language throughout the Romish Church, except among the Maronites in Syria, the Armenians, and some other Oriental Christians in communion with that Church, who rehearse it in their vernacular dialects.

2. The *Missal*, or volume employed in celebrating

mass. According to a tradition generally believed by members of the Romish Church, this liturgy owes its origin to St. Peter. The canon of the mass was committed to writing about the middle of the fifth century. Various additions were subsequently made, especially by Gregory the Great, who reduced the whole into better order. This Missal is in general use throughout the Romish Church. See MASS.

3. The *Ceremoniale* contains the various offices peculiar to the pope. It is divided into three books, the first of which treats of the election, consecration, benediction, and coronation of the pope, the canonization of saints, creation of cardinals, the form and manner of holding a council, and the funeral ceremonies on the death of a pope or of a cardinal, besides various public ceremonies to be performed by the pope as a sovereign prince. The second book prescribes what divine offices are to be celebrated by the pope, and on what days; and the third discusses the reverence which is to be shown to popes, cardinals, bishops, and other persons performing sacred duties; the vestments and ornaments of the popes and cardinals when celebrating divine service; the order in which they are severally to be seated in the papal chapel; incensing the altar, etc. The compiler of this liturgical work is not known.

4. The *Pontificale* describes the various functions which are peculiar to bishops in the Romish Church, such as the conferring of ecclesiastical orders; the pronouncing of benedictions on abbots, abbesses, and nuns; the coronation of sovereigns; the form and manner of consecrating churches, burial-grounds, and the various vessels used in divine service; the public expulsion of penitents from the Church, and reconciling them; the mode of holding a synod; suspending, reconciling, dispensing, deposing, and degrading priests, and of restoring them again to orders; the manner of excommunicating and absolving, etc., etc.

5. The *Rituale* treats of all those functions which are to be performed by simple priests or the inferior clergy, both in the public service of the Church, and also in the exercise of their private pastoral duties. The *Pastorale* corresponds with the *Rituale*, and seems to be only another name for the same book.

V. *Continental Reformed or Protestant Liturgies.*—At the time of the Reformation there were, of necessity, great changes in the matter of public worship. The liturgies in use at its commencement included the prevalent doctrinal system, especially as connected with the Lord's Supper; and very soon changes were made having in view the repudiation of Romish error, and the adaptation of reformed worship to the restored system of scriptural doctrine. The old forms, moreover, had there been no objection to them doctrinally, were liable to the practical objection that they were locked up from popular use in a dead language. The Reformation, to a very great degree, had opened the ears of the people to the intelligent hearing and reception of Christian doctrine. Its task now was to open their mouths to the intelligent utterance of supplication — in other words, to provide forms of worship in the vernacular. This was done very largely by selection and translation from old forms, and, as was necessary, by the preparation of new material. With the English and Lutheran Reformers, the object seems to have been to make as few changes in existing forms as possible. Doubtful expressions, which admitted of a Protestant interpretation, but which, for their own merits, would never have been selected, were thus retained. It is to be said for the Reformers that they seem to have acted in view of the existing circumstances of the communities by which they were surrounded, and from one of them, the most eminent of all, Luther, we have the distinct disavowal of all wish and expectation that his work, in this respect, should be imposed upon other churches or continued in his own any longer than it was found for edification.

a. Lutheran Liturgies.—As first among the Reformers we notice these liturgical works of Luther. Different offices were prepared by him, as needed by the churches under his influence, the earliest in 1523, the latest in 1534. These were afterwards collected in a volume, and became a model for others. In his "Order of Service" provision is made for daily worship in a service for morning and evening, and a third might be held if desirable. These services consist of reading the Scriptures, preaching or expounding, with psalms and responsoria, with the addition, for Sundays, of mass or communion. He dwells earnestly, however, upon the idea, already mentioned, that these forms are not to be considered binding otherwise than in their appropriate times and localities. These views and this action of Luther were responded to by similar action on the part of the churches which through him had received the doctrines of the Reformation. These drew up liturgies for themselves, some of them bearing a close resemblance to that of Wittemberg, others differing from it widely; the differences, in one direction, being conditioned by the Zwinglian or Calvinistic element, in the opposite by the Romish. These, in particular localities, have been changed at different times as circumstances seemed to require. No one Lutheran form has ever been accepted as obligatory upon all Lutheran churches, as is the case with the liturgy of the Church of England in all its dependencies; although it is claimed that there is essential unity—an essential unity of life and spirit in all these unessential diversities as to outward form of particular states and churches. The tendency of the Rationalism of the last century was to neglect, to depreciate, and to mutilate the old liturgies, and then to procure changes which would substitute others in their stead. From this, and in connection with another movement, has followed a healthful reaction. This reaction may be seen in its effects upon the two great classes into which Lutheran Germany is now divided. It has controlled to a very great degree the efforts of the Unionists, has given form to the Union liturgy, and it is leading those who are opposed to this movement to a more careful study and diligent use of the older liturgies. The object of this new liturgy, that of the king of Prussia, first published in 1822, revised once or twice since then, is to unite the worship of the members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in the Prussian dominions. The excitement connected with this movement, in the way of attack and defence, has given a deeper and wider interest to all liturgical questions—an interest deeply felt by the Lutheran churches of this country. Here, where the use of such forms is optional, the number of congregations returning to such use is on the increase. See LUTHERANISM.

In Sweden, which, although Lutheran, retains the episcopate, and may seem to demand a more special notice, there was published in 1811 a new, revised edition of the Liturgy, prepared at the time of the Reformation. This is divided into chapters, and contains the usual parts of a Church service, with forms for baptism, marriage, etc. In Denmark there is also a regularly constituted liturgy, of Bugenhagen's, which, besides morning and evening service for Sundays, contains three services for each of the three great festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

b. Moravian Liturgy. — The liturgy of the Moravians, as recipients, through their great leader, of the Augsburg Confession, is not without its interest in this connection. It was first published in 1632. That which has been adopted by the renewed Moravian Church is mainly the work of count Zinzendorf, who compiled it chiefly from the services of the Greek and Latin churches, but who also availed himself of the valuable labors of Luther and of the English Reformers. The United Brethren at present make use of a Church litany, introduced into the morning service of every Sunday; a litany for the morning of Easter-day, containing a short but comprehensive confession of faith; two offices for the baptism of adults, and two for the baptism of children; two litanies at burials; and offices for confirma-

tion, the holy communion, and for ordination; the *Te Deum*, and doxologies adapted to various occasions. All these liturgical forms in use in England are comprised in the new and revised edition of the *Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren* (London, 1849). Other services peculiar to this Church, which are called "liturgies," consist mainly of a choral, with musical responsoria as a litany. This litany is for Sundays. There is a short prayer of betrothal, a baptismal office, also a form on Easter, used in the church-yards, of expressing their confidence in regard to the brethren departed of the year preceding. The daily service, which is in the evening, is a simple prayer-meeting. In this, as in the Sunday service, the prayers and exhortations are extemporaneous.

c. Calvinistic Liturgies. — The liturgy of Calvin, which, like that of Luther, constitutes the type of a class, differs from this latter in two important respects—the absence of responsive portions, and the discretion conferred upon the officiator in the performance of public worship. This discretion seems to have been limited, however, to the use of one form of prayer rather than another, given in the Directory. These prayers were read by the pastor from the pulpit. The service began with a general confession, was followed by a psalm, prayer again, sermon, prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and benediction. Two additional prayers were provided for occasions of communion, one coming before, the other after; also a very long one of deprecation in times of war, calamity, etc. For the administration of the Lord's Supper there is an exhortation as to its intent—"fencing the tables," as it is called in Scotland. This is followed by the distribution of the elements, with psalms and passages of Scripture appropriate to the occasion. The offices of baptism and marriage are simple, but not discretionary as to their form. In accordance with what seems to be the peculiar Genevan characteristic, they are not wanting in length.

The present liturgy of Geneva is a development of that of Calvin, with certain modifications. It has no responses. Several additional prayers have been added. A distinct service for each day in the week is provided, also for the principal festivals, and for certain special occasions. So also as to the churches in sympathy with the system of Calvin. They have liturgies similar to that of Geneva, although not identical. Such is the case with the churches of Holland and Neufchatel, and the Reformed churches of France. A new edition of the old French Liturgy of 1562 was published in 1826, with additional forms for special occasions. The liturgy of the Church of Scotland is in some respects different. It was drawn up at Frankfort by Knox and others, after the model of Calvin's, and was first used by Knox in a congregation of English exiles at Geneva. It was afterwards introduced by him into Scotland; its use enjoined in 1564, and such usage was continued until after his death. An edition of this liturgy was published in 1841 by Dr. Cumming. It differs from that of Calvin in that it more clearly leaves to the minister officiating to decide whether he shall use any form of prayer given or one of his own compositions extemporaneously or otherwise. It begins with the confession, as in Calvin's, and with the same form. This is followed by a psalm, by prayer, the sermon, prayer, psalm, and benediction. The book contains various offices and alternate forms; among other things, an order of excommunication, and a treatise on fasting, with a form of prayer for private houses, and grace before and after meals. The new book of Scotland of 1644 may be regarded as a modification of those of Knox and Calvin. In the Directory of the Westminster Assembly the discretionary power is greatly enlarged. Scriptural lessons are to be read in regular course, the quantity at the discretion of the minister, with liberty, if he see fit, of expounding. Heads of prayer in that before the sermon are prescribed, and rules for the arrangement of the sermon. The Lord's Prayer is recommended as the most perfect form of devotion. Private and lay baptism are forbidden. The arrangement of the Lord's table is to be such that communicants may sit about it, and the dead are to be buried without prayer or religious ceremony.

d. Intermediate between these two great families of liturgies, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, are those of the other Reformed churches on the Continent. It may be said, in general, that the German-speaking portion of these churches approach and partake of the Lutheran spirit and forms, and the Swiss of the Calvinistic, though there are individual exceptions. In 1523, the same year with Luther's work already mentioned, Zwingle and Leo Judah published at Zurich offices for baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, common prayer, and burial. This was followed by a more complete work in 1525, and subsequently by others. Similar works were published at Berne, Schaffhausen, and Basle at a later period. The peculiarity of these, according to Ebrard, quoted in Herzog, "is the liturgical character in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which they compare favorably with the Calvinistic liturgies; also the custom of announcing the dead, and the special prayers for the festivals." The liturgical issues which during this century have agitated the Lutheran Church have extended to those of the Reformed, not, however, to the same extent, nor with results of such decided character.

VI. *Liturgies in the English Language.*—Previous to the introduction of the Reformation on Anglican ground, the public service of the English churches was, like that of other Western churches, performed in the Latin language. But, though the language was universally Latin, the liturgy itself varied greatly in the different parts of the kingdom. The dioceses of Bangor, Hereford, Lincoln, Sarum, York, and other churches, used liturgies which were commonly designated by the "Uses," and of these the most celebrated were the Breviary and Missal, etc., *secundum usum Sarum*, compiled by Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, about the year 1080, and reputed to be executed with such exactness according to the rules of the Romish Church that they were also employed in divine service in many churches on the Continent. They consisted of prayers and offices, some of which had been transmitted from very ancient times, and others were of later origin, accommodated to the Romish religion. Compare Maskell, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the Uses of Sarum, Bangor, York, Hereford, and the Modern Roman Liturgy* (London, 1844, 8vo). Also by the same, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; or, Occasional Offices of the Church of England, according to the Ancient Use of Salisbury; the Prymer in English, and other Prayers and Forms* (London, 1846, 3 vols. 8vo).

The first attempt in England to introduce the vernacular was made in 1536, when, in pursuance of Henry VIII's injunctions, the Bible, Pater-noster, Creed, and Decalogue were set forth and placed in churches, to be read in English. In 1545 the *King's Primer* was published, containing a form of morning and evening prayer in English, besides the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, the Seven Penitential Psalms, Litany, and other devotions, and in 1547, on the accession of Edward VI, archbishop Cranmer, bishop Ridley, and eleven other eminent divines, martyrs, and confessors, were commissioned to draw up a liturgy in the English language "free from those unfounded doctrines and superstitious ceremonies which had disgraced the Latin liturgies;" and this was ratified by act of Parliament in 1548, and published in 1549. This liturgy is commonly known and cited as the *First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* In the great body of their work Cranmer and his associates derived their materials from the earlier services which had been in use in England; "but in the occasional offices they were indebted to the labors of Melancthon and Bucer, and through them to the older liturgy of Nuremberg, which those reformers were instructed to follow" (Dr. Cardwell's *Two Books of Common Prayer, set*

forth . . . in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, compared, p. xiv, Oxford, 1838). In consequence, however, of exceptions being taken at some things in this book, which were thought to savor too much of superstition, it underwent another revision, and was further altered in 1551, when it was again confirmed by Parliament. This edition is usually cited as the *Second Prayer-book of Edward VI.*: it is very nearly the same with that which is at present in use. *The two Liturgies*, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552, *with other Documents, set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI*, were very carefully edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. Joseph Ketley, M.A., at the Cambridge University Press, in 1844, in octavo. The two acts of Parliament (2 and 3 Edward VI, c. 1, and 5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 1) which had been passed for establishing uniformity of divine service were repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, who restored the Latin liturgies according to the popish forms of worship. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, the Prayer-book was restored, and has been in use ever since. For the later history of the subject, including liturgical books in England, Scotland, and America, see COMMON PRAYER.

Among the curiosities of the subject we notice the following:

(*a.*) *Liturgy of the Primitive Episcopal Church.*—"*The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Primitive Episcopal Church, revived in England in the Year of our Redemption One thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David*," though bearing the imprint of London, was printed at Liverpool, but was never published. It was edited by the Rev. George Montgomery West, M.A., a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state and diocese of Ohio, in North America. This volume is of great rarity, not more than five or six copies being found in the libraries of the curious in ecclesiastical matters. The liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the basis of this edition, excepting two or three alterations in the office for the ministration of baptism, and a few verbal alterations to fit it for use in England and in Ireland. "The Primitive Episcopal Church, revived in England in 1831," had a short existence of little more than twelve months.

(*b.*) *Deistical Liturgy.*—In 1752 a liturgy was published in Liverpool by some of the Presbyterians, as Antitrinitarians are often called in England, but Christ's name is hardly mentioned in it, and the third part of the Godhead is not at all recognised in it. It is known also by the name of "Liverpool Liturgy." In 1776 was published "*A Liturgy on the universal Principles of Religion and Morality:*" it was compiled by David Williams, with the chimerical design of uniting all parties and persuasions in one comprehensive form. This liturgy is composed in imitation of the *Book of Common Prayer*, with responses celebrating the divine perfections and works, with thanksgivings, confessions, and supplications. The principal part of three of the hymns for morning and evening service is selected from the works of Milton and Thomson, though considerable use is made of the language of the Scriptures (see Orton, *Letters*, i, 80 sq.; Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of the Dissenters*, iii, 342).

VII. *Literature.*—Of bibliographical treatises on the literature of liturgy we may name Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis* (Rome, 1776–8, 4 vols. 4to); Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques* (Paris, 1840-51); Kœcher, *Bibliotheca Liturgica*, etc., p. 699-866; *Liturgies and other Documents of the Ante-Nicene Period* (Ante-Nicene Library, Edinb. 1872, 8vo). Special works of note on the subject of liturgy are: J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον, sive Rituale Græcorum*, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Par. 1647; Venice, 1740); Jos. Aloys. Assemani (R. C.), *Codex Liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ . . . . in quo continentur libri rituales, missales, pontificales, officia, dypticha, etc., ecclesiarum Occidentis et Orientis* (published under the auspices of pope Boniface XIV, Rome, 1749–66, 13 vols.); Euseb. Renaudot (R. C.), *Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio* (Paris, 1716; reprinted in 1847, 2 vols.); L. A. Muratori (R. C.), *Liturgia Romana vetus* (Venet. 1748, 2 vols.), contains the three Roman sacramentaires of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory I, also the Missale Gothicum, and a learned introductory dissertation—*De rebus liturgicis;* W. Palmer (Anglican), *Origines Liturgicæ* (Lond. 1832 and 1845, 2 vols. 8vo) [with special reference to the Anglican liturgy]; Thos. Brett, *Collection of the Principal Liturgies used in the Christian Church in the celebration of the Eucharist, particularly the ancient* (translated into English), *with a Dissertation upon them* (London, 1838); W. Trollope (Anglican), *The Greek Liturgy of St. James* (Edinb. 1848); Daniel (Lutheran, the most learned German liturgist), *Codex Liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ in epitomem redactus* (Lips. 1847 sq., 4 vols.; vol. i contains the Roman, vol. iv the Oriental liturgies); Fr. J. Mone (R. C.), *Lateinische u. Griechische Messen aus dem 2ten bis 6ten Jahrhundert* (Frankf. a. M. 1850), contains valuable treatises on the Gallican, African, and Roman Mass; J. M. Neale (Anglican, the most learned English ritualist and liturgist), *Tetralogia liturgica; sive St. Chrysostom, St. Jacobi, St. Marci divinæ missæ: quibus accedit ordo Mozarabicus* (Lond. 1849); the same, *The Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, or according to the Use of the Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople* (Lond. 1859, folio, in the Greek original; and the same liturgies in an English translation, with an introduction and appendices, also at London, 1859); the same, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Ch.* (Lond. 1850–72, 5 vols. 8vo; Gen. Introd. vol. ii); the same, *Essays on Liturgiology and Ch. History* (Lond. 1863) [this work, dedicated to the metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, is a collection of various learned treatises of the author from the *Christian Remembrancer*, on the Roman and Gallican Breviary, the Church Collects, the Mozarabic and Ambrosian liturgies, liturgical quotations, etc.]; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten d. Christ.-Kathol. Kirche*, Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service* (Oxf. 1855, 8vo, enlarged in 1863); Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, etc. (1865); Etheridge, *Syrian Ch.* p. 188 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, p. 284 sq.; and his *Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism* (Phila. 1869, 12mo), p. 275 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 396 sq., 602 sq.; Siegel, *Handb. d. Christl. Kirchl. Alterthümer*, iii, 202 sq., Augusti, *Handb. d. Christl. Archæol.* i, 191 sq.; ii, 537 sq.; iii, 704 sq., 714 sq.; Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. and Doctr. Theol.* s. v., and Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind* (Lond. 1854), vol. vii, which contains *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ* (the Irvingite work); *Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church* (London, 1848–54); Höfling, *Liturgisches Urkundenbuch* (Leipz. 1854); Hefele (C. Jos.), *Beitr. zu Kirchengesch. Archäol. u. Liturgik* (Tüb. 1864), vol. ii; Döllinger, *Heathenism and Judaism;* Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, § 100; *Edinb. Review*, 1852 (April): *The Round Table*, 1867 (August 10); *New Englander*, 1861 (July), art. vi; *Mercersburg Review*, 1871 (January), art. v; *Brit. and For. Miss. Rev.* 1857 (July). (C. W.)

Liutprand. See LUITPRAND.

Liver (כָּבֵד, *kâbêd'*, so called as being the *heaviest* of the viscera) occurs in Exod. xxix, 13, 22; Lev. iii, 4, 10, 15; iv, 9; vii, 4; viii, 16, 25; ix, 10, 19; Prov. vii, 23; Lam. ii, 11; Ezek. xxi, 21. In the Pentateuch it forms part of the phrase translated in the Authorized Version "the caul that is above the liver," but which Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 645, 646), reasoning from the root, understands to be the great lobe of the liver itself rather than the caul over it, which latter, he observes, is inconsiderable in size, and has but little fat. Jahn thinks the smaller lobe to be meant. The phrase is also rendered in the Sept. "the lobe or lower pendent of the liver," the chief object of attention in the art of hepatoscopy, or divination by the liver, among the ancients. (Jerome gives "the net of the liver," "the suet," and "the fat;"

see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 498.) See CAUL. It appears from the same passages that it was burnt upon the altar, and not eaten as sacrificial food (Jahn, *Bibl. Archæol.* § 378, n. 7). The liver was supposed by the ancient Greeks and Romans to be the seat of the passions —pride, love, etc. (see Anacreon, *Ode* iii, fin.; Theocritus, *Idyll.* xi, 16; Horace, *Carm.* i, 13, 4; 25, 15; iv, 1, 12; and the Notes of the Delphin edition. Comp. also Persius, *Sat.* v, 129; Juvenal, *Sat.* v, 647). Some have argued that the same symbol prevailed among the Jews (rendering כָּבֵד, in Gen. xlix, 6, "my *liver*," instead of "my honor," Sept. *τὰ ἥπατα*; compare the Hebrew of Psa. xvi, 9; lvii, 9; cviii, 2), but Gesenius (*Hebr. Lex.* s. v. כָּבוֹד) denies this signification in those passages. Wounds in the liver were supposed to be mortal; thus the expression in Prov. vii, 23, "a dart through his liver," and Lam. ii, 11, "my liver is poured out upon the earth," are each of them a periphrasis for death itself. Æschylus uses a similar phrase to describe a mortal wound (*Agamemnon*, l. 442). See HEART.

The passage in Ezekiel (xxi, 21) contains an interesting reference to the most ancient of all modes of divination, by the inspection of the viscera of animals, and even of mankind, sacrificially slaughtered for the purpose. It is there said that the king of Babylon, among other modes of divination referred to in the same verse, "looked upon the liver." The liver was always considered the most important organ in the ancient art of *Extispicium*, or divination by the entrails. Philostratus felicitously describes it as "the prophesying tripod of all divination" (*Life of Apollonius*, viii, 7, 5). The rules by which the Greeks and Romans judged of it are amply detailed in Adams's *Roman Antiquities*, p. 261 sq. (Lond. 1834), and in Potter's *Archæologia Græca*, i, 316 (Lond. 1775). Vitruvius suggests a plausible theory of the first rise of *hepatoscopy*. He says the ancients inspected the livers of those animals which frequented the places where they wished to settle, and if they found the liver, to which they chiefly ascribed the process of sanguification, was injured, they concluded that the water and nourishment collected in such localities were unwholesome (i, 4). But divination is coeval and coextensive with a belief in the divinity. Cicero ascribes divination by this and other means to what he calls "the heroic ages," by which term we know he means a period antecedent to all historical documents (*De Divinatione*). Prometheus, in the play of that title (i, 474 sq.), lays claim to having taught mankind the different kinds of divination, and that of *extispicy* among the rest; and Prometheus, according to Servius (*ad Virg. Ecl.* vi, 42), instructed the Assyrians; and we know from sacred record that Assyria was one of the countries first peopled. It is further important to remark that the first recorded instance of divination is that of the teraphim of Laban, a native of Padan-Aram, a district bordering on that country (1 Sam. xix, 13, 16), but by which teraphim both the Sept. and Josephus understood "the *liver* of goats" (*Ant.* vi, 11, 4). See TERAPHIM. See generally Whiston's *Josephus*, p. 169, note (Edinb. 1828); Bochart, i, 41, *De Caprarum Nominibus; Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, s. v. Divination; Rosenmüller's *Scholia* on the several passages referred to; Perizonius, *ad Ælian.* ii, 31; Peucer, *De Præcipuis Divinationum Generibus*, etc. (Wittemberg, 1560). See DIVINATION.

Liverpool Liturgy. See LITURGY.

Living Creatures. These, as presented in Ezek. i–x, and Rev. iv sq., are identical with the cherubim. Besides the general resemblance in form, position, and service, we have, Ezek. x, 20: "I knew that they were the cherubim." Ezekiel, being a priest, was familiar with these symbolical forms. The *living ones* present some variations from the cherubim, but not greater than appear in the cherubim themselves. The discussion of their forms and probable uses has already been given, and is not here resumed. See CHERUB. They are taken up here to give a more careful attention to their *symbolical* utility. The importance of these symbols is manifest, 1, in the very minute description of them; 2, in the fact that they do in some way pervade the entire period of grace, from the expulsion of Adam till, in the apocalyptic vision, we arrive at the gates of the city, having a right to the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God—such a right as man in innocence never attained. They were placed first at the front of the garden of Eden; renewed in the tabernacle; extended in the Temple; resumed in the visions of Ezekiel; incorporated in the book of Psalms; and in the prospective history of Revelation they are left with us till the end of the world. The seraphim of Isaiah (ch. vi) appear in all respects to be the same; though differing in name and in position, they perform the same service. Even the idolatrous images, the teraphim, were probably an unwarranted and superstitious imitation of the figures at the east of Eden. True, there are periods when they are under a cloud, e. g. from the Deluge till the erecting of the tabernacle; still, we dare not say they were extinct, for before the tabernacle was built in the wilderness we read of another, called the tabernacle of the congregation (Exod. xxxiii, 7–11). There is much mystery about them, and many mistakes occur among expositors in relation to them. 1. They are not angels, nor do they represent the peculiar ministry of angels. (*a*) The Scriptures know no such orders as angels, archangels, cherubim, and seraphim; the orders of angelic nature are described as thrones, dominions, principalities, powers (Col. i, 16). (*b*) Angelic power would have been a very ineffectual agency for offsetting the sword of flame, and was not needed to wield that sword which turns on its own axis. (*c*) The living ones are distinguished from angels in Rev. xv, 7. (*d*) They join the elders in the new song, "Hast redeemed *us* to God by thy blood," etc. (Rev. v, 9). (*e*) Angels take but a small part in the direct administration of grace; they rather point the inquirer, and furnish assistance to the administrator (Acts x, 3; Rev. i, 1; 1 Chron. xxi, 18; Acts xii, 7). 2. Nothing vindictive or judicial belongs to them. (*a*) There is no need of such power; the sword and the fire imbody the whole power of justice. (*b*) We never find them *executing* judgment, though they concur in it when executed. (*c*) They warn of danger from divine justice (Isa. vi, 3–5). (*d*) They call attention to justice (Rev. vi, 1, 3, 5, 7). (*e*) They deliver the commission to those who execute it (Ezek. x, 2, 7; Rev. xv, 7). (*f*) They join in celebrating the triumph over the victims of judgment (Rev. xix, 4). Very different is their function in the administration of grace; there they make application of the remedy to the very spot (Isa. vi, 6, 7). 3. They are not devoid of human sympathy. (*a*) They have the face of a man. (*b*) They have the hands of a man under their wings (Ezek. i, 8). (*c*) When the prophet was alarmed ("undone"), one of them brought him instant relief—just such relief as he felt in need of. (*d*) The throne which they bear has a man above upon it (Ezek. i, 26). (*e*) In Rev. iv, 6, we find them in the midst of the same throne, and round about it. (*f*) They associate with the elders in sympathy with the one hundred and forty-four thousand who sing the new song (Rev. xiv, 3), and with the Church in celebrating the overthrow of her enemies (Rev. xix, 4). They thus abound in the sympathies of a redeemed humanity.

(I.) In general terms they represent *mercy*, as contradistinguished from justice. 1. They are distinct from the sword, as already shown. If, in Ezek. i, 6, they seem to be evolved out of the fire, this is no more than we have already in the first promise, where the death of death is our life; and in Psa. cxxxvi, 10 sq. 2. They were united to the *ἱλαστήριον*, the mercy-seat itself. 3. They belonged to the holy of holies, both the larger figures of olive-tree, and the smaller of pure gold; but this chamber was a type of heaven (Heb. ix, 24). 4. Other cherubic emblems were wrought on the inner curtains of the tabernacle, and inner walls of the Temple,

both Solomon's and Ezekiel's (1 Kings vi, 29; Ezek. xli, 18–20). All is mercy inside of the Temple. 5. The like figures were made on the washstands of the Temple, interspersed with lions and oxen (1 Kings vii, 29; "lions and palm-trees," ver. 36; comp. Eph. v, 26; Titus iii, 5). 6. The firmament over their heads, with its throne and man upon it (Ezek. i, 26, 27, combines Exod. xxiv, 10 with Rev. i, 15). 7. The *iris* surrounding all this glory of the Lord puts on the finish to that institution where mercy rejoices against judgment (Ezek. i, 28).

(II.) They seem to represent mercy in its *dispensation*, so to speak—in its instrumentalities, with all their interesting and happy varieties. While the *sword*=the whole power of justice, deters man from entering the earthly paradise; drives men away in their wickedness; awakes against the Shepherd; torments enemies in the second death; on the contrary, the *living ones* represent the entire administration of mercy (Ezek. i, 12: "Whither the spirit was to go, they went;" ver. 20: "Thither was their spirit to go"). Whether an organized Church, an open Bible, an altar, or a temple; whether patriarchs or prophets, priests or presbyters; apostles, John the Baptist, or Christ himself; evangelists, pastors, or teachers; whether angelic messengers, or little children, be the instrumentalities in dispensing the grace of God, the qualities of cherubim are, and ought to be, the characteristics with which they are imbued: the courage and power of the lion; the patience and perseverance of the ox; the sublimity, rapidity, and penetration of the eagle; with the sympathetic love and prudent forecast of our own humanity; each one full of eyes, within and without (Eph. iv, 16). In this view they do, as it were, bring God near to men.

(III.) The cherubim, in this dispensation of mercy, bring out prominently the idea of the *throne* of God—the throne of grace (Ezek. i, 26: "Likeness of a throne"). In Psalm xcix, 1, "The Lord reigneth" is parallel with "inhabiting the cherubim." Both in the tabernacle and Temple the Shekinah was between the two cherubim, which seemed to constitute, with the lid of the ark, the very throne itself, according to Exod. xxv, 22, and Ezek. xliii, 7. In the versions of Ezekiel, the cherubim seem to support the throne; in Isa. vi, 2, and Rev. iv, 6–9, they appear as attendants. To the English reader the seraphim might seem to be above the *throne*, but the original places them above the *Temple*, in which position they may still be below the throne, for the skirts of his robe flow down and fill the holy house.

(IV.) The idea of carrying the throne, or bearing royalty in his throne from one place to another, brings us to the acme of the whole cherubic system—"*the chariot of the Lord.*" The key-note of this is given in 1 Chron. xxviii, 18: "Gold for the pattern of the chariot . . . . the cherubim that spread out their wings and covered the ark of the covenant of the Lord;" compare Psa. xviii, 10: "He rode upon a cherub;" and Hab. iii, 8, 13, 15. These figures constituted a "moving throne." See CREATURE.

Livingston, Gilbert Robert, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, a descendant of the celebrated Rev. John Livingston (q. v.), was born at Stamford, Conn., Oct. 8, 1786, and graduated at Union College in 1805. He studied theology under Rev. Dr. Perkins, of Great Hartford, Conn., and Rev. Dr. John Henry Livingston (q. v.). In 1811 he became pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Coxsackie, N.Y., where about six hundred persons were the fruits of his ministry of fifteen years. In 1826 he removed to Philadelphia as pastor of the First (Dutch) Reformed (or Crown Street) Church. Here again his ministry was greatly blessed, three hundred and twenty persons being added to the Church, and over one hundred in a single year. He died March 9, 1834. He was a man of large physical frame, benevolent countenance, and amiable temper. His preaching was practical, and addressed more to the understanding and conscience of the people than to their feelings. His pastoral labors were incessant and successful. At one period of his life he embraced what were generally known as "New Measures," but he lived to abandon them in his later ministry. A single sermon and a tract are all that he is known to have published.—Sprague, *Annals;* Corwin's *Manual Ref. Church;* *Funeral Sermon* by C. C. Cuyler, D.D.; *Historical Discourse* by W. J. R. Taylor, D.D. (W. J. R. T.)

Livingston, Henry Gilbert, son of the preceding, was born at Coxsackie, N.Y., Feb. 3, 1821, graduated at Williams College in 1840, was principal of Clinton Academy (now Hamilton College) for two years, studied theology in Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., where he graduated in 1844, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Long Island in the following autumn. He became pastor of the Presbyterian church of Carmel, N.Y., in 1844, but removed in 1849 as pastor of the Third Reformed Dutch Church of Philadelphia. Resigning in 1854 on account of feeble health, he returned to Carmel, and became principal of the Raymond Institute, and also supplied the vacant church of which he was formerly pastor. He died suddenly, Jan. 25, 1855. "No doubts, no fears, no darkness" beclouded his dying hours. Mr. Livingston was a man of noble mould, tall, massive, intellectual, modest, amiable, dignified in manners, somewhat reserved, diffident, and self-distrustful. His character was finely balanced. True manliness, transparent simplicity, moral purity, generosity, and the most delicate sensibility, were blended with deep piety and beautiful consistency of life, with a holy ministry and a full use of all his talents. Only two of his discourses were published. See *Memorial Sermon* by W. J. R. Taylor, D.D., and Sprague's *Annals*, vol. ix. (W. J. R. T.)

Livingston, John, a noted Scottish Presbyterian divine, was born in 1603, and was educated at Glasgow, where he took the degree of A.M. in 1621. He entered the ministry, and soon distinguished himself as an able preacher. A zealous Covenanter, he opposed the episcopal government of the Church after the Restoration, and on this account suffered many inconveniences. Very remarkable in his life was the result which followed his preaching on a special fast-day appointed by the "Kirk of Shotts," June 21, 1630. He was at this time domestic chaplain to the countess of Wigton. Later he became minister at Ancram. He was twice suspended from his pastoral office, but, his opposition to the government continuing, he was banished the kingdom in 1663. He retired to Holland, and became minister of a Scottish church at Rotterdam. There he died in 1672. He wrote his *Autobiography* (Glasgow, 1754, 12mo); also *Lives of eminent Scottish Divines* (1754, 8vo). See Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of eminent Scotsmen*, s. v.; A. Gunn, *Memoirs of John Livingston* (N. Y. 1829); Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* vol. ii, s. v.

Livingston, John Henry, D.D., S.T.P., the "father of the Reformed Dutch Church in this country," and in many respects its most celebrated representative, was born at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., May 30, 1746, son of Henry Livingston, and a lineal descendant in the fourth generation from the Rev. John Livingston, of Scotland. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and then studied law for two years, when his health gave way under his close application, and he was obliged to discontinue it. About this time he was converted, and then directed his attention to the Christian ministry. By advice of Dr. Laidlie, of New York, he went to Europe to complete his theological studies at the University of Utrecht, in Holland, where he remained four years, and was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Classis of Amsterdam. Having received a call to become pastor and second preacher in English of the Church of New York, he passed examination at the university for the degree of doctor of divinity, returned to New York Sept. 3, 1770, and at once began his labors as pastor of the Church. Here he soon established his great reputation as a pulpit orator and as a learned theologian; but his

grand ecclesiastical achievement was the settlement of the old and bitter controversy between the "Coetus" and "Conferentie" parties of the Reformed Dutch Church, and the consummation in about two years of the union, which has never since been broken. His pastoral relation to the Church in New York continued forty years—1770 to 1810—although during the Revolutionary War he was obliged to leave the city, and upon his return in 1783 he found himself the sole pastor, and so remained for three years. The next year he was appointed professor of theology, and retained this office, with his pastorate, until 1810, when he removed to New Brunswick, N. J., at the request of the synod, and opened the theological seminary in that city, occupying, in connection with it, the presidency of Queens, now Rutgers College. These two offices he held until his death in 1825. It is difficult, in this brief notice, even to sum up the services and character of this eminent man. More than four hundred souls were received into the Church on profession of their faith during the three years of his sole pastorate after the war. Nearly two hundred young men were trained by him for the ministry of the Church. To him, more than to any other man, is due the credit of the separate organization of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in this country. He principally shaped its Constitution; he prepared its first psalm and hymn book. His theological lectures still form the basis of didactic and polemic instruction in the theological seminary of which he was the founder and father. The whole denomination is reaping to-day the fruits of the sacrifices which he made for it. His influence in the Church was like that of Washington in the nation. His grand and eloquent sermon, preached before the New York Missionary Society in 1804, from Rev. xiv, 6, 7, was one of the leading influences in that revival of the missionary spirit which gave Samuel J. Mills and his young friends to the work, and which resulted in the subsequent organization of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" in 1813. Several of Dr. Livingston's occasional productions were published by himself, and a posthumous volume, containing a syllabus of his theological lectures, was issued by the Rev. Jesse Fonda, one of his pupils. His death, at his residence in New Brunswick, January 19, 1825, was like a translation, without pain or complaint, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." His wife, Sarah Livingston, whom he married in October, 1775, was the daughter of Philip Livingston, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Like him, Dr. Livingston was an ardent and fearless patriot, and during all of the Revolutionary struggle he earnestly sustained the cause of freedom. In person Dr. Livingston was tall, commanding, dignified, and imposing. His features were regular and handsome. His manners were refined and studiously polite. He was the model of the Christian gentleman. In his later years his appearance was truly patriarchal. His piety was all-pervading. As a preacher, he possessed eminent abilities. His oratory was peculiar to himself, and very effective. It was full of action, variety, and power. As a theological teacher, he was clear, concise, learned, systematic, and practical. His influence over his students was wonderful. His great aim was to make them experimental ministers of Christ, and they loved and reverenced him almost as an apostle. Whatever faults he had were more than covered, to the eyes of his friends, by his majestic bearing, his admirable character, his pious life, and fruitful ministry, and by his services to the Church of Christ. See Dr. Gunn's *Life*, etc., abridged by Dr. T. W. Chambers; also Sprague, *Annals*, vol. ix, an admirable portraiture; also several funeral discourses, etc. (W. J. R. T.)

Livonia, the largest of the Baltic provinces of Russia; area 18,158 sq. m.; pop. in 1882, 1,173,951. The Germans, who chiefly live in the towns, number about 64,000 inhabitants; the remainder are mostly either Letts (a branch of the Slavi, kindred to the Lithuanians) or Esthonians, who are of Finnish descent. Christianity was first introduced at Riga about 1180 by merchants from Bremen. The great missionary was the Augustinian monk Meinhard, who in 1186 established the first church at Wexküll, on the Duna, and in 1191 was consecrated bishop of Livonia. His successor, abbot Berthold, of Loccum, endeavored to accelerate the conversion of the Livonians by force of arms, and in 1198 fell in a victorious battle of the Crusaders. Bishop Albert, of Apeldern, in 1202 founded the Order of the Knights of the Sword, and gradually overcame the persistent opposition of the Livonians to the enforcement of Christianity. After his death (in 1229) the see of Riga was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Bremen, and in 1246 made an independent archbishopric. The union of the Order of the Sword with the Teutonic Knight secured the subjection and Christianization of Livonia, but involved the bishops in long-protracted conflicts with the order, which hastened the decay of the Church. The army-master, Walter of Plettenberg (1494–1531), adopted the doctrines of the Reformation, and converted Livonia into a secular duchy under Polish sovereignty. The centre of the reformatory movement was in Riga, where the Hussite Nicolaus Russ, of Rostock, had, from 1511 to 1516, prepared the way for a religious reformation. Among the first promoters of the Lutheran Reformation were Andreas Knöpken, a Lutheran schoolteacher from Treptow, in Pomerania, who arrived in Riga in 1521, and Sylvester Tagetmeier, from Hamburg, who arrived in the following year. Both were appointed preachers by the town council, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishop. In Wolmar and Dorpat, Melchior Hoffmann labored so violently in behalf of the Reformation that he created dissatisfaction even among the friends of the movement, and had to leave Livonia. Luther's epistle of congratulation and exhortation (1523) to the congregations of Riga, Revel, and Dorpat shows that at that time the Reformation had made considerable progress. In 1524, the archbishop, Caspar Linde, of Riga, died, deeply mortified at the utter failure of his zealous efforts for saving the Catholic Church. His successor, John VII Blankenfeld, previously bishop of Dorpat and Revel, was no longer recognised by the town council of Riga as sovereign, and in 1525 he was even made a prisoner. Under the archbishop Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg, who in 1539 succeeded Thomas Schonnig, the Reformation spread throughout Livonia; the archbishop himself became favorable to the new doctrine, and at the time of his death the Catholic Church in Livonia had almost ceased to exist. Johann Briesmann (1527–31), who was called from Königsberg to Riga, drew up in 1530 the first agenda. The liturgy for Revel appeared in 1561, but had in 1572 to yield to that of Courland. The Esthonian catechism and the Livonian hymn-book of Mathias Knöpken were likewise published in 1561. In the same year the army-master Ketteler concluded a treaty with Poland, by virtue of which Livonia was placed under the sovereignty of Poland; it was stipulated, however, that the Lutheran Church of Livonia should not be interfered with. In violation of this treaty, the Jesuits at once began their agitation for the restoration of the Catholic Church, but the Swedish rule again secured the predominance of Protestantism, and greatly strengthened it by establishing the University of Dorpat. A new liturgy was introduced in 1632, a new agenda in 1633; at the same time, a Lettish and Esthonian translation of the Bible was published. In the 18th century the religious life of the province suffered greatly from the fact that most of the preachers, being called from Germany, were unable to preach in the native languages. The spiritual destitution of many country districts attracted the Moravians, who continued their zealous labors even when, in 1743, their meetings had been forbidden. For a long time they confined themselves to the Lutheran Church; but the large attendance at their meetings led them (since 1817) to separate from the Lutheran Church.

The latter therefore began, in 1843, to engage in a vigorous contest with the Moravians, invoking the stipulations of the peace of Nystädt (1721), in which Sweden had ceded Livonia to Russia, while the latter confirmed the privileges of the Lutheran Church. The Russian government supported the Lutherans against the Moravians, but, on the other hand, began (1841) to make great efforts to prevail upon the Lettish peasants to join the Greek Church. Several thousands of Letts and Livonians succumbed to the pressure brought upon them by the government, and, after having once joined the orthodox Greek Church, they were forbidden (as many soon desired) to return to the Lutheran Church. All the children born of mixed marriages (Lutheran and Greek) must be educated in the Greek religion. In 1863, the Lutheran bishop Walter, who vigorously stood up for the defence of the rights of his Church, had to yield to an intrigue, and not until 1868 was the rigor of the Russian government against the Lutheran Church somewhat relaxed. These conflicts have awakened a general interest in the religious community, to which the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat (1802) has been greatly instrumental. The number of Roman Catholics is about 5000, that of Greek Catholics is estimated at 143,000; the remainder are Lutherans. (A. J. S.)

Lizard appears in the Auth. Vers. in but one passage (Lev. xi, 30) as the rendering of לְטָאָה, *letaäh'*; but different species of the animal seem to be designated by several Hebrew terms, variously rendered in the English translation. In the East numerous varieties of these reptiles are met with in great abundance, several of which are regarded as venomous (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 241, 344 sq.). Others, again, are used by the modern Arabs for food (comp. also Arrian, *Mar. Eryth.* p. 17, ed. Hudson), whereas the Mosaic law (Lev. xi) classes them among unclean animals.

(1.) Ko'ach (כֹּחַ, *strength*, Lev. xi, 30; Sept. χαμαιλέων, Auth. Vers. "chameleon"), prob. the *Lacerta stellio*, an olive-brown lizard, with black and white spots, and a tail about a span long, while the body itself is scarcely of this length (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 352; figure in Rüppel, *Atlas*, tab. 2). Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 493 sq.) understands this term to refer to the species called *El-waral*, which exhibits its great strength (hence its name) in combat with the crocodile and serpents, is disgusting in appearance, and said to be poisonous (Leon. Afric. *Descript. Afric.* ix, 53). But Michaelis (*Suppl.* 2221) and Rosenmüller have long since remarked that the derivation of the name *koäch* is perhaps from a different root. According to the Arabic interpreters, it is the *land crocodile*, or a species of it, perhaps the *Waran el-hard* or *skink* (*Lacerta scincus*), which sometimes attains a length of six feet or more. See Chameleon.

(2.) Letaäh' (לְטָאָה), perh. so called from its *hiding;* Lev. xi, 30; Sept. χαλαβώτης, Vulg. *stellio*, Auth. Vers. "lizard"), perhaps the species called in Egypt *Shechalit*, described by Forskal (*Descr.* p. 13) as a delicate little animal, about a span in length and of the thickness of the thumb, found in the neighborhood of houses. Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 497 sq.) maintains that it is the *wagrat* of the Arabs, a kind of lizard that clings close to the ground (hence his derivation from an Arabic root, signifying to *stick to the earth*), to which also the Sept. alludes (comp. Oken, *Naturgesch.* III, ii, 203). Geddes regards it as identical with the *Lacerta gecko*.

(3.) Cho'met (חֹמֶט, so called from *lying* close to the ground; Lev. xi, 30; Sept. σαύρα, Auth. Vers. "snail") has been supposed by Bochart (ii, 500 sq.) to mean the *Galkan*, a species of lizard that burrows in the sand (on the precarious interpretation of the Talmud). The interpretation *snail* rests on no better foundation. Both the Arabic interpreters understand the *chameleon*. The species intended is uncertain. (See Fuller, *Miscell.* vi, 9.)

(4.) Anakah' (אַנָקָה, a *shriek;* Lev. xi, 30; Sept. and Vulg. *shrewmouse*, Auth. Vers. "ferret") is regarded by the Arab. Erpen. as the *Waral*, considered by some as identical with the *Lacerta Nilotica* (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 361 sq.), but which last Forskal (*Descript. Animal.* p. 13) calls *Waran* (comp. Robinson, ii, 253). The *Waral* is described by those who have personally seen it (see Leo Afric. *Descr.* ix, 51) as having a length of three or four feet, a scaly, very strong, grayish-yellow skin, and is regarded as poisonous in every part. (See Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, ii, 256 sq.; Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 128.)

(5.) Tsab (צָב, prob. from its *sluggishness;* Lev. xi, 29; Sept. and Vulg. the *crocodile*, Auth. Vers. "tortoise") is doubtless the species of lizard still called by the Arabs *Dhub* (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 463 sq.), a stupid creature tenanting rocky waters. According to Leo Afric. (ix, 52), it is about a yard long, without poisonous qualities, and incapable of drinking. They are caught and eaten in the desert. Forskal (*Descript. Animal.* p. 13) and Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 353 sq.) appear to have described it under the name of *Lacerta Ægyptiaca* (comp. Paulus, *Samml.* ii, 263). According to Burckhardt (ii, 863 sq.), it has a scaly skin of a yellow color, and sometimes attains a length of eighteen inches.

(6.) Tinshe'meth (תִּנְשֶׁמֶת, the hard *breather;* Sept., Vulgate, and Auth. Vers. *mole;* Lev. xi, 30; being the same Heb. word used in Lev. xi, 18; Deut. xiv, 16, to describe a bird, rendered "swan") is (according to Saadias) a species of lizard, probably the *Gecko* (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 356 sq.), a kind described as having a round tail of moderate length, and tufted feet, lamellated lengthwise on the bottom, said to be peculiar for exuding poison from the divisions of its toes, eagerly seeking spots imbued with salt, which it leaves infected with a virus that engenders leprosy (see also Forskal, p. 13). Bochart (ii, 503 sq.) understands the *chameleon*, deriving the etymology from the ancient belief that this creature lived upon the air (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* viii, 33, 51), a notion probably derived from its long endurance of hunger. (See Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 348 sq.; Sonnini, *Trav.* i, 87; Oken, *Naturgesch.* III, ii, 306 sq.; Russel, *Aleppo*, ii, 128 sq.) See Chameleon.

(7.) Semamith' (שְׂמָמִית, prob. as being held *poisonous;* Prov. xxx, 28; Sept. καλαβώτης, Vulg. *stellio*, Auth. Vers. "spider") is mentioned as a small creature of active instincts; prob. the Arabic *saum*, a poisonous lizard with leopard-like spots (Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 1084). Comp. Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, ii, 268. See Spider.

(8.) Tannin' (תַּנִּין) or Tannim' (תַּנִּים), otherwise Tan (תָּן), seems occasionally to signify a huge land serpent or saurian. See Dragon.

(9.) Livyathan' (לִוְיָתָן) sometimes stands for the largest of the lizard tribe, the *crocodile*. See Leviathan.

Under the denomination of *lizard* the modern zoologist places all the cold-blooded animals that have the conformation of serpents with the addition of four feet. Thus viewed as one great family, they constitute the Saurians, Lacertinæ, and Lacertidæ of authors, embracing numerous generical divisions, which commence with the largest, that is, the crocodile group, and pass through sundry others, a variety of species, formidable, disgusting, or pleasing in appearance—some equally frequenting the land and water, others absolutely confined to the earth and to the most arid deserts; and, though in general harmless, there are a few with disputed properties, some being held to poison or corrode by means of the exudation of an ichor, and others extolled as aphrodisiacs, or of medical use in pharmacy; but these properties in most, if not in all, are undetermined or illusory. One of the best known of these is the common chameleon (*Chamæleo vulgaris*). See Chameleon. When it is considered that the regions of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt are overrun with animals of this family, there is every reason to expect allusion to more than one genus in the Scriptures, where so many observations and similes are derived from the natural objects which were familiar

Chamæleo Vulgaris.

to the various writers. Among the names enumerated above, Bochart refers צָב, *tsab* (Lev. xi, 29), to one of the group of Monitors or Varanus, the Nilotic lizard, *Lacerta Nilotica*, *Varanus Niloticus*, or *Waran* of the Arabs. Like the others of this form, it is possessed of a tail double the length of the body, but is not so well known in Palestine, where there is only one real river (Jordan), and that not tenanted by this species. It appears that the true crocodile frequented the shores and marshes of the coast down to a comparatively late period, and therefore it may well have had a more specific name than leviathan—a word apparently best suited to the dignified and lofty diction of the prophets, and clearly of more general signification than the more colloquial designation. Jerome was of this opinion; and it is thus likely that *tsab* was applied to both, as *Waran* is now considered only a variety of, or a young, crocodile. There is a second of the same group, *Lacerta scincus* of Merrem (*Varanus arenarius*), *Waran el-hard*, also reaching to six feet in length; and a third, not as yet clearly described, which appears to be larger than either, growing to nine feet, and covered with bright cupreous scales. This last prefers rocky and stony situations. One of the last mentioned pursues its prey on land with a rapid bounding action, feeds on the larger insects, and is said to attack game in a body, sometimes destroying even sheep. The Arabs, in agreement with the ancients, assert that this species will do fierce and victorious battle with serpents. Considerations like these induce us to assign the Hebrew name כֹּחַ, *koach* (a designation of strength) to the species of the desert; and if the Nilotic *waran* be the *tsab*, then the Arabian *dhab*, as Bruce asserts, will be *Varanus arenarius*, or *waran el-hard* of the present familiar language, and *chardaun* the larger copper-colored species above noticed. But it is evident from the Arabic authorities quoted by Bochart, and from his own conclusions, that there is not only confusion among the species of lizard, but that the ichneumon of Egypt (*Herpestes Pharaonis*) is mixed up with the history of these saurians.

We come next to the group of lizards more properly so called, which Hebrew commentators take to be the לְטָאָה, *letaah*, a name having some allusion to poison and adhesiveness. The word occurs only once (Lev. xi, 30), where saurians alone appear to be indicated. If the Heb. root were to guide the decision, *letaah* would be another name for the *gecko* or *anakah*, for there is but one species which can be deemed venomous; and with regard to the quality of adhesiveness, though the *geckos* possess it most, numerous common lizards run up and down perpendicular walls with great facility. We therefore take חוֹמֶט, *chomet*, or the sand lizard of Bochart, to be the true lizard, several (probably many) species existing in myriads on the rocks in sandy places, and in ruins in every part of Palestine and the adjacent countries. There is one species particularly abundant and small, well known in Arabia by the name of *Sarabandi*. We now come to the *Stelliones*, which have been confounded with the noxious *geckos* and others from the time of Aldrovandus, and thence have been a source of inextricable trouble to commentators. They are best known by the bundles of starlike spines on the body. Among these *Lacerta stellio*, *Stellio Orientalis*, the κροκόδειλος of the Greeks, and *hardun* of the Arabs, is abundant in the East, and a great frequenter of ruinous walls. The genus *Uromastix* offers *Stellio spinipes* of Daudin or *Ur-spinipes*, two or three feet long, of a fine green, and is the species which is believed to strike with the tail; hence formerly denominated *Caudæ verbera*. It is frequent in the deserts around Egypt, and is probably the *Guaril* of the Arabs. Another subgenus, named *Trapelus* by Cuvier, is exemplified in the *Tr. Ægyptiacus* of Geoff., with a spinous swelled body, but remarkable for the faculty of changing color more rapidly than the chameleon. Next we place the *Geckotians*, among which comes אַנָקָה, *anakah*, in our versions denominated *ferret*, but which is with more propriety transferred to the noisy and venomous *abu-burs* of the Arabs. There is no reason for admitting the verb אָנַק, *anak*, *to groan*, *to cry out*, as radical for the name of the ferret, an animal totally unconnected with the preceding and succeeding species in Lev. xi, 29, 30, and originally found, so far as we know, only in Western Africa, and thence conveyed to Spain, prowling noiselessly, and beaten to death without a groan, though capable of a feeble, short scream when at play, or when suddenly wounded. Taking the interpretation "to cry out," so little applicable to ferrets, in conjunction with the whole verse, we find the *gecko*, like all the species of this group of lizards, remarkable for the loud grating noise which it is apt to utter in the roofs and walls of houses all the night through; one, indeed, is sufficient to dispel the sleep of a whole family. The particular species most probably meant is the *Lacerta gecko* of Hasselquist, the *Gecko lobatus* of Geoffroy, distinguished by having the soles of the feet dilated and striated like open fans, from which a poisonous ichor is said to exude, inflaming the human skin, and infecting food that may have been trod upon by the animal. See FERRET. Hence the Arabic name of *abu-burs*, or "father of leprosy," at Cairo. The species extends northwards in Syria, but it may be doubted whether the *Gecko fascicularis*, or *tarentola* of South-eastern Europe, be not also an inhabitant of Palestine; and in that case the שְׁמָמִית, *semamith* of Bochart, would find an appropriate location. To these we add the *Chameleons* proper; and then follows the *Scincus* (in antiquity the name of *Varanus arenarius*), among which *Lacerta scincus*, Linn., or *Scincus officinalis*, is the *El-adda* of the Arabs, figured by Bruce, and well known in the old pharmacy of Europe. *S. Cyprius*, or *Lacerta Cyprius scincoides*, a large greenish species, marked with a pale line on each flank, occurs also; and a third, *Scincus variegatus* or *ocillatus*, often noticed on account of its round black spots, each marked with a pale streak, and commonly having likewise a stripe on each flank, of a pale color. Of the species of *Seps*, that is, viviparous serpent-lizards, having the body of snakes, with four weak limbs, a species with only three toes on each foot, the *Lacerta chalcides* of Linn., appears to extend to Syria. See further details in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Varanidæ; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 534 sq.

From this examination, it appears probable that the generic name for the lizard among the Hebrews (being the only one thus rendered in the Auth. Version) is the לְטָאָה, *letaah*, which, although an unclean animal, does not usually designate a poisonous species. Among the

various kinds with which the East abounds, the *Lacerta stellio*, or starry lizard, may be selected as probably affording the best type of the scriptural terms, or at least of *letaah* in general, as it is the most common in Egypt and Palestine. It is covered with tubercles, and is of a gray color. It lives in the holes of walls, and under stones, and covers itself with dirt. Belon states that it



Lacerta Stellio.

sometimes attains the size of a weasel. This is said to be the lizard which infests the Pyramids, and in other countries where it is found, harbors in the crevices and between the stones of old walls, feeding on flies and other winged insects. This may be the species intended by Bruce when he says, "The number I saw one day, in the great court of the Temple of the Sun at Baalbek, amounted to many thousands; the ground, the walls, the stones of the ruined buildings, were covered with them; and the various colors of which they consisted made a very extraordinary appearance, glittering under the sun, in which they lay sleeping and basking." Lord Lindsay also describes the ruins at Jerash (the ancient Gerasa) as "absolutely alive with lizards." Near Suez, he speaks of "a species of gray lizard;" and on the ascent towards Mount Sinai, "hundreds of little lizards of the color of the sand, and called by the natives *sarabandi*, were darting about." In the Syrian desert, Major Skinner says, "The ground is teeming with lizards; the sun seems to draw them from the earth, for sometimes, when I have fixed my eye upon one spot, I have fancied that the sands were getting into life, so many of these creatures at once crept from their holes." Wilkinson says, "In Egypt, of the lizard tribe, none but the crocodile seems to have been sacred. Those which occur in the hieroglyphics are not emblematical of the gods, nor connected with religion." See SNAIL.

Lizel, GEORG, a German theologian, was born at Ulm, in Würtemberg, Nov. 23, 1694; attended successively the universities of Strasburg, Leipsic, Jena, Halle, Wittenberg, Altdorf, and Tübingen, and in 1735 became vicar at Weidenstetten, and soon after pastor at Steinen Kirch; but in 1736, on account of false charges against his character, he lost his situation. In 1737 he was appointed subrector at the Gymnasium of Ulm, afterwards inspector of the alumni and imperial poet laureate. The Prussian Royal Society of Duisburg, and the German Society of Jena, elected him a member of their respective bodies. He died Mar. 22, 1761. His life was spent in the investigation of science, and in the cause of religion and education. While at the universities he explored numerous antique libraries, and the results he gave to the public in more than twenty volumes. As a theologian Lizel was faithful to his Church, and confronted and challenged Romanism. For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. ii, s. v.

Llorente, DON JUAN ANTONIO, the noted author of a history of the *Inquisition*, etc., was born at Rincon del Soto, near Calahorra, Spain, March 30, 1756. He studied at Tarascone with great success, and received the tonsure when but fourteen years of age. In 1779 he was ordained priest, and took his degree in canon law. At this time the liberal ideas prevailing in France were beginning to make their way into Spain, and Llorente became interested in them. In 1781 he was named advocate of the Council of Castile, and in the year following was made general vicar of the bishopric of Calahorra. While in this position he appears to have connected himself with the Freemasons, and, although this rumor seems to have been generally credited, he was nevertheless appointed commissary of the Inquisition in 1785, and general secretary in 1789. After the downfall of the grand inquisitor he attached himself to the Liberal minister Jovellanos, who contemplated a religious and political regeneration of Spain. The minister fell, and Llorente was involved in his fall, the more surely as he openly expressed his sympathy for him. Suspected by his superiors, he was closely watched. He was subjected to innumerable petty annoyances, his letters were opened, and, without any reason being given for the measure, was deposed from his situation, and imprisoned in a convent for one month. In 1805 he was again received into favor as the reward of a literary service of a very questionable character which he rendered to the minister Godoy. The latter purposed abolishing the ancient privileges of the Basque Provinces, and carrying out in Spain a thorough system of centralization; to accomplish this, he deemed it advantageous to prepare the way by means of a historical essay, disproving the ancient liberties of those provinces. The mission was given to Llorente, who wrote *Noticias historicas sobre las tres provincias Bascongadas* (Madrid, 1806–8, 3 vols. 8vo), a work not in any way remarkable for historical truthfulness. Llorente was now again favored with several high offices. His tendency towards the French ideas, centralization among others, led him perhaps to accept offers which he would otherwise have rejected. Upon the intrusion of the French (1807), Llorente found himself placed between the national government which opposed all progress, and that of a foreign sovereign which offered both political and religious liberty. Unable to serve at once the cause of the hereditary monarch and that of progress, Llorente and the Josephinos chose the latter; but the accusation preferred against them of having sold themselves to France (Hefele, in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 557 sq.) is unsupported by proof, and unlikely; they simply chose a foreign master rather than religious and political slavery. In 1809 the Spanish Inquisition was abolished in Spain, and Llorente was commissioned to search its records for the purpose of writing a history of that tribunal. He had already, as early as 1789, began to collect materials for this purpose, yet two more years were spent, with the aid of several assistants, in compiling the voluminous records. When the convents were abolished he was given the direction of the proceedings, and the charge of the sequestered goods, as also the administration of the national properties, an ungrateful and not very creditable task, for these properties were the result of sequestration; yet he claimed afterwards to have introduced many favorable changes in the administration, such, for instance, as that of leaving the management of the property belonging to parties put under the ban to the members of their family, and the many distinguished persons of Spain to whom he appealed in corroboration of his assertion have never denied its truth. He was, however, accused of embezzlement to the amount of 11,000,000 reals, and lost his position; but the accusation not being substantiated, he was indemnified by another situation. In the mean time he continued to advocate the cause of Joseph Bonaparte both by his pen and in public addresses, and when the celebrated Constitution of the Cortes of Cadiz was proclaimed he was one of its most zealous opponents. When Joseph lost the Spanish throne (1814) Llorente was obliged to quit the country in haste. After his flight, banishment was pronounced against him, and his property, and his library of 8000 volumes, some

of which were rare and costly manuscripts, were sequestered. After stopping a short time in London, Llorente settled in Paris, where he completed the work of which he had published a sketch in Spain: *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (4 vols. 8vo). It was written in Spanish, but was immediately translated into French by Alexis Pellier, under Llorente's own supervision (Par. 1817–18). Translations into most of the languages of Europe were made shortly afterwards. One of the best English editions was published in London in 1826. (For a review, see *British Critic*, i, 119.) Llorente was now the outspoken enemy of the Church, and he was forbidden to officiate as priest in Paris, and thus deprived of his regular means of support. He next attempted to earn a living by teaching Spanish, but the University of Paris forbade him teaching in public, and he became altogether dependent on his literary labors and the assistance of his masonic brethren for a support. To what straits he found himself reduced is seen in the fact that he translated Faublas into Spanish. In 1822 he published his *Portraits politiques des Papes*, which still increased the animosity of the clergy against him, and in this instance it must be granted that he recklessly provoked this enmity by accepting as undoubted facts such legends as that of the popess Joanna, etc., while his friends were obliged to admit that the nature, tendencies, and even the tone of the work were not becoming the character of a priest. In December of the same year (1822) he received orders to leave France within three days. Exiled from the land of his adoption, he returned to that of his birth, but died shortly after (Feb. 5, 1823) at Madrid, in consequence of the hardships he had undergone during his journey.

Llorente's character and writings have been the object of as extravagant praise by some as of extravagant censure by others. He lived in a time of great fermentation, and in a country where the struggle between progress and conservatism gave rise to innumerable parties: under these circumstances he remained true to progress, and if he did not remain true also to any of the divers political parties, it was because he could not maintain his fidelity to both. When writing the history of the Inquisition, he was yet a fervent Roman Catholic; and in attacking an institution which he considered and proved to have been more political than religious, he undeservedly received the censure of a large proportion of the Roman Catholic world; he did not mean to attack the Romish Church, but, on the contrary, to vindicate it from the imputation of having been solidly concerned in the transaction of that fell tribunal. If in his subsequent works he went further, and attacked the Roman Catholic Church itself, the reason is to be found in the persecutions he endured at the hands of that Church. Llorente is not to be considered as a historian; neither his literary talents, nor his historical knowledge, nor the gift of correctly combining and connecting events, gave him any title to that appellation. His greatest production, the *Critical History of the Inquisition*, such Protestant historians as Prescott and Ranke judge to be of but little value, because of its partisan character, and the exaggerations in which it abounds, and, as the readers of this Cyclopædia must have noticed, in the article INQUISITION (see especially p. 603, col. 1), he has rarely been quoted. His only credit in the work is that he brought together much material before inaccessible. We might say Llorente was a good and diligent compiler, but too ardent a partisan to be aught of a historian. See his autobiography entitled *Notitia biografica o Memorias para la Historia de su Vida* (1818); Mahul, *Notice biographique sur Don J. H. Llorente* (1823); Prescott, *Hist. of Ferdinand and Isabella*, i, pt. i; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 142, 272; ii, 293; *Monthly Review*, xci (1820), Append.; *Revue Encyclopédique* (1823). (J. H. W.)

Lloyd, Charles Hooker, a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Haven, Conn., Feb. 21, 1833. His early life was spent in mercantile pursuits in New York City. In 1856, however, purposing to become a missionary to the heathen, he entered New York University; later he studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., and graduated in 1862. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist by the New York Presbytery April 29, 1862, and appointed (June 21, 1862) by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to South Africa. He did not, however, do much effective mission work, as he died Feb. 10, 1865. Mr. Lloyd, as a preacher, was eminently wise to win souls. He was gifted with a strong passion for music, and wrote and arranged many chants and hymns for the African converts. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 169.

Lloyd, Thomas, a noted Quaker preacher, was born in North Wales in 1649. While a student at Oxford University, he visited, during a vacation, his brother Charles, who had been imprisoned for Quakerism at Welch-Pool, and by the latter's influence became himself a convert to the religion of the Friends. He immediately left Oxford, suffered with the Quakers in their persecutions, and became an "instructor" on their "First-days." On account of persecution, reproach, and loss of property for his religion's sake, he emigrated to Pennsylvania soon after the first settlement of that province. He died July 10, 1694. As president of the council, and subsequently as deputy governor of Pennsylvania, he exercised a most salutary influence upon the interests and progress of the colony. See Janney's *History of Friends*, ii, ch. xvii; iii, ch. ii.

Lloyd, William, a noted English prelate, was born in Berkshire in 1627, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1640 he removed to Jesus College, where he became fellow in 1646. He took deacon's orders from Dr. Skinner at the time of Charles's execution. In 1656 he was ordained priest, and acted as tutor of John Backhouse, son of Sir Wm. Backhouse, at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1660 he became master of arts at Cambridge, and was also made a prebendary of Ripon, in Yorkshire. In 1666 he was appointed king's chaplain, and in 1667 was collated to a prebend of Salisbury, and proceeded doctor of divinity at Oxford. In 1668 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Mary's, in Reading, and also installed archdeacon of Merioneth, in the church of Bangor, of which he became deacon in 1672, besides being made prebend in St. Paul's Church, London. In 1674 he was made residentiary of Salisbury, and in 1676 promoted to the see of Exeter, the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster. In 1680 he was appointed bishop of St. Asaph, was translated to Lichfield in 1692, and to Worcester in 1699–1700. He took an active part in the troubles between the Romanists and Protestants in 1678. He preached the funeral sermon of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, believed to have been murdered in carrying out what is known as the popish plot for overthrowing Protestantism in England. In 1688, with six other bishops, he signed, and, as spokesman, presented to the king, a memorial against the publication of his declaration of indulgence to Romanists and Dissenters. He was one of the six bishops who, together with archbishop Sancroft, composing the illustrious seven bishops, for their refusal to publish the king's declaration, were shortly after imprisoned by James II in the Tower, and, after trial, acquitted, to the great joy of all England. He became almoner to William III, and later also to queen Anne. He died at Hartlebury Castle Aug. 30, 1717. Lloyd furnished valuable materials to Burnet's *History of his Own Times*, and wrote *Considerations touching the true Way to suppress Popery in this Kingdom*, etc. (Lond. 1684, 8vo, 2d edit.) [a work which was attacked by MacKenzie (*Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland*, etc.), and was defended by bishop Stillingfleet (*Origines Brit.*), who reprinted it, with Notes by T. P. Panton (Oxford, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo)]:—*History of the Government of the Church of Great Britain*:—*A Dissertation on Daniel's Seventy Weeks*:—*A System of Chronology* (1712):—*Har-*

mony of the Gospels, etc., etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist.* (*Restoration*), i, 500; ii, 5, 28, 141 sq., 146; Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*.

Loaf (properly כִּכָּר, *kikkar'*, a *circle*, in the phrase כִּכַּר לֶחֶם, *a round of bread*, i. e. circular cake, being the form of Oriental bread, or rather biscuit, Exod. xxix, 23, Judg. viii, 5, 1 Sam. x, 3; 1 Chron. xvi, 3; rendered "piece" or "morsel" of bread in Prov. vi, 26; Jer. xxxvii, 21, 1 Sam. ii, 26; sometimes simply לֶחֶם, *le'chem*, *bread*, Lev. xxiii, 17; 1 Sam. xvii, 17; xxv, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 3; 2 Kings iv, 42; and so likewise the Greek ἄρτος, *bread*, espec. in the plural, Matt. xiv, 17, 19; xv, 34, 36; xvi, 9, 10; Mark vi, 38, 41, 44, 52; viii, 5, 6, 14, 19; Luke ix, 13, 16; xi, 5; John vi, 9, 11, 13, 26), a round cake, the usual form of bread among the ancients. See Shew-bread. The bread of the Jews was either in small loaves, or else in broad and thick cakes, as is the present custom in the East. Bread was always broken into such portions as were required, and distributed by the master of the family. See Bread.



Ancient Roman Bread (from a painting on the walls of the Parthenon).



Ancient Egyptian Bread. (The first two figures are from the Monuments, the others from specimens in the British Museum.)

The word חַלָּה, *challah'*, "cake" (2 Sam. vi, 19), often refers to a cake of oblation (Exod. xxix, 23; Lev. viii, 26, Numb. vi, 15, etc.), from the root חָלַל, *chalal*, to pierce through, because they were pricked, as among the Arabians and Jews of the present day. We also find, on the paintings in the monuments of Egypt, representations of offerings of cakes pricked. See Cake.

The two wave loaves mentioned in Lev. xxiii, 17 are called in Hebrew לֶחֶם תְּנוּפָה, *le'chem tenuphah'*, signifying the act of waving or moving to and fro before Jehovah, a ceremony observed in the consecration of offerings; hence applied as a name to anything consecrated in this manner. See Offering.

Lo-am'mi (Heb. *Lo-Ammi'*, לֹא עַמִּי, *not my people*, as it is explained in the context, Hos. i, 9; Sept. Οὐ λαός μου, Vulg. *Non populus meus;* in the parallel passage, Hos. ii, 23, לֹא־עַמִּי, Sept. οὐ λαῷ μου, Vulg. *non populo meo*, Auth. Vers. "not my people"), a symbolical name given by the prophet Hosea at the divine instance to his second son, in token of Jehovah's rejection and subsequent restoration of his people, alluding to the Babylonian captivity (Hos. i, 9; ii, 23; comp. ii, 1). B.C. cir. 725. See Hosea.

Loan (שְׁאֵלָה, *sheelah'*; 1 Sam. ii, 20, a *petition* or request, as elsewhere rendered). The law of Moses did not contemplate any raising of loans for the purpose of obtaining capital, a condition perhaps alluded to in the parables of the "pearl" and "hidden treasure" (Matt. xiii, 44, 45; Michaelis, *Comm. on Laws of Moses*, art. 147, ii, 297, edit. Smith). See Commerce. Such persons as bankers and sureties, in the commercial sense (Prov. xxii, 26; Neh. v, 3), were unknown to the earlier ages of the Hebrew commonwealth. The Mosaic laws which relate to the subject of borrowing, lending, and repaying are in substance as follows: If an Israelite became poor, what he desired to borrow was to be freely lent to him, and no interest, either of money or produce, could be exacted from him; interest might be taken of a foreigner, but not of an Israelite by another Israelite (Exod. xxii, 25; Deut. xxiii, 19, 20; Lev. xxv, 35–38). At the end of every seven years a remission of debts was ordained; every creditor was to remit what he had lent: of a foreigner the loan might be exacted, but not of a brother. If an Israelite wished to borrow, he was not to be refused because the year of remission was at hand (Deut. xv, 1–11). Pledges might be taken, but not as such the mill or the upper millstone, for that would be to take a man's life in pledge. If the pledge was raiment, it was to be given back before sunset, as being needful for a covering at night. The widow's garment could not be taken in pledge (Exod. xxii, 26, 27; Deut. xxiv, 6, 17). The law thus strictly forbade any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person, either in the shape of money or of produce, and at first, as it seems, even in the case of a foreigner; but this prohibition was afterwards limited to Hebrews only, from whom, of whatever rank, not only was no usury on any pretence to be exacted, but relief to the poor by way of loan was enjoined, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden (Exod. xxii, 25; Lev. xxv, 35, 37; Deut. xv, 3, 7–10; xxiii, 19, 20). The instances of extortionate conduct mentioned with disapprobation in the book of Job probably represent a state of things previous to the law, and such as the law was intended to remedy (Job xxii, 6; xxiv, 3, 7). As commerce increased, the practice of usury, and so also of suretyship, grew up, but the exaction of it from a Hebrew appears to have been regarded to a late period as discreditable (Prov. vi, 1, 4; xi, 15; xvii, 18; xx, 16; xxii, 26; Psa. xv, 5; xxvii, 13; Jer. xv, 10; Ezek. xviii, 13; xxii, 12). Systematic breach of the law in this respect was corrected by Nehemiah after the return from captivity (Neh. v, 1, 13; see Michaelis, *ibid.* arts. 148, 151). In later times the practice of borrowing money appears to have prevailed without limitation of race, and to have been carried on upon systematic principles, though the original spirit of the law was approved by our Lord (Matt. v, 42; xxv, 27; Luke vi, 35; xix, 23). The money-changers (κερματισταί and κολλυβισταί), who had seats and tables in the Temple, were traders whose

profits arose chiefly from the exchange of money with those who came to pay their annual half shekel (Pollux, iii, 84; vii, 170; Schleusner, *Lex. N. T.* s. v.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* at Matt. xxi, 12). The documents relating to loans of money appear to have been deposited in public offices in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, ii, 17, 6).

In making loans no prohibition is pronounced in the law against taking a pledge of the borrower, but certain limitations are prescribed in favor of the poor. 1. The outer garment, which formed the poor man's principal covering by night as well as by day, if taken in pledge, was to be returned before sunset. A bedstead, however, might be taken (Exod. xxii, 26, 27; Deut. xxiv, 12, 13; comp. Job xxii, 6; Prov. xxii, 27; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 224; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 47, 231; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Ar.* p. 56; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 57, 58; Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 403; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, arts. 143 and 150). 2. The prohibition was absolute in the case of (*a*) the widow's garment (Deut. xxiv, 17), and (*b*) a millstone of either kind (Deut. xxiv, 6). Michaelis (art. 150, ii, 321) supposes also all indispensable animals and utensils of agriculture; see also Mishna, *Maaser Sheni*, i. 3. A creditor was forbidden to enter a house to reclaim a pledge, but was to stand outside till the borrower should come forth to return it (Deut. xxiv, 10, 11). 4. The original Roman law of debt permitted the debtor to be enslaved by his creditor until the debt was discharged (Livy, ii, 23; Appian, *Ital.* p. 40); and he might even be put to death by him, though this extremity does not appear to have been ever practiced (Gell. xx, 1, 45, 52; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Bonorum Cessio, Nexum). In Athens also the creditor had a claim to the person of the debtor (Plutarch, *Vit. Sol.* 15). The Jewish law, as it did not forbid temporary bondage in the case of debtors, yet forbade a Hebrew debtor to be detained as a bondsman longer than the seventh year, or at furthest the year of jubilee (Exod. xxi, 2; Lev. xxv, 39, 42; Deut. xv, 9). If a Hebrew was sold in this way to a foreign sojourner, he might be redeemed at a valuation at any time previous to the jubilee year, and in that year was, under any circumstances, to be released. Foreign sojourners, however, were not entitled to release at that time (Lev. xxv, 44, 46, 47, 54; 2 Kings iv, 2; Isa. l, 1; lii, 3). Land sold on account of debt was redeemable either by the seller himself, or by a kinsman in case of his inability to repurchase. Houses in walled towns, except such as belonged to Levites, if not redeemed within one year after sale, were alienated forever. Michaelis doubts whether all debt was extinguished by the jubilee; but Josephus's account is very precise (*Ant.* iii, 12, 3; comp. Lev. xxv, 23, 34; Ruth iv, 4, 10; see Michaelis, § 158, ii, 360). In later times the sabbatical or jubilee release was superseded by a law, probably introduced by the Romans, by which the debtor was liable to be detained in prison until the full discharge of his debt (Matt. v, 26). Michaelis thinks this doubtful. The case imagined in the parable of the unmerciful servant belongs rather to despotic Oriental than Jewish manners (Matt. xviii, 34, Michaelis, *ibid.* art. 149; Trench, *Parables*, p. 141). Subsequent Jewish opinions on loans and usury may be seen in the Mishna, *Baba Meziah*, c. iii, x. See JUBILEE.

These laws relating to loans may wear a strange and somewhat unreasonable aspect to the mere modern reader, and cannot be understood, either in their bearing or their sanctions, unless considered from the Biblical point of view. The land of Canaan (as the entire world) belonged to its Creator, but was given of God to the descendants of Abraham under certain conditions, of which this liberality to the needy was one. The power of getting loans, therefore, was a part of the poor man's inheritance. It was a lien on the land (the source of all property with agricultural people), which was as valid as the tenure of any given portion by the tribe or family to whose lot it had fallen. This is the light in which the Mosaic polity represents the matter, and in this light, so long as that polity retained its force, would it, as a matter of course, be regarded by the owners of property. Thus the execution of this particular law was secured by the entire force with which the constitution itself was recommended and sustained. But as human selfishness might in time endanger this particular set of laws, so Moses applied special support to the possibly weak part. Hence the emphasis with which he enjoins the duty of lending to the needy. Of this emphasis the real essence is the sanction supplied by that special providence which lay at the very basis of the Mosaic commonwealth, so that lending to the destitute came to be enforced with all the power derivable from the express will of God. Nor are there wanting arguments sufficient to vindicate these enactments in the light of sound political economy, at least in the case of the Jewish people. Had the Hebrews enjoyed a free intercourse with other nations, the permission to take usury of foreigners might have had the effect of impoverishing Palestine by affording a strong inducement for employing capital abroad; but, under the actual restrictions of the Mosaic law, this evil was impossible. Some not inconsiderable advantages must have ensued from the observance of these laws. The entire alienation and loss of the lent property were prevented by that peculiar institution which restored to every man his property at the great year of release. In the interval between the jubilees the system under consideration would tend to prevent those inequalities of social condition which always arise rapidly, and which have not seldom brought disaster and ruin on states. The affluent were required to part with a portion of their affluence to supply the wants of the needy, without exacting that recompense which would only make the rich more wealthy and the poor more needy, thus superinducing a state of things scarcely more injurious to the one than to the other of these two parties. There was also in this system a strongly conservative influence. Agriculture was the foundation of the constitution. Had money-lending been a trade, money-making would also have been eagerly pursued. Capital would be withdrawn from the land; the agriculturist would pass into the usurer; huge inequalities would arise; commerce would assume predominance, and the entire commonwealth be overturned—changes and evils which were prevented, or, if not so, certainly retarded and abated by the code of laws regarding loans. As it was, the gradually increasing wealth of the country was in the main laid out on the soil, so as to augment its productiveness and distribute its bounties. The same regulations, moreover, prevented those undue expansions of credit and those sudden fluctuations in the relative value of money and staple commodities which have so often brought on financial collapses and prostration in modern communities. While, however, the benign tendency of the laws in question is admitted, and special objects may be adduced as attainable by them, may it not be questioned whether they were strictly just? Such a doubt could arise only in a mind which viewed the subject from the position of our actual society. A modern might plead that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own; that his property of every kind —land, food, money — was his own; and that he was justified to turn all and each part to account for his own benefit. Apart from religious considerations, this position is impregnable. But such a view of property finds no support in the Mosaic institutions. In them property has a divine origin, and its use is intrusted to man on certain conditions, which conditions are as valid as is the tenure of property itself. In one sense, indeed, the entire land—all property—was a great loan, a loan lent of God to the people of Israel, who might well, therefore, acquiesce in any arrangement which required a portion—a small portion—of this loan to be under certain circumstances accessible to the destitute. This view receives confirmation from the fact that interest might be taken of persons who were not Hebrews, and

therefore lay beyond the sphere embraced by this special arrangement. It would open too wide a field did we proceed to consider how far the Mosaic system might be applicable in the world at large; but this is very clear to our mind, that the theory of property on which it rests—that is, making property to be divine in its origin, and therefore tenable only on the fulfilment of such conditions as the great laws of religion and morality enforce—is more true and more philosophical (except in a college of atheists) than the narrow and baneful ideas which ordinarily prevail.

These views may prepare the reader for considering the doctrine of "the Great Teacher" on the subject of loans. It is found forcibly expressed in Luke's Gospel (vi, 34, 35): "If ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again; but love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil." The meaning of the passage is distinct and full, unmistakable, and not to be evaded. He commands men to lend, not as Jews to Jews, but even to enemies, without asking or receiving any return, after the manner of the Great Benefactor of the universe, who sends down his rains and bids his sun to shine on the fields of the unjust as well as of the just. To attempt to view this command in the light of reason and experience would require space which cannot here be given; but we must add, that any attempt to explain the injunction away is most unworthy on the part of professed disciples of Christ; and that, not impossibly at least, fidelity to the behests of him whom we call Lord and Master would of itself answer all doubts and remove all misgivings by practically showing that this, as every other doctrine that fell from his lips, is indeed of God (John vii, 17). Yet, while we must maintain the paramount obligation of our Saviour's precept, corroborative—and, indeed, expansive—as it is, of the essential principle of the Mosaic economy, namely, the inculcation of universal brotherly love, nevertheless common sense, no less than sound morality, dictates at least the following co-ordinate considerations, which should likewise be taken into the account in the exercise of Christian liberality, in loans as well as in gifts: 1. Due inquiry should be instituted, so as to satisfy the lender of the moral worthiness of the creditor, lest the loan, instead of being a benefaction, should really be but a stimulus to vice, or, at least, an encouragement to idleness. 2. The wants of one's own family and nearer dependents must not be sacrificed by ill-judged and untimely generosity. 3. Funds held in trust should be carefully discriminated from one's own personal property, and a greater degree of caution exercised in their administration. 4. We have no right to loan what is already due for our own debts—"We must be just before we are generous." 5. In fine, the great fact that we are but stewards of God's bounty should be the ruling thought in all our benefactions, whether in the form of loans or gifts, and we should therefore dispense funds so as to contribute most to the divine glory and the highest good of the recipients. This principle alone is the true corrective of all selfishness, whether parsimony on the one hand, or prodigality on the other. See Borrow; Lend, etc.

Loaysa, Gracia de, an eloquent Dominican preacher and Spanish cardinal, was born in 1479 at Talavera, Castile; entered the Dominican Order at St. Paul de Pennefiel in 1495, and was made successively professor of philosophy, next of theology, director of studies, rector at St. Gregory, prior of the convent of Avila and of Valladolid, provincial of Spain (1518), and finally general of his order. In 1532 he was chosen confessor to Charles V, of whom he had previously been a teacher. In the following year Charles V made him bishop of Osma. He admitted him into his private council, and very soon made him president of the Royal Council of the Indies, and president of the Crusade. Loaysa strongly opposed the release, without ransom or condition, of Francis I, king of France, made prisoner by Charles at Pavia. Succeeding events proved his counsel good. In 1530 Charles V obtained a cardinalship for him from pope Clement VII, and also the title St. Suzanne. In the same year he named him bishop of Siguenza, and also archbishop of Seville. Loaysa finally became grand inquisitor of Spain. He was frequently ambassador for Charles V, and kept up a private correspondence with him, some of the letters of which (from 1530 to 1532), embracing Charles's stay in Germany, the most important period in the history of the Reformation, are published by G. Heine from the archives of Simancas. These letters prove Loaysa very bitter against the "heretics." Loaysa died April 21, 1546, at Madrid. See Antonio, *Biblioth. Hispana Nova*, iii, 514; Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, ii, 39; Le P. Touron, *Hommes illustres de l'Ordre de Saint-Dominique*, iv, 93; *Table du Journ. des Savans*, vol. vi; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxi, s. v.; Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, i, 158 sq.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Lobbes, a celebrated convent in Hennegau, near Liege, in Belgium, founded by St. Laudelin, is noted particularly because it educated, and at one time had as its abbot, the celebrated monk Heriger, who flourished towards the close of the 10th century. His whole history is so thoroughly entangled in mythical narratives that it is well-nigh impossible to tell when Heriger first came to Lobbes. Vogel, in Herzog (*Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 753), thinks it probable that Heriger entered Lobbes in 960, and that he could not, because of the low condition of the inmates of that monastery previous to this date, have been educated there. Heriger wrote *Vita St. Ursmari:—Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium et Leodiensium* (about A.D. 979):—*Vita St. Laudoaldi* (about 980), etc. He died Oct. 31, 1007.

Löber, Gotthilf Friedemann, a German theologian, was born at Bonneburg, in the duchy of Sachsen-Altenburg, Oct. 22, 1722. In 1738 he entered the University of Jena, where, in 1741, he lectured on linguistics of the Old and New Test., and later on philosophy. Notwithstanding his splendid prospects in this sphere, he gave up academical life in 1743, and removed to Altenburg as assistant court preacher (his aged father was then chief court preacher). In 1745 he became assessor of the Consistory; in 1747, archdeacon: in 1751, preacher of a foundation and councillor of the Consistory; in 1768, superintendent general; in 1792, privy councillor of the Consistory; in the following year he celebrated his jubilee of fifty years of office. He died August 22, 1799. By reason of his extensive learning, profound linguistic attainments, accurate knowledge of all the branches of theology, and great piety, he is considered one of the greatest Lutheran theologians of the 18th century. Of his productions, we mention *Observationes ad historiam vitæ et mortis Jesu Christi in ipsa ætatis flore obitæ spectantes* (Altenburg, 1767, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s. v.

Lobethan, Johann Konrad, a German theologian, was born at Hebel, near Homburg, Sept. 29, 1688. In 1705 he entered the University of Marburg; later, he spent three years in Cassel, and in 1711 went to Bremen to continue his studies. In 1714 he accepted a call to Weimar as court preacher of the duchess dowager Charlotte Dorothea Sophie; in 1720, to Cöthen, as chief minister and superintendent, with the dignity of a councillor of the Consistory. Subsequently he was, for several years, the first minister and councillor of the Consistory of the German Reformed Church at Magdeburg. The latter portion of his life he spent at Cöthen, where he died Nov. 29, 1735. Lobethan was noted as an eminent preacher; the earnest and warm mode of his delivery always captivated the attention of his audience. Of his productions, mostly of an ascetical character, we

mention *Dissert. de magisterio gratiæ sub Novo Testam.* (Bremæ, 1711, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Th. Deutschl.* s. v.

Lobo, Jeronimo, a noted Portuguese missionary of the Order of the Jesuits, was born at Lisbon in 1593. He was at first a professor in the Jesuits' College at Coimbra, whence he was ordered to the missions in India, and removed to Goa in 1622. In 1623 he volunteered for the mission to Abyssinia to Christianize that country, whose sovereign, by Lobo called sultan Segued, had turned Roman Catholic through the instrumentality of father Paez, who in 1603 had gone to Abyssinia (q. v.). Lobo sailed from Goa in 1624, and landed at Paté, on the coast of Mombaza, thinking to reach Abyssinia by land. He proceeded some distance from Paté to the northward among the Gallas, of whom he gives an account, but, finding it impracticable to penetrate into Abyssinia by that way, he retraced his steps to the coast, and embarked for India. In 1625 he started out again, this time in company with Mendez, the newly-appointed patriarch of Ethiopia, and other missionaries. After sailing up the Red Sea they landed at Belur, or Belal Bay (13° 14′ N. lat.), on the Dancali coast, whose sheik was tributary to Abyssinia, and thence, crossing the salt plain, Lobo entered Tigré by a mountain pass, and arrived at Fremona, near Duan, where the missionary settlement was. Here he spent several years as superintendent of the missions in that kingdom. A revolt of the viceroy of Tigré, Tecla Georgis, put Lobo in great danger, for the rebels were joined by the Abyssinian priests, who hated the Roman Catholic missionaries, and indeed represented the protection given to them by the emperor Segued as the greatest cause of complaint against him. The viceroy, however, was defeated, arrested, and hanged; and Lobo, having repaired to the emperor's court, was afterwards sent by his superiors to the kingdom of Damot. From Damot, Lobo, after some time, returned again to Tigré, where the persecution raised by the son and successor of Segued overtook him. All the Portuguese, to the number of 400, with the patriarch, a bishop, and eighteen Jesuits, were compelled to leave the country in 1634. Lobo now sailed for Europe, but on his way was shipwrecked on the coast of Natal, and some time elapsed before he arrived in Portugal, where he sought to enlist the government in behalf of his scheme, the reclamation of Abyssinia to the Romish Church. Neither here nor at the court of Rome did his plan find favor, and he left in 1640 for India, and became provincial of the Jesuits in Goa. In 1656 he returned to Lisbon, and published the narrative of his journey to Abyssinia, entitled *History of Ethiopia* (1659), which was afterwards translated into French by the abbé Legrand, who added a continuation of the history of the Roman Catholic missions in Abyssinia after Lobo's departure, and also an account of the expedition of Poncet, a French surgeon, who reached that country from Egypt, and a subsequent attempt made by Du Roule, who bore a sort of diplomatic character from the French court, but was murdered on his way, at Sennaar, in 1705. This is followed by several dissertations on the history, religion, government, etc., of Abyssinia. The whole was translated into English by Dr. Johnson in 1735. Lobo died at Lisbon in 1678.

Lobstein, Johann Michael, a German theologian, was born at Lampertheim, near Strasburg, May, 1740. In 1755 he entered the university of his native place, went to Paris in 1767, and at the expiration of nearly two years returned to Strasburg, and became pastor of the French Nicolai Church. In addition to this he became, after a few years, preacher of the German Peter's Church, and assistant at the Gymnasium. In 1764 he obtained a position as assistant of the philosophical faculty of the university of the same place. In 1775 he accepted a call to the University of Giessen as prof. ord. of divinity and assessor of the Consistory; in 1777 he received the degree of doctor of divinity, and was appointed inspector and first preacher at Butzbach. In 1790 he again returned to Strasburg as professor and preacher, and there died, June 29, 1794. Lobstein's above-mentioned stay in Paris not only offered him the opportunity of hearing some of the best Orientalists of the day (a fact which chiefly contributed to his extensive and accurate knowledge of the Oriental languages), but also made him acquainted with many great men of that city. Of his scholarly productions we only mention *Diss. de divina animi pace, sanctæ comite* (Argentorati, 1766, 4to):—*Commentatio historico-philologica de montibus Ebal et Garizim* (ibid. 1770, 4to):—*Observationes criticæ in loca Pentateuchi illustria* (Gissæ et Francof. 1787, 8vo). He published also the Samaritan Codex, after the MSS. of the Royal Library at Paris.—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutsch.* s. v.

Lobwasser, Ambrosius, a German Protestant poet, was born at Schneeburg, in Saxony, April 4, 1515. He studied law, and became chancellor of Misnia, which position he resigned in 1563, to assume the duties of a professorship at the University of Königsberg. He died Nov. 25, 1585. Lobwasser exerted great influence over the religious concerns of the duchy of Prussia, which, being at first exclusively Lutheran, finally came to be about equally divided among Lutherans and Calvinists. His reputation chiefly rests, however, on his German version of the Psalms (based upon the French translation of Clement Marot and Theodore Beza), published under the title *Die Psalmen Davids nach franz. Melodey in deutsche Reymen gebracht* (Lpz. 1573, 8vo; Heidelb. 1574; Lpz. 1579; Strasb. 1597, Amsterd. 1704). The translation was so symmetrical that the music made for the French by Claude Gondimel was exactly adapted to the German. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that it is entirely devoid of poetical merit, as might naturally be expected, for a translation from a translation can seldom have any of the original spirit. These Psalms were nevertheless used in the German Reformed churches until the middle of the 18th century, on account of the people's aversion against singing any but sacred productions. Lobwasser wrote also *Summarien aller Kapitel d. heiligen Schrift, in deutschen Reimen* (Lpz. 1584, 8vo). See Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon;* Koch, *Gesch. d. Kirche;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* x, 447; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* xxxi, 428. (J. N. P.)

Local Preachers. The term "local," as applied to preachers in Methodist churches, is used in contradistinction to the term "itinerant" or "travelling," which designates members of Annual Conferences. Local preachers are *lay* preachers. They are not subject to appointment by bishops or stationing committees, as are itinerant ministers. Nevertheless, they are formally licensed, and subject to the direction and friendly requisitions of the pastoral authority in the charge in which they reside. By special arrangement, and by authority of the presiding elder, a local preacher is sometimes appointed preacher in charge or pastor for a longer or shorter period.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the following is the process of the appointment of any person as a local preacher. 1. He must be recommended by the leaders' meeting of the Church to which he belongs. He must be elected by a Quarterly Conference before which he has been examined on the subject of doctrines and discipline. 2. An election by the Quarterly Conference at this stage appoints a candidate to the office of a local preacher. In proof of his appointment, he is furnished with a license signed by the president of the Conference. The license is given for one year only, and, in order to validity, must be renewed every year thereafter. 3. Subject to the following prerequisites, a local preacher may be ordained: (1.) He must have held a local preacher's license for four consecutive years before his ordination. (2.) He must have been examined in the Quarterly Conference on the subject of doctrines and discipline. (3.) He must have received a "testi-

monial" from the Quarterly Conference, signed by the president and countersigned by the secretary. This testimonial must recommend the applicant as a suitable person to receive ministerial orders. (4.) He must pass an examination as to character and acquirements before the Annual Conference, and obtain its approbation and election to orders.

Local preachers are amenable to the Quarterly Conferences of which they are members. An ordained local preacher is not required to have his credentials renewed annually, although his character must be approved each year by the Quarterly Conference. No person is eligible to admission on trial in an Annual Conference who is not a local preacher, and specially recommended by the Quarterly Conference as a suitable candidate for the "travelling connection." Thus the local or lay preacher's office is made preparatory to the itinerant or fully-constituted ministry. Local preachers are subject to all the moral and religious obligations of the regular ministry. Although expected to devise and execute plans for doing good to the extent of their individual ability, they are nevertheless required to act under the direction of their pastors or presiding elders, who are on their part required by the Discipline of the Church to give local preachers regular and systematic employment on the Sabbath.

On large circuits, and on stations embracing missionary work, and where the number of local preachers is considerable, it is customary to arrange and print a *Plan* covering all the appointments of a quarter, and designating the time and place of each individual's services. In the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Great Britain the insertion of a local preacher's name on the current plan of the charge is deemed a sufficient license and public authentication for his office. In his measures for training and employing lay workers in the Congregational Church, Rev. T. Dewitt Talmage, of Brooklyn, has adopted the system of mapping out the work of his lay preachers in a printed plan, after the manner above alluded to.

According to official statistics, the number of local preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the close of 1889 was 13,558, a number less by but 1537 than that of the itinerant ministers of the same Church. The number of local preachers in the eight other Methodist bodies of the United States is supposed to be about 10,000. In all but a few exceptional cases, the individuals forming this great body of evangelical workers render their services to churches and people without fee or reward. Many of them faithfully and zealously obey the commands of the great Teacher: "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind," also, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." While preaching laboriously on the Sabbath, they support themselves by diligence in business during the week.

Within a few years past a spirited effort has been made among the local preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church for mutual improvement, and the general increase of the intellectual and spiritual power of the body. A National Local Preachers' Association has been formed, which has held public sessions in various parts of the United States. "At these annual gatherings representatives from all parts of the world come together for counsel, and for the comparison of personal experience, and observations, and methods of labor; also to discuss questions bearing upon their work generally." This association also encourages the organization of branch associations in different sections of the country. The National Association referred to memorialized the General Conference of 1872, requesting the following legislation, viz.:

(1.) To organize in each presiding elder's district a District Conference, to be composed of all the travelling and local preachers in the district, and to be presided over by the presiding elder, and meet semi-annually.

(2.) To give this District Conference authority to receive, license, try, and expel local preachers, and also to recommend suitable persons to the Annual Conference to be received into the travelling connection, and for ordination as local deacons and elders.

(3.) To authorize the District Conference to assign each local preacher to a field of labor for the quarter, and to hold him strictly responsible for an efficient performance of his work.

This scheme of District Conferences being analogous to that long practiced by the Wesleyans of Great Britain, was, with sundry additions and modifications, adopted, but, nevertheless, made subject to the option of a majority of the Quarterly Conferences in any given district. The local preacher's office may be considered a feature of Methodist churches, in all their branches and in all parts of the world. By means of it lay preaching is not only sanctioned, but regulated and made auxiliary to regular Church and missionary movements. In England a monthly magazine is published, entitled *The Local Preacher's Magazine*, to furnish lay preachers material for study, etc., since 1851. See also J. H. Carr, *The Local Ministry, its Character, Vocation, and Position* (Lond. 1851); G. Smith, *Wesleyan Local Preacher's Manual* (Lond. 1861); Mills, *Local or Lay Ministry* (Lond. 1851). (D. P. K.)

Lochman, John George, D.D., a Lutheran minister, widely and favorably known, was born in Philadelphia Dec. 2, 1773. After the proper preparation, he entered the University of Pennsylvania, at which he was graduated in 1789, and from which institution he subsequently received the doctorate. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. Helmuth, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1794. Soon after, he accepted a call to Lebanon, Penn., where he remained twenty-one years, laboring with great fidelity and the most satisfactory results. In 1815 he was elected pastor of the Lutheran Church at Harrisburg, Penn. His successful labors here were terminated by death July 10, 1826. Dr. Lochman was an able and popular preacher. He was held in high estimation by the Church, and exercised an unbounded influence. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, ix, 110 sq. (M. L. S.)

Loci Communes Theologici is the name given to expositions of evangelical dogmatics in the early times of the Reformation. It originated with Melancthon, and was retained by many as late as the 17th century. Melancthon was led to adopt it in consequence of its classical signification, the word *loci* being then used to denote the fundamental principles of any system or science, and he considered it desirable that the *loci* of theology should also be regularly established and defined: "E quibus rerum summa pendeat, ut quorsum dirigenda sint studia intelligatur" (*Loci communes s. hypotyposes theologicæ*, 1521); "Prodest in doctrina Christ. ordine colligere præcipuos locos ut intelligi possit; quid in summa profiteatur doctrina Christiana, quid ad eam portineat, quid non pertineat" (*Loci communes*, 1533, init.). But, as the very first principle of the Reformation was the Bible as a source of saving truth, it is evident the *Loci communes theologici* could be nothing else than the Scriptures themselves. In the first edition of his *Loci* Melancthon confined himself almost exclusively to the Epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of which he collected the *Communissimi rerum theologicarum loci;* in his second work (1533) he extended his field, following the historical order, and this plan has been generally adopted since. The most striking progress accomplished by this method, compared with the former scholastic treatment of dogmatics, is, as Melancthon himself pointed out, a return to the Bible on all points, instead of to the sentences of Peter Lombard, "Qui ita recitat dogmata ut nec muniat lectorem Scripturæ testimoniis nec de summâ Scripturæ disputet." As the Reformation restored the Bible to the people, it was natural that the *Loci theol.* also should be less scientific and learned works than such as could help the people to a clearer understanding of the Scriptures. Hence

they were published in German by Spalatin (1521), afterwards by J. Jonas (1536), and finally by Melancthon himself (1542), and designated by them as the chief articles and principal point of Scripture (*Hauptartikel u. fürnehmste Punkte d. ganzen heil. Schrift*), or of Christian doctrine (*Hauptartikel christlicher Lehre*). Melancthon, however, in the third part of his *Loci* (1543–59), gradually withdrew from this position, and adopted a manner of treating the subject more akin to scholasticism. This was subsequently the case with the *Loci theologici* of Abdias Prætorius (Schulze) (Wittemberg, 1569) and Strigel (ed. Pezel, Neust. 1581), who held the same views, as well as with those of Martin Chemnitz (ed. P. Lyser, Francf. a. M. 1591) and Hafenreffer (Tüb. 1600), who differed from him; also of Leonard Hütter (Wittemb. 1619), who went on an entirely different principle, which John Gerhard tried to soften down in his renowned *Loci theol.* (Jena, 1610), while A. Calov, in his *Systema locor. theol.* (Wittemb. 1655), carried it to its full extreme. After this time the expression *Loci theologici* ceased to be used in Lutheran dogmatics. In the Reformed Church it was used by Hyperius (Basle, 1566), W. Musculus (Berne, 1561), Peter Martyr (Basle, 1580), J. Maccov (Franeker, 1639), and D. Chamier (Geneva, 1653). See Gass, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (1854, vol. i); Heppe, *Dogmatik des deutsch. Protestantismus*, etc. (1857, vol. i); C. Schwarz, *Studien u. Kritiken* (1855, i, and 1857, ii).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 449. (J. N. P.)

Lock (נָעַל, *naäl'*, to *bar* up a door, Judg. iii, 23, 24; rendered "bolt," 2 Sam. xiii, 17, 18, "inclose," "shut up," in Cant. iv, 12; hence מַנְעוּל, *manul'*, the *bolt* or fastening of a door, Neh. iii, 3, 6, 13, 14, 15, Cant. v, 5). The doors of the ancient Hebrews were secured by bars of wood or iron, though the latter were almost entirely appropriated to the entrance of fortresses, prisons, and towns (comp. Isa. xlv, 2). Thus we find it mentioned in 1 Kings iv, 13 as something remarkable concerning Bashan that "there were threescore great cities, having walls and brazen bars." These were almost the only locks known in early times, and they were furnished with a large and clumsy key, which was applied to the bar through an orifice on the outside, by means of which the bolt or bar was slipped forward as in modern locks (Judg. iii, 24). There were smaller contrivances for inner doors, and probably projecting pieces by which to shove the bolt with the hand (Cant. v, 5). See Key. Lane thus describes a modern Egyptian lock: "Every door is furnished with a wooden lock, called *dabbeh*, the mechanism of which is shown by a sketch here inserted. No. 1 is a front view of the lock, with the bolt drawn back, Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are back views of the separate parts and the key. A number of small iron pins (four, five, or more) drop into corresponding holes in the sliding bolt as soon as the latter is pushed into the hole or staple of the door-post. The key also has small pins, made to correspond with the holes, into which they are introduced to open the lock, the former pins being thus pushed up, the bolt may be drawn back. The wooden lock of a street door commonly has a sliding bolt about fourteen inches long; those of the doors of apartments, cupboards, etc., are about seven, eight, or nine inches. The locks of the gates of quarters, public buildings, etc., are of the same kind, and mostly two feet in length, or more. It is not difficult to pick this kind of lock" (*Mod. Egyptians*, i, 25). Hence they were sometimes, as an additional security, covered with clay (q. v.), and on this a seal (q. v.) impressed (comp. Job xxviii, 14). (See Rauwolff, *Trav.* in Ray, ii, 17; Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 22; Volney, *Trav.* ii, 438; Chardin, *Voy.* iv, 123; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.*, abridgment, i, 15, 16.) See Door.



Modern Egyptian wooden Lock.

The other terms rendered "lock" in the Auth. Vers. refer to the hair of the head, etc.: they are the following: מַחֲלָפוֹת, *machlaphoth'*, *braids* or plaits, e. g. of the long hair of Samson (Judg. xvi, 13, 19); צִיצִת, *tsitsith'*, the *forelock* of the head (Ezek. viii, 3; also a "fringe" or *tassel*, Numb. xv, 38, 39; comp. Matt. xxiii, 5); פֶּרַע, *pe'ra*, the *locks* of hair, as being shorn (Numb. vi, 5; Ezek. xliv, 20; and קְוֻצּוֹת, *kevutstoth'*, the *forelocks* or *sidelocks* of a man's or woman's hair (Cant. v, 2, 12; comp. Schultens, *Op. min.* p. 246); but צָמָה, *tsammah'*, is a *veil* or female covering for the head and face, usual in the East (Cant. iv, 1, 3; vi, 7; Isa. xlvii, 2). See Hair.

Locke, George, a Methodist preacher, was born in Cannonstown, Pa., June 8, 1797, and reared in Kentucky. His early educational advantages were few, but he improved all opportunities to secure knowledge. His parents were Presbyterians, but George was made a Methodist through the preaching of Edward Talbot when a saddler's apprentice. In 1817 he was licensed to exhort, and soon began to preach. In 1819 he entered Tennessee Conference, and was successively appointed to Little River Circuit, to Powell's Valley, and to Bowling Green Circuit, Ky. In 1822 he located in Shelbyville, and engaged in secular business. His conscience forced him to re-enter the ministry, and he successively preached on Jefferson Circuit and Hartford Circuit (Kentucky Conference). In 1826 he was transferred to Corydon Circuit, Illinois Conference. In 1828 he labored on Charleston Circuit, and was the means of one of the greatest revivals that Southern Indiana ever witnessed. The same year he was appointed presiding elder of Wabash District, which embraced an area of territory in Indiana and Illinois of at least 100 miles from east to west, by 200 miles from north to south, on either side of the Wabash River. While on this district he contracted the consumption, and was obliged to become supernumerary. He died in New Albany, Ind., in July, 1834. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 608.

Locke, John, the most notable of modern English philosophers, who has exercised the greatest influence on all subsequent speculation, in both psychology and politics, and whose doctrines, under various modifications or exaggerations, still contribute largely to mould the opinions of the civilized world. He has in great measure determined the complexion of British psychology. As the most strenuous antagonist of Cartesianism; as the precursor and teacher alike of the French encyclopædists and of the Scotch school; as the oracle of the freethinkers, the target of Leibnitz, and the stimulator of Hartley, Berkeley, and Hume, Locke must always attract the earnest consideration of the student of metaphysics. For nearly two centuries his name has been a battle-cry, and his dogmas have been fought over by the shadowy hosts of warring *idéologues* with the zeal and the fury with which the Greeks and the Tro-

jans contended over the body of Patroclus. His labors in the department of mental philosophy constitute only a part of his claims to enduring regard. His inquiries have been scarcely less fruitful in political philosophy and political economy. In the former he is the *avant-courier* of Rousseau; in the latter science, of Adam Smith; and in each he has laid the foundations on which later theorists and later statesmen have been content to build.

Life.—John Locke was born Aug. 29, 1632, at Wrington, Somersetshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later at Christ Church College, Oxford. Here he prosecuted the prescribed studies with diligence and success, but deviated from the beaten path by devoting himself to the discountenanced writings of Des Cartes, who had died a few years before. He obtained the baccalaureate in 1655, and the master's degree in 1658, and then applied himself to the study of medicine, rather for the sake of knowledge and of his sickly frame than with the purpose of practicing his profession.

In 1664 Locke accompanied the embassy to the elector of Brandenburg as secretary of legation, but he returned to Oxford within the year, and applied himself to experimental philosophy, then rising into favor. An accident now decided his course of life, and occasioned his acquaintance with lord Ashley—the celebrated earl of Shaftesbury—with whom he was persuaded to take up his abode the next year. By his skill and good luck he relieved his patron of an abscess which endangered his life, and was induced to confine his medical practice to a small circle of the lord's friends, and to give his chief attention to political speculation and questions of state. He thus became a man of the world before he became a philosopher. In 1668 Locke accompanied the earl and countess of Northumberland to France. The earl proceeded towards Rome, and died on the way. Locke returned with the countess to England, and again found a home with Ashley—chancellor of the exchequer after Clarendon's fall. The future sage was employed to superintend the education of Ashley's heir, a feeble boy of sixteen. He was afterwards commissioned to select a wife for him, and did so satisfactorily. In due course of time he took charge of the education of the eldest son of this marriage, the author of "the Characteristics." "To such strange uses may we come at last!"

Though residing with lord Ashley, Locke retained his connection with Oxford, which he frequently visited. On one of these visits, in 1670, the conversation of Dr. Thomas and other friends turned his thoughts to the difficult, still unsettled, and perhaps insoluble question of the nature and limits of human knowledge. This supplied the germ of the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, though nearly twenty years elapsed before the completion and publication of the work. In 1672, Ashley, the master-spirit in Charles II's "Cabal," was created earl of Shaftesbury, and soon after he was made lord high chancellor. Locke was appointed secretary of Plantations. Next summer Shaftesbury surrendered the great seal, and became president of the Board of Trade and Plantations. Locke was named secretary of the board. It was at this time that he produced for his noble friend and the other proprietors the Constitution of the Carolinas. In another year the Commission of Trade was dissolved, Locke lost his post, and he dreamt of making a livelihood by his profession. But his health was feeble, and he travelled in France, acquiring at Montpellier the intimacy of the earl of Pembroke, to whom he afterwards dedicated his "*Essay*."

On Shaftesbury's restoration to office as lord president of the council, 1679, he sent for Locke, but the minister was dismissed in October of the same year. In two years more he was brought to trial for treason, but the grand jury ignored the indictment. Shaftesbury, however, was compelled to escape secretly to Holland, where he died, June 21, 1683. Locke had followed him, and wrote an affectionate tribute to his memory.

The hostile testimony of bishop Fell proves that Locke had held himself aloof from the intrigues in which Shaftesbury was involved. He did not avoid the malice which such an intimacy invited. He was deprived of his studentship at Christ Church, and vainly attempted to regain it at the Revolution. On the accession of James II his surrender was demanded from the states' general on the charge of complicity in Monmouth's insurrection. He was concealed by his Dutch friends. William Penn offered to procure his pardon, but the office was nobly declined. During this exile Locke composed his first *Letter on Toleration*, and produced his plan of "A Commonplace Book"—if it be his—a cumbrous and inadequate device, which admits of easy improvement. During this period—towards the close of 1687—he finished the *Essay concerning the Human Understanding*. The mode of its composition has left painful traces on the completed work, as was apprehended and acknowledged by its author.

The Revolution of 1688 restored Locke to his native land. He signalized his return by the publication of his great philosophical work. An attempt was made to prohibit its introduction into the University of Oxford. In 1690 he issued his two treatises *On Government*. They controverted the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and referred the origin of government to a social compact, which is equally disproved by theory and by history. They rendered a greater service by recognising labor as the foundation of property, though the tenet was pressed too far.

Locke continued to decline diplomatic honors, but accepted the place of Commissioner of Appeals, with the modest salary of £200. He directed his regards in these years to the coinage of the realm, which was much debased; and published in 1691 his *Considerations on the Lowering of Interest and Raising the Value of Money*, which was followed in 1695 by *Further Considerations on Raising the Value of Money*. He was in frequent consultation with the earl of Pembroke on the subject of that restoration of the British coinage which was brought about by the concurrent action of lord Somers and Sir Isaac Newton.

In 1693 Locke withdrew from the dull, heavy atmosphere of London, and accepted a pleasant retreat for his increasing asthma and advancing age at Oates, in Essex, the seat of Sir Francis Masham, who had married the accomplished daughter of Dr. Cudworth. It had been the fortune of Locke through life to live "*quadris alienis*." His last quarters were at Oates. This was his home till he found a quieter home in the grave, where he waited in *cold abstraction's apathy* for a miracle to reanimate his spirit, according to the dogma of *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (produced in 1695). This work sought the union of all Christian believers by advancing the doctrine that the only necessary article of Christian belief is comprised in *the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah*, making all the requirements beyond this to consist of *practical duties*, of repentance for sin, and obedience to the moral precepts of the Gospel. It will be remembered that king William III, of England, entertained the design of uniting Conformists and Dissenters on some common ground, and to further this scheme Locke wrote *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (comp. *Quarterly Review*, Lond. 1864, July). About the time of his retirement from the city Locke published his third *Letter on Toleration*, and in the first year of his seclusion wrote his little tract on the *Education of Children*. The same year which brought out his exceedingly heterodox essay on Christianity was marked by his philosophical controversy with Dr. Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester.

Locke's circumstances were now rendered perfectly easy by his appointment as commissioner of Trade and Plantations, with emoluments amounting to £1000 per annum. Locke, however, had an aptitude for losing or dropping the gifts of the fairies. Increasing debility made him resign his comfortable sinecure in 1700, and,

four years later, he died calmly at Oates, Oct. 28, 1704. He was buried at the neighboring church of High Laver. Queen Caroline, one of those *femmes précieuses* who, like Christina of Sweden or Euler's princess, followed with her sympathies the studies she could not understand, placed Locke's bust with those of Bacon, Newton, and Clarke, in the mausoleum erected by her at Richmond Park to commemorate the glories of English philosophy.

Locke's health was always exceedingly feeble, and his existence was prolonged only by constant vigilance and care. This doubtless contributed to his abstinence from any energetic vocation, and probably influenced his theories as well as his character and conduct. It rendered his existence a career of tranquil and learned leisure, except so far as it was interrupted by the suspicions and malice which civil discord directs against every man of note. The self-regarding habits of a valetudinarian may have impelled the thoughts of the philosopher to that continual introspection and that exaggeration of personal impressions which so strongly mark his philosophy. His love of ease and security showed itself in his general demeanor. He was cautious and retiring, affable and genial in his intercourse, kindly and affectionate in his nature, free from personal animosities, notwithstanding his transitory difference with Newton and his controversy with bishop Stillingfleet. He avoided the incumbrances of matrimony; and the deficient experiences of an old bachelor—the want of that most suggestive knowledge, the dawn of intelligence in infancy—may be noted in his whole psychology. His life was, however, worthy of his eminence, and was such as to make him a suitable compeer of those *fortunate nimium*—those happy philosophic dispositions which are represented by Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Berkeley, and Hume.

Philosophy.—The philosophy of Locke is very simple, if not very coherent, and very unsystematic in its treatment by himself. It consists rather of one prolific principle and its explanations than of any complete and orderly scheme. That principle furnishes a foundation for a distinctive method, which was only imperfectly and inconsistently developed by him. That method is psychological, and Locke has been too hastily regarded as its inventor, whereas he only applied it too exclusively and within too narrow limits. Locke's controversial works are naturally directed to the removal of the numerous objections and misapprehensions to which his fundamental tenet and its applications are obnoxious; but even the Essay itself is mainly employed in the discussion of topics which illustrate the dogma rather than establish a formal body of doctrine, and which belong to the preliminaries or prolegomena of philosophy much more than to philosophy proper.

An examination of the analysis usually prefixed to the "Essay" will show how small a portion of the work really belongs to the regular exposition of a metaphysical system; how much is occupied with the anticipation of objections, or the simplification of apprehended difficulties. The treatise is divided into four books. The first repudiates the Cartesian doctrine of innate ideas, and is therefore controversial and negative. It does not seem to have been very highly regarded by Locke himself. The second is an inquiry into the origin and limits of human knowledge, and is the characteristic portion of Locke's philosophy. The third is given to the consideration of words, and is in many respects the most valuable part of the book, affording useful suggestions for guarding against the multitudinous seductions of the *Idola Fori*. It is dialectical rather than philosophical, though it affords frequent opportunities of confirming or expounding his cardinal tenet, and many of exhibiting its inadequacy. The fourth book is on the nature of knowledge in general, and does little more than apply the conclusion already reached to the determination of the degree, extent, and quality of human knowledge, which is reduced by him not merely to relativity, but to a beggarly and unsatisfactory relativity.

The circumstances which provoked the composition of Locke's celebrated treatise account in a most instructive manner for the character of his doctrine. His addiction to the writings of Des Cartes in his college days—his rejection of his postulates and conclusions—his fondness for the physical and natural sciences—his utter defect of poetic sensibility—his association with the great and with the *beau monde*—his political and practical proclivities, confined his attention to observed phenomena, cramped and discouraged the criticism of those phenomena, and withdrew his thoughts from what lay beyond, and was required for the intelligent observation and interpretation of the phenomena supposed to be observed. Hence he was led to ignore the spirit of human thought—to exaggerate the importance of the words which served for the counters of metaphysical speculation—to make much of his philosophy turn upon the precision and determinateness of terms, and to consider that a scrupulous recognition of their import in their acceptance and employment constituted the main part of philosophy. Hence, when he undertook "to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with," the examination scarcely reached to that primary and essential problem of metaphysics, but revolved tediously and with needless prolixity around the limits of the meanings of words. He thus necessarily arrived at an excessive, though far from rigorous nominalism.

Locke's point of departure was that of all the philosophers of the latter part of the 17th and the first quarter of the 18th century—Cartesianism. The influence of the suspected doctrine was manifested at the outset of his labors by his proposition to substitute the phrase *determinate ideas* for *clear and distinct ideas*—though a mere change of name, and such a change, could effect little in producing a complete reform of system. It is a startling commentary on the insufficiency of this substitution that no writer has been more capricious and vacillating in his employment of terms than Locke himself, and that the very term *idea*, which he elaborately defines, is used by him without determinate meaning, and in almost every possible sense except its true one. He, however, furnished neither the first nor the solitary example of the abuse of this fine Platonic invention. Locke's popularity may be due to the ease, and vigor, the vivacity, and homeliness of his style; but the style is rugged, ambiguous, conversational, and as far removed from philosophical propriety as it is from literary elegance.

The influence of Des Cartes, educing antagonism, tempted Locke to commence his investigations by an assault on the hypothesis of innate ideas, which unquestionably formed the latent substratum of the Cartesian delusions. Certainly the clear and distinct ideas of Des Cartes had no title to be accepted as innate. Locke had thus an easy task in refuting the Cartesian positions. He failed to recognise that the incriminated doctrine was not thereby refuted. The "*tabula rasa*" of Locke was just as much an assumption and as much a fallacy as the innate truths of his opponent—unless by the *tabula rasa* is understood, what Locke would not have understood, the sensitive and sympathetic tablet ready to restore in the sunlight of life all images presented to it. It is perfectly true that distinct conceptions and formulated maxims are not innate, or anterior to all excitation. This admission does not disprove the reality of congenital and constitutional preadaptations of the intellectual faculties for the acceptance of such conceptions and propositions when suitably presented to the mind and apprehended by it. Locke's doctrine on this point has consequently been surrendered, and the doctrine opposed by him has been accepted, under juster limitations, by many who continue to entertain the profoundest reverence for his general procedure. The Cartesian postulate compelled the assertion of a divine in-

flux to explain the operations of the mind, and suggested Malebranche's celebrated thesis of "seeing all things in God." Locke, who had assailed the heresiarch, felt the necessity of controverting the hazardous modification proposed by the fervent acolyte. But the tenet to which Locke was himself driven by the compulsion of his own erroneous principles was equally hazardous and still more fallacious—that our idea of God is obtained by sensation and reflection.

Having got rid of innate ideas—*tenues sine corpore vitæ*—the English philosopher proceeded to investigate the origin of human knowledge—the avowed object of his main inquiry. There was an inversion of logical order, as Morell has observed, in seeking the *ratio essendi* of the phenomena before ascertaining the phenomena themselves; but the accidental connection between the first and second pairs of the Essay is very intimate. If knowledge be not deduced *ab intra*, it might naturally appear to be derived *ab extra*. Hence Locke concluded that all knowledge is obtained from sensation and reflection. This is his principle, and his principle is his philosophy—the curtain is the picture. The distinction between the sensation and its intellectual appreciation was unsuspected by him; nor did he observe that if sensation and reflection upon sensation are the exclusive sources of knowledge, the knowledge of reflection is derivative from and dependent upon sensation, and all knowledge springs from sensation alone. This oversight occasioned his very inadequate explanations of space, time, power, cause, good and evil, and God; it furnished Hume with his cardinal positions in regard to impressions and ideas; it rendered Locke a suitable patron for the French encyclopædists and the materialists, and created the belief that he espoused the tenet "*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu.*" This tenet was held by neither Aristotle nor Locke, but Locke's development of his own principle often seems to assert and to rest upon that tenet, and both provoked and justified the celebrated response and refutation offered by Leibnitz in the proposed addition to the maxim of the words "*nisi intellectus ipse.*" Locke might have accepted that addition, but it was not declared by his language, nor clearly indicated by his teachings; and its frank acceptance would have been fatal to his philosophical expositions; for, if reflection be considered as a source of knowledge distinct from sensation, it must be different from sensation, and must be a contribution of the mind itself to the intellectual product. Locke's original attitude was that of a polemic engaged in the refutation of Des Cartes; this attitude he never altogether abandoned; it determined his habits of speculation, and continually misled him. Locke was still further misled by the looseness, awkwardness, obscurity, and prolixity of his style, by its colloquial negligence of phrase, by that wavering of expression and impalpability of figurative illustration which have been noted by Sir William Hamilton, Maurice, and nearly every other student of his works. The equivocation of the terms employed by him escaped his recognition, while it perplexes his readers, and produced much the same effect upon his reasoning as was produced upon Hume's by a similar agency. With Locke there might be delusion; there was no sophistry; there was an open, manly spirit, a candor and honesty of investigation which often slighted or ignored consistency in the determined apprehension of what was felt instinctively to be right. His book accordingly exercises a most wholesome influence even when the developments of his doctrine are most aberrant, and its perversions most perilous. The practical character of his own disposition, the predilection for the studies of observation, and the innocence and simplicity of his own nature, guarded him from the effects as well as from the perception of his errors, but at the same time rendered those errors less apparent and more seductive to others. They preserved his own piety, while his system became a *templum impietatis.*

This practical appetency of Locke's mind was so engrossing as to leave him utterly without imagination or poetic sensibility. Poetry he discountenanced from want of taste, but professedly for the more ignoble reason that "no gold was found at the roots of Parnassus." The absence of imagination was a very serious defect. It was not true in his case that *omne ignotum pro mirabili.* On the contrary, the wondrous domain of the unknown and the unapprehended was "undreamt of in his philosophy." These intellectual peculiarities became very manifest in his religious and political treatises—sometimes inducing point, perspicuity, and popularity; sometimes generating prosaic assumptions for want of penetrating vision. Thus were probably occasioned the denial of the immortality of the soul in the *Reasonableness of Christianity*—the ascription of all value to labor originally expended in his economical speculations—the allegation of a social contract and of a state of nature—pure and untenable hypotheses—in his treatises *On Government*, and other less prominent vagaries. These points merit careful consideration, but they can be only noted here. We should not, however, omit to mention that Locke's amiable and tolerant disposition, the associations of his life, the tenor of his philosophy, his love of justice and freedom, rendered efficient service towards the extension of civil, political, and religious liberty at home and abroad, and entitle him to reverential regard as one of the chief benefactors of humanity.

Literature.—The literature illustrative of Locke's philosophy is endless. It includes the greater part of the metaphysical treatises written since the close of the 17th century. It must suffice, therefore, to mention here only the works of most direct importance, and most readily accessible. Of such is the following list composed. Locke, *Works* (London, 1824, 9 vols. 8vo); Locke, *Philosophical Works*, by J. A. St. John (London, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo); Leibnitz, *Nouveaux Essais sur l'Entendement Humain;* Joannes Clericus, *Lockii Vita;* "Life of John Locke," in the *Biographica Britannica;* Lord King, *The Life of John Locke*, etc. (Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 8vo); Forster, *Original Letters of John Locke*, etc. (London, 1847); Browne, "Life of John Locke," in the *Encyclop. Britannica;* Dugald Stewart, *Supplement to the Encyclop. Britannica;* Sir James Mackintosh, *On the philosophical Genius of Bacon and Locke;* Henry Rogers, *Miscellanies* (Lond. 1855, 3 vols. 8vo); Ritter, *Gesch. d. Christl. Philos.* vii, 449 sq.; V. Cousin, *Hist. de la Philosophie;* Lewes, *Biograph. Hist. of Philosophy* (Lond. 1857, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 237 sq.; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 124 sq.; Blakey, *Hist. Philosophy of Mind* (London, 1850, 4 vols. 8vo); Morell, *Crit. History of Modern Philosophy* (Lond. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); *Brit. Quar. Rev.* 1847 (May); *North Brit. Rev.* 1864 (July), p. 37 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* 1864 (April), 1854; *Lond. Quar. Review*, 1864 (July), p. 41 sq. (G. F. H.)

Locke, Nathaniel Clark, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born June 1, 1816, at Salem, N. J., graduated from Middlebury College, Vt., in 1838; from Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1844; was immediately licensed by the New York Presbytery, and soon after entered upon the duties of his first charge at Eastville, Northampton County, Va.; accepted a call to the Central Church, Brooklyn, in 1847; three years later took charge of the Church at Hempstead, L. I., N. Y., and there labored until 1860, when failing health compelled him to seek for a dismission. Dr. Locke was a member of the General Assembly of 1860, which met in Rochester, N. Y. A number of his discourses were published, and he was also a large contributor to the religious press. He died July 21, 1862. He was gifted with a well-trained and well-stored mind, and was eminently genial and social as a pastor and friend, and earnest and eloquent as a preacher. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 188. (J. L. S.)

Locke, Samuel, D.D., a noted American divine and educator, was born at Woburn, Mass., Nov. 23, 1732, and was educated at Harvard University (class of 1755). He was ordained minister of the Gospel at

Sherburne, Mass., Nov. 7, 1759, and remained in the ministry until 1769, when he was called to preside over his alma mater, and was inducted to the office March 21, 1770. Three years later he was honored by the college authorities with the doctorate of divinity, but some troubles must have arisen shortly after, for in December of this self-same year Locke resigned his position at Harvard, and spent the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Sherburne, Mass., Jan. 15, 1788. An estimate of the man we find in two letters written by Dr. Andrew Eliot, of Boston, to Mr. Hollis, of London, the distinguished benefactor of the college, about the time of Locke's election to the presidency of Harvard University, in which he is represented as "a clergyman of a small parish about twenty miles from Cambridge; of fine talents—a close thinker, having when at college the character of a first-rate scholar—of an excellent spirit, and generous, catholic sentiments—a friend to liberty—his greatest defect a want of knowledge of the world, having lived in retirement, and perhaps not a general acquaintance with books." The only production of Dr. Locke's that exists in print is the *Convention Sermon* preached in 1772. "His manner in the pulpit is said to have been marked by great dignity and impressiveness." See *The N. Y. Observer*, March, 1865.

Locke, William E., a minister and instructor, first in the Baptist, and later in the Presbyterian Church, was born in New York City, where he received a good education at the high school, in which he subsequently became an assistant teacher. In 1832 he took charge of the Mantua Manual Labor Institute in New York, and in 1833 was licensed to preach in the Baptist Church. He entered the junior class of Hamilton Institute (now Madison University); in 1835 he accepted his first call from the Church in Messina, N. Y., and was ordained Aug. 18, 1836. He remained in the Baptist connection until 1849, when his views concerning baptism led him to a change of his ecclesiastical relations. He was called in 1850 to the Presbyterian Church at Springfield, N. J., where, because of impaired health, he quit preaching. He subsequently took charge of the Female Collegiate Institute in Lancaster, Pa., and in August, 1857, removed to Missouri, and took charge of the Van Rensselaer Presbyterial Academy. At the end of his first quarter in this new position he was taken ill, and died Nov. 15, 1858. Mr. Locke's talents as a teacher were of a high order, and in the various places in which he labored he made many warm friends. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1860, p. 73. (J. L. S.)

Lockyer, Nicholas, a Presbyterian divine and pious Nonconformist, was born in 1612. He studied at New Inn Hall, Oxford, and became provost of Eton College in 1658, but was ejected at the Restoration. He died in 1684. His writings show him to have been very zealous and affectionate, earnestly bent on the conversion of souls. Some of his most important works are the following: *Baulme for bleeding England and Ireland, or seasonable Instructions for persecuted Christians*, delivered in several sermons [on Col. i, 11, 12] (London, 1644):—*Christ's Communion with his Church militant* [on John xiv, 18] (5th ed. London, 1672, 12mo):—*England faithfully watcht with her Wounds, or Christ as a Father sitting up with his Children in their swooning State; which is the summe of several Lectures painfully preached upon Colossians i* (Lond. 1646, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.

Locust, a well-known insect, which commits terrible devastation to vegetation in the countries which it visits. In the East it is especially prevalent, and at times commits such ravages as to produce famine and render the district almost uninhabitable.

I. There are ten Hebrew words which appear to signify *locust* in the Old Testament, while in the Greek the general term is *ἀκρίς*, which is employed in the New Testament. It has been supposed that some of these words denote merely the different states through which the locust passes after leaving the egg, viz. the larva, the pupa, and the perfect insect—all which much resemble each other, except that the larva has no wings, and that the pupa possesses only the rudiments of those members, which are fully developed only in the adult locust (Michaelis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.* ii, 667, 1080). But this supposition is manifestly wrong with regard to several of these terms, because, in Lev. xi, 22, the word לְמִינֵהוּ, "after his kind," or species, is added after each of them (compare ver. 14, 15, 16). It is most probable, therefore, that all the rest are also the names of species. But the problem is to ascertain the particular species intended by them respectively.

(1.) Arbeh' (אַרְבֶּה), occurs in Exod. x, 4; Sept. *ἀκρίδα πολλήν*, a vast flight of locusts, or perhaps indicating that several species were employed, Vulg. *locustam;* and in verses 12, 13, 14, 19, *ἀκρίς* and *locusta*, Eng. "locusts;" Lev. xi, 22, *βροῦχον*, *bruchus*, "locust;" Deut. xxviii, 38, *ἀκρίς*, *locustæ*, "locust;" Judg. vi, 5; vii, 12, *ἀκρίς*, *locustarum*, "grasshoppers;" 1 Kings viii, 37, *βροῦχος*, *locusta*, "locust;" 2 Chron. vi, 28, *ἀκρίς*, *locusta*, "locusts;" Job xxxix, 20, *ἀκρίδες*, *locustas*, "grasshopper;" Psa. lxxviii, 46, *ἀκρίδι*, Symm. *σκώληκι*, *locustæ*, "locust;" Psa. cv, 34, *ἀκρίς*, *locusta*, "locusts;" Psa. cix, 23, *ἀκρίδες*, *locustæ*, "locust;" Prov. xxx, 27, *ἀκρίς*, *locusta*, "locusts;" Jer. xlvi, 23, *ἀκρίδα*, *locusta*, "grasshoppers;" Joel i, 4; ii, 25, *ἀκρίς*, *locusta*, "locust;" Nah. iii, 15, *βροῦχος*, *bruchus*, "locusts;" ver. 17, *ἀττέλαβος*, *locustæ*, "locusts"). In almost every passage where *arbeh* occurs, reference is made to its terribly destructive powers.

It is the locust of the Egyptian plagues described in Exod. x, where, as indeed everywhere else, it occurs in the singular number only, though it is there associated with verbs both in the singular and plural (ver. 5, 6), as are the corresponding words in the Sept. and Vulgate. This it might be as a noun of multitude, but it will be rendered probable that four species were employed in the plague on Egypt, of which this is named first (Psa. lxxviii, 46, 47; cv, 34). These may all have been brought into Egypt from Ethiopia (which has ever been the cradle of all kinds of locusts), by what is called in Exodus "the east wind," since Bochart proves that the word which properly signifies "east" often means "south" also. The word *arbeh* may be used in Lev. xi, 22 as the collective name for the locust, and be put first there as denoting also the most numerous species; but in Joel i, 4, and Psa. lxxviii, 46, it is distinguished from the other names of locusts, and is mentioned second, as if of a different species; just, perhaps, as we use the word *fly*, sometimes as a collective name, and at others for a particular species of insect, as when speaking of the hop, turnip, meat fly, etc. When the Hebrew word is used in reference to a particular species, it has been supposed, for reasons which will be given, to denote the *Gryllus gregarius* or *migratorius*. Moses, therefore, in Exodus, refers Pharaoh to the visitation of the locusts, as well known in Egypt; but the plague would seem to have consisted in bringing them into that country in unexampled numbers, consisting of various species never previously seen there (comp. Exod. x, 5, 6, 15).

It is one of the flying creeping creatures that were allowed as food by the law of Moses (Lev. xi, 21). In this passage it is clearly the representative of some species of winged *saltatorial orthoptera*, which must have possessed indications of form sufficient to distinguish the insect from the three other names which belong to the same division of orthoptera, and are mentioned in the same context. The opinion of Michaelis (*Suppl.* 667, 910), that the four words mentioned in Lev. xi, 22 denote the same insect in four different ages or stages of its growth, is quite untenable, for, whatever particular species are intended by these words, it is quite clear from verse 21 that they must all be *winged orthoptera*. The Septuagint word *βροῦχος* there clearly shows that

the translator uses it for a winged species of locust, contrary to the Latin fathers (as Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, etc.), who all define the *bruchus* to be the unfledged young or larva of the locust, and who call it *attelabus* when its wings are partially developed, and *locusta* when able to fly; although both Sept. and Vulg. ascribe flight to the *bruchus* here, and in Nah. iii, 17. The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly ascribe to the *βροῦχος* both wings and flight, and therein agree with the descriptions of the ancient Greek naturalists. Thus Theophrastus, the pupil of Aristotle, who, with his preceptor, was probably contemporaneous with the Septuagint translators of the Pentateuch, plainly speaks of it as a distinct species, and not a mere state: "The *ἀκρίδες* (the best ascertained general Greek word for the locust) are injurious, the *ἀττέλαβοι* still more so, and those most of all which they call *βροῦχοι*" (*De Anim*). The Sept. seems to recognise the peculiar destructiveness of the *βροῦχος* in 1 Kings viii, 37 (but has merged it in the parallel passage, 2 Chron.), and in Nah. iii, 15, by adopting it for *arbeh*. In these passages the Sept. translators may have understood the *G. migratorius* or *gregarius* (Linn.), which is usually considered to be the most destructive species (from *βρώσκω, I devour*). Yet, in Joel i, 4; ii, 25, they have applied it to the *yelek*, which, however, appears there as engaged in the work of destruction. Hesychius, in the 3d century, explains the *βροῦχος* as "a species of locust," though, he observes, applied in his time by different nations to different species of locusts, and by some to the *ἀττέλαβος*. May not his testimony to this effect illustrate the various uses of the word by the Sept. in the minor prophets? Our translators have wrongly adopted the word "grasshopper" in Judges and Jer. xlvi, 23, where "locusts" would certainly have better illustrated the idea of "innumerable multitudes;" and here, as elsewhere, have departed from their professed rule "not to vary from the sense of that which they had translated before, if the word signified the same in both places" (translators to the reader, ad finem).

The Hebrew word in question is usually derived from רִבָּה, "to multiply," or "be numerous," because the locust is remarkably prolific; which, as a general name, is certainly not inapplicable; and it is thence also inferred that it denotes the *G. migratorius*, because that species often appears in large numbers. However, the largest flight of locusts upon record, calculated to have extended over five hundred miles, and which darkened the air like an eclipse, and was supposed to come from Arabia, did not consist of the *G. migratorius*, but of a red species (Kirby and Spence, *Introd. to Entomology*, i, 210); and, according to Forskål, the species which now chiefly infests Arabia, and which he names *G. gregarius*, is distinct from the *G. migratorius* of Linn. (*Encyc. Brit.* art. Entomology, p. 193). Others derive the word from אָרַב, "to *lie hid*" or "in ambush," because the newly-hatched locust emerges from the ground, or because the locust besieges vegetables. Rosenmüller justly remarks upon such etymologies, and the inferences made from them (*Scholia in Joel.* i, 4), "How precarious truly the reasoning is, derived in this manner from the mere etymology of the word, everybody may understand for himself. Nor is the principle otherwise in regard to the rest of the species." He also remarks that the references to the destructiveness of locusts, which are often derived from the roots, simply concur in this, that locusts consume and do mischief. Illustrations of the propriety of his remarks will abound as we proceed. Still, it by no means follows from a coincidence of the Hebrew roots, in this or any other meaning, that the *learned* among the ancient Jews did not recognise different species in the different names of locusts. The English word *fly*, from the Saxon *fleon*, the Heb. עוֹף, and its representative "fowl," in the English version (Gen. i, 20, etc.), all express both a general and specific idea. Even a modern entomologist might speak of "the flies" in a room, while aware that from fifty to one hundred different species annually visit our apartments. The Scriptures use popular language; hence "the multitude," "the devourer," or "the darkener," may have been the familiar appellations for certain species of locusts. The common Greek words for locusts and grasshoppers, etc., are of themselves equally indefinite, yet they also served for the names of species, as *ἀκρίς*, the locust generally, from the tops of vegetables, on which the locust feeds; but it is also used as the proper name of a particular species, as the grasshopper: *τεταπτερυλλίς*, "four-winged," is applied sometimes to the grasshopper; *τρωξαλλίς*, from *τρώγω*, "to chew," sometimes to the caterpillar. Yet the Greeks had also distinct names restricted to particular species, as *ὄνος*, *μολουρίς*, *κερκώπη*, etc. The Hebrew names may also have served similar purposes.

(2.) Geb (גֶּבְ, Isa. xxxiii, 4; Sept. *ἀκρίδες*, Vulgate omits, Engl. "locusts"), or Gob (גֹּבַ, Amos vii, 1, *ἐπιγονὴ ἀκρίδων*; Aquila, *βοράδον* [voratrices], *locustæ*, "grasshoppers;" Nah. iii, 17, *ἀττέλαβος*, *locustæ*, "grasshoppers"). Here the lexicographers, finding no Hebrew root, resort to the Arabic, גָּבָא, "to *creep* out" (of the ground), as the locusts do in spring. But this applies to the young of all species of locusts, and Bochart's quotations from Aristotle and Pliny occur unfortunately in general descriptions of the locust. Castell gives another Arabic root, גָּאַב, "to *cut*" or "tear," but this is open to a similar objection. Parkhurst proposes גַּב, anything gibbous, curved, or arched, and gravely adds, "The locust in the *caterpillar* state, so called from its shape in general, or from its continually *hunching* out its back in moving." The Sept. word in Nahum, *ἀττέλαβος*, has already been shown to mean a perfect insect and species. Accordingly, Aristotle speaks of its parturition and eggs (*Hist. Anim.* v, 29; so also Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.*). It seems, however, not unlikely that it means a wingless species of locust, genus *Podisma* of Latreille. Grasshoppers, which are of this kind, he includes under the genus *Tettix*. Hesychius defines the *ἀττέλαβος* as "a small locust," and Pliny mentions it as "the smallest of locusts, without wings" (*Histor. Nat.* xxix, 5). Accordingly, the Sept. ascribes only leaping to it. In Nahum we have the construction גּוֹב גּוֹבַי, *locust of the locusts*, which the lexicons explain as a vast multitude of locusts. Archbishop Newcome suggests that "the phrase is either a double reading where the scribes had a doubt which was the true reading, or a mistaken repetition not expunged." He adds, that we may suppose גּוֹבַי the contracted plural for גּוֹבַיִם (*Improved Version of the Minor Prophets*, Pontefr. 1809, p. 188). Henderson understands the reduplication to express "the largest and most formidable of that kind of insect" (*Comment. on the Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). Some writers, led by this passage, have believed that the *gôb* represents the larva state of some of the large locusts; the habit of halting at night, however, and encamping under the hedges, as described by the prophet, in all probability belongs to the *winged* locust as well as to the *larvæ;* see Exod. x, 13: "The Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all that night; and when it was *morning*, the east wind brought the locusts." Mr. Barrow (i, 257–8), speaking of some species of South African locusts, says that when the larvæ, which are still more voracious than the parent insect, are on the march, it is impossible to make them turn out of the way, which is usually that of the wind. At sunset the troop halts and divides into separate groups, each occupying in bee-like clusters the neighboring eminences for the night. It is quite possible that the *gôb* may represent the *larva* or *nympha* state of the insect; nor is the passage from Nahum, "When the sun ariseth they flee away," any objection to this supposition, for the last stages of the *larva* differ but slightly from the *nympha*, both which states may therefore be comprehended under one name; the *gôb* of Nah.

iii, 17 may easily have been the *nymphæ* (which in all the *Ametabola* continue to feed as in their larva condition) encamping at night under the hedges, and, obtaining their wings as the sun arose, are then represented as flying away (so too Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on Nah. iii, 17). It certainly is improbable that the Jews should have had no name for the locust in its larva or nympha state, for they must have been quite familiar with the sight of such devourers of every green thing, the larvæ being even more destructive than the imago; perhaps some of the other nine names, all of which Bochart considers to be the names of so many species, denote the insect in one or other of these conditions. See GRASSHOPPER.

(3.) GAZAM′ (גָּזָם, Joel i, 4; ii, 25; Amos iv, 9; in all which the Sept. reads *κάμπη*, the Vulg. *eruca*, and the English "palmer-worm"). Bochart observes that the Jews derive the word from גָּזַז or גָּזַז, "to *shear*" or "*clip*," though he prefers גָּזַם, "to *cut*," because, he observes, the locust gnaws the tender branches of trees as well as the leaves. Gesenius urges that the Chaldee and Syriac explain it as the young unfledged *bruchus*, which he considers very suitable to the passage in Joel, where the *gazam* begins its ravages before the locusts; but Dr. Lee justly remarks that there is no dependence to be placed on this. Gesenius adds that the root גָּזַם in Arabic and the Talmud is kindred with גָּסַם, "to *shear*"—a derivation which, however, applies to most species of locusts. Michaelis follows the Sept. and Vulgate, where the word in each most probably means the caterpillar, the larvæ of the lepidopterous tribes of insects (*Supplem. ad Lex.* 290, compared with *Recueil de Quest.* p. 63). We have, indeed, the authority of Columella, that the creatures which the Latins call *erucæ* are by the Greeks called *κάμπαι*, or *caterpillars* (xi, 3), which he also describes as creeping upon vegetables and devouring them. Nevertheless, the depredations ascribed to the *gazam*, in Amos, better agree with the characteristics of the locust, as, according to Bochart, it was understood by the ancient versions. The English word "*palmer-worm*," in our old authors, means properly a hairy caterpillar, which wanders like a palmer or pilgrim, and, from its being rough, called also "beareworm" (Mouffet, *Insectorum Theatrum*, p. 186). See PALMER-WORM.

(4.) CHAGAB′ (חָגָב, Lev. xi, 22; Numb. xiii, 33; Isa. xl, 22; Eccles. xii, 5, and 2 Chron. vii, 13, in all which the Sept. reads *ἀκρίς*, Vulg. *locusta*, and Engl. "grasshopper," except the last, where the Engl. has "locusts." The manifest impropriety of translating this word "grasshoppers" in Lev. xi, 22, according to the English acceptation of the word, appears from its description there as being winged and edible; in all the other instances it most probably denotes a species of locust. Our translators have, indeed, properly rendered it "locust" in 2 Chron.; but in all the other places "grasshopper," probably with a view to heighten the contrast described in those passages, but with no real advantage. Oedman (*Verm. Sanml.* ii, 90) infers, from its being so often used for this purpose, that it denotes the smallest species of locust; but in the passage in Chronicles voracity seems its chief characteristic. An Arabic root, חָגַב, signifying "to *hide*," is usually adduced, because it is said that locusts fly in such crowds as to hide the sun; but others say, from their hiding the ground when they alight. Even Parkhurst demurs that "to veil the sun and darken the air is not peculiar to any kind of locust;" and with no better success proposes to understand the cucullated, or hooded, or veiled species of locust. Tychsen (*Comment. de Locust.* p. 76) supposes that *châgâb* denotes the *Gryllus coronatus*, Linn.: but this is the *Acanthodis coronatus* of Aud. Serv., a South American species, and probably confined to that continent. Michaelis (*Supplem.* 668), who derives the word from an Arabic root signifying "to veil," conceives that *châgâb* represents either a locust at the fourth stage of its growth, "ante quartas exuvias quod adhuc velata est," or else at the last stage of its growth, "post quartas exuvias, quod jam volans *solem cœlumque obvelat*." To the first theory the passage in Lev. xi is opposed. The second theory is more reasonable, but *châgâb* is probably derived not from the Arabic, but the Hebrew. From what has been stated above, it will appear better to own our complete inability to say what species of locust *châgâb* denotes, than to hazard conjectures which must be grounded on no solid foundation. In the Talmud *châgâb* is a collective name for many of the locust tribe, no less than eight hundred kinds of *châgâbîm* being supposed by the Talmud to exist! (Lewysohn, *Zoolog. des Talm.* § 384). Some kinds of locusts are beautifully marked, and were sought after by young Jewish children as playthings, just as butterflies and cockchafers are nowadays. M. Lewysohn says (§ 384) that a regular traffic used to be carried on with the *chagâbîm*, which were caught in great numbers, and sold after wine had been sprinkled over them; he adds that the Israelites were only allowed to buy them before the dealer had thus prepared them. See GRASSHOPPER.

(5.) CHANAMAL′ (חֲנָמָל, occurs only in Psa. lxxviii, 47; Sept. *πάχνη*; Aq. *ἐν κρύει*; Vulg. *in pruina*; Eng. "frost"). Notwithstanding this concurrence of Sept., Vulg., and Aquila, it is objected that "frost" is nowhere mentioned as having been employed in the plagues of Egypt, to which the Psalmist evidently alludes; but that, if his words be compared with Exod. x, 5, 15, it will be seen that the *locusts* succeeded the hail. The Psalmist observes the same order, putting the devourer after the hail (comp. Mal. iii, 11). Hence it is thought to be another term for the locust. If this inference be correct, and assuming that the Psalmist is describing facts, this would make a fourth species of locust employed against Egypt, two of the others, the *arbeh* and *chasil*, being mentioned in the preceding verse. Proposed derivation, חָנָה, *to settle*, and מוּל, *to cut off*, because where locusts settle they cut off leaves, etc., or as denoting some non-migrating locust which settles in a locality (see Bochart, *in voc.*). Michaelis (*Supplem.* 846) suggests the signification of *ants*, comparing the Arabic name for that insect, with ח prefixed. Gesenius regards it as a quadriliteral, and argues from the term בָּרָד, *hail*, in the parallel member, that it denotes something peculiarly destructive to trees. See FROST.

(6.) CHASIL′ (חָסִיל, 1 Kings viii, 37; 2 Chron. vi, 28; Psa. lxxviii, 46; Isa. xxiii, 4; Joel i, 4; ii, 25; Septuag. *ἀκρίς*, but in 2 Chron. *βροῦχος*; Vulg. *rubigo*, *bruchus*, *œrugo*; Engl. always "caterpillar"). Gesenius derives it from the root חָסַל, *to eat off*, Deut. xxxiii, 38. It thus points to the same generic idea of destructiveness prominent in all this genus. See CATERPILLAR.

(7.) CHARGOL′ (חַרְגֹּל, only in Lev. xi, 22; Septuag. *ἐφιομάχης*, Vulg. *ophiomachus*, Auth. Vers. "beetle"), derived by Gesenius from the Arabic quadriliteral root חַרְגַּל, *to gallop* as a horse, and applied by the Arabs to a flight of wingless locusts, but thought by him to indicate in Leviticus a winged and edible locust. Beckmann has arrived at the conclusion that some insect of the sphex or ichneumon kind was meant (apud Bochart, a Rosenmüller, iii, 264). The genus of *locusts* called *Truxalis*, said to live upon insects, has been thought to answer the description. But is it a fact that the genus *Truxalis* is an exception to the rest of the *Acridiidæ*, and is pre-eminently *insectivorous*? Serville (*Orthopt.* p. 579) believes that in their manner of living the *Truxalides* resemble the rest of the *Acridites*, but seems to allow that further investigation is necessary. Fischer (*Orthop. Europ.* p. 292) says that the nutriment of this family is *plants* of various kinds. It is some excuse for the English rendering "beetle" in this place, that Pliny classes one species of gryllus, the house-cricket, *G. domes-*

ticus, under the scarabæi (*Hist. Nat.* xi, 8). The Jews interpret *chargôl* to mean a species of *grasshopper*, German *heuschrecke*, which M. Lewysohn identifies with *Locusta viridissima*, adopting the etymology of Bochart and Gesenius. The Jewish women used to carry the eggs of the *chargôl* in their ears to preserve them from the earache (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. et Rabbin.* s. v. Chargôl). See BEETLE.

(8.) YE'LEK (יֶלֶק, Psa. cv, 34, *βροῦχος*, *bruchus*, "caterpillars;" Jer. li, 14, 27, *ἀκρίς*, *bruchus*, "caterpillars;" and in the latter passage the Vulgate reads *bruchus aculeatus*, and some copies *horripilantes;* Joel i, 4; ii, 25, *βροῦχος*, *bruchus*, "canker-worm;" Nah. iii, 15, 16, *ἀκρίς* and *βροῦχος*, "canker-worm"). Assuming that the Psalmist means to say that the *yelek* was really another species employed in the plague on Egypt, the English word caterpillar in the common acceptation cannot be correct, for we can hardly imagine that the larvæ of the Papilionidæ tribe of insects could be carried by "winds." Canker-worm means *any worm* that preys on fruit. *Βροῦχος* could hardly be understood by the Sept. translators of the minor prophets as an unfledged locust, for in Nah. iii, 16 they give *the βροῦχος flies away*. As to the etymology, the Arabic يَلَقَ, *to be white*, is offered; hence the white locust or the chafer-worm, which is white (Michaelis, *Recueil de Quest.* p. 64; *Supp. ad Lex. Heb.* 1080). Others give לָקַק, *to lick off*, as Gesenius, who refers to Numb. xxii, 4, where this root is applied to the *ox* "licking" up his pasturage, and which, as descriptive of celerity in eating, is supposed to apply to the *yelek*. Others suggest the Arabic وَلَقَ, *to hasten*, alluding to the quick motions of locusts. The passage in Jer. li, 27 is the only instance where an epithet is applied to the locust, and there we find סָמַר יֶלֶק, "rough caterpillars." As the noun derived from this descriptive term (מַסְמֵר) means "nails," "sharp-pointed spikes," Michaelis refers it to the rough, sharp-pointed feet of some species of chafer (*ut supra*). Oedman takes it for the *G. cristatus* of Linn. Tychsen, with more probability, refers it to some rough or bristly species of locust, as the *G. hæmatopus* of Linn., whose thighs are ciliated with hairs. Many grylli are furnished with spines and bristles; the whole species *Acheta*, also the *pupa* species of Linn., called by Degeer *Locusta pupa spinosa*, which is thus described: Thorax ciliated with spines, abdomen tuberculous and spinous, posterior thighs armed beneath with four spines or teeth; inhabits Ethiopia. The allusion in Jeremiah is to the ancient accoutrement of war-horses, bristling with sheaves of arrows. See CANKER-WORM.

(9.) SALAM' (סָלְעָם), only in Lev. xi, 22, *ἀττάκη*, *attacus*, "the bald locust." A Chaldee quadriliteral root is given by Bochart, סָלַעַם, *to devour*. Another has been proposed, סֶלַע, *a rock* or *stone*, and עָלָה, *to go up;* hence the locust, which climbs up stones or rocks; but, as Bochart observes, no locust is known answering to this characteristic. Others give סֶלַע, *a stone*, and עָמַם, *to hide under;* equally futile. Tychsen, arguing from what is said of the *salam* in the Talmud (Tract, *Cholin*), viz. that "this insect has a smooth head, and that the female is without the sword-shaped tail," conjectures that the species here intended is *Gryllus eversor* (Asso), a synonyme that it is difficult to identify with any recorded species. From the text where it is mentioned it only appears that it was some species of locust winged and edible.

(10.) TSELATSAL' (צְלָצַל, as the name of an insect only in Deut. xxviii, 42, *ἐρυσίβη*, *rubigo*, "locust"). The root commonly assigned is צָלַל, *to sound* (whence its use for a *whizzing* of wings, Isa. xviii, 1; for *cymbals*, 2 Sam. vi, 5; Psa. cl, 5; or any ringing instrument, as a *harpoon*, Job xli, 7); hence, says Gesenius, a species of locust that makes a shrill noise. Dr. Lee says a *tree-cricket* that does so. Tychsen suggests the *G. stridulus* of Linn. The song of the *grullo-talpa* is sweet and loud. On similar principles we might conjecture, although with perhaps somewhat less certainty, a derivation from the Chald. צְלָא, *to pray*, and thence infer the *Mantis religiosa*, or Prier Dieu, so called from its singular attitude, and which is found in Palestine (Kitto's *Physical History*, p. 419). The words in the Septuag. and Vulg. properly mean the mildew on corn, etc., and are there applied *metaphorically* to the ravages of locusts. This mildew was anciently believed by the heathens to be a divine chastisement; hence their religious ceremony called Rubigalia (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xviii, 29). The word is evidently onomatopoietic, and is here perhaps a synonyme for some one of the other names for locust. Michaelis (*Supplem.* 2094) believes the word is identical with *chasil*, which he says denotes perhaps the mole-cricket, *Gryllus talpiformis*, from the stridulous sound it produces. Tychsen (p. 79, 80) identifies it with the *Gryllus stridulus*, Linnæus (= *Œdipoda stridula*, Aud. Serv.). The notion conveyed by the Hebrew word will, however, apply to almost any kind of locust, and, indeed, to many kinds of insects; a similar word, *tsalsalza*, was applied by the Ethiopians to a fly which the Arabs called *zimb*, apparently identical with the *tsetse* fly of Dr. Livingstone and other African travellers. In the passage in Deuteronomy, if an insect be meant at all, it may be assigned to some destructive species of grasshopper or locust.

(11.) The Greek term for the locust is *ἀκρίς*, which occurs in Rev. ix, 3, 7, with undoubted allusion to the Oriental devastating insect, which is represented as ascending from the smoke of the infernal pit, as a type of the judgments of God upon the enemies of Christianity. They are also mentioned as forming part of the food of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 4; Mark i, 6), where it is not, as some have supposed, any plant that is intended, but the insect, which is still universally eaten by the poorer classes in the East, both in a cooked and raw state (Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 97).

II. Locusts belong to that order of insects known by the term *Orthoptera* (or *straight-winged*). This order is divided into two large groups or divisions, viz. *Cursoria* and *Saltatoria*. The first, as the name imports, includes only those families of *Orthoptera* which have legs formed for *creeping*, and which are considered unclean by the Jewish law. Under the second are comprised those whose two posterior legs, by their peculiar structure, enable them to move on the ground by *leaps*. This group contains, according to Serville's arrangement, three families, the *Gryllides*, *Locustariæ*, and the *Acridites*, distinguished one from the other by some peculiar modifications of structure. The common house-cricket (*Gryllus domesticus*, Oliv.) may be taken as an illustration of the *Gryllides;* the green grasshopper (*Locusta viridissima*, Fabr.), which the French call *Sauterelle verte*, will represent the family *Locustariæ;* and the *Acridites* may be typified by the common migratory locust (*Œdipoda migratoria*, Aud. Serv.), which



Œdipoda Migratoria.

is an occasional visitor to Europe (see the *Gentleman's Magazine* July, 1748, p. 331, 414; also *The Times*, Oct. 4, 1845). Of the *Gryllides*, *G. cerisyi* has been found in Egypt, and *G. domesticus*, on the authority of Dr. Kitto, in Palestine; but doubtless other species also occur in these countries. Of the *Locustariæ*, *Phaneroptera falcata*, Serv. (*G. falc.* Scopoli), has also, according to Kitto, been found in Palestine, *Bradyporus dasypus* in Asia Minor, Turkey, etc., *Saga Natoliæ* near Smyr-

na. Of the locusts proper, or *Acridites*, four species of the genus *Truxalis* are recorded as having been seen in Egypt, Syria, or Arabia, viz. *T. nasuta*, *T. variabilis*, *T. procera*, and *T. miniata*. The following kinds also occur: *Opsomala pisciformis*, in Egypt, and the oasis of Harrat; *Pœkiloceros hieroglyphicus*, *P. bufonius*, *P. punctiventris*, *P. vulcanus*, in the deserts of Cairo; *Dericorys albidula* in Egypt and Mount Lebanon. Of the genus *Acridium*, *A. mæstum*, the most formidable perhaps of all the *Acridites*, *A. lineola* (=*G. Ægypt.* Linn.),

Acridium Lineola.

which is a species commonly sold for food in the markets of Bagdad (Serv. *Orthop.* 657), *A. semifasciatum*, *A. peregrinum*, one of the most destructive of the species, and *A. morbosum*, occur either in Egypt or Arabia. *Calliptamus serapis* and *Chrotogonus lugubris* are found in Egypt, and in the cultivated lands about Cairo; *Eremobia carinata*, in the rocky places about Sinai. *E. cisti*, *E. pulchripennis*, *Œdipoda octofasciata*, and *Œd. migratoria* (=*G. migrat.* Linn.), complete the list of the *Saltatorial Orthoptera* of the Bible lands. Of one species M. Olivier (*Voyage dans l'Empire Othoman*, ii, 424) thus writes: "With the burning south winds (of Syria) there come from the interior of Arabia and from the most southern parts of Persia clouds of locusts (*Acridium peregrinum*), whose ravages to these coun-

Acridium Peregrinum.

tries are as grievous and nearly as sudden as those of the heaviest hail in Europe. We witnessed them twice. It is difficult to express the effect produced on us by the sight of the whole atmosphere filled on all sides and to a great height by an innumerable quantity of these insects, whose flight was slow and uniform, and whose noise resembled that of rain: the sky was darkened, and the light of the sun considerably weakened. In a moment the terraces of the houses, the streets, and all the fields were covered by these insects, and in two days they had nearly devoured all the leaves of the plants. Happily they lived but a short time, and seemed to have migrated only to reproduce themselves and die; in fact, nearly all those we saw the next day had paired, and the day following the fields were covered with their dead bodies." This species is found in Arabia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia. The ordinary Syrian locust greatly resembles the common grasshopper, but is larger and more destructive. It is usually about two inches and a half in length, and is chiefly of a green color, with dark spots. It is provided with a pair of antennæ or "feelers" about an inch in length, projecting from the head. The mandibles or jaws are black, and the wing-coverts are of a bright brown, spotted with black. It has an elevated ridge or crest upon the thorax, or that portion of the body to which the legs and wings are attached. The legs and thighs of these insects are so powerful that they can leap to a height of two hundred times the length of their bodies; when so raised they spread their wings, and fly so close together as to appear like one compact moving mass.

Locust flying.

Locusts, like many other of the general provisions of nature, may occasion incidental and partial evil, but, upon the whole, they are an immense benefit to those portions of the world which they inhabit; and so connected is the chain of being that we may safely believe that the advantage is not confined to those regions. "They clear the way for the renovation of vegetable productions which are in danger of being destroyed by the exuberance of some particular species, and are thus fulfilling the law of the Creator, that of all which he has made should nothing be lost. A region which has been choked up by shrubs, and perennial plants, and hard, half-withered, impalatable grasses, after having been laid bare by these scourges, soon appears in a far more beautiful dress, with new herbs, superb lilies, fresh annual grasses, and young and juicy shrubs of perennial kinds, affording delicious herbage for the wild cattle and game" (Sparman's *Voyage*, i, 367). Meanwhile their excessive multiplication is repressed by numerous causes. Contrary to the order of nature with all other insects, the males are far more numerous than the females. It is believed that if they were equal in number they would in ten years annihilate the vegetable system. Besides all the creatures that feed upon them, rains are very destructive to their eggs, to the larvæ, pupæ, and perfect insect. When perfect they always fly with the winds, and are therefore constantly carried out to sea, and often ignorantly descend upon it as if upon land. (See below, III.) Myriads are thus lost in the ocean every year, and become the food of fishes. On land they afford in all their several states sustenance to countless tribes of birds, beasts, reptiles, etc.; and if their office as the scavengers of nature, commissioned to remove all superfluous productions from the face of the earth, sometimes *incidentally* and as the operation of a general law, interferes with the labors of man, as do storms, tempests, etc., they have, from all antiquity to the present hour, afforded him an excellent supply till the land acquires the benefit of their visitations, by yielding him in the mean time an agreeable, wholesome, and nutritious aliment.

There are different ways of preparing locusts for food: sometimes they are ground and pounded, and then mixed with flour and water and made into cakes, or they are salted and then eaten; sometimes smoked; boiled or roasted; stewed, or fried in butter. Dr. Kitto (*Pict. Bible*, note on Lev. xi, 21), who tasted locusts, says they are more like shrimps than anything else; and an English clergyman, some years ago, cooked some of the green grasshoppers, *Locusta viridissima*, boiling them in water half an hour, throwing away the head, wings, and legs, and then sprinkling them with pepper and

Dried Locusts on rods borne in procession. (On sculptures from Kouyunjik, now in the British Museum.)

salt, and adding butter: he found them excellent. How strange, then, nay, "how idle," to quote the words of Kirby and Spence (*Entom.* i, 305), "was the controversy concerning the locusts which formed part of the sustenance of John the Baptist, . . . and how apt even learned men are to perplex a plain question from ignorance of the customs of other countries!" They are even an extensive article of commerce (Sparman's *Voyage*, i, 367, etc.). Diodorus Siculus mentions a people of Ethiopia who were so fond of eating them that they were called *Acridophagi*, "eaters of locusts" (xxiv, 3). Whole armies have been relieved by them when in danger of perishing (Porphyrius, *De Abstinentia Carnis*). We learn from Aristophanes and Aristotle that they were eaten by the inhabitants of Greece (Aristoph. *Acharnen.* 1116, 1117, edit. Dind.; Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* v, 30, where he speaks of them as delicacies). (See below, III.) That they were eaten in a preserved state by the ancient Assyrians is evident from the monuments (Layard, *Bab. and Nin.* p. 289).

Birds also eagerly devour them (Russell, *Natural History of Aleppo*, p. 127; Volney, *Travels*, i, 237; Kitto's *Physical History of Pal.* p. 410). The locust-bird referred to by travellers, and which the Arabs call *smurmur*, is no doubt, from Dr. Kitto's description, the "rose-colored starling," *Pastor roseus*. The Rev. H. B. Tristram saw one specimen in the orange-groves at Jaffa in the spring of 1858,

The *Smurmur*, or Locust-eating Bird.

but makes no allusion to its devouring locusts. Dr. Kitto in one place (p. 410) says the locust-bird is about the size of a starling; in another place (p. 420) he compares it in size to a swallow. The bird is about eight inches and a half in length. Yarrell (*British Birds*, ii, 51, 2d ed.) says "it is held sacred at Aleppo because it feeds on the locust;" and Col. Sykes bears testimony to the immense flocks in which they fly. He says (*Catalogue of the Birds of Dakhan*) "they darken the air by their numbers . . . forty or fifty have been killed at a shot." But he says "they prove a calamity to the husbandman, as they are as destructive as locusts, and not much less numerous."

The great flights of locusts occur only every fourth or fifth season. Those locusts which come in the first instance only fix on trees, and do not destroy grain: it is the young, before they are able to fly, which are chiefly injurious to the crops. Nor do all the species feed upon vegetables; one, comprehending many varieties, the truxalis, according to some authorities, feeds upon insects. Latreille says the house-cricket will do so. "Locusts," remarks a very sensible tourist, "seem to devour not so much from a ravenous appetite as from a rage for destroying." Destruction, therefore, and not food, is the chief impulse of their devastations, and in this consists their utility; they are, in fact, omnivorous. The most poisonous plants are indifferent to them; they will prey even upon the crowfoot, whose causticity burns the very hides of beasts. They simply consume *everything* without predilection, vegetable matter, linen, woollen, silk, leather, etc.; and Pliny does not exaggerate when he says, "Fores quoque tectorum," "and even the doors of houses" (xi, 29), for they have been known to consume the very varnish of furniture. They reduce everything indiscriminately to shreds, which become manure. It might serve to mitigate popular misapprehensions on the subject to consider what would have been the consequence if locusts had been carnivorous like wasps. All terrestrial beings, in such a case, not excluding man himself, would have become their victims. There are, no doubt, many things respecting them yet unknown to us which would still further justify the belief that this, like "every" other "work of God, is good"—benevolent upon the whole (see Dillon's *Trav. in Spain*, p. 256, etc., London, 1780, 4to).

III. The general references to locusts in the Scriptures are well collected by Jahn (*Bibl. Archæol.* § 23), while Wemyss gives many of the symbolical applications of this creature (*Clavis Symbolica*, s.v.). It is well known that locusts live in a republic like ants. Agur, the son of Jakeh, correctly says, "The locusts have no king." But Mr. Horne gives them one (*Introduction*, etc., 1839, iii, 76), and Dr. Harris speaks of their having "a leader whose motions they invariably observe" (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, London, 1825). See this notion refuted by Kirby and Spence (ii, 16), and even by Mouffet (*Theat. Insect.* p. 122, Lond. 1634). It is also worthy of remark that no Hebrew root has ever been offered favoring this idea. Our translation (Nah. iii, 17) represents locusts, "great grasshoppers," as "camping in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth as fleeing away." Here the locust, *gob*, is undoubtedly spoken of as a perfect insect, able to fly, and as it is well known that at *evening* the locusts descend from their flights and form camps for the night, may not the cold day mean the cold portion of the day, i. e. the night, so remarkable for its coldness in the East, the word יוֹם being used here, as it often is, in a comprehensive sense, like the Gr. ἡμέρα and Lat. *dies*? Gesenius suggests that גְּדֵרוֹת, "hedges," should here be understood like the Gr. αἰμασιά, shrubs, brushwood, etc. (See above, I, 2.) With regard to the description in Joel (chap. ii), it is considered by many learned writers as a figurative representation of the ravages of an invading "army" of *human beings*, as in Rev. ix, 2–12, rather than a literal account, since such a devastation would hardly, they think, have escaped notice in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Some have abandoned all attempt at a literal interpretation of Lev. xi, 22, and understand by the four species of locusts there mentioned, Shalmaneser, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, and the Romans. Theodoret explains them as the four Assyrian kings, Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar; and Abarbanel, of the four kingdoms inimical to the Jews, viz. the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans (Pococke's *Works*, i, 214, etc., Lond. 1740; Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Joel.* c. i).

From the Scriptures it appears that Egypt, Palestine, and the adjacent countries were frequently laid waste by vast bodies of migrating locusts, which are especially represented as a scourge in the hand of divine Providence for the punishment of national sins; and the brief notices of the inspired writers as to the habits of the insects, their numbers, and the devastation they cause, are amply borne out by the more labored details of modern travellers. 1. Locusts occur in great numbers, and sometimes obscure the sun (Exod. x, 15; Jer. xlvi, 23; Judg. vi, 5; vii, 12; Joel ii, 10; Nah. iii, 15; compare Livy, xlii, 2; Ælian, *N. A.* iii, 12; Pliny, *N. H.* xi, 29; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 187 [fol. 2d ed.]; Ludolf, *Hist.*

Æthiop. i, 13, and *De Locustis*, i, 4; Volney, *Travels in Syria*, i, 236). 2. Their voracity is alluded to in Exod. x, 12, 15; Joel i, 4, 7, 12, and ii, 3; Deut. xxviii, 38; Psa. lxxviii, 46; cv, 34; Isa. xxxiii, 4 (comp. Shaw, *Travels*, p. 187, and travellers in the East, passim). 3. They are compared to horses (Joel ii, 4; Rev. ix, 7. The Italians call the locust "Cavaletta;" and Ray says, "Caput oblongum, equi instar prona spectans." Compare also the Arab's description to Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*). 4. They make a fearful noise in their flight (Joel ii, 5; Rev. ix, 9; comp. Forskål, *Descr.* p. 81: "Transeuntes grylli super verticem nostrum sono magnæ cataractæ fervebant;" Volney, *Trav.* i, 235). 5. Their irresistible progress is referred to in Joel ii, 8, 9 (comp. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 187). 6. They enter dwellings, and devour even the wood-work of houses (Exod. x, 6; Joel ii, 9, 10; comp. Pliny, *N. H.* xi, 29). 7. They do not fly in the night (Nah. iii, 17; comp. Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 173). 8. The sea destroys the greater number (Exod. x, 19; Joel ii, 20; compare Pliny, xi, 35; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 445 [Engl. transl. 1766]; also *Iliad*, xxi, 12). 9. Their dead bodies taint the air (Joel ii, 20; comp. Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 445). 10. They are used as food (Lev. xi, 21, 22; Matt. iii, 4; Mark i, 6; compare Pliny, *N. H.* vi, 35; xi, 35; Diod. Sic. iii, 29; Aristoph. *Achar.* 1116; Ludolf, *H. Æthiop.* p. 67 [Gent's transl.]; Jackson, *Marocco*, p. 52; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 150; Sparman, *Trav.* i, 367, who says the Hottentots are glad when the locusts come, for they fatten upon them; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 232, 419; Kirby and Spence, *Entom.* i, 305). There are people at this day who gravely assert that the locusts which formed part of the food of the Baptist were not the insect of that name, but the long, sweet pods of the locust-tree (*Ceratonia siliqua*), *Johannis brodt*, "St. John's bread," as the monks of Palestine call it. For other equally erroneous explanations, or unauthorized alterations of *ἀκρίδες*, see Celsii *Hierob.* i, 74.

IV. The following are some of the works which treat of locusts: Ludolf, *Dissertatio de Locustis* (Francof. ad Moen. 1694) [this author believes that the *quails* which fed the Israelites in the wilderness were locusts (vid. his *Diatriba qua sententia nova de Selavis sivè Locustis defenditur*, Francof. 1694), as do the Jewish Arabs to this day. So does Patrick, in his *Comment. on Numbers*. A more absurd opinion was that held by Norrelius, who maintained that the four names of Lev. xi, 22 were *birds* (see his *Schediasma de Avibus sacris, Arbeh, Chagab, Solam, et Chargol*, Upsal. 1746, and in the *Bibl. Brem.* iii, 36)]; Faber, *De Locustis Biblicis, et sigillatim de Avibus Quadrupedibus, ex Lev.* xi, 20 (Wittenb. 1710–11); Asso, *Abhandlung von den Heuschrecken* (Rostock, 1787; usually containing also Tychsen's *Comment. de Locustis*); Oedman, *Vermischte Sammlung*, vol. ii, c. vii; Kirby and Spence, *Introduction to Entomology*, i, 305, etc.; Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, iii, 251, etc., ed. Rosenmüller; Kitto, *Phys. History of Palestine*, p. 419, 420; Harris, *Natural Hist. of the Bible*, s. v. (1833); Harmer, *Observations* (Lond. 1797); Fabricius, *Entomol. System.* ii, 46 sq.; Credner, *Joel*, p. 261 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 102 sq.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 306 sq.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 596 sq.; Hackett. *Illustra. of Script.* p. 97; Serville, *Monograph* in the *Suites à Buffon;* Fischer, *Orthoptera Europæa;* Suicer, *Thesaurus*, i, 169, 179; Gutherr, *De Victu Johannis* (Franc. 1785); Rathleb, *Akridotheologie* (Hanover, 1748); Rawlinson, *Five Ancient Monarchies*, ii, 299, 493; iii, 144.

Lod (1 Chron. viii, 12; Ezra ii, 32; Neh. vii, 37; xi, 35). See Lydda.

Lo-de'bar (Heb. *Lo-Debar,'* לֹא דְבָר, *no pasture*, 2 Sam. xvii, 27, Sept. Λωδαβάρ; written לֹ דְבָר in 2 Sam. ix, 4, 5, Septuag. Λωδαβάρ), a town apparently in Gilead, not far from Mahanaim, the residence of Ammiel, whose son Machir entertained Mephibosheth, and afterwards sent refreshments to David (2 Sam. ix, 4, 5; xvii, 27). It is probably the same with the place (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 875) called Debir (or rather *Lidbir',* לִדְבִר, Josh. xiii, 26; Sept. Αεβίρ, Vulg. *Dabir;* for the ל is not a prefix, but a part of the name [see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.], which should probably be pointed לִדְבָר, *Lodebar'*), on the (north-eastern) border of Gad, but in which direction from Mahanaim is uncertain, perhaps north-west (in which general direction the associated names appear to proceed), and not far from *et-Tayibeh.*

Lodenstein, Jodocus von, a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Delft in 1620. He studied under Voetius at Utrecht, and under Cocceius and Amesius at Franeker, and became preacher at Zoetemer in 1644; at Sluys, in Flanders, in 1650, and at Utrecht in 1652—in all of which places he used every exertion to revive the spirit of practical piety among his countrymen, whom great prosperity had rendered worldly-minded and indifferent. When, in 1672, the country was threatened by the invasion of the French under Louis XIV, he proclaimed it a judgment of the Lord, and called on them to repent. He found many followers. In 1665 he ceased to administer the Lord's Supper, from conscientious scruples. Laying great stress on purity of life and of heart, he feared lest he might administer it to some unworthy to receive this sacred ordinance. The number of his adherents gradually increased, and they spread over the whole Netherlands, but they never separated from the Reformed Church like the Labadists. The effect of Lodenstein's doctrines in Holland was like that following Spener's labors afterwards in Germany. He died pastor of Utrecht in 1677. He wrote *Verfallenes Christenthum* (published after his death by J. Hofmann), *Reformationsspiegel* (to be found also in Arnold's *Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorie*), and a number of hymns, etc.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* x, 450. (J. N. P.)

Lodge (properly some form of the verb לוּן, *lûn*, or לִין, *lîn*, to *stay over night*, *αὐλίζομαι*, etc.). See Inn. In Isa. i, 8, the "*lodge* in a garden" (מְלוּנָה, *melunah'*, a *lodging-place*, rendered "cottage" in Isa. xxiv, 20) signifies a shed or lodge for the watchman in a garden; it also refers to a sort of hanging bed or hammock, which travellers in hot climates, or the watchmen of gardens or vineyards, hang on high trees to sleep in at night, probably from the fear of wild beasts (Isa. xxiv, 20). The lodge here referred to was a little temporary hut consisting of a low framework of poles, covered with boughs, straw, turf, or similar materials, for a shelter from the heat by day and the cold and dews by night, for the watchmen that kept the garden, or vineyard, during the short season while the fruit was ripening (Job xxvii, 18), and speedily removed when it had served that purpose. It is usually erected on a slight artificial mound of earth, with just space sufficient for one person, who, in this confined solitude, remains constantly watching the ripening crop, as the jackals during the vintage often destroy whole vineyards, and likewise commit great ravages in the gardens of cucumbers and melons. This protection is also necessary to prevent the depredations of thieves. To see one of these miserable sheds standing alone in the midst of a field or on the margin of it, occupied by its solitary watcher, often a decrepit or aged person, presents a striking image of dreariness and loneliness (Hackett's *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 162). See Cottage.

Lodge, Nathan, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Loudon County, Va., August 20, 1788; was converted in 1804, entered the Conference at Baltimore in 1810, and died Nov. 27, 1815. He was a very zealous and useful minister, and many souls were converted through his preaching. He was greatly lamented by his people, among whom he was suddenly cut down.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 278.

Lodge, Robert, a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Masham, Yorkshire, about 1636. He was a religious youth, and became a Friend about 1660. He preached and suffered for the Quaker cause in Ireland. On July 15, 1690, he died, assuring his

friends, "Blessed be God, I have heavenly peace." See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, ii, 434.

Lodur, one of the three Norse divinities (Odin and Haner), who, walking at the sea-shore, created the first pair of men. See LOKI.

Löffler, Friedrich Simon, a German Protestant theologian, nephew of the celebrated philosopher Leibnitz, was born at Leipzic Aug. 9, 1669, and was educated at the university of his native place. In 1689 he became magister of philosophy and bachelor of divinity. In 1695 he was appointed pastor at Probstheida, and served his people until 1745, when, on account of age, he was made emeritus preacher. He died in 1748. He wrote *Specimen exeges. s. de operariis in vinea:—Diss. de litteris Bellerophonteis;* etc.

Löffler, Josias Friedrich Christian, a noted German Protestant theologian, was born at Saalfeld January 18, 1752. Having lost his father in 1763, he was educated in the orphan asylum and at the University of Halle. In 1774 he went to Berlin, where he made the acquaintance of Teller, and in 1777 became minister of one of the churches of that city. He now made himself known as a writer by translating Souverain's renowned work on the Platonism of the fathers. In 1778 he went to Silesia as chaplain of a Prussian regiment, but returned at the end of a year to Berlin, where he resumed his office, devoting also part of his time to educational pursuits. In 1783 he became professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and minister of the principal church of that city. Here his rationalistic views made him many enemies. In 1787 he was appointed general superintendent at Gotha, but entered on this office only in the following year. The University of Copenhagen conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1792. He died February 4, 1816. Löffler published a number of separate sermons, dissertations, and tracts, and was after 1803 the editor of the continuation of Teller's *Magazin für Prediger*. See Döring, *Die deutsch. Kanzelredner des* 18 *and* 19 *Jahrh.* p. 223; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 451.

Loft (עֲלִיָּה, *aliyah'*, ὑπερῷον), the upper chamber, e. g. of a private house (1 Kings xvii, 19; Acts xx, 9). Such rooms were either over the gate (2 Sam. xix, 1) or built on the flat roof (2 Kings xxiii, 12), and were especially used for prayer, conference, or public meetings. See CHAMBER; HOUSE; ROOF.

Loftus, Dudley Field, an Irish lawyer, noted as a learned Orientalist, was born at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, in 1618. He rose to the position of master in Chancery and a judge of the Prerogative Court. He translated the Ethiopic New Testament into Latin for Walton's Polyglot; also published translations from the Syriac into Latin and English. He died in 1695. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.;* Harris's edition of Ware's *Ireland;* Lodge's *Peerage of Ireland.*

Loftus, William Kennett, an English archæologist, was born at Rye in 1820. He was a zealous traveller and discoverer, and explored the sites of several ancient cities on the Euphrates and Tigris. In 1857 he published a work entitled *Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana;* also an account of *Some Excavations at Warka, the Erech of Nimrod, and Shushan, the Palace of Esther, in* 1849–52. He died in 1858. To the Biblical student Loftus's work is of special importance. See Thomas's *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Log (לֹג, *lôg*, prob. a deep *cavity, basin;* Sept. κοτύλη, Vulg. *sextarius*), the smallest liquid measure (e. g. of oil) among the Hebrews (Lev. xiv, 10, 12, 15, 21, 24), containing, according to the rabbins (see Carpzov. *Apparat.* p. 685), the twelfth part of a "HIN," or six eggs, i. e. nearly a pint. See MEASURE.

Logan, David Swift, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1834. His literary education was commenced in the academy of Beaver, and was continued in Jefferson College (class of 1854). In 1857 he entered the Western Theological Seminary, and, after completing the regular theological course, was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany City, and afterwards ordained as an evangelist by the Presbytery of Steubenville, and for two years preached in the churches of New Philadelphia and Urichville, Ohio. He next labored in the Presbyterian Church of Tiffin, Ohio, until ill health obliged his return to his home in Bridgewater, Pa., where he died, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. Logan was endowed with a well-balanced nature; no single faculty was cultivated at the expense of the rest. He had method, promptness, assiduity, thoughtfulness; he was an earnest preacher and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1865, p. 97. (J. L. S.)

Logan, John, a noted Scottish divine, was born at Fala, in the county of Edinburgh, in 1748. Though the son of a farmer, he was early destined to the clerical profession, and was educated in the University of Edinburgh. Upon graduation he became tutor to Sir John Sinclair. In 1773 he was licensed as a preacher in the Established Church of Scotland, and was shortly after appointed minister at Leith, where he remained until 1785, when he removed to London, retaining by agreement a part of his clerical income, for the purpose of devoting himself altogether to literary labors. He had established quite a reputation as a sacred poet. Logan, if not a learned divine or a very profound thinker, was a man of much eloquence, and a highly popular preacher. But his poetical endowments, strongly lyrical in their tendency, were the highest he possessed; and, unfortunately, he was tempted to apply these in a path where he was ill calculated to shine, and the adoption of which proved fatal not only to his professional usefulness, but to his happiness. In 1783 he printed and caused to be acted in Edinburgh a tragedy called *Runnamede*, which had been rehearsed at Covent Garden, but refused a license by the lord chamberlain. This publication brought on him the anger of his Presbyterian associates; and these and other annoyances, aggravated by a hereditary tendency to hypochondria, drove him to intoxication for relief. He died in London Dec. 28, 1788. His friends, Drs. Blair, Robertson, and Hardy, published a volume of his sermons in 1790, and a second in 1791. These sermons long enjoyed very great popularity, and have been several times reprinted. They are among the most eloquent that the Scottish Church has produced. A third edition of his poems, with an account of his life, appeared in 1805; and the poems are included in Dr. Anderson's collection. Some of his hymns are annexed to the psalmody of the Scottish Church.

Logic. This term, derived from the Greek λόγος, λογικη, has been the subject of numerous definitions. By different authors and schools it has been defined as the art of convincing, the art of thinking, the art of discovering truth, the right use of reason, the science and art of reasoning, the science of deductive thinking, the science of the laws of thought as thought, and the science of the laws of discursive thought. These specimen definitions indicate in some degree the diverse conceptions of the subject which have prevailed at different periods and in different circles. Aristotle, whom Sir William Hamilton extravagantly calls the author and finisher of the general science under consideration, had no single name for it. He treated of its principal parts as *analytic, apodeictic,* and *topic.* In the latter he included the *dialectic* of Plato and the *sophistic* of the Sophists. Notwithstanding the honor credited to Aristotle, he himself says that Zeno the Eleatic was the inventor of dialectics.

Thus we are taken back to the early Greek philosophers for the first formal discussions of what is now universally denominated Logic. They, in successive generations, developed with more or less clearness its prin-

cipal elements. Socrates illustrated induction; Euclid, deduction. Plato treated of mental images as the results of sensation, of notions as the product of the understanding, and of ideas as the product of reason. Aristotle formulated syllogisms, and defined their principal laws. He taught analysis. He devised a system of categories. He enumerated the five predicables, genus, species, difference, property, and accident. In short, he reduced to a system the fragmentary discoveries in the philosophy of mind of those who had gone before him, and embodied them in works destined to exert a great influence upon after ages. Like many other great men, Aristotle was but indifferently appreciated by his contemporaries. Even after his death, his logical system produced but little influence upon his countrymen the Greeks. Several of the Christian fathers, however, give evidence of having profited by its study, and of desiring to use the knowledge they had thus acquired in propagating the truth of Christianity. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement, and others, both used and defended such dialectics as they had learned in the Grecian schools. On the other hand, as the same style of dialectics had been closely identified with the pernicious vagaries of heathen philosophy, Tertullian, Irenæus, Arnobius, and Lactantius considered its use as unfavorable to the interests of Christianity, and destructive of true science and wisdom. Augustine also wrote in the same spirit against the academicians.

Nevertheless, speculative studies held a relative prominence in the learning of Greece and Rome during the early Christian centuries; and when, owing to the barbarian irruptions, learning and civilization declined, dialectical science remained in more general cultivation than almost any other of the higher species of knowledge. Having its subject matter in the human mind, it was not dependent for perpetuity upon those external circumstances which influenced the conditions of general literature. Boethius, who has been called the last of the ancient philosophers, and the connecting link between the classical and the mediæval age, made a translation of Aristotle's categories into Latin. His contemporaries of the 6th century, Cassiodorus, Capella, and Isidore of Seville, together with several Byzantine writers, e. g. George Pachymera, Theodorus Metachita, and Michael Psellus, formed meagre compendiums of logic and rhetoric, without any clear distinction between the two. These manuals superseded or rather substituted the use of the ancient authors on both these subjects, and, imperfect as they were, became the oracles of that long and dismal period in which the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) were the chief topics of study and instruction. The ignorance consequent upon such a condition of things continued for the long period of five centuries without material variation.

In the latter part of the 11th century commenced a period of literary awakening known to history as the first æra of scholasticism. See SCHOLASTICISM. This movement was characterized by attempts to construct systems of theology on the traditional basis with strict dialectical form and method. Paris was the chief seat of the movement. Anselm, an abbot at Bec in 1078, and late in life an archbishop of Canterbury, made the first vigorous attempt in harmony with logical forms, on the basis of *credo ut intelligam*. Abelard opposed him, on the principle that understanding should precede faith. This was the period of Nominalism and Realism, and also of the foundation of universities. Among the most prominent of the great names of this period is that of Roscelinus of Compeigne, who is celebrated as having been the first to revive the question of the reality of universal ideas, and William of Champeaux, who opened a school of logic in Paris in 1109. The fame of the latter was soon eclipsed by that of Peter Abelard, who was able to invest logical disputation with such fascinations as to make it the favorite occupation of the most intelligent minds for generations following.

The 13th century is counted as the second period of scholasticism, during which the leading dialecticians were Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. During this period scholasticism reached its climax. The 14th century, as the third period of scholasticism, witnessed its sensible decline under the protracted but bitter wranglings of the Thomists (Realists) and Scotists (Nominalists).

Notwithstanding an attempt by the Medici of Florence to revive the Platonic philosophy in opposition to that of Aristotle, the latter prevailed in the chief universities of Europe, and the corruptions of it which had been countenanced by scholasticism began to pass away under the influence of more intelligent discussion. In the 16th century, after the invention of printing, the logical and philosophical works of the Stagirite were issued in a purer text and more accurate versions, and largely engaged public criticism.

The authority of Aristotle had been so long supreme in the continental universities, and the union between what passed for his philosophy and the errors of the Church of Rome had been so long established, that it was only natural for Luther and Melancthon, at the beginning of the Reformation, to inveigh strongly against the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. As time passed on, however, it became apparent that the work of the Reformers had largely to be done through the agency of that same Aristotelian logic. Melancthon was not slow to perceive this, and subsequently became an acknowledged follower of Aristotle as to dialectics, and even influenced Luther to retract some of his severer utterances. He introduced into the University of Wittenberg, to which Protestant Germany looked up, a scheme of dialectics and physics founded upon the Aristotelian theory. He also imitated the Stagirite philosopher by teaching logic with constant reference to rhetoric. The advocacy and influence of Melancthon secured the preponderance of the Aristotelian dialectics in the Protestant schools of Germany for more than a century.

About the middle of the 16th century a formidable opposition to the authority of Aristotle sprang up at the University of Paris, under the leadership of Peter Ramus, a scholar of great natural acuteness, and of an intrepid, though somewhat arrogant spirit. He published his *Institutiones Dialecticæ* in 1543. His system, founded with much ingenuity on the writings of Plato, notwithstanding violent opposition, prevailed so far as to greatly weaken the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The heads of the university, alarmed at this innovation, made complaint against Ramus to Parliament. The king himself interfered, and appointed a public trial of the rival systems of logic. As might have been expected, a majority of the judges favored the established system. Ramus was consequently ordered to desist from teaching, and an order passed for the suppression of his book. That order was subsequently removed, and Ramus again became popular as a teacher. He treated logic as merely the art of arguing, and was very severe on the dry and tedious formalities of the schoolmen. His system embraced invention and proofs, and thus blended with rhetoric. In 1551, through the influence of the cardinal of Lorraine, Ramus became royal professor of rhetoric and philosophy, in which capacity he made many proselytes. Having adhered to the Huguenot party, he was killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But he had already travelled and taught in Germany, where his system found no little favor. In Italy it secured a few disciples, but many more in France, England, and Scotland. Andrew Melville introduced the logic of Ramus at Glasgow, and it ultimately became popular in all the Scottish universities. The logical writings of the remainder of the 16th century, and somewhat later, were filled with the Ramist and anti-Ramist controversy, which, though of little permanent importance, doubtless prepared the way for a better comprehension of the true principles and processes of logic in later periods.

In the 17th century the writings of lord Bacon formed another epoch in the history of logic. See BACON. Logic, according to lord Bacon, comprised the sciences of invention, judging, retaining, and delivering the conceptions of the mind. We invent or discover new arts and arguments. We judge by induction or syllogism, and we may improve memory by artificial modes. The first book of the *Novum Organum* developed his celebrated and peculiar division of fallacies, viz. *idola tribûs*, *idola specûs*, *idola fori*, and *idola theatri*. The second book sought to apply the principles of induction to the interpretation of nature. Although, from a defective knowledge of natural phenomena incident to his times, the author's illustrations were far from perfect, and although many logicians have disputed the correctness of his principles, it cannot be questioned that the Baconian logic and method of study exerted a powerful influence upon his own and after times in stimulating thought and discovery. The remaining authors of the 17th century whose writings influenced the study and methods of logic were Des Cartes, Arnauld, author of *L'Art de Penser*, and Locke, of England. Probably the most influential treatise on the direct subject was Arnauld's *Art of Thinking*, commonly called the Port-Royal Logic. It attacked the Aristotelian system, and, being written in a modern language, had the advantage over the heavy Latinity of previous books. In this respect it became an example to subsequent writers, who, from the beginning of the 18th century, were numerous if not influential. But, with all that was written respecting it, the study of logic failed to command general attention. It had few attractions for the popular mind, and its special devotees were seldom able to place it in successful competition with philosophy, natural science, and general literature. Although prescribed in every system of academic study, and at once the agency and topic of ceaseless wrangling among professed scholars, yet its influence upon human life and public opinion was infinitesimally small.

The limits of this article do not admit of a detailed notice of all the logicians and logical systems of modern times, but only of allusion to a few of the most influential. In Germany, more than in all other countries, the study of logic has within the last hundred years assumed new phases and developed new doctrines, more especially in connection with the various systems of idealistic philosophy. Of that philosophy Immanuel Kant [see KANT] may be considered the inaugurator, and his first philosophical production commenced with the study of logic. As early as 1762 he published a treatise on the "False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures," in which he maintained that only the first is pure, and the others *ratiocinia hybrida*. From this point he went on developing his system, till in 1781 he published his *Kritik of Pure Reason*, to which in 1790 he added his *Kritik of the Judgment*. Kant claimed to have subjected the human mind to a new analysis, from which he determined the three comprehensive functions of sense, understanding, and reason. His general scheme is summed up as follows:

I. Doctrine of the transcendental elements of knowledge.
  A. Transcendental æsthetics.
  B. Transcendental logic.
    a. Transcendental analytics.
    b. Transcendental dialectics.
II. The transcendental method.

Not to mention the numerous defenders and modifiers of the Kantian system, we pass to G. W. F. Hegel [see HEGEL], the publication of whose *Wissenschaft der Logik* in 1812 marks another epoch in German metaphysics. Hegel employed the term logic in a very extended sense. Not confining it to abstract forms of thought and the laws of ideas, he considered it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea—the science of truth and reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are identical, it followed that what is true of one is true also of the other, and that the laws of logic are ontological. His system claimed to develop the idea of the absolute by antagonisms through all its successive stadia. With him the primary element of logic consisted in the oneness of the subjective and objective. Instinctive knowledge only regards the object without considering itself. But consciousness, besides the former, contains a perception of itself, and embraces, as three stages of progress, consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. Pure logic, according to Hegel, is divided into, 1. The logic of being; 2. The logic of qualified nature; 3. The logic of the idea.

In 1825, Richard Whately, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, published an article in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, which, having been expanded and printed as his *Elements of Logic*, was soon after extensively adopted as a text-book both in England and America. This publication has justly been considered as constituting an æra in the study of logic in English-speaking countries. The principles of Kant's *Kritik of Pure Reason* were not extensively introduced into Great Britain until after 1836, when Sir William Hamilton began his lectures in the University of Edinburgh. See HAMILTON. Although Hamilton took opposite ground to Whately in reference to the essential character of logic, yet both were admirers and exponents of the *Analytic* of Aristotle. Thus the reawakened taste for logical studies during the current century arose from a restoration, by different methods, of the old logic which had come down from the early ages, and survived all the opposition and ridicule of the modern centuries. It is worthy of especial note that none of the systems put forth by Ramus, Descartes, Locke, or Condillac, and their several modifiers, has been able to stand the test of time like that of the old philosophers and schoolmen. This fact may be accepted as proving that the syllogism indicates substantially the process which takes place in all minds in the act of reasoning. Notwithstanding this small demonstration, and a few other points of general concurrence, the science of logic, which has been the subject of human study for more than two thousand years, remains still incomplete. Many of its principles and processes are yet in continued and active dispute. Since Whately and Hamilton, Mr. John Stuart Mill has written an elaborate work in which he depreciates the syllogism and magnifies induction. But his theories in reference to both bear the stamp of Comte's empirical positivism.

The chief logical discussion of the present day revolves around the "New Analytic of Logical Forms," or the quantification of the predicate introduced by Sir William Hamilton. This new analytic, which is chiefly valuable for its enlargement of the hitherto narrow sphere of formal logical praxis, is an emanation from the metaphysics of Kant, being grounded upon certain principles of the *Kritik of Pure Reason*. Its theory, although illustrated by an ingenious system of notation, was left in a somewhat crude state by Hamilton, but has been ably elaborated by Mansel and Thomson, of England, and Bowen and Mahan, of America. While these writers seem to think that they have attained the end of all logical perfection, Dr. M'Cosh, of Princeton, charges their whole system with fundamental error in presupposing "that there are forms in the mind which it imposes on objects as it contemplates them." To explode this error is the avowed object of M'Cosh's recent treatise, in which, while he falls back for confirmation upon the old logic, he claims to unfold laws which were not noticed by the old logicians. The characteristic of his work is a more elaborate treatment of the notion than has taken place since the publication of the Port-Royal Logic. Thus logic seems destined to pass down to coming centuries as it has descended from the past, a subject of endless debate, but one from which each successive generation derives its advantage in the very process of debate.

See Hallam's *Literature of Europe*; Blakey's *Historical Sketch of Logic*; Kant's *Kritik*; Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik*; Whately's *Elements of Logic*; Sir

William Hamilton's *Lectures on Logic;* Mansel's *Prolegomena Logica;* Thomson's *Laws of Thought; Elements of Logic*, by H. P. Tappan, by W. D. Wilson, by C. K. True, by H. Coppée, by J. R. Boyd, by H. N. Day, by A. Schuyler, by L. H. Atwater; *System of Logic*, by John Stuart Mill; *Science of Logic*, by Asa Mahan; *Formal Logic*, by James M'Cosh. (D. P. K.)

Lŏgos (Λόγος, a *word*, as usually rendered), a special term in Christology, in consequence of its use as such by the apostle John, especially in the opening verses of his Gospel. An excellent article on the subject may be found in the brief but lucid exposition given in Bengel's *Gnomon* (Amer. edit. by Profs. Lewis and Vincent, p. 536 sq.). See WORD.

1. *Rendering.*—The general meaning of *Logos* in every such connection is THE WORD, said symbolically of the law-giving, creative, revealing activity of God. This is naturally suggested here by the obvious reference to Gen. i, 1, 3.

Many have seen in this term but a bold personification of the *wisdom* or *reason* of God, as in Prov. viii, 22. But this sense of *Logos* does not occur in the New Test., and is excluded by the reference to the history of creation. Besides, the repeated "with God" (verses 1, 2) compels us to distinguish the Logos from God; the words "became flesh" (ver. 14) cannot be said of an attribute of God; and the Baptist's testimony, verse 15, in direct connection with this introduction (compare also such sayings of Christ as in ch. viii, 58; xvii, 5), show clearly that John attributes *personal pre-existence* to the *Logos*. Similarly, every attempt to explain away this profound sense of *Logos* is inadequate, and most are ungrammatical. See WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

Thus the fundamental thought of this introduction is, that *the original, all-creating, all-quickening, and all-enlightening Logos*, or *personal divine word*, became man in Jesus Christ. See INCARNATION.

2. *Origin and History of the Idea.*—(1.) John uses the term *Logos* without explanation, assuming that his readers know it to bear this sense. Accordingly, we find this conception of it not new with him, but a chief element in the development of the Old-Test. theology. In the Mosaic account, God's revelation of himself in the creation was, in its nature, *spirit* (Gen. i, 2), in contrast with matter, and in its form, a *word* (Gen. i, 4), in contrast with every involuntary materialistic or pantheistic conception of the creative act. The real significance, under this representation, of the invisible God's revelation of himself by *speech* became the germ of the idea of the *Logos*. With this thought all Judaism was pervaded; that God does not manifest himself immediately, but mediately; not in his hidden, invisible essence, but through an appearance—an attribute, emanation, or being called the *angel of the Lord* (Exod. xxiii, 21, etc.), or the *word of the Lord*. Indeed, to the latter are ascribed, as his work, all divine light and life in nature and history; the law, the promises, the prophecies, the guidance of the nation (compare Psa. xxxiii, 6, 9; cvii, 20; cxlvii, 18; cxlviii, 8; Isa. ii, 1, 3; Jer. i, 4, 11, 13, etc. Even such poetic personifications as Psa. cxlvii, 15; Isa. lv, 11, contain the germ of the doctrinal personality of the Word). See ANGEL.

(2.) Another important element of Hebrew thought was the *wisdom* of God. The consideration of it became prominent only after the natural attributes of God —omnipotence, etc.—had long been acknowledged. The chief passages are Job xxviii, 12 sq.; Prov. viii and ix. Even the latter is a poetic personification; but this is based on the thought that Wisdom is not shut up at rest in God, but active and manifest in the world. It is viewed as the one guide to salvation, comprehending all revelations of God, and as an attribute embracing and combining all his other attributes. This view deeply influenced the development of the Hebrew idea of God. At that stage of religious knowledge and life, Wisdom, revealing to pious faith the harmony and unity of purpose in the world, appeared to be his most attractive and important attribute—the essence of his being. One higher step remained; but the Jew could not yet see that *God is love*.

(3.) In the apocryphal books of Sirach (chap. i and xxiv) and Baruch (iii, and iv, 1–4), this view of Wisdom is developed yet more clearly and fully. The book of Wisdom (written at least B.C. 100) praises wisdom as the highest good, the essence of right knowledge and virtue, and as given by God to the pious who pray for it (ch. vii and viii); see especially vii, 22 sq., where Wisdom has divine dignity and honors, as a holy spirit of light, proceeding from God, and penetrating all things. But this book seems rather to have viewed it as another name for the whole divine nature than as a person distinct from God. And nowhere does it connect this *Wisdom* with the idea of *Messiah*. It shows, however, the influence of both Greek and Oriental philosophy on Jewish theology, and marks a transition from the Old-Test. view to that of Philo, etc. See WISDOM, BOOK OF.

(4.) In Egypt, from the time of Ptolemy I (B.C. 300), there were Jews in great numbers, their head-quarters being at Alexandria (Philo estimates them at a million in his time, A.D. 50), and there they gradually came under the influence of the Egyptian civilization of that age, a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental customs and doctrines. See ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS. Aristobulus, about 150 B.C., seems to have endeavored to unite the ancient doctrines of Wisdom and the Word of God with a form of Greek philosophy. This effort, the leading feature of the Jewish-Alexandrian school, culminated in Philo, a contemporary of Christ, who strives to make Judaism, combined with and interpreted by the Platonic philosophy, do the work of the idea of Messiah, affording by the power of thought a complete substitute for it. This attempt to harmonize heathen and Jewish elements, while it led in him to a sort of anticipation of certain parts of Christian doctrine, explains how he himself vacillates between opposite and irreconcilable views. See PLATONISM.

(5.) Philo represents the absolute God as hidden and unknown, but surrounded by his *powers* as a king by his servants, and, through these, as present and ruling in the world. (These powers, *δυνάμεις*, are, in Platonic language, *ideas;* in Jewish, *angels.*) These are different and innumerable; the original principles of things; the immaterial world, the type of which the material is an image. The two chief of these in dignity are the *Θεός*, *God*, the creative power, and the *Κύριος*, *Lord*, or governing power of the Scriptures. But all these powers are essentially one, as God is one; and their unity, both as they exist in God and as they emanate from him, is called the *Logos*. Hence the Logos appears under two relations: as the reason of God, lying in him—the divine thought; and as the outspoken word, proceeding from him, and manifest in the world. The former is, in reality, one with God's hidden being; the latter comprehends all the workings and revelations of God in the world, affords from itself the ideas and energies by which the world was framed and is upheld, and, filling all things with divine light and life, rules them in wisdom, love, and righteousness. It is the beginning of creation; not unoriginated, like God, nor made, like the world, but the eldest son of the eternal Father (the world being the younger); God's image; the creator of the world; the mediator between God and it; the highest angel; the second God; the high-priest and reconciler.

(6.) Lücke concludes that, such being the development of the doctrine of the Logos when John wrote, although there is no evidence that he borrowed his views from Philo, yet it is impossible to doubt the direct historical connection of his doctrine with the Alexandrian. Meyer thinks that if we suppose John's doctrine entirely unconnected with the Jewish and Alexandrian philosophy, we destroy its historic meaning, and its intelligibleness for its readers. It must be admitted that the term *Logos* seems to be chosen as already associated in

many minds with a class of ideas in some degree akin to the writer's, and as furnishing a common point of thought and interest with those speculative idealists who constantly used it while presenting them with new truth.

(7.) But any connection amounting to *doctrinal dependence* of John upon Philo is utterly contrary to the tenor of Philo's own teaching; for he even loses the crowning feature of Hebrew religion, the moral energy expressed in its view of Jehovah's holiness, and with it the moral necessity of a divine teacher and Saviour. He becomes entangled in the physical notions of the heathen, forgets the wide distinction between God and the world, and even denies the independent, absolute being of God, declaring that, were the universe to end, God would die of loneliness and inactivity. The very universality of the conception, its immediate working on all things, would have excluded to Philo the belief that the whole *Logos*, not a mere part or effluence of his power, became incarnate in Christ. "Heaven and earth cannot contain me," cries his *Logos*, "*how much less a human being.*" On the whole, it is extremely doubtful whether Philo ever meant formally to represent the *Logos* as a person distinct from God. All the titles he gives it may be explained by supposing it to mean the ideal world, on which the actual is modelled. At most, we can say that he goes beyond a mere poetic personification, and prepares the way for a distinction of persons in the Godhead. See PHILO.

(8.) John's connection with the doctrines of the later Jews, though less noticed, is at least as important as that with Philo. In the apocryphal books, as we have seen, the idea of the *Logos* was overshadowed by that of the divine *Wisdom;* but it reappears, prominently and definitely, in the Targums, especially that of Onkelos. These were written, indeed, after John's Gospel (Onkelos, the earliest, wrote not later than the 2d century A.D.), yet their distinguishing doctrines certainly rest upon ancient tradition. They represent the *Word of God*, the *Memrah*, מימרה, or *Dibur*, דבור, as the personal self-revealed God, and one with the *Shekinah*, שכינה, which was to be manifested in Messiah. But it would be absurd to claim that John borrowed his idea of Messiah from the Jews, who in him looked for, not a spiritual revelation of God in clearer light, to save men from sin by suffering and love, but a national deliverer, to gratify their worldly and carnal desires of power; not even for the divine *Word become flesh*, and dwelling among men, but for an appearance, a vision, a mere display, or, at most, an unreal, *docetic* humanity.

(9.) The contrast between John's Logos and Philo's appears in several further particulars. The Logos here is the real personal God, the Word; who did not begin to be when Christ came, but *was* originally, before the creation, "with God, and was God." He made *all things* (ver. 3). Philo held to the original independent existence of matter, the *stuff*, ὕλη, of the world, before it was framed. John's Logos is holy light, which shines in moral darkness, though rejected by it. Philo has no such height of mournful insight as this. This *Logos* became man in the person of Christ, the Son of God. Philo conceives of no incarnation. Thus John's lofty doctrine of the Messiah is not in any way derived from Jewish or Gnostic speculations, but rests partly on pure Old-Testament doctrine, and chiefly on what he learned from Christ himself. His testimony to this forms the historical part of his Gospel. See MEMRA.

3. *Theological Bearing of the Term.*—The word "Logos" is therefore evidently "employed by the evangelist John to designate the mediatorial character of our Redeemer, with special reference to his revelation of the character and will of the Father. It appears to be used as an abstract for the concrete, just as we find the same writer employing *light* for *enlightener*, *life* for *life-giver*, etc.; so that it properly signifies the *speaker* or *interpreter*, than which nothing can more exactly accord with the statement made (John i, 18), 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath *declared* him,' i. e. communicated to us the true knowledge of his mind and character. That the term is merely expressive of a divine attribute, a position which has been long and variously maintained by Socinians, though abandoned as untenable by some of their best authorities, is in total repugnance to all the circumstances of the context, which distinctly and expressly require personal subsistence in the subject which it describes. He whom John styles the Logos has the creation of all things ascribed to him; is set forth as possessing the country and people of the Jews; as the only-begotten (Son) of the Father; as assuming the human nature, and displaying in it the attributes of grace and truth, etc. Such things could never, with the least degree of propriety, be said of any mere attribute or quality. Nor is the hypothesis of a personification to be reconciled with the universally admitted fact that the style of John is the most simply historical, and the furthest removed from that species of composition to which such a figure of speech properly belongs. To the Logos the apostle attributes eternal existence, distinct personality, and strict and proper Deity—characters which he also ascribes to him in his first epistle—besides the possession and exercise of perfections which absolutely exclude the idea of derived or created being." See CHRISTOLOGY.

4. *Literature.*—The following are the principal monographs on this subject: Sandius, *De Λόγῳ* (in his *Interp. Paradox*, Amsterd. 1670); Saubert, *De voce* Λόγος (Altdorf, 1687); Carpzov, *De Λόγῳ Philonis* (Helmstadt, 1749); Bryant, *Philo's* Λόγος (1797); Upham, *Letters on the Logos* (Boston, 1828); Bucher, *Johann. Lehre vom Logos* (Schaffh. 1856). For others, see Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclopædia*, col. 1059; Lange's *Commentary* (Am. ed., Introd. to John's Gospel). Comp. also the *Meth. Quar. Review*, July and Oct. 1851; Jan. 1858; *Christian Examiner*, Jan. 1863; *Am. Presb. Review*, Jan. 1840; July, 1864; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, iii, 672; 1833, ii, 355; 1868, ii, 299. See JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

Logothĕta (λογοθέτης, q. d. *chancellor*) is the title given in the Greek Church to the member of the ecclesiastical courts holding the imperial seal to be appended to their edicts. See GREEK CHURCH.

Loguo is, in the mythology of the Caribbeans, the name of the first man, who descended from his celestial abode to the soft, shapeless mass of which the earth was formed by his creative power. He first imparted to it shape and motion; the sun rendered it dry and hard. Loguo, after his death, reascended to heaven. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s. v.

Lohdius, CARL FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Grünberg, near Waldheim, Dec. 13, 1748, and was educated at the University of Leipsic, where, in 1774, he obtained the degree of A.M. and the privilege of lecturing on theology. He became soon after morning preacher at the university. In 1780 he accepted a call to Grimma as dean, and in 1782 to Dresden. He died there August 4, 1809. Of his scholarly productions we only mention *Delineatur imago doctrinæ de conditione animi post mortem eo, quo Christus et Apostoli vixerunt, sæculo*, diss. i et ii (Lipsiæ, 1790, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s. v.

Löhe, JOHANN KONRAD WILHELM, a German Lutheran minister, was born at Fürth, in Bavaria, Feb. 17, 1808, and was educated at the University of Erlangen, which he entered in 1826. After serving at various places as minister of Lutheran churches, he settled in 1837 at Neuendettelsau as pastor of a flourishing Church. Zealously devoted to the cause of his Master, he studied the ways and means of promoting the Christian religion among the masses of the German people, and in 1849 founded to this end a society for *Inner Missions* (q. v.), and in 1854, following the example of the immortal Fliedner (q. v.), of Kaiserswerth, established a Deacon-

esses' Institute [see DEACONESS], which in our day is known in nearly all the civilized world. Löhe labored here faithfully and successfully until his death, Jan. 28, 1872. He wrote *Der evangelische Geistliche* (2d edition, Stuttg. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Lebenslauf der heilig. Magd Gottes aus dem Pfarrstande* (3d ed. Nuremb. 1869, 8vo):—*Geistlicher Tageslauf* (3d ed. Nuremb. 1870, 8vo):—*Aus der Geschichte d. Diakonissenanstalt Neuendettelsau* (Nuremb. 1870, 8vo); etc. See Schem, *Deutsch-Amerikan. Conv. Lexikon*, vi, 589.

Lohesh. See HAL-LOHESH.

Loin (usually in the dual, חֲלָצַיִם, *chalatsa'yim*, as the seat of strength, spoken of as the place of the girdle, Job xxxviii, 3; xl, 7; Isa. v, 27 ["reins," xi, 5]; xxxii, 11; or as a part of the body generally, Job xxxi, 20; Jer. xxx, 6 [so the Chald. plur. חַרְצִין, Dan. v, 6]; by euphemism for the generative power, Gen. xxxv, 11; 1 Kings viii, 19; 2 Chron. vi, 9; also מָתְנַיִם, *mothna'yim*, as the seat of strength, Gr. ὀσφύς, which are the other terms properly so rendered, and refer to that part of the body simply; but כְּסָלִים, *kesalim'*, Psa. xxxviii, 7, means the *flanks*, as elsewhere rendered, prop. the internal muscles of the loins, near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres; while יְרֵכַיִם, put in Gen. xlvi, 26; Exod. i, 5; comp. Judg. viii, 30, by euphemism for the seat of generation, properly signifies the *thigh*, as elsewhere rendered, being plainly distinguished from the true loin in Exod. xxviii, 42), the part of the back and side between the hip and the ribs, which, as being, as it were, the pivot of the body, is most sensibly affected by pain or terror (Deut. xxxiii, 11; Job xl, 16; Psa. xxxviii, 7; lxix, 23; Isa. xxi, 3; Jer. xxx, 6; Ezek. xxi, 6; xxix, 7; Dan. v, 6; Nah. ii, 1, 10). This part of the body was especially girt with sackcloth, in token of mourning (Gen. xxxvii, 34; 1 Kings xx, 31, 32; Psa. lxvi, 11; Isa. xx, 2; xxxii, 11; Jer. xlviii, 37; Amos viii, 10). The term is most frequently used with allusion to the girdle which encompassed this part of the body, i. q. the *waist;* especially in the phrase to "gird up the loins," i. e. prepare for vigorous effort, either literally (1 Kings xviii, 46; 2 Kings iv, 29; ix, 1; Prov. xxxi, 17), or oftener as a metaphor borrowed from the loose and flowing dress of Orientals, which requires to be gathered closely at the waist, or even to have the skirts tucked up into the belt before engaging in any exertion or enterprise (Job xxxviii, 3; xl, 7; Jer. i, 17; Luke xii, 35; 1 Pet. i, 13). See GIRDLE.

Lo'is (Λωΐς, perh. *agreeable*), the grandmother of Timothy, not by the side of his father, who was a Greek, but by that of his mother. Hence the Syriac has "thy mother's mother." She is commended by the apostle Paul for her faith (2 Tim. i, 5); for, although she might not have known that the Christ had come, and that Jesus of Nazareth was he, she yet believed in the Messiah to come, and died in that faith. Ante A.D. 64. See TIMOTHY.

Loki or **Loke**, in Scandinavian mythology, is the principle of evil, an impious, mischievous wretch, author of all intrigue, vice, and crime; father of the most abominable monsters, of the wolf Fenris, the midgard snake, and Hela (blue Hel), the goddess of death; the "spirit of evil," as it were, mingling freely with, yet essentially opposed to the other inhabitants of the Norse heaven, very much like the Satan of the book of Job. He is called the son of the giant Farbante, and is married to the giantess Angerbode. Sometimes he is called *Asa-Loki*, to distinguish him from Utgarda-Loki, a king of the giants, whose kingdom lies on the uttermost bounds of the earth; but these two are occasionally confounded. It is quite natural, considering the character of Loki, that at a later period he should have become identified with the devil of Christianity, who is called in Norway to the present day *Laake*. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Weinhold, *Die Sagen v. Loki* in Haupt, *Zeitschrift fur deutsches Alterth.* vol. vii; Thorpe, *North. Mythol.* vol. i (see Index); and the excellent article in Thomas, *Biogr. and Mythol. Dict.* (Phila. 1872), s. v.

Lokmân is represented in the Koran and by later Arabian tradition as a celebrated philosopher, contemporary with David and Solomon, with whom he is said to have frequently conversed. He was, we are told, an Arabian of the ancient tribe of Ad, or, according to another account, the king or chief of that tribe; and, when his tribe perished by the Seil el-Arim, he was preserved on account of his wisdom and piety. Other accounts, drawn mostly from Persian authorities, state that Lokmân was an Abyssinian slave, and noted for his personal deformity and ugliness, as for his wit and a peculiar talent for composing moral fictions and short apologues. He was considered to be the author of the well-known collection of fables, in Arabic, which still exist under his name. There is some reason to suppose that Lokmân and Æsop were the same individual, and this view is of late gaining ground. See the excellent articles in the *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; and Hammer-Purgstall, *Literaturgesch. der Araber*, i, 31 sq.

Lollards or **Lol(l)hards**, originally the name of a monastic society which arose at Antwerp about 1300, and the members of which devoted themselves to the care of the sick and dying with pestilential disorders (see CELLITES), was afterwards applied to those who, during the closing part of the 14th and a large part of the succeeding century, were credited with adhering to the religious views maintained by Wickliffe (q. v.).

Origin of the Name.—Great diversity of opinion exists among scholars on the origin of the name *Lollard*. Some have supposed that there existed a person of such a name in Germany, who, differing in many points from the Church of Rome, made converts to his peculiar doctrines, and thus originated an independent sect about 1315 (see *Gen. Biog. Dict.* art. Lollard, Walter), and for this heretical step was burned alive at Cologne in 1322. It is more than probable, however, that this leader received his name from the sect than gave a name to it, just as in the *Prognosticatio* of Johannes Lychtenberger (a work very popular in Germany towards the close of the 15th century) great weight is attached to the predictions of one Reynard Lollard (Reynhardus Lolhardus), who was, no doubt, so called from the sect to which he belonged. Others believe that it was applied to the Cellites because of their practice of singing dirges at funerals—the Low-German word *lollen* or *lullen* signifying to sing softly or slowly. Another derivation of the word is that which makes it an epithet of reproach. In papal bulls and other documents it is used as synonymous virtually with *lollia*, the tares commingled with the wheat of the Church. In this sense we meet with it (A.D. 1382) even before Wickliffe's death. Still another suggestion comes from a correspondent of "Notes and Queries" (March 27, 1852), who, quoting from a passage of Heda's history, cites a statement to the effect that bishop Florentius de Wevelichoven "caused the bones of a certain Matthew Lollaert to be burned, and his ashes to be dispersed," etc. The correspondent remarks that from a note on this passage, where reference is made to Prateolus and Walsingham, it is evident that Heda is speaking of the founder of the sect of the Lollards. The name Lollaert would, of course, indicate that the name of the English sect was derived from a Dutch heretic, buried at Utrecht, and well known in the neighboring region. With much more reason the origin of the word Lollard has been traced of late to the Latin *lollardus*, by a comparison of the later English *Lollard* with the old English *loller*, used by Chaucer and Langeland. Says Whitaker (in his edition of *Piers Plowman*, p. 154 sq.): "Any reader of early English knows that *Lollard* is the late English spelling of the Latin *lollardus*. But what is *lollardus?* It is a Latin spelling of the old English *loller*, used by Chaucer and

Langeland. The real meaning of *loller* is one who *lolls* about, a vagabond; and it was equally applied, *at first*, to the Wickliffites and to the *begging friars* .... [Beghuins (q. v.)]. But, before long, *loller* was *purposely* confused with the Latin *lolium*, by a kind of pun. The derivation of *loller* from to *loll* rests on no slight authority. It is most distinctly discussed and explained, and its etymology declared by no less a person than Langeland himself, who lived at the time it came into use."

English Lollards. — Whatever be the derivation of the word Lollard, certain it is that by this name alone the followers of John Wickliffe (q. v.) were always designated, who, in the early stage of the reformatory movements of the bold English churchman (about A.D. 1360), consisted of the "Poor Priests" (q. v.), a class called together by Wickliffe to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel into the remotest hamlets, and to counteract the influence of the *begging friars* (see BEGHARDS), who were then strolling over the country, preaching instead of the *Word* the legends of the saints and the history of the Trojan War (compare D'Aubigné, *Hist. of the Reformation*, v, 91 sq.). For some time the mendicant orders, which had first entered England in the early part of the preceding century, had been the object of attack, both by the people and the clergy, for their rapacious and shameless conduct. Indeed, so much was the country disturbed by the violence and vices of swarms of these sanctimonious vagabonds that the ancient records often speak of their arrest. Wickliffe's opposition to such a class of persons could not but have secured him the general respect and commendation of the people. Not so, however, when, to counteract the influence of the mendicants, he instituted the "Poor Priests," who, not content with mere polemics, preached the great mystery of godliness, and became so greatly the favorites of the people that the clergy were threatened to be left without any attendants at their churches, preference being shown to the poor priests, preaching in the fields, in some church-yard, or in the market-places. It was not, however, until after Wickliffe's appointment to the University of Oxford that any of the doctrines which the Lollards as a sect afterwards maintained, and which caused his prosecution by the papists, were advocated and propagated. It is true, even as early as 1357, Wickliffe had published a work against the covetousness of Rome (*The last Age of the Church*), and in 1365 had vindicated Edward III's resistance to the claim of Urban V of the arrears of the tribute granted to the papacy by king John (see URBAN V; ENGLAND); but it was not until (in 1372) he had taken the degree of D.D., and entered upon his work at Oxford University by able and emphatic testimony against the abuses of the papacy, that he drew upon himself the enmity of the English prelates, and, in consequence, came to stand forth the advocate of reform and the leader of a movement for this purpose. Nor did the success of his course slacken in the least after his withdrawal from the university and his retirement to the small parish of Lutterworth. Everywhere those persons who had come under his influence or been converted by his writings were busily engaged in disseminating the doctrines which he taught. His followers were to be found among all classes of the population. Some, like the duke of Lancaster, lord Percy, and Clifford, may have been attached to Wickliffe's views mainly by their political sympathies, but the great mass of his adherents were such upon religious grounds. The examinations of those who, during the generation that followed his death (1384), were arrested or punished as heretics, indicate the common doctrinal position which they almost uniformly maintained. It was substantially identical with that taken by Wickliffe in his writings. The supreme authority of the Scriptures in religious matters, the rejection of transubstantiation, the futile nature of pilgrimages, auricular confession, etc., the impiety of image-worship, the identification of the papal hierarchy with Antichrist, the entire sufficiency of Christ as a Saviour, without the need of priestly offices in the mass, or any elaborate ceremonial—such were the points upon which they were pronounced heretical, and, as such, persecuted and condemned.

Up to 1382, through the events of the time, the great schism of the papacy, the indignation excited in England by papal encroachments, the scandalous conduct of many among the prelates and clergy, Wickliffe, as well as his followers, had been left comparatively unmolested, and he himself even escaped altogether. Not so, however, his followers, who were, near the time of his death, rapidly augmenting all over England. The testimony of Knighton and Walsingham indicates the rapid spread of Wickliffe's opinions, though there may be some exaggeration in the remark of the former to the effect that "nearly every other man in England was a Lollard." In 1382, however, more decided action was taken on the part of the ecclesiastics, and resulted in the convening of a council by archbishop Courtney. By it ten of Wickliffe's articles were condemned as heretical, and twenty-four as erroneous. The archbishop issued his mandate, forbidding any man, "of what estate or condition soever," to hold, teach, preach, or defend the aforesaid heresies and errors, or any of them, or even allow them to be preached or favored, publicly or privately. Each bishop and priest was exhorted to become an "inquisitor of heretical pravity," and the neglect of the mandate was threatened with the severest censures of excommunication. This measure took effect at Oxford, where the chancellor, Robert Rygge, was inclined to favor Wickliffe's opinions, and the proctors, John Huntman and Walter Dish, were in sympathy with him. A sermon by Philip Reppyngdon, which they had allowed, and in which Wickliffe's views were defended, subjected them to suspicion. They were summoned before the archbishop, and with some difficulty escaped on submission. The chancellor was required to put Wickliffe's adherents to a purgation or cause them to abjure, publishing before the university the condemnation of his conclusions. His reply was that he durst not do it for fear of death. "What!" exclaimed the archbishop, "is Oxford such a nestler and favorer of heresies that the catholic truth cannot be published?" At the same time, by the archbishop's authority, Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppyngdon, John Ashton, and Lawrence Bedemen, whose names were associated with Wickliffe's, were denied the privilege of preaching before the university, and suspended from every scholastic act. The chancellor himself was addressed as "somewhat inclined and still inclining to the aforesaid conclusions so condemned," and, under pain of the greater excommunication, he was enjoined to permit no one in the university to teach or defend the obnoxious doctrines. The injunction of the archbishop was enforced by the command of the royal council.

In the early months of 1382 the king had favored the persecution of heretics. On the petition of the archbishop, he had allowed him and his suffragans "to arrest and imprison, either in their own prisons, or any other if they please, all and every such person and persons as shall either privily or openly preach or maintain" the condemned conclusions. The persons thus arrested might, moreover, be detained "till such time as they shall repent them and amend them of such erroneous and heretical pravities." The officers and subjects of the king were also required to obey and humbly attend the archbishop and his suffragans in the execution of their process. But the king declined to interfere. Even this, however, did not satisfy the archbishop. The excommunicated Hereford had escaped from prison, and the prelate, disappointed of his victim, asked the king to issue letters for his apprehension. On Ashton's trial in London, the citizens broke open the doors of the conclave, forcing the archbishop to complete his process elsewhere. But popular sympathy was weak to resist the organized efforts of a powerful hierarchy, largely oc-

cupying the most responsible posts of government, and bold enough (Hannay's *Rep. Gov.*) to forge or interpolate parliamentary records, of which they had the control. Some of the accused, like Reppyngdon and Hereford, recanted, and became the most virulent persecutors of their former sympathizers. Others, according to Walden, who mentions William Swinderby, Walter Brute, William Thorpe, and others, whose names figure in Fox's "Martyrs," fled the realm. If Swinderby was one of the refugees, he soon returned. It is doubtful whether he or his associates went farther than to Wales or Scotland. In 1389 he was arraigned before the bishop of Lincoln, and charged with heresy. Forced to recant, he withdrew to the diocese of Hereford. Here he was again arrested as a "truly execrable offender of the new sect vulgarly called Lollards." The issue, so far as episcopal authority was concerned, could not remain doubtful. Swinderby was found guilty, pronounced a heretic, and to be shunned by all. From this sentence he appealed to the king and council.

We have no subsequent record of Swinderby. Foxe supposes him to have been burned in 1399. In 1393, Walter Brute, another Lollard, a layman, was arrested, and, after a tedious trial, was forced to recant. In 1395 the alarm of heresy was again sounded. There was an apprehension that Parliament would take some action in behalf of the persecuted Lollards. A bull of Boniface IX was issued, inciting the bishop of Hereford against the obnoxious sect, and urging him to stimulate the orthodox zeal of the king. The king was at the time absent in Ireland, but Tindale states that intelligence of what had transpired was sent him, and his immediate return, with a view to repress the boldness of the Lollards, was strenuously urged. Nor was the king backward in responding to the petitions of the archbishop and the exhortations of the pope. Reciting his former commission to the bishops and their suffragans, giving them authority to arrest and imprison, he extended this authority, by which the bishop of Hereford was allowed to arrest William Swinderby and Stephen Bell, who had fled to the borders of Wales; while several of the leading members of Parliament were directed to have it proclaimed, wherever they thought meet, that no man of any condition within the said diocese should, under pain of forfeiture of all he had, "make or levy any conventicles, assemblies, or confederacies by any color," and that, if any one should transgress this rule, he should be seized, imprisoned, and safely kept till surrendered to the order of the king and council.

During this time, while special attention was drawn to the danger apprehended from Parliament, the Lollards were spreading their doctrines in other parts of the kingdom. At Leicester and its neighborhood they had made such progress that several of their leaders, eight of whom are mentioned by Foxe by name, were denounced to the archbishop on his visitation as heretics. They were summoned the next day to appear before him and answer to the charge. But they "hid themselves away and appeared not." They were therefore publicly denounced as excommunicate in several of the parish churches. Nor was this all. The whole town of Leicester, and all the churches in the same, were interdicted so long as any of the excommunicated should remain within the same, and "till all the Lollards of the town should return and amend from such heresies and errors, obtaining at the said archbishop's hands the benefit of absolution."

The compact between the leading representatives of the ecclesiastical and civil power which marked the accession of Henry IV to the throne was soon sealed by parliamentary legislation. To prevent the spread of the Lollards, and to suppress their meetings, which were described as confederacies to stir up sedition and insurrection (Crabb's *History of English Law*, p. 334), it was ordained that if persons, sententially convict, refused to abjure their opinions, such persons were to be left to the secular arm. In such cases evidence was to be given to the diocesan or his commissary, and the sheriff, mayor, and bailiff were, after sentence promulgated, to receive them, and in a high place, before the people, to cause them to be burnt. The law did not remain a dead letter. It was not long before a victim was found. The ecclesiastics were only too zealous for an example that might strike terror among the people, and especially the Londoners, who were "not right believers in God, nor in the traditions of their forefathers; sustainers of the Lollards, depravers of religious men, withholders of tythes," etc. The victim selected was "one William Sautre, a good man and a faithful priest, inflamed with zeal for true religion," who in the Parliament of 1401 required that he might be heard for the commodity of the whole realm. The suspicions of the bishops were excited, and he was summoned before the ecclesiastical court. His views were in substance those of the Lollards. He was at first induced to recant, but after his previous trial before the bishop of Norwich was known, as well as his submission and subsequent relapse, there was no disposition to show him mercy. By the king's order, "in some public and open place within the liberties of the city" of London, he was "committed to the fire." So bold a measure, not frequent in English history, naturally terrified the Lollards. They kept themselves secret from the eyes of the bishops. To the king they could no longer look with confidence or the hope of relief. The son of Wickliffe's patron had become the tool of the bishops. His usurped power was sustained by their alliance. As the hopes of relief from the burdens of taxation which had been inspired by the promises made at his accession began to die out, his popularity waned. Complaints were heard from various quarters. The old partisans of Richard II began to murmur, and, to retain his throne in security, Henry IV was compelled to throw himself more and more into the arms of the Church, and concede everything which the prelates might demand. The "cruel constitution" of archbishop Arundel was the fitting ecclesiastical counterpart of the civil statute that legalized the burning of the Lollards. It forbade any one to preach, "whether within the Church or without, in English," except by episcopal sanction. Schoolmasters and teachers were to intermingle with their instructions nothing contrary to the determination of the Church. No book or treatise of Wickliffe was to be read in schools, halls, hospitals, or other places whatsoever. No man hereafter, by his own authority, should translate any text of the Scripture into English or any other tongue, by way of a book, tract, or treatise. No one should presume to dispute upon articles determined by the Church contained in the decrees, decretals, etc. Every warden, provost, or master of every college, or principal of every hall within the University of Oxford, was, at least once every month, to inquire diligently in the college with which he was connected whether any scholar or inhabitant thereof had proposed or defended anything contrary to the determinations of the Church, and the failure of duty in this respect was to be visited by deprivation, expulsion, and the greater excommunication.

But all the precautions of the bishops and the severity of persecuting laws were ineffectual to suppress the hated opinions. Fox narrates the examination of William Thorpe (1407) and the burning of John Badby (1409). The latter event seems to have created sympathy for the Lollards on the part of the Commons. In the eleventh year of Henry IV (1410) they prayed that persons arrested under the obnoxious statute might be bailed and make their purgation, and that they might be arrested by none but sheriffs and lay officers. This petition, however, did not secure the royal approval. The influence and support of the Church would doubtless have been lost to the king if he had yielded to the wishes of the Commons. Other measures which they proposed, designed to set limits to ecclesiastical usurpation, while they gave unequivocal evidence of the unchanged spirit of the nation, met with little more success

In 1413 Henry IV was succeeded by his son, Henry V. The change, however, did not open any brighter prospect to the persecuted Lollards. The beginning of this reign was signalized by a new triumph of the Church. The king surrendered his friend, Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, to the machinations of his persecutors. He was arrested, imprisoned, arraigned before the archbishop and his assessors, pronounced a heretic, and excommunicated. His offence was regarded as of the most aggravated character. He was not only himself heretically inclined, but he had employed his wealth and influence to support Lollard preachers, and transcribe and disperse heretical books. So powerful and bold was the organized conspiracy of the priesthood against him that the king did not venture to interfere in his behalf. He was abandoned to his fate, but by some means escaped from prison, and only some years later was arrested, and subjected to the tardy but sure vengeance of his persecutors. It was not only by his surrender of lord Cobham that the new monarch signalized his subservience to the interests of the hierarchy. In his first Parliament a law was enacted against the Lollards, who were considered as the principal disturbers of the peace not only of the Church, but of the whole kingdom, uniting, as the preamble of the act states, in confederacies to destroy the king and all other estates of the realm. Hence all magistrates, from the chancellor to the sheriffs of cities and towns, were required, on entering office, to take an oath that they would use their whole power and diligence to destroy all heresies and errors, commonly called lollardies, and assist the ordinaries and their commissaries as often as required by them. It was moreover enacted "that whatsoever they were that should read the Scriptures in the mother tongue (which was then called Wickliffe's learning) should forfeit land, cattle, body, life, and goods from their heirs forever, and so be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and most arrant traitors to the land." No sanctuary or privileged ground within the realm, though permitted to thieves and murderers, should shelter them. In case of relapse after pardon they should be hanged as traitors against the king, and then burned as heretics against God.

The terror inspired by such executions and enactments drove many into exile. They fled, says Fox, "into Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and into the wilds of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, working there many marvels against their false kingdom too long to write." It was, of course, the most distinguished members of the sect who had most to apprehend, and who were the first to flee. Those who remained behind belonged very largely to the middle or the lower class. From time to time we meet with the name of some more eminent offender, and, from the precautions taken by their persecutors, we may form some idea of the continued energy as well as existence of the Lollards. Lechler, in the *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol.* (1853, vol. iv), has traced the evidences of their presence and influence in England down to the date of the Lutheran Reformation. The precious legacy of the Lollard faith was transmitted, along with MS. translations of the Scriptures and Lollard books, from generation to generation; and among the English martyrs, just before as well as after the commencement of the Reformation, there were several who might most appropriately be denominated Lollards. The prevalence of their views as late as the middle of the 15th century is attested by the elaborate effort which Reginald Peacock, successively bishop of St. Asaph and of Chichester, made to refute them. His earlier years had been spent in London, in the work of instruction, and here he had become familiar with the work of the Lollards, and the arguments by which they were maintained. With great ingenuity, and with a commendable patience, he undertook their refutation, giving to this method the decided preference over chains, prison, and the stake. Convicted at length himself of holding heretical opinions, and removed from the episcopal office, he spent the last three years of his life in prison, and by some, although unwarrantably, was regarded as a Lollard. On some points his views, indeed, approximated to those of the hated sect, but his writings derive their historical value from the exhibition which they make of the doctrines maintained by the Lollards, or "Bible-men," as he sometimes calls them, and the evidence which they afford of their extensive acceptance. Here we see that for nearly two full generations the same doctrinal views which had been accepted by the immediate followers of Wickliffe were still retained by their successors, and during the two generations which followed they underwent no material change. Thus, when the English Reformation of the 16th century commenced, it derived a new impulse from the earlier Lollard movement which it was destined to absorb into itself. Nor is it a mere fancy which has led writers like Lechler to assert an important and vital connection between the Lollardism of the 15th and the Puritanism of the 16th century. (E. H. G.)

Scottish Lollards.—Lollardism was by no means confined to the southern portion of the British Islands. It penetrated also into Scotland, and in the real home of the *Culdees* (q. v.)—the land where a simple and primitive form of Christianity had been established, while among her southern neighbors Rome presented a vast accumulation of superstitions, and was arrayed in her well-known pomp—received the countenance of those whose position and influence were well calculated to aid in its dissemination among a people that had freely imbibed the spirit of religious reformation so prevalent among the English in the 14th century, especially in the reign of Richard II, at the time of the passage of the statute of *præmunire* (A.D. 1389). More particularly rapid was the spread of the reformatory spirit in Scotland in the western districts, those of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunningham, and hence the surname for the Scotch Lollards, *Lollards of Kyle*, as they were oftentimes called. The clergy, aware of the danger that threatened their state of profligacy and ease, at last, in the beginning of the 15th century, made open war upon these silent antagonists. The first to suffer from the persecution which they inaugurated was a certain John Resby, an English priest who had fled northward from persecution, and in the land of refuge also was fast making converts to his cause. The leading authority and influence in the land was at this time the see of St. Andrews (compare Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Eccles. History of Scotland*, p. 45), over which bishop Henry Wardlaw was now presiding. By his interference Resby was tried before Dr. Laurence de Lindoris, afterwards professor of common law at St. Andrews, and on his refusal to retract his views about the supremacy of the pope, auricular confession, transubstantiation, etc., was burnt at Perth in 1405 or 1407. According to Pinkerton, such a scene was unknown before in Scotland. The burning of Resby is given in the twentieth chapter of the fifteenth book of the *Scotichronicon*. Still these opinions continued to extend, especially in the south and west of Scotland. The regent, Robert, duke of Albany, was known to be opposed to the Lollards; and though king James I was by no means blind to prevailing abuses in the Church, an act of Parliament was passed during his reign, in 1425, by which bishops were required to make inquisition in their dioceses for heretics, in order that they might undergo condign punishment. This act was soon to be put in force. In 1433 another victim for the stake was secured in the person of Paul Craw or Crawar, a physician of Prague, who had sought refuge from persecution in Scotland. As he made no secret of his Lollard or Hussite opinions, he was arraigned before Lindoris and condemned to the flames. After this time we hear but little of Lollardism for quite a long period.

With the closing years of the century, however, to judge from the energy of the papists, it must have been apparent again in a more prominent manner, and from this period dates one of the severest of religious perse-

cutions. In 1494, Robert Blacater, the first archbishop of Glasgow, sought to display his zeal for the Church by a wholesale attack on the pious followers of Lollardism. Accordingly, thirty suspected persons, both male and female, were summoned before the king (James IV) and the great council. Among them were Reid of Barskimming, Campbell of Cessnock, Campbell of Newmills, Shaw of Polkemmet, Helen Chalmers, lady Polkillie, and Isabel Chalmers, lady Stairs. According to Knox (*History of the Reformation*, p. 2), their indictment contained thirty-four different articles, which he informs us are preserved in the Register of Glasgow. Among the chief of these were, that images, relics, and the Virgin are not proper objects of worship; that the bread and wine in the sacrament are not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; that no priest or pope can grant absolutions or indulgences; that masses cannot profit the dead; that miracles have ceased; and that priests may lawfully marry. Providentially for the Lollards of Kyle, king James IV, "a monarch who, with all his faults, had yet too much of manliness and candor to permit his judgment to be greatly swayed by the malignity of the prelates," declined to be a persecutor of any of his people for such moderate reason, and dismissed the prisoners with an admonition to beware of new doctrines, and to content themselves with the faith of the Church. It is by many believed, however, that one particular reason why king James IV abstained from inflicting any punishment on these Lollards of Kyle was their influence and the wide spread of the doctrines they adhered to, and that "divers of them were his great familiars" (compare Lea, *Hist. Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 508; Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland*, i, 34 sq.).

Literature.—Much information concerning the Lollards may be derived from the lives of Wickliffe by Lewis, Le Bas, and especially Vaughan. Fox, in his *Martyrology*, often presents very disconnected documents exceedingly valuable. Walsingham (*Chronica*), Knighton, and Walden have contributed important evidence, although by no means favorable, which subsequent writers have used. The fuller histories of England, as Rapin, for instance, present some leading facts concerning the Lollards in connection with contemporary political movements. The most satisfactory account of the later Lollards is found in articles by Lechler in the *Histor. Zeitschrift* for 1853 and 1854. He has given citations from works hitherto unpublished, which he examined in the libraries of the English universities. See also Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ* (London, 1737, iii); Turner, *History of England during the Middle Ages;* Weber, *Gesch. d. Kirchen Ref. in Grossbritannien* (1856), vol. i; Neander, *Ch. History*, v, 141 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, vii, 404 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 13th cent. p. 323; 14th cent. p. 381, 392, etc.; 15th cent. p. 438 sq.; Shoberly, *Persecutions of Popery*, i, 135 sq.; Ullmann, *Reform. before the Reformation*, ii, 11, 14; Ebrard, *Kirchen und Dogmengesch.* ii, 360, 450, 462 sq.; Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, i, 370 sq., 628, Index for Wickliffe; Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism* (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 237 sq.; Butler (C. M.), *Eccles. Hist.* second series (Philadel. 1872, 8vo), p. 365 sq., 378, 381 sq., 388; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 379 sq.; Reichel, *Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 571 sq.; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1845, iii, 594 sq.; 1848, i, 169 sq.; *Chr. Rev.* vol. viii; *Christ. Remem.* 1853 (Oct.), p. 415; *Ladies' Repos.* 1870 (Sept.), p. 189 sq.

Lombard(us), Peter, a very noted scholastic theologian, derived his name from the province in which he was born, near Novara, in Lombardy, about the opening of the 12th century. He studied at Bologna, Rheims, and afterwards at Paris. Here he acquired a great reputation, was made first professor of theology in the university, and subsequently (in 1159) appointed bishop. He died in the French capital in 1164. Lombardus was considered one of the best scholars of his day, and a zealous priest. His principal work, *Sententiarum libri quatuor*, is a collection of passages from the fathers, of which he attempted to conciliate the apparent contradictions, somewhat in the manner in which Gratian attempted it in his *Décret*. He may be considered as the first author who collected theological doctrines into a complete system, and, whatever the faults of his work, it is the foundation of scholastic theology, and shows much care and system. It became *the* text-book in the schools of philosophy, obtained for him the title of "Master of Sentences" (*Magister Sententiarum*), and placed him at the head of the scholastic divines. The work was first published at Venice (1477, fol.) in four parts, each divided into different headings. After his death, one of the propositions contained in it ("Christus, secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid") was condemned by pope Alexander III. Thomas Aquinas and others have written commentaries on the book. He also wrote *Commentaire sur les Psaumes* (Paris, 1541, fol.):—*Commentaire sur les Epîtres de St. Paul* (1537, fol.). His complete works were published at Nuremberg in 1478, and at Basle in 1486. An able editor was found in Aleaume, who published Peter the Lombard's works at Louvain in 1546. The best edition of the *Sentences* is by Antoine Ghenart (Louvain, 1567, 4to). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas* (Bohn's edit.), vol. ii (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* v, 545, 639, 785; Reuter, *Alexander III*, vol. iii; Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. des antiq. Ecclésiastiques*, xvi, 45 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 583 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lombards. See Longobardi.

Lombardy is the name given to that part of Northern Italy which formed the "nucleus" of the kingdom of the *Longobardi* (q. v.). Incorporated in 774 into the Carlovingian possessions, it became an independent kingdom again in 843, though it was not entirely severed from the Frankish monarchy until 888. It now consisted of the whole of Italy north of the Peninsula, with the exception of Savoy and Venice. In 961 it was annexed to the German empire, and its territory thereafter gradually lessened by the formation of several small but independent duchies and republics. Throughout the Middle Ages the Lombards were compelled to league together with their neighbors to retain their independence from the German emperors. The assumptions of Frederick Barbarossa they successfully defeated in 1176, and so also those of Frederick II. But by internal dissensions they were gradually weakened, and in 1540 Spain finally took possession of Lombardy, and held it until about 1706, when it fell to Austria, and was designated "Austrian Lombardy." In 1796 it became part of the Cisalpine republic, but in 1815 it was restored to Austria, and annexed politically to the newly-acquired Venetian territory under the name of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. This union was dissolved in 1859 by the Italian War, Lombardy, with the exception of the Venetian territory (finally also given to Italy in 1866), falling to the new kingdom of Italy. There is now no political division called Lombardy, the country having been parcelled out into the provinces of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Milan, Pavia, and Sondrio. Its total area was 9086 English square miles, with a population, in 1885, of 3,460,824 souls, mostly Roman Catholics. See Italy.

Lombroso, Jacob, a noted Jewish writer and rabbi of Spanish descent, flourished in Venice, Italy, in the first half of the 17th century. He published in 1639 a beautiful edition of the Old Test. in Hebrew, with valuable comments, and a Spanish translation of the most difficult passages, entitled מִרְלא כף נחת (*a Handful of Quiet*). He also wrote a polemic against Christianity. See Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, iii, 227; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 254.

Loménie de Brienne, Étienne Charles de, a very celebrated French prelate, was born at Paris in

1727. He renounced his primogeniture and the rigors of military glory for the easy honors of the Church, and became a great and powerful opponent of the Protestants. Promoted in 1763 to the archbishopric of Toulouse, he aspired, it would seem, to the part of a Mazarin or a Richelieu in the state, without possessing either the ability or the unscrupulous daring necessary to it. Upon the coronation of Louis XVI in 1775, he took particular pains to strike against the Protestants, but it was not until 1787 that he gained prominence in state affairs. In this year, after figuring in a commission for the reform of the clergy, and coquetting with the philosophy of D'Alembert and the encyclopædists, he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and, having headed the party by whom the administration of Calonne was overthrown, he succeeded that unfortunate as minister, adopted his plans, and proved himself just as incapable of executing them. An excited contest arose between the king and Parliament, and resulted in the dismissal of the latter by force of arms. In 1788 he was made prime minister, and was also promoted to the rich archbishopric of Sens. In 1791 he was offered a cardinal's hat, but, knowing the opposition of the people against the clergy, he declined this distinction. In July, 1788, he was compelled by the dissatisfaction of the people to proceed to the Convocation of the states-general for the month of May following, and on the 24th of August he retired to private life. He resided for a time at Nice, but the cardinal's hat which Pius VI bestowed on him he now gratefully accepted. He was one of those who took the oath as a constitutional bishop, on account of which he was deprived of the cardinal's hat. He was nevertheless arrested February 15, 1794, and died of apoplexy the same night. See *Heroes, Philosophers, and Courtiers of the Time of Louis XVI* (London, 1863, 2 vols. 12mo); Lacroix's Pressensé, *Religion and the Reign of Terror*, p. 43, 124; Droz, *Hist. du règne de Louis XVI;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxi, 532 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lomus, in Hindû mythology, is the first created being, formed by Brahma when he commenced to exist. He immediately concluded to devote himself only to the contemplation of divine things, and, in order to be undisturbed, buried himself in the ground. This pleased the gods so much that they loaded him with favors, increased and fixed his power and piety, and assured him a duration of life surpassing even that of Brahma (q. v.). Lomus, said to be twenty miles long, and covered with hair all over, draws out a hair after the lapse of each cycle Brahma has gone through, and dies only after the last hair is drawn. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s. v.

Lön, Johann Michael, a German Protestant jurist and theologian, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1695. He studied jurisprudence at Marburg, became soon known as an essayist on questions of morals, philosophy, and theology, which he treated with great ease and brilliancy, although occasionally inaccurate in his statements, and was finally appointed president of the Council of Lingen and Tecklenburg. He died in 1776. He is especially known for his efforts to bring about a union of the different Christian churches, or, at least, of the evangelical denominations. He sought to unite them all into one, to carry out indifferentism towards dogmatics to its full extent. With this object in view, he wrote, under the name of Gottlob von Friedenheim, *Evangelischer Friedenstempel nach d. Art d. ersten Kirche* (1724):—*Von Vereinigung d. Protestanten* (1748):—*Die einzig wahre Religion* (1750). These works brought him into a long controversy with Hoffmann, Weickhmann, Brenner, etc., and his attempts at establishing a union proved fruitless.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 452; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 463. (J. N. P.)

London Missionary Society. See Missionary Societies.

Long, Jacques Le. See Le Long.

Long, Roger, D.D., an English divine, noted as an astronomer, was born in Norfolkshire in 1680, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge University, and became M.A. in 1733. He was honored with the chair of astronomy by his alma mater in 1749, and shortly after secured the rectory of Bradwell. He died Dec. 16, 1770. Besides his *Sermons* (1728 sq.), he published and is best known as the author of a *Treatise on Astronomy* (2 vols. 4to; vol. i, 1742; vol. ii, 1764). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and American Authors*, ii, s. v.; Thomas, *Biog. and Mythol. Dict.* s. v.

Long, Thomas, an English Nonconformist, was born at Exeter in 1621. He was educated at Exeter College, and about 1660 became prebendary of Exeter cathedral, from which he was ejected in 1688 for refusing to take the oath to William and Mary. He died in 1700. Mr. Long published a *Vindication of the Primitive Christians in Point of Obedience to their Prince* (1683):—*Answer to Locke's first Letter on Toleration* (1689):—*Vox Cleri on Alterations in the Liturgy* (1690); and a *Review of Dr. Walker's Account of the Author of Eikon Basilike.* See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.;* Thomas, *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*, s. v.

Long Brothers, The Four. Among the leading men of the spiritualists, the four "Long Brothers" must not be overlooked: Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who were as distinguished by their influence as they were eminent in stature. The secret of their power was in their inflexible honesty, combined with hearty and unflinching faith in the system of their choice. See each name.

Longevity. The Biblical narrative plainly ascribes to many individuals in the earlier history of the race lives far longer than what is held to be the present extreme limit, and we must therefore carefully consider the evidence upon which the general correctness of the numbers rests, and any independent evidence as to the length of life at this time. The statements in the Bible regarding longevity may be separated into two classes—those given in genealogical lists, and those interspersed with the relation of events.

1. To the former class virtually belong all the statements relating to the longevity of the patriarchs before Abraham. These, as given by Moses in the Hebrew text, are as follows:

		Years				Years.
Adam	Gen. v, 5	930	Shem	Gen. xi, 10, 11		600
Seth	" 8	912	Arphaxad	" 12, 13		438
Enos	" 11	905	Salah	" 14, 15		433
Cainan	" 14	910	Eber	" 16, 17		464
Mahalaleel	" 17	895	Peleg	" 18, 19		239
Jared	" 20	962	Reu	" 20, 21		239
Enoch	" 23	365	Serug	" 22, 23		230
Methuselah	" 27	969	Nahor	" 24, 25		148
Lamech	" 31	777	Terah	" 32		205
Noah	" ix, 29	950	Abraham	" xxv, 7		175

Infidelity has not failed, in various ages, to attack revelation on the score of the supposed absurdity of assigning to any class of men this lengthened term of existence. In reference to this, Josephus (*Ant.* i, 3, 3) remarks: "Let no one, upon comparing the lives of the ancients with our lives, and with the few years which we now live, think that what we say of them is false, or make the shortness of our lives at present an argument that neither did they attain to so long a duration of life." When we consider the compensating process which is going on, the marvel is that the human frame should not last longer than it does. Some, however, have supposed that the years above named are *lunar*, consisting of about thirty days; but this supposition, with a view to reduce the lives of the antediluvians to our standard, is replete with difficulties. At this rate, the whole time from the creation of man to the flood would not be more than about 140 years; and Methuselah himself would not have attained to the age which many even now do, whilst many must have had children when mere infants! Moses must therefore have meant *solar*, not *lunar* years—averaging as long as ours, although the ancients generally reckoned twelve

months, of thirty days each, to the year. "Nor is there," observes St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xv, 12), "any care to be given unto those who think that one of our ordinary years would make *ten* of the years of these times, being so short; and therefore, say they, 900 years of theirs are 90 of ours—their 10 is our 1, and their 100 our 10. Thus think they that Adam was but 20 years old when he begat Seth, and he but 20⅛ when he begat Enos, whom the Scriptures call (the Sept. ver.) 205 years. For, as these men hold, the Scripture divided one year into ten parts, calling each part a year; and each part had a sixfold quadrate, because in six days God made the world. Now 6 times 6 is 36, which, multiplied by 10, makes 360—i. e. twelve lunar months." Abarbanel, in his *Comment. on Gen. v*, states that some, professing Christianity, had fallen into the same mistake, viz. that Moses meant *lunar*, and not *solar* years. Ecclesiastical history does not inform us of this fact, except it be to it that Lactantius refers (ii, 12) when he speaks of one Varro: "The life of man, though temporary, was yet extended to 1000 years; of this Varro is so ignorant that, though known to all from the sacred writings, he would argue that the 1000 years of Moses were, according to the Egyptian mode of calculation, only 1000 months!"

That the ancients computed time differently we learn from Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vii), and also from Scaliger (*De Emend. Temporum*, i); still this does not alter the case as above stated (see Heidegger, *De Anno Patriarcharum*, in his *Hist. Patr.* Amst. 1688, Zür. 1729).

But it is asked, if Moses meant solar years, how came it to pass that the patriarchs did not begin to beget children at an earlier period than they are reported to have done? Seth was 105 years old, on the lowest calculation, when he begat Enos, and Methuselah 187 when Lamech was born! St. Augustine (i, 15) explains this difficulty in a twofold manner by supposing, 1. Either that the age of puberty was later in proportion as the lives of the antediluvians were longer than ours, or, 2. That Moses does not record the first-born sons but as the order of the genealogy required, his object being to trace the succession from Adam, through Seth, to Abraham.

While the Jews have never questioned the longevity assigned by Moses to the patriarchs, they have yet disputed, in many instances, as to whether it was common to all men who lived up to the period when human life was contracted. Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, ii, 47) takes this view. With this opinion Abarbanel, on Gen. v, agrees; Nachmanides, however, rejects it, and shows that the life of the descendants of Cain must have been quite as long as that of the Sethites, though not noticed by Moses; for only seven individuals of the former filled up the space which intervened between the death of Abel and the flood, whereas ten of the latter are enumerated. We have reason, then, to conclude that longevity was not confined to any peculiar tribe of the ante or post diluvian fathers, but was vouchsafed, in general, to all. Irenæus (*Adversus Hæret.* v) informs us that some supposed that the fact of its being recorded that no one of the antediluvians named attained the age of 1000 years, was the fulfilment of the declaration (Gen. iii), "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" grounding the opinion, or rather conceit, upon Psa. xc, 4, namely, that God's day is 1000 years.

As to the probable reasons why God so prolonged the life of man in the earlier ages of the world, and as to the subordinate means by which this might have been accomplished, Josephus says (*Ant.* l. c.): "For those ancients were beloved of God, and lately made by God himself; and because their food was then fitter for the prolongation of life, they might well live so great a number of years; and because God afforded them a longer time of life on account of their virtue and the good use they made of it in astronomical and geometrical discoveries, which would not have afforded the time for foretelling the periods of the stars unless they had lived 600 years; for the great year is completed in that interval." To this he adds the testimony of many celebrated profane historians, who affirm that the ancients lived 1000 years. In the above passage Josephus enumerates *four* causes of the longevity of the earlier patriarchs. 1. As to the first, viz., their being dearer to God than other men, it is plain that it cannot be maintained; for the profligate descendants of Cain were equally long-lived, as mentioned above, with others. 2. Neither can we agree in the second reason he assigns; because we find that Noah and others, though born so long subsequently to the creation of Adam, yet lived to as great an age, some of them to a greater age than he did. 3. If, again, it were right to attribute longevity to the superior quality of the food of the antediluvians, then the seasons, on which this depends, must, about Moses's time—for it was *then* that the term of human existence was reduced to its present standard—have assumed a fixed character. But no change at that time took place in the revolution of the heavenly bodies, by which the seasons of heat, cold, etc., are regulated: hence we must not assume that it was the nature of the fruits they ate which caused longevity. 4. How far the antediluvians had advanced in scientific research generally, and in astronomical discovery particularly, we are not informed; nor can we place any dependence upon what Josephus says about the two inscribed pillars which remained from the old world (see *Ant.* i, 2, 9). We are not, therefore, able to determine, with any confidence, that God permitted the earlier generations of man to live so long in order that they might arrive at a high degree of mental excellence. From the *brief* notices which the Scriptures afford of the character and habits of the antediluvians, we should rather infer that they had not advanced very far in discoveries in natural and experimental philosophy. See ANTEDILUVIANS. We must suppose that they did not reduce their language to alphabetical order; nor was it necessary to do so at a time when human life was so prolonged that the tradition of the creation passed through only two hands to Noah. It would seem that the book ascribed to Enoch is a work of postdiluvian origin (see Jurieu, *Crit. Hist.* i, 41). Possibly a want of mental employment, together with the labor they endured ere they were able to extract from the earth the necessaries of life, might have been some of the proximate causes of that degeneracy which led God in judgment to destroy the old world. If the antediluvians began to bear children at the age on an average of 100, and if they ceased to do so at 600 years (see Shuckford's *Connect.* i, 36), the world might then have been far more densely populated than it is now. Supposing, moreover, that the earth was no more productive antecedently than it was subsequently to the flood, and that the antediluvian fathers were ignorant of those mechanical arts which so much abridge human labor now, we can easily understand how difficult they must have found it to secure for themselves the common necessaries of life, and this the more so if animal food was not allowed them. The prolonged life, then, of the generations before the flood would seem to have been rather an *evil* than a blessing, leading as it did to the too rapid peopling of the earth. We can readily conceive how this might conduce to that awful state of things expressed in the words, "And the whole earth was filled with violence." In the absence of any well-regulated system of government, we can imagine what evils must have arisen: the unprincipled would oppress the weak, the crafty would outwit the unsuspecting, and, not having the fear of God before their eyes, destruction and misery would be in their ways. Still we must admire the providence of God in the longevity of man immediately after the creation and the flood. After the creation, when the world was to be peopled by one man and one woman, the age of the greatest part of those on record was 900 and upwards. But after the flood, when there were three couples to repeople the earth, none of the patriarchs except Shem reached the age of 500, and only the first three of his

line, viz. Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber, came near that age, which was in the first century after the flood. In the second century we do not find that any attained the age of 240; and in the third century (about the latter end of which Abraham was born), none, except Terah, arrived at 200, by which time the world was so well peopled that they had built cities, and were formed into distinct nations under their respective kings (see Gen. xv; see also Usher and Petavius on the increase of mankind in the first three centuries after the flood).

2. The statements as to the length of the lives of Abraham and his nearer descendants, and some of his later, are so closely interwoven with the historical narrative, not alone in form, but in sense, that their general truth and its cannot be separated. Abraham's age at the birth of Isaac is a great fact in his history, equally attested in the Old Testament and in the New. Again, the longevity ascribed to Jacob is confirmed by the question of Pharaoh and the patriarch's remarkable answer, in which he makes his then age of 130 years less than the years of his ancestors (Gen. xlvii, 9), a minute point of agreement with the other chronological statements to be especially noted. At a later time, the age of Moses is attested by various statements in the Pentateuch, and in the New Test. on St. Stephen's authority, though it is to be observed that the mention of his having retained his strength to the end of his 120 years (Deut. xxxiv, 7) is, perhaps, indicative of an unusual longevity. In the earlier part of the period following we notice similar instances in the case of Joshua, and, inferentially, in that of Othniel. Nothing in the Bible could be cited against this evidence, except it be the common explanation of Psa. xc (esp. ver. 10), combined with its ascription to Moses (see title).

That the common age of man has been the same in all times since the world was generally repeopled is manifest from profane as well as sacred history. Plato lived to the age of 81, and was accounted an old man; and those whom Pliny reckons up (vii, 48) as rare examples of long life may for the most part be equalled in modern times. It must be observed, however, that all the supposed famous modern instances of very great longevity, as those of Parr, Jackson, and the old countess of Desmond, have utterly broken down on examination, and that the registers of countries where records of such statistics have been kept *prove* no greater extreme than about 110 years. We may fortunately appeal to at least one contemporary instance. There is an Egyptian hieratic papyrus in the Bibliothèque at Paris bearing a moral discourse by one Ptah-hotp, apparently eldest son of Assa (B.C. cir. 1910–1860), the fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, which was of shepherds. See Egypt. At the conclusion, Ptah-hotp thus speaks of himself: "I have become an elder on the earth (or in the land); I have traversed a hundred and ten years of life by the gift of the king and the approval of the elders, fulfilling my duty towards the king in the place of favor (or blessing)" (*Facsimile d'un Papyrus Egyptien*, par E. Prisse d'Avennes, pl. xix, lines 7, 8). The natural inferences from this passage are, that Ptah-hotp wrote in the full possession of his mental faculties at the age of 110 years, and that his father was still reigning at the time, and therefore had attained the age of about 130 years, or more. The reigns assigned by Manetho to the shepherd-kings of this dynasty seem indicative of a greater age than that of the Egyptian sovereigns (Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, 2d ed., p. 114, 136). See Chronology.

Longīnus, Dionysius Cassius, a noted Greek philosopher and rhetorician, was born probably in Syria, and flourished in the 3d century of our æra. He was educated at Alexandria under Ammonius and Origen, and became an earnest disciple of Platonism. To expound this system and to teach rhetoric, he opened a school at Athens, and there soon acquired a great reputation. His knowledge was immense, and to him was first applied the phrases, often repeated since, "a living library" and "a walking museum." His taste and critical acuteness also were no less wonderful. He was probably the best critic of all antiquity. Flourishing in an age when Platonism was giving place to the semi-Oriental mysticism and dreams of Neo-Platonism, Longinus stands out conspicuously as a genuine disciple of the great master. Clear, calm, rational, yet lofty, he despised the fantastic speculations of Plotinus (q. v.). In the latter years of his life he accepted the invitation of Zenobia to undertake the education of her children at Palmyra; but, becoming also her prime political adviser, he was beheaded as a traitor, by command of the emperor Aurelian, A.D. 273. Longinus was a heathen, but generous and tolerant. Of his works, the only one extant (in parts only) is a treatise, Περὶ Ὕψους (On the Sublime). There are many editions of it; those by Morus (Leips. 1769), Toupius (Oxford, 1778; 2d edition, 1789; 3d edit., 1806), Weiske (Leipsic, 1809), and Egger (Paris, 1837) being among the best. Translations have been made of it into French by Boileau, into German by Schlosser, and into English by W. Smith. See Ruhnken, *Dissertatio de Vita et Scriptis Longini* (1776); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Longley, Charles Thomas, D.D., the last primate of all England, was born in Westmeathshire in 1794, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, where he distinguished himself as a first-class scholar in classics. After graduating, he remained for some time connected with the university as college tutor, censor, and public examiner. He became perpetual curate of Cowley in 1823, and rector of West Tytherley in 1827, and head master of Harrow School in 1829. In 1836 he was appointed bishop of Ripon, and in 1856 was translated to Durham, in 1860 to the archbishopric of York, and in 1862 to that of Canterbury. Over this see, by virtue of which he was primate of the Church of England, and first of all the Anglican bishops of the world, he presided until his death, October 27, 1868. "Archbishop Longley belonged ecclesiastically to the old school of 'moderate' Establishment divines, but in the last three years of his administration his amiable temper, co-operating with his instinctive hyper-conservatism, led him to temporize with the reckless and audacious policy of bishop Wilberforce and the High-Anglicans, and he became a most inadequate standard-bearer for the English Church in her supreme hour. Incapable of bold and persistent action, the latter portion of his primacy was marked by a series of disastrous vacillations and blunders. He first gave his countenance to the bishop of Capetown in his revolutionary action in South Africa, and then withdrew that countenance. In an interval of reason he encouraged lord Shaftesbury to introduce his anti-ritualistic resolutions, and then he shiveringly withdrew his approval when they came up for action." The most important event during his administration was the so-called "Pan-Anglican" Synod, a meeting of all the bishops of the Church of England and the churches in communion with her, convened in 1867, a measure instigated, it is said, by bishop Wilberforce (q. v.), to stop the tide of ritualism, and to bring about, if possible, a union with the Greek Church (see Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1867, p. 42 sq.). In this synod the archbishop of Canterbury proved entirely untrustworthy. Himself inclining towards ritualism, he moderately rebuked the Ritualists in public, while privately he favored their promotion, and was instrumental in their appointment to colonial bishoprics. He was decidedly a High-Churchman, and, though in person amiable, devout, dignified, and courteous, he showed, in his disastrous primacy, how unfitted are mere moderation, and a desire simply for compromise and peace, to guide the Church in times when her foundations are assailed. We will only add that archbishop Longley died as he had lived, a man of profoundly pious feeling that fell a little too much into formula. He referred to words of Hooker's some three or four

days before his death as containing the faith in which he "wished to die"—words expressive of his sense of guilt and his faith in Christ's blood to cleanse him from that guilt. See *London Spectator*, 1868, Oct. 31, p. 1272; *N. Y. Tribune*, Oct. 29, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Longobardi (otherwise called LOMBARDS), a Teutonic people of the Suevic race, who maintained a dominion in Italy from A.D. 568 to 774.

The name *Lombards* is derived from the Latin *Longobardi* or *Langobardi*, a form in use since the 12th century, and generally supposed to have been given in reference to the long beards of this people; although some derive it rather from a word *parta* or *barte*, which signifies a battle-axe.

The first historical notices present them as a people small in number, having their original seat on the west side of the Lower Elbe, in a territory extending some sixty miles southward from Hamburg. They advanced into Moravia and Hungary, the abode of the Rugi, before 500, and conquered the Heruli, and were invited by Justinian to the neighborhood of the Danube in the year 526. They afterwards crossed into Pannonia, where, though at first in alliance with the Gepidæ, they subsequently (A.D. 566 or 567) subdued the people, yielding in turn to the Avars, and in 569 crossed the Alps into Italy under Alboin, having been invited thither by Narses, as it is said, out of revenge against the province and the emperor. This was fourteen years after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, and the exhausted state of the country left Northern Italy an easy prey. The Goths were Arians, and religious differences with both the Roman and Greek churches went far to prevent the acceptance of their rule, and the establishment at that time of a united government in Italy, for the want of which the country has so many centuries suffered. The Lombards succeeded no better in securing entire dominion. They, however, extended their power, establishing the duchies of Frioul, Spoleto, and Benevento, until only the districts of Rome and Naples, the southern extremity of the peninsula, Venice, and the east coast from the Po to Ancona, with Ravenna as the city of the exarchs, remained under the power of the Greek emperor. The conduct of the Lombards as conquerors has been severely characterized on the authority of early writers of the Romish Church. Gregory the Great, in his epistles and dialogues, draws a frightful picture of their oppressions, as does Paulus Diaconus of the unquestionably lawless sway of the thirty-five dukes, who were the only rulers in the interregnum after the death of Cleph, till, by the threatening approach of the Franks, they were compelled to elect a king in the person of Autharis. Now for the first time (584–590) an orderly constitution was established. Paulus Diaconus speaks with great praise of the new state of things. "Wonderful was the state of the Lombard kingdom: violence and treachery were alike unknown; no one was oppressed, no one plundered another; thefts and robberies were unheard of; the traveller went wherever he would in perfect security" (Paul. Diac. iii, 16).

A general idea of their political constitution may be found in the edict of king Rothari (636–652), a kind of Bill of Rights, which was promulgated Nov. 22, 643, and is memorable as having become the foundation of constitutional law in the Germanic kingdoms of the Middle Ages. It was revised and extended by subsequent Lombard kings, but subsisted in force for several centuries after the Lombard kingdom had passed away. The edict recognises, as among all German nations, three classes—the *free*, the *semi-free*, and *slave* or *vassal*. Among the free were the *nobiles*. The army secured the national unity, civil officers being regarded as rendering military service. The king was elective, and among the dukes he represented the nation. He was commander of the army, head of all police power, chief judge, and general ward. There were courtiers of various ranks. The dukes were also called judges, or *judices civitatis*. Under each *judex* were many local, judicial, police, and military authorities. The cities chosen by the dukes severally as their residences were centres of the Lombard government. There would seem to be but little room for the old Roman municipal constitutions. Concerning the relation of the Lombard rule to the continuance of the Roman law and the rights of the conquered people there are differences of opinion. Under the Goths the former laws and customs remained largely unaffected; but it has been maintained (as by Leo) that under the Lombards the personal liberty, right of property, and municipal constitutions of the conquered people were abolished. The subject was much discussed by the Italians in the last century; and in this century the historians Savigny, Leo, Bandi di Vesme, Fossati, Troya, Bethmann-Hollweg, etc., present conflicting or somewhat varied views. The Lombard laws themselves give but little precise information on this point. The Romans at least lost all united nationality. Roman law seems to have been first distinctively brought into use under Luitprand. The feeling of enmity which, for a long time at least, existed between the people and their conquerors, was increased by religious differences, and on this account the new power was specially obnoxious to the authorities of the Roman Church. A state of war generally prevailed between the two powers. The Church writers are constant and bitter in their complaints of Lombard impiety and oppressions—at least during the earlier period of their dominion—in the wasting of churches and monasteries, and the treatment of ecclesiastics. The Lombard clergy themselves, however, do not seem to be charged as active participants in these deeds. Gregory the Great discerns in the times signs of the approaching judgment. "What is happening in other parts of the world," he says, "we know not; but in this the end of all things not merely announces itself as approaching, but shows itself as actually begun" (*Dial.* iii). Such representations of the spirit and course of the conquerors must be taken with considerable qualification. Still more untrustworthy are the accounts given, especially by Gregory, of numerous miraculous interferences in behalf of the true faith.

The Lombards were Arians. Unlike the Franks, who became by religious sympathy the natural defenders of the pope, they, with the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Suevians, had been converted to Christianity, about the end of the 5th century, by Arian missionaries. Such was the case with the German tribes generally on the lower Danube. But there were among them many, some of whom entered Italy, who were still heathens, and worshipped their gods Odin and Freia south of the Alps. There were probably also some Catholic Pannonians and Noricans who, with their bishops, had joined the expedition. The first influence exerted by Rome for the conversion of the Lombards was through the wife of Alboin, a niece of Clovis, who was a good Roman Catholic, and had been enjoined by the bishop of Treves to convert her husband from his Arian heresy. Theodolinda of Bavaria also exerted a like influence upon her husband Autharis, and under his reign the Catholic faith made considerable progress. On the death of Autharis (590), Theodolinda married Agilulf, and under his government also she continued to labor for the advancement of the Catholic Church, hoping thereby to refine the manners of her own people. Theodolinda persuaded Agilulf to restore a portion of their property and dignities to the Catholic clergy, and to have his own son baptized according to the Catholic rites—an example which was followed by multitudes. Her brother Gundwald, duke of Asti, she influenced to build the magnificent Basilica of St. John the Baptist at Monza, near Milan, in which in subsequent times was kept the Lombard crown, called the *Iron Crown;* indeed, she improved any and every opportunity to advance the interests of the Catholics, and thus hastened the successful establishment of their religion among the Lombards. Gregory the Great (590–604), founder of the papacy, maintained frequent correspondence with the queen in

a friendly relation, similar to that existing between Gregory VII and the countess Matilda. On the occasion of the baptism of her children she received a present from Gregory. Earlier he had sent her four *Books of Dialogues*, "because he knew that she was true to the faith in Christ, and strong in good works" (Paul. Diac. iv, 5).

If the Roman Church had met with material losses by the Lombard invasion, it now gained much for the power of the papacy in the more complete dependence with which all parts of Italy began to look to Rome for a common defence of their faith. Rome became a certain centre of national life through the diffused power of its bishops, and what the Roman Empire had lost by arms the Roman Church was to regain by peaceful means. After Gregory's death Agilulf received the monk Columban with great favor, and allowed him to settle where he would. At Milan he wrote against Arianism. He founded the powerful monastery of Bobbia, which was subsequently very influential in the conversion of the Lombards. Grundeberg, daughter of Theodolinda, married successively the kings Ariowald and Rotharis. Under the latter there was a Catholic and Arian bishop in each city. Aribert (653–661), the son of duke Gundualid, was the first Catholic king. Döllinger says of him, "Rex Horibertus, pius et catholicus, Arrianorum abolevit hæresem et Christianam fidem fecit crescere." The Lombards became now enthusiastic churchmen; many monasteries and churches were founded and richly endowed. There was always, however, a certain degree of independence manifest among them. At the Lateran Council of 649, summoned by Martin I, Milan and Aquileia were not represented. A certain patriarchal and metropolitan prerogative was allowed the pope, with a due reservation of national liberty. In the latter half of the 7th century internal contests for the Lombard crown secured a greater degree of attachment to the Church, while the disputes of Rome with Constantinople brought the Lombards to the defence of the former. In the 8th century the powerful king Luitprand (713–35), who raised the Lombard kingdom to its highest prosperity, sought anxiously to complete the conquest of all Italy, and before 800 it may be said that the national unity of Italy was complete. Each subject was called a Lombard. See LUITPRAND. The Church was subject to the state. Though its clergy and bishops obtained increasing power, it was not of a political character as in France. The bishops were subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges. The bishops were chosen by the people. The cloisters were subject to magisterial power. But the prospect looming up before the popes of soon becoming themselves subject to the rule of the barbaric Lombards, they now entered upon that Machiavelian policy which they long incessantly pursued, of laboring to prevent a union of all Italy under one government, in order to secure for themselves the greater power in the midst of contending parties. This, with the disputes which arose concerning the succession to the Lombard throne, led to the downfall of the Lombard kingdom within no long time after it had reached its utmost greatness. Gregory III, in his distress, fixed his gaze on the youthful greatness of a transalpine nation, the Franks, to afford him the necessary assistance in the struggle now ensuing. The movement against the Lombards was initiated at the election of Zachary, by discarding the customary form of obtaining the consent of the exarchate's authority, at this time vested in the Lombard king; and Stephen II made way for Pepin, after having anointed him to the *patriciate*, i. e. the governorship of Rome, to make war upon Aistulf, the successor of Luitprand. Naturally enough, Pepin's military successes were all turned to the advantage of the pope in securing to him the exarchate and Pentapolis. New causes of hostility between the Frank and Lombard monarchs arose when Charlemagne sent back to her father his wife, the daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius (754–774). In the autumn of 773 Charlemagne invaded Italy, and in May of the following year Pavia was conquered, and the Lombard kingdom was overthrown. In 803 a treaty between Charlemagne, the western, and Nicephorus, the eastern emperor, confirmed the right of the former to the Lombard territory, with Rome, the Exarchate, Ravenna, Istria, and part of Dalmatia; while the Eastern empire retained the islands of Venice and the maritime towns of Dalmatia, with Naples, Sicily, and part of Calabria. See Türk, *Die Longobarden und ihr Volksrecht* (Rost. 1835); Flegler, *Das Königreich der Longobarden in Italien* (Leipz. 1851); Abel, *Der Untergang d. Longobardenreichs in Italien* (Gött. 1858); Leo, *Gesch. d. ital. Staaten* (1829), vol. i; Hautleville, *Hist. des Communes Lombardes depuis leur origine jusqu'à la fin du xiii Siècle* (Paris, 1857), vol. i; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 50 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i, 472; ii, 39 sq. See LOMBARDY.

Longobardi, NICCOLÒ, a Jesuit missionary, was born in Switzerland in 1565. He went to China as missionary in 1596, and died in 1655 at Pekin. He wrote *De Confucio ejusque Doctrina Tractatus*. See Leibo-ritz's notes to a recent edition. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Longuerue, LOUIS DU FOUR, *abbé de*, an eminent, learned French ecclesiastic, born at Charleville Jan. 6, 1652, was the son of a Norman nobleman. When but four years old he was generally known as a learned prodigy. At fourteen he understood several Oriental languages, and undertook to get a complete knowledge of the holy Scriptures by making diligent study of the fathers and of the Jewish and Christian commentators. The Sorbonne, which he sometimes visited, only gave him a distaste for scholastic theology; he preferred to reconstruct positive theology from the original, after the manner of P. Pétau, where he found more exactness and stability. In 1674 he was provided with the abbotship of St. Jean-du-jard, near Melun, and in 1684 with that of Sept-Fontaines, in the diocese of Rheims. After receiving orders he entered the Seminary of St. Magloire, and shut himself up there in complete solitude for fifteen years. When he re-entered the world he opened his house to learned men, and kept up with them a regular correspondence, and manifested a great eagerness to instruct those who consulted him. Longuerue consecrated his whole life to labor; he knew no other rest except that of change of occupation. No part of the domain of learning was strange to him, but he much preferred history. His constitution and memory were good. In conversation he was lively, satirical, critical, humorous, and cynical. He took no part in religious controversy. He died in 1732. Among his works of interest to us are *Traité d'un auteur de la communion Romaine touchant la transubstantiation, où il fait voir que selon les principes de son Eglise ce dogme ne peut être un article de foi* (London, 1686):—*Dissertations touchant les Antiquités des Chaldéens et des Égyptiens* (in the *Lettres choisies* of Richard Simon):—*Dissertation sur le passage de Flavius Josèphe en faveur de Jésus-Christ* (in the *Bibl. ancienne et moderne* of Le Clerc, vii, 237–288):—*Remarques sur la vie du cardinal Wolsey contraires à ceux qui ont écrit contre sa reputation* (in the *Mémoire de Littérat.* of P. Desmolets). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol.* s. v.; *General Biographical Dictionary*, s. v.

Longueval, JACQUES, a learned French Jesuit, was born in the suburbs of Peronne March 18, 1680. At the age of nineteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught rhetoric and theology in different colleges of his order. On account of a violent work published upon the religious quarrels of the period, he was first exiled, but later received permission to reside at the house of professed Jesuits in Paris. He died January 11, 1735. Among his published works are *Traité du Schisme* (Brussels, 1718) [a *Refutation* of this work was published in the same year by Meganck]:—*Dissertation*

sur les Miracles (Paris, 1730, 4to):—*Histoire de l'Église Gallicane* (Paris, 1730–1749, 18 vols. 8vo); Longueval wrote only the first eight volumes, reaching the year 1138; the others have been written by Fontenay, Brumoy, and Berthier. The work has been reprinted at Nîmes (1782) and at Paris (1825). Longueval is also the author of the greater part of the *Réflexions Morales*, an appendix to the *Nouveau Testament* of P. Lallemant. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol.* s. v.; Fontenay, *Éloge de Longueval*, in *l'Histoire Gallicane*, vol. ix.

Lonsdale, John, D.D., a distinguished English prelate, was born at Newmillerdam, near Wakefield, January 17, 1788, and was the son of the Rev. John Lonsdale, vicar of Durfield and incumbent of Chapelthorpe. Young Lonsdale entered Eton College at the age of 11, and completed his studies finally at King's College, Cambridge, where he got nearly all the prizes, and took the B.A. in 1811. He then studied law for a time, but changing for theology, he was ordained priest in 1815. Shortly after he was made examining chaplain to archbishop Sutton and assistant preacher at the temple. In 1821 he was appointed to the office of Christian advocate to Cambridge University, and in the following year domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. From 1831 to 1843 he was prebendary of St. Paul's; from 1839 to 1843, principal of King's College, London, and rector of Southfleet, Kent. He was also archdeacon of Middlesex during 1842 and 1843, and was for some time chaplain at Lincoln's Inn. In 1844, finally, he was appointed, by Sir Robert Peel, bishop of Lichfield. He died at Erdeshall Castle, Staffordshire, Oct. 19, 1867. Bishop Lonsdale was greatly celebrated in the English pulpit; while yet in the infancy of his ministry, two courses of his university sermons, as well as several occasional discourses, were asked for and received by the public (London, 1820, 1821). In 1849 he published, with archbishop Hale, a volume of *Annotations on the Gospels* (see Hale). He is spoken of as "a man of remarkable humility, averse to controversy, and never willing to enter into a public discussion of great questions in theology, from the belief that others were better qualified than he to handle them; but, withal, he was unflinching in his adherence to what he believed to be right." He was greatly beloved, not only by his own Church, but by the Dissenters also. See Appleton's *Ann. Cyclop.* 1867, p. 451; *Am. Ch. Rev.* 1868, p. 675.

Looking-glass. See Mirror.

Loop (only in the plural לְלָאוֹת, *lulaôth', windings*; Sept. ἄγκυλαι, Vulg. *ansulæ*), an attachment or knotted "*eye*," probably of cord, corresponding to the knobs or "taches" (קְרָסִים) in the edges of the curtains of the tabernacle for joining them into a continuous circuit, fifty to a curtain, and formed of blue material (Exod. xxvi, 4, 5, 10, 11; xxxvi, 11, 12, 17). See Tabernacle.

Loos (*Callidius*), Cornelius, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gonda, Holland, in 1546, and was educated at Louvain. He entered the priesthood, and was made doctor of theology at Mentz, where, in a sojourn of several years, he composed most of his works. He afterwards became archbishop of Treves; but, on account of his opinions upon magic, published in a book styled *De vera et falsa magia* (1592), he was forced to remove from his diocese, though he retracted his heretical views. He went to Brussels, and there exercised the humble functions of vicar of the parish. He was soon accused of falling back into his old opinions, and was arrested and imprisoned. He was about to be accused a third time, when he died at Brussels, Feb. 3, 1595. Loos was very zealous against Protestants. Among his works the following are of theological and general interest: *Defensio adversus Chr. Franckenium cæterosque sectarios panis adorationem impie asserentes* (Mayence, 1581):—*Thuribulum aureum sanctarum precationum* (ibidem, 1581):—*Illustrium Germaniæ Scriptorum Catalogus* (ibidem, 1581):—*Ecclesiæ Venatus* (Cologne, 1585):—*Annotationes in Ferum super Joannem*, often reprinted. See Sweert, *Athenæ Belgicæ*; Foppens, *Biblioth. Belgica*; Martin Delrio, *Disquisit. magicæ*, liv. v; Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* (Callidius); Nicéron, *Mémoires*; Paquot, *Mémoires*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Lope de Vega. See Vega.

Lope de Vera y Alarcan, a Christian convert to Judaism, suffered martyrdom for his apostasy by the hands of the inquisitors' tribunal of Spain. The descendant of a noble Spanish family, he had, while a student at Salamanca, interested himself in the study of Jewish literature and Judaism, and finally made a public confession of his belief in Judaism as the only revealed religion. He was imprisoned at Valladolid, and, persisting in his decision, was condemned to death at the stake, July 25, 1644. He was at the time of his death only about twenty-five years old, and had suffered imprisonment for nearly five years. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, x, 101.

Loqui, Martin. See Taborites.

Lorance, James Houston, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Mount Pleasant, Tenn., June 1, 1820. He was educated in Princeton College, N. J., and in divinity in the Princeton Theological Seminary (class of 1846), and was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery, commenced active work at Whitesville, Ala., and subsequently was ordained by Palmyra Presbytery as pastor at Hannibal, Mo. He removed to Courtland, Ala., in 1851, and there continued his pastoral labors until his death, July 1, 1862. Mr. Lorance was an able and eminent preacher, pleasing and affable in manners, and firm but not obstinate in his conscientious attachment to the doctrines and polity of the Church of his fathers. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almn.* 1867, p. 444. (J. L. S.)

Lord is the rendering in the A. V. of several Heb. and Greek words, which have a very different import from each other. "Lord" is a Saxon word signifying *ruler* or *governor*. In its original form it is *hlaford*, which, by dropping the aspiration, became *laford*, and afterwards, by contraction, *lord*.

1. יְהוָה, *Yehovah', Jehovah*, the proper name of the God of the Hebrews, which should always have been retained in that form, but has almost invariably been translated in the English Bible by Lord (and printed thus in small capitals), after the example of the Sept. (Κύριος) and Vulg. (*Dominus*). See Jehovah.

2. אָדוֹן, *adôn'*, one of the early words (hence in the early Phœnico-Greek *Adonis*) denoting the most absolute control, and therefore most fitly represented by the English word *lord*, as in the A. V. (Sept. *κύριος*, Vulg. *dominus*). It is not properly a divine title, although occasionally applied to God (Psa. cxiv, 7; properly with the art. in this sense, Exod. xxiii, 13), as the supreme proprietor (Josh. iii, 13); but appropriately denotes a *master*, as of slaves (Gen. xxiv, 4, 27; xxxix, 2, 7), or a king, as ruler of subjects (Gen. xlv, 8; Isa. xxvi, 13), a husband, as lord of the wife (Gen. xviii, 12). It is frequently a term of respect, like our *Sir*, but with a pronoun attached ("my lord"), and often occurs in the plural. See Master.

A modified form of this word is *Adonay'* (אֲדֹנָי; Sept. Κύριος, *lord, master*), "the old plural form of the noun אָדוֹן, *adon*, similar to that with the suffix of the first person, used as the *pluralis excellentiæ*, by way of dignity, for the name of Jehovah. The similar form *with the suffix*, is also used of men, as of Joseph's master (Gen. xxxix, 2, 3 sq.), of Joseph himself (Gen. xlii, 30, 33; so also Isa. xix, 4). The Jews, out of superstitious reverence for the name Jehovah, always, in reading, pronounce *Adonai* where *Jehovah* is written, and hence the letters יהוה are usually written with the points belonging to *Adonai*, Jehovah. The view that the word

exhibits a plural termination without the affix is that of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s. v. דון), and seems just, though rather disapproved by professor Lee (*Lex.* in אדון). The latter adds that 'our English Bibles generally translate יהוה by LORD, in capitals; when preceded by האדון, they translate it GOD; when צבאות, *tzabaoth*, follows, by LORD, as in Isa. iii, 1, 'The Lord, the LORD of Hosts.' The copies now in use are not, however, consistent in this respect" (Kitto). "In some instances it is difficult, on account of the pause accent, to say whether *Adonai* is the title of the Deity, or merely one of respect addressed to men. These have been noticed by the Masorites, who distinguish the former in their notes as 'holy,' and the latter as 'profane.' (See Gen. xviii, 3; xix, 2, 18; and compare the Masoretic notes on Gen. xx, 13; Isa. xix, 4)." See ADONAI.

3. Κύριος, the general Greek term for supreme mastery, whether royal or private; and thus, in classical Greek, distinguished from Θεός, which is exclusively applied to God. The "Greek Κύριος, indeed, is used in much the same way and in the same sense as *Lord*. It is from κῦρος, authority, and signifies 'master' or 'possessor.' In the Septuagint, this, like *Lord* in our version, is invariably used for 'Jehovah' and 'Adonai;' while Θεός, like GOD in our translation, is generally reserved to represent the Hebrew 'Elohim.' Κύριος in the original of the Greek Testament, and *Lord* in our version of it, are used in much the same manner as in the Septuagint; and so, also, is the corresponding title, *Dominus*, in the Latin versions. As the Hebrew name JEHOVAH is one never used with reference to any but the Almighty, it is to be regretted that the Septuagint, imitated by our own and other versions, has represented it by a word which is *also* used for the Hebrew 'Adonai,' which *is* applied not only to God, but, like our 'Lord,' to creatures also, as to angels (Gen. xix, 2; Dan. x, 16, 17), to men in authority (Gen. xlii, 30, 33), and to proprietors, owners, masters (Gen. xlv, 8). In the New Testament, Κύριος, representing 'Adonai,' and both represented by *Lord*, the last, or human application of the term, is frequent. In fact, the leading idea of the Hebrew, the Greek, and the English words is that of an owner or proprietor, whether God or man; and it occurs in the inferior application with great frequency in the New Testament. This application is either literal or complimentary: *literal* when the party is really an owner or master, as in Matt. x, 24; xx, 8; xxi, 40; Acts xvi, 16, 19; Gal. iv, 1, etc.; or when he is so as having absolute authority over another (Matt. ix, 38; Luke x, 2), or as being a supreme lord or sovereign (Acts xxv, 26): and *complimentary* when used as a title of address, especially to superiors, like the English *Master, Sir;* the French *Sieur, Monsieur;* the German *Herr*, etc., as in Matt. xiii, 27; xxi, 20; Mark vii, 8; Luke ix, 54." See Winer, *De voce* Κύριος (Erlang. 1828).

4. בַּעַל, *ba'al*, master in the sense of *domination*, applied to only heathen deities, or else to human relations, as husband, etc., and especially to a person skilled or chief in a trade or profession (like the vulgar *boss*). To this corresponds the Greek δεσπότης, whence our "despot." See BAAL.

The remaining and less important words in the original, thus rendered in the common Bible (usually without a capital initial), are: גִּבּוֹר, *gebir'*, prop. denoting physical strength or martial prowess; שַׂר, *sar*, a title of nobility; שָׁלִישׁ, *shalish'*, a military officer (see CAPTAIN); and סֶרֶן, *se'ren*, a Philistine term; also the Chald. מָרֵא, *mare'*, an official title (hence the Syriac *mar*, or bishop); and רַב, *rab*, a general name = *præfect*, with its reduplicate רַבְרְבָן, *rabreban'*, and its Greek equivalent ῥαββονί, "*Rabboni*."

Lordly occurs in the A. V. only in the expression סֵפֶל אַדִּירִים, *se'phel addirim'*, *bowl of* [the] *nobles*, i. e. a large vessel fit to be used for persons of quality (Judg. v, 25). See DISH.

Lord, Benjamin, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1693 at Saybrook, Conn., graduated at Yale College in 1714, was chosen tutor in 1715, was ordained pastor Nov. 20, 1717, in Norwich, and there preached until his death, March 31, 1784. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1740, and remained such till 1772. Dr. Lord published *True Christianity explained and exposed, wherein are some Observations respecting Conversion* (1727):—*Two Sermons on the Necessity of Regeneration* (1737):—*Believers in Christ only the true Children of God, and born of him alone*, a sermon (1742):—*God glorified in the Works of Providence and Grace: a remarkable Instance of it in the various and signal Deliverances that evidently appear to be wrought for Mercy Wheeler, lately restored from extreme Impotence and Confinement* (1743); and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 297.

Lord, Daniel Minor, a Presbyterian minister, was born April 9, 1800, at Lyme, Conn., and was educated at Amherst College and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and in April, 1834, was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Long Island, and subsequently ordained at Southampton. In 1835 the Presbytery dismissed him to the Suffolk South Association. Soon after he became pastor of the Boston Mariners' Church. In August, 1848, he became the first pastor of the Shelter Island Church, where he remained until his death, Aug. 26, 1861. Mr. Lord published *The History of Pitcairn's Island;* also various articles on *The moral Claims of Seamen stated and enforced*, and for several years was editor and almost sole writer and publisher of a review, in which he ably, logically, and clearly discussed profound theological questions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 305. (J. L. S.)

Lord, Eleazer, an American theological writer, was born in 1798. With an excellent preparatory education, improved by close study to such a degree that in 1821 Dartmouth College, and in 1827 Williams, conferred on him the honorary degree of A.M., he devoted a portion of his time during an active business life as a merchant, president of an insurance company, and for some years of the Erie Railway Company, to the study of theological science. In 1866 he received from the University of New York the degree of LL.D. Blindness saddened his latter years, but his treasured learning comforted him. He died at Piermont, N. Y., June 3, 1871.

Lord, Isaiah, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Pharsalia, Chenango County, N. York, July 16, 1834, was converted at the age of sixteen, and, joining the Methodist Episcopal Church, at once began to preach. In 1854, while employed as a teacher, his gentle bearing and godly admonitions led many to the cross and salvation. In 1855 he joined the Oneida Conference, and labored in the following places with acceptability and success: Summer Hill, Harford, Borodino, Smyrna, Union Valley, Amber, Freeville, East Homer, and Georgetown, where he died Aug. 21, 1870. "He was a man of stern integrity and sterling worth, fully committed to all the great moral enterprises of the day. . . . His mission was lovingly and fearlessly executed. His piety was deep and real, and his death was but the beginning of everlasting life."—*Conf. Minutes*, 1871.

Lord, James Cooper, a philanthropic New York merchant and iron manufacturer of our day, deserves a place here for his great efforts to advance the interests of his fellow-men. He founded in 1860 "The First Ward Industrial School;" later, a free reading-room, a library, and erected two churches for the benefit of his workingmen and their neighbors. He died Feb. 9, 1869.

Lord, Jeremiah S., D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister of note, was born at Brooklyn, N. York, about 1817, and was educated at Union College, class of 1836.

He entered the ministry in 1843 at Montville, N. J., where he labored until 1847, when he assumed the charge of the Reformed Church of Griggstown, N. Jersey. In the year following, however, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Harlem, and there he labored until his death, April 2, 1869. "Few ministers of our denomination," says the *Intelligencer* (April 8, 1869), "were more highly esteemed by their brethren, or enjoyed in a higher measure the confidence and affection of their people, than did this most excellent brother. The Lord blessed him in his work, and gave him many souls as seals to his ministry. . . . His preaching was characterized by great earnestness and solemnity. The love of Christ in the gift of himself was the central theme of his discourses. His style was clear, compact, and persuasive. His was indeed a most useful life, and his example of faithfulness, earnest zeal, and self-sacrificing devotion to the duties of his high and holy calling is a rich legacy to all his surviving brethren in the ministry."

Lord, John King, a Congregational minister, was born March 22, 1819, at Amherst, N. H. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1863, entered the ministry in 1841, and was ordained pastor in Hartford., Vt., November, 1841, where he remained three years. October 21, 1848, he was installed pastor in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he died, July 13, 1849. A volume of his sermons was published in 1850.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 761.

Lord, Nathan, D.D., LL.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at South Berwick, Me., Nov. 28, 1793; was educated at Bowdoin College (class of 1809), and studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1815. After quitting the college he acted as assistant in Phillips Exeter Academy. Now a theologian, he at once entered the active work of the ministry as pastor of the Congregationalists at Amherst, N. H., the only church he ever served. He remained with his people until 1828, when he was called to the responsible position of president of Dartmouth College, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9, 1870. Possessed of the highest attainments of scholarship, great executive ability, a winning address, equanimity of temper, remarkable "firmness of character and devotion to principle, and unwearied application to labor, Dr. Lord made Dartmouth College one of the most popular of our higher educational institutions: 1824 students were graduated from its halls during his presidency. As a theologian he was, like Edwards, Hopkins, and Bellamy, of the school advocating a strictly liberal interpretation of prophecy, but he has left us few remains in print. He occasionally contributed to our theological quarterlies, and published several sermons and essays. The following deserve notice: *Letter to the Rev. David Dana, D.D., on Prof. Park's Theology of New England* (*New Engl.* 1852); *On the Millennium* (1854); and *Letters to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denominations on Slavery* (1854–5), in which he defended the institution of slavery as sanctioned by the Bible, thereby greatly provoking opposition and criticism from Northern divines. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* s. v.; also the *Annual* for 1870.

Lord, Nathan L., a Baptist missionary and physician, was born in Norwich, Conn., in December, 1821, was educated at the Western Reserve College (class of 1847), and, after completing a theological course, was employed for a time as agent and financial secretary of the college. Having decided to devote himself to the missionary work, he was ordained in October, 1852, and sailed with his wife for Ceylon. After six years of faithful labor, the failure of his health compelled him to return to this country, where he remained nearly four years, during a portion of which time he performed with great acceptance the duties of a district secretary of the Board of Missions in the southern districts of the West. He also attended several courses of medical lectures, receiving the degree of M.D. at Cleveland, Ohio. In 1863 he sailed with his wife and children for the Madura Mission of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, but the climate of India proving unfavorable to his health, he returned in June, 1867. He died Jan. 24, 1868.

Lord's Day. The expression so rendered in the Authorized English Version (ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ) occurs only once in the New Testament, viz., in Rev. i, 10, and is there unaccompanied by any other words tending to explain its meaning. It is, however, well known that the same phrase was, in after ages of the Christian Church, used to signify the first day of the week, on which the resurrection of Christ was commemorated. Hence it has been inferred that the same name was given to that day during the time of the apostles, and was in the present instance used by St. John in this sense, as referring to an institution well known, and therefore requiring no explanation. This interpretation, however, has of late been somewhat questioned. It will be proper here, therefore, to discuss this point, as well as the early notices of this Christian observance, leaving the general subject to be treated under SABBATH. The broader topic of the hebdomadal division of time will be discussed under the head of WEEK.

I. *Interpretation of the Phrase "Lord's Day" in the Passage in question.*—The general consent both of Christian antiquity and of modern divines has referred it to the weekly festival of our Lord's resurrection, and identified it with "the first day of the week," on which he rose, with the patristical "eighth day," or "day which is both the first and the eighth"—in fact, with ἡ τοῦ Ἡλίου Ἡμέρα, the "Solis dies," or "Sunday" of every age of the Church. On the other hand, the following different explanations have been proposed.

1. Some have supposed St. John to be speaking, in the passage above referred to, of the *Sabbath*, because that institution is called in Isaiah lviii, 13, by the Almighty himself, "My holy day." To this it is replied: If St. John had intended to specify the Sabbath, he would surely have used that word, which was by no means obsolete, or even obsolescent, at the time of his composing the book of the Revelation. It is added, that if an apostle had set the example of confounding the seventh and the first days of the week, it would have been strange indeed that every ecclesiastical writer for the first five centuries should have avoided any approach to such confusion. They *do* avoid it; for, as Σάββατον is never used by them for the first day, so Κυριακή is never used by them for the seventh day. See SABBATH.

2. A second opinion is, that St. John intended by the "Lord's day" that on which the Lord's resurrection was *annually* celebrated, or, as we now term it, *Easter day*. On this it need only be observed, that though it was never questioned that the *weekly* celebration of that event should take place on the first day of the hebdomadal cycle, it was for a long time doubted on what day in the *annual* cycle it should be celebrated. Two schools, at least, existed on this point until considerably after the death of St. John. It therefore seems unlikely that, in a book intended for the whole Church, he would have employed a method of dating which was far from generally agreed upon. It is to be added that no patristical authority can be quoted, either for the interpretation contended for in this opinion, or for the employment of ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα to denote Easter day. See EASTER.

3. Another theory is, that by "the Lord's day" St. John intended "the day of judgment," to which a large portion of the book of Revelation may be conceived to refer. Thus, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day" (ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ Ἡμέρᾳ) would imply that he was rapt, in spiritual vision, to the *date* of that "great and terrible day," just as St. Paul represents himself as caught up *locally* into Paradise. Now, not to dispute the interpretation of the passage from which the illustration is drawn (2 Cor. xii, 4), the abet-

tors of this view seem to have put out of sight the following considerations. In the preceding sentence St. John had mentioned the place in which he was writing —Patmos—and the causes which had brought him thither. It is but natural that he should further particularize the circumstances under which his mysterious work was composed, by stating the exact day on which the revelations were communicated to him, and the employment, spiritual musing, in which he was then engaged. To suppose a mixture of the metaphorical and the literal would be strangely out of keeping. Though it be conceded that the day of judgment is in the New Test. spoken of as Ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἡμέρα, the employment of the adjectival form constitutes a remarkable difference, which was observed and maintained ever afterwards (comp. 1 Cor. i, 8, 14; v, 5: 1 Thess. v, 2; 2 Thess. ii, 2; Luke xvii, 24; 2 Pet. iii, 10). There is also a critical objection to this interpretation, for γίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ is not=*diem agere* (comp. Rev. iv, 2). This third theory, then, which is sanctioned by the name of Augusti, must be abandoned.

4. As a less definite modification of this last view we may mention, finally, that others have regarded the phrase in question as meaning simply "the day of the Lord," the substantive being merely exchanged for the adjective, as in 1 Cor. xi, 20: κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, "the Lord's Supper," which would make it merely synonymous with the generally expected temporal appearance of Christ on earth: ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου, "the day of the Lord" (1 Thess. v, 2). Such a use of the adjective became extremely common in the following ages, as we have repeatedly in the fathers the corresponding expressions Dominicæ crucis, "the Lord's cross;" Dominicæ nativitatis, "the Lord's nativity" (Tertullian, *De Idol.* p. 5); λογίων κυριακῶν (Eusebius, *Histor. Eccles.* iii, 9). According to their view, the passage would mean, "In the spirit I was present at the day of the Lord," the word "day" being used for any signal manifestation (possibly in allusion to Joel ii, 31), as in John viii, 56: "Abraham rejoiced to see my day." The peculiar use of the word ἡμέρα, as referring to a period of ascendency, appears remarkably in 1 Cor. iv, 3, where ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας is rendered "man's judgment." Nevertheless, this interpretation, besides the objection of its vagueness as a date, is clogged with all the difficulties that attach to the preceding one.

All other conjectures upon this point may be permitted to confute themselves, but the following cavil is too curious to be omitted. In Scripture the first day of the week is called ἡ μία σαββάτων, in post-scriptural writers it is called ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα as well; *therefore* the book of Revelation is not to be ascribed to an apostle, or, in other words, is not part of Scripture. The logic of this argument is only surpassed by its boldness. It says, in effect, because post-scriptural writers have these two designations for the first day of the week, *therefore* scriptural writers must be confined to one of them. It were surely more reasonable to suppose that the adoption by post-scriptural writers of a phrase so pre-eminently Christian as ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα to denote the first day of the week, and a day so especially marked, can be traceable to nothing else than an apostle's use of that phrase in the same meaning.

II. *Early Notices of this Christian Observance.*—Supposing, then, that ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα of St. John is the Lord's day, as now applied to the first day of the modern week, we have to inquire here, What do we gather from holy Scripture concerning that institution? How is it spoken of by early writers up to the time of Constantine? What change, if any, was brought upon it by the celebrated edict of that emperor, whom some have declared to have been its originator?

1. Scripture says very little concerning it, but that little seems to indicate that the divinely-inspired apostles, by their practice and by their precepts, marked the first day of the week as a day for meeting together to break bread, for communicating and receiving instruction, for laying up offerings in store for charitable purposes, for occupation in holy thought and prayer. The first day of the week so devoted seems also to have been the day of the Lord's resurrection, and therefore to have been especially likely to be chosen for such purposes by those who "preached Jesus and the resurrection."

The Lord rose on the first day of the week (τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων), and appeared, on the very day of his rising, to his followers on five distinct occasions—to Mary Magdalene, to the other women, to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to ten apostles collected together. After eight days (μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ), that is, according to the ordinary reckoning, on the first day of the next week, he appeared to the eleven (John xx, 26). He does not seem to have appeared in the interval—it may be to render that day especially noticeable by the apostles, or it may be for other reasons. But, however this question be settled, on the day of Pentecost, which in that year fell on the first day of the week (see Bramhall, *Disc. of the Sabbath and Lord's Day*, in *Works*, v, 51, Oxford edition), "they were all with one accord in one place," had spiritual gifts conferred on them, and in their turn began to communicate those gifts, as accompaniments of instruction, to others. At Troas (Acts xx, 7), many years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Christianity had begun to assume something like a settled form, St. Luke records the following circumstances: St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and "abode seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." From the statement that "Paul continued his speech till midnight," it has been inferred by some that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning (Jahn's *Bibl. Antiq.* § 398), which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection. But further, the words of this passage, Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον . . . . have been by some considered to imply that such a weekly observance was then the *established custom;* yet it is obvious that the mode of expression would be just as applicable if they had been in the practice of assembling *daily*. Still the whole aim of the narrative favors the reference to what is now known as Sunday. In 1 Cor. xvi, 1, 2, St. Paul writes thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye: Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." This direction, it is true, is not connected with any *mention* of public worship or assemblies on that day. But this has naturally been inferred; and the regulation has been supposed to have a reference to the tenets of the Jewish converts, who considered it unlawful to touch money on the Sabbath (Vitringa, *De Synagogâ*, translat. by Bernard, p. 75–167). In consideration for them, therefore, the apostle directs the collection to be made on the following day, on which secular business was lawful; or, as Cocceius observes, they regarded the day "non ut festum, sed ut ἐργάσιμον" (not as a feast, but as a working day; Vitringa, p. 77). Again, the phrase μία τῶν σαββάτων is generally understood to be, according to the Jewish mode of naming the days of the week, the common expression for the first day. Yet it has been differently construed by some, who render it "upon *one of the days* of the week" (*Tracts for the Times*, ii, 1, 16). In Heb. x, 25, the correspondents of the writer are desired "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is, but to exhort one another," an injunction which seems to imply that a regular day for such assembling existed, and was well known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. Lastly, in the passage given above, St. John describes himself as being in the Spirit "on the Lord's day."

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these

passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice. But, it may be observed, that it is, at any rate, an extraordinary coincidence, that almost as soon as we emerge from Scripture we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord's resurrection; and it is an extraordinary fact that we never find its dedication questioned or argued about, but accepted as something equally apostolic with confirmation, with *infant* baptism, with ordination, or at least spoken of in the same way. As to direct support from holy Scripture, it is noticeable that those other ordinances which are usually considered scriptural, and in support of which Scripture is usually cited, are dependent, so far as mere quotation is concerned, upon fewer texts than the Lord's day is. Stating the case at the very lowest, the Lord's day has at least "probable insinuations in Scripture" (Bp. Sanderson), and so is superior to any other holy day, whether of hebdomadal celebration, as Friday in memory of the crucifixion, or of annual celebration, as Easter day in memory of the resurrection itself. These other days may be, and are, defensible on other grounds, but they do not possess anything like a scriptural authority for their observance. If we are inclined still to press for more pertinent scriptural proof, and more frequent mention of the institution, for such we suppose it to be, in the writings of the apostles, we must recollect how little is said of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and how vast a difference is naturally to be expected to exist between a sketch of the manners and habits of their age, which the authors of the holy Scriptures did *not* write, and hints as to life and conduct, and regulation of known practices, which they *did* write.

2. On quitting the canonical writings we turn naturally to Clement of Rome. He does not, however, directly mention "the Lord's day," but in 1 Cor. i, 40, he says, *πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν*, and he speaks of *ὡρισμένοι καιροὶ καὶ ὧραι*, at which the Christian *προσφοραὶ καὶ λειτουργίαι* should be made.

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John (*ad. Magn.* c. 9), contrasts Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of the contrast, opposes *σαββατίζειν* to living according to the Lord's life (*κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες*).

The epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which, though certainly not written by that apostle, was in existence in the earlier part of the 2d century, has (c. 15) the following words: "We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which, too, Jesus rose from the dead."

A pagan document now comes into view. It is the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan, written (about A. D. 100) while he presided over Pontus and Bithynia. "The Christians (says he) affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be that they were accustomed to meet together on a stated day (*stato die*), before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a god, and to bind themselves by a *sacramentum*, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery; never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon, to deliver up any trust; after which it was their custom to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose" (*Epist.* x, 97).

A thoroughly Christian authority, Justin Martyr, who flourished A.D. 140, stands next on the list. He writes thus: "On the day called Sunday (*τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ*) is an assembly of all who live either in the cities or in the rural districts, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." Then he goes on to describe the particulars of the religious acts which are entered upon at this assembly. They consist of prayer, of the celebration of the holy Eucharist, and of collection of alms. He afterwards assigns the reasons which Christians had for meeting on Sunday. These are, "because it is the *First Day*, on which God dispelled the darkness (*τὸ σκότος*) and the original state of things (*την ὕλην*), and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead upon it" (*Apol.* i, 67). In another work (*Dial. c. Tryph.*) he makes circumcision furnish a type of Sunday. "The command to circumcise infants on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we are circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week (*τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων*); therefore it remains the chief and first of days." As for *σαββατίζειν*, he uses that with exclusive reference to the Jewish law. He carefully distinguishes Saturday (*ἡ κρονική*), the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday (*ἡ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν ἥτις ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέρα*), upon which he rose from the dead. If any surprise is felt at Justin's employment of the heathen designations for the seventh and first days of the week, it may be accounted for thus. Before the death of Hadrian, A.D. 138, the hebdomadal division (which Dion Cassius, writing in the 3d century, derives, together with its nomenclature, from Egypt) had, in matters of common life, almost universally superseded in Greece, and even in Italy, the national divisions of the lunar month. Justin Martyr, writing to and for heathen, as well as to and for Jews, employs it, therefore, with a certainty of being understood.

The strange heretic, Bardesanes, who, however, delighted to consider himself a sort of Christian, has the following words in his book on "Fate," or on "the Laws of the Countries," which he addressed to the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus: "What, then, shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who are Christians, whom in every country and in every region the Messiah established at his coming; for, lo! wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, Christians; and upon one day, which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed days we abstain from food" (Cureton's *Translation*).

Two very short notices stand next on our list, but they are important from their casual and unstudied character. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, in a letter to the Church of Rome, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.* iv, 23), says, *τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν*. And Melito, bishop of Sardis, his contemporary, is stated to have composed, among other works, a treatise on the Lord's day (*ὁ περὶ τῆς Κυριακῆς λόγος*).

The next writer who may be quoted is Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178. He asserts that the Sabbath is abolished; but his evidence to the existence of the Lord's day is clear and distinct (*De Orat.* 23; *De Idol.* 14). It is spoken of in one of the best-known of his Fragments (see Beaven's *Irenæus*, p. 202). But a record in Eusebius (v, 23, 2) of the part which he took in the Quarta-Deciman controversy shows that in his time it was an institution beyond dispute. The point in question was this: Should Easter be celebrated in connection with the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, with the churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, or on the Lord's day, with the rest of the Christian world? The churches of Gaul, then under the superintendence of Irenæus, agreed upon a synodical epistle to Victor, bishop of Rome, in which occurred words somewhat to this effect: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the paschal fast." This confirms what was said above, that while, even towards the end of the 2d century, tradition varied as to the *yearly* celebration of Christ's resurrection, the *weekly* celebration of it was one upon which no diversity existed, or was even hinted at.

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194, comes next. One does not expect anything very definite from a writer of so mystical a tendency, but he has some things quite to our purpose. In his *Strom.* (iv, 3) he speaks of *τὴν ἀρ-*

χίγονον ἡμέραν, τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμῶν, τὴν δὴ καὶ πρώτην τῷ ὄντι φωτὸς γένεσιν, κ. τ. λ., words which bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the seventh day of the Law with the eighth day of the Gospel. As the same learned prelate observes, "When Clement says that the Gnostic, or transcendental Christian, does not pray in any fixed place, or on any stated days, but throughout his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for prayer." But we are not left to mere inference on this important point, for Clement speaks of the Lord's day as a well-known and customary festival (*Strom.* vii), and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name (*Strom.* v).

Tertullian, whose date is assignable to the close of the 2d century, may, in spite of his conversion to Montanism, be quoted as a witness to facts. He terms the first day of the week sometimes Sunday (Dies Solis), sometimes Dies Dominicus. He speaks of it as a day of joy ("Diem Solis lætitiæ indulgemus," *Apol.* c. 16), and asserts that it is wrong to fast upon it, or to pray standing during its continuance ("Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare," *De Cor.* c. 3). Even business is to be put off, lest we give place to the devil ("Differentes etiam negotia, ne quem Diabolo locum demus," *De Orat.* c. 13).

Origen contends that the Lord's day had its superiority to the Sabbath indicated by manna having been given on it to the Israelites, while it was withheld on the Sabbath. It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to keep the Lord's day.

Minucius Felix (A.D. 210) makes the heathen interlocutor, in his dialogue called Octavius, assert that the Christians come together to a repast "on a solemn day" (solenni die).

Cyprian and his colleagues, in a synodical letter (A.D. 253), make the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day prefigure the newness of life of the Christian, to which Christ's resurrection introduces him, and point to the Lord's day, which is at once the eighth and the first.

Commodian (circ. A.D. 290) mentions the Lord's day.

Victorinus (A.D. 290) contrasts it, in a very remarkable passage, with the Parasceve and the Sabbath.

Lastly, Peter, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 300), says of it, "We keep the Lord's day as a day of joy, because of him who rose thereon."

The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John may be thus summed up. The Lord's day (a name which has now come out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with our Lord's resurrection than before) existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of scriptural Christianity. It was never defended, for it was never impugned, or, at least, only impugned as other things received from the apostles were. It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it (though we have not quoted nearly all the passages by which this point might be proved). It was not an institution of severe sabbatical character, but a day of joy (χαρμοσύνη) and cheerfulness (εὐφροσύνη), rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the holy Eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for almsgiving; and though, being an institution under the law of liberty, work does not appear to have been formally interdicted, or rest formally enjoined, Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's day and the Sabbath, in no passage that has come down to us is the fourth commandment appealed to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's day. Ecclesiastical writers reiterate again and again, in the strictest sense of the words, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days" (Col. ii, 16). Nor, again, is it referred to any sabbatical foundation anterior to the promulgation of the Mosaic economy. On the contrary, those before the Mosaic æra are constantly assumed to have had neither knowledge nor observance of the Sabbath. As little is it anywhere asserted that the Lord's day is merely an ecclesiastical institution, dependent on the post-apostolic Church for its origin, and by consequence capable of being done away, should a time ever arrive when it appears to be no longer needed.

If these facts be allowed to speak for themselves, they indicate that the Lord's day is a purely Christian institution, sanctioned by apostolic practice, mentioned in apostolic writings, and so possessed of whatever divine authority all apostolic ordinances and doctrines (which were not obviously temporary, or were not abrogated by the apostles themselves) can be supposed to possess.

3. But, on whatever grounds "the Lord's day" may be supposed to rest, it is a great and indisputable fact that four years before the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa, it was recognised by Constantine, in his celebrated edict, as "the venerable Day of the Sun." The terms of the document are these:

"*Imperator Constantinus Aug. Helpidio.*

"Omnes judices urbanæque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili Die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ liberè licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cœlesti provisione concessa."—*Dat. Non. Mart. Crispo II et Constantino II Coss.*

Some have endeavored to explain away this document by alleging, 1st. That "Solis Dies" is not *the* Christian name of the Lord's day, and that Constantine did not therefore intend to acknowledge it as a Christian institution. 2d. That, before his conversion, Constantine had professed himself to be especially under the guardianship of the sun, and that, at the very best, he intended to make a religious compromise between sun-worshippers, properly so called, and the worshippers of the "Sun of Righteousness," i. e. Christians. 3dly. That Constantine's edict was purely a calendarial one, and intended to reduce the number of public holidays, "Dies Nefasti" or "Feriati," which had, so long ago as the date of the "Actiones Verrinæ," become a serious impediment to the transaction of business; and that this was to be effected by choosing a day which, while it would be accepted by the paganism then in fashion, would, of course, be agreeable to the Christians. 4thly. That Constantine then instituted Sunday for the first time as a religious day for Christians. The fourth of these statements is absolutely refuted, both by the quotations made above from writers of the 2d and 3d centuries, and by the terms of the edict itself. It is evident that Constantine, accepting as facts the existence of the "Solis Dies," and the reverence paid to it by some one or other, does nothing more than make that reverence practically universal. It is "venerabilis" already. It is probable that this most natural interpretation would never have been disturbed had not Sozomen asserted, without warrant from either the Justinian or the Theodosian Code, that Constantine did for the sixth day of the week what the codes assert that he did for the first (*Eccles. Hist.* i, 8; comp. Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv, 18). The three other statements concern themselves rather with what Constantine *meant* than with what he *did*. But with such considerations we have little or nothing to do. He may have purposely selected an ambiguous appellation. He may have been only half a Christian, wavering between allegiance to Christ and allegiance to Mithras. He may have affected a religious syncretism. He may have wished his people to adopt such syncretism. He may have feared to offend the pagans. He may have hesitated to avow too openly his inward leanings to Christianity. He may have considered that community of religious days might lead by-and-by to community of religious thought and feeling. He may have had in view the rectification of the calendar. But all this is nothing to the purpose. It is a fact, that in

the year A.D. 321, in a public edict, which was to apply to Christians as well as to pagans, he put especial honor upon a day already honored by the former—judiciously calling it by a name which Christians had long employed without scruple, and to which, as it was in ordinary use, the pagans could scarcely object. What he did for it was to insist that worldly business, whether by the functionaries of the law or by private citizens, should be intermitted during its continuance. An exception, indeed, was made in favor of the rural districts, avowedly from the necessity of the case, covertly, perhaps, to prevent those districts where paganism (as the word pagus would intimate) still prevailed extensively from feeling aggrieved by a sudden and stringent change. It need only be added here that the readiness with which Christians acquiesced in the interdiction of business on the Lord's day affords no small presumption that they had long considered it to be a day of rest, and that, so far as circumstances admitted, they had made it so long before.

Were any other testimony wanting to the existence of Sunday as a day of Christian worship at this period, it might be supplied by the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. The fathers there and then assembled make no doubt of the obligation of that day—do not ordain it—do not defend it. They assume it as an existing fact, and only notice it incidentally in order to regulate an indifferent matter—the posture of Christian worshippers upon it (*Conc. Nic.* canon 20).

Chrysostom (A.D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest (σχολάζειν) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii, 24), and various other enactments from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business.

See Pearson, *On the Creed*, ii, 341, edit. Oxf.; Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* iii, 236; Baxter, *On the Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day*, p. 41, ed. 1671; Hessey, *Bampton Lecture* for 1860; Gilfillan, *The Sabbath*, p. 8. See SUNDAY.

Lord's Prayer, the common title of the only form given by Jesus Christ to his disciples. Matthew inserts it as part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi, 9–13); nor is it inappropriate to the connection there, for the general topic of that part of the discourse is prayer. Luke, however, explicitly assigns the occasion for its delivery as being at the request of the disciples (Luke xi, 2–4); and we cannot reasonably suppose either that they had forgotten it, if previously given them, or that our Lord would not have referred to it as already prescribed. The following analysis exhibits its comprehensive structure:

Gradations.	Prologue.	Body of the Prayer.		[Epilogue.
	Address.	*Homage.*	*Petitions.*	*Doxology.*
General.	Father	Hallowed be thy name!	Give us this day our needful bread;	for thine is the kingdom,
Christian.	of us,	Thy kingdom come!	and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;	and the power,
Consummation.	who art in heaven,	Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven!	and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:	and the glory,

forever.

Attestation.—Amen.]

The closing doxology is omitted by Luke, and is probably spurious in Matthew, as it is not found there in any of the early MSS. The prayer is doubtless based upon expressions and sentiments already familiar to the Jews; indeed, parallel phrases to nearly all its contents have been discovered in the Talmud (see Schöttgen and Lightfoot, s. v.). This, however, does not detract from its beauty or originality as a whole. The earliest reference found to it, as a liturgical formula in actual use, is in the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions* (q. v.), which give the form entire, and enjoin its stated use (vii, 44), but solely by baptized persons, a rule which was afterwards strictly observed. The Christian fathers, especially Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, are loud in its praise, and several of them wrote special expositions or treatises upon it. Cyril of Jerusalem is the first writer who expressly mentions the use of the Lord's Prayer at the administration of the holy Eucharist (*Catech. Myst.* v). St. Augustine has also alluded to its use on this solemn occasion (*Hom.* lxxxiii). The *Ordo Romanus* prefixes a preface to the Lord's Prayer, the date of which is uncertain. It contains a brief exposition of the prayer. All the Roman breviaries insist upon beginning divine service with the Lord's Prayer; but it has been satisfactorily proved that this custom was introduced as late as the 13th century by the Cistercian monks, and that it passed from the monastery to the Church. The ancient homiletical writings do not afford any trace of the use of the Lord's Prayer before sermons (see Riddle, *Manual of Christian Antiquities*). Its absurd repetition as a *Pater Noster* (q. v.) by the Romanists has perhaps led to an undue avoidance of it by some Protestants. In all liturgies (q. v.) of course it occupies a prominent place, and it is usual in many denominations to recite it in public services and elsewhere. That it was not designed, however, as a formula of Christian prayer in general is evident from two facts: 1. It contains no allusion to the atonement of Christ, nor to the offices of the Holy Spirit; 2. It was never so used or cited by the apostles themselves, so far as the evidence of Holy Writ goes, although Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* iii, 3) and Gregory (*Epp.* vii, lxiii) affirm that it was used by apostolical example in the consecration of the Eucharist. The literature of the subject is very copious (see the *Christ. Remembrancer*, Jan. 1862). Early monographs are cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 33 sq., 131. Among special recent comments on it we may mention those of Bocker (Lond. 1835), Anderson (ibid. 1840), Manton (ib. 1841), Rowsell (ibid. 1841), Duncan (ibid. 1845), Kennaway (ibid. 1845), Prichard (ibid. 1855), Edwards (ibid. 1860), and Denton (ib. 1864; N. Y. 1865). See PRAYER.

Lord's Supper, the common English name of an ordinance instituted by our Saviour in commemoration of his death and sufferings, being one of the two sacraments universally observed by the Christian Church.

I. *Name.*—It is called "the Lord's Supper" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον) in 1 Cor. xi, 20 because it was instituted at supper-time. Synonymous with this is the phrase "the Lord's table" (τράπεζα Κυρίου, 1 Cor. x, 21), where we also find the name "the cup of the Lord" (ποτήριον Κυρίου). Many new terms for it were early introduced in the Church, among which the principal are *Communion* (κοινωνία, a festival in common), a term borrowed from 1 Cor. x, 16, and *Eucharist* (Εὐχαριστία and εὐλογία), "a giving of thanks," because of the hymns and psalms which accompanied it. Among the many other Greek and Latin names applied to the Lord's Supper, but for which we have no exact equivalent, we mention Σύναξις, "a collection" (for celebrating the Lord's Supper), Λειτουργία (Liturgy, q. v.), Μυστήριον (Sacrament, q. v.), *Missa* (Mass, q. v.), etc. See EUCHARIST.

II. *Biblical Notices.*—1. *Original Accounts.*—The institution of this sacrament is recorded by Matthew (xxvi, 26–29), Mark (xiv, 22–25), Luke (xxii, 19 sq.), and by the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xi, 24–26), whose words differ very little from those of his companion, Luke; and the only difference between Matthew and Mark is, that the latter omits the words "for the remission of sins." There is so general an agreement among them all that it will only be necessary to recite the words of one of them: "Now, when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve" to eat the Passover which had been prepared by his direction, "and as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my

blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi, 20, 26–28). Its institution "*in remembrance*" *of Christ* is recorded only by Luke and Paul. John does not mention the institution at all, but the discourse of Jesus in chap. vi, 51–59 is referred by many interpreters to the Lord's Supper. Paul warns the Corinthians (1 Cor. x, 16–21) that they cannot partake of the Lord's table and at the same time eat of the pagan sacrifices, because (verse 19) "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God;" and in another part of his first epistle (xi, 27–29), that "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Other passages of the New Test. are referred by many exegetical writers to the Lord's Supper, but they establish no new point concerning the Biblical doctrine. They will be examined, however, in detail in this connection, leaving the ecclesiastical relations of the subject for the title COMMUNION.

2. *Paschal Analogies.*—This is an important inquiry in the discussion of the history of that night when Jesus and his disciples met together to eat the Passover (Matt. xxvi, 19; Mark xiv, 16; Luke xxii, 13). The manner in which the paschal feast was kept by the Jews of that period differed in many details from that originally prescribed by the rules of Exod. xii. The multitudes that came up to Jerusalem met, as they could find accommodation, family by family, or in groups of friends, with one of their number as the celebrant, or "proclaimer" of the feast. The ceremonies of the feast took place in the following order (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, xiii; Meyer, *Comm. in Matt.* xxvi, 26). (1.) The members of the company that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being then as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. Matt. xxvi, 20, *ἀνέκειτο*; Luke xxii, 14; and John xiii, 23, 25). The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing "for the day and for the wine," pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to rabbinic traditions, to be mixed with water; not for any mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best way of using the best wine (comp. 2 Macc. xv, 39). (2.) All who were present then washed their hands; this also having a special benediction. (3.) The table was then set out with the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as Charóseth (חֲרוֹסֶת), a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins, and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 831). (4.) The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the Charoseth and ate them. (5.) The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the questions that might be asked by children or proselytes, who were astonished at such a strange beginning of a feast, and the cup was passed round and drunk at the close of it. (6.) The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the paschal supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving, followed by Psa. cxiii and cxiv. (7.) Then came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread, and gave thanks over it. All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Charoseth, and so ate them. (8.) After this they ate the flesh of the paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked; and, after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the "cup of blessing," was handed round. (9.) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Psa. cxv–cxviii, followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song. (10.) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the "great Hallel" (possibly Psa. cxx–cxxxvii) was sung over it. See PASSOVER.

Comparing the ritual thus gathered from rabbinic writers with the N. T., and assuming (*a*) that it represents substantially the common practice of our Lord's time, and (*b*) that the meal of which he and his disciples partook was really the Passover itself, conducted according to the same rules, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the old practice presented for the institution of the new. To (1.) or (3.), or even to (8.), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (Luke xxii, 17, 18); to (2.) or (7.), the dipping of the sop (*ψωμίον*) of John xiii, 26; to (7.), or to an interval during or after (8.), the distribution of the bread (Matt. xxvi, 26; Mark xiv, 22; Luke xxii, 19; 1 Cor. xi, 23, 24); to (9.) or (10.) ("after supper," Luke xxii, 20), the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the whole was ended. It will be noticed that, according to this order of succession, the question whether Judas partook of what, in the language of a later age, would be called the consecrated elements, is most probably to be answered in the negative.

The narratives of the Gospels show how strongly the disciples were impressed with the words which had given a new meaning to the old familiar acts. They leave unnoticed all the ceremonies of the Passover, except those which had thus been transferred to the Christian Church and perpetuated in it. Old things were passing away, and all things becoming new. They had looked on the bread and the wine as memorials of the deliverance from Egypt. They were now told to partake of them "in remembrance" of their Master and Lord. The festival had been annual. No rule was given as to the time and frequency of the new feast that thus supervened on the old, but the command, "Do this as oft as ye drink it" (1 Cor. xi, 25), suggested the more continual recurrence of that which was to be their memorial of one whom they would wish never to forget. The words, "This is my body," gave to the unleavened bread a new character. They had been prepared for language that would otherwise have been so startling by the teaching of John (vi, 32–58), and they were thus taught to see in the bread that was broken the witness of the closest possible union and incorporation with their Lord. The cup, which was "the new testament" (*διαθήκη*) "in his blood," would remind them, in like manner, of the wonderful prophecy in which that new covenant had been foretold (Jer. xxxi, 31–34), of which the crowning glory was in the promise, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." His blood shed, as he told them, "for them and for many," for that remission of sins which he had been proclaiming throughout his whole ministry, was to be to the new covenant what the blood of sprinkling had been to that of Moses (Exod. xxiv, 8). It is possible that there may have been yet another thought connected with these symbolic acts. The funeral customs of the Jews involved, at or after the burial, the administration to the mourners of bread (comp. Jer. xvi, 7, "neither shall they break bread for them in mourning," in marginal reading of A. V.; Ewald and Hitzig, ad loc.; Ezek. xxiv, 17; Hos. ix, 4; Tob. iv, 17), and of wine, known, when thus given, as "the cup of consolation." May not the bread and the wine of the Last Supper have had something of that character, preparing the minds of Christ's disciples for his departure by treating it as already accomplished? They were to think of his body as already anointed for the burial (Matt. xxvi, 12; Mark xiv, 8; John xii, 7), of his body as already given up to death, of his blood as already shed. The passover meal was also, little as they might dream of it, a funeral feast. The bread and the wine were to be pledges of consolation for their sorrow, analogous to the verbal promises

of John xiv, 1, 27; xvi, 20. The word διαθήκη might even have the twofold meaning which is connected with it in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

May we not conjecture, without leaving the region of history for that of controversy, that the thoughts, desires, emotions of that hour of divine sorrow and communion would be such as to lead the disciples to crave earnestly to renew them? Would it not be natural that they should seek that renewal in the way which their Master had pointed out to them? From this time, accordingly, the words "to break bread" appear to have had for the disciples a new significance. It may not have assumed, indeed, as yet, the character of a distinct liturgical act; but when they met to break bread, it was with new thoughts and hopes, and with the memories of that evening fresh on them. It would be natural that the Twelve should transmit the command to others who had not been present, and seek to lead them to the same obedience and the same blessings. The narrative of the two disciples to whom their Lord made himself known "in breaking of bread" at Emmaus (Luke xxiv, 30–35) would strengthen the belief that this was the way to an abiding fellowship with him.

3. *Later N.-T. Indications.*—In the account given by the writer of the Acts of the life of the first disciples at Jerusalem, a prominent place is given to this act, and to the phrase which indicated it. Writing, we must remember, with the definite associations that had gathered round the words during the thirty years that followed the events he records, he describes the baptized members of the Church as continuing steadfast in or to the teaching of the apostles, in fellowship with them and with each other, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers (Acts ii, 42). A few verses further on, their daily life is described as ranging itself under two heads: (1.) that of public devotion, which still belonged to them as Jews ("continuing daily with one accord in the Temple"); (2.) that of their distinctive acts of fellowship: "breaking bread from house to house (or 'privately,' Meyer), they did eat their meat in gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Taken in connection with the account given in the preceding verses of the love which made them live as having all things common, we can scarcely doubt that this implies that the chief actual meal of each day was one in which they met as brothers, and which was either preceded or followed by the more solemn commemorative acts of the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup. It will be convenient to anticipate the language and the thoughts of a somewhat later date, and to say that apparently they thus united every day the Agapè, or feast of love, with the celebration of the Eucharist. So far as the former was concerned, they were reproducing in the streets of Jerusalem the simple and brotherly life which the Essenes were leading in their seclusion on the shores of the Dead Sea. It would be natural that, in a society consisting of many thousand members, there should be many places of meeting. These might be rooms hired for the purpose, or freely given by those members of the Church who had them to dispose of. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as "the Church" in this or that man's house (Rom. xvi, 5, 23; 1 Cor. xvi, 19; Col. iv, 15; Philem. ver. 2). When they met, the place of honor would naturally be taken by one of the apostles, or some elder representing him. It would belong to him to pronounce the blessing (εὐλογία) and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία), with which the meals of devout Jews always began and ended. The materials for the meal would be provided out of the common funds of the Church or the liberality of individual members. The bread (unless the converted Jews were to think of themselves as keeping a perpetual passover) would be such as they habitually used. The wine (probably the common red wine of Palestine, Prov. xxiii, 31) would, according to their usual practice, be mixed with water. Special stress would probably be laid at first on the office of breaking and distributing the bread, as that which represented the fatherly relation of the pastor to his flock, and his work as ministering to men the word of life. But if this was to be more than a common meal, after the pattern of the Essenes, it would be necessary to introduce words that would show that what was done was in remembrance of their Master. At some time before or after the meal of which they partook as such, the bread and the wine would be given with some special form of words or acts, to indicate its character. New converts would need some explanation of the meaning and origin of the observance. What would be so fitting and so much in harmony with the precedents of the paschal feast as the narrative of what had passed on the night of its institution (1 Cor. xi, 23–27)? With this there would naturally be associated (as in Acts ii, 42) prayers for themselves and others. Their gladness would show itself in the psalms and hymns with which they praised God (Heb. ii, 46, 47; James v, 13). The analogy of the Passover, the general feeling of the Jews, and the practice of the Essenes may possibly have suggested ablutions, partial or entire, as a preparation for the feast (Heb. x, 22; John xiii, 1–15; comp. Tertull. *de Orat.* c. xi; and, for the later practice of the Church, August. *Serm.* ccxliv). At some point in the feast, those who were present, men and women sitting apart, would rise to salute each other with the "holy kiss" (1 Cor. xvi, 20; 2 Cor. xiii, 12; Clem. Alex. *Pædagog.* iii, c. 11; Tertull. *de Orat.* c. 14; Justin Mart. *Apol.* ii). Of the stages in the growth of the new worship we have, it is true, no direct evidence, but these conjectures from antecedent likelihood are confirmed by the fact that this order appears as the common element of all later liturgies.

The next traces that meet us are in 1 Cor., and the fact that we find them is in itself significant. The commemorative feast has not been confined to the personal disciples of Christ, or the Jewish converts whom they gathered round them at Jerusalem. It has been the law of the Church's expansion that this should form part of its life everywhere. Wherever the apostles or their delegates have gone, they have taken this with them. The language of St. Paul, we must remember, is not that of a man who is setting forth a new truth, but of one who appeals to thoughts, words, phrases that are familiar to his readers, and we find accordingly evidence of a received liturgical terminology. The title of the "cup of blessing" (1 Cor. x, 16), Hebrew in its origin and form (see above), has been imported into the Greek Church. The synonyme of "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. x, 21) distinguishes it from the other cups that belonged to the Agapè. The word "fellowship" (κοινωνία) is passing by degrees into the special signification of "communion." The apostle refers to his own office as breaking the bread and blessing the cup (1 Cor. x, 16). The table on which the bread was placed was the Lord's table, and that title was to the Jew, not, as later controversies have made it, the antithesis of altar (θυσιαστήριον), but as nearly as possible a synonyme (Mal. i, 7, 12; Ezek. xli, 22). But the practice of the Agapè, as well as the observance of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evils had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social meal, to which all contributed, was a sufficiently familiar practice in the common life of Greeks of this period, and these club-feasts were associated with plans of mutual relief or charity to the poor (comp. Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s. v. Eranoi). The Agapè of the new society would seem to them to be such a feast, and hence came a disorder that altogether frustrated the object of the Church in instituting it. Richer members came, bringing their supper with them, or appropriating what belonged to the common stock, and sat down to consume it without waiting till others were assembled and the presiding elder had taken his place. The poor were put to shame, and defrauded of their share in the

feast. Each was thinking of his own supper, not of that to which we now find attached the distinguishing title of "the Lord's Supper." When the time for that came, one was hungry enough to be looking to it with physical, not spiritual craving; another so overpowered with wine as to be incapable of receiving it with any reverence. It is quite conceivable that a life of excess and excitement, of overwrought emotion and unrestrained indulgence, such as this epistle brings before us, may have proved destructive to the physical as well as the moral health of those who were affected by it, and so the sickness and the deaths of which Paul speaks (1 Cor. xi, 30), as the consequences of this disorder, may have been so, not by supernatural infliction, but by the working of those general laws of the divine government which make the punishment the traceable consequence of the sin. In any case, what the Corinthians needed was to be taught to come to the Lord's table with greater reverence, to distinguish (*διακρίνειν*) the Lord's body from their common food. Unless they did so, they would bring upon themselves condemnation. What was to be the remedy for this terrible and growing evil he does not state explicitly. He reserves formal regulations for a later personal visit. In the mean time, he gives a rule which would make the union of the Agapè and the Lord's Supper possible without the risk of profanation. They were not to come even to the former with the keen edge of appetite. They were to wait till all were met, instead of scrambling tumultuously to help themselves (1 Cor. xi, 33, 34). In one point, however, the custom of the Church of Corinth differed apparently from that of Jerusalem: the meeting for the Lord's Supper was no longer daily (1 Cor. xi, 20, 33). The directions given in 1 Cor. xvi, 2 suggest the constitution of a celebration on the first day of the week (compare Just. Mart. *Apol.* i, 67; Pliny, *Ep. ad Traj.*). The meeting at Troas was on the same day (Acts xx, 7).

The tendency of this language, and therefore, probably, of the order subsequently established, was to separate what had hitherto been united. We stand, as it were, at the dividing point of the history of the two institutions, and henceforth each takes its own course. The Agapè, as belonging to a transient phase of the Christian life, and varying in its effects with changes in national character or forms of civilization, passes through many stages; becomes more and more a merely local custom, is found to be productive of evil rather than of good, is discouraged by bishops and forbidden by councils, and finally dies out. Traces of it linger in some of the traditional practices of the Western Church. There have been attempts to revive it among the Moravians and other religious communities, but in no considerable body does it survive in its original form. See Love-Feast. On the other hand, the Lord's Supper also has its changes. The morning celebration takes the place of the evening. New names—Eucharist, Sacrifice, Altar, Mass, Holy Mysteries—gather round it. New epithets and new ceremonies express the growing reverence of the people. The mode of celebration at the high altar of a basilica in the 4th century differs so widely from the circumstances of the original institution that a careless eye would have found it hard to recognise their identity. Speculations, controversies, superstitions, crystallize round this as their nucleus. Great disruptions and changes threaten to destroy the life and unity of the Church. Still, through all the changes, the Supper of the Lord vindicates its claim to universality, and bears a permanent testimony to the truths with which it was associated.

In Acts xx, 11 we have an example of the way in which the transition may have been effected. The disciples at Troas meet together to break bread. The hour is not definitely stated, but the fact that Paul's discourse was protracted till past midnight, and the mention of the many lamps, indicate a later time than that commonly fixed for the Greek *δεῖπνον*. If we are not to suppose a scene at variance with Paul's rule in 1 Cor. xi, 34, they must have had each his own supper before they assembled. Then came the teaching and the prayers, and then, towards early dawn, the breaking of bread, which constituted the Lord's Supper, and for which they were gathered together. If this midnight meeting may be taken as indicating a common practice, originating in reverence for an ordinance which Christ had enjoined, we can easily understand how the next step would be (as circumstances rendered the midnight gatherings unnecessary or inexpedient) to transfer the celebration of the Eucharist permanently to the morning hour, to which it had gradually been approximating. Here also in later times there were traces of the original custom. Even when a later celebration was looked on as at variance with the general custom of the Church (Sozomen, *supra*) it was recognised as legitimate to hold an evening communion, as a special commemoration of the original institution, on the Thursday before Easter (Augustine, *Ep.* 118; *ad Jan.* c. 5–7); and again on Easter eve, the celebration in the latter case probably taking place "very early in the morning, while it was yet dark" (Tertullian, *ad Uxor.* ii, c. 4).

The recurrence of the same liturgical words in Acts xxvii, 35 makes it probable, though not certain, that the food of which Paul thus partook was intended to have, for himself and his Christian companions, the character at once of the Agapè and the Eucharist. The heathen soldiers and sailors, it may be noticed, are said to have followed his example, not to have partaken of the bread which he had broken. If we adopt this explanation, we have in this narrative another example of a celebration in the early hours between midnight and dawn (comp. v. 27, 39), at the same time, i. e. as we have met with in the meeting at Troas.

All the distinct references to the Lord's Supper which occur within the limits of the N. T. have, it is believed, been noticed. To find, as a recent writer has done (*Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1860), quotations from the Liturgy of the Eastern Church in the Pauline Epistles involves (ingeniously as the hypothesis is supported) assumptions too many and bold to justify our acceptance of it. Extending the inquiry, however, to the times as well as the writings of the N. T., we find reason to believe that we can trace in the later worship of the Church some fragments of that which belonged to it from the beginning. The agreement of the four great families of liturgies implies the substratum of a common order. To that order may well have belonged the Hebrew words Hallelujah, Amen, Hosanna, Lord of Sabaoth; the salutations "Peace to all," "Peace to thee;" the Sursum Corda (*ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας*), the Trisagion, the Kyrie Eleison. We are justified in looking at these as having been portions of a liturgy that was really primitive; guarded from change with the tenacity with which the Christians of the 2d century clung to the traditions (the *παραδόσεις* of 2 Thess. ii, 15; iii, 6) of the first, forming part of the great deposit (*παρακαταθήκη*) of faith and worship which they had received from the apostles and have transmitted to later ages (comp. Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.* bk. xv, ch. vii; Augusti, *Christl. Archäol.* b. viii; Stanley on 1 Cor. x and xi).

III. *Ecclesiastical Representations.* — The Christian Church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the Lord's Supper. In accordance with the original institution, all Christians used wine and bread, with the exception of the Hydroparastates (Aquarii), who used water instead of wine, and the Artotyrites, who are said to have used cheese along with bread. The wine was generally mixed with water (*κρᾶμα*), and an allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements. In the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries we meet with some passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and, at the same time, with others which indicate belief in a real participation of the body and blood of Christ. Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and

the elements. Tertullian and Cyprian are representatives of the symbolical aspect, though both occasionally call the Lord's Supper simply the body and blood of Christ. The symbolical interpretation prevails in particular among the Alexandrine school. Clement called it a mystic symbol which produces an effect only upon the mind, and Origen decidedly opposed those who took the external sign for the thing itself. The idea of a sacrifice, though not yet of a daily propitiatory sacrifice, appears in the writings of Justin and Irenæus. Cyprian says that the sacrifice is made by the priest, who acts instead of Christ, and imitates what Christ did. It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Ebionites celebrated the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord's Supper. The development of liturgies in and after the third century, and the introduction of many mystical ceremonies, showed that the fathers generally regarded the Lord's Supper, with Chrysostom, as a "dreadful sacrifice." They clearly speak of a *real union* of the communicants with Christ; some, also, of a *real change* from the visible elements into the body and blood of Christ, though most of their expressions can be understood both of consubstantiality or of transubstantiation. Theodoret drew a clear distinction between the sign and the thing signified, while Augustine sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical. Gelasius, bishop of Rome, very decidedly denied "the ceasing of the substance and nature of bread and wine." The notion of a daily repeated sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of Gregory the Great. A violent controversy concerning the Lord's Supper arose in the 9th century. Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corvey, clearly propounded the doctrine of transubstantiation in his *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, addressed to the emperor Charles the Bald, between 830 and 832. He was opposed by Ratramnus in his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, which was written at the request of the emperor, who drew a distinction between the sign and the thing represented by it, between the internal and the external. The most eminent theologians of the age, as Rabanus Maurus and Scotus Erigena, took an active part in the controversy. Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II) endeavored to illustrate the doctrine of transubstantiation by the aid of geometrical diagrams. Toward the middle of the 11th century the doctrine of transubstantiation was rejected by Berengar, canon of Tours (q. v.), who principally condemned the doctrine of an entire *change* in such a manner as to make the bread to cease to be bread. Several synods in succession, between 1050 and 1079, condemned his views. At one of these synods cardinal Humbert imposed upon Berengar an oath that he believed "corpus et sanguinem Domini non solum sacramento sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri." Among the scholastics, Lanfranc developed the distinction between the subject and the accidents. The term *transubstantiatio* was first used by Hildebert of Tours, though similar phrases, as *transitio*, had previously been employed (by Hugo of St. Victor and others). Most of the earlier scholastics, and, in particular, the followers of Lanfranc, defended both the change of the bread into the body of Christ and that of the "accidentia sine subjecto," both of which were inserted in the *Decretum Gratiani* (about 1150), and declared an article of faith by the fourth Council of Lateran. Later, the Scholastics discussed a great many subtle questions, such as, Do animals partake of the body of Christ when they happen to swallow a consecrated host? By the institution of the Corpus-Christi day by pope Urban IV (1264), the doctrine of transubstantiation received a liturgical expression. However, a considerable time before, it had become a custom in the Latin Church that the laity received the Lord's Supper only in the form of the host. Alexander Hales, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas expressly demanded that only the priests should partake of the cup. The Hussites demanded the admission of the laity also to a partaking of the cup, and the refusal of this demand by the Council of Constance was one of the causes of the Hussite War. The doctrine that Christ existed wholly in either of the elements (for which doctrine the theologians used the expression *concomitance*) was expressly confirmed by the Council of Basle. The number of those who during the Middle Ages expressed their dissent from the doctrine of transubstantiation is limited.

The doctrine of *impanation*, or a coexistence of Christ's body with the bread, was first advanced by John of Paris, who was followed by William Ockham and Durandus de Sancto Porciano. Both transubstantiation and impanation were combated by Wickliffe, who, with Berengar of Tours, believed it a change from the inferior to the superior. His views were probably shared by Jerome of Prague, while Huss seems to have believed in transubstantiation. The Reformers of the 16th century agreed in rejecting transubstantiation as unscriptural, but they differed among themselves in several points. Carlstadt believed that the words of institution were to be understood δεικτικῶς, i. e. that Christ, while speaking to them, had pointed at his own body. Zuingle took the word "*is*" (ἐστί) in the sense of *signifies*, and viewed the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration, and as a visible sign of the body and blood of Christ. Œcolampadius differed from Zuingle only grammatically, retaining the literal meaning of "*is*," but taking the predicate, "my body" (τὸ σῶμα μου), in a figurative sense. Luther believed it impossible to put any of these constructions on the letter of the Scripture, and adhered to the doctrine of the *real presence* of Christ's body and blood *in*, *with*, and *under* the bread and wine (consubstantiation). Together with this view he professed a belief in the ubiquity of the body of Christ. Calvin rejected the doctrine of the real presence; but, after the precedence of Bucer, Myronius, and others, spoke of a real, though spiritual participation of the body of Christ which exists in heaven. This participation, however, he restricted to the *believer*, while Luther agreed with the Roman Church in maintaining that also infidels partook of Christ's body, though to their own hurt. Attempts at mediating between the views of Luther and Calvin were early made, and there were crypto-Calvinists in the Lutheran, and crypto-Lutherans in the Calvinistic churches. But the Lutheran view received a dogmatic fixation in the *Formula Concordiæ*, which shut out any further influence of Calvinism. The decline of Lutheran orthodoxy in general caused also the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to grow into disuse, and the Protestant theologians generally adopted the views either of Calvin or of Zuingle. The latter, at length, prevailed. (See the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1860; Müller, *De Lutheri et Calvini sententiæ de Sacra Cœna*, Hal. 1853.) It was, in particular, adopted by the Arminian churches, as also by the Socinians. In the Church of England there was from the beginning a real-presence and a spiritual-presence party, and the controversy between them frequently became very hot. The real-presence party generally agreed with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but some of its writers advanced views more resembling those of the Roman Church. In the 19th century the High-Church parties of the German Lutheran Church, and of the Episcopal Church of England, Scotland, and America, revived and emphasized again the doctrine of the real presence. Under the influence of rationalistic theology and speculative theology a number of new interpretations sprang up like mushrooms, and disappeared again just as fast. The leading theologians of the United Evangelical Church of Germany in the 19th century fell back on the doctrine of Calvin, and emphasized the *real and objective communication* of the whole God-man Christ to the believer, and the same views have become predominant in the German Reformed Church of America. Very different from the doctrine of all the larger Christian denom-

inations were the views which some mystic writers of the ancient and mediæval Church intimated, and which were fully developed in the 16th century by Paracelsus, and afterwards adopted by the Society of Friends. They regard communion as something essentially internal and mystical, and deny the Lord's Supper to be an ordinance which Christ desired to have perpetuated. — Lavater, *Historia controversiæ Sacramentariæ* (Tig. 1672); Hospinianus, *Hist. Sacramentaria* (Tig. 1602); Planck, *Geschichte d. Entstehung, etc., des protest. Lehrbegriffs*, ii, 204 sq., 471 sq.; iii, (1.) 376 sq.; iv, 6 sq.; v, (1) 89 sq., 211 sq., (2) 7 sq.; vi, 732 sq. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IV. *Form of Celebration.*—1. *The Elements.*—(*a*) At the institution of the Lord's Supper Christ used *unleavened bread.* The primitive Christians carried with them the bread and wine for the Lord's Supper, and took the bread which was used at common meals, which was leavened bread. When this custom ceased, together with the Agapè, the Greeks retained the leavened bread, while in the Latin Church the unleavened bread became common since the 8th century. Out of this difference a dogmatic controversy in the 11th century arose, the Greek Church reproaching the Latin for the use of unleavened bread, and making it heresy. At the Council of Florence, in 1439, which attempted to unite both churches, it was agreed that either might be used; but the Greeks soon rejected, with the council also, the toleration of the unleavened bread, and still maintain the opposite ground at the present day.

We see, from 1 Cor. xi, 24, that in the apostolic Church the bread was broken. This custom was discontinued in the Roman Church when, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the host or holy wafer was cut in a peculiar way, so as to represent upon it a crucified Saviour. Luther retained the wafer, but the Reformed churches reintroduced the use of common bread and the breaking of it. The same was the case with the Socinians and the United Evangelical Church of Germany. In the Episcopal Church of England, and the churches derived from it, cut pieces of common wheaten bread are given into the hands of the communicants. See J. G. Hermann, *Hist. convertationum de pane asymo* (Lips. 1737); Marheineke, *Das Brod in Abendmahle* (Berlin, 1817).

(*b*) The second element used by Christ was *wine.* It is not certain of what color the wine was, nor whether it was pure or mixed with water, and both points were always regarded as indifferent by the Christian Church. The use of mixed wine is said to have been introduced by pope Alexander I; it was expressly enacted in the 12th century by Clement III, and divers allegorical significations were given to the mingling of these two elements. Also the Greek Church mingles the wine with water, while the Armenian and the Protestant churches use pure wine.

The question as to whether the wine originally used in the Lord's Supper was *fermented* or not, would seem to be a futile one in view of the fact, 1. that the unfermented juice of the grape can hardly, with propriety, be called *wine* at all; 2. that fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and, 3. that it has invariably been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages and countries. But for the excessive zeal of certain modern well-meaning reformers, the idea that our Lord used any other would hardly have gained the least currency. See WINE.

In accordance with the original institution, both elements were used separately during the first centuries, but it became early a custom to carry to sick persons bread merely dipped in wine. The Manichæans, who abstained wholly from wine, were strongly opposed by teachers of all other parties, and pope Gelasius I, of the 5th, called their practice *grande sacrilegium.* In the 10th century it became frequent in the West to use only consecrated bread dipped in wine, but it was not before the end of the 13th century that, in accordance with the doctrine, then developed by the Scholastics, that Christ was wholly present in both bread and wine, and that the partaking of the bread was sufficient, the Church began to withhold the wine from the laity altogether. The Waldenses, Wickliffe, Huss, and Savonarola protested against this withdrawal of the cup, and all the Protestant denominations agreed in restoring the use of both elements. The Greek Church has always used the wine for the laity also. See Spitler, *Geschichte des Kelches im Abendmahl* (Lemgo, 1780); Schmidt, *De fatis calicis eucharistici* (Helmstadt, 1708).

2. *Consecration and Distribution of the Elements.*—To "consecrate" meant in the ancient Church only to set apart from common and devote to a sacred use. But, by degrees, a magical effect was attributed to consecration, as was already done by Augustine, and when the doctrine of transubstantiation became prevalent in the Roman Church, it was supposed that the pronunciation of the words "*This is my body*" changed the elements into the body and blood of Christ. The formulæ which were used at the consecration were at first free, but afterwards fixed by written liturgies. All liturgies contain the words of institution and a prayer; the liturgy of the Greek Church, moreover, a prayer to the Holy Spirit to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. In the ancient Church both elements were distributed by the deacons, afterwards only the wine; at a later period of the Church, again, both elements. According to the Protestant theologians, the administration belongs properly to the ministers of the Church; but Luther, and many theologians with him, maintained that where no regular teachers can be obtained, this sacrament may be administered by other Christians to whom this duty is committed by the Church.

3. *Time and Place.*—In the apostolic Church, as we have seen, the Lord's Supper was regularly celebrated in the public assemblies, hence in private dwellings, at common tables, during the persecutions in hidden places, at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and, later, in the churches at special tables or altars. In imitation of its first celebration by Christ, it was at first celebrated at night; later, it became almost universally connected with the morning service. In the primitive Church, Christians partook of it almost daily; and when this was made impossible by the persecutions, at least several times a week, or certainly on Sundays. In the 5th century many theological writers complain of the laxity of Christians in the participation of the Lord's Supper, and afterwards several synods had to prescribe that all Christians ought to partake of it at least a certain number of times. The fourth Synod of Lateran, in 1415, restricted it to once a year. The Reformers insisted again on a more frequent participation, without, however, making any definite prescriptions as to the number of times. Many of the Protestant states punished those who withdrew altogether from it with exile, excommunication, and the refusal of a Christian burial.

4. *Persons by whom, and the Manner in which the Lord's Supper is received.*—In the primitive Church all baptized persons were admitted to the Lord's Supper; afterwards the catechumens and the *lapsi* were excluded from it. Communion of infants is found in an early period, and is still used in the Greek Church. See Zorn, *Hist. eucharist. infant.* (Berl. 1742). To those who were prevented from being present at the public service the consecrated elements were carried by deacons. Thus it was especially carried to the dying as a *Viaticum*, and until the 5th or 6th century it was even placed in the mouth of the dead, or in their coffin (see Schmidt, *De eucharistia mortuorum*, Jena, 1645).

The apostles received the Lord's Supper reclining, according to Eastern custom. Since the 4th century the communicants used to stand, afterwards to kneel, the men with uncovered head, the women covered with a long white cloth.

Since the 4th century a certain order was introduced in approaching the communion table, so that first the higher and lower clergy, and afterwards the laity came.

The self-communion of the laity is prohibited by all Christian denominations. The self-communion of officiating clergymen is the general usage in the Roman Church, but also permitted and customary in the Episcopal Church, among the Moravians, and with other denominations.

5. *Ceremonies in Celebration.*—In the Roman Church the communicants, after having confessed and received absolution, approach the communion table, which stands at some distance from the altar, and receive kneeling a host from the priest, who passes round, taking the host out of a chalice which he holds in his left hand, repeating for each communicant the words "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam æternam." The communion service of the Greek Church is nearly the same as that of the ancient Church.

In the Lutheran Church the communion is preceded by a preparatory service, confession (q. v.). After the sermon the clergyman consecrates the host and the wine at the altar. Amid the singing of the congregation, the communicants, first the men, then the women, step, either singly or two at a time, to the altar, where the clergyman places the host in their mouth, and reaches to them the cup, using the following or a similar formula: "Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; it may strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto life everlasting. Amen. Take, drink, this is the blood," etc. The service is concluded with a prayer of thanks, and with the blessing. During the service frequently candles burn on the altar.

In the Reformed, Presbyterian, Congregational, Arminian, etc., churches, the service begins commonly with a formula containing the passage 1 Cor. xi. The communicants step, in most places singly, to the communion table, and the broken bread and the cup are given into their own hands. In some places they remain sitting in the pews, where the elders carry to them bread and wine; in others, twelve at a time sit around a table. Private communion of the sick is an exception.

In the Episcopal Church of England the service of the Lord's Supper is immediately preceded by a general confession of sins, which is followed by a prayer of consecration and the words of institution. The clergymen first commune themselves, then the communicants, who approach without observing any distinction, and kneel down at the communion table, receiving the bread (which is cut) and the cup into their hands. The same service takes place in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and substantially in the Methodist churches.

The Socinians have, on the day before they celebrate the Lord's Supper, a preparation ("discipline") with closed doors, when the preacher exhorts the Church members, rebukes their faults, reconciles enemies, and sometimes excludes those guilty of grave offences from the Church. On the following day, at public service, the altar tables are spread and furnished with bread and wine. The communicants sit down round the table, and take with their hands the bread, which is broken by the preacher, and the cup.

The service of the Moravians approaches that of the primitive Church. It is celebrated every fourth Sunday at the evening service, and was formerly connected with the Agapæ (love feasts), washing of feet, and the kiss of peace.

On the ceremonies in the Eastern churches, see *Ritus Orientalium, Coptorum, Syrorum, et Armenorum, in administrandis Sacramentis.* Ex Assemanis, Renandotio, Trombellio aliisque fontibus authenticis collectos. Edidit Henricus Denziger, Ph. et S. Th. Doc. et in Univ. Wirceburgensi Theol. Dogmat. Prof. (tom. i, London, D. Nutt, 1863).

V. The *Literature* on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is very extensive. A history of the doctrine was given by Schulz (Rationalistic), *Die christliche Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahle* (2d ed. Leipsic, 1831); Ebrard (Evangelical), *Das Dogma vom Abendmahl und seine Geschichte* (Frankfort, 1845); Kahnis (High Lutheran), *Die Lehre vom Abendmahle* (Leipsic, 1851); L. J. Ruckert (Rationalistic), *Das Abendmahl, sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche* (Leipsic, 1856, 2 vols.). For many other foreign monographs, see Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Abendmahl; Volbeding, *Index*, p. 50; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 194; Malcom, *Theol. Index*, p. 275. The following are the principal English works on the subject: Wilberforce (Puseyite), *Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Lond. 1853), and *Sermons on the Holy Communion* (ib. 1854); J. Taylor (in opposition to Wilberforce), *True Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London, 1855); Goode (W.), *Nature of Christ's Person in the Eucharist* (1856); Pusey (E. B.), *Real Presence* (1853–7); Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service;* Turton (Bp.), *Eucharist*, and Wiseman's *Reply* (in ten *Essays*, 1854). More general are Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1864, 5 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, div. ii, p. 116; and his *Protest. Theol.* p. 298; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. i, § 73; Heppe, *Dogmatik*, p. 455; Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* i, 205; ii, 142 sq.; Auberlen, *Dis. Revel.* p. 210 sq.; Browne, *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, p. 683 sq.; Forbes, *Explan. of the XXXIX Articles*, ii, 496; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 482 sq.; J. Pye Smith, *Christian Theology*, p. 686 sq.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* iii, 10, 247; Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity* (see Index under Eucharist); Münscher, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 673 sq. See also *Ch. of Engl. Quart.* 1855, Jan. art. i; *Evangel. Rev.* 1866, p. 369 sq.; *Method. Quart. Rev.* 1860 (Oct.), p. 648 sq.; 1870 (April), p. 301; *Jahrb. deutsche Theol.* 1867, ii, 21 sq.; 1868, vol. i and ii; 1870, vol. iii and iv; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, iii, 715 sq.; 1839, i, 69, 123; 1840, ii, 389; 1844, ii, 409; 1866, ii, 362; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. Wissensch. Theol.* 1867, p. 84; *Christian Monthly*, 1844 (May), p. 542; *Christian Rememb.* 1853 (Oct.), p. 93, 263; 1867, p. 84; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1854 (Oct.), p. 102; *Bibl. Sacra*, 1862, art. vi; 1863, p. 3; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1858, p. 103; *Ch. Review*, 1866, p. 11 sq.; *Christian Rev.* xl, 191; *Lit. and Theol. Rev.* 1836 (Sept.); *Bapt. Quart. Review*, 1870 (Oct.), p. 497; *Contemp. Rev.* 1868 (July and Nov.); *Edinb. Rev.* 1867 (April), p. 232; *Brit. Quart. Rev.* 1868, p. 113; *Princeton Rev.* 1848; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, 1868, p. 431; *Westm. Rev.* 1871, p. 96 sq. An account of the mode of the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the various denominations is given by Scheibel, *Feier des heiligen Abendmahls bei den verschiedenen Religionsparteien* (Breslau, 1824). See SUPPER.

Lorenz, JOHANN MICHAEL, a German theologian, was born at Strasburg June 16, 1692, and was educated at the university of that city. In 1713 he obtained the degree of A.M.; in 1714 he was appointed preacher in his native place; in 1722, professor ordinary of divinity at his alma mater. In addition to this, he was appointed in 1724 visitor of Williams College; in 1728, morning preacher and prebendary of the foundation of St. Thomas; in 1734, pastor of the Thomas Church; in 1741, vice-president of the ecclesiastical conference. The doctorate in divinity he obtained in 1722. He died Aug. 13, 1752. By more than fifty Latin dissertations on dogmatical and exegetical theology Lorenz gained an honorable name in theological literature. We only mention *Dissertatio de unctione Spirituali, ad* 1 *Joh. ii*, 27 (Argentorati, 1723, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lorenzo or **Lorenzetto,** AMBROGIO and PIETRO DI, two celebrated Italian painters of the 14th century, were born at Siena about 1300. They were brothers, as we learn from an inscription which was attached to their pictures of the "Presentation" and of the "Marriage of the Virgin," destroyed in 1720. The principal of their works, which was painted in the Minorite convent at Siena, and represented the fatal adventures of some missionary monks, has been destroyed. In the first compartment a youth was represented putting on the monastic costume, in another, the same youth was represented with several of his brother monks about to set out for Asia, to convert the Mohammedans; in a third, these missionaries are already at their place of destina-

tion, and are being chastised in the sultan's presence, and are surrounded and mocked by a crowd of scoffing infidels; the sultan judges them to be hanged; in a fourth the young monk is already hanged to a tree, yet he notwithstanding continues to preach the Gospel to the astonished multitude, upon which the sultan orders their heads to be cut off; the next compartment is their ceremonious execution by the sword, and the scaffold is surrounded by a great crowd on foot and on horseback; after the execution follows a great storm, which is represented in all the detail of wind, hail, lightning, and earthquake, from all of which the crowd are protecting themselves as they best can, and this miracle, as it was considered, is the cause of many conversions to Christianity. Of the several pictures by Ambrogio mentioned by Ghiberti only one remains, the *Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple*, in the Scuole Regie. Of works by Pietro Lorenzo there is only one authenticated work; it is in the Stanza del Pilone, a room against the sacristy of the cathedral of Siena, and represents, according to Rumohr, some passages from the life of John the Baptist, his birth, etc. Vasari mentions many works by Pietro in various cities of Tuscany, and attributes to him a picture of the early fathers and hermits in the Campo Santo at Pisa. In 1355 Pietro was invited to Arezzo to paint the cathedral, in which he painted in fresco twelve stories from the life of the Virgin, with figures as large as life and larger, but they have long since perished; they were, however, in good preservation in the time of Vasari, who completely restored them. He speaks of parts of them as superior in style and vigor to anything that had been done up to that time.—*English Cyclop.* s. v. See also Vasari, *Vite de' Pittori*, etc.; Della Valle, *Lettere Sanesi;* Lanzi, *Storia Pittorica*, etc.; and especially Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen*, in which the two Lorenzetti are treated of at considerable length.

Loretto, properly **Loreto** (LAURETUM), an Italian city of some 8000 inhabitants, several miles south of Ancona, is renowned simply as a place of pilgrimage. It is the site of the celebrated sanctuary of the Virgin Mary called the *Santa Casa*, or Holy House. The church of Santa Casa was built in 1461–1513. The first mention of this *santa casa* is to be found in Flavius Blondus's († 1463) *Italia illustrata*, where he says of it, "Celeberrimum totius Italiæ sacellum beatæ Virginis in Laureto." He mentions the many rich presents which were made to the shrine as a proof that "at this place the prayers for the intercession of the mother of God are granted," but he says nothing of the origin of the place. Pope Paul II († 1471) granted indulgences to those who visited this shrine, and this example was followed by his successors. Baptista Mantuanus, in his *Redemptoris mundi matris ecclesiæ Lauretanæ historia* (Antwerp, 1576), relates, quoting a history found at the shrine itself (and probably written about 1450–80), that the house of the Virgin Mary, in which Christ was brought up, and which was said to have been discovered by St. Helena, was, after the total downfall of the country, and the destruction of its Christian churches by the Turks in May, 1291, brought by the angels to Dalmatia, and four and a half years later to Italy, in the neighborhood of Recanati, and was thence finally transferred to its present site. This story is contradicted by the Church historians of the 14th century themselves, who say that in their day Mary's house at Nazareth was still visited by pilgrims. The houses of Recanati resembled each other very much, and the selection of the original habitation of the Virgin proved very difficult, as private interests became mixed up with it.

But now as to the church of the Santa Casa itself. It stands near the centre of the town, in a piazza which possesses other architectural attractions, the chief of which are the governor's palace, built from the designs of Bramante, and a fine bronze statue of pope Sixtus V. The great central door of the church is surmounted by a splendid bronze statue of the Madonna; and in the interior are three magnificent bronze doors filled with bas-reliefs, representing the principal events of scriptural and ecclesiastical history. The celebrated Holy House stands within. It is a small brick house, with one door and one window, originally of rude material and construction, but now, from the devotion of successive generations, a marvel of art and of costliness. It is entirely cased with white marble, exquisitely sculptured, after Bramante's designs, by Sansovino, Bandinelli, Giovanni Bolognese, and other eminent artists. The subjects of the bas-reliefs are all taken from the history of the Virgin Mary in relation to the mystery of the incarnation, as the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, with the exception of three on the eastern side, which are mainly devoted to the legend of the Holy House itself and of its translation. The rest of the interior of the church is rich with bas-reliefs, mosaics, frescoes, paintings, and carvings in bronze. Of this material, the finest work is the font, which is a master-piece of art. The Holy House having been at all times an object of devout veneration, its treasury of votive offerings is one of the richest in the Western world. It suffered severely in the French occupation of 1796, but it has since received numerous and most costly accessions. Each of the innumerable gold and silver lamps kept burning at the shrine is endowed to the amount of several thousand dollars to secure their being always kept burning. The remainder of the wax candles and oil (of which some 14,000 pounds are burned annually) is sold as possessing sanative virtues, which are also supposed to accompany the use or even the handling of household vessels belonging to the shrine. As many as 40,000 masses have been said there in one year, which also adds greatly to the income. Popes Julius II, Sixtus V, and Innocent XII attached indulgences to the pilgrimages and prayers offered here, but nevertheless the number of pilgrims, which was said in 1600 to have reached 200,000 per annum, fell in the last century to 40,000, and in our own day remains at this number. The frescoes of the church are among the finest to be found in the world. The name it took from Laureta, a lady on whose estate the *Santa Casa* remained for a while.

The history of this shrine has been critically examined by P. P. Bergerius, and in 1619 by Prof. Vernegger, of Strasburg. Its principal champions were Jesuits; among them we would mention Turrianus, Canisius, and Baronius. Imitations of the *Santa Casa* have been erected in some places, as at Prague, near Augsburg, etc., and, in turn, became shrines.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 489.

Loria (or **Luria**) **Isaac** (by the Jews אר"י [*Lion*], the initials of אשכנזי רבי יצחק), a noted rabbi and great expounder of the Cabala (q. v.), was born at Jerusalem in 1534, of a German-Jewish family. His father having died when he was a child, he was cared for by a rich uncle, and was dedicated to the study of the Talmud at Cairo. When twenty-four years of age he was considered one of the greatest Talmudists of that place. Unfortunately, however, Loria became an ardent admirer of the mystical writings of the Jews, and especially enraptured with the *Sohar* (q. v.), one of the Cabalistic works. The hermit of Cairo was the first to bring the intricate and confused system of the Sohar into order, unity, and congruity; he also made many valuable additions. A most remarkable feature of his views are the numerous divisions of his psychology, with its two sexes. Still, all these theories were, with him, only premises to lead on to a more important and practical branch in the Cabala, which he called the "*world of perfection*" (Olam ha-Tikkun). He also held peculiar views on the fall of man. By reason of Adam's original sin, he held, the higher and the infernal souls, the good and the evil, came into confusion, and became intermixed with each other, a transmigration and separation of souls was thus a necessity. In addition to this he teaches the *Superfœtatio*. He pretended to have a full knowledge concerning the origin, relation, and rami-

fication of souls; further, to possess the power and faculty to compel the spirits of the upper world to take their abode in the bodies of living men, in order to reveal to them what is going on in the upper world; further, to be able to read on every man's brow in which relation his soul stands to the higher worlds. In Cairo nobody interested himself in his mysticism, and he therefore emigrated in 1569 to Safet, the cabalistic Jerusalem, where the Cabala was esteemed as high as the Bible. His superior knowledge, faculties, and gifts gradually secured him the favor of the Cabalists, and Loria was soon surrounded by troops of young and old Cabalists, who came to listen to his new revelations. He subsequently formed a cabalistic community, who lived together apart from the non-Cabalists, and according to his prescriptions. After Loria's death (August, 1572), Vital Calabrese became his successor and gathered his productions, while another of his disciples, the Italian Israel Saruk, propagated his teachings in Europe. Indeed, it may be said that the influence of this Cabalist extended more or less over all the Jews of the globe, and many of them to this very day follow this great Jewish mystic in assigning to the Sohar equal value as to the Bible. It must be confessed, however, that by his influence he also called forth a revival in the Jewish communities everywhere, and a reaction in the pharisaic, lifeless prayers, while even upon the Christian theosophy, mysticism, and exegetical studies his influence was considerable. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, ix, 437 sq.; x, 125; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* iii, 138, 145; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 257 sq.

Loria, Salomo, a noted rabbi, was born at Posen in 1510. Gifted with great talents, he devoted himself to a thorough research of Jewish literature. On account of his onslaughts on Jewish tradition he became involved in manifold controversies with his colleagues, and was persecuted; but, though personally disliked on account of his inclination to polemics, and not sparing even the private characteristics of living authorities, his just merits concerning the Talmud were recognised after all, and his commentaries on six volumes of the Talmud are held in high reputation among the Talmudic Jews to this very day. He died in 1573. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 467 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* ii, 260 sq.

Lorin(us), Jean, a Jewish commentator on the Scriptures, distinguished in his day as an exegetical scholar, was born at Avignon in 1559; taught theology at Paris, Rome, and Milan, and died March 26, 1634, at Dôle. For a list of his works, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 662.

Lorraine, Charles de Guise, *Cardinal of*. See Guise, Charles.

Lorsbach, Georg Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Dillenburg, in the duchy of Nassau, Feb. 29, 1752. In 1768 he entered the University of Herborn; in 1771 he removed to that of Göttingen, and became there an enthusiastic student of the Oriental languages under Michaelis. After having finished the academical course, he spent four years in private study in his father's house, preparing himself for the ministry. In 1778 he became rector at Siegen; in 1786, at the grammar-school of his native place, and obtained, at the same time, the dignity of professor; in 1791, rector at the grammar-school of Herborn, and, at the same time, professor of Oriental languages at the academy there, and in the following year was appointed to lecture at the university of that place on history and exegesis. In 1793 he became the third professor ordinary of divinity; in 1794, the second professor and a counsellor of the Consistory. Having become famous, by reason of his literary contributions, as an eminent Orientalist, he was, in 1812, called to the University of Jena as professor of Oriental literature. The theological faculty of Marburg bestowed on him the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 30, 1816. He belongs to the few and rare scholars of the ancient languages who combined acuteness with extensive learning. De Sacy places him among the first German Orientalists. He published an *Archiv d. morgenländischen Literatur* (Marburg, 1791–94, 2 bde. 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lorsch, Convent of (otherwise *Lauresham*, *Laureshem*, *monasterium Laureacense*, *Laurissense*, *Laurissa*), situated four miles from Heidelberg, was established about A.D. 764 by countess Williswinda (widow of count Rupert, who, by order of Pepin, conducted pope Stephen back to Rome) and her son Cancor. Its first abbot is said to have been a near relative of the founders, Chrodegang of Metz. The first establishment was on an island of the Weschnitz, dedicated to St. Peter; a second was soon erected on a hill in the neighborhood. Charlemagne greatly interested himself in this monastery, and added to it as endowment Heppenheim (in January, 773) and Oppenheim (in September, 774), and personally attended the consecration. Louis the Pious, Lothaire, Louis the German, and Louis III all confirmed successively the donations of Charlemagne. But one of the greatest sources of prosperity for the convent was its having received from Rome the relics of St. Nazarius, which brought it numberless presents and donations, and soon made it one of the most prosperous convents at the time. Lorsch also enjoys great literary fame. Its monks especially distinguished themselves by their literary pursuits, to which the *Annales Laureshamenses* bear witness. The early part of these annals (703–768) is evidently derived from those of the convent of Murbach, which were very popular; but after that time they are clearly original, and continue down to 803. Aside from the less important *Annales Laurissenses minores*, we must mention the *Annales Laurissenses*, formerly called *plebeji* or *Loiseliani*, which are the most important annals of the time. Ranke has lately discovered in them the official work of a Carlovingian court historian, which was afterwards used by Einhard as the basis of the annals bearing his name. Until the 11th century the convent enjoyed great prosperity. Then its reverses commenced, and, after various struggles, it fell in the 12th century, till "a planta pedis usque ad verticem non fuit in eo sanitas." The moral condition of the Lorsch monastery had greatly deteriorated ever since the 11th century, and it became necessary to inaugurate a reform. This task was intrusted to archbishop Sifried II of Mentz, A.D. 1229. His successor, Sifried III, however, was really the man who completed this task by subjecting the monks to the Cistercian rule, "ut ordo," says Gregory IX in his brief, "de nigro conversus in album purgetur vitiis et virtutibus augeatur." By him also were subsequently installed into Lorsch some Præmonstrant canons of the convent of All Saints (diocese of Strasburg), and the pope approved it as a new organization Jan. 8, 1248. In the second half of the 16th century Lorsch was subjected to the rule of the electoral administration. Vainly did the Præmonstrants appeal to pope Alexander VII: the convent retained only the original foundation at Mentz and its dependencies. Not until after the completion of the treaty of Westphalia (1650) was a part of its other possessions restored to it. In 1651 the Palatinate renewed its claims to the lands of the convent, and questioned the propriety of the independence of Lorsch as a separate duchy, with representation in the Diet. The quarrel lasted nearly through the whole of the 18th century, but was finally settled in 1803, when the convent became the possession of the house of Hesse-Darmstadt. See Rettberg, *K. Geschichte Deutschlands*, i, 584 sq.; K. Dahl, *Beschreib. d. Fürstenthums Lorsch* (Darmstadt, 1812, 4to); *Codex principis olim Laureshamensis*, etc., edit. Academ. elector. scient. Theodoro-Palatina, vol. iii (Mannh. 1768, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 490.

Lort, Michael, D.D., an English theologian, was born in 1725; entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 1745; became professor of Greek at Cambridge in 1759; rec-

tor of St. Matthew, London, in 1771; prebendary of St. Paul's in 1780. He died in 1790. His works were, *Papers in Archæology*, 1777, '79, '87:—*Short Comment on the Lord's Prayer*, 1790:—*Inquiry Relative to the Authorship of "The whole Duty of Man;"* and a small volume of *Sermons*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lo-ruha'mah (Heb. *Lo-Rucha'mah*, לֹא רֻחָמָה, *not pitied*, as it is explained in both contexts, Hos. i, 6, Sept. Οὐκ ἠλεημένη, Vulg. *Absque misericordia*, and as it is rendered in the Auth. Vers., Hos. ii, 23, "not obtained mercy"), the name divinely appointed for the first daughter of the prophet Hosea by the formerly dissolute Gomer, a type of Jehovah's temporary rejection of his people by the Babylonian captivity in consequence of their idolatry (Hos. i, 6; ii, 23; comp. ii, 1). B.C. cir. 725. See Hosea.

Losada, Christopher, a martyr to the cause of Protestantism in Spain in the 16th century, was, at the time of his conversion under the preaching of Dr. Egidius [see Gil, Juan], an eminent physician and learned philosopher. He was chosen pastor of a Protestant Church in Seville, which met ordinarily in the house of Isabella de Baena, "a lady not less distinguished for her piety than for her rank and opulence." Among the members of note in his congregation were Don Juan Ponce de Leon, and Domingo de Guzman, and others equally well celebrated. Arrested by the Inquisition in consequence of his zeal in diffusing Protestant principles among his countrymen, neither the prison nor the rack availed to make him renounce his convictions, and he was consequently condemned to the stake. He suffered death at an "auto-da-fe," solemnized at Seville Sept. 24, 1559, in the square of St. Francis, and attended by four bishops, the members of the royal court of justice, the chapter of the cathedral, and a great assemblage of nobility and gentry, the occasion of the death-penalty on twenty-one apostates from the Romish belief. The most distinguished individual aside from Dr. Losada was one of his members, Don Juan Ponce de Leon, whom we have mentioned above. They both bore their trial with admirable Christian patience, committing their souls to a faithful Creator. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 136; M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 217, 300, 307. (J. H. W.)

Löscher, Johann Kaspar, a German theologian, was born at Werden May 8, 1636, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He flourished successively as superintendent of the churches of Sondershausen (1668), pastor at Erfurt (1676), superintendent at Zwickau (1679), and then as senior preacher in the west Prussian city of Dantzic. In 1687 he was made doctor and professor of theology at his alma mater, and he remained there until his death, July 11, 1718. He wrote many theological dissertations, of but little value in our day.

Löscher, Valentin Ernst, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Sondershausen in 1673. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg (where his father, Caspar Löscher, was a professor) and Jena, and then went on a perigrinatio academica through the Netherlands and Denmark, and the cities Hamburg and Rostock. In the last-named place he connected himself with the anti-Pietist party, but after his return he devoted himself to historical studies, and delivered lectures on genealogy and heraldry, as well as on exegesis, morals, etc. In 1698 he was appointed superintendent by the duke of Weissenfels, and, some time after, began, in connection with some friends, the publication of the first theological periodical in Germany, the *Unschuldige Nachrichten von alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen* (20 vols. to 1720; continued by Henry Reinhard until 1731). This became the organ of the orthodox party in Saxony, as opposed to the pietism and indifferentism prevailing at the time. His sphere of influence was afterwards enlarged, first as superintendent of Delitzsch, and, later (1702), as professor in the University of Wittenberg. In 1704 he was appointed superintendent of Dresden and member of the supreme consistorial court. In this position his activity was soon manifested in the improved facilities for religious and secular instruction. Besides establishing several parish schools, he laid the foundation of a *seminarium ministerii;* at the same time he zealously instructed candidates for the ministry, preached both on Sundays and week-days, besides carrying on an extensive correspondence with the princes, states, and pastors who held fast to the orthodox faith, and opposed, with him, the inroads of pietism and indifferentism. He died Feb. 12, 1741. Löscher left a collection of his letters forming five volumes folio, which are preserved in the Hamburg Library. His principal works are *Historia mortuum* (part i, 1707; pt. iii, 1722):—*Die Reformationsukta:*—*Timotheus Verinus* (1718). See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* s. v.; Tholuck, *Der Geist d. lutherischen Theologen Wittenb.* (1852); M. v. Engelhardt, *Valentin Ernst Löscher nach s. Leben u. Wirken* (Dorpat, 1853; 2d edit., Stuttg. 1856); Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 109 sq., 116 sq., 130.

Loskiel, George Henry, a bishop of the Moravian Church, celebrated as a preacher, hymnologist, and author, was born Nov. 7, 1740, at Angermünde, in Courland, where his father had charge of a Lutheran parish. In early life he joined the Moravians, and studied both theology and medicine at their college at Barby, in Germany. After practicing medicine for a time, he devoted himself wholly to the ministry, in Holland, Germany, and Livonia. In 1802 he was consecrated a bishop, and came to the United States in order to fill the office of president of the provincial board which governs the Moravian churches in this country. Failing health and other circumstances constrained him to retire from this position in 1810. Two years later he was elected into the general board of the Church at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony; but the war with Great Britain and the state of his health prevented him from leaving America. He died Feb. 23, 1814, at Bethlehem, Pa. His two principal works are *Geschichte d. Mission der Evang. Brüder unter den Indianern in N. A.* (1789), translated into English by La Trobe, and published in London (1794), a standard on the Moravian missions among the Indians, with a full account of their manners and customs, based upon the reports of the missionaries, and *Etwas fürs Herz auf dem Wege zur Ewigkeit* (Religious Meditations for every Day in the Year), a book which passed through eight editions (the last in 1848), and is still read with great profit by thousands of Christians in Germany. See De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), p. 662 sq. (E. de S.)

Lösner, Christopher Friedrich, a German theologian, noted in the department of exegesis, was born at Leipsic in 1734, and was educated at the university of that place. He afterwards held a professorship in his alma mater. He died there in 1803. His chief work is *Observationes ad Novum Testamentum, e Philone Alexandrino* (Leipsic, 1777, 8vo). In this work "the force and meaning of words are particularly illustrated, together with points of antiquity, and the readings of Philo's text. The light thrown upon the New Test. by the writings of Philo is admirably elucidated by Lösner" (Horne). Another valuable production of his is *Observationes in reliquias versionis Proverbiorum Salomonis Græcæ Aquilæ, Symmachi et Theodotionis.*

Loss (prop. some form of the verb אָבַד, ἀπόλλυμι, but likewise a frequent rendering of several other Heb. and Gr. terms which usually imply an idea of *damage*). According to the Mosaic law, whoever among the Hebrews found any lost article (אֲבֵדָה) was required to take it to his home, and then endeavor to discover the proper owner (Deut. xxii, 1–3). This would, of course, particularly apply to stray animals, and Josephus gives some special details with respect to money so found

(*Ant.* iv, 8, 29; compare the Mishna, *Shekal.* vii, 2). In case of the abstraction of property while in the possession of the finder, the latter had not only to make it good, but also to add one fifth of its value, and even to make a sin-offering likewise (Lev. vi, 3 sq.). The Mishna makes many casuistical distinctions on this subject (*Baba Mezia*, i, 2), especially with regard to advertising (הכרזה, i. e. *κηρύττειν*) the discovered property. See DAMAGE.

Loss, LEWIS HOMRI, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta, N. Y., July 1, 1803, and was educated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (class of 1828). In 1829 he was licensed and ordained by Oneida Presbytery, and installed pastor of the Church in Camden, Oneida County, N. Y. In the pastoral office he afterwards served in Elyria, Ohio; in Rockford and Chicago, Ill.; and in Joliet and Marshalltown, Iowa. He was synodical missionary three years to the synod of Peoria, Ill.; also prominent in bringing into existence institutions of learning, as Beloit College and Rockford Female Seminary, Ill. He died July 10, 1865. Mr. Loss was an eminently successful preacher, erecting many churches, and especially prominent in the Sabbath-school cause. He always had the fullest confidence of the men of the world; they recognised his worth as a man and a citizen. See Wilson, *Presb. Histor. Alm.* 1866, p. 217. (J. L. S.)

Lossius, CASPAR FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Erfurt Jan. 31, 1753, and was educated at the university of that place, which he entered in 1770. Dissatisfied with the innovations which Bahrdt undertook in theology, he removed in 1773 to the University of Jena; and again, not quite satisfied with the rationalistic innovations of the day, he was obliged to acquire the greater part of his learning by private study. In 1774 he became school-teacher at his native place; in 1781 dean of Andreas Church, and in 1785 dean to the Prediger Church of the same place. He died March 26, 1817. Lossius was a man of great learning; the literature of the Reformation was almost his daily study. Having seen the danger which threatened his country, both religiously and morally, from the rationalistic innovations, and from the consequences of the French Revolution, he dedicated most of his time and talent as a popular author to the cause of the faith and principles of the fathers of the Reformation. Some of his productions passed through several editions in a short time. Some were even translated into French, and rescued thousands from moral degradation and spiritual destruction. A complete list of his works is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lost Tribes. See CAPTIVITY; ISRAEL.

Lot (properly גּוֹרָל or גֹּרָל, *goral'*, *κλῆρος*, literally a *pebble*, used anciently for balloting; other terms occasionally thus rendered are חֶבֶל or חֶבֶל, *che'bel*, a *portion*, Deut. xxxii, 9; 1 Chron. xvi, 18; Psa. cv, 11, referring to an inheritance; and *λαγχάνω*, to *obtain by lot*, Luke i, 9; John xix, 24), strictly *a small stone*, as used in casting lots (Lev. xvi, 8; Numb. xxxiii, 54; Josh. xix, 1; Ezek. xxiv, 6; Jonah i, 7), hence also a method used to determine chances or preferences, or to decide a debate. The decision by lot was often resorted to among the Hebrews, but always with the strictest reference to the interposition of God. As to the precise manner of casting lots, we have no certain information; probably several modes were practiced. In Prov. xvi, 33 we read that "the lot," i. e. pebble, "is cast into the lap," properly into the *bosom* of an urn or vase. It does not appear that the *lap* or *bosom* of a garment worn by a person was ever used to receive lots.

The use of lots among the ancients was very general (see Dale, *Orac. ethn.* c. 14; Potter, *Greek Antiq.* i, 730; Adams, *Rom. Ant.* i, 540 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. Sors) and highly esteemed (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* i, 6, 46), as is natural in simple stages of society (Tacit. *Germ.* 10), "recommending itself as a sort of appeal to the Almighty secure from all influence of passion or bias, and a sort of divination employed even by the gods themselves (Homer, *Iliad*, xxii, 209; Cicero, *De Div.* i, 34; ii, 41). The word *sors* is thus used for an oracular response (Cicero, *De Divina*, ii, 56). So there was a mode of divination among heathens by means of arrows, two inscribed and one without mark, *βελομαντεία* (Hos. iv, 12; Ezek. xxi, 21; Mauritius, *De Sortitione*, c. 14, § 4; see also Esth. iii, 7; ix, 24–32; Mishna, *Taanith*, ii, 10). See DIVINATION. Among heathen instances the following additional may be cited: 1. Choice of a champion, or of priority in combat (*Il.* iii, 316; vii, 171; Herod. iii, 108); 2. Decision of fate in battle (*Il.* xx, 209); 3. Appointment of magistrates, jurymen, or other functionaries (Aristot. *Pol.* iv, 16; Schol. *On Aristoph.* Plut. 277; Herod. vi, 109; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* iv, 5, 55; Demosth. *c. Aristog.* i, 778, 1; comp. Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Dicastes); 4. Priests (Æsch. *in Tim.* p. 188, Bekk.); 5. A German practice of deciding by marks on twigs, mentioned by Tacitus (*Germ.* 10); 6. Division of conquered or colonized land (Thucydides, iii, 50; Plutarch, *Pericles*, 84; Böckh, *Public Econ. of Ath.* ii, 170)."

The Israelites sometimes had recourse to lots as a method of ascertaining the divine will (Prov. xvi, 33), and generally in cases of doubt regarding serious enterprises (Esth. iii, 7; compare Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 301), especially the following: (*a.*) In matters of partition or distribution, e. g. the location of the several tribes in Palestine (Numb. xxvi, 55 sq.; xxxiii, 54; xxxiv, 13; xxxvi, 2; Josh. xiv, 2; xviii, 6 sq.; xix, 5), the assignment of the Levitical cities (Josh. xxi, 4 sq.), and, after the return from the exile, the settlement in the homesteads at the capital (Neh. xi, 1; compare 1 Macc. iii, 36). Prisoners of war were also disposed of by lot (Joel iii, 3; Nah. iii, 10; Obad. 11; compare Matt. xxvii, 35; John xix, 24; compare Xenoph. *Cyrop.* iv, 5, 55). (*b.*) In criminal investigations where doubt existed as to the real culprit (Josh. vii, 14; 1 Sam. xiv, 42). A notion prevailed among the Jews that this detection was performed by observing the shining of the stones in the high-priest's breastplate (Mauritius, c. 21, § 4). The instance of the mariners casting lots to ascertain by the surrendering of what offender the sea could be appeased (Jonah i, 7), is analogous; but it is not clear, from Prov. xviii, 18, that lots were resorted to for the determination of civil disputes. (*c.*) In the election to an important office or undertaking for which several persons appeared to have claims (1 Sam. x, 19; Acts i, 26; comp. Herod. iii, 128; Justin. xiii, 4; Cicero, *Verr.* ii, 2, 51; Aristot. *Polit.* iv, 16), as well as in the assignment of official duties among associates having a common right (Neh. x, 34), as of the priestly offices in the Temple service among the sixteen of the family of Eleazar and the eight of that of Ithamar (1 Chron. xxiv, 3, 5, 19; Luke i, 9), also of the Levites for similar purposes (1 Chron. xxiii, 28; xxiv, 20–31; xxv, 8; xxvi, 13; Mishna, *Tamid*, i, 2; iii, 1; v, 2; *Joma*, ii, 2, 3, 4; *Shabb.* xxiii, 2; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* in Luke i, 8, 9, vol. ii, p. 489). (*d.*) In military enterprises (Judg. xx, 10; compare Val. Max. i, 5, 3).

In the sacred ritual of the Hebrews we find the use of lots but once prescribed, namely, in the selection of the scape-goat (Lev. xvi, 8 sq.). The two inscribed tablets of boxwood, afterwards of gold, were put into an urn, which was shaken, and the lots drawn out (*Joma*, iii, 9; iv, 1). See ATONEMENT, DAY OF. Eventually lots came into frequent usage (comp. the Mishna, *Shaabb.* xxiii, 2). In later times they even degenerated into a game of hazard, of which human life was the stakes (Josephus, *War*, iii, 8, 7). *Dice* appear to have been usually employed for the lot (חִשְׁלַךְ גּוֹרָל, to "*throw* the die," Josh. xviii, 8; so חוֹרָה, to *cast*, Josh. xviii, 6; *δίδωμι*, to *give*, Acts i, 26; נָפַל, *πίπτω*, to *fall*, Jonah i, 7; Ezek. xxiv, 7; Acts i, 26), and were sometimes drawn from a vessel (יָצָא הַגּוֹרָל, "the lot *came forth*," Numb. xxxii,

54; so עָלָה, to "*come up*," Lev. vi, 9; comp. the Mishna, *Joma*, iv, 1). A different kind of lot is elsewhere indicated in the Mishna (*Joma*, ii, 1; comp. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 714). A sacred species of lot was by means of the URIM and THUMMIM (q. v.) of the high-priest (Numb. xxvii, 21; 1 Sam. xxviii, 6), which appears to have had some connection with the divination by means of the sacerdotal EPHOD (1 Sam. xxiii, 6, 9). Stones were occasionally employed in prophetical or emblematical lots (Numb. xvii, 6 sq.; Zech. xi, 10, 14). See also PURIM. Election by lot appears to have prevailed in the Christian Church as late as the 7th century (Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.* iv, 1, 1, vol. i, p. 426; Bruns, *Conc.* ii, 66). Here also we may notice the use of words heard, or passages chosen at random from Scripture. *Sortes Biblicæ*, like the *Sortes Virgilianæ*, prevailed among Jews, as they have also among Christians, though denounced by several councils (Johnson, "Life of Cowley," *Works*, ix, 8; Bingham, *Eccl. Antiq.* xvi, 5, 3; *id.*, vi, 53 sq.; Bruns, *Conc.* ii, 145–154, 166; Mauritius, c. 15; Hofmann, *Lex.* s. v. Sortes).

On the subject generally, see Mauritius, *De Sortitione ap. vet. Hebræos* (Basil, 1692); Chrysander, *De Sortibus* (Halle, 1740); Benzel, *De Sortibus vet.* in his *Syntagma dissertat.* i, 297–318; Winckler, *Gedanken über d. Spuren göttl. Providenz in Loose* (Hildesheim, 1750); Paläophili, *Abhandl. v. Gebrauchs d. Looses in d. heil. Schr.* in Semler's *Hall. Samml.* i, 2, 79 sq.; Junius, *De Sorte, remedio dubias caussas dirimendi* (Lips. 1746); Eenberg, *De Sortilegiis* (Upsal. 1705); Hanovius, *De electione per sortem* (Gedan. 1743; in German by Tramhold, Hamb. 1751); Bauer, *Vormitze Kunst*, etc. (Hildesh. 1750).

The term "*lot*" is also used for that which falls to one by lot, especially *a portion* or *inheritance* (Josh. xv, 1; Judg. i, 3; Psa. cxxv, 3; Isa. xvii, 14; lvii, 6; Acts viii, 21). Lot is also used metaphorically for *portion*, or *destiny*, as assigned to men from God (Psa. xvi, 5): "And arise to thy lot in the end of days" in the Messiah's kingdom (Dan. xii, 13; comp. Rev. xx, 6). See HERITAGE.

Lôt. See MYRRH.

Lot (Heb. *id.*, לוֹט, a *covering*, as in Isa. xxv, 7; Sept. and N. T. Λώτ, Josephus Λῶτος; occurs Gen. xi, 27, 31; xii, 4, 5; xiii, 1–14; xiv, 12, 16; xix, 1–15, 18, 23, 29, 30, 36; Deut. ii, 9, 19; Psa. lxxxiii, 8; Luke xvii, 28, 29, 32; 2 Pet. ii, 7), the son of Haran and nephew of Abraham (Gen. xi, 27). His sisters were Milcah, the wife of Nahor, and Iscah, by some identified with Sarah. [In our treatment of the history, we freely avail ourselves of the articles in Kitto and Smith.] The following genealogy exhibits the family relations:



By the early death of his father (Gen. xi, 28), he was left in charge of his grandfather Terah, with whom he migrated to Haran, B.C. 2089 (Gen. xi, 31), and the latter dying there, he had already come into possession of his property when he accompanied Abraham into the land of Canaan, B.C. 2088 (Gen. xii, 5), and thence into Egypt, B.C. 2087 (Gen. xii, 10), and back again, by the way of the Philistines, B.C. 2086 (Gen. xx, 1), to the southern part of Canaan again, B.C. 2085 (Gen. xiii, 1). Their united substance, consisting chiefly in cattle, was not then too large to prevent them from living together in one encampment. Eventually, however, their possessions were so greatly increased that they were obliged to separate, and Abraham, with rare generosity, conceded the choice of pasture-grounds to his nephew. Lot availed himself of this liberality of his uncle, as he deemed most for his own advantage, by fixing his abode at Sodom, that his flocks might pasture in and around that fertile and well-watered neighborhood (Gen. xiii, 5–13). He had soon very great reason to regret this choice; for, although his flocks fed well, his soul was starved in that vile place, the inhabitants of which were sinners before the Lord exceedingly. There "he vexed his righteous soul from day to day with the filthy conversation of the wicked" (2 Pet. ii, 7).

Not many years after his separation from Abraham (B.C. 2080), Lot was carried away prisoner by Chedorlaomer, along with the other inhabitants of Sodom, and was rescued and brought back by Abraham (Gen. xiv), as related under other heads. See ABRAHAM; CHEDORLAOMER. This exploit procured for Abraham much celebrity in Canaan; and it ought to have procured for Lot respect and gratitude from the people of Sodom, who had been delivered from hard slavery and restored to their homes on his account. But this does not appear to have been the result.

At length (B.C. 2064) the guilt of "the cities of the plain" brought down the signal judgments of heaven (Gen. xix, 1–29). Lot is still living in Sodom (Gen. xix), a well-known resident, with wife, sons, and daughters—married and marriageable. The rabbinical tradition is that he was actually "judge" of Sodom, and sat in the gate in that capacity. (See quotations in Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* s. v. Loth and Sodomah.) But in the midst of the licentious corruption of Sodom—the eating and drinking, the buying and selling, the planting and building (Luke xvii, 28), and of the darker evils exposed in the ancient narrative—he still preserves some of the delightful characteristics of his wandering life, his fervent and chivalrous hospitality (xix, 2, 8), the unleavened bread of the tent of the wilderness (ver. 3), the water for the feet of the wayfarers (ver. 2), affording his guests a reception identical with that which they had experienced that very morning in Abraham's tent on the heights of Hebron (comp. xviii, 3, 6). It is this hospitality which receives the commendation of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in words that have passed into a familiar proverb, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (Heb. xiii, 2). On the other hand, it is his deliverance from the guilty and condemned city—the one just man in that mob of sensual, lawless wretches—which points the allusion of St. Peter, to "the godly delivered out of temptations, the unjust reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, an ensample to those that after should live ungodly" (2 Pet. ii, 6–9). The avenging angels, after having been entertained by Abraham, repaired to Sodom, where they were received and entertained by Lot, who was sitting in the gate of the town when they arrived. While they were at supper the house was beset by a number of men, who demanded that the strangers should be given up to them, for the unnatural purposes which have given a name of infamy to Sodom in all generations. Lot resisted this demand, and was loaded with abuse by the vile fellows outside on that account. They had nearly forced the

door, when the angels, thus awfully by their own experience convinced of the righteousness of the doom they came to execute, smote them with instant blindness, by which their attempts were rendered abortive, and they were constrained to disperse. Towards morning the angels apprised Lot of the doom which hung over the place, and urged him to hasten thence with his family. He was allowed to extend the benefit of this deliverance to the families of his daughters who had married in Sodom; but the warning was received by those families with incredulity and insult, and he therefore left Sodom accompanied only by his wife and two daughters. As they went, being hastened by the angels, the wife, anxious for those who had been left behind, or reluctant to remove from the place which had long been her home, and where much valuable property was necessarily left behind, lingered behind the rest, and was suddenly involved in the destruction by which—smothered and stiffened as she stood by saline incrustations—she became "a pillar of salt" (Gen. xix, 1–26). This narrative has often been regarded as one of the "difficulties" of the Bible. But it surely need not be so. Even under the above extreme view of the suddenness of the event, the circumstances appear to be all sufficiently accounted for. In the sacred record the words are simply these: "His wife looked back from behind him, and became a pillar of salt;" words which neither in themselves nor in their position in the narrative afford any serious difficulty, even without the supposition of a miracle. It is true that, when taken with what has gone before, they seem to imply (vers. 22, 23) that the work of destruction by fire did not commence till after Lot had entered Zoar. The storm, however, may have overtaken her in consequence of her delay. Later ages have not been satisfied to leave the matter, but have insisted on identifying the "pillar" with some one of the fleeting forms which the perishable rock of the south end of the Dead Sea is constantly assuming in its process of decomposition and liquefaction (Anderson's *Off. Narr.* p. 180). The first allusion of this kind is perhaps that in Wisd. x, 7, where "a standing pillar of salt, the monument (*μνημεῖον*) of an unbelieving soul," is mentioned with the "waste land that smoketh," and the "plants bearing fruit that never come to ripeness," as remaining to that day, a testimony to the wickedness of Sodom. This notion was regarded by the Roman Catholics as scriptural authority that might not be disputed. See the quotations from the fathers and others in Hofmann's *Lexikon* (s. v. Lot), and in Mislin, *Lieux Saints* (iii, 224). Josephus also (*Ant.* i, 11, 4) says that he had seen it, and that it was then remaining. So, too, do Clemens Romanus (*Epist.* i, 11) and Irenæus (iv, 51, 64). So does Benjamin of Tudela, whose account is more than usually circumstantial (ed. Asher, i, 72). Rabbi Petachia, on the other hand, looked for it, but "did not see it; it no longer exists" (ed. Benisch, p. 61). The same statement is to be found in travellers of every age, certainly of our own times (see Maundrell, March 30). The origin of these traditions relative to this pillar has lately been satisfactorily explained by the discovery by the American party under Lieut. Lynch of an actual column still standing on the south-western shore of the Dead Sea, at a place retaining the traces of the name of Sodom in the form of Usdum, of which he gives a pictorial sketch, describing it as a round pillar, about forty feet high, on a lofty pedestal, standing detached from the general mass of the mountain, of solid salt, slightly decreasing in size upwards, and capped with carbonate of lime; but, although himself a Catholic, he admits, with scientific candor, that it is merely the result of the action of the winter rains upon the rock-salt hills, which the cap of limestone has here protected, leaving the surrounding parts to wash away, till a column has thus gradually been carved out (*Narrative of Expedition*, p. 307, 308). Prof. Palmer also visited this singular object, called by the Arabs *Bint Sheik Lot*, or "Lot's [daughter] wife." He describes and gives a view of it as "a tall

"Lot's Wife."

isolated needle of rock, which really does bear a curious resemblance to an Arab woman with a child upon her shoulder. The Arab legend of Lot's wife differs from the Bible account only in the addition of a few frivolous details. They say that there were seven cities of the plain, and that they were all miraculously overwhelmed by the Dead Sea as a punishment for their crimes. The prophet Lot and his family alone escaped the general destruction. He was divinely warned to take all that he had and flee eastward, a strict injunction being given that they should not look behind them. Lot's wife, who had on previous occasions ridiculed her husband's prophetic office, disobeyed the command, and, turning to gaze upon the scene of the disaster, was changed into this pillar of rock" (*Desert of the Exodus* [Harper's], p. 396 sq.). The expression of our Lord, "Remember Lot's wife" (Luke xvii, 32), appears from the context to be solely intended as an illustration of the danger of going back or delaying in the day of God's judgments. From this text, indeed, it would appear as if Lot's wife had gone back or had tarried so long behind in the desire of saving some of their property. Then, as it would seem, she was struck dead, and became a stiffened corpse, fixed for the time to the soil by saline or bituminous incrustations. The particle of similitude must here, as in many other passages of Scripture, be understood, "*like* a pillar of salt." See Nagel, *De culpa uxoris Loti* (Altdorf, 1755); Distel, *De salute uxoris Lothi* (Altd. 1721); Waller, *Diss. de statua sal. uxoris Loti* (Lipsiæ, 1764); Wolle, *De facto et fato uxoris Loti* (Lips. 1730); Schwollmann, *Comm. qua de uxore L. in statuam sal. conversa dubitatur* (Hamburg, 1749); Milom, *Sendschr. u. d. Salzsäule in die L.'s Weib vervandelt worden* (Hamb. 1767); Clerici *Diss. de statua salina*, in his *Comment. in Gen.*; Tieroff, *De statua salis* (Jen. 1657); Müller, *idem* (Helmstadt, 1764); Oedmann, *Samml.* iii, 145; Bauer, *Hebr. Geschichte*, i, 131; Maii *Observat. sacr.* i, 168 sq.; H. v. d. Hardt, *Ephem. philol.* p. 67 sq.; Jenisch, *Erörter. zweier wichtig. Schriftstellen* (Hamb. 1761); Michaelis and Rosenmüller on Gen. xix, 26; Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 72.

Lot and his daughters meanwhile had hastened on to Zoar (q. v.), the smallest of the five cities of the plain, which had been spared on purpose to afford him a refuge; but, being fearful, after what had passed, to remain among a people so corrupted, he soon retired to a cavern in the neighboring mountains, and there abode (Gen. xix, 30). After some stay in this place, the daughters of Lot became apprehensive lest the family of their father should be lost for want of descendants, than which no greater calamity was known or appre-

hended in those times; and in the belief that, after what had passed in Sodom, there was no hope of their obtaining suitable husbands, they, by a contrivance which has in it the taint of Sodom, in which they were brought up, made their father drunk with wine, and in that state seduced him into an act which, as they well knew, would in soberness have been most abhorrent to him. They thus became the mothers, and he the father, of two sons, named Moab and Ammon, from whom sprung the Moabites and Ammonites, so often mentioned in the Hebrew history (Gen. xix, 31–38). With respect to Lot's daughters, Whiston and others are unable to see any wicked intention in them. He admits that the incest was a horrid crime, except under the unavoidable necessity which apparently rendered it the only means of preserving the human race; and this justifying necessity he holds to have existed in their minds, as they appear to have believed that all the inhabitants of the land had been destroyed except their father and themselves. But it is incredible that they could have entertained any such belief. The city of Zoar had been spared, and they had been there. The wine also with which they made their father drunk must have been procured from men, as we cannot suppose they had brought it with them from Sodom. The fact would therefore seem to be that, after the fate of their sisters, who had married men of Sodom and perished with them, they became alive to the danger and impropriety of marrying with the natives of the land, and of the importance of preserving the family connection. The force of this consideration was afterwards seen in Abraham's sending to the seat of his family in Mesopotamia for a wife to Isaac. But Lot's daughters could not go there to seek husbands; and the only branch of their own family within many hundred miles was that of Abraham, whose only son, Ishmael, was then a child. This, therefore, must have appeared to them the only practicable mode in which the house of their father could be preserved. Their making their father drunk, and their solicitous concealment of what they did from him, show that they despaired of persuading him to an act which, under any circumstances, and with every possible extenuation, must have been very distressing to so good a man. That he was a good man is evinced by his deliverance from among the guilty, and is affirmed by an apostle (2 Pet. ii, 7); his preservation is alluded to by our Saviour (Luke xvii, 18, etc.); and in Deut. ii, 9, 19, and Psa. lxxxiii, 9, his name is honorably used to designate the Moabites and Ammonites, his descendants. This account of the origin of the nations of Moab and Ammon has often been treated as if it were a Hebrew legend which owed its origin to the bitter hatred existing from the earliest to the latest times between the "children of Lot" and the children of Israel. The horrible nature of the transaction—not the result of impulse or passion, but a plan calculated and carried out, and that not once, but twice, would prompt the wish that the legendary theory were true. But even the most destructive critics (as, for instance, Tuch) allow that the narrative is a continuation without a break of that which precedes it, while they fail to point out any marks of later date in the language of this portion; and it cannot be questioned that the writer records it as a historical fact. Even if the legendary theory were admissible, there is no doubt of the fact that Ammon and Moab sprang from Lot. It is affirmed in the statements of Deut. ii, 9 and 19, as well as in the later document of Psa. xxxiii, 8, which Ewald ascribes to the time when Nehemiah and his newly-returned colony were suffering from the attacks and obstructions of Tobiah the Ammonite and Sanballat the Horonite (Ewald, *Dichter*, Psa. lxxxiii).

This circumstance is the last which the Scripture records of the history of Lot, and the time and place of his death are unknown. A traditional respect has been shown to his memory (also that of his wife, who is called *Edith*, עִידִית [one of his daughters being called Plutith, פְּלוּטִית], in the tract *Pirke Elieser*, ch. xxv) by the Talmudists (see Otho's *Lex. Rabb.* p. 389) and Arabs (see Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* ii, 495); and the Mohammedans still point out his grave in the village of Beni-Nain, east of Hebron (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 187). For the pretty legend of the repentance of Lot, and of the tree that he planted, which, being cut down for use in the building of the Temple, was afterwards employed for the cross, see Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* p. 428–431. The Mohammedan traditions of Lot are contained in the Koran, chiefly in chap. vii and xi; others are given by D'Herbelot (s. v. Loth). According to these statements, he was sent to the inhabitants of the five cities as a preacher, to warn them against the unnatural and horrible sins which they practiced—sins which Mohammed is continually denouncing, but with less success than that of drunkenness, since the former is perhaps the most common, the latter the rarest vice of Eastern cities. From Lot's connection with the inhabitants of Sodom, his name is now given not only to the vice in question (Freytag, *Lexicon*, iv, 136 a), but also to the people of the five cities themselves—the *Lothi*, or *Kaûm Loth*. The local name of the Dead Sea is *Bahr Lût*—Sea of Lot. See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* ii, 185 sq.; Blaufurs, *Le Loti hospitalitate* (Jena, 1751); Körner, *De indole generorum Lothi* (Weissenf. 1755); Seidenstrücker, in the *Schleswig Journal*, 1792, vol. vi, and in Hencke's *Magaz.* iii, 67 sq.; Bauer, *Mythol. d. Hebr.* i, 238 sq.; Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.

Lo'tan (Heb. *Lotan'*, לוֹטָן, *coverer;* Sept. Λωτάν), the first-named of the sons of Seir, the Horite, and a petty prince of Idumæa prior to the supremacy of the Esauites (Gen. xxxvi, 20, 29; 1 Chron. i, 38). His sons are mentioned as being Hori and Hemam or Homam, and his sister as being named Timna (Gen. xxxvi, 22; 1 Chron. i, 39), by which latter he was allied to Esau's oldest son (Gen. xxxvi, 12). B.C. cir. 1927.

Lothaire OF LORRAINE. See HINCMAR; NICHOLAS I (*pope*).

Lothaire I. See LOUIS LE DÉBONNAIRE; PASCHAL I (*pope*).

Lothaire II, sometimes called LOTHAIRE OF SAXONY, succeeded Henry V as emperor of Germany in 1125. Lothaire was born in 1075, and was the son of Gebhard, count of Arnsberg. He is noted in Church history for the part he took in the struggle against Innocent II, whom he installed in Rome in 1136, a service for which he was rewarded by the papal incumbent with coronation at Rome (comp. the comments on this act by Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* p. 37, note). He died in 1137.—Jaffe, *Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter Lothar von Sachsen* (1843). See INNOCENT II.

Lothasu'bus (Λωθάσουβος, Vulg. *Abusthas* v. r. *Sabus*), one of the supporters of Esdras as he read the law (1 Esd. ix, 44); evidently the HASHUM (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Neh. vii, 22).

Lots, Feast of. See PURIM.

Lot's Wife. See LOT.

Lotto, LORENZO, a celebrated Venetian painter of the 16th century, is supposed by some to have been a native of Bergamo, but by others a native of Venice. Lotto lived, besides, at Bergamo, also some time at Trevigi, at Recanati, and at Loretto, where he died. His works range from 1513 to 1554. Lanzi ventures an opinion that Lotto's best works could scarcely be surpassed by Raffaelle or by Correggio, if treating the same subject. His masterpieces are the Madonnas of St. Bartolomeo and Santo Spirito, at Bergamo.

Lotus. See LILY.

Loudun, CONVENT OF. See GRANDIER.

Louis (or LUIS) OF GRANADA, a Spanish ascetic, theologian, and writer, was born at Granada in 1504. In 1524 he joined the Dominicans, in the convent of

Santa Cruz of Granada. In 1529 he was, on account of his great reputation, transferred to the convent of St. Gregory at Valladolid, where he attracted much attention by his preaching. He was afterwards recalled to Granada, to reform the convent of Scala Cœli, in the Sierra de Cordova. In the solitude of this convent he composed a number of religious works. He next went to Cordova as preacher, and became acquainted with John of Avila (q. v.), who acquired great influence over him. After spending eight years in Cordova, Louis went to Badajoz, where he founded a convent, of which he was the first abbot. Cardinal Henry, infant of Spain and archbishop of Ebora, desiring to avail himself of Louis's talents, attached him to his diocese. The queen of Portugal vainly offered to make him bishop of Viseu, and afterwards metropolitan of Braga; he accepted no office whatever, except that of provincial of his order in Portugal, which he held for some years. He finally retired into the convent of Santa Domingo of Lisbon, and devoted the remainder of his life to pastoral duties and to writing religious works. He died Dec. 31, 1588. His works, a large number of which were translated into French, Italian, and German, are very numerous; among them the most important are, *Memorial de la vida Christiana* (Salamanca, 1566, 2 vols. 8vo; Barcelona, 1614, fol.):—*Simbolo de la Fé* (Salamanca, 1582, fol.; often reprinted and translated):—*Guida de Pecadores* (Salamanca, 1570, 8vo):—*Compendio de la dottrina Christiana* (Lisbon, 1564; Madrid, 1595, 4to):—*Institucion y regla de bien vivir para los que empiecan a servir a Dios* (Barcelona, 1566, 8vo; Madrid, 1616):—*Libro de la Oracion y Meditacion* (Salamanca, 1567, 8vo):—*Collectanea moralis Philosophiæ* (Lisbon, 1571, 3 vols. 8vo; Paris, 1582; and under the title *Loci communes Philosophiæ moralis*, Cologne, 1604):—*Rhetorica ecclesiastica* (Lisbon, 1576, 4to), etc.; and a number of sermons. See Louis Munos, *La Vida y Virtudes de Luiz de Grenada* (Madrid, 1639, 4to); N. Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana*, iv; Quetil and Echard, *Scriptores ordines Prædicatorum*, ii; Tournon, *Hommes illustres de l'ordre de Saint-Dominique*.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 516; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 1034 sq. (J. N. P.)

Louis I (German *Ludwig*, Latin *Ludovicus*), called "*Le Débonnaire*," and also "*the Pious*," youngest son of Charlemagne, was born at Casseneuil A.D. 778. The great empire of the West had just been recreated by the heroic efforts of Charles, therefore honored with the title of "the Great;" but it was not absolutely the love of war and conquest, and the honor of his name, that had actuated Charles; he rather sought to accomplish what the great Ostrogoth Theodoric (q. v.) had contemplated, but failed to effect, viz., *the union of the Christian Germanic nations into one empire*. Charlemagne, it must be remembered, was eminently "a champion of the Church," and, believing that the conversion of the Saxons and other Germanic tribes could be accomplished only by their subjection, he came to dream of a union of them all under one imperial head, and gratefully he accepted the result in his own coronation as "Charles Augustus" by pope Leo III, A.D. 800. See Charlemagne. But Charlemagne still believed in the independence of the imperial crown from the papal chair, and manifestly evinced this by one of his latest acts. As early as 806 he had made provision for his successors by apportioning to his three sons different parts of his possessions. To Pepin he gave Italy, to Louis, Aquitaine, and to Charles the remainder, consisting chiefly of German countries; but when, by the decease of two of these, he saw that upon Louis only would centre all the responsibility of an imperial crown, he called him to his side in 813, when feeling his own end approaching, and at Aix-la-Chapelle, on a Sunday, when in the cathedral together, caused Louis to place the golden crown upon his head, and, thus crowned, presented his son as the future king of all the Franks, without first awaiting the anointment of the pope. Not so independent was our Louis, who, in the year following the event just recorded, by the death of Charlemagne, became sole emperor of the West and king of France. Thus far the race of the Carlovingians had produced consecutively four great men—a rare occurrence in history. With Louis I opened a new æra; for, though his personal appearance was by no means insignificant, being of a prepossessing countenance and of a strong frame, and so well practiced in archery and the wielding of the lance that none about him equalled him, "he was weak in mind and will, and his surname 'the Pious' implies not only that he was religious, but principally that he was so easy tempered that it required much to displease him." Or, as Milman puts it: "In his gentler and less resolute character religion wrought with an abasing and enfeebling rather than ennobling influence" (*Latin Christianity*, ii, 514). A ruler of this description was not likely to hold in union the vast empire of Charlemagne. His first troubles arose with Bernard, son of Pepin, whom Charlemagne, on the decease of his eldest son, had made king of the Italian possessions. Bernard's ambition soared higher. He was not content with Italy; he desired the mastery over the whole of the imperial lands, and ungratefully conspired against his uncle. He was unsuccessful, however; was seized by the imperial troops, and condemned to death. Louis was determined to mitigate the lot of Bernard, but state interests compelled him to inflict the severe punishment of depriving his nephew of eyesight, which was the cause shortly after, no doubt, of his death. This conspiracy, as well as sundry other occurrences, made Louis feel the necessity of provisions for the succession, and, finally deciding in favor of the principle of primogeniture, his son Lothaire was appointed successor. Besides Lothaire, Louis had two sons, Pepin and Louis. To the former of these two he gave Aquitania; to the latter Bavaria, Bohemia, and Carinthia. Unfortunately, however, for the peace of the family, Louis lost his faithful companion, the mother of these children, shortly after this partition of his possessions, and, marrying a second wife, became the father of a fourth son, Charles, whose mother, Judith, conspired in his behalf for a portion of the imperial crown. This resulted in 830 in a revolt of Lothaire against his father, on the plea of the bad conduct of the step-mother. At a diet, however, which was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, the father and son were reconciled. Not so happily ended a second revolt in 833, when Louis, forsaken by his followers, was obliged to give himself up to his son Lothaire, who took him as prisoner to Soissons, sent the empress Judith to Tortona, and confined her infant son Charles, afterwards Charles the Bald, the object of the jealousy of his half-brothers, in a monastery. A meeting of bishops was held at Compiègne, at which the archbishop of Rheims presided, and the unfortunate Louis, being arraigned before it, was found guilty of the murder of his nephew Bernard, and of sundry other offences. He was deposed, condemned to do public penance in sackcloth, and was kept in confinement. This misusage of the emperor enraged the youngest son, Louis of Bavaria (840-876), "an energetic prince, of lofty stature and noble figure, with a fiery eye and a penetrating mind," and, after securing the assistance of his other brother, Pepin, in the following year, he obliged Lothaire to deliver up their father, who, after having been formally absolved by the bishops, was reinstated on the imperial throne. Not made wiser by past experience, Louis, listening to the selfish counsel of his wife, Judith, now assigned to his fourth son, Charles, the kingdom of Neustria, or Eastern France, including Paris, and, after Pepin's death, Aquitania also. Lothaire possessed all Italy, with Provence, Lyons, Suabia, Austrasia, and Saxony. But Louis of Bavaria, who had done most for his father, was favored least, and therefore set up his claim for all Germany as far as the Rhine, and, being refused, determined to make war against his father, and invaded Suabia. The emperor Louis marched against him, and also assembled a diet at Worms to judge his rebellious son. Mean-

time, however, the emperor fell ill, and died on an island of the Rhine near Mentz, in June, 840, after sending to his son Lothaire the imperial crown, his sword, and his sceptre. Of what account this last act of Louis was may be inferred from the partition of the dominion. Lothaire, as emperor, held Italy, Provence, Burgundy, and Lorraine. Charles the Bald succeeded his father as king of France, and Louis of Bavaria retained all Germany. Thus ends the history of this man, whose life, notwithstanding his kind disposition, was "one continued scene of trouble and affliction, because he knew not how to govern his own house, much less his empire."

Of a prince so feeble and dependent as Louis proved himself in the affairs of state, we cannot, of course, expect the same vigor and determination towards the papacy that characterized the reign of Charlemagne, and it may be safely said that with the death of the latter a new æra opens in the history of the Latin Church. Charlemagne had proved an earnest supporter of the Church and the papacy, but he had known how to oppose their pretensions. Not so Louis. His feebleness and incapacity to govern gave rise to many abuses, or gave new life to such as had before been successfully repressed. The whole reign of Louis, indeed, abounded in political disorders. "Distraction and weakness," says Neander (*Ch. Hist.* iii, 351), "gave many opportunities for the Church to interfere in the political strifes," and for it the Church had been anxiously but patiently in waiting. With the coronation of Charlemagne the pope of Rome had transferred his allegiance from the East to the West, and thus, by his action, had not only conferred a most doubtful title on Charlemagne, but secured at the same time a political ascendency of the papacy. Under Charlemagne, however, the thunders of the Church were controlled by the emperor; but in Louis "the Pious" was found a willing slave, and with rapid strides the Romish Church marched onward to establish its *superiority* over the empire. See PAPACY. What Louis would do for the Church was clearly seen in his *submissive* acts—the master of Europe in 822 a penitent before the prelates assembled at the Council of Attigny. Here the triumphs of the spiritual power, under the auspices of a rapid progress towards domination, were plainly foreshadowed. The hierarchy failed not to discover the hour of Louis's weakness, and day by day new laws were proposed and enacted, the ecclesiastical fabric enlarged and strengthened, the power of the secular authority enfeebled and abrogated. Prominent among the ecclesiastics who influenced the king to favor the Church and her institutions was Wala, abbot of Corbie. What Wala (q. v.) advised was worthy of adoption, and he had no sooner made his proposals than they became law. Thus the granting of monasteries to laymen, and grants of Church property at pleasure to the vassals of the crown without consent of the bishops, were abrogated, virtually making the bishops co-legislators; and by 829 the ecclesiastic royal counsellor hesitated not to declare that "everything depended on keeping the line of demarcation clearly drawn between the ecclesiastical and the civil province, the king and the bishops concerning themselves only about the affairs which belonged to their respective callings." Unfortunately, however, the concessions which the king was daily making to the clergy gave to the bishops much of the business strictly belonging to the secular authority, and "the scope and the danger of the authority thus successively conferred upon the Church were most impressively manifested when Louis was deposed by his sons (in 833), . . . and Lothaire determined to render impossible the restoration of his father to the throne. . . . The people had been invited by Louis himself, eleven years before, at Attigny, to see the bishops sit in judgment on their monarch; and the *decretals* (q. v.) of Siricius and Leo I, forbidding secular employment and the bearing of arms by any one who had undergone public penance, were not so entirely forgotten but that they might be revived. Accordingly, when Lothaire returned to France, dragging his captive father in his train, he halted at Compiègne, and summoned a council of his prelates to accomplish the work from which his savage nobles shrunk. With unfaltering willingness they undertook the odious task, declaring their competency through the power to bind and to loose conferred upon their order as the vicars of Christ and the turnkeys of heaven. They held the wretched prisoner accountable for all the evils which the empire had suffered since the death of Charlemagne, and summoned him at least to save his soul by prompt confession and penitence, now that his earthly dignity was lost beyond redemption. . . . With that overflowing hypocritical unction which is the most disgusting exhibition of clerical craft, the bishops labored with him for his own salvation, until, overcome by their eloquent exhortations, he threw himself at their feet, begged the pardon of his sons, and implored their prayers in his behalf, and eagerly demanded the imposition of such penance as would merit absolution. The request was not denied. In the church of St. Mary, before the tombs of the holy St. Medard and St. Sebastian, the discrowned monarch was brought into the presence of his son, and surrounded by a gaping crowd. There he threw himself upon a sackcloth, and four times confessed his sins with abundant tears, accusing himself of offending God, scandalizing the Church, and bringing destruction upon his people, for the expiation of which he demanded penance and absolution by the imposition of those holy hands to which had been confided the power to bind and to loose. Then, handing his written confession to the bishops, he took off sword and belt, and laid them at the foot of the altar, where his confession had already been placed. Throwing off his secular garments, he put on the white robe of the penitent, and accepted from his ghostly advisers a penance which should inhibit him during life from again bearing arms. The world, however, was not as yet quite prepared for this spectacle of priestly arrogance and royal degradation. The disgust which it excited hastened a counter-revolution; and when Louis was restored to the throne, Ebbo of Rheims and St. Agobard of Lyons, the leaders in the solemn pantomime, were promptly punished and degraded. Yet the piety of Louis held that the very sentence for the imposition of which they incurred the penalty was valid until abrogated by equal authority, and accordingly he caused himself to be formally reconciled to the Church before the altar of St. Denis, and abstained from resuming his sword until it was again belted on him by the hand of a bishop" (Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* p. 319–321). "These melancholy scenes," says Milman (*Lat. Christianity*, bk. v, ch. ii), "concern Christian history no further than as displaying the growing power of the clergy, the religion of Louis gradually quailing into abject superstition, the strange fusion and incorporation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs." For six years more Louis the Pious swayed the sceptre of the Carlovingian empire, but he did it without power—a tool in the hands of contending factions, which at his death took up arms in open warfare, and continued their contest until Lothaire had been defeated on the field of Fontenay, and peace restored by the division of the empire at Verdun. But what is most eventful about these transactions in the life and reign of Louis the Pious, and leads us to assign them such prominence here, is the part which the clergy played in arranging, conducting, and accomplishing them, and thus bringing them under the sanction of religion. This circumstance alone is enough to show how the power of the Church was growing. But there was another and more important circumstance that still more clearly indicates it. Stephen IV had died, and a successor had been chosen who assumed the responsibility of the papal chair as Paschal I. Instead of waiting for his confirmation by Louis, he took immediate possession of the high dignity conferred upon him by the Church, and thus inaugurated the principle of independence of the pope from the emperor. It is true a deprecatory epistle was

prudently dispatched from Rome, but the same liberty was taken by his successor Eugenius II, who contented himself with sending a legate to apprise the emperor of his accession, instead of awaiting the imperial sanction to the election; and though the Romans were afterwards obliged to bind themselves by oath never to consent to the installation of a pope elect until the sanction of the emperor had reached Rome, the effort was unavailing. Events were hurrying on destined to render all such measures futile, and to accomplish the revolution of European institutions, resulting in the power of the priesthood and the irresponsible autocracy of the pope (comp. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* p. 38–42).

In the question of image-worship alone, perhaps, it can be said that Louis played an independent part. It was under his commission that Claudius of Turin labored in the interests of iconoclasm, and it was by his influence, also, that Eugenius II was forced to amity towards the Eastern advocates of iconoclasm. Compare Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. v, chap. ii, A.D. 839, and the articles CLAUDIUS; CLEMENS; ICONOCLASM.

The most celebrated acts in the life of Louis worthy of special record in our work are his efforts to advance the Christian religion by the foundation of two religious institutions, viz., the monastery of Corvey and the archbishopric of Hamburg. The former he built for laborers among the Saxon colony he had caused to settle on the Weser, and it speedily became not only a religious centre, but the best school for education in that country. The latter furthered the missionary cause among the northern nations, especially among the Juts [see JUTLAND], by the zealous labors of Anschar [see ANSCHAR], generally known as the "Apostle of the North" (compare Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, chap. xi). The kind treatment which Louis afforded to the Jews deserves particular mention. He took them under his especial protection, and suffered neither nobles nor clergy to do them harm. In this respect he simply carried out the policy of his father, but he certainly improved their condition during his reign (comp. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, chap. viii; and our article JEWS, vol. iv, p. 908, col. 2). See Funck, *Ludwig der Fromme* (Frkf.-a.-M. 1832); Himly, *Wala et Louis le Débonnaire* (Par. 1849); Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity* (N. Y. 1864, 8 vols. 12mo), ii, bk. iv, chap. xii; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 351 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, ch. iv; Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. v and vi; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, i (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Louis VI, OF THE PALATINATE, was born July 4, 1539, and succeeded his father, Frederick III, in 1576. The late elector had been a strong Calvinist, but Louis VI had imbibed Lutheran principles at the court of Philibert of Bavaria, and gradually introduced them into the country.

Louis VII, OF FRANCE, called "*Le Jeune*," son of Louis le Gros, was born in 1119, and succeeded his father in 1137. By nature of a cruel disposition, he had been especially harsh towards disobedient subjects, and, under the pretence that he must aid the Church to atone for his great sins, he was advised by St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, to go on a crusade. Accordingly, the king set out, at the head of a large army, in 1147. Suger and Raoul, count of Vermandois, Louis's brother-in-law, were left regents of the kingdom. This second crusade proved unsuccessful: the Christians were defeated near Damascus, and Louis, after several narrow escapes, returned to France in 1149. The repudiation of his first wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and his marriage with Constance of Castile, brought on a war with Henry II of England, who had taken Eleanor for his wife. The war was, however, unimportant in its consequences. In Henry's controversy with Thomas à Becket, Louis VII greatly furthered the cause of Becket (comp. Robertson, *Becket* [London, 1859, sm. 8vo], p. 211 sq., 295). He died at Paris in September, 1180. See Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 327 sq.; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. viii, ch. vi and ch. viii. (J. H. W.)

Louis IX (or ST. LOUIS) OF FRANCE (1226–1270), was born in Poissy April 25, 1215, and succeeded his father, Louis VIII, when but twelve years of age, his mother, Blanche de Castile, acting as regent. During the minority of the king there was a constant struggle between the crown and the feudal lords, headed by Thibaut, count of Champagne, and the count of Brittany. Amid these troubles queen Blanche displayed great firmness and ability, and Louis, as soon as he was old enough, by the assistance of those who had remained faithful to the crown, made war against Henry III, king of England, who had supported the French refractory nobles, and beat the English in 1242 at Taillebourg, at Saintes, and at Blaye, but finally made a truce of five years with the English sovereigns, at the same time pardoning also his rebellious nobles. During an illness Louis had made a vow to visit the Holy Land, and in June, 1248, after having appointed his mother regent, he set out for the East with an army of 40,000 men, to conquer the Holy Sepulchre. He landed first in Egypt and took Damietta, but was made prisoner at the battle of Mansoura, and compelled to pay a heavy ransom. He then sailed, with the remainder of his army, now only 6000 strong, to Acre, and carried on the war in Palestine, but without success. After the death of his mother (Nov., 1252), he made preparations for his return to France. At home in 1254, he now applied himself with great diligence to the interests of his realm. It was Louis IX of France that first gave life to Gallicanism by his "Pragmatic Sanction," which he enacted in 1268. See GALLICAN CHURCH. He also published several useful statutes, known as the *Établissements de St. Louis;* established a police in Paris, under the orders of a *prévôt;* organized the various trades into companies called *confrairies;* founded the theological college of *La Sorbonne*, so called after his confessor; created a French navy, and made an advantageous treaty with the king of Aragon, by which the respective limits and jurisdictions of the two states were defined. The chief and almost the only fault of Louis, which was, however, that of his age, was his religious intolerance; he issued oppressive ordinances against the Jews, had a horror of heretics, and used to say "that a layman ought not to dispute with the unbelievers, but strike them with a good sword across the body." By an ordinance he remitted to his Christian subjects the third of the debts they owed to Jews, and this "for the good of his soul." This same spirit of fanaticism led him (in July, 1270) to undertake, against the wishes of his best friends, another crusade — a crusade the most ignoble, and not the least calamitous of all the *crusades* (q. v.). He sailed for Africa, laid siege to Tunis, and, while there, died in his camp of the plague, Aug. 25, 1270. Pope Boniface VIII canonized him in 1297. See *Histoire de St. Louis* (edited by Ducange, with notes, Paris, 1668, folio, English trans.); Petitot, *Collection compl. des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1824); *Dissertations et réflexions sur l'histoire de St. Louis;* Le Nain de Tillemont, *Vie de St. Louis* (ed. J. de Gaulle, Paris, 1846, 5 vols.); H. L. Scholten, *Geschichte Ludwigs IX* (Münster, 1850–1853, 2 vols.); E. Alex. Schmidt, *Gesch. v. Frankreich*, i, 486 sq.; K. Rösen, *Die pragm. Sanktion, welche unter d. Namen Ludwigs IX v. Frankreich auf uns gekommen ist* (Munich, 1853); Neander, *Church Hist.* iv, 203 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 618 sq.; and the works already cited in the article GALLICAN CHURCH. See also PAPACY.

Louis XIV OF FRANCE, grandson of Henry IV, and third of the Bourbons, was born in 1638. The regency of his mother, Anne of Austria, controlled by cardinal Mazarin (q. v.), continued during the minority of the sovereign. So far, indeed, as the policy of Mazarin was concerned, it prevailed until his death in 1661,

when Louis first really assumed for himself the reins of government, and indicated the principles of his administration. During the minority of its youthful sovereign the country had been distracted by civil wars, those of the Fronde, partly through Spanish influences, partly through an unsatisfied and factious element of the French nobility. Perplexing difficulties, moreover, and even actual conflicts of the regent and her minister with the Parliament and States General, had more than once arisen, usually terminating, however, in the triumph of the former, Louis himself, in his eighteenth year, dismissing one of these bodies, and forbidding any future exercise of some of its most important functions. The internal difficulties, so far as due to the hostile policy of the Spanish court, were disposed of by the marriage of Louis with the infanta Maria Theresa in 1660, through the skilful management of Mazarin. The effect of these troubles, however, was to shape, to some degree, the policy of Louis, and to enable him to carry it out successfully. That policy was to avoid all conflict of authority by centring all power in the person of the sovereign.

The administration of Louis, extending over a period of great significance in the secular condition and history of Europe, concerns us here in view of its principles and results religiously and ecclesiastically; for, while it may be said that one of the grand objects of this administration was to supersede Austria as the paramount Catholic sovereignty of Europe, it sought this end in connection with the destruction and diminution of Protestantism, not only in France, but elsewhere. To enable us to consider his policy as it affected the religious condition of France and Europe, the course of his civil and military administration must, however, be first examined.

Louis's civil policy — the consolidation of all power in the hands of the sovereign, detaching the crown from its alliance with all the legislative, judicial, and municipal institutions—he himself has best interpreted for us. "The worst calamity which can befall any one of our rank," is his language to the dauphin, "is to be reduced to that subjection in which the monarch is obliged to receive the law from his people. . . . It is the will of God that every subject should yield to his sovereign implicit obedience. . . . I am the state!" These assertions of supreme prerogative are put forth, indeed, in connection with a recognition of accountability to the divine Source from which such powers are derived; but below him there was no accountability, no limitation to the action of his royal vicegerent. Consistently with this theory was the operation of his internal administration. The first and most effective instrument for the carrying out of such policy was a thorough military organization. This was perfected to a degree hitherto unknown, among its new features the most effective to the end proposed being the emanation of all commissions, promotions, and distinctions from the king; doing away altogether with the possibility of the existence of such a balance of power as had previously been maintained, and rendering impossible all limitation of prerogative. The States General—the great central legislative representation of the clergy, nobles, and commons—ceased to exist. The provincial states, having a more limited function of the same nature, shared the same fate. The Parliaments, from registering, protecting, and partly legislative bodies, became simply judicial tribunals to execute, under the forms of law, the decrees of a royal master. That in the thorough working out of this system Louis exhibited rare administrative ability cannot be denied. That he possessed the peculiar capacity of selecting efficient subordinates is no less manifest. That, moreover, under his rule there was a great evolution of administrative, military, and literary capacity is equally undoubted. Not so salutary or favorable were the results, however. Louis's policy eventually broke down the resources of the country; and it set in operation certain tendencies, which only worked themselves out in the crash of the French Revolution.

But this concentration of all power in the person of the sovereign had in view the carrying out of an external as well as an internal policy. "Self-aggrandizement," to use his own words, "is at once the noblest and most agreeable occupation of kings," and this he did not always pursue under the real requirements of truth and right. "In dispensing with the strict observance of treaties, we do not," said he, "violate them; for the language of such instruments is not understood literally; it is conventional phraseology, just as we use complimentary expressions in society." These two sentences are the text, of which the internal policy of Louis may be regarded as constituting the commentary. His reign, counting from the death of Mazarin, was characterized by four great wars, occupying altogether forty-two years, or seven ninths of its continuance. The first of these was his attack upon Spanish Flanders, and this in violation of the treaty of the Pyrenees, made at his marriage, by which all claim of inheritance, in right of his wife, to Spanish territory was solemnly renounced. Out of this contest, at first opposed, but afterwards (1670) assisted by England, for a long time varying in successes, but, on the whole, to the advantage of France, Louis, by the treaty of Nimeguen, 1678, came forth with the possession of a large addition of territory, a part of which was the duchy of Lorraine, and to which he afterwards added Strasburg, then a free German city—possessions which remained a part of France until restored to Germany by the war of 1870. Next, to provoke a war of nine or ten years' duration was his claim for his sister, the duchess of Orleans, to a portion of the Palatinate, enforced by an invasion of the territory in question. To repel this movement the League of Augsburg was formed, consisting of the emperor of Germany, the kings of Spain, Denmark, and Sweden, the duke of Savoy, and eventually of the king of England. This war, characterized by the devastation of the Palatinate and the sack of Heidelberg, terminated with the Peace of Ryswick, 1697, leaving Louis without a navy, his finances embarrassed, his people impoverished, and many of them suffering from actual starvation. But by far the greatest contest was provoked by Louis's claim for his family to the succession of the crown of Spain, for which there were three competitors—Louis, the emperor Leopold, and the elector of Bavaria. Through the influence of the pope and of the Spanish nobility, Louis had succeeded in procuring the succession for his grandson, the duke of Anjou. To this Holland, under threat of invasion, had been forced to accede; and William of England, unable to secure the co-operation of Parliament in the way of resistance, was obliged to pursue the same course. Leopold, however, began hostilities, and in a short time England, Holland, and Denmark united with him in the Second Alliance, and the conflict only ended in 1713 with the Peace of Utrecht, leaving the duke of Anjou upon the throne of Spain, but at the expense to France of the damage and humiliation of many defeats, and the loss of many colonies, besides a distinct provision against the union of France and Spain under the same monarch. During this last contest, moreover, with external enemies, there had been an internal war destroying the national resources, that of the Camisards in the Cevennes, infuriated and maddened by religious persecution into rebellion. See CAMISARDS.

Louis's religious and ecclesiastical policy is exhibited in connection with his treatment of the national Church, and its central head, the papacy; his action with reference to a division of sentiment among different portions of this national Church; and, last of all, in his treatment of his Protestant subjects. As to the national Church, it may be said that he found the machinery of ecclesiastical despotism made to his hands, in the concordat of Leo X and Francis I, already mentioned. His peculiarity consisted in the skill with which such machinery was worked, the thoroughness and extent of its operation. The "liberties of the Gallican Church," which usually meant the liberty of the monarch to con-

trol all temporalities, and to fleece all classes of the beneficed clergy without dividing the wool with the pope, was energetically asserted during the reign of Louis. His effort was to free the national Church from the control of the papacy; through his appointments, to make it subservient to his general policy. His treatment of the pope, especially in connection with the question of the privilege of the French ambassador at Rome, was harsh and overbearing; and although compelled, in 1691, to yield in certain assertions of prerogative, it but slightly affected the exercise of his ecclesiastical supremacy. His bishops were, many of them, learned, able, and eloquent. There was a higher standard, both of literary taste and of ecclesiastical propriety, than in reigns preceding. Their writings constitute this period, in some respects, one of the most brilliant in the history of the Church of France. But these writings contain no vigorous protest against the vices and cruelties of their royal master, and many of them are implicated in the support of his most flagrant cruelties and acts of oppression. It was perfectly understood that no other course would be tolerated. His own account to Massillon of the effect produced upon him by his court preachers will enable us to understand the character of their preaching. "I have heard a great many speakers in my chapel, and I have been very well pleased with *them;* when I hear you, I am *displeased* with *myself*." But the unfavorable testimony of this one faithful witness, and of at least one other not less faithful, Fénelon, could not counteract the flattery of so many others. The difficulty with the Jansenists constitutes, perhaps, one of the most striking illustrations of this despotic policy in ecclesiastical and religious matters. In this contest between Jesuitism and a purer form of Romanism, the pope, and, through the pope and the Jesuits, Louis, became a party. See JANSENIUS.

It is, however, in the course pursued towards his Protestant subjects that the policy of Louis may be recognised; that the ecclesiastical and religious history of his reign has an interest altogether unique and peculiar, namely, the position of the Huguenots and Dissenters, holding, under the law, certain legal privileges—among others, the exercise of freedom, not only of religious opinion, but of worship. The old-fashioned orthodox practice of extermination by fire and sword had been already tried, more than once, without success. At the close of every such unsuccessful effort, terms had been made insuring them conditions of existence. Prior to the Edict of Nantes, such terms constituted rather a truce than a peace; and when the contesting parties had rested a little, the truce ended and the conflict was renewed. This, however, was not the case with the Edict of Nantes, which really constituted a peace, and was more favorable to the Huguenots than any preceding arrangement; and, although containing in it some objectionable features, became to the Protestants the charter of their existence. They and the Catholics, under different ecclesiastical laws, were alike under the law of the land—enjoyed its sanctions, lived under its protection. Louis, whose great doctrine was uniformity and submission in all things, therefore proposed for himself the task, not of violating this great compact with his Protestant subjects, but of doing away with the necessity of its existence by bringing them all within the national Church. Urged forward in this attempt by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, wholly under the control of the Jesuits, and by the latter themselves, on the plea that by such a course he would merit the forgiveness of heaven for the many sins of his youth, especially his illicit connection with Madame de Montespan, two great agencies were immediately set in operation to the attainment of this result—those of bribery and intimidation. Conversions were sought by purchase, or by appeals to the interests or ambition of the parties concerned. Special provision was made for the purchase of such conversions by a fund collected of one third of the profits of all ecclesiastical benefices, and placed in the hands of a Huguenot renegade, to be used for this purpose. The matter went so far that there was a regular scale of prices for converts of different grades, and large successes were published as the result of this mode of operation. To cut off the temptation of relapse, so as to insure the price of a second conversion, an edict was issued condemning all relapsed persons to banishment for life and confiscation of their property. With these efforts, moreover, which only reached the weak and worthless, was combined the other element of harassment and intimidation. Commissions of Romish clergy were instituted, sometimes upon their own motion, sometimes upon popular complaint, and with the well-understood approval of court officials, to investigate the legal titles of churches of the Huguenots, which for the purpose had been called in question. One infelicity in the position of the Protestants, even under the Edict of Nantes, was that which was connected with what may be called the Church territorial system. They were territorially in the dioceses of Romish bishops, in the parish limits of Romish priests, in some indefinite manner regarded as in their pastoral charge, and these annoying questions of Church property could thus be easily started. The result, in many cases where these titles were called in question, was a long, vexatious litigation, ending in the decision that it was imperfect, and that the church building should be shut up and demolished. The decisions of the sovereign were well known, and loyalty, ambition, and interest alike found their expression and exercise through these agencies in the rank of proselytism.

As, however, these proved insufficient to the attainment of the desired end, and the law still guaranteed the legal existence of the as yet unconverted Protestants, more vigorous steps were taken prior to the final one in the direction of annoyance and severity. Without, therefore, revoking the existing law, it was subverted by new edicts of the most vexatious and harassing character. Many of these may be found detailed under the article HUGUENOTS.

There was, however, another form of operation in this effort of exterminating Protestantism by conversion. Human wickedness, in this effort, found out the way to commit a new crime. This new crime, unique and pre-eminent in the achievements of malicious ingenuity, had to be described by a new name, and the world thus heard for the first time of the Dragonnade—the dragooning of people out of one religion into another. The process was that of quartering soldiers—Romanists, of course, the bigotry of the Romanist being combined with the brutality of the soldier—in the families and houses of Protestants. The commanders were instructed to quarter them on Protestant families, and to keep them there until the families were brought over to the Catholic faith, and then to transfer them to others of the same character and for the same object. As the army employed for this purpose was a large one, so whole districts at once were subjected to this intolerable annoyance and oppression. Multitudes, of course, yielded; and where they subsequently recanted their act of weakness, they became subject to banishment and confiscation. The suffering involved may be more easily imagined than described. "The dragoons," says one who passed through it, "fixed their crosses to their musquetoons, so as the more readily to compel their hosts to kiss them; and if the kiss was not given, they drove the crosses against their stomachs and faces. They had as little mercy for the children as for the adults, beating them with these crosses or with the flats of their swords, so violently as not seldom to maim them. The wretches also subjected the women to their barbarities: they whipped them, they disfigured them, they dragged them by the hair through the mud or along the stones. Sometimes they would seize the laborers on the highway, or when following their carts, and drive them to the Romish churches, pricking them like oxen with their own goads to quicken their pace."

If, in any case, these outrages were resisted, and there was anything like a Protestant gathering, the result was a massacre. The mere collection of such population, to indicate that they were not all carried over to the national Church, was thus treated. Upon the assumption, therefore, that these agencies, after having operated for four or five years, had accomplished their intended purpose; that Protestantism, to any calculable degree, had ceased to exist, in 1685 the Edict of Nantes, as no longer of any use or necessity, was abrogated. To proclaim the falsehood and cruelty of this pretence, and the proceedings based upon it, they were followed by enactments against the non-existent Protestantism (see vol. iv, p. 396, col. 1). The only privilege left to the Protestants was the permission of enjoying their religion in private. The non-intent of this concession was best exhibited by the declaration of an ordinance of Louis himself thirty years later (1715), "that every man who had continued to reside in France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had given conclusive proof that he was a Catholic, because only as a Catholic he would have been allowed to dwell there, and, therefore, if any man persisted in Protestantism, he must be treated as a relapsed heretic. In other words, if such a one emigrated in 1685 as a Protestant, he was condemned to the galleys. If he did not, he was regarded as a Catholic, and at any subsequent period could be proceeded against for his Protestantism as a relapsed Catholic."

Within five months after his ordinance against Protestants just mentioned the career of Louis terminated. To use the language of another, "He was an infirm and aged man. He had survived his children and his grandchildren. He had been overwhelmed by the victories of Eugene and Marlborough. He was oppressed with debt. He was hated by the people who had idolized him, and was compelled to listen to the indignant invectives which the whole civilized world poured forth against his blind and inhuman persecutions. He died declaring to his spiritual advisers that, being himself ignorant of ecclesiastical questions, he had acted under their guidance and as their agent in all that he had done against either the Jansenists or the Protestant heretics, and on those his spiritual advisers he devolved the responsibility to the Supreme Judge." There can be no question that in many cases the persecuting policy of Louis was quickened by the influence of Madame de Maintenon and her ecclesiastical advisers; that in many cases his subordinate agents pursued courses of outrage and cruelty exceeding his intentions; that such men as Bossuet, Arnauld, Flechier, and the whole Gallican Church, in approving this policy, identified themselves with it in its guilt and in its consequences; but, after all, it was essentially his policy. It was the carrying out in ecclesiastical the autocratic principle enunciated with reference to civil matters. The concentration of all power in the hands of the sovereign required that he should be not only the State, but the Church.

Louis dying Sept. 1, 1715, was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV. His son the dauphin and his eldest grandson died at an earlier period. Some of his children, the fruit of an adulterous connection with Madame de Montespan, were legitimized during his lifetime, but the act was annulled after his death. In regard to other children from similar connections no such action was taken. After the death of his first wife he privately married Madame de Maintenon. The works of Louis are contained in six volumes. They are occupied with instructions for his sons, and with correspondence bearing upon the history of his times. His reign may be regarded as one of the most brilliant in the annals of French literature. In the department of theological and controversial literature this was peculiarly the case, while in that of pulpit eloquence there was an array of talent and genius beyond parallel.

Literature.—Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV;* Pellisson, *Histoire de Louis XIV;* Dangeau, *Journ. de la cour de Louis XIV; Lettres de Madame de Maintenon;* Larrey, *Hist. de France sous le Règne de Louis XIV;* Capefigue, *Louis XIV son Gouvernement,* etc. (1837, 6 vols. 8vo), James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV* (Bohn's ed., Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 12mo); Smedley, *Hist. Ref. Rel. in France* (N. Y. 1834, 3 vols. 18mo), Barnes's Felice, *Hist. Protest. France* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch.* v, 86 sq.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. Engl.* (Ch. of Restoration, see Index in vol. ii); Hase, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. Papacy,* ii, 272 sq., 293; *Student's France* (Harper's), p. 410 sq.; Vehse, *Mem. of the Court of Austria,* ii, 14 sq.; *Quart. Rev.* (Lond.), 1818 (July); *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 470 sq. See also the references in the articles FRANCE and HUGUENOTS. (C. W.)

Louse. See LICE.

Louvard, FRANÇOIS, a French Jansenistic theologian of the Benedictine order, was born in Champgeneteux in 1661, entered the convent of Saint Melaine, in Brittany, in 1679, and studied sacred and profane literature. In 1700 he was transferred to the convent of St. Denis, near Paris, to devote himself to the study of the text of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In 1713 pope Clement XI published the memorable bull "Unigenitus." The ecclesiastics of St. Maur all silently opposed it except Louvard, who openly denounced it, and was therefore greatly censured by P. le Tellier as one disobeying the apostolic decrees. He was exiled to Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, but here also he frankly pronounced his opposition to the bull, and he was sent into confinement in the monastery of Landevence, in Brittany. In 1715, on the death of Louis XIV, Louvard was restored to the monastery of St. Denis. In 1717, several bishops and two monks, one of them Louvard, called a meeting of the opponents of the bull, and became so troublesome even to the government that Louis XV exiled some of them, and published an edict that whosoever recommenced the controversy should be treated as a rebel to the public peace. Louvard protested. He had been the first of his order to oppose the bull; now, almost all the Benedictines were on his side; and, receiving no reply, he renewed his appeal with the four bishops in 1720. On complaint to the general of the order Louvard was specially interrogated, and, being found thoroughly bent on both present and future opposition, he was exiled to Tuffé. Here he wrote new polemics, preached, and taught the simple inhabitants that there was a difference between the holy religion of P. Quesnel and the manufactured heresies of the disciples of Loyola. In 1723 he was transferred to Cormori, diocese of Tours. Here he continued proselyting. The general of his order offered to forgive him all the past if he would cease. He refused, and had to be placed in the monastery of St. Laumer, at Blois; but, still continuing his opposition, he was removed to the monastery of St. Gildas de Bois, in Brittany. Louvard persisting in his attacks on the Jesuits, the latter brought charges against him as plotting against the state, and he was imprisoned in the castle of Nantes in 1728. Here he published a manifest against his accusers, and was therefore transferred to the Bastile in the same year. In 1734 a *lettre de cachet,* signed by the king, transferred him to the monastery of Rabais, diocese of Meaux. But Louvard, continuing in his former course, was to be rearrested. Apprised of this, he made his escape to the Carthusian monastery of Schonau, in Holland, where he died in April, 1739. Among his numerous works the following are of special importance: *Lettre contenant quelques Remarques sur les Œuvres de St. Grégoire de Nazianze,* in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres,* vol. xxxiii (1704):—*Prospectus novæ editionis operum S. Gregorii* (1708):—*Œuvres de St. Grégoire* (1778–1840):—*De la Nécessité de l'Appel des églises de France au futur Concile général* (1717):—*Lettre au Cardinal de Noailles, pour prouver à cette éminence que la constitution Unigenitus n'est recevable en aucune façon* (1718):—*Relation abrégée de l'Imprisonnement de dom Louvard* (1728). See D. Tassin, *Hist. Littér. de la Congrégation*

de St. Maur; D. Clemencet, *Preface de l'Édition des Œuvres du St. Grégoire de Nazianze;* B. Harèau, *Hist. Littér. du Maine*, ii, 175; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 28 sq.

Love (prop. אַהֲבָה, *ἀγάπη*) is an attachment of the affections to any object, accompanied with an ardent desire to promote its happiness: 1, by abstaining from all that could prove injurious to it; 2, by doing all that can promote its welfare, comfort, or interests, whether it is indifferent to these efforts, or whether it appreciates them. This is what Kant calls *practical* love, in contradistinction from *pathological* love, which is a sort of sensual self-love, and a desire for community in compliance with our own feelings. In reality, love is something *personal*, emanating from a personal being and directed towards another, and thus its moral or immoral character is determined by the fact of its being called forth by the real worth of the personality towards which it is directed, or by the physical appearance of the latter, or by the advantages it may offer.

In the Christian sense, as we find it spoken of in the Word of God, love is not merely a peculiar disposition of the feelings, or a direction of the will of the creature, though this also must have its root in the creative principle, in God. God is love, the original, absolute love (1 John iv, 9). As the absolute love, he is at once subject and object, i. e. he originally loved himself, had communion with himself, imparted himself to himself, as also we see mention made of God's love before the creation of the world, the love of the Father towards the Son (John xvii, 24). Derived from this love is the love which calls into being and preserves his creatures. Creatures, that is, existences which come from God, are through him and for him; not having life by themselves, but immediately dependent upon God; existing by his will, and consequently to be destroyed at his will; created in time, and consequently subject to time, developing themselves in it to the full extent of their nature according to God's thoughts, with the possibility of departing therefrom, which it were impossible to suppose of God, the eternally real and active idea of himself. In regard to the creature, the divine love is the will of God to communicate to it the fulness of his life, and even the will to impart, according to its receptive faculty, this fulness into something which is not himself, yet which, as coming from God, tends also towards God, and finds its rest in him, and its happiness in doing his will. But, as emanating from an active God, this love, with all its fulness, can only be directed towards a similarly organized and consequently personal creature, conscious of its relation to God and of himself as its end, possessing in itself the fulness of created life (microcosm).

It must, then, be man towards whom this divine love is directed as the object of God's delight, created after his image. This love is manifested in the earnestness of the discipline (commands and threats, Gen. ii, 17) employed to strengthen this resemblance to God, to educate man as a ruler by obedience, as also by the intercourse of God with man; and, after the fall, by the hope and confidence awakening promises, as well as in the humiliating condemnation to pain, labor, and death. All these contain evidences of love, of this will of God to hold man in his communion, or to restore him to it. At the bottom of it lies an appreciation of his worth, namely, of his inalienable resemblance to God, of the imparted divine breath. This appreciation is also the foundation of compassionate love, for it is only on this ground that man is worthy of the divine affection. But it is also the ground which renders him deserving of punishment. For punishment, this destiny of evil, which is felt as a hinderance of life, is in one respect an expiation, i. e. a retrieving of God's honor, being incurred by that disregard of the value of this communion with God, and consequently of the real life, which must be considered as injurious to the life of man, and leading him to ruin; on the other hand, it is inducement to conversion, as this consequence of sin leads man to recognise the restoration of this disturbed relation to God as the one thing needful and desirable. Punishment consequently proceeds in both cases on the assumption of the worth of man in the eye of God, and is a proof of it. Hence the anger of God, as manifested by these punishments, is but another form of his love. It is a reaction of rejected love which manifests itself in imparting suffering and pain on the one who rejects it, proving thereby that its rejection is not a matter of indifference to it. This love may not be apparent at first sight, but it is clearly revealed in God's conduct towards all mankind, as well towards the heathen as towards the chosen people. God allowed the heathen to walk in their own ways (Acts xiv, 17); he allows them to fall into all manner of evil (Rom. i, 21 sq.) in order to bring them to a sense of their misery and helplessness as well as of their guilt. But at the bottom of this anger there is still love, and this is clearly shown in the fact that he manifested himself to them in their conscience, and also took care of them (Acts xiv, 17; xvii, 25 sq.). But, if this love is thus evinced towards the heathen, it is still more clearly manifested towards the chosen people, the fact of their choice being itself a manifestation of that love (Deut. vii, 6 sq.), which is further shown both in the blessings and punishments, the anger and the mercy, of which they were the objects. Holiness and mercy are the chief characteristics of the divine love as manifested towards Israel; the one raising them above their weaknesses, their evils, and their sins; the other understanding these failings, and seeking to deliver and restore them. But in both also is manifested the constancy of that love, its faithfulness; and the exactitude with which it adheres to the covenant it had itself made evinces its righteousness by saving those who fear God and obey his commandments. Both holiness and mercy are, for the moral, religious consciousness, harmonized in the expiatory sacrifice, in a figurative, typical manner in the O. T., and in a real, absolute manner in the N. T. The divine right in regard to fallen humanity is maintained, the death penalty is paid, but in such a manner that the chief of all, the divine Son of man, who is also Son of God, suffers it for all, of his own free will, and out of love to man, in accordance with the wishes of his Father. Thus the curse of sin and death is removed from humanity, and the possibility of a new existence of righteousness and felicity restored.

The New Covenant is therefore the full revelation of the spirit and object of the divine love. The incarnation of the Son of God is the revelation of God himself, and leads to his self-impartation by the Holy Spirit. Hence the eternal love discloses itself as being, in its inner nature, the love of the Father for the Son, and of the Son for the Father by the Holy Ghost, which proceeds from both, and is the fulness of the love that unites them, whence we can say that God is love; as also, in its manifestation, it is the divine love towards fallen creatures, which is the will to restore their perfect communion with God by means of the all-sufficient expiatory sacrifice of the God-man, and the communication of the Holy Spirit, by which both the Father and the Son come to dwell in the hearts of men, thus forming a people of God's own, as was postulated, but not yet realized in the O. T. The love of God in man, therefore, is the consciousness of being loved by God (Rom. v, 5), resulting in a powerful impulse of love towards the God who has loved us first in Christ (1 John iv, 19), and an inward and strong affection towards all who are loved by God in Christ (1 John iv, 11); for the divine love, even when dwelling in man, remains all-embracing. This love takes the form of a duty (1 John iv, 11), but at the same time becomes a gradually strengthening inclination. And this is the completion or the ripening of the divine love in man (*ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται*), that it manifests itself in positive results for the advantage of others.

We find the beginning and examples of this love un-

der the old dispensation where mention is made of desire after God, joy in him, eagerness to serve him, zeal in doing everything to please and honor him. The inclination towards those who belong to God, the holy communion of love in God, that characteristic feature of the N. T., is also foreshadowed in the O. T. by the people of God, who are regarded as one in respect to him, and whose close, absolute communion with God is represented by the image of marriage. This image is still repeated in the N. T., nevertheless in such a manner that the union is represented as not yet accomplished; for, though Christ is designated as the bridegroom and the Church as the bride, the wedding is made to coincide with the establishment of his kingdom. Thus considered, the love of God and the furtherance of the love of God are still a figurative expression. God wants the whole heart of his people: one love, one sacrifice, exclusively directed towards him, so that none other should exist beside it; and that all inclinations of love towards any creature should be comprised in it, derived from it, and return to it. On this account his love is called jealous, and he is said to be a jealous God. This jealousy of God, however, this decided requiring of an exclusive submission on the part of his people, is, on the other hand, the tenderest carefulness for their welfare, their honor, and their restoration. The close connection, indeed the unity of both, is evident. The effect of this jealousy of God is to kindle zeal in those who serve him, and consequently opposition against all that opposes, or even does not conduce to his service. This is a manifestation of love towards God, which love is essentially a return of his own love, and consequently gratitude, accompanied by the highest appreciation, and an earnest desire for communion with him. It includes joy in all that serves God, absolute submission to him, and a desire to do everything for his glory. The love in God, i. e. the love of those who feel themselves bound together by that common bond, is essentially of the same character; but, from the fact of its being directed towards creatures who are afflicted with many failings and infirmities, must also include—as distinguished from the love towards God—a willingness to forgive, which makes away with all hinderances to full communion, a continual friendliness under all circumstances, consequently patience and gentleness, zeal for their improvement, and sympathy for their failings and misfortunes. But as the love of the creative, redemptive, and sanctifying God, extending further than merely those who have attained to that communion with him, embraces all, so should also the love of those who love God. Yet in the divine love itself there is a distinction made, inasmuch as God's love towards those who love him and keep his commandments is a strengthening, sustaining pleasure in them (John xiv, 21, 23), while his love towards the others is benevolence and pity, which, according to their conduct, the disposition of their hearts, and their receptivity, is either not felt at all by them, or only produces pain, fear, or, again, hope, desire, etc., but not a feeling of complete, abiding joy. So in the love of the children of God towards the human race we find the distinction between brotherly and universal love (Rom. xii, 10; Heb. xiii, 1; 1 Pet. i, 22; 2 Pet. i, 7). In both we find the characteristics of kindness and benevolence, sympathy, willingness to help, gentleness, and patience; but in the universal love there is wanting the feeling of delight, of an equal aim, a complete reciprocity, of conscious unity in the one highest good.

Love also derives a special determination from the personality, the spiritual and essential organization of the one who loves, and also his particular position. It manifests itself in friendship as a powerful attraction, a hearty sympathy of feelings, a strong desire for being together and enjoying a communion of thoughts and feelings. In sexual love it is a tender reciprocal attraction, a satisfaction in each other as the mutual complement of life, and a desire for absolute and lasting community of existence. Parental, filial, and brotherly love can be considered as a branch of this affection. Both friendship and love have the full sanction of Christian morals when based on the love of God. As wedded love is an image of the relation between the Lord and his people, or the Church (Eph. v, 23 sq.), so paternal, filial, and brotherly love are respectively images of the love of God towards his children, of their love towards him, and of their love towards each other. All these relations may want this higher consecration, and yet be well regulated; they have then a moral character. But they may also be disorderly: friendship can be sensual, selfish, and even degenerate into unnatural sexual connection; sexual love may become selfish, having no other object but the gratification of lust; parental love may change to self-love, producing over-indulgence, and fostering the vices of the children; brotherly love can degenerate into flattery and spoiling. Thus this feeling, which in its principle and aim should be the highest and noblest, can become the most common, the worst, and the most unworthy. Both kinds of love are mentioned in Scripture. The highest and purest tendency of the heart is in the Bible designated by the same name as the more natural, immoral, or disorderly tendency. The same was the case among the Greeks and Romans: Ἔρως, *Amor*, and Ἀφροδίτη, *Venus*, had both significations, the noble and the common; but Christianity has in Christ and in his Church the perfect illustration and example of true love, whose absolute type is in the triune life of God himself. This divine love, as it exists in God, and through the divine Spirit in the heart of man, together with the connection of both, is represented to us in Scripture as infinitely deep and pure. We find it thus represented in the Old Testament (see Deut. xxxiii, 3; Isa. xlix, 13 sq.; lvii, 17 sq.; lv, 7 sq.; Jer. xxxi, 20; xxxii, 37 sq.; Ezek. xxxiv, 11 sq.; Hos. iii, 2 sq.; Mic. vii, 18 sq.). Then in the whole mission of Christ, and in what he stated of his own love and of the Father's, see Matt. xi, 28; Luke xv; John iv, 10, 14; vi, 37 sq.; vii, 37 sq.; ix, 4; x, 12 sq.; xii, 35; xiii, 1; xv, 12, 13; xvii; and, for the testimony of the apostles, Rom. v, 5 sq.; viii, 28 sq.; xi, 29 sq.; 1 Cor. xiii; Eph. i, 3, 17 sq.; v, 1 sq.; 1 John iii, 4, etc. These statements are corroborated by the testimony of Christians in all ages, who have all been witness to this love, however much their views may have differed on other points. In later times, ethical essays on the subject have thrown great light on the nature and modes of manifestation of this love; see among them, Daub, *Syst. d. christl. Moral*, ii, 1, p. 310; Marheineke, *Syst. d. theol. Moral*, p. 470; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, ii, 350.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 388 sq. See *Wesleyana*, p. 54.

Love, Christopher, a Presbyterian divine, was born at Cardiff, Wales, in 1618; entered the active work of the ministry in 1644, in London, after which he became a member of the Assembly of Divines. After the death of Charles I, to whom he had previously been opposed, he entered into a plot against Cromwell, for which cause he was executed in August, 1651. Mr. Love was the author of a number of sermons and theological treatises published in 1645–54. As a writer, he was plain, impressive, evangelical. See Wild, *Tragedy of Christopher Love;* Neal, *Puritans*, i, 528; ii, 123 sq.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.;* Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Love, John M., D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Paisley, Scotland, in 1757. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He died in 1825. Dr. Love published in 1796 *Addresses to the People of Otaheite*, republished after his death; also 2 vols. of *Sermons* and *Lectures* in 1829; a vol. of *Letters* in 1838; 34 *Sermons*, preached 1784–5, in 1853. See Chambers and Thomson, *Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, 1855, vol. v; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Love Family. See Familists.

Love-feast. In the article AGAPÈ (q. v.) the subject has been treated so far as it relates to an institution in the early Church. It remains for us here only to speak of the love-feast as observed in some Protestant churches, especially the Methodist connection. In a strictly primitive form, the love-feast is observed by the Moravian Brethren. They celebrate it on various occasions, "generally in connection with a solemn festival or preparatory to the holy communion. Printed odes are often used, prepared expressly for the occasion. In the course of the service a simple meal of biscuit and coffee or tea is served, of which the congregation partake together. In some churches the love-feast concludes with an address by the minister" (E. de Schweinitz, *Moravian Manual* [Philad. 1859, 12mo], p. 161). From the Moravians Wesley borrowed the practice for his own followers, assigning for its introduction into the Methodist economy the following reasons: "In order to increase in them [persons in *bands* (q. v.)] a grateful sense of all his [God's] mercies, I desired that one evening in a quarter all the men in band, on a second all the women, would meet, and on a third both men and women together, that we might together 'eat bread,' as the ancient Christians did, 'with gladness and singleness of heart.' At these love-feasts (so we termed them, retaining the name as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning) our food is only a little plain cake and water; but we seldom return from them without being fed not only with the 'meat which perisheth,' but with 'that which endureth to everlasting life'" (Wesley, *Works*, v, 183). In the Wesleyan Church only members are attendants at love-feasts, and they are appointed by or with the consent of the superintendent (*Minutes*, 1806). Admission itself is gained only by a ticket; and as it frequently happened that members would lend their tickets to strangers, it was enacted in 1808 that "no person who is unwilling to join our society is allowed to attend a love-feast more than once, nor then without a note from the travelling preacher;" . . . . and "that any person who is proved to have lent a society ticket to another who is not in society, for the purpose of deceiving the door-keepers, shall be suspended for three months" (comp. Grindrod, *Laws and Regulations of Wesl. Methodism* [Lond. 1842], p. 180). In the Methodist Episcopal Church the rule also exists that admission to love-feasts is to be had by tickets only (comp. *Discipline*, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 17 [2]), but the rule is rarely, if ever observed, and they are frequently attended by members of the congregation as well as by the members of the Church. By established usage, the presiding elder (and in his absence only the minister in charge) is entitled to preside over the love-feasts, and they are therefore held at the time of the *Quarterly Conference*. See CONFERENCE, METHODIST. The manner in which they are now generally observed among Methodists is as follows: They are opened by the reading of the Scriptures, followed by the singing of a hymn, and then by prayer. During and after the dealing out of the bread and water, the different members of the congregation so disposed relate their Christian experience since the last meeting, etc. This is also the occasion for a report of the prosperity of the Church on the part of the pastor and by rule of Discipline (pt. ii, ch. ii, § 17); for the report of the names of those who have been received into the Church or excluded therefrom during the quarter; also the names of those who have been received or dismissed by certificate, and of those who have died or have withdrawn from the Church.

Among the Baptists, in their missionary churches abroad, they seem to celebrate the real *Agapè*. At Berlin, Prussia, they are held quarterly, and are made the occasion of a general social gathering, substituting coffee and cake for the bread and water; but this practice is by no means general among the communicants of that Church. (J. H. W.)

Love, Virgins of, a female order in the Romish Church, called also *Daughters of Charity* (q. v.), whose office it is to administer assistance and relief to indigent persons confined to their beds by sickness and infirmity. The order was founded by Louisa le Gras, and received, in the year 1660, the approbation of the pope.

Lovejoy, Elijah Parish, a Presbyterian minister, noted for his anti-slavery activity, was the son of the Rev. Daniel Lovejoy, and was born at Albion, Maine, Nov. 9, 1802; graduated at Waterville College, Maine, September, 1826; and taught for a time in St. Louis, Mo. In 1832 he was converted, and united with the Presbyterian Church, and entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. The following spring he obtained license to preach from the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, and began preaching in Newport, R. I., and in New York City. In 1833 he established the *St. Louis Observer*, a weekly religious newspaper, in St. Louis, Mo. In 1836, on account of a bitter dislike for the *Observer's* opposition to slavery and the prevailing principles on divorce, a mob destroyed Mr. Lovejoy's printing-office. The same year he removed to Alton, Ill., where he established and maintained by solicited contributions "The Alton Observer." Continuing in his anti-slavery movements, resolutions were passed against him, and his press was twice destroyed by a pro-slavery mob. While defending a third press near his premises at Alton, he was mortally wounded, Nov. 7, 1837.

Lovejoy, Owen, a Congregational minister, brother of the preceding, was born at Albion, Me., Jan. 6, 1811. From 1836 to 1854 he was minister in charge of a Congregational Church at Princeton, Ill. He was elected a member of Congress by the Republicans of the third district of Illinois in 1856; was re-elected in 1858, 1860, and 1862, and is included among the eminent opponents of the slave power. He died at Brooklyn, New York, March 25, 1864.

Lovejoy, Theodore A., a Methodist preacher, was born at Stratford, Conn., Feb. 18, 1821; was converted in Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1842, and soon after joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1847 he joined the New York East Conference, remaining a faithful and valued member of the same till his death, at Watertown, Conn., June 7, 1867. See W. C. Smith, *Sacred Memories* (New York, 1870), p. 301.

Loveys, JOHN, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Devon County, England, May 7, 1804; was confirmed in the Church of England in his youth; in 1825 was converted, and united with the Wesleyan Methodists; emigrated to America in 1829; spent one year at Cazenovia Seminary, N. Y., and in 1830 entered the Black River Conference. In 1834 he was stationed at Ogdensburg; in 1836 was made presiding elder on Potsdam District; then preached at Oswego (1839), and various other appointments, until his death, Aug. 30, 1849. He was a valuable preacher, clear, original, vigorous, and devout; an "excellent economist," a "diligent student," and a man of large spirit and liberal influence.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 474; *Black River Conference Memorial*, p. 249.

Low Churchmen, a name for persons who, though attached to the system of government maintained in the Church of England, or in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as "the Church," yet consider that the ministrations of other churches are not to be disregarded. See LATITUDINARIANS. The term was primarily applied to those who disapproved of the schism made by the Non-jurors, and who distinguished themselves by their moderation towards Dissenters. See RITUALISM.

Löwe, ben-Bezalel, a rabbi and Jewish teacher of note, was born probably in Posen about 1525. Of his early history but little is authenticated. We find him first occupying a position of influence and prominence at Prague, where he was best known as "the learned Rabbi Löwe," towards the close of the 16th century (1573). Previous to his coming to Prague he had been

rabbi over a congregation in Moravia for some twenty years. In 1583 he was elected chief rabbi of the Jews in the Bohemian capital. In 1592 he became chief rabbi of Posen and Poland; he returned, however, in 1593 to Prague, and there died in 1609. He left nineteen different works, of which several are yet in manuscript in the library of the University of Oxford, England. Besides his great Talmudical knowledge, which made him one of the first authorities of his time, he also enjoyed a great reputation as mathematician and philosopher. He seems to have also possessed great knowledge of astronomy and astrology, the favorite studies of the age. He was befriended by the renowned Tycho Brahe, astronomer at the court of the emperor Rudolph II; and the latter also, it is said, honored the rabbi, and at one time admitted him to a prolonged audience; indeed, it is a well-established fact that his extended knowledge and unblemished character secured for himself and the Jews of his time happier days, and, like a sunbeam in the midst of dark clouds, appears the short period in which he officiated as rabbi in the sad history of the Jewish congregation of Prague. He was opposed to the unscientific manner in which the Talmud was studied, by hunting after imaginary contradictions and difficulties (Pilpul), and he called into existence new societies for a more scientific study of the same. In connection with his son-in-law, rabbi Chayim Wahle, he founded a seminary for Talmudical studies. The rabbi's knowledge of natural philosophy caused him frequently to make experiments, which gave birth to many legends, as the ignorant saw in them the supernatural power of the Cabalist. A Christian Bohemian historian claims for the rabbi the honor of inventing the *camera-obscura*. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 496 sq.; Sekles, *Some Jewish Rabbis* (v), in the *Jewish Messenger* (N. Y. 1871); Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 266 sq. (J. H. W.)

Löwe, Joel, BEN-JEHUDAH LOEB (also called *Bril*, ברר"ל, from the initials בן רבי יהודה לייב, *ben-R. Jehudah Loeb*), a Jewish writer of note, born about 1740, was a distinguished disciple of Moses Mendelssohn, and afterwards, although a Jew, held a professorship in the William's school at Breslau. He died in that city, February 11, 1802. Besides many valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis and literature in the Berlin Magazine for the Advancement of Jewish Scholarship, entitled *Meassef* or *Sammler* (Collector), of which he was at one time also editor, he published (1) *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, with an elaborate Introduction, written conjointly with Wolfssohn, to Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1788; republished in Prague, 1803; Lemberg, 1817): —(2) *Annotations on Ecclesiastes*, also conjointly with Wolfssohn, published with Mendelssohn's commentary on this book, and Friedländers' German translation (Berlin, 1788):—(3) *Commentary on Jonah*, with a German translation (Berl. 1788):—(4) *Commentary on the Psalms*, with an extensive introduction (באור זמירות ישראל עם), containing an elaborate treatise on the musical instruments of the ancient Hebrews, as well as on Hebrew Poetry; published with Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1785–91):—(5) *German Translation and Heb. Commentary on the Sabbatic and Festival Lessons from the Pentateuch and the Prophets* [see HAPHTARAH] (Berl. 1790–91):—(6) *German Translation of the Pentateuch* for beginners, preparatory to Mendelssohn's version (Breslau, 1818):—(7) *Elementary Hebrew Grammar*, entitled עמודי הלשון, according to logical principles, for the use of teachers (Berlin, 1794; republished in Prague, 1803). Of his articles published in quarterlies, the following are the most important: 1. *Notes on Joshua and the Song of Songs*, in Eichhorn's *Allgemeine Bibliothek* (Leips. 1789), ii, 183 sq.:—2. *Treatise on Personification of the Deity and the Sephiroth*, ibid. (Leips. 1793), v, 378 sq. See Fürst, *Biblioth. Hebraica*, ii, 268; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1627 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, s. v.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, xi, 131 sq.

Lowell, Charles, D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister of note, son of judge John Lowell, to whom Massachusetts is indebted for the clause in her Constitution which abolished slavery, was born in Boston Aug. 15, 1782, and was educated first at Andover Academy, and later at Harvard College, class of 1800. After graduation he went abroad, and travelled extensively in the Old World. At Edinburgh he entered the divinity school of the university, and spent there three semesters. On his return home he studied theology with Rev. Dr. Zedekiah Sanger, of South Bridgewater, and Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity at Cambridge, and was ordained pastor over the West Church, in Boston, Jan. 1, 1806. In 1837 his feeble health demanded relief, and the Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol was ordained as his colleague. Dr. Lowell continued his pastoral connection until his death (at Cambridge, January 20, 1861), although he officiated but occasionally. He was remarkable for kindness, integrity, directness and simplicity of character, and was a most zealous and consistent opponent of slavery. As a preacher his popularity was eminent, and he was almost adored by his parishioners. Graceful as an orator, with a voice of uncommon sweetness, he preached with such an ardor and sincerity that he seemed to his hearers to be almost divinely inspired. He published some twenty different discourses, a volume of *Occasional Sermons* (Bost. 1856, 12mo), and a volume of *Practical Sermons* (1856):—*Meditations for the Afflicted, Sick, and Dying;* and *Devotional Exercises for Communicants.* He also contributed largely to the periodical literature of his day. Among his surviving children are Prof. Lowell, the poet; the Rev. Robert Lowell, author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay," a novel of Newfoundland life; and Mrs. Putnam, the well-known writer on Hungarian history. See *Christian Examiner*, 1870, p. 389; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Drake, *Dict. Am. Biog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, s. v.

Lowell, John, an American philanthropist, deserves our notice as the founder (in 1839) of "the Lowell Institute," at an expense of $250,000, to maintain forever in Boston, his native place, annual courses of free lectures on natural and revealed religion, the natural sciences, philology, belles-lettres, and art. Mr. Lowell was born May 11, 1799, and was entered student at Harvard in 1813; but was compelled already, in 1815, by poor health, to seek relief by residence in the East. He died at Bombay March 4, 1836. He was a superior scholar, and possessed one of the best private libraries in America. See *New American Cyclop.* s. v.

Lower Parts OF THE EARTH (תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ), properly *valleys* (Isa. xliv, 23); hence, by extension, *Sheol*, or the under-world, as the place of departed spirits (Psa. lxiii, 9; Eph. iv, 9), and by meton. any hidden place, as the womb (Psa. cxxxix, 15). In the original of Ezek. xxvi, 20; xxxii, 18, 24, the words are transposed, and used in the second sense.

Löwisohn, SALOMON, a Jewish writer of note, and really the first Jew who chronicled the history of his people in the German tongue, was born at Moor, Hungary, in 1789, and was truly a self-made man. Amid the greatest difficulties he acquired an education, and particularly a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew. Possessed of great poetical talent, he wrote מליצת ישורון, a sort of *Ars Poetica* (Vienna, 1816). The first work in which a Jew applied Clio's pencil to the history of the chosen people of God, in a German version, was Löwisohn's *Vorlesungen über die neuere Geschichte der Juden* (Vienna, 1820, 8vo), which starts with their dispersion, and dwells at length on the Talmud and its authors. Unfortunately, however, the young man so well endowed to do this work, so auspiciously began, was brought to an early grave by disappointment in love.

He died of broken heart, in his native place, in 1822. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 453 sq.; *Oriental. Literaturbl.* 1840, col. 10; *Beth El.* 1856, p. 72 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lowman, Abraham, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana County, Pa., in 1835; made an early profession of faith, and joined the Associate Reformed Congregation at Jacksonville, Pa.; entered the Theological Seminary of the First Associate Reformed Synod (class of 1857); was licensed by the Presbytery of Westmoreland, and in 1858 received and accepted a call from the Associate Reformed congregation at Brookville, Pa., but while preparing to enter upon the active duties of this charge he suddenly died, Nov. 27, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1860, p. 159.

Lowman, Moses, a learned English dissenting divine, was born in London in 1680, and was educated at Middle Temple, and subsequently at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1710 he became minister of a Presbyterian congregation at Clapham, Surrey, where he labored until his death in 1752. He was eminently skilled in Jewish antiquities, and is the author of a learned work on the *Civil Government of the Hebrews* (London, 1740, 1745, 1816, 8vo); of a *Paraphrase and Notes of Revelation* (1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo), of which work Doddridge remarked that he had "received more satisfaction from it, in regard to many difficulties in that book, than he ever found elsewhere, or expected to have found at all:"—*Argument from Prophecy in proof that Jesus is the Messiah* (London, 1733, 8vo), which Dr. Leland calls "a valuable book;" and *Rationale of the Ritual of Hebrew Worship* (1748, 1816, 8vo). See *Prot. Diss. Mag.* vol. i and ii; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s. v.

Lowrie, John Marshall, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Pittsburg, Pa., July 16, 1817, and was educated for two years in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. (class of 1840); and then at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. (class of 1842). In April, 1842, he was licensed by Newton Presbytery, and soon after, accepting a call to the churches of Blairstown and Knowlton, in Warren County, N. J., he was ordained and installed by Newton Presbytery Oct. 18, 1843. In 1846 he accepted a call to Wellsville, Ohio; subsequently he removed to Lancaster, Ohio, and thence to Fort Wayne, Ind., where he labored faithfully until his death, Sept. 26, 1867. Dr. Lowrie contributed largely to the press, and wrote many precious gems in poetry and prose; he was a man of more than ordinary gifts, a clear, vigorous intellect, and sound judgment; he excelled in systematic arrangement, clear statement, and forcible argument. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1868, p. 115 sq.

Lowrie, Reuben, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Butler, Pa., Nov. 24, 1827, and was educated at the University of New York City, where for one year he served as tutor; studied theology at Princeton, N. J.; afterwards became principal of a presbyterial academy in Luzerne County, Pa.; was licensed by the Luzerne Presbytery in 1851, at which time he engaged in the work of foreign missions among the Choctaw Indians; in 1853 he was ordained, and April 22 sailed as missionary to Shanghai, China. Here he applied himself to the study of the Chinese language, translated the *Shorter Catechism*, and a *Catechism on the Old-Testament History*, into this dialect; devoted much time to the completion of a *Dictionary of the Four Books*, commenced by his deceased brother; he had also nearly finished a *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* in Chinese when he died, April 26, 1860. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, p. 96.

Lowrie, Walter Macon, a Presbyterian missionary to China, was born in Butler, Pa., in 1819 (?), graduated from Jefferson College in 1837, passed a theological course at Princeton, was ordained by the Second Presbytery of New York, and entered on his ministerial labors. While passing from Shanghai to Ningpo, Aug. 19, 1847, he was thrown overboard by pirates, and drowned at sea, about twelve miles from Chapoo, China. The date of his embarkation from America is not known, but he was in China some time prior to 1842. He was a young man of fine powers and large culture, and promised much for the Church and the world. His piety was of a lofty, self-denying stamp, which made him equal to all obstacles, and his career was opening grandly when thus suddenly called to his reward. He wrote *Letters to Sabbath-school Children:—Land of Sinim, or Exposition of Isaiah xlix* (Phila. 1846, 18mo). A volume of his *Sermons* preached in China was also published (1851, 8vo). See Pierson, *Missionary Memorial*, p. 396; *New York Observer*, Jan. 8, 1848; *Memoirs of W. M. Lowrie* (New York, Carter and Brothers, 1849); *Princeton Review*, xxii, 280.

Low Sunday, the first Sunday after Easter, so called because it was customary to repeat on this day some part of the solemnity which was used on Easter day, whence it took the name of Low Sunday, being celebrated as a feast, but of a *lower degree* than Easter day itself.

Lowth, Robert, D.D., a distinguished English prelate, and son of William Lowth (q. v.), was born at Buriton Nov. 27, 1710. In 1737 he graduated master of arts at Oxford University, and in 1741 was elected professor of poetry in his alma mater. Entering the ecclesiastical order, he was presented with the rectory of Ovington, in Hampshire, in 1744. After a four year's residence on the Continent, he was, on his return in 1750, appointed by bishop Hoadley archdeacon of Winchester, and three years after to the rectory of East Woodhay in Hampshire. It was in this very year that Lowth published his valuable work *De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum, Prælectiones Academicæ* (Oxon. 1753, 4to; 2d edit. with annot. by Michaelis, Götting. 1758; Oxf. 1763; Götting. 1768; Oxford, 1775, 1810; with notes by Rosenmüller, Leips. 1815; and last and best, Oxford, 1821, 8vo). An English translation of the first 18 lectures was prepared by Dr. Dodd for the *Christian Magazine* (1766–67), and of all by Dr. Gregory (Lond. 1787, 1816, 1835, 1839, 1847); a still more desirable English translation was prepared by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1829, 8vo). "In these masterly and classical dissertations," says Ginsburg (in Kitto, *Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, s. v.), "Lowth not only evinces a deep knowledge of the Hebrew language, but philosophically exhibits the true spirit and characteristics of that poetry in which the prophets of the O. T. clothed the lively oracles of God. It does not at all detract from Lowth's merits that both Abrabanel and Azariah de Rossi had pointed out two centuries before him the same features of Hebrew poetry [see Rossi] upon which he expatiates, inasmuch as the enlarged views and the invincible arguments displayed in his handling of the subject are peculiarly his own; and his work is therefore justly regarded as marking a new epoch in the treatment of the Hebrew poetry. The greatest testimony to the extraordinary merits of these lectures is the thorough analysis which the celebrated [Jewish] philosopher Mendelssohn, to whom the Hebrew was almost vernacular, gives of them in the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freien Künste*, vol. i, 1756." In 1751 Lowth received the degree of doctor in divinity from the University of Oxford by diploma. In 1755 he went to Ireland as chaplain to the marquis of Hartington, then appointed lord lieutenant, who nominated him bishop of Limerick, a preferment which he exchanged for a prebend of Durham and the rectory of Sedgefield. In 1766 Dr. Lowth was appointed bishop of St. David's, whence a few months later he was translated to the see of Oxford, and thence, in 1777, he succeeded Dr. Terrick in the diocese of London. In 1778, only one year after his appointment at London, he gave to the public his last and greatest work, *Isaiah: a new Translation, with a preliminary Dissertation, and Notes* (13th

edit. 1842, 8vo). This elegant and beautiful version of the evangelical prophet, of which learned men in every part of Europe have been unanimous in their eulogiums, and which is alone sufficient to transmit his name to posterity, aimed "not only to give an exact and faithful representation of the words and sense of the prophet by adhering closely to the letter of the text, and treading as nearly as may be in his footsteps, but, moreover, to imitate the air and manner of the author, to express the form and fashion of the composition, and to give the English reader some notion of the peculiar turn and cast of the original." In the elaborate and valuable Preliminary Dissertation where bishop Lowth states this, he enters more minutely than in his former production into the form and construction of the poetical compositions of the O. T., lays down principles of criticism for the improvement of all subsequent translations, and frankly alludes to De Rossi's view of Hebrew poetry, which is similar to his own. See Rossi. This masterly work soon obtained a European fame, and was not only rapidly reprinted in England, but was translated into German by professor Koppe, who added some valuable notes to it (Götting. 1779–81, 4 vols. 8vo). It must not, however, be presumed that the work did not meet also with opposition, so far as the views of the author could lead to difference in opinion; and we incline with Dr. G. B. Cheever to the belief that Lowth's "only fault as a sacred critic was a degree of what archbishop Secker denominated the '*rabies emendandi*,' or rage for textual and conjectural emendations. The prevalence of this spirit in his work on Isaiah was the only obstacle that prevented its attaining the name and rank, as classic in sacred literature, which has been accorded to the *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*" (*North Amer. Rev.* xxxi, 376; comp. here Horne, *Bibl. Bib.* 1839, 287). On the death of archbishop Cornwallis, the primacy was offered to Dr. Lowth, a dignity which he declined on account of his advanced age and family afflictions. In 1768 he lost his eldest daughter, and in 1783 his second daughter suddenly expired while presiding at the tea-table; his eldest son was also suddenly cut off in the prime of life. Bishop Lowth himself died Nov. 3, 1787. The other and minor writings of bishop Lowth, consisting of (1) *Tracts*, belonging to his controversy with bishop Warburton (q. v.), to which a trifling difference of opinion on the book of Job gave rise:—(2) *Life of William of Wyckham* (1758):—(3) *Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762). The *Sermons and other Remains of Bishop Lowth* were published with an *Introductory Memoir* by the Rev. Peter Hall, A.M. (London, 1834, 8vo). See *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Bp. Lowth* (Lond. and Götting. 1787, 8vo); *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxix, 765, 992; *Gentl. Magazine*, lvii, lviii, etc.; Kitto, *Journal of Sac. Lit.* i, 94, 295; v, 373; xvii, 138; *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Darling, *Eccles. Biog.* ii, 1873; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.; and especially Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Auth.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lowth, Simon, D.D., an English non-juring divine, was born in Northamptonshire about 1630. In 1679 we find him vicar of St. Cosmus, a position of which he was deprived in 1688. He died in 1720. Dr. Simon Lowth published *Historical Collections concerning Ch. Affairs* (Lond. 1696, 4to), besides several theological treatises (1672–1704). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lowth, William, D.D., a distinguished English divine, father of bishop Robert Lowth, was born in London Sept. 11, 1661. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, whence he was elected to a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1675, when not yet 14 years old; became M.A. in 1683, and B.D. in 1688. His *Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Old and New Test.* (Lond. 1692; 3d edit. with two sermons, 1821, 12mo), in answer to Le Clerc's attacks on the inspiration of Scripture, brought him prominently into notice; and the first to favor him was bishop Mew, of Winchester, who had been president of St. John's College, and well knew Lowth's great attainments. He made him his chaplain, and presented him with a prebendal stall in his cathedral at Winchester in 1696, and with the living of Buriton and Petersfield in 1699. Dr. Lowth died May 17, 1732. Though less celebrated as a writer than his son Robert, he is generally acknowledged to have been the profounder scholar, and might, and no doubt would, have attained to as great distinction in the Church as his son had he lived as much in the public eye, and, instead of serving others in the preparation of their works, gone directly before the people himself. So great, indeed, was his modesty, that, in an estimate of his scholarship, we can be just only after a careful inquiry of the amount and extent of the assistance he furnished to the works of his contemporaries, upon whom Dr. Lowth, having carefully read and annotated almost every Greek and Latin author, whether profane or ecclesiastical, especially the latter, dispensed his stores with a most liberal hand. The edition of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by Dr. (afterwards archbishop) Potter; that of *Josephus*, by Hudson; the *Ecclesiastical Historians*, by Reading (Cambridge); the *Bibliotheca Biblica*, were all enriched with valuable notes from his pen. Bishop Chandler, of Durham, during the preparation of his *Defence of Christianity* from the prophecies of the Old Testament, against the discourse of the "Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion," and in his vindication of the "Defence" in answer to *The Scheme of literal Prophecy considered*, held a constant correspondence with him, and consulted him upon many difficulties that occurred in the course of that work. Many other English scholars were also indebted to Dr. William Lowth's labors for important aid. But the most valuable part of his character was that which least appeared in the eyes of the world. His piety, diligence, hospitality, and beneficence rendered his life highly exemplary, and greatly enforced his public exhortations. Besides the *Vindication* already mentioned above, Dr. Lowth wrote *Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures*, etc. (1708, 12mo; 7th edit. Lond. 1799, 12mo), an excellent little work, which has gone through many editions; and last, but chiefly, *A Commentary on the prophetical Books of the Old Testament*, originally published in separate portions (1714–1725), and afterwards collected in a folio volume as a continuation of bishop Patrick's commentary, and generally accompanying the commentary collected severally from Patrick, Whitby, Arnald, and Lowman (best editions of the whole commentary, Lond. 1822, 6 vols. royal 4to; Philad. 1860, 4 vols. imp. 8vo). "Lowth," says Orme (*Bibl. Bib.*), "is one of the most judicious commentators on the prophets. He never prophesies himself, adheres strictly to the meaning of the inspired writer, and is yet generally evangelical in his interpretations. There is not much appearance of criticism; but the original text and other critical aids were doubtless closely studied by the respectable author. It is often quoted by Scott, and . . . . is pronounced by bishop Coutson the best commentary in the English language." See *Life of Dr. William Lowth*, by his son, *Biog. Brit.*; *Churchman's Magazine*, 1809 (March and April), 781 sq.; Jones, *Christian Biog.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* ii, 1875; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vii, 75; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Loyola, Ignatius or, St., or, with his full Spanish name, Don *Iñigo Lopez de Recalde*, the founder of the Jesuits, was born in 1491, in the Castle of Loyola, which was situated not far from Azpeytia, in the Spanish province of Guipuscoa. He was the youngest of the eleven children of Don Bertand, Señor d'Aguez y de Loyola, and Martina Saez de Balde. His family prided itself on belonging to the ancient, pure nobility of the country, and was distinguished for chivalric sentiment. After receiving his first instruction in religion from his aunt, Doña Maria de Guevara, a fervid Catholic, he became a page at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic.

But Ignatius had too great a desire for glory to be satisfied with court life, and, following the example of his brothers, who served in the army, he resolved to become a soldier. During the first campaign in which he took part he distinguished himself at the siege of Najara, a small town situated on the frontier of Biscaya, the capture of which was partly attributed to his bravery. The town was given up to pillage, in which he took, however, no part. His life at this time, as one of his biographers says, was by no means regular; "being more occupied with gallantry and vanity than anything else, he generally followed in his actions the false principles of the world, and in this way he continued to live until his twenty-ninth year, when God opened his eyes." During the siege of Pampeluna, the capital of Novara, by the French, he was, on May 20, 1521, severely wounded by a cannon ball in both legs. The French, after taking the place, honored his courage, and had him transported on a litter to his native castle of Loyola, which is not far from Pampeluna. As the first operation had not been successful, the leg had to be broken again and to be reset anew. The extreme painfulness of this operation brought on a fever on the eve of the festival of the apostles Peter and Paul, which it was thought would prove fatal; but this fever suddenly ceased, and Ignatius ascribed his unexpected recovery to the miraculous aid of the prince of the apostles, who, as he states, appeared to him in a dream, touched him with his hand, and cured him from his fever. But, notwithstanding this belief in his miraculous recovery, Ignatius remained imbued with a worldly spirit. The recovery proved, however, not to be complete, and Ignatius, in order to get fully restored, had to submit to several other painful operations, in spite of all of which his right leg remained considerably shorter than the other. While his recovery was slowly proceeding, he demanded novels for pastime; but as no books of this class were to be found in the castle, he received in their stead a Life of Jesus Christ and of the Saints. He read this at first without the least interest in the subject, and only because no other book could be found; but gradually his fiery imagination learned how to derive food from this reading, and a determination sprang up to imitate the spiritual combats which he found described in this book, and to excel the saints in heroic deeds. For a time the reviving thirst of glory, and a strong attachment to a lady of the royal court, continued to prove formidable obstacles, but finally he fully overcame them, and began the new career upon which he had resolved to enter with a pilgrimage to the convent of Montserrat, famous for the immense concourse of pilgrims from all parts of the world to a miraculous picture of the Virgin Mary. To conceal his design, he pretended to make a visit to his old friend the duke of Najara, and immediately after making the visit dismissed his two servants, and took alone the road to Montserrat. There, during three successive days, he made a general confession of all the sins of his life, and took the vow of chastity. Before the picture of the Virgin Mary he held a vigil, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then repaired to Manresa, a small town situated about three leagues from Montserrat, and containing a convent of the Dominican order and a hospital chiefly for pilgrims. Here he desired to live unknown until the pestilence should cease at Barcelona, and the opening of the port should allow him to carry out his wish of visiting the Holy Land. He first entered the hospital, and there practiced the austerest asceticism, until it became known that he was a nobleman, when the number of persons who came to see him from curiosity induced him to hide himself in a neighboring cave which was known to few, and which no one had yet dared to enter. The horrors of this place, and the cruel, unnatural asceticism to which he gave himself up, produced a state of mind in which he believed himself alternately to be attended by temptations of the devil and to be gladdened by visions of the Saviour and the holy Virgin. Gradually he began to be settled in his mind, and resolved to labor for the conversion and sanctification of souls. He began to speak in public on religion, and made the first draft of his famous book of the Spiritual Exercises (*Exercitia Spiritualia*), in the composition of which he claims to have had divine aid. This book has contributed more than any other to the erection of the new papal theocracy which has recently been completed by the promulgation of the doctrine of papal infallibility. It consists of meditations, which are grouped in four divisions or weeks. The first week, after an introductory meditation on the destiny of man and of all created things, occupies itself with sin, its hideousness, and its terrible consequences. The second week has for its basis the meditation on the kingdom of Christ, who is represented as being in the highest sense of the word the king by the grace of God, whose call to the spiritual campaign all men have to obey, and in whose service every noble heart will feel itself inspired to noble deeds. In a life-picture of Christ it is shown how man must prove himself in the war for and with Christ. The meditation then turns to the mysteries of incarnation, to the childhood of Jesus, and his retired life in Nazareth. Here the contemplation of the life of Christ is interrupted by the meditation on the two banners: the horrid banner of the prince of darkness is unfolded by the side of the lovely banner of Christ before the eyes of the soul, which is eagerly courted on both sides. Returning to the public life of Christ, which is now followed step by step, the Exercises prepare the mind for finally determining the future course of life. During the third week the sufferings and the death of the Lord are meditated upon, in order to strengthen the soul for all the combats which a resolution to lead a religious life must entail. The subjects of the fourth week are taken from the mysteries of the resurrection and ascension of Christ. The whole is concluded with a meditation on the love of God. The book was for the first time printed in Rome in 1548, and on July 31 of the same year approved by pope Paul III, and urgently recommended to the faithful. In the hands of the Jesuits this book subsequently became one of the chief instruments which secured the thoroughly military discipline of their order, as well as of their devoted adherents.

After passing ten months in Manresa, Ignatius, in January, 1523, embarked at Barcelona for the Holy Land. He spent a few days in Rome, then went to Venice, where he embarked for Jerusalem on July 14, and arrived there on September 4. It was his wish to remain here, in order to labor for the conversion of the people of the East; but the provincial of the Franciscan monks, who had been authorized by the popes either to retain the pilgrims or to send them home again, did not allow him to stay. Accordingly, he had to return to Europe, and arrived in Venice in January, 1524. In March he was again on Spanish soil, and having become convinced during his voyage of the importance of a literary education for the accomplishment of his plans, he entered, although 33 years old, a grammar-school at Barcelona, where he studied, in particular, the elements of Latin. Two years later he went, with three disciples whom he had gained at Barcelona, to the University of Alcala, which a short time before had been founded by cardinal Ximenes. Here he was, with his companions, imprisoned for six weeks, by order of the Inquisition, for giving religious instruction without special authorization. After being released, he went, at the advice of the archbishop of Toledo, to the University of Salamanca to continue his studies. But, when there, he had new difficulties with the Inquisition; he resolved to leave Spain, and, not accompanied by any of his disciples, went to the University of Paris, where he studied from February, 1528, to the end of March, 1535, and on March 14, 1533, obtained the title of master of arts. Here his plan was fully matured to establish a society of men who might aid him in carrying out his religious ideas. The first who was gained for the plan was Pierre Lefèvre (Petrus Faber), who for some time had been his tutor in his phil-

osophical studies. The second was Francis Xavier, a young nobleman of Novara. Soon after they were joined by the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alphonse Salmeron, and Nicholas Alphonse Bobadilla, and the Portuguese Simon Rodriguez d'Azendo. For the first time they were called together by Ignatius in July, 1534. On August 15, on the festival of the assumption of the Virgin Mary, he took them to the church of the Abbey of Montmartre, near Paris, where, having received the communion from the hands of Lefèvre, the only priest in their midst, they all, with a loud voice, took the solemn vow to make a voyage to Jerusalem, in order to labor for the conversion of the infidels of the Holy Land; to quit all they had in the world besides what they indispensably needed for the voyage; and in case they should find it impossible either to reach Palestine or remain there, to throw themselves at the feet of the pope, offer him their services, and go wherever he might send them. As several members of the company had not yet finished their theological studies, it was agreed that they should remain at the university until January 25, 1537. Ignatius in the meanwhile undertook to labor against the further progress of the Reformation in France; his ascetic practices soon undermined again his health, and, at the advice of his physician, he had to return to his native land, where he soon recovered. On Jan. 6, 1537, he was met at Venice by all his companions, who, after his departure from Paris, had been joined by Claude le Jay, Jean Codure, and Pasquier Brouet. Two months later all the members of the society were sent by Ignatius to Rome, he himself remaining at Venice, as he believed the influential cardinal Caraffa (subsequently pope Paul IV) to be unfriendly to him. The pope, Paul III, received the companions of Ignatius favorably, and gave them permission to be ordained priests by any bishop of the Catholic Church. As the war between Venice and the sultan made it impossible for Ignatius to go with his companions to Palestine, Ignatius, who had again united all the members of the society at Vicenza, resolved to go with Lefèvre and Lainez to Rome, in order to place the services of his society at the disposal of the pope. Before separating, Ignatius instructed all his companions, in case they were asked who they were, and to what society they belonged, to reply that they belonged to the Society of Jesus, as they had united for a combat against heresy and vice under the banner of Jesus Christ. On his journey to Rome, Ignatius claimed to have had another vision in the lonely, decayed sanctuary of Storia, about six miles from Rome, and to have received a direct promise of divine aid and protection. At Rome Ignatius succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the pope. A charge of heresy and sorcery, which a personal enemy brought against him, was easily refuted, but it was found more difficult to overcome the opposition to his projected order from three cardinals, by whose advice the pope was chiefly guided. But, undaunted by this great obstacle, as Helyot (*Histoire des Ordres Monastique*, ed. Migne, ii, 643) says, "he continued his urgent representations with the pope, and redoubled his prayers to God with all the greater confidence, as, not doubting the success of his enterprise, he promised to God three thousand masses in recognition, and thanksgiving for the favor which he hoped to obtain from his divine Majesty." The steady progress of the Reformation overcame, however, at last the reluctance of the cardinals, and, by the bull of Sept. 27, 1540, *Regimini militantis ecclesiæ*, the pope gave to the new order the papal sanction and the name Society of Jesus. At the election of a general of the new order Ignatius received a unanimous vote. He at first declined to accept; but when, at a second election, he was again found to be the unanimous choice of his brethren, and when his confessor, the Franciscan monk father Theodore, urged him not to resist the call of God, he was prevailed upon to accept. He soon drew up the constitution of his order, which, however, did not receive the final sanction until after his death. In Nov. 1554, in consequence of his failing health, he appointed father Nadal his assistant. During the following spring he believed himself to have sufficiently recovered to do without this support, but during the summer of 1556 his health broke entirely down, and he died on July 31, 1556. The only three wishes which he professed to have, the approbation of his order by the Church, the sanction of his book of spiritual exercises by the pope, and the promulgation of the constitution of his order, were fulfilled. During the sixteen years from the foundation of the order until the death of Ignatius, the order spread with a rapidity rarely equalled in the history of monastic orders. See JESUITS. In 1609 Ignatius was beatified by pope Paul V; in 1622 he was canonized by Gregory XV. The *Acta Sanctorum* for July 31 gives, besides the *Commentarius prævius*, two biographies of Ignatius — one by Gonzales, based on communications received from Ignatius himself, and another by Ribadeneira. Larger works on the life of Ignatius have been written by Ribadeneira, Maffei, and Orlandini. There is hardly a language spoken which has not furnished us a biography of Ignatius; in English we have his life by Isaac Taylor and by Walpole. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 524; Ranke, *Röm.-Päpste*, iii, 383; *Retrospective Rev.* (1824), vol. ix; and the literature in the art. JESUITS. (A. J. S.)

Lo'zon (Λωζών, Vulg. *Dedon*), one of the sons of "Solomon's servants" who returned with Zorobabel (1 Esd. v, 33); the DARKON (q. v.) of the Heb. lists (Ezra ii, 56; Neh. vii, 58).

Lubbert(us), LIBRAND(US), a Reformed clergyman and professor of divinity at Franecker, was born at Longoworde, Friesland, in 1556, and was educated at Wittenberg University, where he gained great perfection in Hebrew. Afterwards he diligently attended the lectures at Geneva, and still later went to Neustadt, to hear the Calvinistical professors. Lubbert then entered the ministry, and accepted a call to the Reformed Church of Brussels; later he removed to Embden. In 1584 he went to Friesland as preacher to the governor and deputies of the provincial states, and also read lectures on divinity at Franecker University, then just opened. He received the title of D.D. from Heidelberg University. In the controversies concerning the Scriptures, the pope, the Church, and councils, he wrote against the celebrated divines Bellarmine, Gretserus, Socinus, Arminius, Peter Bertius, Vorstius, and Grotius's *Pietas Ordinum Hollandiæ*. He preached zealously, pointedly, and eloquently against all the evils of his times, both in the Church and out of it. He observed the statutes severely, and sometimes refused rectorships because of the debauchery of unreformable scholars. He died at Franecker January 21, 1625.

Lubec, REFORMATION IN. See HANSE TOWNS (in *Supplement*).

Lubienietski (Latinized LUBIENIECIUS), STANISLAS, of a family greatly distinguished in the Polish Socinian controversy, being the most prominent of five who have become particularly identified with the Socinian movement in Poland, was born at Cracow August 23, 1623. He was minister of a Church at Lublin until driven out by the arm of power for his opinions in 1657, when all anti-Trinitarians were expelled from Poland. He went first to Sweden, and sought the influence of the Swedish monarch for the Unitarians, but was signally disappointed at the conclusion of peace between Sweden and Poland at Oliva. Lubienietski found more favor at the court of the Danes; he was obliged, however, to quit the capital because of his able advocacy of heretical opinions, and the danger to Lutheranism, and he finally settled at Hamburg, where he died May 18, 1675. His death is stated to have been caused by poison—a fact borne out by the death of his two daughters, and the serious illness of his wife, after eating of the same dish; but the Hamburg magistracy neglected to institute the investigation usual in cases of sudden death. His theological works are numerous, and may

be found in Sandius, *Bibl. Antitrin.* (Freist. 1684), with the exception of the *Historia Reformationis Polonicæ*, published in 1685 at Freistadt, with a life prefixed. Of his secular works, his *Theatrum Cometicum* has a world-wide celebrity. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Krasinski, *Hist. Ref. in Poland*, ii, chap. xiv; Fock, *Der Socinianismus* (Kiel, 1847).

Lu'bim (Heb. *Lubim'*, לוּבִים, from the Arab., signifying inhabitants of a *thirsty* land, Nah. iii, 9; "Lubims," 2 Chron. xii, 3; xvi, 8; also *Lubbim'*, לֻבִּים, "Libyans," Dan. xi, 43; Sept. everywhere Λιβυες), the Libyans, always joined with the Egyptians and Ethiopians; being "mentioned as contributing, together with Cushites and Sukkiim, to Shishak's army (2 Chron. xii, 3); and apparently as forming with Cushites the bulk of Zerah's army (xvi, 8); spoken of by Nahum (iii, 9) with Put or Phut, as helping No-Amon (Thebes), of which Cush and Egypt were the strength; and by Daniel (xi, 43) as paying court with the Cushites to a conqueror of Egypt or the Egyptians. These particulars indicate an African nation under tribute to Egypt, if not under Egyptian rule, contributing, in the 10th century B.C., valuable aid in mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Egyptian armies, and down to Nahum's time, and a period prophesied of by Daniel, probably the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes [see ANTIOCHUS IV], assisting, either politically or commercially, to sustain the Egyptian power, or, in the last case, dependent on it. These indications do not fix the geographical position of the Lubim, but they favor the supposition that their territory was near Egypt, either to the west or south. For more precise information we look to the Egyptian monuments, upon which we find representations of a people called REBU or LEBU (R and L having no distinction in hieroglyphics), who cannot be doubted to correspond to the Lubim. These Rebu were a warlike people, with whom Menptah (the son and successor of Rameses II) and Rameses III, who both ruled in the 13th century B.C., waged successful wars. The latter king routed them with much slaughter. The sculptures of the great temple he raised at Thebes, now called that of Medînet Abû, give us representations of the Rebu, showing that they were fair, and of what is called a Shemitic type, like the Berbers and Kabyles. They are distinguished as northern, that is, as parallel to, or north of, Lower Egypt. Of their being African there can be no reasonable doubt, and we may assign them to the coast of the Mediterranean, commencing not far to the westward of Egypt. We do not find them to have been mercenaries of Egypt from the monuments, but we know that the kindred Mashawasha-u were so employed by the Bubastite family, to which Shishak and probably Zerah also belonged; and it is not unlikely that the latter are intended by the Lubim, used in a more generic sense than Rebu, in the Biblical mention of the armies of these kings (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* ii, 79 sq.). We have already shown that the Lubim are probably the Mizraite LEHABIM: if so, their so-called Shemitic physical characteristics, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, afford evidence of great importance for the inquirer into primeval history. The mention in Manetho's Dynasties that, under Necherophes, or Necherochis, the first Memphite king, and head of the third dynasty (B.C. cir. 2600), the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but returned to their allegiance through fear, on a wonderful increase of the moon, may refer to the Lubim, but may as probably relate to some other African people, perhaps the Naphtuhim, or Phut (Put). The historical indications of the Egyptian monuments thus lead us to place the seat of the Lubim, or primitive Libyans, on the African coast to the westward of Egypt, perhaps extending far beyond Cyrenaica. From the earliest ages of which we have any record, a stream of colonization has flowed from the East along the coast of Africa, north of the Great Desert, as far as the Pillars of Hercules. The oldest of these colonists of this region were doubtless the Lubim and kindred tribes, particularly the Mashawasha-u and Tahen-nu of the Egyptian monuments, all of whom appear to have ultimately taken their common name of Libyans from the Lubim. They seem to have been first reduced by the Egyptians about B.C. 1250, and to have afterwards been driven inland by the Phœnician and Greek colonists. Now, they still remain on the northern confines of the Great Desert, and even within it, and in the mountains, while their later Shemitic rivals pasture their flocks in the rich plains. Many as are the Arab tribes of Africa, one great tribe, that of the Benî 'Alî, extends from Egypt to Morocco, illustrating the probable extent of the territory of the Lubim and their cognates. It is possible that in Ezek. xxx, 5, Lub, לוּב, should be read for Chub, כּוּב; but there is no other instance of the use of this form: as, however, לוּד and לוּדִים are used for one people, apparently the Mizraite Ludim, most probably kindred to the Lubim, this objection is not conclusive. See CHUB; LUDIM. In Jer. xlvi, 9, the A. V. renders Phut 'the Libyans;' and in Ezek. xxxviii, 5, 'Libya.'" See LIBYA.

Lubin, Augustin, a French monk, was born in Paris Jan. 29, 1624; was early admitted to the Order of Reformed Augustinian monks, became their provincial at Bourges, and assistant general at Rome. He died at Paris March 7, 1695. Lubin had a particular knowledge of all the benefices of France and the abbeys of Italy. He published many learned works on ancient and sacred geography; among others, *Tabulæ Sacræ Geographicæ* (Paris, 1670):—*Martyrologium Romanum, cum tabulis geographis et notis historicis* (Paris, 1660):—*Tables géographiques pour les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, dressés sur la traduction de l'Abbé Tallemant* (Paris, 1671):—*Clef du grand Pouillé des Bénéfices de France*, containing the names of the abbeys, of their founders, their situation, etc. (Paris, 1671); etc. See Dupin, *Auteurs ecclésiast. du dixseptième siècle; Journal des Savants*, 1695, p. 220.

Lubin, Eilhard, one of the most learned Protestants of his time, was born at Westersted, in Oldenburg, March 24, 1556, of which place his father was minister. He was educated first at Leipsic, where he prosecuted his studies with great success, and for further improvement went thence to Cologne. After this he visited the several universities of Helmstadt, Strasburg, Jena, Marpurg, and, last of all, Rostock, where he was made professor of poetry in 1595, and ten years later was advanced to the divinity chair in the same university. He died in June, 1621. One of his works deserves special mention, *Phosphorus de prima causa et natura mali, tractatus hypermetaphysicus*, etc. (Rostock, 1596, and 8vo and 12mo in 1600), in which he established two coeternal principles (not matter and a vacuum, or void, as Epicurus did, but), God and the nihilum, or nothing. God, he supposed, is the good principle, and nothing the evil principle. He added that sin was nothing else but a tendency towards nothing, and that sin had been necessary in order to make known the nature of good; and he applied to this nothing all that Aristotle says of the first matter. He was answered by Grawer, but published a reply entitled *Apologeticus quo Alb. Graw. calumniis respond.*, etc. (Rostock, 1605). He likewise published the next year, *Tractatus de causa peccati, ad theologos Augustinæ confessionis in Germania.* See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.

Luca, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, an Italian prelate, was born at Venosa, Naples, in 1614. He raised himself by merit from poverty to the highest stations in the Church. He became referendary of the two signatures, and auditor of pope Innocent XI, who appointed him cardinal Sept. 1, 1681. Before entering the Church Luca had been a lawyer, and treatises on jurisprudence form the greater part of his works. He died at Rome Feb. 5, 1683. His *Theatrum Veritatis et Justitiæ* (1697, 7 vols.)

treats of canon and civil law, and was very highly esteemed. Among his remaining works are the following: *Concilium Tridentium, ex recensione J. Gallimarti et Aug. Barbosæ, cum notis Cardinalis de Luca* (Cologne, 1664). See Tiraboschi, *Storia della Litteratura Italiana*, vol. viii; Migne, *Hist. des Cardinaux*, in the *Encyclop. Ecclésiast.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Lucānus or **Luciānus**, a disciple of Marcion and the Gnostics, flourished in the latter part of the second century. He denied the reality of the body of Christ, as well as the immateriality and immortality of the soul. He regarded the souls of animals as of the same kind with those of men, and allowed the resurrection of the former. He is known to have been the author of numerous forgeries: among others, the *History of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary*, the *Protevangelion, or History of James*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. He seems to have been the same heretic who is sometimes called *Lucius, Leicius, Leucius, Lentitius, Leontius, Lentius, Seleucus, Charinus, Nexocharides*, and *Leonides*. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 245. See Lucian, St.

Lucarius, Cyrillus. See Cyril, Lucar.

Lu'cas (Λουκᾶς, Vulg. *Lucas*), a friend and companion of Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Philem. 24). A.D. 57. He is doubtless the same as Luke, the beloved physician, who is associated with Demas in Col. iv, 14, and who remained faithful to the apostle when others forsook him (2 Tim. iv, 11), on his first examination before the emperor. For the grounds of his identification with the evangelist Luke, see the article Luke.

Lucas de Tuy (or Tudensis), a Spanish theologian and writer, was born at Leon, where he became canon of St. Isidore, and was afterwards appointed deacon of Tuy, in Gallicia. In 1227 he made a journey to Jerusalem, saw pope Gregory IX in Italy, and also the general of the Order of Franciscans. He was appointed bishop of Tuy in 1239, and died in 1250. He wrote a Chronicle of Spain, extending from 670 to 1236 (published by Schott in his *Hisp. Ill.*, Francf. 1663, fol., vol. iv), and a *Vita et historia translationis S. Isidori*, which is reproduced in the article on that saint in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April 4. The second part of this work, which does not at all relate to St. Isidore, is a passionate and superficial attack against the Cathari (q. v.); valuable, however, for its information concerning some customs of that sect in the south of France and in Spain. This part of Lucas's work was published separately by Mariana, under the inappropriate title of *Libri tres de altera vita fideique controversiis contra Albigensium errores* (Ingolst. 1613, 4to; reprinted in the *Biblioth. Patrum Maxima*, xxv, 188, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Cologne, xiii, 228). Lucas also rejected as heretical the view which afterwards obtained of the three persons of the Trinity being of different ages, and asserted, contrarily to the then prevailing notion, that Christ ought not to be represented as crucified with the feet crossed, but with the two feet side by side, each pierced with a separate nail.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* viii, 553. (J. N. P.)

Lucas, Franciscus (Brugensis), one of the ablest of the Roman Catholic theologians of the 16th century, was born at Bruges in 1549. He studied theology at Louvain, and became at once celebrated for his knowledge of the sacred languages and their cognate dialects. In 1562 he was appointed archdeacon and dean of the cathedral of St. Omer, and there he remained until his death, Feb. 19, 1619. As the fruits of his great scholarship he has left us mainly works of value in Biblical theology. The following deserve special mention: (1) the edition of the *Biblia Regia* (brought out by Plantin, the famous printer of Antwerp, under the auspices of Philip II of Spain), which Lucas superintended. But the work by which he is principally known is (2) his *Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia* (Antw. 1606), which was completed by *Supplementum Commentar. in Luc. et Joann.* (Antw. 1612, 1616), a commentary of no ordinary merit. "Entirely passing by, or alluding in the briefest manner to the mystical sense, and omitting all doctrinal discussions, he explains clearly and concisely the literal meaning, illustrating it frequently from the Greek and Latin fathers, as well as from later writers of authority, though never burdening his pages with lists of conflicting authorities. His plan is a simple one, and judiciously carried out. He chooses one sense, and that the one which the sacred writer appeared to have had in view, and briefly expounds and illustrates that, never distracting his readers with varying interpretations only mentioned to be rejected. Lucas had no mean critical ability, and his knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac was exact and trustworthy. A truly devotional spirit breathes through the whole." (3) *Notationes in Sacr. Bibl.* (Antw. 1580–83), with a careful summary of the various readings, which were also appended to the edition of the Vulgate that appeared from the press of Plantin with Emman. Sa's notes (Antw. 1624), under the title *Fr. Lucæ, Roman. correct. in Bibl. Latin. loc. insigniora.* (4) *Sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatæ editionis Concordantiæ* (Antw. 1606, 5 vols. fol.; best ed. Antw. 1642). See Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth.* p. i and iii; Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclésiast. du dix-septième Siècle*, col. 1572; Simon, *Hist. Crit. des Versions du Nouv. Test.* chap. iii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lucas, Richard, an English clergyman and moralist, was born in 1648 in Radnorshire, Wales, entered Jesus College, Oxford, in 1664, and, after taking his degree, was for some time engaged in teaching. He finally entered the ministry, and became vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, London, in 1683. In 1696 he became prebend of Westminster. Blindness afflicted him in his later years. He died in June, 1715, at London. He published a number of occasional sermons (1683–1704; 3d edit. 1710, 2 vols.; 1712–16–17, 3 vols.; and 2d ed. 1722, 3 vols.). Among his devotional treatises the following are highly recommended by such critics as Knox, dean Stanhope, bishop Jebb, Sir Richard Steele, and Dr. Doddridge: *Inquiry after Happiness* (1685, 2 vols.):—*Practical Christianity, or an Account of the Holiness which the Gospel enjoins, with the Motives to it*, etc. (5th edit. 1700; last edit. 1838). See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Luce, Abraham, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Northville, Long Island, N. Y., March 13, 1791; studied at Clinton Academy, Easthampton, and afterwards theology with the Rev. Jonathan Hunting, of Southold, and Rev. Dr. Aaron Woolworth, of Bridgehampton, L. I., and also with Prof. Porter, of Andover, Mass. In 1812 he was licensed by the Long Island Presbytery, and in 1813 was ordained pastor of the church at Westhampton. He was chosen for three consecutive years to represent the Presbytery in the General Assembly, and was a great many times elected moderator. He died Oct. 23, 1865. Mr. Luce was a man of fine abilities, and superior as an executive officer. He held a high place in the esteem and confidence of his ministerial brethren, and was always placed first on responsible commissions and committees. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1867, p. 311.

Lucernarium (λυχναψία), a name given to the evening service of the ancient Church, because ere it began it was usually dusk, and the place had to be lighted up with lamps. See Bingham, *Antiqu. Christian Church*, bk. xiii, ch. ix, § 7. See Hours; Vespers.

Lucia, St., a Roman Catholic saint of the 3d or the beginning of the 4th century, is said to have been of a noble Sicilian family. Her legendary history is as follows. Having gone on a pilgrimage with her mother to the grave of St. Agatha for the restoration of the latter's health, she resolved to become a nun. Her mother assented, but a young man whom she was engaged to marry, angry at her resolution, denounced her as a Christian. She acknowledged the truth of the charge

when brought before the judges, and was condemned to enter a brothel; but when Paschasius gave the order to take her thence it was found impossible to move her from the spot, even though yokes of oxen were employed to draw her. Paschasius now attempted to burn her, and had boiling pitch and oil poured on her, but in vain; he then ran her through with a sword, when she prophesied the downfall of Diocletian, the death of Maximian, and the arrest and death of Paschasius. She died after partaking of the body of the Lord, and on the spot a church was afterwards erected. Her life is contained in Laurentius Servius's *De probatis Sanctorum historiis*, Dec. 13, and in a number of martyrologues, but it has often been attacked as spurious even by Romanists, and is therefore not found in the *Acta Sanctorum*. She is commemorated on Dec. 13. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 496; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Lucian (*Λουκιανός*), a celebrated Greek rhetorician, the Voltaire of Grecian literature, was born at Samosata, a city on the west bank of the Euphrates, in the Syrian province of Commagene. We possess no particulars respecting his life on which any reliance can be placed except a few scattered notices in his own writings. From these it appears that he was born about the latter end of Trajan's reign (A.D. 53–117), that he lived under both the Antonines, and died about the end of the 2d century. His parents, who were in humble circumstances, placed him with his maternal uncle, a sculptor, in order to learn statuary; but he soon quitted this trade, and applied himself to the study of the law. He afterwards practiced at the bar in Syria and Greece; but, not meeting with much success in this profession, he resolved to settle in Gaul as a teacher of rhetoric, where he soon obtained great celebrity and numerous scholars. He appears to have remained in Gaul till he was about forty, when he gave up the profession of rhetoric, after having acquired considerable wealth. During the remainder of his life we find him travelling about from place to place, and visiting successively Macedonia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Bithynia. The greater part of his time, however, was passed in Athens, where he lived on terms of the greatest intimacy with Demonax, a philosopher of great celebrity, and where he probably wrote most of his works, which principally consist of attacks upon the religion and philosophy of his age. Towards the latter part of his life he held a lucrative public office in Egypt, which was bestowed upon him by the emperor Commodus. The account of his being torn to death by dogs for his attack on the Christian religion rests on no credible authority, and was probably invented by Suidas, who appears to have been the earliest to relate it.

The writings of Lucian, in the form of dialogue, are in a remarkably pure and elegant Greek style, free from the false ornaments and artificial rhetoric which characterize most of the writings of his contemporaries. Modern critics have usually given him his full meed of praise for these excellences, and have also deservedly admired the keenness of his wit, his great talent as a writer, and the inimitable ease and flow of his dialogue; but they have seldom done him the justice he deserves. They have either represented him as merely a witty and amusing writer, but without any further merit, or else they have attacked him as an immoral and infidel author, whose only object was to corrupt the minds of his readers, and to throw ridicule upon all religion. But these opinions appear to us to have arisen from a mistaken and one-sided view of the character of Lucian, and an intent to utterly ignore the peculiarities of the period in which he flourished. He seems to us to have endeavored to expose all kinds of delusion, fanaticism, and imposture; the quackery and imposition of the priests, the folly and absurdity of the superstitious, and especially the solemn nonsense, the prating insolence, and the immoral lives of the philosophical charlatans of his day (see his *Alexander*). Lucian may, in fact, be regarded as the Aristophanes of his age, and, like the great comic poet, he had recourse to raillery and satire to accomplish the great objects he had in view. His study was human character in all its varieties, and the times in which he lived furnished ample materials for his observation. Many of his pictures, though drawn from the circumstances of his own days, are true for every age and country. As an instance of this, we mention the essay entitled *On those who serve the Great for Hire*. If he sometimes discloses the follies and vices of mankind too freely, and occasionally uses expressions which are revolting to our ideas of morality, it should be recollected that every author ought to be judged by his standard of religion and morality. The character of Lucian's mind was decidedly practical; he was not disposed to believe anything without sufficient evidence of its truth, and nothing that was ridiculous or absurd escaped his raillery and sarcasm. The tales of the poets respecting the attributes and exploits of the gods, which were still firmly believed by the common people of his age, were especially the objects of his satire and ridicule in his dialogues and in many other of his works. That he should have attacked the Christians in common with the false systems of the pagan religion will not appear surprising to any one who considers that Lucian probably never took the trouble to inquire into the doctrines of a religion which was almost universally despised in his time by the higher orders of society, who did, indeed, visit with ridicule all religious belief. Says Gibbon (Harpers' edit. i, 36), "We may be well assured that a writer conversant with the world would never have ventured to expose the gods of his country to public ridicule had they not already been the objects of secret contempt among the polished and enlightened orders of society." Volaterranus, indeed, affirmed, but without stating his authority, that Lucian apostatized from Christianity, and was accustomed to say he had gained nothing by it but the corruption of his name from Lucius to Lucianus. So also the scholiast on the *Peregrinus* calls him *παραβάτης*, while the scholiasts on the *Veræ Historiæ* and other pieces frequently apostrophize him in the bitterest terms, and make the most far-fetched and absurd charges against him of ridiculing the Scriptures. These accusations of blasphemy, however, could be made only against an apostate, and such, it is now well established, Lucian was not. Born of pagan parents, he led the life of a pagan philosopher of the 2d century, when, as Gibbon tells us, "the ingenious youth who, from every part, resorted to Athens, and the other seats of learning in the Roman empire, were alike instructed in every school to reject and to despise the religion of the multitude" (i, 36). Lucian is no more amenable to the charge of blasphemy than Tacitus or any other profane author, who, from ignorance of the Christian religion, has been led to vilify and misrepresent it. The charge might be urged with some color against Lucian if it could be shown that he was the author of the dialogue entitled *Philopatris*. A sneering tone pervades the whole piece, which betrays so intimate a knowledge of Christianity that it could hardly have been written but by one who had been at some time within the pale of the Church. Some eminent critics, and among them Fabricius (*Biblioth. Græca*, v, 340 [ed. Harles]), have held Lucian accountable for this production, but it is now pretty generally admitted not to be from his pen. (Compare Gesner, *De Ætate et Auctore Philopatridis*, in which it is shown that the piece could not have been Lucian's; and many considerations are brought forward which render it very probable that the work was composed in the reign of Julian the Apostate. Compare Neander, *Church History*, ii, 89, note 5.)

The works of Lucian may be divided into, I. Rhetorical.—*Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου*, *Somnium seu Vita Luciani*; *Ἡρόδοτος*, *Herodotus sive Aëtion*; *Ζεύξις*, *Zeuxis sive Antiochus*; *Ἁρμονίδης*, *Harmonides*; *Σκύθης ἢ Πρόξενος*, *Scytha*; *Ἱππίας ἢ Βαλανεῖον*, *Hippias seu Balneum*; *Προσλαλία ἢ Διόνυσος*, *Bacchus*; *Προσλα-*

λία ἢ Ἡρακλῆς, *Hercules Gallicus*; Περὶ τοῦ ἠλέκτρου ἢ τῶν κύκνων, *De Electro seu Cygnis*; Περὶ τοῦ οἴκου, *De Domo*; Περὶ τῶν διψάδων, *De Dipsadibus*; Τυραννοκτόνος, *Tyrannicida* (perhaps spurious); Ἀποκηρυττόμενος, *Abdicatus* (attributed sometimes to Libanius); Φάλαρις πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος, *Phalaris prior et alter*; Μυίας ἐγκώμιον, *Encomium Muscæ*; Πατρίδος ἐγκώμιον, *Patriæ Encomium*. II. Critical Works.—Δίκη φωνηέντων, *Judicium Vocalium*; Λεξιφάνης, *Lexiphanes* (considered by some as directed against the *Onomasticon* of Pollux, by others against Athenæus); Πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν, *Quomodo Historia sit conscribenda*, the best of Lucian's critical works; Ῥητόρων διδάσκαλος, *Rhetorum Preceptor*; Ψευδολογιστής, *Pseudologista*; Δημοσθένους ἐγκώμιον, *Demosthenis Encomium* (rejected by some as spurious); Ψευδοσοφιστής, *Pseudosophista* (also attacked, and on better grounds than the preceding). III. Biographical Works.—Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ Ψευδόμαντις, *Alexander seu Pseudomantis*; Δημώνακτος βίος, *Vita Demonactis*; and Περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς, *De Morte Peregrini*. This last work, containing an account of the life and voluntary auto-da-fé of Peregrinus Proteus, a fanatical cynic and apostate Christian, who publicly burnt himself from an impulse of vainglory about A.D. 165, is really, for us, the most important work under consideration; for Lucian here discharges his satire upon Cynicism and Christianity. Peregrinus, a perfectly contemptible man, after having committed the commonest and grossest crimes —adultery, sodomy, and parricide—joins the credulous Christians in Palestine, cunningly imposes on them, soon rises to the highest repute among them, and, becoming one of the confessors in prison, is loaded with presents by them, in fact, almost worshipped as a god, but is afterwards excommunicated for eating some forbidden food (probably meat of the idolatrous sacrifices), then casts himself into the arms of the Cynics, travels about everywhere in the filthiest style of that sect, and at last, about the year 165, in frantic thirst for fame, plunges into the flames of a funeral pile before the assembled populace of the town of Olympia for the triumph of philosophy. "Perhaps this fiction of the self-burning," says Dr. Schaff (*Church History*, i, 189), "was meant for a parody on the Christian martyrdom, possibly of Polycarp, who about that time suffered death by fire at Smyrna. . . . An Epicurean worldling and infidel, as Lucian was, could see in Christianity only one of the many vagaries and follies of mankind, in the miracles only jugglery, in the belief of immortality an empty dream, and in the contempt of death and the brotherly love of the Christians, to which he was constrained to testify, a silly enthusiasm." We certainly find in Lucian a singular combination of impartiality and injustice. Wrongly interpreting rather than misrepresenting the Christian belief, he treats its advocates oftener with a compassionate smile than with hatred. He nowhere urges persecution. He never calls Christ an impostor, as Celsus does, but a "crucified *sophist*," a term which he uses as often in a good as in a bad sense. But then, in the end, both the Christian and the heathen religions amount, in his view, to imposture; and there is in all his writings, says Pressensé (*Early Years of Christianity*, ii [N. Y. 1871, 12mo], 454), "scarcely a page which is not an insult to religion in itself. That by which he is mainly distinguished is what may be called his universal impiety, his contempt of all greatness, goodness, or glory. He was the most accomplished disciple of the *nil admirari* school," and hence he has most aptly been termed the Voltaire of his day (compare Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. d. ersten sechs Jahrh.* [Leipsic, 1869] p. 161). It remains a question simply whether in these contemptuous exhibitions of all religion he aimed merely to satirize the failings of the advocates of religious belief, or whether he actually himself believed *nothing*. The latter must certainly be doubted when we consider his exposé of *Pyrrhonism* (q. v.); and we are inclined to accept as most just the treatment he has received at the hands of Thomas Dyer, in Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* ii, 814, col. ii, based on Lucian's own statement in his Ἁλιεύς (§ 20), and in his *Alexander* (§ 54), where he indignantly spurns the charge of immorality brought against him. Mr. Dyer concedes that Lucian was "a hater of pride, falsehood, and vainglory, and an ardent admirer of truth, simplicity, and all that is naturally amiable." (Comp. however, the dissertations by Krebs, *De Malitioso Luciani Consilio Religionem Christianam scurrili dicacitate vanam et ridiculam reddendi* [*Opusc. Acad.* p. 308 sq.], and Eichstadt, *Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare voluerit Religionem Christianam* [Jena, 1822].) IV. Romances.—Under this head may be classed the tale entitled Λούκιος ἢ Ὄνος, *Lucius sive Asinus*, and the Ἀληθοῦς ἱστορίας λόγος α' καὶ β', *Veræ Historiæ*. The adventures related in the latter work are of the most extravagant kind, but show great fertility of invention. It was composed, as the author tells us in the beginning, to ridicule the authors of extravagant tales, including Homer's *Odyssey*, the *Indica* of Ctesias, and the wonderful accounts of Iambulus of the things contained in the great sea. The adventure with the robbers in the cave is thought to have suggested the well-known scene in *Gil Blas*. That the *Veræ Historiæ* supplied hints to Rabelais and Swift is sufficiently obvious, not only from the nature and extravagance of the fiction, but from the lurking satire. V. Dialogues.—These dialogues, which form the great bulk of his works, are of very various degrees of merit, and are treated in the greatest possible variety of style, from seriousness down to the broadest humor and buffoonery. Their subjects and tendencies, too, vary considerably. Still we may divide them into three classes: first, those which are more exclusively directed against the heathen mythology; next, those which attack the ancient philosophy; and, lastly, those in which both the preceding objects are combined, or which, having no such tendency, are mere satires on the manners of the day, and the follies and vices natural to mankind. In the first class may be placed Προμηθεὺς ἢ Καύκασος, *Prometheus seu Caucasus*; Ἐνάλιοι Διάλογοι, *Dei Marini*; Ζεὺς Ἐλεγχόμενος, *Jupiter Confutatus*; Ζεὺς τραγῳδός, *Jupiter Tragœdus*, which strikes at the very existence of Jupiter and that of the other deities; Θεῶν ἐκκλησία, *Deorum Concilium*; Τὰ πρὸς Κρόνον, *Saturnalia*. To the second class belong Βίων πρᾶσις, *Vitarum Auctio*: in this humorous piece the heads of the different sects are put up to sale, Hermes being the auctioneer. The Ἁλιεὺς ἢ Ἀναβιοῦντες, *Piscator seu Reviviscentes*, is a sort of apology for the preceding piece, and may be reckoned among Lucian's best dialogues; Ἑρμότιμος is chiefly an attack upon the Stoics, but its design is also to show the impossibility of becoming a true philosopher; Εὐνοῦχος, *Eunuchus*; Φιλοψευδής, on the love of falsehood natural to some men purely for its own sake. Some commentators have thought that the Christian miracles were alluded to in § 13 and § 16, but this does not seem probable; the Δραπέται, *Fugitivi*, is directed against the Cynics, by whom Lucian seems to have been attacked for his life of Peregrinus; Συμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι, *Convivium seu Lapithæ*, is one of Lucian's most humorous attacks on the philosophers. The third and more miscellaneous class, containing some of his best, includes Τίμων ἢ μισάνθρωπος, *Timon*, which may perhaps be regarded as Lucian's masterpiece. The Νεκρικοὶ Διάλογοι, *Dialogi Mortuorum*, are perhaps the best known of all Lucian's works. The subject affords great scope for moral reflection, and for satire on the vanity of human pursuits. Among modern writers, these dialogues have been imitated by Fontenelle and lord Lyttelton. The Μένιππος ἢ Νεκυομαντεία, *Necyomanteia*, bears some analogy to the *Dialogues of the Dead*: it wants, however, Lucian's pungency, and Du Saul thought that it was written by Menippus himself The Ἰκαρομένιππος ἢ Ὑπερνέφελος, *Icaro-Menippus*, on the contrary, is in Lucian's best vein, and a masterpiece of Aristophanic humor. Χάρων ἢ ἐπισκοποῦντες,

Contemplantes, is a very elegant dialogue, but of a graver turn than the preceding; it is a picture of the smallness of mankind when viewed from a philosophic as well as a physical height. The Κατάπλους ἢ Τύραννος, *Kataplus sive Tyrannus*, is, in fact, a dialogue of the dead. Ὄνειρος ἢ Ἀλεκτρύων, *Somnium seu Gallus*, justly reckoned among the best of Lucian's. Δὶς κατηγορούμενος, *Bis Accusatus*, so called from Lucian's being arraigned by Rhetoric and Dialogue, is chiefly valuable for the information it contains of the author's life and literary pursuits. We may here also mention the Κρονοσόλων, *Crono-Solon*, and the Ἐπιστολαὶ Κρονικαί, *Epistolæ Saturnales*, which turn on the institution and customs of the Saturnalia. Among the dialogues which may be regarded as mere pictures of manners, without any polemical tendency, may be reckoned Ἔρωτες; Ἑταιρικοὶ Διάλογοι, *Dialogi Meretricii*; Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί, *Navigium seu vota*. Among the dialogues which cannot be placed in any of the above three classes are the Εἰκόνες, *Imagines*, which some suppose to have been addressed to a concubine of Verus, and which Wieland conjectures to have been intended for the wife of Marcus Antoninus; Ὑπὲρ τῶν Εἰκόνων, *Pro Imaginibus*, a defence of the preceding, with the flattery of which the lady who was the subject of it pretended to be displeased. Τόξαρις, *Toxaris*, on friendship; Ἀνάχαρσις, *Anacharsis*, an attack upon the Greek gymnasia; Περὶ ὀρχήσεως, *De Saltatione:* this piece is hardly worthy of Lucian, but contains some curious particulars of the art of dancing among the ancients. Διάλεξις πρὸς Ἡσίοδον, *Dissertatio cum Hesiodo*, the genuineness of which is doubted. VI. Miscellaneous Pieces.—These bear in their form some analogy to the modern essay: Πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα Προμηθεὺς εἶ ἐν λόγοις, *Ad eum qui dixerat Prometheus es in Verbis;* Περὶ Θυσιῶν, *De Sacrificiis*, against the absurdities of the heathen worship, and especially of the Egyptian. Περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων, *De Mercede Conductis;* Ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μ. συν., *Apologia pro de Merc. Cond.;* Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῇ προσαγορεύσει πταίσματος, *Pro Lapsu in Salutando*, a playful little piece, though containing some curious learning. Περὶ πένθους, *De Luctu*, in opposition to the received opinion concerning the infernal regions. Πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον, *Adversus Indoctum*, is a bitter attack upon a rich man who thought to acquire a character for learning by collecting a large library. Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥᾳδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ, *Non temere credendum esse Delationi.* VII. Poems.—These consist of two mock tragedies, Τραγοποδάγρα and Ὠκύπους, and about fifty epigrams, the genuineness of some of which is considered doubtful. The following works, which have sometimes been ascribed to Lucian, are considered by the most eminent critics as spurious: Ἀλκυών ἢ περὶ Μεταμορφώσεως, *Halcyon seu de Transformatione*, deemed to be by Leo the Academician; Περὶ τῆς Ἀστρολογίας, *De Astrologia;* Περὶ τῆς Συρίης Θεοῦ, *De Dea Syria;* Κυνικός, *Cynicus;* Χαρίδημος ἢ περὶ καλλοῦς, *Charidemus seu de Pulchro;* Νέρων ἢ περὶ τῆς ὀρυχῆς τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ, *Nero, seu de Fossione Isthmi.*

It is probable that the greater part of Lucian's rhetorical pieces, as well as some others, are lost. "His writings have a more modern air than those of any other classic author; and the keenness of his wit, the richness yet extravagance of his humor, the fertility and liveliness of his fancy, his proneness to scepticism, and the clearness and simplicity of his style, present us with a kind of compound between Swift and Voltaire. There was abundance to justify his attacks in the systems against which they were directed, yet he established nothing in their stead" (Dyer, in Smith, s. v.).

Editions.—Lucian's works were first published (in Greek) at Florence in 1496, folio, from rather incorrect MSS.; a corrected edition was brought out at Venice by Antoni Francini in 1535 (2 vols. 8vo), very good and scarce. The first edition of the Greek text with a Latin version appeared at Basle in 1563 (4 vols. 8vo), the result of the work of several savans: the parts of Erasmus, T. Morus, J. Micyllus, are deserving of praise; this is not the case with that of Vincent Obsopœus. The notes by Sambucus are considered of no account, but those of Gilbert Cousin are highly esteemed. In 1730 the distinguished philologist, Tib. Hemsterhuys, began to print his excellent edition; but dying in 1736, before a quarter of it had been finished, the editorship was assigned to J. F. Reitz, a much less capable man: it appeared at Utrecht in 1743 (4 vols. 4to; republished by Schmidt, at Mittau, 1776–1780, 8 vols. 8vo). This edition contains a large number of valuable notes; the last volume is a lexicon. A much esteemed edition is that of Deux-Ponts, 1789–93, 10 vols. 8vo, which is a careful reprint of Hemsterhuys's edition, the lexicon being replaced by an index, and the 10th volume containing the various readings compiled by Belin de Ballu from the MSS. in the Royal Library of Paris. In 1800 Schmieder published at Halle a text without translation, with various readings compiled from the libraries of France and Germany. There were to appear commentaries in connection with it, which, however, were not published. This edition is much esteemed, although some of the various readings are thought to have been collected without sufficient care. The edition of Lehmann (Lpz. 1821–31, 9 vols. 8vo), with a large number of notes, is of great use for the correct understanding of the text. A much esteemed edition is that of C. Jacobitz (Lpz. 1837–41, 4 vols. 8vo); the text was established with the aid of the most valuable MSS. and with the greatest care. Dindorf published in 1840, at Paris, a Greek text of Lucian, with a Latin version, but no notes, which forms part of the *Bibliotheca Græca*, and stands deservedly high. Separate pieces of Lucian's have been often published.

Lucian has been translated into most of the European languages. In French the best editions are by Belin de Ballu in 1788 (6 vols. 8vo), and by Eugene Talbot (Par. 1857, 2 vols. 18mo). Among the English versions may be named one by several parties, including W. Moyle, Sir H. Shere, and Charles Blount (Lond. 1711). It was several years preparing, and Dryden wrote for it a life of Lucian, which is very incorrect. Carr's version (1773–1798, 4 vols. 8vo) is a pretty correct translation, but the notes are valueless. The best English version is that of Dr. Franklin (Lond. 1780, 2 vols. 4to, and 1781, 4 vols. 8vo), but some of the pieces are omitted. Mr. Tooke's version (London, 1820, 2 vols. 4to) is of little value. In 1675 Charles Cotton published a burlesque imitation of some of the dialogues: it was reprinted in 1686 and 1751. The best German translation of Lucian has been furnished by Wieland (Leips. 1788, 6 vols. 8vo). The notes accompanying it are also valuable; but the translator left out some pieces which he considered of minor interest. Another good translation is by Pauly (Stuttgardt, 1828–1831, 15 vols. 12mo). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Jacob, *Characteristik Lucian's v. Samosata* (1832); Tiemann, *Versuch ü. Lucian und seine Philosophie* (1804); Struve, *Specimina ii de Ætate et vita Luciani* (1829–30); Passow, *Lucian u. d. Gesch.* (1854); Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, i, 315 sq.; Baur, *Die drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 395 sq.; Donaldson, *Greek Literature*, ch. liv, § 3 and 4; Lardner, *Works*, viii, ch. xix; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. Free Thought*, p. 48 sq.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1828; Fraser's *Magazine*, 1839; *Journal Sac. Lit.* vols. x and xii; and especially Planck, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1851, and in an English version in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1853 (April and July); Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.* iii, 812, and the excellent article by Theodor Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 497–504.

Lucian, St., presbyter of Antioch, and a martyr, is said by some to have been born at Samosata, in the Syrian province of Commagene, about the middle of the 3d century. His parents died while he was yet a boy, and, left to depend upon his own resources, the twelve-year-old lad removed to Edessa, where he was baptized, and became a pupil of Macarius, an eminent Biblical schol-

ar. He entered the ministry as a presbyter at Antioch, and finally assumed the lead of a theological school, which he himself founded. He became greatly celebrated both as an ecclesiastic and as a Biblical scholar, and was an ornament of the Christian Church when suddenly cut down by martyrdom, which he suffered A.D. 312, by order of Maximin, during the reign of Diocletian. He was drowned, and was buried at Helenopolis, in Bithynia. Lucian is frequently mentioned by ecclesiastical writers not only as a man of great learning, but also as noted for his piety. Eusebius calls him a "person of unblemished character throughout his whole life" (*Hist. Eccl.* viii, 13); and Chrysostom, on the anniversary of Lucian's martyrdom, pronounced a panegyric upon him which is still extant. Jerome informs us, in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers* (c. 77), that "Lucian was so laborious in the study of the sacred writings that in his own time some copies of the Scriptures were known by the name of Lucian;" and we learn from another part of his works (*Præf. in Paralip.* i, 1023) that Lucian's revision of the Septuagint version of the Old Test. was generally used in the churches, from Constantinople to Antioch. Lucian also made a revision of the New Testament, which Jerome considered inferior to his edition of the Septuagint. There were extant in Jerome's time some treatises of Lucian concerning faith, and also some short epistles; but none of these have come down to us, with the exception of a few fragments.

There has been considerable dispute among critics respecting Lucian's belief in the Trinity. From the manner in which he is spoken of by most of the Trinitarian fathers, and from the absence of any censure upon his orthodoxy by Jerome and Athanasius, it has been maintained that he must have been a believer in the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity; but, on the other hand, Epiphanius, in his *Anchoret* (xxxv, vol. ii, p. 40, D), speaks of the Lucianists and Arians as one sect; and Philostorgius (who lived about 425, and wrote an account of the Arian controversy, of which considerable extracts are preserved by Photius) expressly says that Eusebius of Nicomedia, and many of the principal Arians of the 4th century, were disciples of Lucian; yet this does not prove that their Arian principles were derived from Lucian's teachings. It is nevertheless probable that Lucian's opinions were not quite orthodox, since he is said, by his contemporary Alexander (in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i, c. 4, p. 15, B), to have been excluded from the Roman Catholic Church by three bishops in succession, for advocating the doctrines of Paul of Samosata. Indeed, it was from Lucian's school at Antioch that the great teacher of *Arianism* (q. v.), Arius of Alexandria, came. According to Epiphanius, Lucian was originally a follower of Marcion, but finally formed a sect of his own, known as Lucianists, agreeing, however, in the main with the Marcionites (q. v.). Like the latter, the Lucianists conceived of the Demiurgos, or Creator, as distinct from the perfect God, ὁ ἀγαθός, "the good one;" and described the Creator, who was also represented as the judge, as ὁ δίκαιος, "the just one." Besides these two beings, between whom the commonly received attributes and offices of God were divided, the Lucianists reckoned a third, ὁ πονηρός, "the evil one." Together with the Marcionites, they condemned marriage, and, according to some, though rather questionable authorities, they even denied the immortality of the soul, asserting it to be material, and to be followed by an entirely new substance (tertium quiddam). See GNOSTICISM. Lucian himself, however, repented of his heresy, and returned to the Roman Catholic communion before his death. It was probably on the occasion of his return to the orthodox fold that he gave to the Church his *Confession of Faith*, which is mentioned by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 5), and given at length by Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 10), and which was promulgated by the semi-Arian or Eusebian Synod of Antioch, A.D. 341 (compare Smith, *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 811, col. 1; Bull, *Def. Fid. Nicæn.* ii, 13, § 4–8). See LUCANUS.

There have been three other persons of the name of Lucian connected with the history of the Church: one suffered martyrdom in 250; the second was the first bishop of Beauvais; and the third wrote, about 415, a letter on the whereabouts of the body of St. Stephen. See, besides the authorities already quoted, Tillemont, *Mémoires*, v, 474; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac.* l. c.; Cave, *Hist. litt.* ad ann. 294; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iii, 715 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 504 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Lucianists or **Lucanists**, a sect so called from their founder. See LUCANUS.

Lucĭdus, a presbyter in the Gallic Church in the 5th century, was one of the most distinguished members of the ecclesiastical party which in that period defended the doctrines of St. Augustine against Semi-Pelagianism then greatly preponderating in the Church. The views of Lucidus are to be ascertained from the works resulting from the controversy between himself and Faustus of Rieg, who obliged him to recant. The latter wrote against Lucidus his *Fausti Rejensis epistola ad Lucidum*, and the recantation of Lucidus—probably posterior to the Synod of Arles, 475, as indicated by the expression, "Juxta prædicandi recentia statuta concilii damno vobiscum sensum illum," etc.—is entitled *Lucidi errorem emendantis libellus ad episcopos*. In some respects Lucidus, indeed, had gone further than St. Augustine himself, especially in regard to predestination, allowing no free agency to man, and making all the workings of human conscience to be but the effects of the immediate and gratuitous influence of God. Such, at least, is the accusation which was brought against him at the Council of Arles. The text of his recantation is to be found in all the *Bibl. Patr.* and in the collections of councils. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii, 454; Mansi, vii, 1008 sq.; *Bibl. PP.* edit. ii, vol. iv, p. 875; Wiggers, *August. u. Pelag.* ii, 225, 329, 346; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xviii, 148 sq.; Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* vol. ii, pt. ii. (J. N. P.)

Lu'cifer (Heb. *Heylel'*, הֵילֵל; Sept. ὁ Ἑωσφόρος), a word that once occurs in the English Version in the lines,

> "How art thou fallen from heaven,
> *O Lucifer, son of the morning!*
> How art thou cut down to the ground,
> Which didst weaken the nations!"

(Isa. xiv, 12). It is taken from the Vulgate, which understood the Hebrew word to be the *name* of the morning star, and therefore rendered it by the Latin name of that star, *Lucifer*, i. e. "light-bringing." The derivation has been supposed to be from הָלַל, *halal'*, to *shine*. The same word here translated "Lucifer," however, occurs also in Ezek. xxi, 12 [17], as the imperative of יָלַל, *yalal'*, "to howl," "to lament," and is there rendered "*howl*." Some take it in the same acceptation in the above passage, and would translate, "Howl, son of the morning!" But to this the structure of the verse is entirely opposed, for the parallelism requires the second line to refer entirely to the condition of the star before it had fallen, as the parallel member, the fourth line, does to the state of the tree before it was cut down. Hence the former derivation is to be preferred, namely, "brilliant," "splendid," "illustrious," or, as in the Septuagint, Vulgate, the rabbinical commentators, Luther, and others, "brilliant star;" and if *Heylel*, in this sense, was the proper name among the Hebrews of the morning star, then "Lucifer" is not only a correct but beautiful interpretation, both as regards the sense and the application. That it was such is probable from the fact that the proper name of the morning star is formed by a word or words expressive of brilliance, in the Arabic and Syriac, as well as in the Greek and Latin (see Gesenius, *Commentar*, ad loc.). Tertullian and Gregory the Great understood this passage of Isaiah in reference to the fall of Satan; in consequence of which the name Lucifer has since been applied to Satan, and this is now

the usual acceptation of the word. But Dr. Henderson, who in his *Isaiah* renders the line "Illustrious son of the morning!" justly remarks in his annotation: "The application of this passage to Satan, and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of those gross perversions of Sacred Writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to seek for more in any given passage than it really contains, a disposition to be influenced by sound rather than sense, and an implicit faith in received interpretations." The scope and connection show that none but the king of Babylon is meant. In the figurative language of the Hebrews, *a star* signifies an illustrious king or prince (Numb. xxiv, 17; compare Rev. ii, 28; xxii, 16). The monarch here referred to, having surpassed all other kings in royal splendor, is compared to the harbinger of day, whose brilliancy surpasses that of the surrounding stars. Falling from heaven denotes a sudden political overthrow—a removal from the position of high and conspicuous dignity formerly occupied (comp. Rev. vi, 13; viii, 10). Delitzsch adopts the same view (*Comment.* ad loc.). "In another and far higher sense, however, the designation was applicable to him in whom promise and fulfilment entirely corresponded, and it is so applied by Jesus when he styles himself 'The bright and morning Star' (Rev. xxii, 16). In a certain sense it is the emblem also of all those who are destined to live and reign with him (Rev. ii, 28)." See STAR.

Lucifer, bishop OF CAGLIARI, in Sardinia, surnamed *Calaritanus*, a noted character in ecclesiastical history, the founder of an independent sect known as *Luciferians*, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, held in 354, he appeared as joint legate with Eusebius of Vercelli from pope Liberius, and here he displayed great opposition to the Arian believers. He refused to hold any communion with the clergy who had, during the reign of Constantius, conformed to the Arian doctrines, although it had been determined in a synod at Alexandria, in 352, to receive again into the Church all the Arian clergy who openly acknowledged their errors, and was, in consequence, imprisoned for a time, and finally banished. He took up his residence in Syria, but here also became involved in disputes, and greatly increased the disorders which agitated the Church at Antioch by his ordination of Paulinus as bishop in opposition to Meletius. Disapproved and ignored by his former friends and associates, he retired in disgust to his native island, and there founded an independent sect, whose distinguishing tenet was that no Arian bishop, and no bishop who had in any measure yielded to the Arians, even although he repented and confessed his errors, could enter the bosom of the Church without forfeiting his ecclesiastical rank; and that all bishops and others who admitted the claims of such persons to a full restoration of their privileges became themselves tainted and outcasts—a doctrine which, had it been acknowledged at this period in its full extent, would have had the effect of excommunicating nearly the whole Christian world. Lucifer died during the reign of Valentinian, about A.D. 370.

The number of Luciferians is believed to have been always small; Theodoret says that the sect was extinct in his day (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, c. 5, p. 128, D). Their opinions, however, excited considerable attention at the time when they were first promulgated, and were advocated by several eminent men; among others, by Faustinus, Marcellinus, and Hilarius Diaconus. Jerome wrote a work in refutation of their doctrines, which is still extant. Augustine remarks, in his work on Heresies (c. lxxxi), that the Luciferians held erroneous opinions concerning the human soul, which they considered to be of a carnal nature, and to be transfused from parents to children. Compare the article NOVATIANS.

Lucifer himself is acknowledged by Jerome and Athanasius to have been well acquainted with the Scriptures, and to have been exemplary in private life, but he appears to have been a man of violent temper and great bigotry. His writings were first published entire by Johannes Tillius, bishop of Meaux (Paris, 1568, 8vo), and were dedicated to pope Pius V: *Two Books addressed to the Emperor Constantius in Defence of Athanasius:—On Apostate Kings:—On the Duty of having no Communion with Heretics:—On the Duty of dying for the Son of God:—On the Duty of showing no Mercy to those who sin against God;* and a short *Epistle to Florentius.* The best edition, however, is by the brothers Coleti (Venet. 1778, fol.). See Schönemann, *Bibliotheca Patr. Lat.* i, § 8; Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 396 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. History*, bk. ii, cent. iv, pt. ii, chap. iii, § 20; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, ii, 428 sq., 438, 457; Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzereien* (Lpz. 1766), iii, 388 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* vol. ii, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Luciferians (I.) is the name of a sect founded by *Lucifer of Cagliari* (q. v.), which originated as follows: In 360 the Arians of Antioch had chosen Meletius of Sebaste, formerly a Eusebian, but afterwards an adherent of the Nicene Confession, their bishop. But his inaugural discourse convinced them of their mistake about his views, and they deposed him after the lapse of only a few days. Meletius was next chosen bishop of the Homoousian congregation at Antioch. The appointment of one who had been an Arian was, however, resisted by a part of the people, headed by Paulinus, a presbyter. Athanasius and the Synod of Alexandria, A.D. 362, used every influence to heal this schism. But Lucifer of Cagliari, whom the synod for this purpose deputed to Antioch, took the part of the opposition, and ordained Paulinus counter-bishop. What next followed has been narrated under LUCIFER. A comparison of this sect with the English Puritans is made by Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism*, i, ch. iii.

(II.) The same name was afterwards applied to some heretics of the Middle Ages, who were accused of addressing prayers to the devil (Lucifer). It was particularly applied to fourteen of these heretics who were burned alive at Tangermünde, in Prussian Saxony (1336), by order of the elector of Brandenburg, influenced by the representations of the superior of the Franciscans. These heretics were probably *Fratricelli* (q. v.).

Lucifŭgæ, or LUCIFŬGAX NATIO, *Light-haters;* a term of reproach given to the early Christians, because in times of persecution they frequently held their assemblies at night, or before the break of day.

Lucilla. See DONATISTS.

Lu'cius (Λεύκιος v. r. Λούκιος), a Roman consul (ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων), who is said to have written the letter to Ptolemy (Euergetes) which assured Simon I of the protection of Rome (B.C. cir. 139–8; 1 Macc. xv, 10, 15–24). The whole form of the letter—the mention of one consul only, the description of the consul by the prænomen, the omission of the senate and of the date (comp. Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* § cxix)—shows that it cannot be an accurate copy of the original document; but there is nothing in the substance of the letter which is open to just suspicion. Josephus omits all mention of the letter of "Lucius" in his account of Simon, but gives one very similar in contents (*Ant.* xiv, 8, 5), as written on the motion of *Lucius* Valerius in the ninth (nineteenth) year of Hyrcanus II; and unless the two letters and the two missions which led to them were purposely assimilated, which is not wholly improbable, it must be supposed that he has been guilty of a strange oversight in removing the incident from its proper place.

The imperfect transcription of the name has led to the identification of Lucius with three distinct persons: (1.) [Lucius] Furius Philus (the lists, Clinton, *Fasti Hell.* iii, 114, give P. Furius Philus), who was not consul till B.C. 136, and is therefore at once excluded. (2.) Lucius Cæcilius Metellus Calvus, who was consul in B.C. 142, immediately after Simon assumed the government. On this supposition it might seem not unlikely that the answer which Simon received to an application for protec-

tion, which he made to Rome directly on his assumption of power (comp. 1 Macc. xiv, 17, 18) in the consulship of Metellus, has been combined with the answer to the later embassy of Numenius (1 Macc. xiv, 24; xv, 18). (3.) But the third identification with Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was consul B.C. 139, is most probably correct. The date exactly corresponds, and, though the prænomen of Calpurnius is not established beyond all question, the balance of evidence is decidedly against the common lists. The *Fasti Capitolini* are defective for this year, and only give a fragment of the name of Popillius, the fellow-consul of Calpurnius. Cassiodorus (*Chron.*), as edited, gives *Cn.* Calpurnius, but the eye of the scribe (if the reading is correct) was probably misled by the names in the years immediately before. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus (i, 3) is wrongly quoted from the printed text as giving the same prænomen. The passage in which the name occurs is in reality no part of Valerius Maximus, but a piece of the abstract of Julius Paris inserted in the text. Of eleven MSS. of Valerius which have been examined, it occurs only in one (Mus. Brit. *Burn.* 209), and there the name is given Lucius Calpurnius, as it is given by Mai in his edition of Julius Paris (*Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* iii, 7). Sigonius says rightly (*Fasti Cons.* p. 207): "Cassiodorus prodit consules Cn. Pisonem . . . epitoma L. Calpurnium." The chance of an error of transcription in Julius Paris is obviously less than in the *Fasti* of Cassiodorus; and even if the evidence were equal, the authority of 1 Macc. might rightly be urged as decisive in such a case.

Lucius of Adrianople (or *Hadrianople*), an Eastern prelate of note, flourished as bishop of Adrianople in the 4th century. Decidedly orthodox in his opinions, the predominant and powerful Arians deposed him from his see, and in 340 or 341 we meet him at Rome before pope Julius I pleading for his restoration. Although he went back with a demand from the Roman pontiff to reinstate the deposed orthodox bishop, the Oriental prelates refused to recognise the papal authority, and he did not recover his see until the emperor Constantius, constrained by the threats of his brother Constans, then emperor of the West, restored Lucius (about 347). Upon the death of Constans (350), Lucius was again deposed by the infuriated Arians, and banished. He died in exile. He is commemorated in the Romish Church February 11. See Athanasius, *Apolog. de Fuga sua*, c. 3; *Arianor. ad Monach.* c. 19; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 15, 23, 26; Bolland, *Acta Sanct.* Februarii, ii, 519; Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* ii, 825.

Lucius of Alexandria, an Arian prelate, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. He was elected patriarch by the Arians, when, upon the death of the emperor Constantius (361) and the murder of the Arian patriarch, George of Cappadocia, Athanasius had recovered the patriarchate of Alexandria, and expelled the Arians from the churches. Even in the lifetime of Athanasius the two patriarchs wrangled much for authority, but the contest became fierce between Arian and Orthodox after the decease of Athanasius (373). The latter had nominated his successor without any regard to Lucius, and it was only after the deposition and imprisonment of Peter, the nominee, who had in the mean while been ordained, that Lucius regained the patriarchate, to hold it only until Peter, who had made his escape to Rome, returned with letters confirming his ordination (A.D. 377 or 378). Lucius was, in all probability, never again restored. In 380 he is found in company with Demophilus, Arian patriarch of Constantinople, just as he was withdrawing from the city by order of expulsion. Nothing more is known of Lucius. According to Jerome, he wrote *Solemnes de Paschate Epistolæ* and minor treatises. See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 4; iv, 21 sq., 24, 37; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 371; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ix, 247; Labbe, *Concilii*, vol. vi, col. 313; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 825.

Lu'cius (Λούκιος, for Latin *Lucius*, a common Roman name), surnamed the Cyrenian (ὁ Κυρηναῖος, "of Cyrene"), thus distinguished by the name of his city—the capital of a Greek colony in Northern Africa, and remarkable for the number of its Jewish inhabitants—is first mentioned in the N. T. in company with Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Manaen, and Saul, who are described as prophets and teachers of the Church at Antioch (Acts xiii, 1). A.D. 44. These honored disciples having, while engaged in the office of common worship, received commandment from the Holy Ghost to set apart Barnabas and Saul for the special service of God, proceeded, after fasting and prayer, to lay their hands upon them. This is the first recorded instance of a formal ordination to the office of evangelist, but it cannot be supposed that so solemn a commission would have been given to any but such as had themselves been ordained to the ministry of the Word, and we may therefore assume that Lucius and his companions were already of that number. Whether Lucius was one of the seventy disciples, as stated by Pseudo-Hippolytus, is quite a matter of conjecture, but it is highly probable that he formed one of the congregation to whom Peter preached on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10); and there can hardly be a doubt that he was one of "the men of Cyrene" who, being "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," went to Antioch preaching the Lord Jesus (Acts xi, 19, 20).

In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, vii, 46, it is stated that Paul consecrated Lucius bishop of Cenchreæ, which is probably a mere inference from the supposition that the epistle to the Romans was written from that Corinthian port. Different traditions make Lucius the first bishop of Cyrene and of Laodicea, in Syria.—Smith, s. v.

It is commonly supposed that Lucius is the kinsman of Paul mentioned by that apostle as joining with him in his salutation to the Roman brethren (Rom. xvi, 21). A.D. 55. There is, however, no sufficient reason for regarding him as identical with Luke the Evangelist, though this opinion was apparently held by Origen (ad loc.), and is supported by Calmet, as well as by Wetstein, who adduces in confirmation of it the fact reported by Herodotus (iii, 121), that the Cyrenians had throughout Greece a high reputation as physicians. But it must be observed that the names are clearly distinct. The missionary companion of Paul was not *Lucius*, but *Lucas* or Lucanus, "the beloved physician," who, though named in three different epistles (Col. iv, 14; 2 Tim. iv, 11; Philemon 24), is never referred to as a relation. Again, it is hardly probable that Luke, who suppresses his own name as the companion of Paul, would have mentioned himself as one among the more distinguished prophets and teachers at Antioch. Olshausen, indeed, asserts confidently that the notion of Luke and Lucius being the same person has nothing whatever to support it (Clark's *Theol. Lib.* iv, 513). See Luke.

Lucius, king of England, said to have introduced Christianity into Britain in the second half of the 2d century. See England, Church of (I).

Lucius, Samuel, etc. See Lutz.

Lucius I, pope, succeeded Cornelius as bishop of Rome, after the death of the latter, in Sept. 252. He was soon after banished from Rome, but returned, and is spoken of as a martyr as early as March, 253. There seems, however, to be no precise information as to the length of his pontificate. Nicephorus (*H. E.* vi, 7) states that he held the office six months; Eusebius (*H. E.* vii, 2) says eight; and the *Liber Pontific.* three years and eight months, which must certainly be an error. The latter work ascribes to him the ordinances forbidding any but persons of the purest morals and the best conduct to officiate at the altars, and all priests from entering alone the residence of a woman; also those directing that the pope and the bishops were always to be attended by two priests and three deacons, who should bear witness of their conduct. A pseudo-decretal letter

is also ascribed to him. According to Cyprian, Lucius I must have suffered a short exile from Rome during his pontificate, for Cyprian wrote Lucius a letter of congratulation on the occasion of his return from exile (*Ep.* 61 *ad Luc.*). According to this author (*Ep.* 65), Lucius wrote several letters on the treatment of backsliders, but they are not known at present. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, i, 61; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv, 118 sq.

Lucius II, pope, of Bologna, properly GERHARD CACCIANAMICI, was a regular Augustinian chorister of St. John of Lateran. He was made cardinal priest of Santa Croce of Jerusalem by Honorius II, and vice-chancellor and librarian of the Church of Rome by Innocent II. He was finally elected pope after the death of Celestine II, March 12, 1144. Soon after his accession, the Romans, under the guidance of Arnold of Brescia, rose against the papal authority, determined, by an Arnoldian spirit [see ARNOLD OF BRESCIA], to re-establish the old republic, and to this end appointed a patrician in the capitol to govern them, and chose Jordan, son of Peter Leo, as such, giving him all the revenues of the city, and restricting the pope to the tithes and voluntary offerings. "Cæsar should have the things that are Cæsar's, the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money" (compare Neander, *Ch. History*, iv, 151). The pope attempted to oppose this revolution, and, at the head of a band of armed followers, went forth to attack the capitol, but was wounded by a stone, and died of this wound, Feb. 25, 1145. See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire*, vi, 426 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 226 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, vi, 52 sq. See also TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

Lucius III, properly UBALDO ALLUCINGOLI, belonged to a distinguished family of Lucca. He was made cardinal priest of St. Praxedas by Innocent II in 1140, and cardinal bishop of Ostia and Velletri by Adrian IV in 1158. Having distinguished himself in some negotiations with France, Sicily, and the emperor Frederick, he became a prominent member of the "holy college," and was finally elected pope Sept. 2, 1181. Soon after his arrival at Rome, however, he got into difficulties with the Romans, and was finally obliged to flee the city. Christian, archbishop of Mentz and chancellor of the emperor, started to assist him with a large army, but died on the way. In 1183 Lucius returned to Rome, but his conduct and that of his followers having created fresh troubles, he soon left that city forever and retired to Verona, where he was nearer his imperial protector. The emperor himself arrived at Verona soon after, and the two princes held a consultation on the state of the Church. In this council the Romans were denounced as enemies of the Church, and the Waldenses also were put under the ban, and a crusade was advised to help the persecuted Christians in the East. While engaged in demanding assistance for the crusaders from the kings of England and France, Lucius fell sick and died, Nov. 24, 1185. His letters are in Mansi, *Coll. Conciliorum*, xxii. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 609; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vi, 159 sq.; *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 202; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, iv, 439 sq.; Buske, *Med. Popes and Crusaders*, ii, 155, 165, 168.

Luck, JOHANN PHILIPP, a German theologian, was born at Erbach Aug. 28, 1728. In 1745 he entered the University of Jena. In 1750 he became preacher at Gütterbach; two years later, town-pastor at Michelstadt; in 1757, assessor of the Consistory; two years afterwards, counsellor of the same; and in 1781 was appointed court-preacher. He died Nov. 8, 1791. Well posted in all branches of theology, especially in Church history, familiar with the French, and furnished with the gift of eloquence, he was a most active and efficient worker for the preservation of the moral and religious principles of the Reformation. As a commentator, he was an opponent of the innovations of Bahrdt. The best of his works in this line are his *Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Gemeinen zu Galatien* (Jena, 1753, 4to):—*Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Römer* (ibid. 1753, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lücke, GOTTFRIED CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH, an eminent German theologian, was born at Egeln, near Magdeburg, August 23, 1781. He studied theology at the universities of Halle and Göttingen. In 1813 he became lecturer in the latter university, and in 1816 went to Berlin University, and there lectured on the exegesis of the N. T. Here he became intimate with De Wette and Schleiermacher, whose views greatly influenced the remainder of his career as a theologian. In 1818 he was, at the same time as Gieseler, appointed professor at the newly-established University of Bonn, and in 1827 became professor of theology at Göttingen. He died in that city Feb. 14, 1855. He wrote *Commentatio de Ecclesia Christianorum apostolica* (Götting. 1813, 4to):—*Ueber den neutestam. Kanon des Eusebius von Cäsarea* (Berlin, 1816, 8vo):—*Grundriss d. neutestam. Hermeneutik u. ihrer Gesch.* (Götting. 1817, 8vo):—*Commentar. ü. d. Schriften d. Evangelisten Johannes* (Bonn, 1820–32, 4 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 1843–56; transl. into English under the title *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, Edinb. 1837, 12mo):—*Quæstiones ac vindiciæ Didymianæ* (Göttingen, 1829, 4 parts, 4to). He also took part with De Wette and Schleiermacher in the publication of the *Theologische Zeitschrift* (Berlin, 1819–22, 3 parts, 8vo), and with Gieseler in that of the *Zeitschrift für gebildete Christen* (Elberfeld, 1823 and 1824, 4 parts 8vo). He also contributed some valuable articles to the *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxii, 165; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 569; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 525 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1879; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 860.

Luckenbach, ABRAHAM, a Moravian missionary among the Delaware tribe of the North American Indians, was born in Lehigh County, Pa., May 5, 1777; entered Nazareth Hall, a boy's boarding-school at Nazareth, Pa.; taught there in 1797, and in 1800 became a missionary, "and labored as such with great faithfulness at various stations for forty-three years, when he retired to Bethlehem, where he died, March 8, 1854." Luckenbach edited the second edition of Zeisberger's *Delaware Hymn-book*, and published in the Delaware language *Select O.-T. Scripture Narratives*. See De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 659.

Luckey, SAMUEL, D.D., a noted minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rensselaerville, Albany County, N. Y., April 4, 1791; entered the ministry in 1811, at Ottawa, Lower Canada; from 1812–16, inclusive, labored at Dutchess, Montgomery, Saratoga, and Pittstown, and in 1817–18 in the city of Troy. In 1819 he was at Rhinebeck, and in 1820–21 at Schenectady, where he received from Union College the degrees of master of arts and of doctor of divinity. The next ten years of his life were spent at New Haven, Brooklyn, Albany, and as presiding elder on the New Haven District. In 1822 he became principal of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary at Lima, N. Y., where he remained four years. At the General Conference of 1836 he was a delegate, and was elected editor of *The Christian Advocate and Journal* at New York. At that time the office involved the senior editorship of the Book Room. After an honorable service of four years he returned to the itinerancy, first for a time at Duane Street, New York, and in 1842 was again transferred to the Genesee Conference. From this time to the day of his death (Oct. 11, 1869) he remained in Western New York, residing mostly in Rochester City, but filling the offices of presiding elder, pastor, and chaplain of the Monroe County Penitentiary, in which latter position he served for nine years, bestowing great labor on the reclamation of the fallen. Dr. Luckey had also the honor to be appointed in 1847 one of the regents of the State University. He wrote an excellent treatise on the *Sacrament*

of the Lord's Supper, a work on the *Trinity* (a respectable 12mo volume, which gained for him a wide repute for theological acumen and polemic tact), and a small volume of *Ethic Hymns and Scriptural Lessons for Children*. The hymns, which are original and not without merit, are rhythmical paraphrases of Scripture, mostly of the Psalms. "Dr. Luckey was a man of no ordinary power of intellect. For depth of penetration and soundness of judgment he had few superiors. His knowledge of the forms and principles of law, both civil and ecclesiastical, was quite extensive. He was a thorough Methodist, and with the genius and historic development of his Church he was as familiar as with the alphabet. He long stood among the magnates of his people, and his history is woven in the history of his Church." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1870, p. 280 sq.

Lucopetrians is the name given to a sect of fanatics and ascetics who believed in a double Trinity, rejected marriage, scorned all external forms of worship, and adopted absurdly allegorical interpretations of Scripture. They were believed to have had as their founder an ecclesiastic by the name of Lucopetrus, but the probability is that Lucopetrus is a nickname, and it is said to have been given to a person called Peter, who promised to appear on the third day after his death, and who was called Wolf-Peter or Lucopetrus afterwards, because the devil on that day appeared to his followers in the shape of a wolf. See BOGOMILES; MESSALIANS.

Lucretius, TITUS CARUS, a noted Roman poet, deserves a place here as the exponent of *Epicurianism*. He flourished some time towards the opening of the 1st century, but of his life we know almost nothing with certainty, as he is mentioned merely in a cursory manner in contemporary literature. St. Jerome, in his translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, gives the date of his birth as B.C. 95 (according to others, 99), but he does not specify the source from which his statement is derived. It is alleged, further, that he died by his own hand, in the 44th year of his age, having been driven frantic by a love-potion which had been administered to him; that he composed his works in the intervals of his madness, and that these works were revised by Cicero; but all these statements rest on very insufficient authority, and must be received with extreme caution. His peculiar opinions rendered him specially obnoxious to the early Christians, and it is possible that the latter may have been too easily led to attribute to him a fate which, in its mysterious nature and melancholy termination, was deemed but a due reward for the bold and impious character of his teachings. The great work on which his fame rests is *De Rerum Natura*, a philosophical didactic poem in six books (*editio princeps*, Brescia, about 1473; best editions by Wakefield [London, 1796, 3 vols. 4to, and Glasgow, 1813, 4 vols. 8vo], by Forbiger [Leips. 1828, 12mo], and by Lachmann [Berlin, 1850, 2 vols.]. English translations in verse by Creech [Lond. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo], Good [Lond. 1805–7, 2 vols. 4to]; in prose by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. [London, Bohn's Classical Library, 1851, post 8vo])—in large measure an exposition of the physical, moral, and religious tenets of Epicurus. See EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY. "Regarded merely as a literary composition, the work of Lucretius stands unrivalled among didactic poems. The clearness and fulness with which the most minute facts of physical science, and the most subtle philosophical speculations are unfolded and explained; the life and interest which are thrown into discussions, in themselves repulsive to the bulk of mankind; the beauty, richness, and variety of the episodes which are interwoven with the subject-matter of the poem, combined with the majestic verse in which the whole is clothed, render the *De Rerum Natura*, as a work of art, one of the most perfect which antiquity has bequeathed to us" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.). See Smith, *Dict. Class. Biog.* s.v.

Lud (Heb. *id.* לוּד, derivation unknown; Sept. Λούδ, but in Ezek. Λυδοί; Auth. Vers. "Lydia," in Ezek. xxx, 5), the name apparently of two nations. See ETHNOLOGY.

1. The fourth son of Shem (B.C. post 2513), and founder of a tribe near the Assyrians and Aramæans (Gen. x, 22; 1 Chron. i, 17). According to Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 4), they were the *Lydians;* in which opinion agree Eustathius, Eusebius, Jerome, and Isidore, and among moderns Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 12) and Gesenius. On the contrary, Michaelis (*Spicileg.* ii, 114 sq.) reads לוּד, and understands the *Indians* (see also his *Supplement*, No. 1416; comp. Vater, *Comment.* i, 130). Lud would thus be represented by the Lydus of the mythical period (Herod. i, 7). "The Shemitic character of the manners of the Ludim, and the strong Orientalism of the art of the Lydian kingdom during its latest period and after the Persian conquest, but before the predominance of Greek art in Asia Minor, favor this idea; but, on the other hand, the Egyptian monuments show us in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries B.C. a powerful people called RUTEN or LUDEN, probably seated near Mesopotamia, and apparently north of Palestine, whom some, however, make the Assyrians. We may perhaps conjecture that the Lydians first established themselves near Palestine, and afterwards spread into Asia Minor; the occupiers of the old seat of the race being destroyed or removed by the Assyrians." With the latter supposition, compare the apocryphal statement in Judith ii, 23. See LYDIA.

2. One of the Hamitic tribes descended from Mizraim (*Ludim*, Gen. x, 13), apparently a people of Africa (perhaps of Ethiopia), sprung from the Egyptians, and accustomed to fight with bows and arrows (Ezek. xxvii, 10; xxx, 5; Isa. lxvi, 19, where they are associated with Cush and Phut; comp. the Ludim, Jer. xlvi, 9, and the Phud and Lud of Judith ii, 23). Some have referred the name to the people of *Luday*, on the western coast of Africa, south of Morocco (see Michaelis, *Spicileg.* i, 259 sq.; also *Suppl.* No. 1417); and combine with this the mention of a river *Laud* in Tangitania (Pliny, v, 2). Others, as Bochart (*Phaleg*, iv, 56) and Gesenius (*Comment.* ad loc. Isa.), regard them as a branch of the Ethiopians. Hitzig (*Comment.* ad loc. Isa. and Jer.) thinks that the *Libyans* are intended (by an interchange of letters), but *Nubia* appears to be rather indicated by the scriptural notices. Still more improbable is the supposition of Forster (*Ep. ad Michael.* p. 13 sq.), that the *inhabitants of the oases* are intended, designated in Coptic by a term having some resemblance to Lud. The Arabic interpreters have *Tanites;* the Targum of Jonathan renders *inhabitants of the nome of Neut.* The opinion of Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1418), that by the Ludim the prophets meant the Lydians, has lately been re-enforced by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 746) with the remark that the Egyptians and Tyrians employed soldiers from Asia Minor in their armies (Herod. ii, 152, 154, 163; iii, 1). But the Egyptians, at least, had also mercenary troops from Africa, and the Asiatics referred to were only from Ionia and Caria. Rosellini (*Monument. stor.* III, i, 321 sq.) speaks of a province of *Ludin*, but the locality is uncertain. See LUDIM.

Ludämilia, ELISABETH VON SCHWARZBURG RUDOLFSTADT, a noted female hymnist of Germany, was born April 7, 1640, and died March 12, 1672. She wrote 215 hymns, many of which are the pearls of German sacred song. They were published entire in 1687, under the title *Die Stimme der Freundin* (new edit. 1868). See her biography by Thilo (1856).

Lüdeke, CHRISTOPH WILHELM, a German theologian, was born at Schönberg, Prussia, Mar. 3, 1737. In 1758 he went to the Levant as a preacher of the Danish mission, and afterwards became pastor of the Lutheran Church, and director of their school at Smyrna. In 1768 he accepted a call to Magdeburg as pastor; in 1773 to Stockholm, as German preacher and inspector of the German Lyceum. He died June 18, 1805. He was an excellent scholar in many branches of theology, has done

much for mission and education, and by his contributions to the literature on the Orient contributed largely to Bible geography. His *Expositio brevis locorum Sacræ Scripturæ ad Orientem sese referentium*, etc., deserves special mention (Halæ, 1777, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lüderwald, Johann Balthasar, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Fahrland, Prussia, Sept. 27, 1722. He attended the University of Helmstädt, and, having finished the academical course, became in 1742 tutor; in 1747, pastor at Glentorf, near Helmstädt; afterwards superintendent and first pastor at Forsfelde, where he died, August 25, 1796. He is noted as a defender of the truth against Lessing after the publication of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments by the latter. His *Commentatio de vi argumenti, quod licitur e silentio Scriptoris* (Guelpherbyti, 1745, 8vo), deserves special mention. He also wrote *Spicilegium observationum in præstantissimum Deborœ epinicium, Judic.* v, 4 (ibid. 1772, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Ludgardis (Ludgaris, or Lutgardis), a celebrated thaumaturgist of the 12th century, was born about 1182. At the early age of twelve she entered the Benedictine convent of St. Trudo, and soon gave evidence of mystic tendencies. She claimed to have visions in which she held familiar converse with the Virgin Mary, the angels, John the Baptist and the apostles, St. Catharine, and a number of other saints. Once she stated she had seen St. John the evangelist in the form of a shining eagle, who, opening her mouth with his beak, filled her with divine wisdom. But Christ himself was generally the object of her ecstatic visions. After taking the veil in 1200, she was in 1205 appointed abbess of the convent. In 1206, by advice of John de Lirot and of St. Christine, she entered the convent of the Cistercians of Aquiric, near Brussels. Here her visions became still more striking and numerous: in her meditations on the sufferings of Christ her body became covered with blood, etc. She was also said to have worked a great number of miracles. She died June 16, 1246. Her biography was written by the Dominican Thomas Cantipratanus. See Alban Stolz, *Legenden* (Freib. 1856), vol. ii, l. c.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 511.

Lüdicke, Johann August, a German theologian, was born at Cöthen Sept. 15, 1737, and was educated at the Universities of Halle and Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In 1759 he became tutor; in 1762, subrector of the German Reformed town-school of his native place; in 1776, pastor at Gnetsch, where he remained until 1813. He died at Cöthen July 9, 1821. For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lu'dim (Heb. *Ludim'*, לוּדִים, Sept. Λωδιείμ; in 1 Chron. לוּדִיִּם, Λωδιείμ; in Jer. Λοῦδοι, A. V. "Lydians"), a Mizraitish or Egyptian people or tribe (Gen. x, 13; 1 Chron. i, 11; Jer. xlvi, 9), probably the same with Lud, No. 2. From their position at the head of the list of the Mizraites, it is probable that the Ludim were settled to the west of Egypt, perhaps further than any other race of the same stock. Isaiah mentions "Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow (מֹשְׁכֵי קֶשֶׁת), Tubal, and Javan, the isles afar off" (lxvi, 19). Here the expression in the plural, "that draw the bow" (Vulg. *(tendentes sagittam)*, may refer only to Lud, and therefore not connect it with one or both of the names preceding. A comparison with the other three passages, in all which Phut is mentioned immediately before or after Lud or the Ludim, goes to confirm the Sept. reading, Phut, Φούδ, for Pul, a word not occurring in any other passage, as the true one; and we also notice as coincident the extraordinary change from מֹשְׁכֵי to Μοσόχ. See Pul; Mesech. Jeremiah, in speaking of Pharaoh Necho's army, makes mention of "Cush and Phut that handle the buckler, and the Ludim that handle [and] bend the bow" (xlvi, 9). Here the Ludim are associated with African nations as mercenaries or auxiliaries of the king of Egypt, and therefore it would seem probable, *primâ facie*, that the Mizraitish Ludim are intended. Ezekiel, in the description of Tyre, speaks thus of Lud: "Persia, and Lud, and Phut were in thine army, thy men of war: buckler (מָגֵן) and helmet hung they up in thee; they set thine adorning" (xxvii, 10). In this place Lud might seem to mean the Shemitic Lud, especially if the latter be connected with Lydia; but the association with Phut renders it as likely that the nation or country is that of the African Ludim. In the prophecy against Gog a similar passage occurs. "Persia, Cush, and Phut (A. Vers. "Libya") with them [the army of Gog]; all of them [with] buckler (מָגֵן) and helmet" (xxxviii, 5). It seems from this that there were Persian mercenaries at this time, the prophet perhaps, if speaking of a remote future period, using their name and that of other well-known mercenaries in a general sense. The association of Persia and Lud in the former passage therefore loses somewhat of its weight. In one of the prophecies against Egypt Lud is thus mentioned among the supports of that country: "And the sword shall come upon Mizraim, and great pain shall be in Cush, at the falling of the slain in Mizraim, and they shall take away her multitude (הֲמוֹנָהּ), and her foundations shall be broken down. Cush, and Phut, and Lud, and all the mingled people (עֶרֶב), and Chub, and the children of the land of the covenant, shall fall by the sword with them" (xxx, 4, 5). Here Lud is associated with Cush and Phut, as though an African nation. The *Ereb*, whom we have called "mingled people" rather than "strangers," appear to have been an Arab population of the Sinaitic peninsula, perhaps including Arab or half-Arab tribes of the Egyptian desert to the east of the Nile. Chub is a name nowhere else occurring, which perhaps should be read Lub, for the country or nation of the Lubim. See Chub; Lubim. The "children of the land of the covenant" may be some league of tribes, as probably were the Nine Bows of the Egyptian inscriptions; or the expression may mean nations or tribes allied with Egypt, as though a general designation for the rest of its supporters besides those specified. It is noticeable that in this passage, although Lud is placed among the close allies or supporters of Egypt, yet it follows African nations, and is followed by a nation or tribe at least partly inhabiting Asia, although possibly also partly inhabiting Africa. See Egypt.

There can be no doubt that but one nation is intended in these passages, and it seems that thus far the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the Mizraitish Ludim. There are no indications in the Bible known to be positive of mercenary or allied troops in the Egyptian armies, except of Africans, and perhaps of tribes bordering Egypt on the east. We have still to inquire how the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and of profane history may affect our supposition. From the former we learn that several foreign nations contributed allies or mercenaries to the Egyptian armies. Among them we identify the Rebu with the Lubim, and the Sharyatana with the Cherethim, who also served in David's army. The latter were probably from the coast of Palestine, although they may have been drawn in the case of the Egyptian army from an insular portion of the same people. The rest of these foreign troops seem to have been of African nations, but this is not certain. The evidence of the monuments reaches no lower than the time of the Bubastite line. There is a single foreign contemporary inscribed record on one of the colossi of the temple of Abû-Simbel in Nubia, noting the passage of Greek mercenaries of a Psammetichus, probably the first (Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, ii, 329). From the Greek writers, who give us information from the time of Psammetichus I downwards, we learn that Ionian, Carian, and other Greek mercenaries formed an important element in the Egyptian army in all times when the country was independent, from the reign of

that king until the final conquest by Ochus. These mercenaries were even settled in Egypt by Psammetichus. There does not seem to be any mention of them in the Bible, excepting they be intended by Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recollected that it is reasonable to connect the Shemitic Lud with the Lydians, and that at the time of the prophets by whom Lud and the Ludim are mentioned the Lydian kingdom generally or always included the more western part of Asia Minor, so that the Lud and Ludim might well apply to the Ionian and Carian mercenaries drawn from this territory. See LUD.

The manner in which these foreign troops in the Egyptian army are characterized is perfectly in accordance with the evidence of the monuments, which, although about six centuries earlier than the prophet's time, no doubt represent the same condition of military matters. The only people of Africa beyond Egypt portrayed on the monuments whom we can consider as most probably of the same stock as the Egyptians are the ReBU, who are the Lubim of the Bible, almost certainly the same as the Mizraitish Lehabim (q. v.); therefore we may take the ReBU as probably illustrating the Ludim, supposing the latter to be Mizraites, in which case they may indeed be included under the same name as the Lubim, if the appellation ReBU be wider than the Lubim of the Bible, and also as illustrating Cush and Phut. The last two are spoken of as handling the buckler. The Egyptians are generally represented with small shields, frequently round; the ReBU with small round shields, for which the term here used, מָגֵן, the small shield, and the expression "that handle," are perfectly appropriate. That the Ludim should have been archers, and apparently armed with a long bow that was strung with the aid of the foot by treading (דֹּרְכֵי קֶשֶׁת), is noteworthy, since the Africans were always famous for their archery. The ReBU, and one other of the foreign nations that served in the Egyptian army—the monuments show the former only as enemies—were bowmen, being armed with a bow of moderate length; the other mercenaries—of whom we can only identify the Philistine Cherethim, though they probably include certain of the mercenaries or auxiliaries mentioned in the Bible—carrying swords and javelins, but not bows. These points of agreement, founded on our examination of the monuments, are of no little weight, as showing the accuracy of the Bible. See SHIELD.

Lüdke, FRIEDRICH GERMANUS, a German theologian, was born at Stendal, Prussia, April 10, 1730. He began his academical course very young, and, upon its completion, became pastor of the Nicolai Church at Berlin, which office he held until his death, March 8, 1792. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as a man of an independent, decided, and philosophical mind, and ably defended the Christian truths. He was also an earnest advocate of tolerance, and wrote "About Tolerance and Freedom of Conscience." — Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Ludlow, John, D.D., LL.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Acquackanonck, now Passaic, N. J., Dec. 13, 1793; graduated at Union College, 1814, and at the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J., 1817. His first settlement was in the First Reformed (Dutch) Church of New Brunswick, 1817; in 1819 he was elected professor in the theological seminary at that place; in 1823 he became pastor of the First Reformed (Dutch) Church in Albany, where he sustained himself with great power as a preacher, pastor, and public man. In 1834 he was made provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and retained that position with distinguished ability until 1852, when he returned to New Brunswick as professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the theological seminary, and also as professor of mental philosophy in Rutgers College. He died in 1857, in the full assurance of hope and of faith. In every respect Dr. Ludlow was "a mighty man," physically, mentally, spiritually; as a theologian, a preacher, and a leader of men. He was full of power. His intellect was like his bodily frame, massive, compact, and vigorous. His will and his emotional nature were equally strong. His spirit and labors in the pulpit, in the professor's chair, at the head of the university, and in public bodies, were always direct, well ordered, and indomitable. "He adorned every relation that he sustained, and was one of the very finest specimens of intellectual and moral nobility."—Sprague, *Annals; Memorial Sermons* by Drs. George W. Bethune, Isaac Ferris, and W. J. R. Taylor; Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church; N.Y. Observer* (1866); *American College Presidents*, xliii. (W. J. R. T.)

Ludlow, Peter, a Baptist minister, was born in Enfield, Conn., Aug. 8, 1797, of Presbyterian parentage. He was for a time a member of Princeton College, N. J.; then began the study of law, but his religious convictions became so deep that he decided to become a minister. The distinguished Summerfield aided him in his theological studies. He joined the Baptist Church, received license, and was ordained Sept. 2, 1823 pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Providence, R. I. His continued ill-health necessitated his acceptance of a call to the Baptist Church in Georgetown, S. C. He died in New York, May 6, 1837. Rev. Dr. Jackson, of Newport, says of him: "His talents were of a high order, and he was not less distinguished for his evangelical views than for his attractive and effective eloquence." See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vi, 727 sq.

Ludolf, JOB, a noted Ethiopic scholar, also a lawyer and statesman of distinguished merit, was born at Erfurt, in Thuringia, in 1624. After finishing his education, he spent several years in travelling, and subsequently filled important stations in his native city, and under the elector palatine at Frankfort. He then devoted himself to the completion of his works, of which his *Ethiopic History*, and his commentaries on it, his *Amharic* and *Ethiopic Grammars*, and *Ethiopic Lexicon*, are the most valuable, and have universally met with the highest esteem from the learned.

Ludolph DE SAXONIA was distinguished among the Dominican mystics of the 14th century. He entered the order about A.D. 1300, and in further pursuance of his pious devotion became a Carthusian at Strasburg. His *Vita Jesu Christi* has often been edited and translated into various languages. He flourished in Saxony, but the date both of his birth and death are unknown.

Lüers, JOHN H., an American Roman Catholic prelate of great ability and note, was born at Lütten, in Oldenburg, Germany, Sept. 29, 1819, came to this country in 1833, and, after a short service as clerk, entered St. Mary's Theological Seminary at Cincinnati, Ohio, and was consecrated priest in 1846, and bishop of Fort Wayne in 1858. He deserves the commendation of all Christian people for his great zeal in behalf of educational facilities for the lower classes of his Church. He was especially active during his presidency over the diocese of Northern Indiana, where he built many churches and established schools. He died in Cleveland, Ohio, June 29, 1871.

Luft, FRIEDRICH MATTHÄUS, a German theologian, was born at Kirch-Rüsselbach, Aug. 3, 1705. In 1723 he entered the University of Altdorf, where his uncle, G. G. Zelter, was then professor of theology and of the Oriental languages. In 1730, when Prof. Zelter resigned his professorship and became pastor at Poppenreut, Luft accompanied him, and was made vicar in 1732. In 1733 he became the first chaplain at Fürth, where he unexpectedly died, May 24, 1740. His death caused great grief, since his knowledge and unwearied diligence gave promise of future usefulness and eminence. He rendered great service in issuing the Bible-work of Prof. Zelter. He himself committed only a few minor productions to print, but among his papers valuable MSS.

were found, intended as preparations for quite extensive labors. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. ii, s. v.

Lugo, Juan de, a learned Spanish Jesuit and cardinal, was born at Madrid, Nov. 25, 1583, and for twenty years was theological professor at Rome; was made cardinal in 1643, and died Aug. 20, 1660. In his office as cardinal he was distinguished for his plain manner of life and his liberality to the poor. He wrote *De Incarnatione dominica* (Lyons, 1633, fol.):—*De Sacramentis in genere* (1635, fol.):—*Responsorum Moralium* lib. vi (1651, fol.), etc. All his works were collected in seven large folios (Venice, 1751). Pallavicini boasted of having been his pupil. Liguori names him as a theologian next to Thomas Aquinas.

Lugo's brother Francisco was also a Jesuit, and the author of several theological works. They are of minor value, however. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxii, 212.

Lu'hith (Heb. *Luchith'*, לוּחִית [always with the art. prefixed], prob. *tableted* [see below]; Sept. Λουείθ, but in Jer. [חלחוּת] Ἀλαώθ v. r. Ἀλωθ), a Moabitish place (but whether a town or not is uncertain, as it is only found in the phrase "ascent of Luhith"), apparently situated on an eminence between Zoar and Horonaim, on the track of the invading Babylonians (Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 5). According to Eusebius, it lay between Areopolis and Zoar. M. de Saulcy thinks it may be identified with a site on the hill *Nouekin*, about half way up on the south side of the ravine leading north-easterly from the northern opening of the peninsula of the Dead Sea (*Narrative*, i, 386, 267, and map). The position is probably not far from correct (although not between Ar and Zoar), but no such name appears on Robinson's or Zimmermann's map: it does, however, on Van de Velde's.

Luhith, "as a Hebrew word, signifies 'made of boards or posts' (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 748); but why assume that a Moabitish spot should have a Hebrew name? By the Syriac interpreters it is rendered 'paved with flagstones' (Eichhorn, *Allg. Bibliothek*, i, 845, 872). In the Targums (*Pseudojon.* and *Jerus.* on Numb. xxi, 16, and *Jonathan* on Isa. xv, 1) Lechaiath is given as the equivalent of Ar-Moab. This may contain an allusion to Luchith, or it may point to the use of a term meaning 'jaw' for certain eminences, not only in the case of the Lehi of Samson, but also elsewhere. See Michaelis, *Suppl.* No. 1307; but, on the other hand, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1134."

Luini (or *Lovino*), Bernardino, a celebrated painter of the Lombard school, born about 1460 at Luini, near the Lago Maggiore, was the ablest pupil of Leonardo da Vinci and of Stefano Scotto. He imitated the style and execution of his master Leonardo da Vinci so closely as to deceive experienced judges, and yet his general manner has a delicacy and grace sufficiently original and distinct from that of Leonardo. Many of Luini's best and greatest works, in oil and in fresco, are still in a good state of preservation, namely, the *Magdalen* and *St. John with the Lamb*, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; the *Enthroned Madonna*, painted in 1521, the *Drunkenness of Noah*, and other works in the gallery of the Brera at Milan; the frescoes of the Monastero Maggiore, or San Maurizio, in the same city, from which, however, the ultramarine and gold have been scraped off; several at Saronno, among them his chef-d'œuvre, *Christ disputing with the Doctors;* and other extensive and equally good works in the Franciscan convent Degli Angeli at Lugano, on the lake of that name. The date of his death is not exactly known, but he was alive in 1530.

He had a brother, Ambrogio, who imitated his style, and several sons who also were painters. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Luitprand, or Liudprand, king of Lombardy (A.D. 712–744), was born towards the close of the 7th century. In 702 his father, Ansprand, a powerful Lombard lord, and an adherent of king Luitbert, having been defeated by the usurper Aribert II, retired to the Bavarian court. He was joined there by Luitprand, but the other members of his family, having fallen into the hands of Aribert, were put to death. In 712 Luitprand and his father succeeded in overthrowing Aribert, and Ansprand dying shortly after, Luitprand succeeded to the throne. His first care was to restore peace to his kingdom, suffering from internal dissensions. He enacted a series of laws in the years 712, 717, 720, 721, 723, 724, which, with the Edict of Rotharis, form the principal basis of the Lombard law as it remained in force in Northern Italy until the 14th, and in the kingdom of Naples until the 16th century. Peace and prosperity once restored to his people, Luitprand eagerly sought for an opportunity for the aggrandizement of his dominions. He had his eye especially on Rome and the exarchate, and when the quarrel broke out between the pope and the emperor of Constantinople concerning image worship, Luitprand suddenly announced himself and his Lombards devout worshippers of images, and, under pretence of taking the pope's part, he seized the exarchate of Ravenna and several cities. But pope Gregory II, alarmed at the growing power of Lombardy, and the prospect that hereafter the papacy might be dependent on the rule of a people looked upon as vile barbarians [see Lombards], preferred to seek aid in other quarters not only for himself, but also for the exarchate, whose days seemed about to be numbered. He therefore enjoined upon the duke of Venetia to aid the exarch in retaking the provinces seized by Luitprand. Gregory at the same time persuaded the inhabitants of the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento to throw off the Lombard yoke. Luitprand, however, matched the pope in cunning, for he no sooner learned the position of the pontiff than he turned to the side of the exarch, and, after having aided him in subduing his insurgent provinces, marched himself against Rome, with the intention of taking his revenge on the pope. The latter, however, succeeded in pacifying Luitprand, and the Lombard returned into his kingdom. In 736, being dangerously ill, he surrendered for a while his power to his nephew Hildebrand, whom the Lombards had elected his successor, but when he recovered his health he found himself obliged to divide his authority with Hildebrand. In 739 Luitprand overcame a league formed against him by pope Gregory III, and the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento and the exarch of Ravenna, and, to punish the incumbent of the apostolic see, he appeared before the gates of Rome. The pope, in his distress, called upon Charles Martel for assistance. Gregory's appeal is truly touching: "His tears are falling night and day for the destitute state of the Church. The Lombard king and his son are ravaging the last remains of the property of the Church, which no longer suffices for the daily service; they have invaded the territory of Rome, and seized all his farms. His only hope is in the timely succor of the Frankish king." Valuable presents accompanied this appeal—among them the mystic keys of the sepulchre of St. Peter, and filings of his chains, which no Christian could resist—also a proffer of the title of "Patrician and Consul of Rome"—yea, the deliverer of the Eternal City was to become even the patron of the Romish Church. Of course Martel answered favorably to such an invitation. Unfortunately, however, for the Romish cause, he died shortly after. But, even before Martel could have taken the field against Luitprand, the latter had been induced to withdraw his troops from Rome. A state of hostility, however, continued between the Lombards and the Romans until the death of Gregory III. The next pontiff (Zachary) finally succeeded, by a personal visit to Luitprand, in securing a treaty with the Lombards by which the latter restored to the Church all the possessions taken from it during the war. Luitprand thereafter seems to have been favorably inclined towards Zachary and the Church. He died in January, 744. See Paul Diacre,

Historia Longobardorum; Anastasius, *Vitæ Pontif.;* Muratori, *Annales Script. Ital.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* vol. xxxii; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 54 sq.; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christ.* ii, 374 sq. (J. H. W.)

Luitprand, or LIUTPRAND, a distinguished Italian historian, is supposed to have been born at Pavia about A.D. 920, of a noble family very high in favor at the court of king Hughes. Luitprand received a very good education, and was at an early age appointed deacon of the cathedral of Pavia. He soon after became chancellor of king Berengar, by whom he was, about 946, sent on a mission to Byzantium. After his return in 950, he fell under the displeasure of the king and of queen Willa, and retired to the court of Otho I of Germany. He remained there eleven years, learned the language of the country, and became acquainted with all the most distinguished characters. In 958 he began, at the request of the bishop of Elvira, to write a history of his own age, and he continued this task until 962, when he returned to Otho in Italy. He was now at once appointed bishop of Cremona, and was in 963 sent by Otho to pope John XII, ostensibly for the purpose of assuring the latter of the emperor's good will, but in reality to incite the Roman aristocracy against the pope. Shortly after, when the pope was accused before the Synod of Rome, Luitprand spoke against him in the name of the emperor. Two years afterwards Otho sent him again to Rome, together with the bishop of Spiers, to direct the pontifical election, a duty which he performed to the emperor's entire satisfaction. In 968 Luitprand went to Constantinople to negotiate a marriage between princess Theophania and the son of Otho, but herein he failed. In 971 he was sent, with some others, to renew negotiations for the same object, Nicephorus being dead; but he died himself soon after, in the early part of 972. His works, which are of great value for the history of those times, are *Antapodosis*, begun at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in 958, concluded in Italy in 962, a historical work, in which he seeks to revenge himself for the wrongs he had suffered, especially from Berengar and Willa:—*Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis Magni imperatoris*, an account of events from 960 to 964, which is the more valuable from the fact that Luitprand was an eyewitness and often an actor in all the occurrences he relates:—*Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* of 968, very important for the information it contains on events and customs, and the best written of Luitprand's works. The *Antapodosis* and *Historia Ottonis*, of which the original MS., partly in Luitprand's own handwriting, is preserved in the library of Munich, were published at Antwerp (1640, fol.), and in several historical works of the Middle Ages, as in those of Reuber and Du Chesne, and in the *Scriptores* of Muratori, vol. ii. The best edition of Luitprand's works is contained in Pertz, *Monumenta*, vol. iii, who has also published them separately. A German translation of the *Antapodosis* was published by the baron of Osten-Sacken (Berlin, 1853), with an Introduction by Wattenbach. See Köpke, *De Vita et Scriptis Luitprandi* (Berl. 1842, 8vo); Pertz, *Monum.* iii, 264; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (2d ed. Berl. 1866), p. 209; Contzen, *Geschichtschreiber d. sächsischen Kaiserzeit*, etc. (Regensb. 1837); Giesebrecht, *Kaiserzeit*, i, 740, 742 sq.; Dönniges, *Otto I*, p. 199 sq.; Niebuhr, *SS. Byz.* vol. xi.; Martini, *Ue. d. Geschichtschreiber Liudprand*, in *Denkschrift. d. Kön. Akad. d. Wissensch.* of Munich, 1809, 1810; Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 219; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 442; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, vol. ii (see Index).

Luke, the evangelist, and author of the Acts of the Apostles. Although himself not an apostle, he has admirably supplemented their labors by his pen, and has thus laid the literary world under lasting obligation.

I. *His Name.*—This, in the Greek form, Λουκᾶς, is abbreviated from Λουκανός, the Græcized representative of the Latin *Lucanus*, or Λουκιλιός, *Lucilius* (comp. *Silas* for *Silvanus; Annas* for *Annanus; Zenas* for *Zenodorus:* Winer, *Gram.* p. 115). The contraction of *ανός* into ᾶς is said to be characteristic of the names of slaves (see Lobeck, *De Substantiv. in* ᾶς *exeuntibus*, in Wolf, *Analect.* iii, 49), and it has been inferred from this that Luke was of heathen descent (which may also be gathered from the implied contrast between those mentioned Col. iv, 12–14, and the *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, ver. 11), and a *libertus*, or freedman. This latter idea has found confirmation in his profession of a physician (Col. iv, 14), the practice of medicine among the Romans having been in great measure confined to persons of servile rank (Middleton, *De Medicorum apud Roman. degent. Conditione*). To this, however, there were many exceptions (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Medicus), and it is altogether an insufficient basis on which to erect a theory as to the evangelist's social rank. So much, however, we may probably safely infer from his profession, that he was a man of superior education and mental culture to the generality of the apostles, the fishermen and tax-gatherers of the Sea of Galilee.

II. *Scripture History.*—All that can be with certainty known of Luke must be gathered from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. The result is but scanty. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them "of the circumcision" by Paul (comp. Col. iv, 11 with ver. 14). If this be not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idioms in his style, for he might be a Hellenistic Jew, nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of Paul, a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not, indeed, "an eyewitness and minister of the Word from the beginning" (Luke i, 2), or he would have rested his claim as an evangelist upon that ground. His name does not once occur in the Acts, and we can only infer his presence or absence from the sudden changes from the third to the first person, and *vice versa*, of which phenomenon, notwithstanding all that has of late been urged against it, this, which has been accepted since the time of Irenæus (*Contr. Hær.* iii, 14), is the only satisfactory explanation. Rejecting the reading *συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν*, Acts xi, 28 (which only rests on D. and Augustine, *De Serm. Dom.* ii, 17), which would bring Luke into connection with Paul at a much earlier period, as well as the identification of the evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii, 1: Rom. xvi, 21), which was current in Origen's time (*ad Rom.* xvi, 39; see Lardner, *Credibility*, vi, 124; Marsh, *Michaelis*, iv, 234), and would make him a kinsman of Paul, we first find Luke in Paul's company at Troas, and sailing with him to Macedonia (Acts xvi, 10, 11). A.D. 48. Of his previous history, and the time and manner of his conversion, we know nothing, but Ewald's supposition (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* vi, 35, 448) is not at all improbable, that he was a physician residing in Troas, converted by Paul, and attaching himself to the apostle with all the ardor of a young convert. He may also, as Ewald thinks, have been one of the first uncircumcised Christians. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great apostle's followers without any hint that this was his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by Paul himself. There are some who maintain that Luke had already joined Paul at Antioch (Acts xi, 27–30; see *Journal of Sacred Literature*, October, 1861, p. 170, and Conybeare and Howson's *Life of Paul*, chap. v, new ed. Lond. 1861). He accompanied Paul as far as Philippi, but did not share in the imprisonment of his master and his companion Silas, nor, as the third person is resumed (Acts xvii, 1), did he, it would seem, take any further part in the apostle's missionary journey. The first person appears again on Paul's third visit to Philippi, A.D. 54 (Acts xx, 5, 6), from which it has been gathered that Luke had spent the whole intervening time—a period of seven or eight years—in Philippi or its neighborhood. If any credit is to be given to the ancient opin-

ion that Luke is referred to in 2 Cor. viii, 18 as "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches" (a view adopted by the Church of England in the collect for Luke's day), as well as the early tradition embodied in the subscription to that epistle, that it was sent from Philippi "by Titus and *Lucas*," we shall have evidence of the evangelist's missionary zeal during this long space of time. If this be so, we are to suppose that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi (Acts xx, 3) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth on this errand, the word "gospel" being, of course, to be understood, not, as Jerome and others erroneously interpret it, of Luke's written gospel, but of his publication of the glad tidings of Jesus Christ. The mistaken interpretation of the word "gospel" in this place has thus led some to assign the composition of the Gospel of Luke to this period, a view which derives some support from the Arabic version published by Erpenius, in which its writing is placed "in a city of Macedonia twenty-two years after the Ascension," A.D. 51. From their reunion at Philippi, Luke remained in constant attendance on Paul during his journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx, 6–xxi, 18), and, disappearing from the narrative during the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, reappears again when he sets out for Rome (Acts xxvii, 1). A.D. 56. He was shipwrecked with Paul (xxviii, 2), and travelled with him by Syracuse and Puteoli to Rome (vers. 12–16), where he appears to have continued as his fellow-laborer (*συνεργός*, Philem. 24; Col. iv, 4) till the close of his first imprisonment, A.D. 58. The Second Epistle to Timothy (iv, 11) gives us the latest glimpse of the "beloved physician," and our authentic information regarding him beautifully closes with a testimony from the apostle's pen to his faithfulness amidst general defection, A.D. 64.

III. *Traditionary Notices.*—The above sums up all we really know about Luke; but, as is often the case, in proportion to the scantiness of authentic information is the copiousness of tradition, increasing in definiteness, be it remarked, as it advances. His Gentile descent being taken for granted, his birthplace was appropriately enough fixed at Antioch, "the centre of the Gentile Church, and the birthplace of the Christian name" (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 4; comp. Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* 7; *In Matt.* Præf.), though it is to be observed that Chrysostom, when dwelling on the historical associations of the city, appears to know nothing of such a tradition. He was believed to have been a Jewish proselyte, ignorant of Hebrew (Jerome, *Quæst. in Gen.* c. xlvi), and probably —because he alone mentions their mission, but in contradiction to his own words (Luke i, 23)—one of the seventy disciples who, having left our Lord in offence (John vi, 60–66), was brought back to the faith by the ministry of Paul (Epiphan. *Hær.* li, 11); one of the Greeks who desired to "see Jesus" (John xii, 20, 21), and the companion of Cleopas on the journey to Emmaus (Theophyl. *Proem in Luc.*). An idle legend of Greek origin, which first appears in the late and credulous historian Nicephorus Callisus (died 1450), *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 43, and was universally accepted in the Middle Ages, represents Luke as well acquainted with the art of painting (*ἄκρως τὴν ζωγράφου τέχνην ἐξεπιστάμενος*), and assigns to his hand the first portraits of our Lord, his mother, and his chief apostles (see the monographs of Manni [Florent. 1764] and Schlichter [Hal. 1734]).

Nothing is known of the place or manner of his death, and the traditions are inconsistent with one another. Gregory Naz. reckons him among the martyrs, and the untrustworthy Nicephorus gives us full details of the time, place, and mode of his martyrdom, viz., that he was crucified to a live olive-tree in Greece, in his eightieth year. According to others, he died a natural death after preaching (according to Epiphanius, *Contra Hær.* li, 11) in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia; was buried in Bithynia, whence his bones were translated by Constantius to Constantinople (Isid. Hispal. c. 82; Philostorgius, vol. iii, chap. xxix). See generally Köhler, *Dissert. de Luca Ev.* (Lipsiæ, 1695); Credner, *Einleit. ins N. T.* i, 124.

LUKE, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO, the third in order of the canonical books of the New Testament.

I. *Author—Genuineness.*—The universal tradition of Christendom, reaching up at least to the latter part of the 2d century, has assigned the third member of our Gospel collection to Luke, Paul's trusted companion and fellow-laborer, *συνεργός*, who alone continued in attendance on his beloved master in his last imprisonment (Col. iv, 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Its authorship has never been questioned until comparatively recent times, when the unsparing criticism of Germany—the main object of which appears to be the demolishing of every ancient belief to set up some new hypothesis in its stead—has been brought to bear upon it, without, however, effectually disturbing the old traditionary statement. The investigations of Semler, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, Baur, Schleiermacher, Ewald, and others, have failed to overthrow the harmonious assertion of the early Church that the third Gospel, as we have it, is the genuine work of Luke. It is well known that, though the "Gospels" are referred to by Justin Martyr as a collection already used and accepted by the Church (*Apol.* i, 66; *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 10), and his works supply a very considerable number of quotations, enabling us to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these *εὐαγγέλια* with the first three Gospels, we do not find them mentioned by the names of their authors till the end of the 2d century. In the Muratorian fragment, which can hardly be placed later than A.D. 170, we read, "Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucam Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris (*τοῦ δικαίου*) studiosum ['itineris socium,' *Bunsen*] secum adsumsisset nomine suo ex ordine ['opinione,' *Credner*] conscripsit (Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne), et idem prout assequi potuit, ita et a nativitate Johannis incepit dicere" (Westcott, *Hist. of Can.* p. 559). The testimony of Irenæus, A.D. cir. 180, is equally definite, *Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο* (*Contra Hær.* iii, 1, 1), while from his enumeration of the many particulars, *plurima evangelii* (ib. iii, 14, 3), recorded by Luke alone, it is evident that the Gospel he had was the same we now possess. Tatian's *Diatessaron* is an unimpeachable evidence of the existence of four Gospels, and therefore of that by Luke, at a somewhat earlier period in the same century. The writings of Tertullian against Marcion, cir. 207, abound with references to our Gospel, which, with Irenæus, he asserts to have been written under the immediate guidance of Paul (*Adv. Marc.* iv, 2; iv, 5). In Eusebius we find both the Gospel and the Acts specified as *θεόπνευστα βιβλία*, while Luke's knowledge of the sacred narrative is ascribed to information received from Paul, aided by his intercourse with the other apostles (*τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων ὁμιλίας ὠφελημένος*, *H. E.* iii, 4 and 24). Eusebius, indeed, tells us that in his day the erroneous view which interpreted *εὐαγγέλιον* (Rom. ii, 16; comp. 2 Cor. viii, 18) of a written document was generally received, and that, in the words "according to my Gospel," Paul was supposed to refer to the work of the evangelist. This is also mentioned by Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.* 7), and accepted by Origen (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 25)—one among many proofs of the want of the critical faculty among the fathers of that age.

Additional evidence of the early acceptance of Luke's Gospel may be derived from the *quæstio vexata* of its relation to the Gospel of Marcion. This is not the place to discuss this subject, which has led critics to the most opposite conclusions, for a full account of which the reader may be referred to De Wette, *Einleit. in N. T.* p. 119 137, as well as to the treatises of Ritschl, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Hahn, and Volckmar. It will be enough for our purpose to mention that the Gnostic teacher Marcion, in pursuit of his professed object of restoring the purity of the Gospel, which had been corrupted by Judaizing

teachers, rejected all the books of the canon with the exception of ten epistles of Paul and a gospel, which he called simply a gospel of Christ. We have the express testimony of Irenæus (*Contr. Hær.* i, 27, 2; iii, 12, 12, etc.), Tertullian (*Cont. Marc.* iv, 1, 2, 6), Origen (*Cont. Cels.* ii, 27), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* xlii, 11) that the basis of Marcion's Gospel was that of Luke, abridged and altered by him to suit his peculiar tenets (for the alterations and omissions, the chief being its curtailment by the first two chapters, see De Wette, p. 123–132), though we cannot assert, as was done by his enemies among the orthodox, that all the variations are due to Marcion himself, many of them having no connection with his heretical views, and being, rather, various readings of great antiquity and high importance. Of late years, however, the opposite view, which was first broached by Semler, Griesbach, and Eichhorn, has been vigorously maintained, among others, by Ritschl and Baur, who have endeavored to prove that the Gospel of Luke, as we have it, is interpolated, and that the portions Marcion is charged with having omitted were really unauthorized additions to the original document. See Bleek, *Einl. in das N. T.* § 52. Volckmar, in his exhaustive treatise *Das Evang. Marcions* (Lips. 1852), has satisfactorily disposed of this theory, and has demonstrated that the Gospel of Luke, as we now have it, was the material on which Marcion worked, and, therefore, that before he began to teach, the date of which may be fixed about A.D. 139, it was already known to and accepted by the Church. Zeller and Ritschl have since abandoned their position (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 337, 528), and Baur has greatly modified his (*Markusevangel.* 1851, p. 191). See also Hahn, *Das Evangelium Marcions* (Königsb. 1823); Olshausen, *Echtheit der vier Kanon. Evangelien* (Königsb. 1823); Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions* (Tübing. 1846); Baur, *Krit. Untersuchung über d. Kan. Evangelien* (Tübing. 1847); Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Untersuchungen* (Halle, 1850); bishop Thirlwall's *Introduction to Schleiermacher on St. Luke;* De Wette, *Lehrbuch d. N. T.* (Berl. 1848); Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels* (Bost. 1844), iii, add. note C, p. xlix.

II. *Sources.*—The authorities from which Luke derived his Gospel are clearly indicated by him in the introduction (i, 1–4). He does not claim to have been an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, or to have any personal knowledge of the facts he records, but, as an honest compiler, to have gone to the best sources of information then accessible, and, having accurately traced the whole course of the apostolic tradition from the very first, in its every detail (παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς), to have written an orderly narrative of the facts (πραγμάτων) already fully believed (πεπληροφορημένων) in the Christian Church, and which Theophilus had already learned, not from books, but from oral teaching (κατηχήθης; comp. Acts xviii, 25; Gal. vi, 5). These sources were partly the "oral tradition" (παρέδοσαν) of those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word," and partly the written records (to which Ewald, vi, 40, on unexplained grounds, dogmatically assigns a non-Judæan origin) which even then "many" (πολλοί) had attempted to draw up, of which, though the evangelist's words do not necessarily bear that meaning, we may well suppose that he would avail himself. Though we thankfully believe that, as well in the selection of his materials as in the employment of them, Luke was acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, it will be remarked that he lays claim to no such supernatural guidance, but simply to the care and accuracy of an honest, painstaking, and well-informed editor, not so consciously under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as to supersede the use of his own mental powers. His use of his authorities is not mechanical; though often incorporating, apparently with little alteration, large portions of the oral tradition, especially in the case of the words of our Lord, or those with whom he conversed, and adopting narratives already current (of which the first two chapters, with their harsh Hebraistic phraseology, immediately succeeding the comparatively pure Greek of the dedication, are an example), the free handling of his pen is everywhere to be recognised. The connecting links and the passages of transition evidence the hand of the author, which may again be recognised in the greater variety of his style, the more complex character of his sentences, and the care he bestows in smoothing away harshnesses, and imparting a more classical air to the synoptical portions.

Notwithstanding the almost unanimous consent of the fathers as to the Pauline origin of Luke's Gospel (Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv, 5, "Lucæ digestum Paulo adscribere solent;" Irenæus, *Cont. Hær.* iii, 1; Origen apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 25; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 4; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* 7), there is little or nothing in the gospel itself to favor such a hypothesis, and very much to contradict it. It is true that the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi, 23–25, displays an almost verbal identity with Luke xxii, 19, 20; and, as Paul affirms that he received his "from the Lord," it is highly probable that the evangelist has in this instance incorporated a fragment of the direct teaching of his master. But this is a solitary example (Luke xxiv, 34, comp. with 1 Cor. xv, 5, is too trifling to deserve mention), and it is impossible that the evangelist should have expressed himself as he has done in his preface if he had derived the facts of his narrative from one who was neither "an eye-witness" nor "a minister of the Word from the beginning." Nor again in the general tone and character of the gospel, when impartially viewed, is there much that can fairly be considered as bearing out the hypothesis of a Pauline origin. Those who have sifted the gospel with this object have, it is true, gathered a number of passages which are supposed to have a Pauline tendency (see Hilgenfeld, *Evang.*, and the ingenious essay prefixed to this gospel in Dr. Wordsworth's *Greek Testament*), e. g. Luke iv, 25 sq.; ix, 52 sq.; x, 30 sq.; xvii, 16–18; and the parables of the prodigal son, the unprofitable servant, and the Pharisee and publican, which have been instanced by De Wette as bringing out the apostle's teaching on justification by faith alone; but, as dean Alford has ably shown (*Greek Test.* i, 44, note *b*), such a list may easily be collected from the other gospels, while the entire absence of any definite statement of the doctrinal truths which come forward with the greatest prominence in the apostle's writings, and, with very scanty exceptions, of his peculiar theological phraseology, is of itself sufficient to prove how undue has been the weight assigned to Pauline influence in the composition of the gospel. It is certainly true that, in the words of bishop Thirlwall (Schleiermacher *On St. Luke*, Introd. p. cxxviii), "Luke's Gospel contains numerous indications of that enlarged view of Christianity which gave to the gospel, as preached by Paul, a form and an extent very different from the original tradition of the Jews," but no more can be legitimately inferred than that Luke was Paul's disciple, instructed by the apostle of the Gentiles, and naturally sharing in his view of the gospel as a message of salvation for all nations; not that his gospel was in any sense derived from him, or rested on the apostolic basis of Paul.

The question naturally arises whether the gospels of Matthew and Mark were among the διηγήσεις to which Luke refers. The answers to this have been various and contradictory, the same data leading critics to the most opposite conclusions. Meyer (*Comment.* ii, 217) is of opinion that Luke availed himself both of Matthew and Mark, though chiefly of the latter, as the "primitive gospel;" while De Wette, on the other hand (*Einleit.* sec. 94, p. 185), considers Mark's Gospel the latest of the three, and based upon them as authorities. In the face of these and other discordant theories, of which a list may be seen (De Wette, *Einleit.* § 88, p. 162–168), it will be wise not to attempt a categorical decision. A calm review of the evidence will, however, lead most unbiassed readers to the conclusion that all three wrote in perfect independence of one another; each, under the

guidance of the Holy Spirit, giving a distinct view of the great complex whole, the reflex of the writer's own individual impressions, and that least of all is Luke to be considered as a mere *rédacteur* of the prior writings of his brother synoptists—a theory, the improbabilities and absurdities of which have been well pointed out by dean Alford in the *Prolegomena* to his *Greek Testament*, i, 2–6, 41.

III. *Relation to Matthew and Mark.*—Believing that no one of the three synoptical gospels is dependent on the others, and that the true explanation of this striking correspondence, not only in the broad outline of our Lord's life and work, and the incidents with which this outline is filled up, but also, to a considerable extent, in the parables and addresses recorded, and even in the language and forms of expression, is to be sought in the same apostolical oral tradition having formed the original basis of each, we have presented a very interesting point of inquiry in tracing the correspondence and divergence of the several narratives. In particular, a comparison of Luke with the other synoptists furnishes many striking and important results. With the general identity of the body of the history, we at once notice that there are two large portions peculiar to this evangelist, containing events or discourses recorded by him alone. These are the first two chapters, narrating the conception, birth, infancy, and early development of our Lord and his forerunner, and the long section (ix, 51–xviii, 14) devoted to our Lord's final journey to Jerusalem, and comprising some of his most beautiful parables. We have also other smaller sections supplying incidents passed over by Matthew and Mark—the questions of the people and the Baptist's replies (iii, 10–14); Simon and the woman that was a sinner (vii, 36–50); the raising of the widow's son (viii, 11–17); the story of Zacchæus (xix, 1–10); our Lord's weeping over Jerusalem (xix, 39–44); the journey to Emmaus (xxiv, 13–35). In other parts he follows a tradition at once so much fuller and so widely at variance with that of the others as almost to suggest the idea that a different event is recorded (ch. iv, 16–30; comp. Matt. xiii, 54–58; Mark vi, 1–6; ch. v, 1–11; comp. Matt. iv, 18–22; Mark i, 16–20). Even where the language employed so closely corresponds as to remove all question of the identity of the events, fresh details are given, often of the greatest interest, e. g. *προσευχομένου* (iii, 21); *σωματικῷ εἴδει* (iii, 22); *πληρ. πνεύμ. ἁγ.* (iv, 1); *ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, κ. τ. λ.* (iv, 6); *ἄρχι καιροῦ* (iv, 13); *δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν, κ. τ. λ.* (v, 17); *καταλιπὼν ἅπαντα* and *δοχὴ μεγ.* (v, 28, 29); the comparison of old and new wine (v, 39); *ἐπλήσθ. ἀνοίας* (vi, 11); *δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχ.* (vi, 19); the cures in the presence of John's disciples (vii, 21), and the incidental remarks (ver. 29, 30); many additional touches in the narratives of the Gadarene demoniac (viii, 26–39), and the transfiguration, especially the fact of his "praying" (Luke records at least six instances of our Lord having prayed omitted by the other evangelists), and the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah (ix, 28–36); notices supplied (xx, 19; xxi, 37, 38), all tending to convince us that we are in the presence not of a mere copyist, but of a trustworthy and independent witness. Luke's account of the passion and resurrection is to a great extent his own, adding much of the deepest significance to the synoptical narrative, particularly the warning to Simon in the name of the twelve (xxii, 31, 32); the bloody sweat (ver. 44); the sending to Herod (xxiii, 7–12); the words to the women (ver. 27–31); the prayer for forgiveness (ver. 34); the penitent thief (ver. 39–43); the walk to Emmaus (xxiv, 13–35); and the ascension (ver. 50–53).

It has been remarked that there is nothing in which Luke is more characteristically distinguished from both the evangelists than in his selection of our Lord's parables. There are no less than eleven quite peculiar to him: (1.) The two debtors; (2.) Good Samaritan; (3.) Friend at midnight; (4.) Rich fool; (5.) Barren fig-tree; (6.) Lost silver; (7.) Prodigal son; (8.) Unjust steward; (9.) Rich man and Lazarus; (10.) Unjust judge; (11.) Pharisee and publican; and two others, the Great Supper, and the Pounds, which, with many points of similarity, differ considerably from those found in Matthew.

Of our Lord's miracles, six omitted by Matthew and Mark are recorded by Luke: (1.) Miraculous draught; (2.) The son of the widow of Nain; (3.) The woman with a spirit of infirmity; (4.) The man with a dropsy; (5.) The ten lepers; (6.) The healing of Malchus's ear. Of the seven not related by him, the most remarkable omission is that of the Syrophœnician woman, for which *à priori* reasoning would have claimed a special place in the so-called Gospel of the Gentiles. We miss also the walking on the sea, the feeding of the four thousand, the cure of the blind men, and of the deaf and dumb, the stater in the fish's mouth, and the cursing of the fig-tree.

The chief omissions in narrative are the whole section, Matt. xiv–xvi, 12; Mark vi, 45–viii, 26; Matt. xix, 2–12; xx, 1–16, 20–28; comp. Mark x, 35–45; the anointing, Matt. xxvi, 6–13; Mark xiv, 3–9.

With regard to coincidence of language, a most important remark was long since made by bishop Marsh (Michaelis, v, 317), that when Matthew and Luke agree verbally in the common synoptical sections, Mark always agrees with them also; and that there is not a single instance in these sections of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke alone. A close scrutiny will discover that the verbal agreement between Luke and Mark is greater than that between Luke and Matthew, while the mutual dependence of the second and third evangelists on the same source is rendered still more probable by the observation of Reuss, that they agree both in excess and defect when compared with Matthew: that when Mark has elements wanting in Matthew, Luke usually has them also; while, when Matthew supplies more than Mark, Luke follows the latter; and that where Mark fails altogether, Luke's narrative often represents a different *παράδοσις* from that of Matthew.

IV. *Character and general Purpose.*—We must admit, but with great caution, on account of the abuses to which the notion has led, that there are traces in the gospel of a leaning towards Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham, so as to connect him with the whole human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the mission of the Seventy, which number has usually been supposed to be typical of all nations; as twelve, the number of the apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes.

On the supposed "doctrinal tendency" of the gospel, however, much has been written which it is painful to dwell on, but easy to refute. Some have endeavored to see in this divine book an attempt to ingraft the teaching of Paul on the Jewish representations of the Messiah, and to elevate the doctrine of universal salvation, of which Paul was the most prominent preacher, over the Judaizing tendencies, and to put Paul higher than the twelve apostles! (See Zeller, *Apost.*; Baur, *Kanon. Evang.*; and Hilgenfeld.) How two impartial historical narratives, the Gospel and the Acts, could have been taken for two tracts written for polemical and personal ends, is to an English mind hardly conceivable. Even its supporters found that the inspired author had carried out his purpose so badly that they were forced to assume that a second author or editor had altered the work with a view to work up together Jewish and Pauline elements into harmony (Baur, *Kanon. Evang.* p. 502). Of this editing and re-editing there is no trace whatever; and the invention of the second editor is a gross device to cover the failure of the first hypothesis. By such a machinery it will be possible to prove in after ages that Gibbon's History was originally a plea for Christianity, or any similar paradox.

The passages which are supposed to bear out this

"Pauline tendency" are brought together by Hilgenfeld with great care (*Evangelien*, p. 220); but Reuss has shown, by passages from Matthew which have the same "tendency" against the Jews, how brittle such an argument is, and has left no room for doubt that the two evangelists wrote facts and not theories, and dealt with those facts with pure historical candor (Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie*, vol. ii, b. vi, ch. vi). Writing to a Gentile convert, and through him addressing other Gentiles, Luke has adapted the form of his narrative to their needs, but not a trace of a subjective bias, not a vestige of a personal motive, has been suffered to sully the inspired page. Had the influence of Paul been the exclusive or principal source of this gospel, we should have found in it more resemblance to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains (so to speak) the Gospel of Paul.

The chief characteristic of Luke's Gospel which distinguishes it from those of the other synoptists, especially Matthew, is its *universality*. The message he delivers is not, as it has sometimes been mistakenly described, for the Gentiles as such, as distinguished from the Jews, but for *men*. As we read his record, we seem to see him anticipating the time when all nations should hear the Gospel message, when all distinctions of race or class should be done away, and all claims based on a fancied self-righteousness annulled, and the glad tidings should be heard and received by all who were united in the bonds of a common humanity, and felt their need of a common Saviour, "the light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel." It is this character which has given it a right to the title of the Pauline Gospel, and enables us to understand why Marcion selected it as the only true exponent of Christ's Gospel. This universalism, however, is rather interwoven with the gospel than to be specified in definite instances; and yet we cannot but feel how completely it is in accordance with it that Luke records the enrolment of the Saviour of the world as a citizen of the world-embracing Roman empire — that he traces his genealogy back to the head of the human race—that his first recorded sermon (iv, 16–27) gives proof of God's wide-reaching mercy, as displayed in the widow of Sarepta and Naaman—that in the mission of the twelve, the limitation to the "cities of Israel" should have no place, while he alone records the mission of the seventy (a number symbolical of the Gentile world)—that in the sermon on the mount all references to the law should be omitted, while all claims to superior holiness or national prerogative are cut away by his gracious dealings with, and kindly mention of, the despised Samaritans (ix, 52 sq.; x, 30 sq.; xvii, 11 sq.).

As with the race in general, so with its individual members. Luke delights to bear witness that none are shut out from God's mercy—nay, that the outcast and the lost are the special objects of his care and search. As proofs of this, we may refer to the narratives of the woman that was a sinner, the Samaritan leper, Zacchæus, and the penitent thief; and the parables of the lost sheep and lost silver, the Pharisee and publican, the rich man and Lazarus, and, above all, to that "which has probably exercised most influence on the mind of Christendom in all periods" (Maurice, *Unity of the Gospel*, p. 274), the prodigal son.

Most naturally also in Luke we find the most frequent allusions to that which has been one of the most striking distinctions between the old and modern world —the position of woman as a fellow-heir of the kingdom of heaven, sharing in the same responsibilities and hopes, and that woman comes forward most prominently (the Syrophœnician, as already noticed, is a single marked exception) as the object of our Lord's sympathy and love. Commencing with the Virgin Mary as a type of the purity and lowly obedience which is the true glory of womanhood, we meet in succession with Anna the prophetess, the pattern of holy widowhood (comp. 1 Tim. v, 5); the woman that was a sinner; the widow of Nain; the ministering women (viii, 2, 3); Mary and Martha; the "daughter of Abraham" (xiii, 11); and close the list with the words of exquisite tenderness and sympathy to the "daughters of Jerusalem" (xxiii, 28).

This universal character is one, the roots of which lie deep in Luke's conception of the nature and work of Christ. With him, more than in the other gospels, Jesus is "the second man, the Lord from heaven" (Lange); and if in his pages we see more of his divine nature, and have in the more detailed reports of his conception and ascension clearer proofs that he was indeed the Son of the Highest, it is here too, in "the life-giving sympathy and intercourse with the inner man, in the human fellowship grounded on not denying the divine condescension and compassion" (Maurice, *u. s.*), that we recognise the perfect ideal man.

Luke, it has been truly remarked, is the gospel of contrasts. Starting with the contrast between the doubt of Zacharias and the trustful obedience of Mary, we find in almost every page proofs of the twofold power of Christ's word and work foretold by Simeon (ii, 34). To select a few of the more striking examples: He alone presents to our view Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the thankful and thankless lepers, the tears and hosannas on the brow of Olivet; he alone adds the "woes" to the "blessings" in the sermon on the mount, and carries on in the parables of the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and publican, and the good Samaritan, that series of strong contrasts which finds so appropriate a close in the penitent and blaspheming malefactors.

Once more, Luke is the hymn-writer of the New Testament. "Taught by thee, the Church prolongs her hymns of high thanksgiving still" (Keble, *Christian Year*). But for his record the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, and *Nunc Dimittis* would have been lost to us; and it is he who has preserved to us the *Ave Maria*, identified with the religious life of so large a part of Christendom, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which forms the culminating point of its most solemn ritual.

To turn from the internal to the external characteristics of Luke's Gospel, these we shall find no less marked and distinct. His narrative is, as he promised it should be, an orderly one (καθεξῆς, i, 3); but the order is one rather of subject than of time. As to the other synoptists, though maintaining the principle of chronological succession in the main outline of his narrative, "he is ever ready to sacrifice mere chronology to that order of events which was the fittest to develop his purpose according to the object proposed by the inspiring Spirit, grouping his incidents according to another and deeper order than that of mere time" (Maurice, *u. s.*). It is true that he furnishes us with the three most precise dates in the whole Gospel narrative (ii, 2; iii, 1, 23 —each one, be it remarked, the subject of vehement controversy), but, in spite of the attempts made by Wieseler and others to force a strict chronological character upon his gospel, an unprejudiced perusal will convince us that his narrative is loose and fragmentary, especially in the section ix, 49–xviii, 14, and his notes of time vague and destitute of precision, even where the other synoptists are more definite (ch. v, 12; comp. Matt. viii, 1; ch. viii, 4; comp. Matt. xiii, 1; ch. viii, 22; comp. Mark iv, 35, etc.).

"The accuracy with which Luke has drawn up his Gospel appears in many instances. Thus, he is particular in telling us the dates of his more important events. The birth of Christ is referred to the reign of Augustus, and the government of Syria by Cyrenius (ii, 1–3). The preaching of John the Baptist is pointed out as to its time with extreme circumstantiality (iii, 1–2). But it is in lesser matters that accuracy is chiefly shown. Thus the mountain storm on the Lake of Gennesaret is marked by him with a minute accuracy which is not seen in Mark or Matthew (comp. ch. viii, 23 with parallel Gospels, and with Josephus, *War*, iii, x; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, ch. vi). In ch. xxi, 1, we read of a gesture on

Christ's part which marks a wonderful accuracy on the part of Luke. We read there that Christ "*looked up*," and saw the rich casting their gifts into the treasury. From Mark xii, 41 we learn the reason of Luke's expression, which he does not give himself, for there we read that Christ, after warning his disciples against the scribes, "*sat down*," and would therefore have to look up in order to see what was going on. This minute accuracy marks Luke's description of our Lord's coming to Jerusalem across the Mount of Olives (xix, 37–41). Travellers who are very accurate in topographical description speak of two distinct sights of Jerusalem on this route, an inequality of ground hiding it for a time after one has first caught sight of it (*Clerical Journal*, August 22, 1856, p. 397). Luke distinctly refers to this nice topographical point; in ver. 37 he marks the first sight of Jerusalem, and in ver. 41 he marks the second sight of the city, now much nearer than before. The correctness of Luke's date in the matter of the government of Syria by Cyrenius has indeed been often questioned, but on insufficient grounds. The just way of dealing with very ancient documents which have given general proofs of trustworthiness, but which, in particular instances, make statements that do not appear to us to be correct, is to attribute this apparent want of correctness to our ignorance rather than to that of the writer. In the particular case before us recent research has shown that Cyrenius was in all probability *twice* governor of Syria, thus establishing, instead of overthrowing, the correctness of Luke" (Fairbairn). Compare Huschke, *Ueber den zur Zeit der Geburt Christi gehaltenen Census* (Breslau, 1840); Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien* (Hamburg, 1843); Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*. See CYRENIUS.

In his narrative we miss the graphic power of Mark, though in this he is superior to Matthew, e. g. ch. vii, 1–10; comp. Matt. viii, 5–13: ch. viii, 41–56; comp. Matt. ix, 18–26. His object is rather to record the facts of our Lord's life than his discourses, while, as Olshausen remarks (i, 19, Clark's ed.), "He has the peculiar power of exhibiting with great clearness and truth our Lord's conversations, with all the incidents that gave rise to them—the remarks of the by-standers, and their results."

We may also notice here the passing reflections, or, as bishop Ellicott terms them (*Hist. Lect.* p. 28), "psychological comments," called up by the events or actors which appear in his Gospel, interpolated by him as *obiter dicta* in the body of the narrative. We may instance ii, 50, 51; iii, 15; vi, 11; vii, 29, 30, 39; xvi, 14; xx, 20; xxii, 3; xxiii, 12.

V. *Style and Language.*—Luke's style is more finished than that of Matthew or Mark. There is more of composition in his sentences. His writing displays greater variety, and the structure is more complex. His diction is substantially the same, but purer, and, except in the first two chapters, less Hebraized, as remarked by Jerome (*Comment. in Es.*; compare *ad Damas. Ep.* 20). It deserves special notice how, in the midst of close verbal similarity, especially in the report of the words of our Lord and others, slight alterations are made by him either by the substitution of another word or phrase (e. g. Luke xx, 6; comp. Matt. xxi, 26; Mark xi, 32: Luke vii, 25; Mark xi, 8: Luke ix, 14; Mark vi, 39, 40: Luke xx, 28, 29; Mark xii, 20, 22: Luke viii, 25; Mark viii, 27), the supply (Luke xx, 45; Mark xii, 38: Luke vii, 8; Matt. viii, 9), or the omission of a word (Luke ix, 25; Matt. xvi, 26; Mark viii, 36), by which harsh constructions are removed, and a more classical air given to the whole composition.

The Hebraistic character is more perceptible in the hymns and speeches incorporated by him than in the narrative itself. The following are some of the chief Hebraisms that have been noticed: (1.) the very frequent use of ἐγένετο in a new subject, especially ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, with the accusative and infinitive, corresponding to וַיְהִי ב, twenty-three times, not once in Matt., only twice in Mark; (2.) the same idiom, without ἐγένετο, e. g. ix, 34, 36; x, 35; xi, 37; (3.) ἐγένετο ὡς, or ὡς alone of time, the Hebrew כְּ, e. g. ii, 15; v, 4, only once each in Matthew and Mark; (4.) Ὕψιστος, used for *God*=עֶלְיוֹן, five times, once in Mark; (5.) οἶκος, for family=בַּיִת; (6.) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν=מֵעַתָּה, four times, not once in the other gospels; (7.) ἀδικία in the genitive as an epithet, e. g. οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας; (8.) προσέθετο πέμψαι, xx, 11, 12; (9.) καρδία=לֵב.

On the other hand, we find certain classical words and phrases peculiar to Luke taking the place of others less familiar to his Gentile readers, e. g. ἐπιστάτης for ῥαββί, six times; νομικοί for γραμματεῖς, six times; ναί, ἀληθῶς, or ἐπ' ἀληθείας for ἀμήν, which only occurs seven times to thirty in Matthew, and fourteen in Mark; ἅπτειν λύχνον for καίειν λ., four times; λίμνη of the Lake of Gennesareth for θάλασσα, five times; παραλελυμένος for παραλυτικός; κλίνιδιον for κράββατος; φόρος for κῆνσος.

The style of Luke has many peculiarities both in construction and in diction; indeed, it has been calculated that the number of words used only by him exceeds the aggregate of the other three gospels. Full particulars of these are given by Credner (*Einleit.*) (copied by Davidson, *Introd. to the N. T.*) and Reuss (*Geschichte d. H. Schrift.*). The following are some of the most noteworthy. Of peculiar constructions we may remark, (1.) the infinitive with the genitive of the article (Winer, *Gr. Gr.* i, 340), to indicate design or result, e. g. Luke ii, 27; v, 7; xxi, 22; xxiv, 29; i, 9; i, 57; ii, 21. (2.) The substantive verb with the participle instead of the finite verb, iv, 31; v, 10; vi, 12; vii, 8; xxiii, 12 (Winer, § 65–67). (3.) The neuter participle with the article for a substantive, iv, 16; viii, 34; xxii, 22; xxiv, 14. (4.) τό, to substantivise a sentence or a clause, especially in indirect questions, i, 63; vii, 11; ix, 46, etc. (5.) εἰπεῖν πρός, sixty-seven times; λέγειν πρός, ten times; λαλεῖν πρός, four times, the first being used once by Matthew, and the others not at all by him or Mark. (6.) Participles are copiously used to give vividness to the narrative, ἀναστάς, seventeen times; στραφείς, seven times; πεσών, etc. (7.) ἀνήρ used with a substantive, e. g. ἁμαρτωλός, v, 8; xix, 7; and προφήτης, xxiv, 19.

Of the words peculiar to, or occurring much more frequently in Luke, some of the most remarkable are, the use of Κύριος in the narrative as a synonym for Ἰησοῦς, which occurs fourteen times (e. g. vii, 13; x, 1; xiii, 15, etc.), and nowhere else in the synoptical gospels save in the addition to Mark, xvi, 19, 20; σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, not found in the other gospels, except the first two once each in John; χάρις, eight times in the Gospel, sixteen in the Acts, and only thrice in John, χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω; εὐαγγελίζομαι, very frequent, while εὐαγγέλιον does not occur at all; ὑποστρέφω, twenty-one times in the Gospel, ten in the Acts, and only once in Mark; ἐφιστάναι, not used in the other three gospels; διέρχεσθαι, thirty-two times in Luke's Gospel and the Acts, and only twice each in Matthew, Mark, and John; παραχρῆμα, frequent in Luke, and only twice elsewhere, in Matthew; ὑπάρχω, seven times in Gospel, twenty-six in Acts, but nowhere in the other gospels, and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, eight times in Gospel to three in Matthew alone; ἅπας, twenty times in Gospel, sixteen in Acts, to thrice in Matthew and four times in Mark; Ἱερουσαλήμ, instead of the Ἱεροσόλυμα of the other gospels; ἐνώπιον, twenty-two times in Gospel, fourteen times in Acts, once besides in John; σύν, twenty-four times in Gospel, fifty-one in Acts, and only ten times in the other gospels; the particle τε, which hardly appears in the other gospels, is very frequent in Luke's writings. The words ἀτενίζω, ἄτοπος, βουλή, βρέφος, ἔοικα, δέησις, δοχή, δράχμη, ἐλαμβος, ἐμπίλιον, ἔντασις, καθότι, καθόλου, καθεξῆς, κακοῦργος, κόραξ, λεῖος, λυτρόω, λύτρωσις, οἰκόνομος-ία-έω, παιδεύω, παύω, πλέω, πλῆθος, πλήθω, πλήν, πράσσω, σιγάω, σκιρτάω, τυρ-

βάζομαι, χήρα, ὥσει, καθώς, are almost or quite peculiar to him; he is very partial to καὶ αὐτός and καὶ αὐτοί, εἰ, δέ, μή, γε, and abounds in verbs compounded with prepositions, where the other evangelists use the simple verb.

Some omissions are to be noted: ἀληθής does not occur once, ἀληθινός only once, εὐαγγέλιον, διάκονος, δαιμονιζόμενος, not once; δαιμονισθείς only once; and ὥστε, which is found fifteen times in Matthew, and thirteen in Mark, occurs only thrice in the whole gospel.

A few Latin words are used by Luke—ἀσσάριον, xii, 6; δηνάριος, vii, 41; λεγέων, viii, 30; μόδιον, xi, 33; σουδάριον, xix, 20; Acts xix, 12, but no Hebrew or Syriac forms, except σίκερα, i, 15.

On comparing the Gospel with the Acts, it is found that the style of the latter is more pure and free from Hebrew idioms, and the style of the later portion of the Acts is more pure than that of the former. Where Luke used the materials he derived from others, oral or written, or both, his style reflects the Hebrew idioms of them; but when he comes to scenes of which he was an eye-witness, and describes entirely in his own words, these disappear.

VI. *Quotations from the O. T.*—It is a striking confirmation of the view propounded above of the character of Luke's Gospel, and the object of its composition, that the references to the O. T., the authority of which with any except the Jews would be but small, are so few—only twenty-four in the one against sixty-five in the other—when compared with their abundance in Matthew. Only eight out of the whole number are peculiar to our evangelist (marked with an asterisk in the annexed list), which occur in the portions where he appears to have followed more or less completely a παράδοσις of his own; the history of the birth and childhood of our Lord, the visit to Nazareth (ch. iv), and that of the passion. The rest are found in the common synoptical sections. We may also remark that, with the most trifling exceptions, Luke never quotes the O. T. himself, nor speaks on his own authority of events occurring in fulfilment of prophecy, and that his citations are only found in the sayings of our Lord and others. The following list is tolerably complete, exclusive of the hymns, which are little more than a cento of phrases from the O. T.

* i, 17, Mal. iv, 6.
* 25, Gen. xxx, 23.
* ii, 23, Exod. xiii, 2.
* 24, Lev. v, 11.
iii, 4–6, Isa. xl, 3–5.
iv, 4, Deut. viii, 3.
8, Deut. vi, 13.
10–11, Psa. xc, 11–12.
12, Deut. vi, 16.
* 18–19, Isa. lxi, 1–2.
Isa. lviii, 6.
vii, 27, Mal. iii, 1.
viii, 10, Isa. vi, 9.
x, 27, Deut. vi, 5.
Lev. xix, 18.
xiii, 27, Psa. vi, 8.
35, Psa. cxvii, 26.
xviii, 20, Exod. xx, 13–15.
xix, 46, Isa. lvi, 7.
xx, 17, Psa. cxvii.
28, Deut. xxv, 5.
37, Exod. iii, 6.
42–43, Psa. cix, 1.
* xxii, 37, Isa. liii, 12.
* xx.ii, 30, Hos. x, 8.
* 46, Psa. xxx, 5.

VII. *Time and Place of Composition.*—In the complete silence of Scripture, our only means for determining the above points are tradition and internal evidence. The statements of the former, though sufficiently definite, are inconsistent and untrustworthy. Jerome (*Præf. in Matthew*) asserts that it was composed "in Achaia and the regions of Bœotia," an opinion which appears to have been generally received in the 4th century (Gregory Nazianzen, Ἐν Ἀχαΐδι), and has been accepted by Lardner (*Credibility*), who fixes its date A.D. 63 or 64, after the release of Paul. An Arabic version, published by Erpenius, places its composition "in a city of Macedonia, twenty-two years after the ascension," A.D. 51; a view to which Hilgenfeld and Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.* i, 170) give in their adherence. A still earlier date, thirteen years after the ascension, is assigned by the subscription in some ancient MSS. Other statements as to the place are Alexandria Troas, Alexandria in Egypt (the Peshito and Persian versions, Abulfeda, accepted by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein), Rome (Ewald, vi, 40; Olshausen), and Cæsarea (Bertholdt, Schott, Thiersch, Alford, Abp. Thomson).

Amid this uncertainty, it will be well to see if there is any internal evidence which will help us in determining these points. We are here met at the outset by those who are determined to see in every clear prophecy a *vaticinium post eventum*, and who find in the predictions of the overthrow of Jerusalem (xiii, 34, 35; xix, 43, 44; xxi, 20–24), and the persecutions of our Lord's followers (xii, 52, 53; xxi, 12), and the nearness of the παρουσία (xxi, 25–33), a clear proof that the Gospel was composed after A.D. 70. This has come to be regarded as a settled point by a certain school of criticism (Ewald, v, 134; De Wette, *Einleit.* p. 298; Credner, *Einleit.*; Reuss, *Gesch. de Heil. Schr.* p. 195; Meyer; Rénan, *Vie de Jésus*, xvi; Nicolas, *Études, N. T.*, etc.), though there is no small diversity among its representatives as to the time and place of its publication of the Gospel and the sources from which it was derived. Those, on the other hand, who, brought up in a sounder and more reverent school, see no *à priori* impossibility in a future event being foretold by the Son of God, will be led by the same data to a very different conclusion, and will discover sufficient grounds for dating the Gospel not later than A.D. 58. It is certain that the Gospel was written before the Acts of the Apostles (Acts i, 1). This latter could not have been composed before A.D. 58, when the writer leaves Paul "in his own hired house" at Rome; nor probably long after, since otherwise the issue of the apostle's imprisonment and appeal to Cæsar must naturally have been recorded by him. How long the composition of the Gospel preceded that of the Acts it is impossible to determine, but we may remark that the different tradition followed in the reports of the ascension in the two books renders it probable that the interval was not very small, or, at any rate, that the two were not contemporaneous. If we follow the old tradition given above, we may find reason for supposing that the interval between Luke's being left at Philippi (Acts xvi, 12; xvii, 1) and his joining the apostle there again (xx, 5) was employed in writing and publishing his gospel. This view is accepted by Alford, *Proleg.* p. 47, and is ably maintained by Dr. Wordsworth, *Gr. Test.* i, 168–170, though he weakens his argument by referring εὐαγγέλιον (2 Cor. viii, 18) to a *written* gospel, a later sense never found in the New Test. Another and more plausible view, adopted by Thiersch, which has found very wide acceptance, is that the Gospel was written under the guidance and superintendence of Paul during his imprisonment at Cæsarea, A.D. 55; but, as this imprisonment did not last for two years, as usually held, there is here no room for the composition. Olshausen, among others, places it a little later, during Paul's captivity at Rome, where he may have made the acquaintance of Theophilus, if, as Ewald (vi, 40) maintains, the latter was a native of Rome. This view, which places the writing of the Gospel in the early part of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, A.D. 56, is supported by Luke's leisure at the time, and the fact that the Acts followed not very long after as a sequel.

VIII. *For whom written.*—On this point we have certain evidence. Luke himself tells us that the object he had in view in compiling his gospel was that a certain *Theophilus* "might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been (orally) instructed." Nothing more is known of this Theophilus, and it is idle to repeat the vague conjectures in which critics have indulged, some even denying his personal existence altogether, and arguing, from the meaning of the name, that it stands merely as the representative of a class. See Theophilus. One or two inferences may, however, be made with tolerable certainty from Luke's words. He was doubtless a Christian, and, from his name and the character of the Gospel, a Gentile convert; while the epithet κράτιστος, generally employed as a title of honor (Acts xxiii, 26; xxiv, 3; xxvi, 25), indicates that he was a person of official dignity. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the evangelist minutely describes the position of places which to such a

one would be well known. It is so with Capernaum (iv, 31), Nazareth (i, 26), Arimathæa (xxiii, 51), the country of the Gadarenes (viii, 26), the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem (Acts i, 12; Luke xxiv, 13). By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian (Acts xvi, 12), nor an Athenian (Acts xvii, 21), nor a Cretan (Acts xxvii, 8, 12). But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data. In tracing Paul's journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely (Acts xxvii, 8, 12, 16); but when he comes to Sicily and Italy this is neglected. Syracuse and Rhegium, even the more obscure Puteoli, and Appii Forum and the Three Taverns, are mentioned as to one likely to know them. (For other theories, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii, part i, p. 236; and Kuinöl's *Prolegomena*.) All that emerges from this argument is that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. But, though the Gospel is inscribed to him, we must not consider that it was written for him alone, but that Theophilus stands rather as the representative of the whole Christian world; not, as we have already seen, of the Gentiles, as such, to the exclusion of the Jews, but the whole race of man, whom Luke had in his eye; and for whom, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the work was adapted "as the Gospel of the nations (*τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιημένοις*, Origen, *apud Euseb.* vi, 25), full of mercy and hope assured to the whole world by the love of a suffering Saviour" (Westcott, *Study of Gospels*, p. 218).

IX. *Contents of the Gospel.*—After the brief preface—the value of which it is difficult to overestimate as throwing light on the history of the composition of the gospels in general, and the true theory of scriptural inspiration—the narrative of the Gospel may be divided into four portions: 1. The time preceding our Lord's public life, including the conception and birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, his circumcision, presentation in the Temple, and the single incident recorded of his childhood (ii, 41–51), comprised in the first two chapters. The whole of this portion is in form, and to a considerable extent in substance, peculiar to our evangelist. See § X. 2. A large number of originally detached and independent narratives, comprising our Lord's baptism, temptation, and Galilæan ministry, almost the whole being common to Luke with the other synoptists (iii, 1–ix, 49). 3. A large section, sometimes, but improperly, termed the *gnomology*, containing narratives of events and reports of discourses belonging to the period from the close of our Lord's direct Galilæan ministry to his visit to Jericho a few days before his royal entrance into Jerusalem, and mostly occurring during the actual journey (ix, 50–xviii, 14). The whole of this, in its present form, is peculiar to Luke. 4. The last days of Christ: his entry into Jerusalem, discourses in the Temple, his sufferings and death, his resurrection and ascension, common to Luke and the other evangelists in substance, though there are considerable differences in detail in the narratives of the passion and resurrection (especially the journey to Emmaus), and that of the ascension is entirely Luke's own (xviii, 15–xxiv, 53).

X. *Integrity of the Gospel—the first two Chapters.*—The Gospel of Luke is quoted by Justin Martyr and by the author of the Clementine Homilies. The silence of the apostolic fathers only indicates that it was admitted into the canon somewhat late, which was probably the case. The evidence of the Marcionite controversy is, as we have seen, that our gospel was in use before A.D. 120. A special question, however, has been raised about the first two chapters. The critical history of these is best drawn out perhaps in Meyer's note. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marcion's Gospel, who omits the first two chapters, and connects iii, 1 immediately with iv, 31. (So Tertullian, "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum descendisse in civitatem Galilææ Capharnaum," *cont. Marc.* iv, 7.) But any objection founded on this would apply to the third chapter as well; and the history of our Lord's childhood seems to have been known to and quoted by Justin Martyr (see *Apology*, i, § 33, and an allusion, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 100) about the time of Marcion. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the first two chapters and the rest; and the arguments for the genuineness of Luke's Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it (see Meyer's note; also Volckmar, p. 130).

XI. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on Luke's Gospel: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* iii, 979); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, xiv); Athanasius, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* I, ii); also *Commentaria* (*ib.* iii, 31); Ambrose, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* i, 1257); Augustine, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* iv, 311); Jerome, *Homiliæ* [from Origen] (in *Opp.* vii, 245); also *Expositio* (in *Opp.* [*Supposita*], xi, 764); Cyril Alex., *Additamentum* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* ix, 741); *Commentaria* (ed. Smith, Lond. 1858, 4to; *Commentary*, tr. by same, ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo); Eusebius, *Excerpta* (*ibidem*, i, 107); Titus Bostrensis, *Commentarius* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* iv, 415); Apollinarius Laodicensis, *Fragmenta* (in Mai, *Class. Auct.* x, 495); Bede, *In Lucam* (in *Opp.* v, 217; *Works*, ed. Giles, x and xi); Photius, *Specimen* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* I, i, 189); Nicetas Senon. *Catena* (*ib.* ix, 626); Ælfridus Rivellensis, *Homiliæ* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xxiii, 1); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* ii, 3); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 10); Decorosus, *Laudes* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* ix, 182); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 181); Brentius, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* v); Lambert, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1524, Argent. 1525, 8vo); Agricola, *Commentarius* (Aug. Vind. 1515, Norib. 1525, Hag. 1526, 8vo); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1529, Francft. 1541, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentaria* (Tigur. 1546, fol.); Hofmeister, *Commentarius* [includ. Matt. and Mark] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Paris, 1563, Colon. 1572, 8vo); Logenhagen, *Commentarius* [from Augustine] (Antwerp, 1574, 8vo); Soar, *Commentaria* (Conimb. 1574, Par. 1578, fol.); Stella, *Commentarius* [Rom. Cath.] (Salmart. 1575, Complut. 1578, Lugdun. 1580, 1583, 1592, Rom. 1582, Antw. 1582, 1584, 1591, 1600, 1605, 1608, 1613, 1622, 1654, Mogunt. 1680, fol.; Ven. 1583, Mayence, 1681, 4to); De Horosco, *Commentarius* (Complut. 1579, 4to); Gualther, *Homiliæ* (Tigur. 1585, fol.); Piscator, *Analysis* (Sigen. 1596, 1608, 8vo); De Melo, *Commentaria* (Vallis. 1597, fol.); Toletus, *Commentaria* [on ch. i–xii] (Rom. 1600, Par. 1600, Colon. 1612, fol.; Ven. 1600, 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1601, Giess. 1609, Lub. 1616, 8vo); Del Pas, *Commentaria* (Rom. 1625, 2 vols. fol.); Corderius, *Catena* (Antw. 1628, fol.); Novarinus, *Expensus* (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomarus, *Illustratio* (in *Opp. theolog.* i, 149); A Lapide, *In Lucam* (Antwerp, 1660, fol.); Spielenberg, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1663, 4to); Hartsöcker, *Aantekingen* [continued by Molinæus] (Amst. 1687, 4to); Tölaar, *Verklaaring* (Hamb. 1741, 3 vols. 4to); Pope, *Erläuterung* (Bremen, 1777, 1781, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. *Anmerk.* (Lps. 1792, 8vo); Morus, *Prælectiones* (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Schleiermacher, *Versuch* (vol. i, 1817, 8vo; trans. *Essay*, Lond. 1825, 8vo); Major, *Notes* (Lond. 1826, 8vo); Bomermann, *Scholia* (Lips. 1830, 8vo); Stein, *Kommentar* (Halle, 1830, 8vo); Wilson, *Questions* (Cambridge, 1830, 12mo); Sumner, *Exposition* (3d ed. 1833, 8vo); Watson, *Exposition* [ch. i–xiii] (in *Works*, xiii; also separately, N. Y. 8vo); Short, *Lectures* (London, 1837, 12mo); Sirr, *Notes* (pt. i, London, 1843, 8vo); Trollope, *Commentary* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Thomson, *Lectures* (Lond. 1849–51, 3 vols. 8vo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (London, 1854, 8vo); Foote, *Lectures* (Glasg. 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Goodwin, *Commentary* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); Stark, *Commentary* (London, 1866, 2 vols. 12mo); Van Doren, *Commentary* (Lond. and N. Y. 1868, 2 vols. 12mo); Godet, *Commentaire* (Neufchatel, 1870, 8vo). See GOSPELS.

Luke OF PRAGUE, one of the most celebrated bishops and writers of the *Unitas Fratrum*, or the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, was born about 1460, in Bohe-

mia, and studied at the University of Prague, where he attained to the degree of A.B. A member of the Utraquist, or National Church, he quitted Prague in consequence of difficulties with the Roman Catholics, sought out the Brethren, whose simple faith and stanch confession of it attracted him, and joined their communion about 1480. At that time they were on the eve of serious dissensions, owing to the gradual separation of two parties among them, the one extreme, the other moderate in its views of the discipline. The former represented the illiterate, and the latter the educated portion of the membership. Luke, being a thoroughly learned man, gifted with great executive ability, and distinguished for his unassuming piety, soon won a prominent position. He held to the moderate party, but enjoyed the confidence of many on the other side. In 1491 he was sent, with three associates, on a visit to the East, in order to find, if possible, a body of Christians free from the corruptions of the age, with whom the Unitas Fratrum might establish a fellowship. Returning from this journey without having accomplished its object, he devoted himself to literary labors, and wrote a number of works treating of the points in dispute among the Brethren. These publications contributed not a little to the ascendency of the moderate party, and to the final pacification of the Church in 1494, after the most violent of the extremists had seceded, and organized a sect of their own, called the Amosites, which soon degenerated into fanaticism. Three years later, Luke undertook a mission to the Waldenses of Italy and France, and on his return in 1500 was elected bishop. His sound judgment and unflinching courage sustained the Brethren in times of persecution; his sense of the dignity and proprieties of public worship served to develop their ritual; his enthusiastic conviction of the scriptural character of their faith opened the way for their rapid increase among the higher classes; and his wonderful diligence gave them a literature far superior to that of the Utraquists and of the Bohemian Roman Catholics. In 1505 he published a *Catechism* and a *Hymn-book*, the first evangelical works of this kind in the Middle Ages. Having, in 1518, become the senior bishop of the Church and president of its ecclesiastical council, he began to watch the progress of Luther's Reformation with close attention, and in 1522 sent a deputation to Wittenberg in order to present the good wishes of the Brethren. The result, however, was not satisfactory. Luke disagreed with Luther in regard to the doctrines both of the Lord's Supper and of justification by faith. On the one hand, he upheld the spiritual presence, and, on the other, he gave undue prominence to good works. Each published a defence of his own views. Luther wrote with moderation, and in a friendly spirit; Luke was more severe in his strictures. His stand-point touching justification, however, was not, as Gindely asserts, a Romish one. He was led to extremes by his desire to prevent a misuse of the doctrine of free grace. This purpose induced him, in 1524, to renew his correspondence with Luther. A second deputation visited Wittenberg, and gave him a full account of the discipline of the Brethren, in the hope that he would introduce a similar system among his followers, and thus bring about a reform not merely of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian life. But again the negotiations failed. Indeed, they produced a personal estrangement between Luke and Luther, and for a time all intercourse with Wittenberg was broken off. The real cause of this disagreement is not clear. In part it was owing to the grave offence which the deputies took at the loose morals of the Wittenberg students, and to the freedom with which they denounced their manner of life. Luther, on his side, attacked the rigorism of the Brethren in his *Tischreden*. In the following years the Brethren suffered a severe persecution in Bohemia. Luke himself was seized, loaded with chains, and imprisoned, and escaped execution only through the intervention of a powerful noble belonging to the Unitas Fratrum. After his liberation he was active for a few years longer, although suffering from a most painful disease, and died at Zungbunzlau Dec. 11, 1528. His literary labors were astonishing. He was the author of more than eighty different works, written partly in Latin and partly in Bohemian, and consisting of doctrinal, exegetical, and polemical treatises. The most of them have been lost. For a further account of his life, see Gindely, *Geschichte der Böhm. Brüder*, vol. i, bk. i, ch. iii, and bk. ii; Crözer, *Geschichte d. alten Brüderkirche*, i, 95–192; Czerwegka, *Geschichte der Evang. Kirche in Böhmen*, vol. ii, chap. iii–vii. (E. de S.)

Luke's, St., Day, a festival observed in the Greek and Romish churches on the 18th of October.

Lukewarm (χλιαρός, *tepid*), moderately warm; spoken figuratively of Christians in a half-backslidden state (Rev. iii, 16), who are threatened with the divine excision, as we instinctively reject from the mouth water in this insipid state.

Lullus OF MAYENCE, a noted German prelate of the Romish Church, flourished in the 8th century as successor of Boniface, in the archbishopric of Mayence. He was a native of England, and was educated in the cloister of Meldun, but went to Germany on invitation of Boniface, and was his ambassador to pope Zachary about 754. He attended the Council of Attigny in 763, and of Rome in 769. In 785 he baptized Witikind, leader of the Saxons. He founded the cloister of Hersfeld, and on his death in 786 was buried there. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 221.

Lully (LULL or LULLE), RAYMOND, surnamed the *Doctor Illuminatus*, an eminent Spanish philosopher and theologian, was born at Palma, on the island of Majorca, about 1234. In early life he followed his paternal profession of arms, and abandoned himself to all the license of a soldier's life. Even when married he continued to pursue pleasures inconsistent with conjugal fidelity, and the theme of his poetical compositions was sensual love. About the year 1266, sick and tired of debauchery, he retired to a desert to lead a life of solitude and rigorous asceticism. Here he pretended to have visions, and, among others, a manifestation of Christ on the cross, who called him to his service, and to the conversion of the Mohammedans. He therefore at once engaged in diligent study to prepare for the labors and duties of a missionary. Having mastered the Arabic, and thoroughly entered into the spirit of Arabian philosophical writings, he took to the use of his pen for the conversion of the Saracens, seeking to demonstrate the truth of Christianity in opposition to all the errors of infidels. His first work was his *Ars major* or *generalis*, which has so severely tested the sagacity of commentators. This work is the development of the method of teaching known subsequently as the "Lullian method," and afforded a kind of mechanical aid to the mind in the acquisition and retention of knowledge by a systematic arrangement of subjects and ideas. Like all such methods, however, it gave little more than a superficial knowledge of any subject, though it was of use in leading men to perceive the necessity for an investigation of truth, the means for which were not to be found in the scholastic dialectics, and it was published by Lully with the special aim of serving as the preparatory work to a strictly scientific demonstration of all the truths of Christianity.

The king of Majorca, hearing of his reputation, called Lully to Montpellier, where, in 1275, he wrote his *Ars demonstrativa*, and founded a convent for the preparation of Minorites as missionaries to the Saracens. This was the first linguistic school for missionary purposes. In 1287 he went to Paris, where he lectured on the *Ars generalis* to a large number of students, and before Bertauld de St. Denis, chancellor of the university. He next went to Rome to seek the countenance of the pope for his plan of establishing missionary schools, which he thought would prove more effective than the Crusades,

of which he said, "I see many knights going to the Holy Land in the expectation of conquering it by force of arms; but, instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves. Therefore it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be attempted in no other way than as thou (Christ) and thy apostles undertook to accomplish it—by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives." Meeting, however, with but little success, he returned to Tunis in 1291, and commenced labors as a missionary by holding conferences with the most learned Mohammedan scholars and theologians. In proclaiming to them the truth of the Christian religion, he insisted especially on the necessary adaptation which a perfect Being could not fail to establish between the primary cause and its effect, and attempted to explain the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation by purely metaphysical arguments. He was, however, expelled by the king of Tunis, and owed his life only to the intercession of a learned and liberal Mohammedan. Lully now went back to Paris, resumed his teaching there, and wrote his *Tabula generalis* and *Ars expositiva*, which are a continuation of his former works, and present the same ideas under a different form. In 1298 he succeeded in establishing at Paris, under the protection of king Louis Philippe le Bel, a college where his method was taught. France was at that time in great ferment: Philippe le Bel was planning the destruction of the order of Knight Templars, and Boniface VIII, in revindicating the right previously claimed by Gregory VII, had aroused the greatest opposition in France. Lully himself, after having again in vain applied to Rome for help in carrying out his plans, withdrew to labor wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. In 1301 he went to Cyprus, and thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Oriental Church to orthodoxy. He then visited Hippone, Algiers, and other cities on the coasts of Africa, and finally Bugia, then the seat of the Mohammedan empire. Here he publicly lectured in Arabic, proclaiming "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false; and this he was ready to prove to every one." He was again imprisoned, but made his escape by the aid of some Genoese merchants, enduring many hardships on his journey to Europe by shipwreck. He finally reached Paris, and there resumed his lectures with great success. In 1311 the Council of Vienne, mainly by his influence, no doubt, decided that, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen, professors of Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee, two for each language, should be established at Rome, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca; those at Rome to be maintained and paid by the pope; those at Paris by the king of France, etc.; and excluded the doctrines of Averroes from the schools. But Lully could not long bear the easy but monotonous life he was leading as a teacher and philosopher; so, on Aug. 14, 1314, he once more crossed to Africa, where, after laboring at first secretly, then openly, he was at last stoned to death by order of the king, June 30, 1315. His body was recovered by some Genoese merchants and brought back to Europe. According to another account, he was still alive when rescued, but so seriously wounded that he died in sight of his native island.

Lully appears to have been in many points in advance of his contemporaries. Although at the time of his conversion he inclined to a life of asceticism, he afterwards declared himself strongly against the monastic spirit of his age. He deplored it as a great evil that pious monks retired into solitudes, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and preaching the Gospel among the infidels. Concerning pilgrimages, he contrasted the gorgeous processions of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem; what he did to seek men, and what they do to seek him, and exclaimed, "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, while thou art so near that every man, if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber. . . . The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they meet in taverns and churches, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage." As a theologian, Lully, as we have seen from his history, was a self-taught man, not having been trained in the school of any of the great teachers of his time. The speculative and the practical were intimately blended in his mind, and so they are also in his system. "His speculative turn entered even into his enthusiasm for the cause of missions, and his zeal as an apologist. His contests, growing out of this latter interest, with the school of Averroes, with the sect proceeding from that school which affirmed the irreconcilable opposition between faith and knowledge, would naturally lead him to make the relation subsisting between these two a matter of special investigation. It is true, the enthusiasm for truth which filled his mind, the union of a fervid imagination with logical formalism, led him to form extravagant hopes of a fancied absolute method adapted to all science—applicable, also, to the truths of Christianity, and by which these truths could be demonstrated in a convincing manner to every man. Yet his writings generally abound—far more than that formal system of science, his *Ars magna*—in deep apologetic ideas. The enthusiasm of a most fervent love to God, a zeal equally intense for the cause of faith and the interests of reason and science, expressed themselves everywhere in his works" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 426).

One of his biographers states that the works of Lully numbered four thousand. Most of them are contained in an edition published at Mayence (10 vols. fol.), under title "Lulli *Opera omnia*, per Baccholium collecta, curante electore Palatino, et edita per Saltzingerum." They may be divided into four classes: I. Works concerning the "*Ars magna:*" *Ars generalis; Ars demonstrativa; Ars inventiva; Ars expositiva; Ars brevis; Tabula generalis; Ars magna generalis ultima* (this latter was published separately, Majorca, 1647); *Arbor Scientiæ* (Barcelon. 1582); *Liber Quæstionum super quatuor libris sententiarum* (Lyons, 1451); *Quæstiones magistri Thomæ Alubatensis solutæ secundum Artem* (Lyons, 1451). II. Religious works: *De articulis fidei Christianæ demonstrative probatis* (Majorca, 1578); *Controversia cum Homerio Sarraceno* (Valencia, 1510); *De Demonstratione Trinitatis per æquiparantiam* (Valencia, 1510); *Liber natalis pueri Jesu.* III. Against the Averroists: *Libri duodecim Principiorum Philosophiæ, contra Averrhoistas* (Strasb. 1517); *Philosophiæ, in Averrhoistas, Expositio* (Paris, 1516). IV. The works in which he speaks of himself, as the *Phantasticus* (Paris, 1499), and a very curious biography of R. Lully preserved in MS. in the college of Sapientia, at Rome, and which appears to have been written by himself. To these must be added his numerous unpublished works, preserved in the Imperial Library, the libraries of the Arsenal and Ste. Geneviève, at Paris, and those of Angers, Amiens, the Escurial, etc. We might also mention a number of works on alchemy generally attributed to him, but distinguished critics incline to the opinion that they are due to another person of the same name. Indeed, it appears certain that under the name of R. Lulle several distinct persons have been confounded together.

See Wadding, *Vie de R. Lulle;* Bouvelles, *Epistol. in Vit. R. Lull. eremitæ* (Amiens, 1511); Pax, *Elogium Lulli* (Alcala, 1519); Segni, *Vie de R. Lulle* (Majorca, 1605); Colletet, *Vie de R. Lulle* (Paris, 1646); Perroquet, *Vie et Martyre du docteur illuminé R. Lulle* (Vendôme, 1667); Vernon, *Hist. de la sainteté et de la doctrine de R. Lulle* (Paris, 1668); *Dissertacion historica del rulto in memoril del beato R. Lulli* (Majorca, 1700); Loëv, *De Vitâ R. Lulli specimen* (Halle, 1830); Delécluze, *Vie de R. Lulle,*

in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 15, 1840; Hauréau, *Hist. de la Scholastique*, ii; Rénan, *Averrhoes et l'Averrhoïsme;* Rousselot, *Hist. philosophique du Moyen-Age*, iii, 76–141; Helffereich, *Raymond Lull* (Berl. 1858, 8vo); and especially Ritter, *Gesch. d. Christl. Philos.* iv, 486 sq.; Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, p. 354 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxxii, 222; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 558. (J. H. W.)

Lumĭnum Dies (*Day of Lights*), another name for the *Epiphany* (q. v.), supposed to be the day of our Saviour's baptism, and so named because baptism was frequently called *lux*, or light.

Lump (דְּבֵלָה, *debelah'*), a round mass of any substance pressed together, specially of dried figs (2 Kings xx, 7; Isa. xxxviii, 21; "cake," 1 Sam. xxv, 18; xxx, 12; 1 Chron. xii, 40). The Greeks adopted the Heb. term in a softened form, *παλάθη*, which the Sept. uses. This was the usual shape in which figs were preserved for sale or use among the ancients, and is still found in the modern package called a "drum of figs." (See Celsii *Hierobot.* ii, 377–379; J. E. Faber on Harmar's *Obs.* i, 389 sq.) See Fig.

The term rendered "lump" in the New Test. is *φύραμα*, a kneaded *mass*, e. g. of potter's clay prepared for moulding (Rom. ix, 21), or of dough (proverbially, 1 Cor. v, 6; Gal. v, 9; tropically, Rom. xi, 16; 1 Cor. v, 7). See Pottery.

Lumper, Gottfried, a noted Benedictine, was born in 1747, and entered in his youth the Benedictine cloister of St. George at Villingen, in the Black Forest of Baden. He remained there in various offices, and as theological teacher, till his death in 1801, and distinguished himself by his works on Church History, the chief of which is *Historia theologico-critica de vita, scriptis atque doctrina SS. Patrum, aliorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum trium primorum sæculorum* (Augsburg, 1783–1799, 13 vols. 8vo). See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Lumsden, William O., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Va., about 1805. He was converted in the fifteenth year of his age, was received into the Baltimore Annual Conference in 1824, and held the following appointments in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia: 1824, Prince George's; 1825, Harford; 1826, Bedford Circuit; 1827, Phillipsburg; 1828, Gettysburg; 1829, Fairfax; 1830, Stafford; 1831, Prince George and St. Mary's; 1832–3, Montgomery; 1834, Severn; 1835, Springfield; 1836–7, Carlisle Circuit; 1838–9, Fairfax; 1840, Westmoreland; 1841–2, Winchester Circuit; 1843–4, Calvert; 1845–6, William Street, Baltimore; 1847, Whatcoat, Baltimore; 1848, Baltimore Circuit; 1849, Summerfield. In 1850 failing health obliged him to take a supernumerary relation. He died May 15, 1868. He was an active and efficient laborer in the vineyard of the Lord to the last. Though he was a supernumerary for eighteen years, he ceased not to preach of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1869, p. 13.

Luna, Pedro de. See Benedict XIII (A).

Lunatic (*σεληνιάζομαι, to be moon-struck*, as the Latin term *lunaticus* also signifies, a term the origin of which is to be found in the belief that diseases of a paroxysmal character were affected by the light, or by the changes of the moon), in Greek usage is i. q. *epileptic*, the symptoms of which disease were supposed to become more aggravated with the increasing moon (comp. Lucan. *Tox.* 24); in the N. Test. (and elsewhere) the same malady is ascribed to the influence of dæmons or malignant spirits (Matt. iv, 24; xvii, 15; comp. Lucan. *Philops.* 16; Isidor. *Orig.* iv, 7; Manetho, iv, 81, 216). In the enumeration of Matt. iv, 24, the "lunatics" are distinguished from the dæmoniacs; in Matt. xvii, 15, the name is applied to a boy who is expressly declared to have been possessed. It is evident, therefore, that the word itself refers to some disease affecting both the body and the mind, which might or might not be a sign of possession. Perhaps the distinction in the one case was that of *periodicity* or lucid intervals, in contrast with the continual demency of the possessed. See Dæmoniac. Persons of this description are highly venerated in the East as saints, or individuals highly favored of heaven. In Egypt, according to Lane (*Modern Egyptians*, i, 345 sq.), "Lunatics who are dangerous to society are kept in confinement, but those who are harmless are generally regarded as saints. Most of the reputed saints of Egypt are either lunatics, or idiots, or impostors. Some of them go about perfectly naked, and are so highly venerated that even women do not shun them. Men of this class are supported by alms, which they often receive without asking for them. An idiot or a fool is vulgarly regarded by them as a being whose mind is in heaven, while his grosser part mingles among ordinary mortals; consequently he is regarded as an especial favorite of heaven." This opinion entertained of lunatics by the Orientals serves to illustrate what is said of David when he fled to Achish, king of the Philistines, and feigned himself mad, and thus saved his life (1 Sam. xxi, 10–15). Also the words of the apostle are thought to be illustrated from the same superstitious custom: "For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise" (2 Cor. xi, 19). See Madness.

Lundy, Benjamin, an American philanthropist, of Quaker parentage, was born at Handwich, Sussex Co., N. J., Jan. 4, 1789. At the age of nineteen he went to learn the saddler's trade in Wheeling, Va., and there gained an insight into, and a lasting hatred of, negro slavery. He organized in 1815 an association called the "Union Humane Society," and soon after joined Charles Osborne, Esq., in publishing *The Emancipator*, at Mount Pleasant, O. In 1821 he successfully started a monthly entitled *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, into which he afterwards merged *The Emancipator*. In 1824 he delivered his first antislavery address at Deep Creek, North Carolina, and lecturing and journeying about on foot from place to place, organized about fourteen abolition societies in that state, besides some in Virginia. In the same year he removed *The Genius* to Baltimore, and issued it weekly. In 1825 he visited Hayti, and made provisions there for emancipated slaves. In 1828 he visited the antislavery advocates of the East, and lectured in their principal cities. In 1828–9 he was assaulted for alleged libel, censured by the court, and compelled to remove his paper to Washington, and finally to Philadelphia, where he gave it the name of *The National Inquirer*, and finally it merged into *The Pennsylvania Freeman*. In 1838 his property was burnt up by the proslavery mob which fired Pennsylvania Hall. Undaunted, he began anew by issuing *The Genius* at Lowell, La Salle Co., Ill., and there continued until his death, August 22, 1839. See Earle, *Life, Travels, etc., of Benj. Lundy;* Greeley, *American Conflict*, i, 111; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Lunsford, Lewis, a Baptist preacher, born in Stratford Co., Va., in 1753, began to preach when seventeen at the Potomac (now Hartwood) Church. Later he travelled in Westmoreland, Northumberland, Lancaster, and all the counties of the northern Virginia Neck, and several churches sprang up as the fruit of his toil; among others, Nomini and Wicomico. On the establishment of Moratico Church in 1778, he became its pastor for life. His sect was much persecuted at the time he was preaching in Richmond Co., and Lunsford was arrested, and thereafter tried in vain to get license to preach. He never was ordained, because he thought a Church's call was sufficient. Faithful study in and out of his profession made up for a limited schooling. He died in Essex Co., Va., Oct. 26, 1793. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vi, 125 sq.

Lunt, William Parsons, D.D., an eloquent and popular Unitarian divine, born at Newburyport, Mass., April 21, 1805, was ordained pastor of the Second Unita-

rian Church in New York, June 19, 1828; left here Nov. 19, 1833, and became pastor of the Unitarian Church in Quincy, Mass., June 3, 1835, where he remained until his death, Mar. 20, 1857. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Lupetino, Fra Baldo, one of the first martyrs to the Protestant cause in Italy in the 16th century, was born of ancient and noble parents in Albano, and actively propagated the reformed opinions in Venice. On becoming provincial within the Venetian territories of the Franciscan monks (to whose order he had been previously admitted) he urged the young men not to assume monastic orders. One of his contemporaries gives the following account of his further career. "After having long preached the Word of God in both the vulgar languages (the Italian and Sclavonian) in many cities, and defended it by public disputation in several places of celebrity with great applause, he was at last thrown into close prison at Venice by the inquisitor and papal legate. In this condition he continued during nearly twenty years to bear an undaunted testimony to the Gospel of Christ, so that his bonds and doctrine were made known not only to that city, but to the whole of Italy, and even to Europe at large, by which means evangelical truth was more widely spread. . . . At last this pious man, whom neither threatenings nor promises could move, sealed his doctrine by an undaunted martyrdom, and exchanged the filth and protracted tortures of a prison for a watery grave." See M'Crie's *History of the Reformation in Italy* (Phila. 1842), p. 105, 221.

Lupset, Thomas, an English scholar and theologian, was born in London in 1498; was educated at English schools, but took the degree of B.A. in Paris. In 1518 he obtained the chair of rhetoric at Oxford University. Later he was secretary to the Italian ambassador. On his return he took charge of the education of the natural son of Wolsey in Paris. In 1530 he was appointed prebend of Salisbury. He died Dec. 27, 1532. Among his works we notice *Epistolæ Variæ*, in the *Epistolæ aliquot eruditi. Virorum* (Bâle, 1520): — *Treatise teaching how to die well* (1534): — *An Exhortation to young Men* (1540, 8vo): — *Treatise of Charity* (1546, 8vo): — *Rules for a godly Life* (London, 1660). See Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Lupus, St. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates three saints by this name. The most important of them was born at Toul about the beginning of the 5th century. He was of a good family, and received a good education. He was afterwards married to Pimeniola, sister of Hilarius, bishop of Arles. Seven years after he abandoned his wife and children, and joined the disciples of St. Honoratus, who were there laying the foundations of the afterwards renowned convent of Lerins. In 426 he returned to Macon, and was elected to the see of Troyes, and greatly distinguished himself by his learning, both classical and theological. In 429 a council of the bishops of Gaul sent him, together with Germain of Auxerre, to Brittany, to oppose the Pelagian heresy, which was making great progress in that country. In 451, when Attila conquered Troyes, we find the barbarian king in intimate association with the bishop, and in his retreat Attila was accompanied by Lupus as far as the shores of the Rhine. Lupus died, according to tradition, July 29, 479. His most distinguished contemporaries called him "episcopus episcoporum," the Jacob of his age, and praised him particularly for his experience and his knowledge in all ecclesiastical matters. We possess only two works of his. One of them is an answer to some canonical questions propounded by Talassius, bishop of Angers, and to be found among the *Instrumenta* of the *Gallia Christiana* (vol. iv, col. 39). It contains some interesting information concerning marriage among the clergy. There is, it says, no general rule on this point: in the churches of Autun and Troyes married deacons are ordained without difficulty; but those who were single when ordained are not permitted to marry, and a married priest, on losing his wife, cannot marry again. (Comp. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 84.) His other work is a letter to Apollinarius, published in Achery, *Spicilegium*, v, 579. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii, 486; *Gallia Christ.* xii, col. 485; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 564; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 16. (J. N. P.)

Lupus, Christian. See Wolf.

Lupus, Servatus, or **Loup** de Ferrières, a French ecclesiastical writer, was born in the neighborhood of Sens about the year 805; studied at the abbey of Ferrières, and afterwards at Fulda, under the celebrated Rabanus Maurus. Eginhard instructed him in the classics. In 836 he returned to Sens, where he soon acquired a great reputation for learning. He was called to the court of the empress Judith, and became a favorite both with Louis le Débonnaire and his successor, Charles the Bald. In 841, the latter prince, having resolved to remove Odon, abbot of Ferrières, appointed Lupus in his stead. This intervention of the royal power in the affairs of the Church displeased the ecclesiastical authorities, and Lupus failed to secure their sanction until he had obtained from king Charles a charter granting to the monks of Ferrières the right of appointing in future their own abbots. This charter is to be found in the *Gallia Christiana*, among the *Instrumenta* of vol. xii, column 8. Lupus had great influence both with the king and with the clergy, and was present at all the councils held in France from 844 to 859, taking an active part in their proceedings. When the Normans landed in France in 861 he sought refuge in the diocese of Troyes. Still in the same year we find him present at the Council of Pistes, and in 862 at that of Soissons. There is no mention made of him afterwards; whether he died then, or whether, as would appear from the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre, he was exiled from Ferrières, and his rival Guanelon appointed in his stead, does not appear. His works, so far as they were then extant, were collected by Etienne Baluze, and published first in 1644, then, with notes and corrections, in 1710, 1 vol. 8vo. His treatise *De tribus Quæstionibus* discusses free-will, the twofold predestination, and the question whether Christ died for all men, or only for the elect. Gottschalk had mooted these three questions, strongly maintaining the necessity of grace; John Scotus Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, and Hincmar had more or less defended the doctrine of free-will. Lupus here attempts to conciliate these two opposite views, without, however, concealing his preference for that of Gottschalk. He thinks that, in the fallen human nature, free-will does indeed, to some extent, participate in our good impulses, yet is of no effect compared with grace. These impulses themselves originate in grace, and can only avail through grace; but, at the same time, grace enlightens the will, which becomes then a voluntary agent in continuing the work thus begun by grace alone. The Jansenists often quoted these views of Lupus. See *Gallia Christ.* vol. xii, col. 159; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v, 255; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxii, 19; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 562; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 459, 482.

Luque, Hernando de, the first Spanish bishop of Peru, was born in Darien, Isthmus of Panama, towards the close of the 15th century. After teaching a short time, he became priest and vicar of Panama. In 1525, as appears from subsequent events, he represented the licentiate Gaspar de Espinosa, principal alcalde in Darien, in that famous written and consecrated contract between himself, Pizarro, and Almagro, by which he was to furnish the money for the outfit and expenses of an expedition for the conquest of Peru, the success of which depended mainly upon his exertions. His services were rewarded by the king of Spain with the bishopric, and he was, besides, declared *Protector of the Indians of Peru*. He died suddenly in 1532. See Oviedo y Valdes, *Historia general y natural de las Indias*, etc. (edit. de

M. Amador de los Rios); Herrera, *Historia general de los Viajes en las Indias occidentales;* Prescott, *Hist. of Peru;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Luria. See Loria.

Luscinius, Othmar. See Nachtigall.

Lush. See Laish.

Lusk, H. K., a Presbyterian minister, prosecuted his college studies at the Western University, in Monongahela City, and graduated with high honors. In 1842 he entered the theological seminary at Canonsburg, Penn., and in 1846 was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Chartiers. For a time he labored in many of the vacant places of the Church, but subsequently received a call from the congregation of Cambridge, N. Y. He afterwards accepted a call from the congregation of Hulton, where he spent the rest of his ministry. He died Oct. 25, 1862. Mr. Lusk was gifted with a simplicity of manners which made him eminently social. Familiar with the government and discipline of the Church, he filled an important place in its courts. His convictions of truth and duty were such as to prompt a fearless and unswerving advocacy of what he deemed to be right and proper. See Wilson, *Presbyt. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 358. (J. L. S.)

Lust (usually תַּאֲוָה, *ἐπιθυμία*), in the ethical sense, is used to express sinful longings—sinful either in being directed towards absolutely forbidden objects, or in being so violent as to overcome self-control, and to engross the mind with earthly, carnal, and perishable things. Lust, therefore, is itself sinful, since it is an estrangement from God, destroys the true spiritual life, leads to take pleasure in what displeases God and violates his laws, brings the spirit into subjection to the flesh, and makes man a slave of sin and ungodliness. Lust, therefore, is the inward sin; it leads to the falling away from God; but the real ground of this falling away is in the will. It took place in the earliest days of mankind (Rom. i, 21), and is natural to all in the unregenerated state; it can only be abolished by Christ. The nature of man is not changed, only his empirically moral mode and place of existence. Lust, the origin of sin, has its place in the heart, not of a necessity, but because it is the centre of all moral forces and impulses, and of spiritual activity. The law does not therefore destroy sin, nay, it rather increases it, yet not in an active manner, but by the sinner's own fault. The psychological reason of this is, that the law does not destroy the lust, even while accompanied by punishment; consequently the estrangement from God can only be cancelled by regeneration. This takes place in the reconciliation with God through Christ, because, in giving his Son as a ransom for sinners, God has manifested his love in such a manner as to awaken man, and give him the strength to love God again. This love of God forms the substance of regeneration, and of the operations of the Holy Spirit, and destroys sinful lust by bringing man into union with God, or by the reception of the Spirit of Christ through faith. According to Matt. v, 28, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." This forcible expression is correct, for he who is regenerated, and whose heart is filled with true love of God, and who is possessed of the Spirit of Christ, cannot have such worldly lusts. He, therefore, who looks on a woman to (*πρός*) lust after her, or, in other words, he in whom her sight will awaken the lust of carnal pleasure, has already committed adultery in his heart. In Mark iv, 19 (Matt. xiii, 22; Luke viii, 14): "And the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful;" by *lusts* we are to understand the objects of desire, for lust does not enter the heart, but, on the contrary, proceeds from it, as appears from Matt. xv, 19: "For out of the heart proceed [through lust] evil thoughts [sins], murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." In Rom. i, 24: "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts;" and ver. 26, it is not God who awakened the lusts, but man, who had withdrawn from God, and made gods unto himself to worship. In view of its final object, this estrangement from God is a mystery, as it is an act of free volition. So in Rom. vi, 12: "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;" it can be understood how one could be good so far as intentions are concerned, while yet sin would reign in the lower *ego*—in the perishable body (compare with vii, 19, Gal. v, 17). But the apostle considers man, spiritually and bodily, as a whole. He who lives in God through Christ, and is dead unto sin (Rom. vi, 11), must not let lust govern his perishable body, or listen to his desire, but, on the contrary, these ought no longer to exist in him; the body is to be made as subservient to righteousness as the spirit, for it is the temple of the spirit, and therefore is the instrument wherewith the human mind, animated by the Holy Spirit, is to act. Accordingly it is stated in Rom. vii, 5, "For when we were in the flesh [before being regenerated], the motions [acts] of sins, which were by the law [which were shown by the law as such], did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." So in Rom. vii, 7, 8: "What shall we say, then? Is the law sin [the original source of sin]? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin [the fact of its existence within me] but by the law; for I had not known lust [that it was evil] except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But [my natural] sin [the principle of sin, or lust], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence [sinful desires resulting from the general lusts of the flesh]. For without the law sin was dead [i. e. not absent, but partly in the sense of not being recognised as sin or lust, and partly because the knowledge of the restrictions imposed by the law served but to increase the desire for what it forbade]." *Χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά* is a general and popularly expressed aphorism, which is not received in theory. In Gal. v, 16, 17, 24, we are directed, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh [sin] lusteth against [in contradiction with] the [Holy] Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the thing that ye [simply] would; but they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh (in the regeneration), with the affections and lusts." The effect of the strife between the flesh and the Spirit is to prevent the evil which man desires after the flesh. The Holy Spirit helps man to triumph over lust. The image of God is never entirely obliterated, but the lusts of the flesh can lead into enormous sins, and have done so. In like manner, in Rom. i, 24, etc.; Eph. iv, 22 (Col. iii, 5 comp. with Eph. ii, 2; Tit. iii, 3): "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;" lust (estrangement from God), as an impulse of free volition, is the original source of error which obscures both the mind and the heart. Further, Rom. i, 21, 22; 1 Tim. vi, 9 ("But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition"); 2 Tim. ii, 22 ("Flee also youthful lusts"); Tit. ii, 12 ("Teaching us that, denying ungodliness [*ἀσέβειαν*] and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world)." Christians can and must be in the world, but not of the world, and must hold themselves aloof from its contamination. So, again, James i, 27; 1 Pet. ii, 11 ("Dearly beloved, I beseech you, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul"); 1 Pet. iv, 1–3 ("He that has suffered in the flesh [ethically, is dead unto the flesh] hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in

lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries"); compare 1 Pet. i, 4; 2 Pet. ii, 10, 18; iii, 3; Jude 16. Once more, 1 John ii, 15–17: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." Finally, James i, 14, 15: "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death (or misery)." The N. T. teaches us that man should eagerly avail himself of the power of sanctification proffered through grace to overcome lust and the consequent sin.—Krehl, *Neu-test. Wörterbuch*. See TEMPTATION.

Lustration, a formal and public application of water in token of consecration or expiation. Such acts were prevalent not only among heathen nations, more especially those of the southern climates, such as the Indians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (compare Wetstein, *Nov. Test. Evang. Matth.* iii, 6), but also among the Jews (see Häner, *De lustratione Hebræorum*, Wittenb. 1733). With these latter they were preparations for divine services of a different nature, and even for private prayer (Judith xii). They formed a part of the offering-service, and more especially of the sin-offering (Lev. xvi); and for that reason the prayer-houses (*προσευχαί*) were usually established in the vicinity of running waters (compare Kuinöl, *ad Act.* xvi, 13). Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 5) gives an account of the manifold lustrations of the Essenes. In the language of the prophets, cleansing with water is used as an emblem of the purification of the heart, which in the Messianic age is to glorify the soul in her innermost recesses, and embrace the whole of the theocratic nation (Ezek. xxxvi, 25 sq.; Zech. xiii, 1). Such declarations gave rise to or nourished the expectation that the advent of the Messiah would manifest itself by a preparatory lustration, by which Elijah or some other great prophet would pave the way for him. This supposition lies evidently at the bottom of the questions which the Jews put to John the Baptist (John i, 25; compare Matt. and Luke iii, 7), whether he was the Messiah, or Elijah, or some other prophet? and if not, why he undertook to baptize? (compare Schneckenberger, *Ueber das Alter der Jüdischen Proselytentaufe*, § 41 sq.). Thus we can completely clear up the historical derivation of the rite, as used by John and Christ, from the general and natural symbol of baptism, from the Jewish custom in particular, and from the expectation of a Messianic consecration. See BAPTISM.

Among the ancient Greeks, and more particularly the Romans, lustrations were of most solemn import. Those of which we possess direct knowledge are always connected with sacrifices and other religious rites, and consisted in the sprinkling of water by means of a branch of laurel or olive, and at Rome sometimes by means of the aspergillum, and in the burning of certain materials, the smoke of which was thought to have a purifying effect. Whenever sacrifices were offered, it seems to have been customary to carry them around the person or thing to be purified. Lustrations were made in ancient Greece, and probably at Rome also, by private individuals when they had polluted themselves by any criminal action. Whole cities and states also sometimes underwent purifications to expiate the crime or crimes committed by a member of the community. The most celebrated purification of this kind was that of Athens, performed by Epimenides of Crete, after the Cylonian massacre. Purification also took place when a sacred spot had been unhallowed by profane use, as by burying dead bodies in it, as was the case with the island of Delos. See ABLUTION.

The Romans performed lustrations on many occasions on which the Greeks did not think of them, and the object of most Roman lustrations was not to atone for the commission of crime, but to obtain the blessing of the gods upon the persons or things which were lustrated. Thus fields were purified after the business of sowing was over, and before the sickle was put to the corn. Sheep were purified every year at the festival of the Palilia. All Roman armies before they took the field were lustrated, and, as the solemnity was probably always connected with a review of the troops, the word lustratio is always used in the sense of the modern review. The establishment of a new colony was always preceded by a lustratio with solemn sacrifices. The city of Rome itself, as well as other towns within its dominion, always underwent a lustratio after they had been visited by some great calamity, such as civil bloodshed, awful prodigies, and the like. A regular and general lustratio of the whole Roman people took place after the completion of every lustrum, when the censor had finished his census, and before he laid down his office. This lustratio (also called lustrum) was conducted by one of the censors, and held with sacrifices called *Suovetaurilia*, because the sacrifices consisted of a pig (or ram), a sheep, and an ox. It took place in the Campus Martius, where the people assembled for the purpose. The sacrifices were carried three times around the assembled multitude. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiquities*, s. v. Lustratio.

Something of the nature of lustration prevails in the use of "*holy water*" (q. v.) by the Roman Catholics.

Lutĕi, *earthy*, one of the terms of reproach with which the first Christians were assailed by their persecutors.

Luther, MARTIN, the greatest of the Reformers of the Christian Church, whose name is the watchword of Protestantism, and marks a new æra in the history of Europe.

I. *Youth*.—He sprang from an old and widely-extended German family, of which there are documentary traces as early as 1137. He was born at Eisleben, a village of Lower Saxony, Nov. 10, 1483 (see, however, an argument for a later date, 1484, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1872), fifteen years before the martyrdom of Savonarola. As one of the heralding stars declined to its setting in blood, the Morning Star of the Reformation drew near the horizon of the new day. His father, Hans Luther, was a miner of the village of Moehra. His mother's name was Margaretha Lindemann. His parents subsequently removed to Mansfeld, and there his father became a man of property and town senator.

Luther grew up under pious but rigorous discipline. His father was characterized by severity, tempered with great honesty and clearness of judgment. Luther's mother was a woman of earnest piety, which, however, had also a tinge of harshness. Luther went to school at Magdeburg in 1497, in 1498 to Eisenach, and in 1501 he entered the University of Erfurt. Here he took the Bachelor's degree in 1503, and the degree of Master of Arts, which entitled him to teach in the university, in 1505. He was designed for the profession of the law; but a prevailing discomfort and occasional anguish of mind, under a sense of sin and the dread of the wrath of God, heightened first by the sudden, violent death of a friend, and later by a stroke of lightning which fell near his feet, determined Luther quite otherwise. He vowed to St. Ann that he would become a monk. The evening before his entrance to the cloister of the Augustinians he spent in lively conversation and song with his university friends, and the first announcement to them of his purpose was made at the close of the festal hours. "To-day you see me; after this you will see me no more," said Luther. When night was passing into morning, July 17, 1505, he presented himself for admission at the convent—soon to become the birthplace of Lutheran Protestantism and of the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law.

II. *Cloister Life* (1505–1517).—He passed through his

novitiate, and finally, in opposition to his father's wishes, to whom it seemed that his son had chosen "a life little differing from death," took the vows, and was consecrated to the priesthood May 2, 1507. Luther had entered the priesthood to find peace for his soul. He says, "I chose for myself twenty-one saints, read mass every day, calling on three of them each day, so as to complete the circuit every week; especially did I invoke the holy Virgin, as her womanly heart was more easily touched, that she might appease her Son. I verily thought that by invoking three saints daily, and by letting my body waste away with fastings and watchings, I should satisfy the law, and shield my conscience against the goad; but it all availed me nothing: the further I went on in this way the more was I terrified, so that I should have given over in despair had not Christ graciously regarded me, and enlightened me with the light of the Gospel." From his deep depression of soul he was lifted by a brother in the cloister, who fixed his attention on the article in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the remission of sins." Staupitz, one of the noblest men of his time, dealt with Luther very faithfully. "Staupitz," says Luther, "once comforted me on this wise: 'You would be a painted sinner, and have a painted Christ as a Saviour. You must make up your mind that you are a very sinner, and that Christ is a very Saviour.'" "I sought to make out the meaning of Paul in the term 'the righteousness of God,' and at last I came to apprehend it thus: Through the Gospel is revealed the righteousness which availeth with God —a righteousness by which God in his mercy and compassion justifieth us, as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith.' The expression, 'the righteousness of God,' which I so much hated before, became now dear and precious, my darling and most comforting word, and that passage of Paul was to me the true door of Paradise."

Luther now zealously devoted himself to the earnest study of theology. "The writings of Biel and D'Ailly he could repeat almost word for word; Occam he read long and carefully, and rated his acumen higher than that of Thomas and Scotus. He read Gerson with diligence, but the entire writings of Augustine he had read more frequently and fixed more thoroughly in his memory than any others" (Melancthon, *Vit. Luth.*). "Next after the holy Scriptures," says Luther, "no teacher in the Church is to be compared with Augustine; take the entire body of the fathers together, there is not to be found in them half that we find in Augustine alone" (*Werke*, xiv, 209). It was an unconscious presage when Luther, on entering the cloister, took the name of Augustine. Among the mediæval writers, Bernard held the highest place in Luther's regard. "If ever there was a holy monk, Bernard was that monk. He is golden when he teaches and preaches—then he surpasses all the doctors in the Church" (*Werke*, xii, 1696; xxii, 2050). Augustine and Bernard became increasingly precious to him as his continued studies of the holy Scriptures brought him to a profounder acquaintance with the truth. In 1508 his scholarship received acknowledgment by a call to the chair of philosophy in the newly-founded University of Wittenberg, the capital of the old electorate. The university was under the protection of the elector (Frederick)—not of an ecclesiastic—which was a happy circumstance for its part in the future. Its patron saints were Paul and Augustine. Luther went thither, and lectured on dialectics and physics according to Aristotle. In 1509 he became Baccalaureus ad Biblia; 1511, Sententiarius (*Sentences of Lombard*, first two books), Formatus (*Sentences*, last two books); October 4, 1512, Licentiatus (to teach theology in general); and October 19, 1512, Doctor of Theology, a degree which involved not a mere honor, but an office, in receiving which Luther swore "to teach purely and sincerely according to the Scriptures." He now transferred his labors from philosophy to theology. His favorite books, on which he delivered his earliest theological lectures, were the Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. The lectures rested upon a study of the Vulgate and of the fathers. Philosophy he still prized, but most of all as a handmaid to true theology, which, he says, "searches for the kernel of the nut, the marrow of the fruit."

A *journey to Rome* was made by Luther in 1510, on foot. He went partly in the interests of his order, and yet more as a pilgrim. As the Eternal City rose before his eyes, he fell on his knees, and fervently exclaimed, "Hail, sacred Rome! thrice hallowed with the blood of martyrs!" St. Peter's was half finished. The man now looked upon it who was to make its completion the bankruptcy of Rome, though Rome held the world's coffers in her hands. New Rome stood on the heaped graves of the dead, old pagan city. Luther was not insensible to the historical and antiquarian interest which clustered around every site, but every other feeling was subordinate to the religious one. He was full of honest fervor, full of pious credulity. He went up the staircase of Pilate on his knees, yet with his heart protesting as he crept: Not thus do "the just live by faith." He looked upon the handkerchief of Veronica; he gazed on the heads of Paul and Peter, and his strong sight was too much for his strong credence—he pronounced the heads carvings in wood, and bad carvings. Luther saw the pomps and the corruptions of Rome, but his heart remained fixed still in its strong love to the "Roman Church, honored of God above all others" (1519).

The visitation of the cloisters of Misnia and Thuringia, conducted by Luther (1516), in the absence of the provincial Staupitz (who was then in the Netherlands), was the means of opening Luther's eyes to the corruptions among the people and the clergy, but did not shake his faith in the Church. "His first prejudices were enlisted in the service of the worst portion of the Roman Catholic Church; his opening reason was subjected to the most dangerous perversion; and a sure and early path was opened to his professional ambition. Such was not the discipline which could prepare the mind for any independent exertion; such were not the circumstances from which any ordinary mind could have emerged into the clear atmosphere of truth. In dignity a professor, in theology an Augustinian, in philosophy a Nominalist, by education a mendicant monk, Luther seemed destined to be a pillar of the Roman Catholic Church, and a patron of all its corruptions."

The first light of the Gospel as Luther sheds it, beams forth in his lectures on the Psalms and Romans. Among his earliest works are his series of sermons on the Ten Commandments, his exposition of the penitential psalms, printed in 1517, and his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, delivered during Lent in 1517, and printed in 1518. He had become a student of Tauler and of the "German theology." The influence of the pure and profound mysticism of these books shows itself in all of Luther's later life, for true mysticism is the internal mirror of the truth of God. Luther's advance in Biblical study, and the influence of this loftier mysticism, brought him more and more out from the influence of Aristotle and of scholasticism. He was unconsciously preparing for the opening of that grand part which he was to play in the history of the Church and in the history of mankind.

The traffic in *indulgences* (q. v.) had been brought into the vicinity of Wittenberg, with the approval of the archbishop of Mayence, by Tetzel, a Dominican monk. The expressions with which Tetzel recommended his treasure appear to have been marked with peculiar impudence and indecency. But the act had in itself nothing novel or uncommon; the sale of indulgences had long been recognised as the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, and was sometimes censured by its more firm or more prudent members. But the crisis had at length arrived in which the iniquity could no longer be repeated with impunity. The cup was at length full, and the hand of Luther was destined to dash it to the ground. In the attitude which Luther took

toward this traffic, his design was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. At the confessional and in the pulpit he began to warn his people. He wrote earnest letters of remonstrance to the bishops of Brandenburg and Mayence, holding in regard to repentance that a distinction is to be made between the internal repentance, which is of the heart, and the external thing of confession and satisfaction. Receiving unfavorable comments on his position from the prelates, he determined to make his opposition public.

III. *First Movements as a Reformer* (Oct. 31, 1517–May 4, 1521).—On the 31st of October, 1517, at midday, Luther affixed to the castle church at Wittenberg ninety-five theses, which he proposed to defend at the university, completely denying the position on which Tetzel rested the merits of indulgences. He declared, in substance, that the command of Jesus to repent implies that the whole life is to be a repentance, not to be confounded with the confession and satisfaction made to a priest. Repentance, indeed, demands with that which is internal an external mortification of the flesh. The power of the papal indulgence can go no further than the penances imposed by the pope himself. The papal indulgence, consequently, can produce no reconciliation with God, nor, in fact, take away the guilt of the smallest daily sin. The pope can only announce and confirm the forgiveness imparted by God. This, indeed, is not to be despised, yet it can be found without the pope's indulgence where there is true compunction and faith. The true treasure of the Church is not a treasure of indulgences intrusted to the pope, but is the Gospel of the grace of God. He distinctly held the obtaining of grace to be a thing of immediate relation between the soul and God. In these theses Luther believed that he expressed throughout the mind of the pope, who he supposed was ignorant of the abuses that had been practiced in his name. It seems at first remarkable that Luther gives so little prominence to faith in the theses, and in the sermons on indulgence and grace which appeared simultaneously with the theses, and were meant for the people, Nov. 1517. But a careful study will show that his conception of repentance is that larger Biblical one in which it embraces both penitence and faith. Repentance is sometimes used as synonymous with penitence, and we then speak of repenting and believing, repentance and faith. Sometimes repentance covers both, and then God is said to command men everywhere to repent. Thus, in the 12th art. of the *Augsburg Confession*, it is said: "Repentance properly consists of these two parts: The first is contrition, or the terrors of a conscience smitten with acknowledged sin. The other part is faith, which is conceived from the Gospel or absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are remitted." "This first act of Luther's evangelical life," says Gieseler, "has been hastily ascribed by at least three eminent writers of very different character—Bossuet, Hume, and Voltaire—to the narrow monastic motive, the jealousy of a rival order. It is asserted that the Augustinian friars had usually been invested in Saxony with this profitable commission, and that it only became offensive to Luther when transferred to the Dominicans. There is no ground for this assertion. The Dominicans had been for nearly three centuries the peculiar favorites of the holy see, and objects of all its partialities; and it is particularly remarkable that, after the middle of the fifteenth century, during a period scandalously fruitful in the abuse in question, we very rarely meet with the name of any Augustinian as employed in that service. Moreover, it is almost equally important to add that none of the contemporary adversaries of Luther ever advanced this charge against him, even at the moment in which the controversy was carried on with the most unscrupulous wrath." The influence of the theses was instantly felt far and wide. "The theses," says Luther himself, "ran clear through all Germany in fourteen days, for all the world was complaining about the indulgences; and because all the bishops and doctors were silent, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, Luther became a renowned doctor, because at last somebody had come who took hold of the thing." Luther, in his frank, artless confidence that the pope would be his most enthusiastic patron, was soon undeceived, but his higher trust was strengthened by the course of events. "If," said he, "the work be of God, who can overthrow it?" (Compare here the article Leo X in this volume, especially p. 363 sq. A careful reprint of the theses, after the original, is given in Ranke's *Reformation's Geschichte.*)

In 1518 the Augustinian Order held a convention at Heidelberg. All of Luther's friends counselled him against going thither, as his life was threatened. Luther, faithful to the vow to his order, went, on foot, to the convention. In Heidelberg he disputed on theses in theology and philosophy; on free-will and the fall; grace, faith, justification, and good works. He took ground against Aristotle. An immense audience, not only of students, but of citizens and courtiers, attended the disputation. Among the auditors were Bucer, Brentius, and others, destined to play a memorable part in the scenes of the coming Reformation. Meanwhile the principles maintained in the ninety-five theses had provoked the assaults of a number of stanch adherents to the practice of the indulgence traffic; but Luther stoutly defended himself against all of them in his "Resolutiones," that is, solution of points in dispute concerning the virtue of indulgences; and, still hoping for redress from Rome, sent these to Leo X. His appeal was first of all to holy Scripture, and, next to this, to Augustine, as the profoundest expositor of Scripture among the fathers.

While the elector, in the interest of the university, protected Luther, Rome avoided coming to the last extremity. As early as Feb., 1518, the pope had instructed the general of the Augustinian Order, Gabriel Venetus, to turn Luther from the path he was following. As this measure failed of success, Luther had been called forward for trial to Rome. By the intercession of the elector, in place of appearing at Rome to answer the citation, the appointment was made that cardinal Cajetan should give him a hearing at Augsburg. Urban, the orator of the marquis of Montferrat, tried his arts of persuasion previous to Luther's meeting Cajetan. To him Luther said, "If I can be convinced that I have said anything in conflict with the understanding of the holy Roman Church, I will at once condemn it, and retract it." Urban said, "Do you think the elector is going to hazard his land for you?" Luther replied, "I would in no wise have it so." "Where, then, will you abide?" Luther answered, "Under the cope of heaven." The Italian replied, "Had you the pope and the cardinals in your power, what would you do?" "I would," said Luther, "give them all due honor and reverence." At this the messenger, after the Italian manner, biting his thumbs, went away (Fuller, *Abel Redivivus* [Nichols], 1867, i, 44).

The cardinal himself attempted, Oct. 1518, to bring "little brother Martin" to submission, but without success. "I don't wish to talk more with this beast; he has a deep eye, and marvellous speculations in his head." The good offices of Staupitz, the head of the Augustinians, and a firm friend of Luther, were also called in to move Luther, but the service was not one after his heart. When Luther asked Staupitz for some other interpretation of the Scripture than that on which his faith rested, Staupitz acknowledged that he could not give it, and showed where his heart was when he said to Luther, "Remember, dear brother, that thou hast begun in the name of Jesus." In order that Luther might not be hampered, Staupitz had absolved him from the vow of obedience to the order. Luther finally appealed from "our most holy master Leo X, illy informed, to Leo X, to be better informed." Having reason to fear violence, he made his escape in the night of Oct. 20. Staupitz furnished him with a horse and an old guide. Luther, disguised in a long mantle, barefooted, and unarmed,

rode until the evening of the day following, and when dismounted, could not stand, but lay helpless on the straw. At Gräfenthal he was overtaken by count Albert of Mansfeld, who laughed heartily at Luther's style of horsemanship, and insisted on having him as his guest. Two days after Luther's departure the appeal was fastened to the door of the cathedral at Augsburg.

The papal bull of the month following condemned the attacks upon indulgences, and claimed for the pope the power of delivering sinners from all punishments due to every sort of transgression. Luther, now despairing of any reasonable accommodation with the pontiff, finding that nothing short of the six letters "r e v o c o" would answer, appealed on Nov. 25, 1518, from the pope to a general council. Leo, however, by this time aware of the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the German Church, seeing around Luther fast gathering the great, and the strong, and the learned, hastily dispatched Miltitz, the papal chamberlain and legate, whose moderation and skill adapted him for the mission of conciliation. Though he utterly failed to procure any recantation, he yet succeeded in obtaining from Luther (1519) an expression of submissiveness, and induced him to write to the pope a letter full of courtesy and humility, promising silence if it were also imposed on his adversaries. See Leo X.

IV. *Leipsic Disputation.*—But the vanity and eagerness of his opponents were too great to allow the stipulation any practical force. They saw spurs to be won, and would not lift their lances from rest. Eck in the previous year (1518) had challenged Carlstadt to a disputation, but his whole course proved that Luther was to be the main object of his attack, and Luther hesitated not to appear in defence. The disputation took place at Leipsic, in the Pleissenberg Castle, from June 26 to July 16, 1519. Carlstadt was no match for Eck, who was incomparably the best debater on the side of Rome in the century. The discussion was so tedious at times that the hall was emptied. The debate itself, and the part Luther himself took during its progress, have already been spoken of in the article Eck, in vol. iii, especially at p. 47 sq.

The breach with Rome was decided at these disputations by Luther's declaration that among the articles of Huss there were also some condemned by the Council of Constance completely Christian and evangelical, thus clearly denying, *de facto*, the authority of the Church to decide in matters of faith. In August, 1520, appeared the reformatory writing, "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, of the bettering of the Christian State." In this work Luther unsparingly exposed what the pope had done to convert the Germans, a noble, loyal race, into treacherous perjurers, and showed with what forbearance Germany had borne these indignities. The German knighthood had offered to draw sword in Luther's defence, but he declined the aid of all earthly power, as out of keeping with the holy interests of the kingdom. This great book showed to the knights that Luther's arms were mightier than theirs. In his book, "Of the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," Oct. 6, 1520, Luther presented the *doctrinal* aspects of the Reformation, as in his book to the nobles he had looked at it in its *political* relations. He demanded the total abrogation of indulgences as "devilish institutions," the restoration of the cup to the laity, the limitation of the number of the sacraments: "If we wish to speak rigidly, there are in the Church *two sacraments* only." He declared transubstantiation to be no article of faith, and set forth the view that "true bread and true wine," not their mere accidents, remain in the Supper. He urges the cessation of external ecclesiastical satisfactions. Through the whole he argues the sufficiency of the faith by which alone man is justified. It might have seemed fixed that reconciliation with the Church of Rome was no longer possible; yet, as the result of a second conference with Miltitz at Lichtenberg, Oct. 12, 1520, Luther expressed himself willing once more to test the question. If reconciliation were to be had at all, the sermon "Of the Freedom of a Christian Man" (Wittenb. 1520) breathed the very spirit in which alone it was possible. It is "pleasant, without polemics, full of devoutness, and of the overwhelming might of love to God and love to man. In it the reformatory principle appears in its depth, its rich devotional spirit, its religious freshness. Its life-breath is the spirit of the higher peace; it contains a treasure of new impulses for the intellectual, and, indeed, the speculative life of the Christian soul. The evangelical principle, as it involves faith and love, has perhaps never been unfolded with such clearness, fullness, and depth. It is noble and full of significance that Luther appended this golden little book to his last letter to the pope (Sept. 6, 1520), as if with a petition for a peaceful separation and a more kindly construction. But it is a happy thing besides to note the quiet self-possession, the profound repose, and clearness of soul with which Luther stood as the strife grew more threatening, and the bull of excommunication was impending. This undoubted mirror of a child-like heart, reflecting the peace of heaven, is in amazing contrast with the thunder-storm which gathered about it, and is a demonstration that the confessor of the justification which is by faith had what he confessed, and was what he taught" (Dorner, *Gesch. der Prot. Theol.* p. 101, 108). Rome had meanwhile been getting ready to settle the whole matter by a coup de main. In September, 1520, Eck appeared in Germany with the papal bull, dated June 15. It condemned as heresies forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's writings, ordered his works to be burned wherever they were found, and summoned him, on pain of excommunication, to confess and retract his errors within sixty days, and to throw himself upon the mercy of the pope. This bull brought Luther to a step decisive beyond recall. Susceptible to gentleness, he met violence and threatening with unshakable courage. Like a great general, promptly accepting the warfare forced upon him, he carried the war instantly into the heart of the enemy's territory. Before the gate which opens towards the river Elster, at Wittenberg, in the presence of a vast multitude of all ranks and orders, he burned the papal bull, and with it the decree, the decretals, the Clementines, the Extravagants, the entire code of Romish canon law, as the root of all the evil, Dec. 10, 1520. Archdeacon Manning, whose testimony here will carry peculiar weight, says: "The just causes of complaint which made Luther first address the bishops, his steady appeals through every gradation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a general council; and, on the other, the violent and corrupt administration of Leo X, ending in an excommunication against a man whose cause was still unheard, seem effectually to clear both him and those who, for his sake, were driven from the unity of the Church from the guilt of schism" (*Unity of the Church* [London, 1842], p. 328, 329). Thus Luther broke openly, as he had already broken virtually, with Rome, forever. This final rupture gave a character of sharpest decision to his appeal to a general council, with which he prefaced the burning of the bull, and to his writings *Against the Bull of Antichrist*, against Emser, and others. He still continued a faithful member of the Catholic Church of the West, holding its old faith, which knew nothing of a pope with unlimited despotic authority. He stood then in many respects in the same general position which is occupied by Döllinger now. The bull of excommunication promptly followed, Jan. 6, 1521. In consequence of Luther's daring act, the papal legate, Alexander, demanded of the Diet sitting at Worms that he should be put under the ban of the empire. But it was the wish of the estates of the empire that, in advance of giving effect to the papal bull, Luther should be summoned to appear and have a hearing before the Diet. To this Diet, against the urgent advice of his friends, under a safeguard from Charles V, who had succeeded Maximilian in 1519, Luther went, saying, "Though there were

as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on its roofs, still would I enter." In the memorable transaction at Worms, "the most splendid scene in history," as it has been styled, Luther stood in the presence of the emperor, the archduke Ferdinand, six electors, twenty-four dukes, eight margraves, thirty bishops, and other princes and prelates of the realm, April 17, 18, 1521. It "was the most remarkable assembly ever convened on earth—an empire against a man! Lucas Cranach's picture represents Luther as he stood there, so lone and strong, with his great full heart—a second Prometheus, confronting the Jove of the 16th century and the German Olympus." "His friends were yet few, and of no great influence; his enemies were numerous and powerful, and eager for his destruction: the cause of truth, the hope of religious regeneration, appeared to be placed at that moment in the discretion and constancy of one man. The faithful trembled." But Luther was victorious in his good confession. Having examined the books laid before him, April 17, he acknowledged them as his own. After deep reflection, for which he had solicited time, he defended himself on the following day in an address of two hours in length. He upheld freedom of conscience, and denied the right of the priesthood to control by force the religious convictions of men. His manner was free from all vehemence, his expression was modest, gentle, and humble; "but in the matter of his public apology he declined in no one particular from the fulness of his convictions. Of the numerous opinions which he had by this time adopted at variance with the injunctions of Rome, there was not one which in the hour of danger he consented to compromise." At the close of his speech, which was in German, he complied with the request to repeat it in Latin, for the sake of the emperor and of others. When urged with the direct question whether he would recant, he replied in Latin, "Unless I shall be convinced by the testimonies of the Scriptures or by evident reason (for I believe neither pope nor councils alone, since it is manifest they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted, and my conscience is held captive by the word of God; and as it is neither safe nor right to act against conscience, I cannot and will not retract anything." He added in German, "Here I stand; I cannot otherwise; God help me. Amen" (*Acta Wormatiæ habitæ*, in *Opera* [Jena], ii, 414. The historical character of these last [German] words has been disputed [see Burckhardt, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1869], but without good grounds). Luther's enemies now made violent efforts to effect his ruin. They counselled the violation of the imperial safe-conduct. They appealed to the crime of Constance as a precedent. Charles replied that if honor were banished from every other home, it ought to find refuge in the heart of kings. The ban of the empire was published May 25, 1521. It made Luther an outlaw.

V. *The Wartburg Exile and the Return* (May 5, 1521–1522).—On Luther's return from Worms the imperial herald accompanied him to the border of Hesse. At this point Luther, with no companion but Amsdorf, turned his face towards Möhra, to visit his grandmother. At Altenstein, May 4, in the Thuringian Forest, he was seized by masked horsemen, and was taken for protection by his friend the elector to the Wartburg, the Patmos of the opening apocalypse of history (see "Leo and Luther," by Eugene Lawrence, in Harper's *Monthly*, xxxix, 91–106). Here, in the apparel of a knight, he was known as Jungker George. His enemies accounted for his sudden disappearance by asserting that he had been carried off by the devil, a theory which, from their point of view, does not give to that august person the due generally conceded to his sagacity—if Rome was right, there was no one whom the devil had so much reason to wish to keep on earth as Luther. The leisure enjoyed by Luther at the Wartburg was employed by him in preparing the first draught of the translation of the New Testament.

After an exile of ten months he was called back to Wittenberg, March 6, 1522, by the disorders which had broken out. The Augustinian monks had abrogated the mass; in the transactions which took place between them, the university, and the elector, Carlstadt had intermeddled. Carlstadt had gone on at once to introduce what, in his judgment, were manifest consequences of Luther's principles. The communion was administered in both kinds, with the exclusion of the sacrificial elements and of the mass, and without confession. A great number of the usual ceremonies also were set aside, and the marriage of the priests, and of others under ecclesiastical vows, was introduced. The radical violence of the whole tendency and of its modes gave evidence that Carlstadt was availing himself of Luther's absence to attempt what he would not have dared to do when Luther was present. The passionate violence of Carlstadt was fanned by the Zwickau Prophets, who at this time made their appearance at Wittenberg. The wild storm of iconoclasm was met by Luther with discussion for the scholar, with sermons for the people. The personal character and force of Luther, the solid truth of his position, and his irresistible popular eloquence gained a complete victory over Carlstadt (q. v.). The two men were in heart sundered from this hour, though they did not come into open controversy until 1525. Previous to the struggle with Carlstadt the life of Luther in every element and trait had made an ineffaceable impression of grandeur on the hearts of the whole German nation. Every independent heart, and all the nobler Roman Catholics, acknowledged him in the highest sense a man of the people, and, in a sense not less high, a man of God. He had "opened the sanctuary of a pure faith, and in heroic struggle had kept it open" (Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.*, trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor [Edinb. 1871], i, 97, 98). At this time took place his change from monasticism and asceticism to evangelical life: the former in 1524, when he dropped the monastic dress; the latter in 1525, when he married. Here also belong the part he took in 1529 at the colloquy in Marburg (q. v.), where an effort was made to harmonize the peculiar views of Luther and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper; and his work for the Augsburg Confession (q. v.).

VI. *Last Efforts at Conciliation with Rome.*—All the later efforts to bridge over the gulf between himself and the papacy Luther regarded as too weak, in their very conception, to justify any great solicitude either of hope or of despair on his part. At Coburg, in 1530, he warned the sanguine among his own adherents of the hopelessness of the effort to compromise with the pope without the sacrifice of the truth. The colloquy in Wittenberg, Nov. 1535, with Vergerius, the papal nuncio sent by Paul III, Luther considered a farce. The embassy filed into Wittenberg "with twenty-one horses and *one ass*." Luther confided to his barber the chief preparation he felt it necessary to make for meeting the nuncio of the holy father, and, with a full sense of the humor of the position, put on the best clothes and the largest jewels he could command, and in the splendor of an open carriage, which would now be considered a cart, rode forth "pope of Germany, with cardinal Bugenhagen" at his side. The legate was treated with courtesy, but not with reverence. Luther declared himself willing to appear before a general council whenever it might be summoned, though he should know that it would end in his being burned. Vergerius: "The pope would not be unwilling to meet you here in Wittenberg." Luther: "Let him come; we shall be glad to see him." Vergerius: "Would you prefer his coming with an army, or without one?" Luther: "Just as he pleases; we are ready for him either way." When the legate had mounted, he said to Luther, "See to it that you are ready for the council." Luther replied, "I shall come, sir, if it costs me my head." His opinion of the proposed council was expressed in his work *Of Councils and Churches* (1539), and by his advice the evangelical

(Lutheran) princes declined to participate in the council.

Melancthon in 1545 prepared the Wittenberg Reform, the sketch of a plan of union. To this Luther gave his subscription, but shortly afterwards published his book *Against the Papacy at Rome, founded by the Devil*, one of the very fiercest of his controversial works.

VII. *Luther and the Bohemians.*—On the other hand, Luther sought to perpetuate the fellowship formed with the Bohemians, who in 1536 had again sent their representatives to him. He wrote prefaces to their Apology of the Faith in 1533 and 1538. The dissatisfaction he had felt in 1541 with some things in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which appeared to him suspicious, was dispelled in 1542.

VIII. *Luther's last Days.*—The Protestant princes had drawn the sword in the feud. Luther did all in his power to preserve the peace between the princes and the emperor; but the future looked threatening, and his soul was as full of solicitude as a soul could be whose trust in God was so implicit. The council and the congregation in Wittenberg gave Luther very serious trouble. The great renown and prosperity of Wittenberg, given to it by Luther and his coworkers, had brought the evils which naturally attend the inflowing of wealth and the attainment of position. Frivolity and fashion corrupted the people. Luther fought with all his energies against the evil. In 1530, after a powerful sermon of rebuke, he withdrew, disheartened, for a long time from the pulpit. He at length left Wittenberg, and advised his wife to sell her property there. The elector himself was obliged to interpose, to restore the old relations. From the time of his return Luther continued to preach, but discontinued his lectures.

Luther's last work was one of love and conciliation. Under the pressure of many cares, he started, in February, 1546, on a journey to Eisleben, to attempt a conciliation between the counts of Mansfeldt, a work in which they had solicited his good offices. For fourteen years Luther had been a sufferer from severe and complicated diseases. He was not well when he reached the inn at Eisleben, and from the beginning of his sickness had a presentiment that he would die in the place where he was born. He was able, however, to preach once. The day before his death he expressed a strong assurance that we shall know our loved ones in heaven. February 17 he was too ill to leave his bed. When Aurifaber called, he found him so much worse that he summoned medical aid at once. Rubbing and bathing afforded him temporary relief, and about nine o'clock Luther lay down upon a couch, and after gathering a little strength by an hour's rest, proposed to his attendants that he should be helped to his bed. Jonas, and Martin, and Paul, Luther's sons, and two servants, watched by his side. His pains, however, became so great that he could not remain in his bed. Count Albert and the countess sent in haste for their own physicians. Luther used everything prescribed, but spoke of nothing but his death, which he felt sure was at hand. He poured forth his soul in fervent prayer, and, after commending his soul into the hands of God, lay silent and waiting. Among the stimulants used was shavings of the horn of the narwhal, or sea-unicorn, a remedy then greatly prized. None of the stimulants had any effect. A little before his last breath Jonas and Cœlius asked him whether he died in firm assurance of the truth of the doctrine he had taught. With a distinct voice, he replied "Yes." He expired about four o'clock in the morning, Feb. 18, 1546 (C. E. Stowe, *Last Days and Death of Luther*, in the *Bibl. Repository*, 1845, p. 195, 212).

His body was taken to Wittenberg, followed along the whole route by thousands of mourners, the tolling of the bells, and the dirges which gave expression to a universal sorrow. It was interred in front of the pulpit in the Castle Church. The funeral discourses were pronounced by Bugenhagen and Melancthon. Six weeks after Luther's death his wife wrote: "My dear husband was not the minister of a city, or of a land, but of the whole world. To have lost a princedom, to have lost an empire, would not be such a loss as I deplore" (*Briefe* [De Wette, Leidemann], vi, 650).

Luther's situation in reference to *earthly possessions* would have been that of very moderate competence (his greatest income was about three hundred gulden), had not his unbounded charity kept him perpetually poor. The large or older cloister of the Austin monks in Wittenberg was given to him by John the Constant. It was purchased from Luther's heirs for the academy at the price of 3700 gulden. Luther purchased the Little Cloister for 430 gulden: it was sold by his heirs for 300 thalers. He also owned an orchard and garden valued at 500 gulden, the manor of Wachsdorf, a malefief valued at 1500 gulden, and the Zeilsdorf property, which sold for 956 gulden. For his books, which enriched his publishers, he would take nothing.

IX. *Domestic and Social Life.*—In the midst of the warfare which conscience compelled him to carry on with Erasmus, Carlstadt, and others, who professed to take in whole or in part the general ground against Rome, Luther entered on that domestic life, the charm of which still wins the heart of men, whose sympathies have been lost to him as a reformer, or as a conservator in reformation. June 13, 1525, he married Catharine von Bora, who had fled from the Cistercian nunnery of Nimptsch. "This was the event of his life which gave most triumph to his enemies and perplexity to his friends. It was in perfect conformity with his masculine and daring mind, that, having satisfied himself of the nullity of his monastic vows, he should take the boldest method of displaying to the world how utterly he rejected them." Luther's intercourse with his wife and children, his letters to them, the touching story of the death of Margaret and of Madeleine, present him as the model of the head of a Christian family (Krauth, *Conservative Reform*, p. 33–43; Stork, *Luther at Home* [1872]).

Luther had six children: 1. John, born June 7, 1526, was a jurist in Königsberg, and died there October 28, 1575. Some of his descendants were found in Bohemia in 1830 in a state of poverty. 2. Elizabeth, born Dec. 10, 1527; died Aug. 3, 1528. 3. Madeleine (Magdalene), born May 4, 1529; died Oct. 20, 1542. 4. Martin, born Nov. 7, 1531, studied theology, but had not the intellectual gifts necessary for the ministry; laid down his office, and died as a private citizen, March 3, 1565. 5. Paul, born Jan. 28, 1533, was physician in ordinary at various courts, and died March 8, 1593. 6. Margaret, born in 1534, was married to George von Kunheim, Prussian counsellor, and died in 1570. See Nobbe, *Stammbaum der Familie des Dr. Luther* (Grimma, 1846); Hofman, *Catharine von Bora, oder Luther als Gatte u. Vater* (Leipzig, 1845); C. Becker, *Luther's Familienleben* (Königsb. 1858).

The direct line of male descent from Luther terminated with Martin Gottlob L., who was an advocate in Dresden, and died in 1759. The family of Luther's brother, and of Catharine von Bora, have living representatives.

The great coworkers with Luther were also his dearest personal friends. First among them were Melancthon, Amsdorf, Justus Jonas, and Bugenhagen. The *Tisch-reden* (Table-talk), which appeared twenty years after Luther's death, professes to be a record of his conversations, made immediately after them. It is not strictly authentic, and where it conflicts with well known and carefully avowed opinions of Luther, is of no value as testimony. It often presents the prosiest construction of the poetry of Luther's mind, and the dullest matter-of-fact perversion of his most brilliant thoughts. It confounds Luther himself with the character he dramatizes, in order to vivify his aversion to it, and the liveliest sallies of his wit and humor are given with the air of the most solid and painful judgments. Luther's annalist had the idolatry of a Boswell, but little of his skill. Nevertheless, the Table-talk is a record,

though a clumsy one, of many of Luther's best sayings.

X. *Luther and Erasmus.*—In their negations Luther and Erasmus had many points of contact and sympathy. Luther admired the polished scholarship of Erasmus; Erasmus acknowledged the power of Luther, the purity of his motives, and the necessity for his earlier work. He wrote to Luther and of him as a friend (1519). When the diversity of their positions, the difference of their characters, and the pressure of circumstances made a conflict between them growingly probable, each dreaded the other as an antagonist as he dreaded no other man. (Compare here Luther's letter to Erasmus, cited in the article Erasmus.) Erasmus was forced into the controversy. Had Erasmus had his own way, he would perhaps have never entered the lists against Luther, and he would never have written his Defence of free-will. The will of Erasmus was under bondage to the will of Henry VIII. Luther, with more solicitude than the presence of princes and prelates had ever given him, was obliged to take up the gage of battle. To the years 1524, 1525 belongs this controversy. It began with an attack on the part of Erasmus in his book *De libero Arbitrio.* Luther wrote *De servo Arbitrio.* Erasmus wrote in reply his *Hyperaspistes.* Luther felt that Erasmus had made no new points, and that his own had been sufficiently put, and the controversy ceased. As regards the *vital point* in this discussion, the mass of earnest Christian thinkers from Luther's time to this have been a unit in their estimate. Erasmus simply made a development of a refined pagan naturalism (for Pelagianism is no more) under the phrases of Christianity. Luther's main point is the common ground of evangelical Christianity, though many of his particular phrases might not meet with universal approval. "Erasmus makes man at first richer than Luther does, but yet how far is Luther's conception of freedom ultimately superior to that of Erasmus, who views the highest and best element of freedom as reached in freedom of choice, and who accordingly must logically teach an everlasting possibility of falling, and make perfection eternally insecure! Luther's conception of freedom leads to godlike, real freedom by grace; for this it could seem to be no advantage, but only a defect, to be involved in choice and hesitation" (Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.* [transl.], i, 217). In justifying the classing of this controversy with Luther's war against Rome, Köstlin says: "Not only did Erasmus write under the pressure brought to bear on him by the papal opponents of Luther, but Luther, in his reply, shows that he recognises the same interest as involved here, as that which had so far conditioned his whole struggle with Rome. He writes under the consciousness that in Erasmus he has again to do battle with the old principle of the Pelagianism of Rome" (ii, 36). (Comp. here a review of M. Durand du Laur's *Érasme* in *The Academy*, September 15, 1872.)

XI. *The character of Luther* lies so open in his life that it is hardly necessary to trace its lines. He was so ingenuous that if all the world had conspired to cover up his faults, his own hand would have uncovered them. His violence was that of a mighty nature, strong in conviction, waging the battle of truth against implacable foes. The expressions which jar upon the refined ear of the modern world were natural in a rough æra, and from the lips of one who was too pure to be prudish. The coarsenesses of the mendicant life can hardly fail to leave their traces on any man who has been subjected to them—the taint of a system in which filthiness is next to godliness, or, rather, is a part of it. The inconsistencies charged upon Luther's thinking are those of a man of great intuitions, who grows perpetually, and who will not stop for the hopeless and useless task of harmonizing with the crudities of yesterday the ripeness of to-day. His widest diversities, after the sap of Reformation began to swell in his veins, are like those of the tree which bends with the mellow fruit of autumn, careless of consistency with its first buddings in the cold rains of March. That Luther was unselfish, earnest, honest, inflexibly brave in danger, full of tenderness and humanity, the ideal of Germanic strength and of Germanic goodness; that he was one of the great creative spirits of the race, mighty in word and deed, matchless as a popular orator, one of the very people, yet a prince among princes, a child of faith, a child of God—this is admitted by all (see Krauth's *Conservative Reformat.* p. 45–87).

There is scarcely another instance in history in which an individual, without secular authority or military achievement, has so stamped himself upon a people, and made himself to so great an extent the leader, the representative, the voice of the nation. He has been to Germany what Homer was to Greece. "He was the only Protestant reformer," says Bayard Taylor, "whose heart was as large as his brain." (See "An Interview with Martin Luther," in Harper's *Monthly*, xxii, 231.) Luther was well-set, not tall, was handsome, with a "clear, brave countenance," and fresh complexion. His eyes were remarkable for their keenness, "dark and deep-set, shining and sparkling like a star, so that they could not well be looked upon," as old Kessler describes them. The fulness of face given him in his later pictures was the result, not of robustness, but of a dropsical tendency, resulting from his early austerities. His physical life was largely one of suffering. His habits were abstemious, and his enjoyments at the table were social, not Epicurean. His voice was not loud nor strong. Melancthon's happy phrase touching Luther's words is, that they were "fulmina," not "tonitrua"—it was their lightning, not their thunder, by which their mighty effects were produced. The papal system, the upas of the ages, which they struck, is not dead, but it is riven and blasted from its crown to its root.

XII. *Luther as a Conservator.*—The culmination of Luther's epic for the world at large is undoubtedly the defence at Worms. An obvious source of the diminution of interest in the later years of Luther's life is that the carrying through of what had been so grandly begun presents, in the nature of the case, less that brings before the mind, in all the magic of its unparalleled power, the personal character of Luther. When the warfare is ended, the life of the greatest soldier becomes as tame as that of the ordinary man. But, beyond this, a diminished interest and a divided sympathy are due to the fact that in the development of doctrine and of the constitution of the Church Luther took a position on which the Protestant world has divided. The occasion for the exhibition of Luther's conservatism was given by his conflict with the Zwickau Prophets (1522) and Carlstadt, and by the dreadful excesses of the peasant insurrections. In these he encountered what claimed to be results of the German mystical thinking—a mysticism which he himself had cherished; he found that these wild fanatics put their own construction upon his views of Christian liberty and the rights of the congregation, and appealed to those views in self-defence. These results and this construction Luther looked upon with abhorrence. Luther brought to a fuller exhibition what was the real difference in principle between the position of these fanatics and his own. He saw that they consciously ignored and rejected a principle without which reformation would be transformed into a radical and violent revolution, foreign in its own nature to the whole genius and history of Christianity. This principle is that of the unbroken historical life and development of the Church. Not as a something isolated from the Church, but as a divine power within it, had the truth of God reached the soul of Luther. The power which opened to Luther the true nature of repentance, justification, and grace, had not simply lingered in the Church, but had ripened in it, and the Reformation could no more have been, nor Luther have been Luther, without the Church in history, than without the Word. Men are begotten of God through the

Word, but the Church is the mother who bears them. The Word of God is the all-sufficient rule of faith, but it must be seen or heard in order to be applied; and the rule of faith does not write itself, print itself, circulate itself, or speak itself, and all the ordinary organs of its perpetuation, circulation, and application are within the Church. The divinity of the Word and the divinity of the Church are doctrines not only in harmony with each other, but necessary to each other's existence. The first without the second is fanaticism, sectarianism, and hopeless individualism; the second without the first is popery. The movement of Luther, from the hour of its riper self-perception, was so completely churchly and historical that the fanatics hated Luther more than they hated the pope. Among the evidences that Luther felt the need of building the sound, as well as of thinning down and removing the rotten, may be mentioned the Wittenberg Order of the Congregations, 1522; the Leisnig Order of the General Fund, 1523; letter to the landgrave of Hesse in regard to the Homberg Church-Order, 1527; the Visitation, 1527–1529; the part he took in the arrangement of the consistories and for the government of the Church.

Those who do not sympathize with his conservatism yet admit that Luther's personal religious character was deep and consistent, and that in the sphere of conscience, and where he stands on the verities of his own internal experience, he is the unshakable reformer. But it is said by these objectors that where his own immediate religious consciousness ceases he shows himself under the influence of his earlier views; that, unknown to himself, he stands forth with the "ineffaceable traces of the monk, the priest, and the scholastic theologian." By this supposition is solved the fact that, while he rejected the mass as it embodied the idea that the Lord's Supper is a proper sacrifice, and rejected transubstantiation, he yet found it impossible to abandon the thought that the Lord's Supper veils the mystery of redemption, and is "more than an act in which a congregation unites in a pious and believing memorial." This it was, they think, which led him "to a conception of the sacrament obscure and indeterminate, and to a doctrine which maintains on a scholastic basis the presence of Christ, and the ubiquity, the omnipresence of his body." From the same direction comes the charge that, "blinded by the halo which to the eyes of the people invests the head of the imperial majesty, he overlooked the fact that it is not only Christian for a great cause to go cheerfully to the scaffold, but that it is also Christian and manly for inalienable rights to resist imperial oppression with the sword." Luther's holding back, and Luther's scruples, are charged as the main cause that the Evangelical States made so little use of the favorable opportunities which were so often presented in the political relations of the times; opportunities which, rightly used, would have enabled them to seize and to maintain the pre-eminence.

To these objections it may be answered that all that is of real importance in the judgment of Luther's position as to the Lord's Supper hinges upon the question, Is his doctrine the Biblical one? If it be Biblical, the main objections vanish. They could at the worst fix no more than the charge of doing a right thing in a wrong way. If we were to concede for Luther in these controversies what he confessed for himself at Worms, that he had fallen into personal expressions which did not become his character as a Christian, nor as a minister of Christ, yet we could say for him, as he said for himself at the same great æra, the question is not concerning his person, but his doctrine. If the doctrine be unbiblical, the proof of that fact swallows up all minor questions. But those who prize the thing will at least forgive the mode. Loving him for the "re" in which he was "fortiter," they will absolve him for its sake for having carried the "fortiter" also into the "modo." Here, as elsewhere, the estimate of Luther's character is properly made from the position of those who harmonize with his views, not of those who differ from him, for the practical difference between the construction of firmness and obstinacy usually is, that firmness stands fast to what we cherish, and obstinacy holds stiffly to what we reject, or care nothing about. To the Romanist Luther was obstinate at Worms, firm at Marburg; to the Zwinglian portion of Protestants he was obstinate at Marburg, firm at Worms.

As regards Luther's political position, it may be said that it saved the Reformation in its infancy; and when evil counsels of the friends of Protestantism harmonized with the efforts of the Romanists to drag the question of the æra into the arena of state-struggle, the Reformation was brought to the verge of ruin. Had Luther shared the political views of the Zwinglian side of the Reformation, the appeal to arms made in the Thirty Years' War might have come a century earlier, and might have ended in the overthrow of the Reformation. But once in his career did Luther yield to the pressure of political considerations (the bigamy of the landgrave of Hesse), and in that yielding the Reformation received its severest blow, and the name of Luther its solitary blot. His simple trust in God was the highest principle. It was, though Luther did not think of it as such, the highest policy.

A complete, comprehensive, and systematic statement of his doctrines was never given by Luther, not even in his confessional writings. Others have endeavored to arrange his views in systematic order: Kirchner, *Thesaurus* (in Latin, 1566; in German, 1566, 1570, 1578); Theodosius Fabricius, *Loci Communes* (Lond. 1593; 1651, Latin; and in German, 1597); Maius, *M. L. Theologia Pura* (1709; with a Supplement, 1710); Beste, *M. L.'s Glaubenslehre* (Halle, 1845). In this general class may also be mentioned And. Musculus, *Schatz* (1577), and Salzmann, *Singularia Lutheri* (1664, fol.). It was Luther's work to restore doctrine, he left to others the arrangement of it. He made history, others might write it. Luther's great aim constantly was to give prominence and strength to those doctrines which were denied, ignored, or corrupted. His plan of warfare was that of attack rather than of defence. He fought many battles, but underwent and conducted few sieges. "The wealth of his theological knowledge and teaching rests essentially upon his direct mighty grasp, intuition, and unifying view of truth. As the result of this, it is the peculiarity of his mind that there is a relative throwing into the background of that aspect and endowment of intelligence which are directed to calm reflection upon the diverse individual elements and parts of the object, to notional formulating, to logical or dialectical systematizing" (Köstlin, *The Theology of Luther* [1863]). The grand impulse of his life was to testify to the truth; so to impart the knowledge in which his own soul had found healing and salvation that it might be to others health and life.

XIII. *Polemics and Irenics.*—Inflexible in his opposition to Rome, he yet showed himself solicitous to preserve peace while peace was possible. Very gradually and very cautiously he declared himself for the right of armed resistance, when, in the conscientious judgment of men learned in the law, the nature of the violation of rights is such as to demand war as the sole possible mode of self-defence.

1. The doctrine of the *Lord's Supper* grew to a subject of extended conflict, and of far-reaching doctrinal and practical power in Luther's life and in the Reformation. It became, indeed, a touchstone. The laws of interpretation which determined the doctrine of the Supper either way, conditioned more or less the entire distinctive characteristics of both tendencies in the Reformation. While he was engaged in the controversy with Carlstadt, he heard, Nov. 12, 1524, that Zwingle, and Jan. 13, 1525, that Œcolampadius held the same views—"the poison widely creeping." There were, indeed, three mutually contradictory processes of interpretation; each of the three overthrew the other two, and

was overthrown by them; but as they concurred in the one result, the denial of the true presence, Luther regarded them from the beginning as essentially one view.

2. *Luther's course in the sacramental controversies* exercised an immense influence on the internal and external history of the Reformation, and on nothing in his history has Protestant sentiment been so completely and so passionately divided. In his sermon on the venerable sacrament (1519), in which he for the first time presented with comparative fulness the evangelical view of the Lord's Supper, he still retained the doctrine of transubstantiation. His own doctrine of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ without a change in the elements ("true bread and wine remains") he first brought clearly forth in his work on the adoration of the holy sacrament (1523), addressed to the Bohemian Brethren, who had directed their inquiries to him. They claimed that they held an objective gift of God in the sacrament; and, although their doctrine has been asserted by some to be that of a purely spiritual presence, they gave it such an approximation to the doctrine maintained by Luther that he was entirely satisfied with their statement. He discussed the question further in a letter to the preacher at Strasburg (1525), and in a preface to the Suabian Syngramma (1526), with which he declared himself in harmony. He fought earnestly against the doctrine of the Lord's Supper proposed by Carlstadt and Zwingle, which had the common feature that it regarded the Lord's Supper not so much a divine institution as a movement of man towards God. Over against their views Luther designates the forgiveness of sins as the special, distinctive grace of this sacrament, as in that forgiveness Christ has laid the efficacy of his passion. That bread remains bread, and is yet, in the sacramental complex, the body of Christ, involves to faith no contradiction. He defended his views in the *Sermon of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ* (1526); *that the Words "This is my Body" still stand fast* (1527); and in *Confession touching the Supper* (1529). The colloquy at Marburg (1529) only in part removed his suspicions of Zwingle: "You have another spirit than we." The Schwabach *Articles* gave renewed expression to the doctrine of the true presence, even stronger than that in the articles which were drawn up at Marburg to express the consent and dissent of the two parties. A more hopeful turn of mind was called forth by the visit of Bucer to Coburg in 1530. As a result of this visit, Luther, in letters to Albert of Prussia and to the people of Frankfort, expressed himself more gently towards Zwingle. The Wittenberg Concord of 1536 resulted from this new movement. This Concord led to a temporary friendly recognition of the Swiss, and a correspondence with them; but all the old distrust showed itself again in the *Short Confession touching the Holy Sacrament* (1544). Luther had set himself with unshakable decision against every league of the Evangelical (Lutheran) States with the Swiss. He had not been able, however, to deter the landgrave Philip from forming a league with them. In the conflict with Zwingle there had been a special development of Luther's Christological views, and an expansion and distinctiveness imparted to his entire theological thinking.

3. The controversies which most deeply distressed Luther were those which took place within the Evangelical Church itself. The *Osiandrian* controversy in Nuremberg, 1533, in regard to the general form of public absolution, to which Andrew Osiander (q. v.), who was constitutionally self-opinionated, objected on the ground that many were unprepared for absolution, was decided by Luther with that thorough moderation which never failed him when he believed that principle was not compromised. He thought the form unobjectionable, but advised that if Osiander felt scruples he should be allowed to omit it, without censuring those who used it, or being censured by them. He quenched the *Antinomistic* controversy excited in Wittenberg in 1537 by John Agricola (q. v.), who had been one of his dearest friends. Agricola completely retracted his erroneous views, but the tenderness of the old confidence and love was never restored.

XIV. *Literary Activity.*—The activity of Luther in the period which followed his return to Wittenberg was largely directed to the internal shaping of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church. Among its richest results may be mentioned, 1. his German hymns in the first German Hymn-book (1524), and the Wittenberg Hymn-book (1529). He stands forth in these as the father and founder of German hymnology and Church music. See HYMNOLOGY. He was the author of thirty-six hymns, and of several original melodies adapted to them. 2. His *Order of Divine Service and of the Congregation* (Wittenberg, 1523); his *Formula Missæ et Communionis* (1524); *German Mass and Order of Divine Service* (1526) (all of these are given in *Sunday Services of the Churches of the Reformation*, by C. P. Krauth), with which he connected his Ritual of Baptism and Marriage, and a form of Confession. The great visitation in the states of the elector of Saxony (1527–1529) led to Melancthon's writing the Book of Visitation. This was revised by Luther, and issued anew in 1538.

Among Luther's greatest labors are to be mentioned the two *Catechisms* (1529), and his *Translation of the Bible.* This he commenced with the New Testament in 1522; the Old was sent out in parts, commencing in 1525, and was issued complete in 1534. The final revision was made in 1541, and the latest edition of this final revision, which Luther himself helped to correct, typographically, appeared in 1545. The Bible of Luther is an acknowledged masterpiece—one of the wonders of the intellectual world. "The modern German attained its full development and perfect finish in Luther's version. By means of that book it obtained a currency which nothing else could have given it. It became fixed; it became universal; it became the organ of a literature which, more than any other since the Greek, has been a literature of ideas. It became the vehicle of modern philosophy, the cradle of those thoughts which at the moment act most intensely on the human mind" (Hedge). "He created the German language," says Heine.

XV. *Activity in Church Constitution.*—He took an active interest in the constitution of the Consistories: *Bedenken* — Considerations of the Theologians touching Consistories (1538). An important part was borne by Luther in the preparation of the confessional writings of the renewed Church. He was, in conjunction with other divines, the author of the Marburg Articles and Schwabach Articles (1529), which furnished the basis and, to a large extent, the material, both doctrinal and verbal, of the Augsburg Confession (1530), during the direct preparation and presentation of which Luther was at Coburg. As he was under the ban of the empire, to have appeared at Augsburg would have almost certainly cost him his life, and would have made all negotiation impossible, as it would have been regarded as an open act of aggression on the part of the Protestant princes. He was brought, therefore, to the nearest point at which he could be safe, and where he could be consulted. His influence at Augsburg was no less real and hardly less direct than if he had been there in person. The great hymn "Eine feste Burg" is generally supposed to have been written at this time, but there are strong grounds for believing that it appeared in 1529. In 1537 he prepared the Schmalcald Articles, to be laid before the council which had been summoned to convene at Mantua. In aiding in giving to the Church her proper external relations, Luther exercised his influence by letters, and by his writings in connection with the Diet of Nuremberg and of Ratisbon, the religious Peace of Nuremberg (1532), and the Interim of Ratisbon (1536). At the formation of the Torgau alliance (1526) and of the Schmalcald League (1530) he had sent his opinion and advice, and, with his counsel to his elector, the protestation was made at Spires (1529).

XVI. *Memorials.*—1. A monumental bronze statue was erected to Luther's memory in the market-place of Wittenberg, 1817. Another monument, reared by the German nation at Worms, was inaugurated June 25, 1868.

2. The number of *medals* struck in honor of Luther and of his work is very great (Jüncker's *Life of Luther*, illustrated by medals, in Latin, 1699, and German, 1707; Cyprian's *Hilaria Evangelicæ* [1719, fol.]).

3. The third centennial anniversary of the death of Luther was observed Feb. 18, 1846, throughout all Germany, with Wittenberg and Eisleben as its focal points. Nor was the celebration limited to Germany. Solemn memorial services were held in France, Holland, Sweden, Russia, and other countries. The anniversary was made the occasion of establishing a number of beneficent institutions. Among these were a Luther-school in Wittenberg for the poor, an evangelical Lutheran Orphan-house in Warsawa, and the Luther-establishment in Leipzig, Feb. 18, 1846, the object of which was to make provision for descendants of Luther, and to circulate Luther's writings, especially his translation of the Bible.

4. *Poetry and Art* have devoted many of their noblest efforts to Luther and his work. But neither Bechstein's epic ("Luther," Leipz. 1834), nor the dramas of Werner ("Martin Luther, or the Consecration of Power") and Köster, nor Trümpelmann's *Luther u. Seine Zeit* (Gotha, 1869), which is the latest attempt to dramatize Luther's life, have taken the place in the heart of the people which they would have filled had they been wholly worthy of their theme. The great war had its Achilles, but it waits for its Homer. The most ambitious effort in English in this line is Robert Montgomery's *Luther, or the Spirit of the Reformation* (3d edit. Lond. 1843).

5. Among the *paintings* of renown, the first place historically is due to Luther's portrait by Lucas Cranach. It is now in the possession of Winter, in Heidelberg. The copies and engravings of it have been multiplied by millions. Busts or portraits of Luther are found in many of the Protestant (Lutheran) churches on the Continent, and in some in America.

XVII. *Literature.*—Luther's separate *works* amount to about four hundred. In a collected shape his works have appeared in the following editions: 1. 1539–1559, 20 vols. folio (at Wittenberg), by order of the elector John Frederick. Seven of the volumes are in Latin (1545–1558), and one (Breslau, 1563) is the Index. 2. 1555–1558, 12 vols. folio (Jena). Four are Latin. The Index (1573 and 1592) was completed by Aurifaber (Eisleben, 1564–1565, 2 vols. folio). Text more trustworthy than that of the Wittenberg. 3. 1661–1664, 10 vols. folio (Altenburg), by order of the duke Frederick William; edited by J. Ch. Sagitarus. German only. A supplement to these three editions was published in 1702, by J. G. Seidler (Halle, 1702). 4. 1729–1740, 23 vols. folio, German (Leipzig); best of the folio editions. 5. 1740–1753, 24 vols. 4to, German, J. G. Walch (Halle). Preferred to the others because of its fulness, and the incorporation of important documents; objected to because of inaccuracies, and liberties with the text. 6. *a.* 1826–1857, 67 vols. 12mo, German (Erlangen); edited by John G. Plochmann and John C. Irmischer. It is the most critical of all the editions. *b.* The Latin series of the same edition is not yet completed.

Selections from Luther's works, or abridgments, have been edited by F. W. Lommler (Gotha, 1816–17, 3 vols.), by Vent (Hamb. 1826–27, 10 vols.), by Pfitzer (Frankf. 1837), by Otto von Gerlach (1840–1848, 24 vols.), and by Zimmermann (1846–1850, 4 vols. 8vo). For the German Christian people, by Frobenius, Schellbach, and others (1847–1855). Political writings, by Mundt (Berl. 1844). *Kirchen-Postille*, by Francke (Leipzig, 1844). Manual Concordance of Luther's writings, edited by Lomler and others (Darmstadt, 1827–1831, 9 vols.). See Bretschneider, *Luther an Unsere Zeit* (Erfurt, 1817).

Translations from Luther into English are catalogued in Lowndes's *Bibliographer's Manual* (Bohn, 1860), p. 1415–1417.

Luther's *Letters* have been edited, 1. by G. Th. Strobel (1780–83) and by De Wette (1825–28); supplement by Seidemann (1856). 2. Correspondence edited by Burckhardt (1866). See Veesenmayer, *Literargeschichte* ("Literary History of the Collections of Luther's Letters," Berlin, 1821).

The "*Table-Talk*" (*Tischreden*, Aurifaber, 1566; Stangwald, 1571, 1591) has been critically edited by Förstemann and Bindseil (1844–48). The most complete translation into English is by Capt. Henry Bell (Lond. 1652, folio; 2d edit. 1791; new edit. Burckhardt, 1840 [garbled]; transl. by Wm. Hazlitt, London, 1848; new edit., with additions, London [Bohn], 1857, Philad. 1868).

The writers on the life of Luther are numerous (Fabricii *Centifolium* [Hamburg, 1728, 1730, 2 vols.; Ukert, 1817]; E. G. Vogel, *Biblioth. Biographica Luth.* [Halle, 1851], give the literature), namely, Melancthon, *Historia de vita et Actis Lutheri* (Wittenberg, 1546; edited by Augusti, Breslau, 1817; with Preface by Neander, Berl. 1841; transl. by Zimmermann, Göttingen, 1816; in English, London, 1561, 1817); Cruciger (1553); Mathesius. *Geschichte Luther's*, in *Seventeen Sermons* (Nürnberg, 1565, and frequently since; edited, with observations by Rust, Berl. 1841; by Schubert, Stuttg. 1852); Selnecker (1575); Dresser (1598); Walch, in his edition of *Luthers Werke*, xxiv, 1–875; Keil (2d ed. Leipz. 1764, 4 vols.); Schröckh (Leipzig, 1778); Tischer (Leipz. 1793; new edit. 1803); Ukert (Gotha, 1817, 2 vols. [rich in notices of literature]); Spieker, *Geschichte Luther's und der Reformation* (Berlin, 1818, 1 vol.); Stang, *Leben u. Wirken* (1835–37; after J. Mathesius, Nürnb. 1833); G. Pfizer (Stuttg. 1836); Ledderhose (1836); Meurer, *Luther's Leben, aus den Quellen, erzählt* (Dresden, 1843–1846 [transl. N.Y. 1848], 1852; 3d edit. 1870; abridged, 1850, 1861, 1869); F. W. Genthe, *Leben u. Werke* (Eisleb. 1841–45); Jürgens, First Divis. 3 vols.—reaches only to 1517 (Leipz. 1846–47); Weydmann (1850), H. Gelzer, *Historical Sketches, with pictorial illustrations* by G. König (Hamb. 1851; transl., with an Introduction and view of the Reformation in England by Croly, 1853, 1858; 3d ed. Bohn, 1860; reprinted, Philadelphia, with Introduction by T. Stork, 1854); J. A. Jander, *Luther's Leben* (Leipzig, 1853); K. Zimmermann (Darmstadt, 1855); G. A. Hoff, *Vie de Luth.* (Paris, 1860); H. W. J. Thiersch, *Luther, Gustav Adolph, und Maximilian I* (Nordl. 1869); Jäkel, *Dr. M. L. Gesch. seines Lebens und seiner Zeit* (1870); Schultz (E. S. F.), *Luther's Leben u. Wirken* (Berl. 1870); Lang, *M. L.* (1870). The biographical dictionaries and the encyclopædias all have articles on Luther. Among the former may be mentioned Bayle, among the latter the *Britannica* (Bunsen) and Herzog (by Köstlin). Many of the most important works which treat of Luther's life, as, for example, Sleidan, Sculletus, Seckendorf, Tenzel, Spalatine, Myconius, among the older writers, and Marheineke, Ranke, D'Aubigne, Waddington, among recent ones, present it in its connections with the history of the Reformation (q. v.).

The most noticeable lives of Luther from *Roman Catholic* hands are by Cochlæus (1549; tr. into German by Hueber, 1582), Ulenberg (1622; trans. into German, Mainz, 1836), Michelet (1833–35, trans. by Lawson, 1836; by G. H. Smith and by Hazlitt, 1846), and Audin (Par. 1838, 1850; transl. Philad. 1841; by Trumbull, London, 1854).

The best known by *English* hands are by Bower (1813), Riddle (1837), and John Scott (London, 1832; New York, Harpers, 1833). The *Schönberg-Cotta Family* (1864) is the best picture of Luther from an English pen; little more than the frame is fiction.

From the hands of *American* authors we have lives by Sears (1850), Weiser (1848, 1866), Loy (tr. of Frick, 2d edit. 1869), J. G. Morris (*Quaint Sayings and Doings concerning Luther*, 1859), and A. Carlos Martyn (1866).

The third centennial of Luther's death, Feb. 18, 1846, called forth an immense number of writings: Ortmann, Pasig, Köthe, Meurer, Petermann, Heyl, John, and Löschke. Petermann and others published histories of Luther's last days, and of his death and burial. There

appeared at this time the account of Luther's last hours by two eye-witnesses, Justus Jonas and Cœlius of Mansfeld; Luther's sermons, hitherto unprinted, edited by Hök (from the MSS. of the Wolfenbüttel Library); selections from Luther's German letters, by Döring; and Luther's hymns, by Kurtz, Wackernagel, and Crusius. Among the best books called forth is the prize work of Hopf—his critique (*Würdigung*) of Luther's translation of the Bible, with reference to the older and the more recent translations (1847).

On Luther's theology, see Julius Köstlin, *L.'s Theologie*, "Luther's Theology, in its historical unfolding and in its internal connection" (Stuttgart, 1863); *L.'s Theologie*, "Luther's Theology, with special reference to his doctrine of Atonement and Redemption" (Harnack, 1862–7); Dorner, *Gesch. der Protest. Theolog.* (München, 1867; trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor, Edinb. 1871, 2 vols); Plitt, *Einleitung in die Augustana* (Erlangen, 1868); Chr. Weisse, *Luther's Christologie* (1855); Luther's *Philosophie von Theophilos* (1 Theil, die Logik, Hanover, 1870).

On Luther's German style, see Dietz, *Wörterbuch zu Dr. M. L.'s Deutschen Schriften* (Leipsic, 1868); Opitz, *Die Sprache L.* (Halle, 1869).

On the character and merits of Luther, Ackermann *L. Seinem Vollen Werth und Wesen nach, aus seinen Schriften dargestellt* (1 Heft, "Luther im Kampf," Jena, 1871). For other literature, see REFORMATION. (C. P. K.)

Lutheran CHURCH, LUTHERANISM, LUTHERANS. I. The *name* "Lutherans," as a designation of all those who were in sympathy with Luther's views, was, at the opening of the Reformation, first applied to them by Eck (q. v.) and pope Hadrian VI, and was meant as a term of depreciation, and at first and for a considerable time designated the entire body of those who opposed the corruptions of Rome. The official and proper titles of the particular churches on which the name Lutheran has finally been fixed are "Protestant" (q. v.), "Evangelical" (q. v.), and "Adherents of the Augsburg Confession." The Protestant Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession has not, as a whole, to this hour, by any official act, received or acknowledged the title "Lutheran," but has tolerated it because of the historical necessities of the usage. Like the name "Christian" itself, invented by enemies, it has been borne until it has become a name of honor. It became more and more the received term for the Protestant Evangelical Church in consequence of the struggles of that Church with the Zwinglian and Calvinistic-Reformed without, and the Philippists within. It marked Lutheranism in antithesis to Calvinism, and the thoroughgoing adherence to the faith of Luther, over against the changes furtively introduced and extended under the plea, true or false, of the authority of Melancthon (q. v.; also PHILIPPISTS).

The Lutheran Church is the ecclesiastical communion which adheres to the rule and articles of faith restored in the Reformation, of which Luther was the chief instrument. The acceptance of this rule (God's Word) and the confession of this faith are set forth in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which is the common confession of the entire Lutheran Church. The major part of the Lutheran Church formally and in terms acknowledges, and the rest of it, almost without exception, virtually acknowledges the Apology of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Schmalcald Articles of 1537, the two Catechisms of Luther of 1529, and the Formula of Concord of 1579, as accordant with the rule of faith and with the Augsburg Confession. These confessions, together with the œcumenical creeds, form the Book of Concord of 1580, and are often styled *the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church*. The system of faith and life involved in the Church's Confession is *Lutheranism*, the Church which officially receives it is the *Lutheran Church*, and the members of that Church are *Lutherans*. The faith of the Lutheran Church is thus summarily presented by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 127): "We are justified by God, not through any merits of our own, but by his tender mercy, through faith in his Son. The depravity of man is total in its extent, and his will has no positive ability in the work of salvation, but has the negative ability (under the ordinary means of grace) of ceasing its resistance. Jesus Christ offered a proper, vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice. Faith in Christ presupposes a true penitence. The renewed man co-works with the Spirit of God. Sanctification is progressive, and never reaches absolute perfection in this life. The Holy Spirit works through the word and sacraments, which only in the proper sense are means of grace. Both the Word and the Sacraments bring a positive grace, which is offered to all who receive them outwardly, and which is actually imparted to all who in faith embrace it." The chief peculiarities of Lutheran doctrine, which have to any considerable degree become subjects of controversy outside of the body itself, relate to (1.) Original Sin, (2.) the Person of Christ, (3) Baptism, and (4) the Lord's Supper. These will be found specially treated under those heads. Luther's own views on the last point will be detailed under the art. TRANSUBSTANTIATION. For a more complete view of the doctrines of Lutheranism, see Krauth, *Conservative Reformation* (Phila. 1871), and Prof. Jacobs in the *Mercersburg Review*, Jan. 1872, p. 77 sq.; Zöckler, *Augsburgische Confession* (1870).

II. *Origin and Extent.*—The rupture with the dominant part of the Church of Rome, and the formation of the new communion, was made inevitable by the Diet at Spires in 1529, at which the solemn protestation of the evangelical princes was presented, in opposition to the imperial recess (decree) in its bearing on the great religious interests of the time. This event gave to the Lutheran Church the title PROTESTANT (q. v.), by which it is almost exclusively known in parts of Europe. The rupture was completed by the events connected with the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530. The fundamental principle of the Lutheran Church prevented its formation into a new, concentrated, and united whole, like that which had grown to such enormous proportions and baleful power in the Church of the West. Nor was it Luther's object to form an independent Church. He hesitated as much in the establishment of an independent organization as do the leaders of the Old Catholic movement in our day (1872). Luther's single aim, like Döllinger's to-day, was the reformation and revival of Christianity, and the restoration of the whole Church, in its universal form, to primitive and scriptural purity. Denominationalism he knew not. His conception of the Church comprehended Catholic Christianity. In spite of himself, however, his peculiar views, which for convenience sake we will now denominate "Lutheranism," spread rapidly, especially after the Diet of Worms (1521), and though as late as 1522 Luther himself wrote, "I beseech you, above all things, not to use my name; not to call yourselves Lutherans, but Christians" (*Works*, xviii, 293, in the 6th Leips. ed.; comp. also Gelzer, *Life of Luther*, p. 288, 291), national churches sprang up in every country where his followers constituted the majority. These state churches were all independent of each other, and were based much upon the same fundamental principles of polity, allowing, however, of great variety in the forms of application. Instead of the bishop of Rome, the princes of the different countries now assumed the rights of bishops, and the direct rule of the Church was conducted by the *Consistories* (q. v.). John the Constant, elector of Saxony, followed in the steps of his brother and predecessor, Frederick the Wise, in devotion to the work of Luther. The landgrave Philip of Hesse also became an adherent. In Prussia the Lutheran doctrine was introduced in 1523 by George of Polentz, bishop of Samland. Thus, at the beginning of the year 1525, the three princes of Saxony, Hesse, and Prussia were its defenders. The Reformed doctrine found an especially ready entrance in the free imperial cities, where the voice of the people was a power.

In Würtemberg it was introduced under duke Ulrich in 1534; in the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt in 1541; in Brunswick about 1545. The views which Luther had expressed at an early period in regard to a congregational constitution were thrown into the background by the disturbances of the Anabaptists and the insurrections of the peasants. The leagues of the evangelical princes were one of the earliest forms in which there was an expression of the unity of the different parts of the Lutheran Church. The conventions of the theologians for the adjustment of doctrinal controversies tended to the same end. In the political relations of the Church the unity found expression in the "Corpus Evangelicorum" (q. v.) at the Diets.

The rapid, and, for a time, resistless growth of the Lutheran Church received its first check in the "ecclesiastical reservations" of the religious peace of Augsburg. By the terms of this peace the transition of an ecclesiastical prince was attended by a loss of his secular power. The miscarriage of the attempt at reformation by Gebhard Truchsess in the archbishopric of Cologne in 1583 was a serious disaster to the Lutheran Church. The larger part of Germany was inclined to the Lutheran faith. The apostasy of several of the princes, as, for example, Pfalz-Neuburg, on political grounds, and the influence of the counter reformation conducted by the Jesuits in Bavaria and Austria, preserved a part of Germany for the pope; but the peace of Westphalia finally fixed the bounds of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and they remain, very much as they then were, to the present day. The transition of the elector of Saxony, of the duke of Brunswick, and of other princes to the Church of Rome, exercised no very marked influence upon their people. A large part of the higher nobility, which in the earlier movements of the Reformation had manifested, almost without exception, a drawing towards it, gradually lapsed again into Romanism. (On these perversions, and other losses to the Lutheran Church, see Löbell's *Hist. Briefe;* Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. vii [1868].) At an earlier period than that of these changes, the Philippistic and Reformed churches of the Palatinate, and in Hesse, in Anhalt, and on the Lower Rhine, in East Friesland and Bremen, Lippe, Nassau, and Tecklenburg, had sundered themselves from the Lutheran Church. In the present century these churches have come together in the "Union." Beyond the bounds of Germany the Lutheran Church was firmly established in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and in the German Baltic provinces of Russia. In Poland it was suppressed (comp. Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*). In the United States of America the Lutheran Church has won a new territory. (See below, LUTHERANS IN AMERICA.) In Hungary and Transylvania the German (Saxon) nationality accepted the Lutheran confession. The Magyars became Reformed. In Sweden, Olaf and Lorenz Peterson, pupils of Luther, preached the purified faith. Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden, greatly promoted the interests of the Lutheran Church; and at the Diet of Westerås, in 1544, the last remnants of the papal system were removed. In Denmark, as early as 1527, Christian II had favored the Reformation. Frederick I was also a decided Lutheran. Christian III called in Bugenhagen to prepare and introduce a Church discipline and ritual. Riga and Courland entered into the League of Schmalcald in 1538. Apart from the vast Lutheran element within the "Union" in Prussia, the Lutheran Church is the predominant Church in the minor German lands: Baden, Brunswick, Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, the principality of Reuss in Hesse, the Saxon lands, Schwarzburg, and Würtemburg; also in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; in Russia, in the departments of Livonia, Esthland, St. Petersburg, Finland, and Courland. Lutherans constitute a large body in Hungary, France, the British empire, and North America. They are, in fact, found the world over. There are not less, probably, than forty millions of them altogether. (Comp. Krauth, p. 124, 125.)

III. *Organization and Constitution.*—The first fresh impulses of the evangelical life of faith was not allowed to shape a complete congregational life in entire accordance with the pure principles which had been restored. Although the early Lutheran princes were, as a body, men of devoted piety, yet the interests of the Church in the particular state territories were subjected to political policy. The tendencies of the Romish ideas, which in every department had struck their roots too deeply into European life to be easily eradicated, put forth new vigor in the reactionary after-time. The Lutheran Church was repressed in one part of her development, and stimulated to the highest degree by her liberty in another, and by the doctrinal necessities which taxed all her resources. The result was that she matured abnormally—the strength of her polity bore no proportion to the perfection of her doctrinal system. In the organization of the Church an important part was borne by the Church visitation in Saxony in 1529, and resulted in assigning the oversight of the churches and schools to superintendents (q. v.). A Saxon Church Order of Discipline and Worship was prepared, which became, to a very large extent, the model in the organization of the state churches throughout Germany. The Lutheran Church held herself in principle remote from the two extremes of hierarchy, which absorbed the State into the Church, and Cæsaropapacy, which absorbed the Church into the State. The princes and magistrates, in the time of the Church's need, took the position of provisional bishops. They were the supreme officers in the Church, its highest representatives. In the execution of the duties thus assumed they called to their aid Consistories (q. v.), an official board composed of clergymen and laymen. A condition of things which had been justified by the immediate necessity of the Church gradually became normal in the "Episcopal system." The provisional became legalized into the fixed, and the head of the State was in effect the chief bishop of the Church. Such a distinction as Rome had made between clergy and laity, and which ignored the great New-Testament doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, was no longer recognised. The ministry ceased to be a self-perpetuating, independent order, and was regarded as a divine office, with a divine vocation, given by Christ's command, through the Church. A hierarchical division of the clergy, as of divine right, was rejected as at war with the Christianity of the New Testament and of the early Church; but the propriety and usefulness of grades in the ministry (bishops, superintendents, provosts), as of human right only, was acknowledged, and they are retained in some countries. Thus, in Denmark, in the very infancy of Lutheranism, evangelical bishops took the place of the deposed Roman Catholic prelates; while in Sweden the prelates embracing the Reformed doctrine were continued in office, and thus secured to that country "apostolical succession" in the High-Church sense. Very generally the rule of the Church is by consistories, but as these depend upon the instructions of the congregations, the ultimate power lies with the latter. See CONSISTORY; SYNOD; CHURCH.

IV. *Progress.*—The internal history of the Church became largely a process of the development of doctrine (see Hundeshagen, *Beitr. z. Kirch.-politik*); and in this progress, naturally enough, opposition was encountered, and gave rise to controversies with parties both from within and without. In the earliest period of the history of the Lutheran Church, her chief struggles were with Popery, the Anabaptists, and the Sacramentarians. These controversies drew the boundary-lines of her own territory, as biblical over against Rome, historical and conservative over against Anabaptism and the more radical type of Protestantism. To the fixing of the bounds of her territory succeeded a long series of efforts to bring that territory under complete and harmonious cultivation. To be consistent in general over against systems which, as systems, were indefensible, was not enough. The

Lutheran system was to bring all its own parts into working harmony, and hence the various dissensions and difficulties when it was yet in its infancy. The most important of the internal controversies which arose during this effort are: 1. The *Antinomistic*, from 1537 to 1540, on the relation between the Gospel and the law, the use of the law, and its necessity. See AGRICOLA, JOHN. 2. The *Osiandrian*, from 1549 to 1567, on redemption, justification, and sanctification. See OSIANDER, ANDREW. 3. The *Majoristic*, from 1551 to 1562: Are good works necessary to salvation? and in what sense? See MAJOR, GEORGE. 4. The *Stancaristic*, 1552: According to what nature was Christ's redemptory work wrought out—the divine, the human, or both? 5. The *Synergistic*, from 1555 to 1570, on the question whether there is an active co-operation on the part of man before and on his conversion. 6. The *Flacian*, 1561: Is original sin substantial or accidental? See FLACIUS ILLYRICUS. All these controversies had a common aim—they wished to define more perfectly the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, to show what it presupposed and what it involved, to exhibit its objective and subjective aspects. All doctrines were viewed in these controversies in their relations to the central doctrine, and the great aim was to adjust *them* to *it* (see Dorner, *Geschichte der Prot. Theologie* (1867; in English dress, Edinb. 1872, 2 vols. 8vo). A deeper impression was made upon the life of the people by the controversies which grew out of the interim in 1548, involving the mode of worshipping God. It touched matters which appealed to the senses as well as to the convictions of the worshippers. Out of it arose the *Adiaphoristic controversy* (q. v.) (1550–1555): Whether the Church could permit certain usages, in themselves indifferent, to be imposed upon her by force or civil policy. The vehement opposition of the Flacians to the Philippists also had a great influence upon the shaping of the Lutheran Church. Unfortunately, however, these divisions among the Protestants gave the Romanists many advantages: they tended at the Diet of Augsburg (1566) to change the political situation greatly in favor of the Roman Catholics, and protracted the strife for years (Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vii, 63). See INTERIM. Against Calvinism, the controversy turned especially upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the associated doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the doctrine of predestination. It involved the whole essential diversity between Lutheranism and Calvinism; also the Philippistic tendency, so far as it approximated to Calvinism in some features (*Crypto-Calvinism*). To compose these differences and close up these questions within the Church was the aim of the *Formula of Concord*, which, after various ineffectual efforts in the same general direction at the Assembly of the Electors in Frankfort (1558), at the Assembly of the Princes in Naumburg (1561), and at the Altenburg Colloquy (1568), was finally carried to a successful completion at Cloister Bergen, near Magdeburg, in 1577. See CONCORD, FORMULA OF. The preparation of the Formula of Concord is the last act in the series of events which gave full confessional shape to the *doctrines* of the Lutheran Church.

During Luther's lifetime the Lutheran Church had taken a firm and final position over against the Roman Catholic. The Augsburg Confession was the rallying point of the friends of the revised faith. The Apology defended the Confession in Melancthon's incomparable manner; the Schmalcald Articles gave forth Luther's trumpet note of a battle in which no quarter could now be given—a battle for victory or death. The people had their Manual in the Shorter Catechism, and the pastors, in using it, had the Larger Catechism, the best commentary on the lesser. Yet these immortal documents did not exhaust the development of the faith. Even in the individual peculiarities of Luther and Melancthon there were impulses to conflicting tendencies. After Luther's death the Lutheran Church was threatened with a schism, which might have been followed by the complete triumph of Rome over the whole reformatory work. On the one side was the gentler, unionistic tendency of Melancthon and his party (the Philippists), yearning for union, and temporizing sometimes with Calvinism, and yet more frequently with Romanism. On the other side stood the stricter party, headed by Amsdorf, Flacius, and Wigand. Over against the Church of Rome on the one side, and the Reformed Church on the other, the Lutheran Church insisted earnestly on the doctrines which distinguished and separated her from both. She was unwilling that open questions should be perpetuated, and desired that the points of controversy should be adjusted and closed. Shall theology be simply a mode of thinking, or shall it be a system of faith? was the question involved. Shall it be a ball for the play of theologians, or a world for the firm footing of believers? The controversies which now arose took their root in questions which involved the relations of the two parties, on the one side to Romanism, on the other to Calvinism. Toward the Church of Rome the question in controversy had reference to the doctrines of redemption and justification. The intellectual centres of these struggles were the *universities* (q. v.). Wittenberg at this period was the home of the Melancthonian theology. Its great antagonist in the interests of the conservative Lutheranism was Jena, which for various causes—some of the subordinate ones, no doubt, being of a political character—had been founded in 1558 by the older Saxon line. It was the citadel of conservative Lutheranism until its exponents were driven from it for conscience sake. Their refuge proved to be Magdeburg. This period reaches its culmination in the preparation of the *Formula Concordiæ*, in which the Swabian tendency, whose great representatives were Brentius and Andreä, obtained official recognition (compare Schmid, *Geschichte der Abendmahlslehre*). The orthodoxy thus fixed was dominant from this time to the beginning of the 18th century. Its elaborate polemics were built up on almost impregnable doctrinal authority. The scholastic acuteness and dryness more and more supplanted the freer and more vital faith of the Reformation. The religion of the heart was too much absorbed into the elaborate system of theology. The temple was solid and grand, but the hearthstones of the people were too often cold. George Calixtus (1586–1656) revived in Helmstadt the humanism of Melancthon. His school became involved with orthodoxy in the *Syncretistic controversy* (q. v.). It sought, in the interests of Church peace, to soften the asperities of dogmatic disputes and the exclusiveness of the doctrinal systems. The plan on which it proposed to accomplish this result was to distinguish between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, and to return to the yet largely vague and general expressions of the first five centuries, which, while they regarded a pure faith as necessary to salvation, endured, without deciding the conflicting opinions on various points. The most unsparing and one of the ablest opponents of this tendency was Abraham Calovius (q. v.). Spener produced a revival of religious feeling by pietism. This active Christianity was needed in opposition to the one-sided scholasticism which had grown up in the Church. So far it revived the truer Lutheranism of the first æra. But it soon deviated into an outward form of religious life. The Biblical theology of its representatives degenerated into arbitrary interpretations and applications of Scripture. *Pietism* (q. v.), in various shades, made good its footing in the Church. It wrought in its better forms a more earnest spirit in theology. Next to Spener, as a representative of the best type of pietism, was Aug. Hermann Francke (q. v.). Its most distinguished opponents were Johann Benedict Carpzov (q. v.) and Valentine Ernest Löscher (q. v.). The inflexible narrowness of the Church life was alleged as a ground of separation from the Church by the mystical fellowships which attached themselves to J. Böhme, Gichtel, and Dippel, and by the Church of the Brethren. By these movements, and by Bengel

and the theosophy of Oetinger, the dominion of the mediævalism of the seventeenth century was broken. Under the influence of rationalism, at the end of the eighteenth century, the points of distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, both in Church life and in theology, lost more and more their significance. Efforts at union, which were vigorous without being in any high sense earnest, were made, especially in Westphalia and on the Rhine. These efforts resulted in very little until after the Wars of Liberation. From that great series of struggles went forth an intense religious feeling through all Germany. It was felt alike in both the Protestant churches. It stood in strong opposition to the shallow spirit of rationalism, but was, in the nature of the case, more interested at the beginning in the great common principles of the religious life of the whole Protestant movement than with particular, and still more than with specific distinctive doctrines. Prussia now took steps for a "union" of all the Protestants. By the Lutheran conservatives this new movement was looked upon with distrust. The union, they held, depended for its moral power upon a depreciation in part of the confession. It had been made possible by rationalism; but its perplexity was that, if it remained true to what was in so large a part its original source, it lost its power on men in proportion as their convictions were heightened and intensified; if, on the other hand, it abandoned the mild laxity of rationalism, it at once helped to restore the way to a strict confessionalism. It is impossible for men to be intelligently earnest, either as Reformed or Lutheran, and regard the differences of the two churches as of little importance. Claus Harms, in his theses, treated the union as a rationalistic volatilization of the very substance of the faith. Among the people of conservative stamp also, the changes in the liturgy, the hymn-books, and in the Church usages of various kinds, were regarded with suspicion and dislike as an assault upon the religion of the fathers. Under these circumstances, the "Old Lutheran" movement, under the leadership of Scheibel, in Breslau, Huschke, the distinguished jurist, and Steffens, the natural philosopher, separated itself from connection with the State Church and formed an independent communion. See Old Lutheranism. The religious life of the Church continued to suffer from the evils which in the course of her history had been fixed upon German Lutheran Protestantism. Prominent among them were the hampering of the congregational life—a life which was demanded by the principles of Lutheranism—and the repression of public life which characterized the first half of the nineteenth century. The newly-awakened religious life withdrew itself, in consequence, very largely into the smaller religious circles, and derived from them more or less of a pietistic hue. See Pietism. These circles themselves drew more and more toward the ancient orthodoxy. To this they were impelled by the unionistic efforts, and the havoc created by infidelity and rationalism. The new theological tendencies were met by the system set forth in the Confessions. The feeling grew that without a restoration of the old relations of fealty on the part of ministers to the great Church standards there would be no internal harmony in the Church. This opposition to union first embodied itself in the Lutheran Conferences held at Leipzig in 1843, and subsequently. Rudelbach was the earliest leader of this movement. He was succeeded by Harless. It gained strength by the civil commotions of 1848, so that at that time it demanded of the members of the conferences a subscription to the symbolical books. Under this tendency were formed the provincial associations, which united with the Lutheran Conventions at Wittenberg in 1849 and 1851. In these conventions, as well as in a great variety of publications, a strong opposition to the "union" was developed. It was evident that the conservatives were a unit on the two points—the dissolution of the state union and the complete re-establishment of the Lutheran Church. The prevailing political current in Prussia from 1852 favored this tendency. (See below, under *Ritual and Worship.*) In the different lands and provinces of Germany, the efforts in the one direction of emancipation and restoration bore the common character of earnestness and vigor, but in forms and modes shaped by circumstances. In Bavaria the leaders were Löhe, Thomasius, and Harless. In Mecklenburg its great representatives were Kliefoth and Krabbe. In Hanover its chief organs were the Conference at Stade, and Petri, Münchmeier (*Dogma of the Invisible and Visible Church*, 1854), and Uhlhorn; on the Rhine itself, and in Westphalia, Ravensberg. The "New Lutheranism" was not, indeed, an internal unit in all its views. Among its great theologians, Hoffmann and Kahnis completely alienated their early friends. In Bavaria, Löhe (died 1872), in carrying through his principles, came into conflict with the government in the Lutheran Church.

Efforts were made to annul the union and restore genuine Lutheranism. Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, who will be considered above any suspicion of sympathy with the distinctive theology of Lutheranism, gives the history and characteristics of the two doctrinal tendencies, the unionistic mediating and the Lutheran, which come into conflict at this point: "The controversies arising from the question of the union have had this result in dogmatics, that no man can defend the Church doctrine without either taking position with the doctrines held in common—the consensus-dogmatik—or taking the strictly confessional position. As the chief opponents of the union are the Lutheran theologians, who, with all their strength, give force to their confessional interest, the main opposition to the dogmatik of the consensus is offered by the Lutheran dogmatik. On the side of the consensus the main representatives are theologians of the school of Schleiermacher, among whom are Nitzsch, Lücke, J. Müller, Dorner, and others. To relieve the union from the charge of lacking confessional character, they find it necessary to maintain a distinct dogmatical system. But as it is essential to the idea of the union to set aside the particular distinctive doctrines which sunder the confessions, the system of the theologians of the union can only accept the ground common to both. In this spirit Nitzsch, in the *Urkundenbuch d. Evangelischen Union* (1853), and J. Müller, *The Evangelical Union, its Nature and divine Right* (1854), have attempted to present, in the different articles, a formula exhibiting the agreement of the confessions. The consensus, however, can only be brought about by a limiting and tempering of the two doctrines to a medium in which the sharpness of the antithesis is lost. This method of union may be applicable to a certain set of doctrines, but it goes to pieces of necessity on the distinctive doctrines which can allow of no modification without loss of their essential character. The principle on which the theology of the consensus rests is that that alone is essential in Protestantism in which the two confessions agree. Schleiermacher was the first to maintain this, but his object was by it to neutralize and render indifferent both systems, in order to set them aside as antiquated, and to substitute for them a point of view in consonance with modern culture. With all the care which Schleiermacher takes to give himself the appearance of complete harmony with the ancient system, it is easy to see that the new form of consciousness breaks through the old, and that the old is retained simply to introduce the new, and to smooth the way for it. In the case of these doctrinaries of the union, however, the dogmatics of the consensus is a mere illusion, which has no ground except in their lack of mental freedom. They find the particularism of the confessional systems too narrow for them; they are urged by something within them to sustain a freer relation to those systems; and there is no ignoring the fact that they take a position which has gone beyond them. But they are not willing to confess this to themselves; instead of looking

forward where their proper goal lies, they turn backwards. They are constantly recurring to the point on which the confessional differences originally rested. They desire to establish by the Church confessions what they hold to be the real substance of the evangelical faith. Yet they must themselves confess that they cannot be satisfied that they are throughout in harmony with either the Lutheran or the Reformed doctrine, and that on this ground they are wishing for what can be found in neither. The more the two systems are compared, the more do they show that the one excludes the other. This is the contradiction out of which there is no escape, the code in which there is a perpetual revolution between union and confession. The sympathy for the old system is lost, and yet there is lack of force and courage to rise to a new one. Men know in their hearts that they are no longer at one with the Church, and yet they are afraid to break with it outwardly. They hold fast to the union, and yet cannot let go of the confessional. Is it a matter of wonder that all the dogmatic products of this school of theologians have an air of feebleness, superficiality, and lifelessness? From the dogmatic position it is impossible to deny that the opponents of the theology of the union are right; from it we must justify the Lutheran theologians, whose system, with all the offensiveness of its particularism, has at least the advantages of character, decision, and logical consistency" (*Kirchengeschichte des Neunz. Jahrh.* [Tübing. 1862], p. 409–411).

Mecklenburg isolated itself by its exclusive state-churchism. Even the Hanoverian Catechism, with which the earliest agitations in North Germany had been connected, did not secure the unmixed approval of the portion of the Church with whose views it was in sympathy. New Lutheranism has been accused of manifesting a tendency towards Romanizing, especially in the doctrine of the ministry, of the sacraments, and of the Church. To the ministerial office it is charged with imputing a hierarchical priestly character. It is charged with holding that ordination confers a divine authority for the ministration of the Word and sacraments, and for the discipline and government of the Church. With this tendency has been connected a desire to restore private confession, which its opponents say is almost equivalent to auricular confession. With it has arisen a strong opposition to the presbyterial constitution. It is said to maintain that the sacraments derive their operativeness from the "office of the means of grace." In connection with this view, an exalted importance is attached to the sacraments. The Lord's Supper is made the proper centre of the public service. The whole artistic sense has been developed in this movement; a higher interest has been excited in the proper performance of the ritual, and, indeed, of the whole liturgical service of the Church. The intoning and the whole musical element in worship has been assigned its old place of esteem. This school has been charged with maintaining that, in order to preserve the pure doctrine, a view of tradition in affinity with that of Rome is to be held. Subjection to the authority of the Church is to be substituted for individual faith. The most important literary organ of this tendency has been Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, established in 1827, which maintains within the Prussian union, with immense force and success, the position of distinctive Lutheranism. This tendency separated itself from the orthodoxy which bore the tinge of pietism, and from the mediating theology, especially in the work of inner missions (q. v.), with which it refused to co-operate, on the ground that it was not churchly. In the Prussian Church it opposed itself to the regulations of the congregations, and to the constitution of the State Church. In the department of missions to the heathen (the term foreign missions has ceased to answer, since it has become the fashion for one set of Christians to establish missions for the conversion of another set), the revised New Lutheranism has pursued an independent course. Against this Dorner expressed himself, in a memorial of the Prussian High Consistory in 1866, which did not, however, prevent the newly-acquired state churches (such as Hanover, etc.) from being placed under the care of the minister of cultus. The Lutherans outside of Prussia, the Mecklenburgers, Bavarians, and others, at the conference at Hanover in 1868, with the Hanoverians, and others in Church fellowship with them, made use of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession (of the Church and its true unity) to keep up the agitation against all union with the rest of the State Church of Prussia. See *Neue Evangel. Kirchenzeitung* (1868); Ritschl, in Dorner's *Zeitschrift fur das Kirchen-recht* (1869); Matthes, *Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik* (1871).

V. *Ritual and Worship* (cultus) *of the Lutheran Church.*—The foundation for these was laid by Luther in his Formula Missæ (1523) and his German Mass (1525). In these he proceeded upon the principle, which he expressed and defended, that the Church service was not to be abrogated as a whole; that the vital parts of it had a noble origin; that the great thing was to purge off its excrescences and defilements, and to restore to its true place in it the Word of God, which had been more and more neglected. In conformity with Luther's fundamental principles, the ritual was purified, the neglected elements replaced, and the more necessary parts developed still further. It was brought back to the standard of the Bible, and of early pure Catholic antiquity. The Lord's Supper, restored to its true position, became the grand point of culmination in all the chief services. The office of the Word was renewed. Preaching became a great indispensable element of the chief public services. The congregation took a direct part in the service in response and singing. The services were held in the vernacular of the country, though a certain proportion of the familiar old Latin part of the services was in many cases continued, mainly, however, in order to retain the noble Church-music, until time had been given to fit it to a vernacular service complete in all its parts. Luther insisted simply on an organization of worship which should preserve its rich treasures and resources. Services for the morning and evening, and for the days of the week, were retained or arranged. More than all, congregational singing was developed. In conformity with these views, there arose the service of the Lutheran type which we find in the agenda (q. v.) of the 16th and 17th centuries. In northern, eastern, and middle Germany the Wittenberg order was followed, and is maintained to this day. The service is of moderate length, and is rich liturgically.

The forms established in the æra of the Reformation were more or less broken through, or altered in a very wretched manner, in consequence of the theological revolution which marked the 18th century. With the religious life, whose reviving power was felt towards the close of the first quarter of the 19th century, came a strong desire for relief from these mischievous changes. To this desire, at least as one of its greatest motives, the Prussian agenda owes its origin; yet, alike in the mode of its introduction and in elements which pervaded it throughout, it involved a breach with the original Lutheran type, to which it claimed in large measure to conform. As this fact became more and more manifest, the effort was made to bring the forms of the agenda into harmony with the better elements which still survived in the congregations; yet, after all that could be done in this way, the result was imperfect and unsatisfactory. In consequence of this, in the most recent period, a still closer approximation has been made in Prussia to the original Lutheran ritual. One set of influential thinkers, as Höfling and Kliefoth, contended for an unconditional repristination of the worship of the Reformation time. Others held that various changes were necessary to adjust what was furnished by the history in Church worship with the well-grounded views of the present and the actual needs of the congregations.

The "agenda" became a source of special trouble in the controversy between the Unionists and the "Old Lutherans." The contest on the agenda raged particularly severe in Silesia. Among the most active participants in this struggle were the pastors Scheibel, Berger, Wehrhahn, and Kellner, at Hönigern. A pacific royal order of Feb. 28, 1834, in regard to the continued force of the confessions, accomplished little. Nor was the conflict allayed by the rescript of the Consistory of Breslau, May 15, 1834, which demanded that the clergy who had not acceded to the Union should use the revised agenda of 1829, and forbade any public attacks upon the Union. In consequence of infraction of these orders the offending clergymen were suspended (1834). In Hönigern the military were called in to force open the Church for the introduction of the State-Union service (Dec. 24, 1834). Similar disturbances arose in Halle in connection with Guericke, professor in the university, who was removed by the government in 1836. But this opposition element was not to be seduced by flattery nor terrified by force. In a synod held at Breslau in 1835 they had resolved to exhaust all legal measures to secure for themselves purity, independence, and integrity in doctrine, worship, and constitution. Missionary preachers travelled from place to place, administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Berlin and Erfurt new congregations were formed. In the Mark and in Silesia a special apostolical Church constitution was adopted. Among the decided Lutherans, however, there were two tendencies. The stricter tendency demanded a complete separation from the State Church. The relatively more moderate party, with which Guericke stood, desired to carry out their Lutheran convictions within the State Church as far as the legal concessions allowed them to do so. These troubles matured a purpose in thousands of the oppressed confessors of the faith to leave their native land for conscience sake. In spite of various concessions on the part of the government, a great emigration to Australia took place under the leadership of Kavel. To these "pilgrim fathers" of our day were added many from Saxony, led by Stephan, and from Würtemberg and the Wupperthal. From 1838, and especially after the advent of Frederick William IV to the throne of Prussia (1840), the tone of the government towards the Lutherans became milder.

VI. "*Separate Lutherans.*"—A royal general concession was issued July 23, 1845, for the relief of those Lutherans who held themselves aloof from the State "Evangelical" Church. They were granted the right to form congregations of their own, and to have them united under a common direction, which was not to be subject to the control of the State Church. The congregation, having obtained the consent of the state to its formation, could call pastors, whose vocation was to be confirmed by the Direction, and who were to be ordained by ordained ministers. The baptisms, confirmations, proclamation of the bans, and marriages of these clergymen were acknowledged in law, and their Church registers were to be received in evidence. Their obligation as regarded the taxes and burdens of the parochial connection was to be determined by the common law. Under these provisions the Lutherans constituted a High Consistory in 1841 under the presidency of professor Huschke. This official board is the supreme ecclesiastical authority for the Lutherans in Prussia. It consists of four regular members; it is controlled by the Synod, and has charge of the purity of the Church in doctrine and life, of the reception of new congregations, the regulation of the parochial relations, and the appointments of clergymen; to it is committed the decision in complaints made by the officials of the churches and of the higher schools. It has oversight of the ritual, of the decisions in ecclesiastical cases, and of censures, the calling of synods, and similar matters. The clergy are supported by a fixed salary, and by perquisites. The processes of Church discipline are monition, temporary exclusion from the communion, the making of apologies in various degrees, and final excommunication. The Church service is conducted according to the agenda which have been in use; the preaching on free texts requires the permission of the Board of the High Consistory; the Lord's Supper is an essential part of the chief service. The Lutherans are not obliged to send their children to the United schools. Thus the Lutheran Church in Prussia obtained a definite independent foundation. In 1847 the High Consistory had in its care twenty-one congregations recognised by the state, and numbering about nineteen thousand souls. Of these the largest proportion was in Silesia—ten congregations, with 8400 members. The smallest proportion was in Westphalia and in the Rhine Provinces. In addition to these Separate Lutherans there was an immense number of Lutherans who, in consequence of concessions guaranteed by the government, remained in the State Church. Outside of Prussia, a Lutheran movement was felt in Nassau in 1846, in which Brunn of Steeten, near Runkel, was leader. The government and the deputies declined to authorize the formation of a separate Lutheran commission. The connection between the Lutherans was strengthened by the press and by conventions. Their literary organs were the *Zeitschrift für Lutherische Theologie*, edited by Rudelbach and Guericke; the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, edited by Harless and others; and various popular periodicals, such as the *Pilger aus Sachsen*, the *Sonntagsblatt*, and others. Conventions were held at Berlin, Triglaff, and Gnadau. The Lutheran Conference in Leipsic held its first session in 1843. With the great political movement of 1848 the interests of the Positive Lutherans entered on a new æra. Of the urgent demands made at that time for the separation of Church and State, they took advantage especially in their struggle against the Union established by the State Church. Meanwhile the difference of conviction between the Lutherans within the Union and those separated from it was not completely removed. The Separate Lutherans urged the impossibility of a Lutheran clergyman's remaining with good conscience in the Union. The Lutherans who did not withdraw from the government Church nevertheless began to come into closer association under the leadership of Göschel, Stahl, Heubner, and Schmieder. Their views and claims were supported by Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*, and by provincial associations in Saxony, Pomerania, Silesia, and Posen. They agreed, at a meeting in Wittenberg, in September, 1849, on the following principles: "We stand upon the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; our congregations have never justly ceased to be Lutheran congregations; we demand the recognition and adherence to the Lutheran Confession in worship, the order of the congregation, and Church government; first of all is to be insisted on the freeing of the altar service from everything that is dubious, and the giving of the stamp of the Confession to the entire service; furthermore, there should be in the government of the Church a management which would give security to confessional independence; finally, there should be a guarantee of Lutheran principles in the constitution of the congregations." These aims they did not, however, propose to secure by separation, but by contending within the State Church for the rights of the Lutheran Church in the districts belonging to it. This decision rendered more bitter the feeling of alienation between the Lutherans who remained in the State Church and those who separated from it. In addition to these internal controversies, there arose also differences with the civil government of the Church, especially on the part of Lutherans within the State Church. These differences were caused partly by the establishment of the High Consistory in 1850, and partly by the proposed Evangelical Order of Congregations, which was opposed on the ground that the Confession was not sufficiently secured. The High Consistory attempted to meet the opposition, and to harmonize feel-

ings by various concessions; but, with a growing consciousness of need and of right, the Lutherans constantly rose in their demands. They asked for the abolition of the mixed boards, the institution of exclusively Lutheran faculties, the return of the Church property, and for other changes looking in the same general direction. The result finally was the issue of a cabinet order of July 12, 1853, which showed that the king, Frederick William IV, was determined to make no further concessions. The stricter Lutherans had shown themselves unwilling to co-operate in various movements of the time. Thus had they declined to co-operate in the plan of the Inner Missions (1849), and opposed the confederation of churches proposed at the Church Diet at Wittenberg in 1849. In other lands the struggles of the Lutheran Church for truth and right continued. The University of Erlangen was the centre of the struggle in Bavaria, and Harless, the president of the High Consistory, one of its great supports. But at the General Synod at Anspach, in consequence of opposition on the part of the congregations, the stricter Lutheran views could not be carried out in regard to creed, Church government, changes in the liturgy, confession, and Church discipline. Here also arose the stricter party, with the pastors Löhe and Wacheren, which took ground against fellowship at the Lord's Supper with the reformed, and favored separation from the State Church. This party was resisted by the High Consistory. In Nassau, the two Hesses, Hanover, and the Saxon duchies, the stricter Lutheranism had adherents. As a rule, the mission festivals were their centres of union. In Baden, under pastor Eichhorn as leader, the conflict with the government resulted in a legal separation from the State Church in 1856. In Saxony, especially about Schönburg, the stricter Lutheran clergy were numerous. The emigration of Stephan injured the cause very much in the general estimation. During these public movements various questions of profound interest in scientific theology were discussed by the great divines in the Lutheran Church. Among the most important of these discussions was, 1, that between Hoffmann in Erlangen and Philippi in Rostock on the doctrine of the atonement; 2, the controversy in Mecklenburg, which resulted in the deposition of professor Baumgarten in 1858. A convention of clergymen and laymen at Rothenmoor in 1858 represented the strictest Lutheranism, of which Kliefoth had been the especial promoter. See F. J. Stahl, *Die Lutherische Kirche u. die Union* (Berl. 1859). (C. P. K.)

LUTHERANS IN AMERICA. I. *Early History.*—The celebrated German divine, Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg (q. v.), is generally and justly recognised as the founder of the Lutheran Church in America. He arrived in this country in 1742. Long previous to his coming, however, the Lutherans had gained a footing here. Adherents of the Church of the great German reformer first came to these shores of the West from Holland in 1621. In consequence of the severe measures adopted by the Synod of Dort (1618–19), the stay of non-Calvinists had been made uncomfortable in the mother country, and with the first Dutch settlers in the province of New Amsterdam (now New York) came several Lutheran immigrants, seeking here a home, and a place to worship God agreeably to the dictates of their conscience. They had come, however, without a shepherd, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1638, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For many years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministerial care. The first to perform this duty was Reorus Torkillus (died in 1643), whose successor, John Campanius, "a man of enlightened zeal, deeply interested in his work, and burning with a strong desire to promote the spiritual interests of the aborigines," was the first to publish in this country Luther's Smaller Catechism, and first to furnish it to the Red Man in his own vernacular—"perhaps the first work ever rendered into the Indian language, and the Swedes most probably were the first missionaries among the Indians in this country." Strangely enough, the Swedes were also the first to fall away from their mother Church and enter into communion with those of the Protestant Episcopal Church—a result due, no doubt, in a great measure, to the want of complete organization, as we shall see below.

Dr. Mühlenberg, as we have noted above, was of the German Church, and, though his labors were mainly confined to those of his own nationality, the influence of this man of God extended over all Lutherans in the states, and caused them to be "of one heart and one mind," and to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The first German Lutherans preceded the doctor very nearly one hundred years. He himself, as we have seen, came hither in 1742; the first of his countrymen in the faith reached these shores in 1644. They came in company with the Dutch, and, like the latter, for a long time depended on lay instruction. By 1653 they had increased in strength sufficiently to seek the services of a preacher, but in vain they directed a petition to the Dutch Directory to secure permission for such a step. In 1664, finally, the much-coveted privilege came to them from the English authorities, who, immediately upon their acquisition of this territory, granted the Lutherans religious liberty. The first to preach to the German Lutherans in their own vernacular was Jacob Fabricius, who reached this country in 1669. The first house of worship, however, they enjoyed two years later (1671); but they were deprived of it by the Dutch in 1673. It was rebuilt in 1703 (on the south-west corner of Broadway and Rector Street). The Lutherans enjoyed a decided accession in 1710, when four thousand Germans, the victims of civil oppression and religious persecution, who had fled for refuge to England under the patronage of queen Anne, came to the provinces of New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. Quickly others followed, until in 1717 their large numbers began to excite the serious apprehension of the civil authorities. In Pennsylvania the government actually felt it its *duty* to direct the attention of the "Provincial Council" to the fact "that large numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and constitution, had lately been imported into the province." All these people had come without their ministers, and so it happened that, by settling in Pennsylvania and South Carolina, they were deprived of the regular ministrations of the sanctuary, and dependent for religious instruction upon those of their own number best informed "in heavenly things." A colony of German Lutherans, refugees from civil oppression and Romish intolerance at Salsburg, was founded under better auspices in Georgia in 1734. Their pastors were John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau. In the following year they received large accessions from the mother country, and by the time of Dr. Mühlenberg's arrival the Lutherans of Georgia formed quite a considerable Christian band (over 1200 of them). Indeed, it is said that these Lutherans exerted a very salutary influence on the piety of John and Charles Wesley.

As early as 1733, the German Lutherans of Philadelphia and other places had sent urgent petitions for ministerial help and pecuniary aid to the Lutherans of England and of the mother country. At Halle, where now flourished the pious Aug. Hermann Francke, their prayers were heard, and by the untiring exertions of the founder of the "Halle Orphan Asylum," the future founder and leader of American Lutheranism was induced to leave his native land, and "to relieve," among his brethren of the faith and fellow-countrymen who had sought a home in the wilds of America, "the spiritual destitution that prevailed, to gather together the lost sheep, and to preach to them the truths of the Gospel." With the year 1742, therefore, opens a new epoch in the history of the Lutheran Church in America—the

epoch in which it assumed organic form. No man could have been more eminently fitted than was H. M. Mühlenberg for the mission to be accomplished. "He possessed piety, learning, experience, skill, industry, and perseverance." He was, moreover, "deeply interested in the work to which he had devoted himself, as is apparent from the manner in which he discharged his duties, and the condition in which he left the Church at the time of his decease." When he came there was an absence of all organization. It is true the Swedish brethren gave assistance to their German brethren freely and cheerfully, but this was by no means sufficient to advance the interests of Lutheranism. Mühlenberg saw this clearly, and he at once applied himself to the task of effecting an organic union of German Lutherans at least. The greatest obstacle he found in the want of preachers and of houses of worship; but he was not in the least discomfited by this jejuneness of his beloved Church. His influence at home was that of a pious and devoted servant of the Lord, and he soon drew a number of his former associates and friends to this side of the Atlantic, so that by 1748, only six years after his landing on these shores, he was enabled to call around him the strongest and ablest representatives of the Lutheran ministry in America, to counsel together and form a synod. The Swedes had contented themselves with the election of one of their own number as *provost* (q. v.), to preside over them and act as their representative before the country. Mühlenberg, however, desired stricter conformity to the rules and regulations of the mother Church, and, as the fate of the Swedish Lutheran Church afterwards showed, his course proved to be the only safe way towards a perpetuation of the Lutheran Church in America. The men who joined Mühlenberg in the convention at Philadelphia, Aug. 14, 1748, for the purpose of organizing the first Lutheran synod in America, were Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Hartwig, of the German, and Sandin and Naesman, of the Swedish Lutheran Church. It was by this body that the first German Lutheran was regularly set apart in this country to the work of the ministry. His name was John Nicholas Kurtz. He was not, however, the first Lutheran minister ordained here. As early as 1701, Falkner, a student of divinity, was ordained by the Swedish ministers Rudman, Björk, and Auren, to labor in the Swedish Lutheran Church; quite an eventful act, also, because it set aside forever the supposition that the Swedish Lutherans received the doctrine of the episcopacy in the sense in which it is taught in the Anglican Church. After 1748 the synod met regularly each year, and these meetings "were attended with the most beneficial results. They not only advanced the prosperity of the Church, but the hands of the brethren were strengthened, and their hearts encouraged. They promoted kind feeling, and formed a bond of union among the churches." In 1765 a private theological seminary was started, under the care of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, and in 1787 the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College, "for the special benefit of the Germans of the commonwealth, as an acknowledgment of services by them rendered to the state, and in consideration of their industry, economy, and public virtues." There were, in the year of Mühlenberg's arrival in this country, in Pennsylvania alone, 110,000 Germans, and of these about two thirds were of the Lutheran Church. One of the sons of Dr. H. M. Mühlenberg—Henry Ernest—at this time pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, Pa., was honored with the distinction of first president of this now widely celebrated institution of learning. In 1791 the Lutheran Church received further recognition for its services to education by the Pennsylvania Legislature in the gift of 5000 acres of land "to the free-schools of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia," the centre of Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg's labors.

During the Revolutionary days the Lutherans acted the part of patriots and Christians; many of their number came forward in defence of the country of their adoption. Dr. Mühlenberg, among others, had two sons in the army; one of them exchanged the gown for the colonel's uniform. In consequence of this identification of the Lutherans with the cause of American liberty, the English came to dislike them greatly, and many were the sufferings and deprivations to which they were subjected; several of their churches were burned or desecrated, and all manner of oppression was visited upon them. The close of the War of Independence, however, left them, if anything, gainers in the struggle. Aside from the liberal donations which they received in Pennsylvania, as we have seen above, they received large accessions from the very ranks of their enemies. Many of the German soldiers who, by the ignominious treaty of the English with the Hessians, had been brought to this country to exterminate the love of freedom, at the close of hostilities concluded to remain this side the Atlantic, and became valuable members of the Lutheran Church in America. Out of 5723 soldiers that had come here from Brunswick, 1200, with seven officers and their chaplain, at one time entered the fold of American Lutheranism. Of the Hessians, also, some 7000 remained to swell the number of adherents to the Church of the great German reformer.

Not so auspicious was the outlook at the close of the eighteenth century. On October 7, 1787, the patriarch and founder of the Lutheran Church in America departed this life, and the Church was bereft of its great stronghold. There had been slowly growing, ever since the establishment of American independence, a decided preference for the introduction of the English language into the exercises of public worship. The older and more conservative portion of the Church contended for the use of the language which the great reformer had so much embellished and invigorated, and of which he was really the second father. Some of the Germans even believed that their language might actually be made the language of the country, and thus the proposition of the younger and Americanized portion for the use of the English proved an occasion of discord and alienation, "resulted in serious injury to the Church, and almost caused its total ruin. . . . Thousands abandoned their parental communion, and sought a home among other denominations, because their children did not understand the German, while many who remained, because of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the services, and became careless in their attendance on the ministrations of the sanctuary." Dr. Mühlenberg had counselled due consideration of the wants of this young and growing element, and frequently himself preached in English; but, his tongue once silent, the conservative element impolitically gloried in its wisdom (comp. here Dr. S. S. Schmucker's *Am. Luth. Ch.* [5th edit. Philad. 1852, 12mo], p. 27–29). The first Lutheran Church in which the English was exclusively used was not built until 1809, and it remained for many years the only one to represent the English-speaking element in the Lutheran Church. Efforts for more complete and effectual organization were made in New York State in 1785 by the establishment of the New York Synod; hitherto the Pennsylvania Synod was the only *ministerium* (q. v.) in existence. In 1803 a synod was organized in North Carolina; in 1819, in Ohio; in 1820, both in Maryland and Virginia. In 1816 the educational advantages of the Church also received new strength by the founding of a theological seminary at Hartwick, N. Y.—the first public training-school of the American Lutherans for young men prospecting the holy office of the ministry. An asylum for orphans the Lutheran Church had founded as early as 1749, in the midst of the thriving colonists at Ebenezer, in Georgia. It was widely known as the "Salzburger Waisenhaus," and is said to have received no little encouragement from Whitefield.

II. *Organization of the General Synod of American Lutherans.*—The need of a central bond of union for the different synods extending over a territory so vast as

that of the United States gave rise in 1820 to the formation of a "general synod"—"a starting-place and a central radiating point of improvement in the Church." There were at this time 170 ministers connected with the Lutherans, and 35,000 communicants in the Lutheran connection. Of these, 135 preachers and 33,000 communicants were represented at the meeting which, Oct. 22, 1820, formed the General Synod. The constantly increasing influx of European Lutherans frequently gave rise to the manifestation of the most diverse opinions on ecclesiastical matters, and, in consequence, to many controversies, first of a milder, and gradually of a more decided character, until a schism became inevitable. Even previous to the outbreak of our civil war there had been frequent secessions of several of the synods from the general body, but the strife of 1861–65 gave a more decided influence in favor of the establishment of rival bodies by the side of the "General Synod." The first to establish themselves independently were the Southern Lutherans, who instituted a "Southern General Synod," later known as the "General Synod of North America," and now (1872) embracing 5 synods, 92 ministers, 175 churches, and 13,457 communicants.

A more serious division was, however, preparing, on doctrinal grounds, in the Northern synods. The constitution of the General Synod did not make membership dependent upon an adhesion to the letter of the "Augsburg Confession" of 1530, the great standard of faith of the early Lutheran Church. While heartily indorsing the Augsburg Confession as the most important historical document as regards the doctrines of the Church, the constitution aimed to secure to all Lutherans the liberty of rejecting some utterances of that confession which had early been discarded by a considerable number of the followers of Luther as unevangelical and semi-papal. This feature was obnoxious to the strict Lutheran party, which wished Lutheranism to remain for all time to come as defined by the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and which desired to bring back the whole Lutheran Church of the United States to this point.

III. *Organization of the "General Council."* — The party differences, after creating frequent disturbances at the meetings of the General Synod, led to an open rupture in 1864, when the Franckean Synod, a New York State body, which was regarded by the Confessional Lutherans as positively unchurchly and heretical, was admitted to the General Synod. In consequence of this act, the oldest synod, that of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the Convention. At the next meeting of the General Synod, in 1866, the Pennsylvania Synod was consequently declared by the president and a majority of the delegates out of practical connection with the General Synod. In reply to this decision, the Pennsylvanians called on all Lutherans adhering to the letter of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 to organize upon this basis a new and genuine Lutheran Church. The call was responded to by a number of synods hitherto connected with the General Synod, and also by some independent synods, and a preliminary convention was held in December, 1866, at Reading, Pa. This meeting drew up a constitution, and provided for the convention of the first "General Council" of the new organization as soon as the constitution should be adopted by ten synods. The preliminaries having been complied with, the "General Council" met at Fort Wayne Nov. 20, 1867. Twelve synods, representing 140,000 communicants, a larger number than the combined membership of the two other organizations—the "General Synod" and the Southern "General Synod of North America"—together, were in attendance. A resolution was passed inviting those only "who are in the unity of the faith with us, as set forth in the fundamental articles of this General Council," as "visiting brethren," making this body distinctively Confessional in the character of its Lutheranism. The last Convention of the "General Council," held at Rochester, New York, in November, 1871, was presided over by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth, of Philadelphia. At this meeting there were only nine synods, representing 511 ministers, 971 congregations, and 141,875 communicants. Two other synods—the Danish-Norwegian Augustana Synod and the Indiana Synod—had, however, announced their intention to join the "Council." A meeting is now (Nov., 1872) in progress at Akron, Ohio. Its proceedings will have to be given in the Appendix volume.

IV. *Movement towards the Formation of a General Conference.*—The tendency of a majority of the American churches towards ecclesiastical union has of late made an impression also on the Lutheran communicants, and there is now in progress a movement for the organization of a new body, to be called the "General Conference," with the avowed object of making it "the organization of a general Lutheran body, on the basis of the unqualified reception of all the symbolical books as a bond of union between all Lutheran synods in America." This movement was started several years ago, mainly by the independent synods (see for list, V. *Statistics*). At the meeting held at Fort Wayne, Indiana, Nov. 14, 1871, about 60 members were present, representing most of the independent synods. The reports of the meeting for final organization, which was to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., on the second Wednesday of July, 1872, have not yet come to our notice. If all the six independent synods have adopted the Constitution and joined the "General Conference," this body is now the strongest in the Lutheran connection, its membership exceeding that of either the General Synod or of the General Council. (Comp. Schäffer, *Early Hist. of the Lutheran Church in America*; Schmucker, *Amer. Luth. Church* [5th edition, Phila. 1852]; and the excellent article in Schem, *Deutsch-Amerikan Conv. Lexikon*, vi, 690–704: *Annual to New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871.)

V. *Statistics.*—We are enabled to present our readers with the latest statistics of the Lutheran Church in the United States of America. The almanacs for 1890 furnish a list of—theological seminaries, 26; colleges, 25; female seminaries, 11; academies 37; charitable institutions (orphan homes, infirmaries, hospitals, etc.), 56; Church boards and societies, 27. The General Synod embraces—synods, 23; ministers, 979; churches, 1437; communicants, 151,404. The General Council embraces—synods, 8; ministers, 910; churches, 1552; communicants, 259,801. The Southern General Synod embraces—synods, 9; ministers, 201; churches, 385; communicants, 37,528. The grand total is—synods, 58; ministers, 4692; churches, 7948; communicants, 1,099,868. The periodicals are—English, 48; German, 51; Norwegian, 16; Swedish, 26.

Growth of the Lutheran Church in the United States.

Year.	Synods.	Ministers.	Congregations.	Communicants.
1823	—	178	900	———
1833	—	337	1017	———
1845	22	538	1307	135,629
1860	36	1193	2279	232,780
1851	38	1322	2300	246,788
1862	42	1366	2575	270,780
1871	54	2157	3727	450,410
1890	58	4692	7948	1,099,868

For special local and national statistics of the Lutheran Church, see AMERICA; ANHALT; AUSTRIA; BADEN; BAVARIA; BELGIUM; BOHEMIA; BRUNSWICK; BREMEN; CARINTHIA and CARNIOLA; DENMARK; ENGLAND; FRANCE; HESSE; HOLLAND; HUNGARY; ICELAND; LIPPE; LUBECK, MECKLENBURG; MORAVIA; NORWAY; OLDENBURG; POLAND; PRUSSIA; RUSSIA; SAXONY; SILESIA; STEIERMARK; SWEDEN; THURINGIA; TRANSYLVANIA; UNITED STATES; WESTPHALIA; WURTEMBERG. For missions of the Lutheran churches, see MISSIONS.

On the history of the Lutheran Church, compare Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), especially ch. iv; Göbel, *Die religiösen Eigenthümlichkeiten d. Luth. u. ref. Kirchen* (1837).

Augusti, *Beiträge z. Geschichte u. Statistik der Evangel. Kirche* (1838); Wiggers, *Statistik* (1842, 2 vols.); Harnack, *Die Luth. Kirche im Lichte d. Gesch.* (1855); Kahnis, *German Protestantism* (1856); Seiss, *Ecclesia Lutherana, a brief Survey of the Evang. Luth. Church* (1868); Dorner, *Gesch. der Protest. Theologie* (1867); Müller (J. T.), *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangel. Luth. Kirche* (Stuttg. 1860, 8vo); Plitt, *Lutheranische Missionen* (Erlangen, 1871, 8vo).

Lütkemann, Joachim, a German theologian, was born at Demmin, in Pomerania, Dec. 15, 1608; studied at Stettin, and afterwards at the universities of Greifswald and Strasburg; then travelled through France and Italy; and was *magister legente* of the philosophical faculty of Rostock in 1638, and appointed professor of metaphysics in 1643. He published at this time several philosophical works, such as his *Lineamenta corporis physici* (Rostock, 1647). He also preached at the same time, and soon acquired great reputation by his eloquence and Christian earnestness. He became involved, however, in a quarrel with the strict orthodox party of Mecklenburg, upheld by the duke, on the question of the humanity of Christ in his death. Lütkemann defended his views in his *Dissertatio physico-theologica de vero homine*, maintaining that the human nature of Christ ended in his death. He was expelled for these views, but immediately called to Brunswick as general superintendent and court preacher. Here he prepared in 1651 a School Discipline, and in 1652 a Church Discipline, which were adopted in Brunswick. He died in 1655. His most important works were devotional, and in this line he may be ranked next to Arndt and Müller. The principal are: *Vorschmack d. göttlichen Güte* (Wolfenb. 1643): —*Vom irdischen Paradies: — Harfe auf zehn saiten.* See P. Rethmeyer, *Schicksalen, Schriften u. Gaben Lütkemann's* (Brunswick); Tholuck, *Akad. Leben*, part ii, p. 109; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 536; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. ii, § 217.

Lutz, Johann Ludwig Samuel, a distinguished German theologian, historian, and biographer, was born at Bern in 1785; studied first in his native city, then at the universities of Tübingen and Göttingen; was in 1812 appointed professor of the gymnasium, and rector of the literary school of Bern; in 1824 became pastor of Wynau, and afterwards of Bern; and was there in 1833 appointed professor of exegesis. He died Sept. 21, 1844. Among his works the most noteworthy is *Gesch. der Reformation in Basel* (Basle, 1814, 8vo). His theological lectures were published by Rütschi and Ad. Lutz, under the title *Biblische Dogmatik und Hermeneutik* (1847 and 1849). See Hundeshagen, *Lutz, ein theolog. Charakterbild*, 1844; *Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen*, vol. xxii; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 631; Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Gén.* xxxii, 314. (J. N. P.)

Lutz (or Lucius), **Samuel,** one of the most important representatives of early pietism in Switzerland, was born in 1674. His father, the pious and learned pastor of Biglen, was his first teacher. Lutz at first turned his attention especially to mathematics, the classics, and Hebrew, then to Church discipline, and finally left all these to devote himself exclusively to the study of Scripture, and the works of the fathers and reformers, especially Luther's. German pietism was then beginning to strike root in Switzerland, in spite of all the efforts of the orthodox party, headed by the theologians of Berne. To oppose it, a committee was appointed to take charge of all things pertaining to religion, and in 1699, by its influence, several prominent and influential preachers, tainted with pietism, were exiled or deprived of their office, a number of adherents of the pietist party fined or otherwise punished, and several stringent laws passed to secure the "uniformity of faith, doctrine, and worship." Finally both the citizens and clergy were obliged to take the so-called *oath of association*—a sort of Test Act. Lutz's first and rather insignificant appointment as pastor was at Yverden in 1703. Here he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, winning the respect and affection not only of the German, among whom he labored, but also of the French inhabitants. As he was accused of pietism, all attempts to secure more important appointments, with a view to increasing his sphere of usefulness, were defeated, in spite of his reputation for learning and eloquence, until about 1726, when he was appointed pastor of Amfoldingen. In 1738 he removed to Diessbach, where he died, May 28, 1750. His collected works were published under the title *Wohlriechender Strauss v. schönen u. gesunden Himmelsblumen* (Basle, 1736 and 1756, 2 vols.). See Leu, *Schweiz. Lexikon*, xii; Haller, *Bibl. d. Schweizergesch.* ii, 290; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, i, 191 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 621.

Lux Mentis (*the light of the mind*), another name for *baptism*, so called on account of the instruction in the Christian religion which was given to the candidates for baptism before they were admitted to the sacred ordinance.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Luxury, a disposition of mind addicted to pleasure, riot, and superfluities. Luxury implies a giving one's self up to pleasure; voluptuousness, an indulgence in the same to excess. Luxury may be further considered as consisting in, 1. Vain and useless expenses; 2. In a parade beyond what people can afford; 3. In affecting to be above our own rank; 4. In living in a splendor that does not agree with the public good. In order to avoid it, we should consider that it is ridiculous, troublesome, sinful, and ruinous. See Robinson's *Claude*, i, 382; Ferguson, *On Society*, part vi, sec. 2; Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

Luz (Heb. *id.* לוּז, a nut-bearing tree, either the *almond* or *hazel*, as in Gen. xxx, 37 [but according to Fürst, after Hiller, *sinking*, as of a valley]; Sept. Λουζά, but in Gen. xxviii, 19 unites with the preceding word Οὐλαμλούζ), the name of two places.

1. The ancient name of the Canaanitish city on or near the site of Bethel (Gen. xxviii, 19; xxxv, 6; xlviii, 3), on the border of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 13); taken and destroyed, with all its inhabitants (except one family that had acted as spies), by the descendants of Joseph (Judg. i, 23). The spot to which the name of Bethel was given appears, however, to have been at a little distance in the environs of Luz, and they are accordingly distinguished in Josh. xvi, 2, although the Heb. name of Bethel eventually superseded the Canaanitish one Luz; or rather, perhaps, Luz was the name of a locality near which Bethel was afterwards built. The form of the name in the Sept., Eusebius, and the Vulg. seems to have been derived from Josh. xviii, 13, where the words אֶל־כֶּתֶף לוּזָה should, according to ordinary usage, be rendered "to the shoulder of Luzah;" the *ah*, which is the particle of motion in Hebrew, not being required here, as it is in the former part of the same verse. Other names are found both with and without a similar termination, as Jotbah, Jotbathah; Timnath, Timnathah; Riblah, Riblathah. Laish and Laishah are probably distinct places. Van de Velde is confident that he has recovered the site of Luz in the modern ruins called Khurbet *el-Lozeh*, one hour and a half west of Beth-el (*Notes* to the 2d ed. of his *Map*, p. 16). See Bethel.

2. A small place in the district of the Hittites, founded by an inhabitant of the former Luz, who was spared on the destruction of this place by the tribe of Benjamin (Judg. i, 26); and this seems to dispose of the identification with the ruins still found on Mt. Gerizim (Stanley, p. 231 sq.), bearing the name of *Luza* (Seetzen, *Reise*, i, 174; Wilson, ii, 69), about ten minutes beyond the trench of the Samaritan sacrifice (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 331). Schwarz thinks the site may be identified with that of wady *Luzan*, in the interior of the desert of et-Tih, north-west of Jebel el-Araif, on the strength of the Talmudic statement that this place lay without the bounds of Palestine (*Palest.* p. 213). This is doubtless the wady *Lussân* described by Dr. Robinson as a broad

plain swept over by torrents from the mountains on the right, destitute of any fountain or water, and containing only a few remains of rude walls and foundations, which he regards as the traces of the Roman station *Lysa* along this route (*Researches*, i, 276, 277). Rosenmüller (*Alterth.* II, ii, 129) refers the name to *Luza*, a city, according to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v.), lying three miles from Shechem; but this could not have been Hittite territory. Studer (*Buch d. Richter*, p. 45) adopts a suggestion of D. Kimchi, that a city of the Phœnicians (Kittim, so Eusebius, Κεττείμ, *Onomast.* s. v. 2) is meant. Probably it was some place near Hebron, in southern Palestine, where the Hittites were settled. See HITTITE.

Luz. See HAZEL.

Luzzatto, Mose Chayim, BEN-JACOB, the great modern Jewish mystic of Italy, was born at Padua in 1707, and enjoyed the highest educational advantages the country of his birth could afford. When a youth of only twenty, his extended studies in Hebrew literature, especially the cabalistic writings, secured for him a universal reputation. Had he known how to avoid mysticism, he might have proved one of the greatest ornaments of Judaism, but the *Cabala* (q. v.) led him astray, and he not only compiled a second *Zohar* (q. v.), but actually came to believe himself the predicted Messiah of his people. He was excommunicated, and obliged to quit Italy. For a time he flourished in Amsterdam, and about 1744 he removed to the Holy Land. He died shortly after, at Safet, in May, 1747, and was buried at Tiberias. Of his multifarious works twenty-four are yet unedited; twenty-eight have been published, comprising treatises in theology, dogmatic and cabalistical, philosophy, morals, and rhetoric, and a body of poetry, devotional, lyrical, and dramatic. His most important writings are cited in Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 393. See also Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, x, 369–383; and his biography in *Kerem Chemed* (1838), iii, 113 sq. (J. H. W.)

Luzzatto, Samuel David, one of the most noted Jewish writers of our day, the *Jehudah ha-Levi* (q. v.) of the 19th century, was born at Trieste (Italy) in 1800, the scion of one of the most eminent Italian families. He received a thorough academical training, and early displayed great ability as a writer. Greatly interested in the study of the history and literature of his people, he became one of the most prominent writers in this field. Says Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 502), "If Krochmal and Rapaport were the fathers of Jewish history, Luzzatto must be acknowledged as her mother." He brought to light the most beautiful pages of Jewish history of the Franco-Spanish epoch—the tragical fate of the Jews in the persecutions of the Middle Ages and the reformatory period—which had been given up as lost; and thereby prepared the way for the labors of Kayserling, Sachs, Zunz, and others. Luzzatto also labored creditably in the department of O.-T. exegesis, and when the *collegio rabbinico* was opened at Padua in 1829, he became one of its professors, continuing in this service until his death in 1865. He wrote Hebrew, Italian, French, and German. His diction is graceful and exceedingly pleasant. His essays and treatises in this field appeared first in the "Bikkure Ittim," and afterwards (1841, etc.) in the "Kerem Chemed," published in Vienna and then in Prague by a man of great learning in Jewish literature, Samuel L. Goldenberg, of Tarnapol. One of his best works is his *Dialogues, etc., on the Cabala, the Zohar, the antiquity of the vowel-points and accents of the Bible* (1852), which shows the folly of the Cabala, the origin of the Zohar in the 13th century, and the vowel-points in the 5th, and the accents probably in the 6th. Luzzatto also published on Hebrew grammar, *Prolegomena ad una gram. Hebr.*; and later a complete Hebrew grammar, *Oheb Guer* (אוהב גר); a work on the Aramaic version of Onkelos (Vienna, 1830); an Italian version of *Job* (Livorno, 1844); *French Notes on Isaiah* (in Rosenmüller's version, Leips. 1834); *Heb. Notes on the Pentateuch* (Vienna, 1850); and finally *Isaiah*, an Italian translation with an extensive Hebrew commentary (Vienna, 1850). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 499 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums*, iii, 345 sq.; *Maggid*, 1864–1865; *The Israelite* (Cincinnati, O.), Jan. 19, 1872. (J. H. W.)

Luzzatto, Simone (Heb. *Simcha*), a noted rabbi, who flourished at Venice about 1590, exerted no small influence on the Italian Jews of the 16th century. He was an associate of *Leo da Modena* (q. v.), and aided the latter greatly by his superior abilities. He died in 1663. He wrote *Via della Fede*, in which he teaches that the prophecies of Daniel refer rather to a by-gone age than to a future Messiah. This peculiar view has given rise to the belief that he accepted Jesus as the Messiah (see Wolf, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 1128). His most valuable work, however, is his *Discorso circa il stato degli Hebrei* (Venice, 1638), in which he ably defends Judaism and the Jews. The excesses of the Cabalists he deplored, and stoutly opposed all relation with them. See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, x, 162 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lybon or **Libo,** a city mentioned in the *Antonine Itinerary* as being situated thirty-two Roman miles from Heliopolis (Baalbek), and the same distance from Laodicea. Its name has elsewhere been displaced in the same itinerary by that of *Conna*. The modern village of *Lebweh* is doubtless the same (*Bibl. Sacr.* 1848, p. 699), although the distances have become corrupted (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 322 sq.). It is a poor village, in the middle of a basin, on a low tell among the streams on the eastern slope of Lebanon, with some remains of antiquity, and a considerable Arabian history (Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 532 sq.).

Lybrand, JOSEPH, an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Lutheran parentage in Philadelphia, Oct. 3, 1793; was converted at about ten; entered the Philadelphia Conference in April, 1811; was presiding elder on Philadelphia District in 1824–8; 1834–8 was on stations in Philadelphia; desisted from labor in 1843 at Harrisburg, and died April 24, 1845. Mr. Lybrand was a man of deep fidelity to God, and immovable fidelity to man. As an eloquent preacher he had few equals in the American pulpit. His style was elegant and weighty, full of masterly argument and powerful exhortation, and many souls were added to the Church by his long and blessed ministry. So strong was his conviction in his duty to preach only that he refused to accept some of the most important offices in the gift of his denomination. Thus he declined in 1832 to assume the responsibilities of the publishing house taken from Dr. Emory, who had been elected bishop.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 598.

Lycaö'nia (Λυκαονία, either from the mythological name *Lycaön*, or from λύκος, a *wolf*), a province of Asia Minor, having Cappadocia on the east, Galatia on the north, Phrygia on the west, and Isauria and Cilicia on the south. These boundaries, however, are differently described by ancient authors (Ptolemy, vi, 16; v, 6; Pliny, v, 25; Strabo, xiv, 663; Livy, xxxviii, 38). It extends in length about twenty geographical miles from east to west, and about thirteen in breadth. It was an undulating plain, involved among mountains, which were noted for the concourse of wild asses. The soil was so strongly impregnated with salt that few of the brooks supplied drinkable water, so that good water was sold for money; but sheep throve on the pasturage, and were reared with great advantage (Strabo, xii, 568; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* viii, 69). Lycaonia first appears in history in connection with the expedition of Cyrus the younger (Xenophon, *Anab.* i, 2, 19; iii, 2, 23; *Cyrop.* vi, 2, 20). The inhabitants were a hardy race, not subject to the Persians, and lived by plunder and foray (Dionysius, *Per.* 857; Prisc. 806; Avien. 1020). With these descriptions modern authors agree (Leake's *Journal*, p. 67 sq.; Rennel, *Geog. of West. Asia*, ii, 99; Cramer, *As. Min.* ii, 63; Mannert, *Geog.* VI, ii, 190 sq.). It

was a Roman province when visited by Pau. (Acts xiv, 6), and its chief towns were Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, of which the first was the capital (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.). "The speech of Lycaonia" (Acts xiv, 11) is supposed by some to have been the ancient Assyrian language, also spoken by the Cappadocians (Jablonsky, *Disquis. de Lingua Lycaonica*, Berlin, 1714; also in his *Opusc.* iii, 3 sq.); but it is more usually conceived to have been a corrupt Greek, intermingled with many Syriac words (Guhling, *Dissert. de Lingua Lycaonica*, Viteb. 1726), since the people appear, from the account in the Acts, to have adopted the Grecian mythology as the basis of their religion (see Sommel, *De Lingua Lyc.* Lond. 1787). "It is deeply interesting to see these rude country people, when Paul and Barnabas worked miracles among them, rushing to the conclusion that the strangers were Mercury and Jupiter, whose visit to this very neighborhood forms the subject of one of Ovid's most charming stories (Ovid, *Metam.* viii, 626). Nor can we fail to notice how admirably Paul's address on the occasion was adapted to a simple and imperfectly civilized race (Acts xiv, 15–17). See Bömer, *De Paulo in Lycaonia* (Lips. 1708). See Asia Minor; Paul.

Lyc'ia (Λυκία, prob. from λύκος, a *wolf;* according to some, from its earliest king, *Lycus;* for a Shemitic origin of the name, see Simonis, *Onomast. N. T.* p. 101; Sickler, *Handb.* p. 568), a province in the south-west of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Rhodes, having Pamphylia on the east, Phrygia on the north, Caria on the west, and the Mediterranean on the south. The last eminences of the range of Taurus come down here in majestic masses to the sea, forming the heights of Cragus and Anticragus, with the river Xanthus winding between them, and ending in the long series of promontories called by modern sailors the "Seven Capes," among which are deep inlets favorable to seafaring and piracy. It forms part of the region now called *Tekeh.* It was fertile in corn and wine, and its cedars, firs, and other trees were celebrated (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xii, 5). Its inhabitants were believed to be descendants of Cretans, who came thither under Sarpedon, brother of Minos. One of their kings was Bellerophon, celebrated in mythology. Lycia is often mentioned by Homer (*Il.* vi, 171; x, 430; xii, 312; *Odys.* v, 282, etc.), according to whom it was an ally of Troy. Herodotus assigns several ancient names to the country (i, 173). The Lycians were a warlike people, powerful on the sea, and attached to their independence, which they successfully maintained against Crœsus, king of Lydia, and were afterwards allowed by the Persians to retain their own kings as satraps, and their ships were conspicuous in the great war against the Greeks (Herod. vii, 91, 92). After the death of Alexander the Great, Lycia was included in the Greek Seleucid kingdom, and was a part of the territory which the Romans forced Antiochus to cede (Livy, xxxvii, 55). It was made, in the first place, one of the continental possessions of Rhodes [see Caria]; but before long it was politically separated from that island, and allowed to be an independent state. This has been called the golden period of the history of Lycia (see further in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.). It is at this time that it is named in 1 Macc. xv, 23, as one of the countries to which the Roman senate sent its missive in favor of the Jews. The victory of the Romans over Antiochus (B.C. 189) gave Lycia rank as a free state, which it retained till the time of Claudius, when it was made a province of the Roman empire (Sueton. *Claud.* 25; *Vespas.* 8). At first it was combined with Pamphylia, and the governor bore the title of "Proconsul Lyciæ et Pamphyliæ" (Gruter, *Thes.* p. 458). Such seems to have been the condition of the district when Paul visited it (Acts xxi, 1; xxvii, 5). At a later period of the Roman empire it was a separate province, with Myra for its capital. Lycia contained many towns, two of which are mentioned in the New Testament: Patara (Acts xxi, 1, 2) and Myra (Acts xxvii, 5); and one, Phaselis, in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xv, 23). This



Coin of Lycia.

region, abounding in ancient remains and inscriptions (the last copiously illustrated by Schmidt, Jena, 1868, fol.), was first visited in modern times by Sir Chas. Fellows. See his *Journal* (London, 1839, 1841); Forbes, *Travels* (London, 1847); Texier, *L'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1838); *Encycl. of Useful Knowledge*, xiv, 210 sq.; Cramer's *Asia Minor*, ii, 282 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, iii, 150 sq.; Cellarius, *Notit.* ii, 93 sq.

Lych-gate or Lich-gate (Anglo-Sax. *lic* or *lice*, a body or corpse), i. e. *corpse-gate*, is a covered gate erected, especially in England, at the entrance of a churchyard, beneath which the persons bearing a corpse for interment were wont to pause, sometimes to read the burial-service under this sheltered place. It is also applied to the path by which a corpse is carried.

Lych- or Corpse-gate at Blackford Church, Perthshire.

Lychnoscope (an opening for *watching the light*), a name assigned by conjecture to an unglazed window or opening, which is frequently found near the west end of the chancel, and usually on the south side, below the range of the other windows, and near the ground. What purpose these low side windows served in churches is not now known.

Lycus (*Wolf*), a river of Palestine, mentioned by ancient geographers as situated between ancient Biblus and Berytus (Strabo, xvi, p. 755; Pliny, v, 20). This is evidently the modern *Nahr el-Kelb* (Dog River), at the mouth of which, about 2½ hours N.E. of Beirut, are found the remarkable rock-tablets of ancient victorious kings (Wilson, ii, 405; Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 619 sq.).

Lyd'da (Λύδδα, Acts ix, 32, 35, 38; from the Heb. "*Lod,*" לֹד, *strife;* Sept. Λόδ v. r. Λώδ, 1 Chron. viii, 12; Λυδδών v. r. Λοδαδί and Λοδαδίδ, by union with the following name, Ezra ii, 33; Neh. vii, 37; Λύδδα, Neh. xi, 35; 1 Macc. xi, 34; so also Josephus), a town within the limits of the tribe of Ephraim; according to Eusebius and Jerome, nine miles east of Joppa, on the road between that port and Jerusalem; according to the *Antonine Itin.*, thirty-two miles from Jerusalem and ten from Antipatris. It bore in Hebrew the name of Lod, and appears to have been first built by the Benjamites, although it lay beyond the limits of their territory (1 Chron. viii, 12); and we find it again inhabited by Benjamites after the exile (Ezra ii, 33; Neh. xi, 35). In all these notices it is mentioned in connection with Ono. It likewise occurs in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xi, 34) as having been taken from Samaria and annexed to Judæa by Demetrius Nicator; and at a later date its inhabitants are named among those who were sold into slav-

cry by Cassius when he inflicted the calamity of his presence upon Palestine after the death of Julius Cæsar (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 11, 2; xii, 6). In the New Testament the place is only noticed under the name of Lydda, as the scene of Peter's miracle in healing Æneas (Acts ix, 32, 35). Some years later the town was reduced to ashes by Cestius Gallus, in his march against Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, ii, 19, 1); but it must soon have revived, for not long after we find it at the head of one of the toparchies of the later Judæa, and as such it surrendered to Vespasian, who introduced fresh inhabitants from Galilee (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 5; iv, 8). At that time it is described by Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 6, 2) as a village equal to a city; and the Rabbins have much to say of it as a seat of Jewish learning, of which it was the most eminent in Judæa after Jabneh and Bether (Lightfoot, *Parergon*, § 8; *Horæ Heb.* p. 35 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 399 sq.). About the time of the siege it was presided over by rabbi Gamaliel, second of the name (Lightfoot, *Chor. Cent.* xvi). Some curious anecdotes and short notices from the Talmuds concerning it are preserved by Lightfoot. One of these states that "queen Helena celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles there!" In the general change of names which took place under the Roman dominion, Lydda became *Diospolis* (Ptolemy, v, 16, 6; Pliny, v, 15; see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 877), and under this name it occurs in coins of Severus and Caracalla, and is often mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. It was early the seat of a bishopric, and at the different councils the bishops are found to have subscribed their names variously, as of Lydda or Diospolis; but in the later ecclesiastical records the name of Lydda predominates. Tradition reports that the first bishop was "Zenas the lawyer" (Tit. iii, 13), originally one of the seventy disciples (Dorotheus, in Reland, p. 879); but the first historical mention of the see is the signature of "Ætius Lyddensis" to the acts of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325; Reland, p. 878). The bishop of Lydda, originally subject to Cæsarea, became at a later date suffragan to Jerusalem (see the two lists in Von Raumer, p. 401); and this is still the case. In the latter end of 415 a council of fourteen bishops was held here, before which Pelagius appeared, and by whom, after much tumultuous debate, and in the absence of his two accusers, he was acquitted of heresy, and received as a Christian brother (Milner, *Hist. of Ch. of Christ*, cent. v, chap. iii). The latest bishop distinctly mentioned is Apollonius, in A.D. 518. Lydda early became connected with the homage paid to the celebrated saint and martyr St. George, who was not less renowned in the East than afterwards in the West. He is said to have been born at Lydda, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in the earliest persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, at the end of the 3d century. His remains were transferred to his native place, and a church erected in honor of him by the emperor Justinian. This church, which stood outside the town, had just been levelled to the ground by the Moslems when the Crusaders arrived at Lydda; but it was soon rebuilt by them, and they established a bishopric of Lydda and Ramleh. Great honors were paid by them to St. George, and they invested him with the dignity of their patron: from this time his renown spread more widely throughout Europe, and he became the patron saint of England and of several other states and kingdoms. The church was destroyed by Saladin in 1191, and there is no evidence that it was ever rebuilt, although there was in later centuries an unfounded impression that the church, the ruins of which were then seen, and which still exist, had been built by the English king Richard. From that time there has been little notice of Lydda by travellers. It now exists, in a fruitful plain, one mile north of Rama, and three east of Jaffa, under its ancient name of *Lud* or *Ludda* (*Lidd* in Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 69, 456). Within a circle of four miles still stand Ono (Kefr Auna), Hadid (el-Haditheh), and Neballat (Beit-Neballah), three places constantly associated with Lod in the ancient records. The water-course outside the town is said still to bear the name of Abi-Butrus (Peter), in memory of the apostle (Tobler, p. 471). The town is, for a Mohammedan place, busy and prosperous (see Van de Velde, *Syr. and Palest.* i, 244). Buried in palms, and with a large well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of persons, old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind, or afflicted with loathsome diseases of the eyes. It is a considerable village of small houses, with nothing to distinguish it from ordinary Moslem villages save the ruins of the celebrated church of St. George, which are situated in the eastern part of the town. The building must have been very large. The walls of the eastern end are standing only in the parts near the altar, including the arch over the latter; but the western end remains more perfect, and has been built into a large mosque, the lofty minaret of which forms the landmark of Lud. As the city of St. George, who is one with the famous personage El-Khudr, Lydda is held in much honor by the Moslems. In their traditions the gate of the city will be the scene of the final combat between Christ and Antichrist (Sale's *Koran*, note to chap. xliii; and *Prel. Disc.* iv, § 4; also Jalal ad-Din, *Temple of Jerusalem*, p. 434). See Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 208; Robinson, *Bib. Researches*, iii, 55; Sandys, *Travailes;* Cotovicus, *Itiner.* p. 137, 138; D'Arvieux, *Mémoires*, ii, 28; Pococke, *Description*, ii, 58; Volney, *Voyage*, i, 278; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 291 sq.

Lydgate, John, an ancient English theologian, celebrated particularly as a poet, one of the successors of Chaucer, was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk. The dates of only a few of the events of his life have been ascertained. He was ordained a subdeacon in 1389, a deacon in 1393, and a priest in 1397, whence it has been conjectured that he was born about 1375. He seems to have arrived at his greatest eminence about 1430. After a short education at Oxford he travelled in France and Italy, and returned a complete master of the language and literature of both countries. He chiefly studied Dante, Boccaccio, and Alain Chartier, and became so distinguished a proficient in polite learning that he opened a school in his monastery for teaching the sons of the nobility versification and composition. Although philology was his subject, he was not unacquainted with the philosophy of the day: he was not only a poet and a rhetorician, but a geometrician, an astronomer, a theologist, and a disputant. He died about 1461.—*English. Cyclop.* s. v.; Warton, *Hist. Engl. Poetry;* Chambers, *Cyclop. Eng. Lit.* i, 40 sq.

Lyd'ia (Λυδία), the name of a country, and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. The Hebrew Lud ("Lydia" in Ezek. xxx, 5; see also Ludim), a province in the west of Asia Minor, supposed to have derived its name from Lud, the fourth son of Shem (Gen. x, 22). Thus Josephus states "those who are now called *Lydians* (Λυδοί), but anciently *Ludim* (Λούδοι), sprung from Lud" (Λούδα, *Ant.* i, 6, 4; compare Bochart, *Opera*, i, 83, and the authorities cited there). See Ethnology. Lydia was bounded on the east by Greater Phrygia, on the north by Æolis or Mysia, on the west by Ionia and the Ægæan Sea, and on the south it was separated from Caria by the Mæander (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s. v.). The country is for the most part level (Schubert, *Reisen*, i, 369 sq.). Among the mountains, that of Tmolus was celebrated for its saffron and red wine (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vi, 2, 21). Lydia, however, lay on the west coast of Asia Minor, and thus was far removed from the other possessions of the Shemitic nations. Greek writers inform us that Lydia was originally peopled by a Pelasgic race called *Mœonians* (Homer, *Iliad*, ii, 866; x, 431), who received their name from Mæon, an ancient king (Bochart, *l. c.*). They also state that the name Lydians was derived from a king who ruled them at a later period (Herod. i, 7).

About eight centuries B.C. a tribe of another race migrated from the east, and subdued the Mæonians. These were the Lydians. For some time after this conquest both nations are mentioned promiscuously, but the Lydians gradually obtained power, and gave their name to the country (Kalisch, *On Gen.* x; Dionysius, i, 30; Pliny, v, 30; comp. Strabo, xii, 572; xiv, 679). The best and most recent critics regard these Lydians as a Shemitic tribe, and consequently the descendants of Lud (Movers, *Die Phönicier*, i, 475). This view is strengthened by the description of the character and habits of the Lydians. They were warlike (Herod. i, 79), skilled in horsemanship (*ib.*), and accustomed to serve as mercenaries under foreign princes (vii, 71). Now, in Isa. lxvi, 19, a warlike people called *Lud* is mentioned in connection with Tarshish and Pul; and again in Ezek. xxvii, 10, the prophet says of Tyre, "They of Persia, and of *Lud*, and of Phut, were in thine army, thy men of war." There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the Shemitic nation mentioned in Genesis, and which migrated to Western Asia, and gave the province of Lydia its name. The identity has recently been called in question by professor and Sir Henry Rawlinson, but their arguments do not seem sufficient to set aside the great mass of circumstantial evidence in its favor (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 160, 659, 667; comp. Kalisch, ad loc. Gen.; Prichard, *Physical History of Mankind*, iv, 562 sq.; Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, i, 87; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 745). In the palmy days of Lydia its kings ruled from the shores of the Ægæan to the river Halys; and Crœsus, who was its king in the time of Solon and of Cyrus, was reputed the richest monarch in the world (Strabo, xv, 735). He was able to bring into the field an army of 420,000 foot and 60,000 horse against Cyrus, by whom, however, he was defeated, and his kingdom annexed to the Persian empire (Herod. i, 6). Lydia afterwards formed part of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ; and it is related in 1 Macc. viii, 8, that Antiochus the Great was compelled by the Romans to cede Lydia to king Eumenes (comp. Apian. *Syr.* 38). Some difficulty arises in the passage referred to from the names "India and Media" found in connection with it; but if we regard these as incorrectly given by the writer or by a copyist for "Ionia and Mysia," the agreement with Livy's account of the same transaction (xxxvii, 56) will be sufficiently established, the notice of the *maritime* provinces alone in the book of Maccabees being explicable on the ground of their being best known to the inhabitants of Palestine. In the time of the travels of the apostles it was a province of the Roman empire (Ptolemy, v, 2, 16; Pliny, v, 30). Its chief towns were Sardis (the capital), Thyatira, and Philadelphia, all of which are mentioned in the New Testament, although the name of the province itself does not occur. Its connection with Judæa, under the Seleucidæ, is referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 3, 4). The manners of the Lydians were corrupt even to a proverb (Herod. i, 93). See Th. Menke, *Lydiœa* (Berlin, 1844); Cramer, *Asia Minor*, i, 413; Forbiger, *Handb. der Alten Geogr.* ii, 167; Clinton, *Fasti Hellen.* Appendix, p. 361; Niebuhr, *Lectures on Anc. Hist.* i, 82; Cellarius, *Notitiæ*, ii, 108 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, iii, 345 sq.; *Allgem. Welthistor.* iv, 623 sq.; Beck, *Weltg.* i, 308 sq.; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, i, 154 sq.

2. A woman of Thyatira, "a seller of purple," who dwelt in the city of Philippi, in Macedonia (Acts xvi, 14, 15). A.D. 47. The commentators are not agreed whether "*Lydia*" should be regarded as an appellative, or a derivative from the country to which the woman belonged, Thyatira, her native place, being in Lydia. There are examples of this latter sense; but the preceding word ὀνόματι seems here to support the former, and the name was a common one. (See Biel and I. Hase in the *Bibl. Brem.* ii, 411; iii, 275; v, 670; vi, 1041; *Symb. Brem.* II, ii, 124; compare Ugolini *Thesaur.* xiii, xxix.) Lydia was not by birth a Jewess, but a proselyte, as the phrase "who worshipped God" imports. It was at the Jewish Sabbath-worship by the side of a stream (Acts xvi, 13) that the preaching of the Gospel by Paul reached her heart. She was converted, being the first person in Europe who embraced Christianity there, and after she and her household had been baptized she pressed the use of her house so earnestly upon the apostle and his associates that they were constrained to accept the invitation. As her native place was in the province of Asia (Acts xvi, 14; Rev. ii, 18), it is interesting to notice that through her, indirectly, the Gospel may have come into that very district where Paul himself had recently been forbidden directly to preach it (Acts xvi, 6). We infer that she was a person of considerable wealth partly from the fact that she gave a home to Paul and his companions, partly from the mention of the conversion of her "household," under which term, whether children are included or not, slaves are no doubt comprehended. Of Lydia's character we are led to form a high estimate from her candid reception of the Gospel, her urgent hospitality, and her continued friendship to Paul and Silas when they were persecuted. Whether she was one of "those women who labored with Paul in the Gospel" at Philippi, as mentioned afterwards in the epistle to that place (Phil. iv, 3), it is impossible to say. The Lydians were famous for the art of dyeing purple vests (Pliny, vii, 57; Max. Tyr. xl, 2; Valer. Flacc. iv, 368; Claud. *Rapt. Proserp.* i, 275; Ælian, *Anim.* iv, 46), and Lydia, as "a seller of purple," is supposed to have been a dealer in vests so dyed rather than in the dye itself (see Kuinöl on Acts xiv, 14).

Lyd'ian (Jer. xlvi, 9). See Lud; Ludim; Lydia.

Lydius, Balthasar, a Dutch theologian of German origin, was born at Umstadt, near Darmstadt, about 1577; studied at Leyden; became pastor at Streefkerk in 1602, and in 1608 at Dordrecht. He was present at the Synod of Dort. He died in 1629. Lydius was a violent opponent of the Remonstrants. Of his literary labors, one deserves special mention, *Waldensia* (now very rare, Rotterdam, 1616–17; 2d ed. Amsterdam, 1623, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he seeks to show an intimate connection between the Moravians and Waldensians. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 63, 64.

Lydius, Jacob, a Dutch theologian, son of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century at Dordrecht, and took a prominent part in the synod held there. He died in 1688. Some of his works deserve special mention: *Agonistica Sacra, sive Syntagma vocum et phrasium agonisticarum quæ in Scriptura occurrunt* (Rott. 1657, 12mo):—*Florum Sparsio ad historium passionis Jesu Christi* (ibid, 1672, 8vo). See Brandt, *Hist. of the Reformation in the Low Countries*: Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxii, 388.

Lydius, Johannes (1), a German theologian, brother of Balthasar, was born at Frankfort about 1577, and became pastor at Oudewater (the birthplace of Arminius) in 1602. He died in 1643. Like his brother Balthasar, he is noted for his opposition to Arminianism. He was the editor of the works of Clemanges, Wessels, etc. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 64.

Lydius, Johannes (2), one of the early Dutch ministers of the Reformed Church in America, was educated in Holland, and settled at Schenectady and Albany, N. Y., in 1702. Like his predecessors in the same Church, he labored successfully for the instruction and salvation of the Mohawk Indians. He ministered among the tribes of the "Five Nations," and received from the governor and council suitable compensation for his services. He died March 1, 1710. About thirty Indian communicants were in connection with his Church at his decease. He is represented by his contemporary, Rev. Thomas Barclay, of the Church of England, in a report to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, as "a good, pious man," who "lived in entire friendship" with him, "and sent his own children to be catechized."—*Documentary Hist. of New York*, iii, 897; Dr. Rogers's *Hist. Discourse*. (W. J. R. T.)

Lydius, Martin, a noted Dutch theologian, father of Balthasar and Jacob, was born at Lubeck, Germany, in 1539 or 1540, of Dutch parentage, and was educated at the universities of Tübingen and Heidelberg, where in 1566 he was employed at the *Collegium Sapientiæ* as teacher. On account of persecution in the Palatinate, he went to Holland, and became in 1579 pastor of a Church at Amsterdam. Upon the founding of the university at Franecker in 1585, he was called thither as professor. He died in 1601. He is noted for the part he took in the Arminian controversy. It is he who forwarded to Arminius the works of Koornhert and Arnold Cornelius for refutation, which resulted instead in the conversion of Arminius. See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* xx, 61 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 970, 971. See Arminianism.

Lye, Edward, an English philologist and clergyman, was born at Totnes, Devonshire, and was educated at Hertford College, Oxford; took holy orders in 1719; was presented to the living of Haughton Parva, Northamptonshire; in 1750 became vicar of Yardley Hastings, and died in 1767. He acquired distinction by his researches in the Saxon language and literature. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lye, Thomas, an English Nonconformist clergyman, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. While minister at All-Hallows, Lombard Street, London, he was called upon to take oath against the king; refusing, he was ejected in 1651; reinstated, he was once more expelled, because of his refusal to take the oath of uniformity, in 1662. He was very popular among Puritan families. His *Sermons* were published (Lond. 1660, 4to; 1662; 1681). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* (Church Restoration), i, 278.

Lyell, Thomas, D.D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Richmond County, Va., May 13, 1775. Though educated in the Protestant Episcopal Church, he became in early life a Methodist, and officiated on the Frederick Circuit, Va., also in Providence, R. I., and was chaplain to Congress. In 1804, however, he became rector of Christ's Church, N. Y., and remained ever after in that connection. In 1803 he was made A.M. by Brown University, and in 1822 D.D. by Columbia College. Through a long ministry he held on the even tenor of his way, and was an active member of almost every institution connected with the diocese of New York. He died March 4, 1848.—Sprague, *Annals*, v, 495.

Lyford, William, an English theologian and zealous Calvinist, was born in 1598 at Perpmere (Berkshire); graduated at Oxford; became a fellow of Magdalen College; entered the Church; became vicar of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, and spent the remainder of his life there. He died in 1653. Among other sermons and treatises are published, *Cases of Conscience propounded in the Time of Rebellion* (which preaches tolerance to all parties):—*Principles of Faith and of a good Conscience* (Lond. 1642; Oxford, 1652, 8vo):—*An Apology for our public Ministry and Infant Baptism* (Lond. 1652, 1653, 4to):—*The plain Man's Senses exercised to discern both good and evil* (ibid. 1655, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Lyle, John, A.M., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., October 20, 1769, and graduated at Liberty Hall in 1794. Soon after he was employed in teaching, pursued his theological studies, and was licensed in 1797. He was ordained in 1799, and in 1800 took charge of the churches of Salem and Sugar Ridge, in Clark County. In 1805 he was appointed a missionary within the bounds of the Cumberland Presbytery, and subsequently a commissioner of the General Assembly. He removed to Paris, Bourbon Co., Ky., in 1807, established an academy, and at the same time preached to the churches of Cave Ridge and Concord. He next supplied the church of Mount Pleasant, in Cynthiana, Harrison County, and passed the summer of 1814 in the counties of Bourbon, Harrison, Nicholas, and Fayette, preaching chiefly to the colored people. Having been instrumental, between 1815 and 1818, in the settlement of ministers on the field of his own labors, he devoted the rest of his life to missionary service, in which he was successfully engaged till his death in Paris, Ky., July 22, 1825. He published *Contributions to Periodicals:—A New American English Grammar* (1804):—*A Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of Gospel Ministers* (1821).—Sprague, *Annals*, iv. 178.

Lyman, Henry, an American missionary, was born at Northampton, Mass., Nov. 23, 1809, and graduated at Amherst College in 1829. He went as a missionary to Sumatra, and was killed there by the Battahs, with Mr. Munson, Jan. 28, 1834. He published *Condition of Females in Pagan Countries.*

Lyman, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 14, 1749, at Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1767, was chosen tutor in 1770, in which position he remained two years, and was installed pastor in Hatfield, Mass., March 4, 1772, where he died March 27, 1828. He was elected president of the Hampshire Miss. Society in 1812, vice-president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1819, and president in 1823. Dr. Lyman published several occasional *Sermons* (1787–1821).—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 10.

Lyman, William, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born about 1763, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1784. He was pastor at Haddam, Conn., and China, N. Y., and died in 1833. The College of New Jersey honored him with the doctorate in divinity in 1808. Dr. Lyman published four *Occasional Sermons* (1806, 1807, 1810). See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* p. 570; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, s. v.

Lynch, Thomas M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkerson County, Miss., August 1, 1826, was converted at Oxford, Ga., while a student at the university, at once joined the Church, and was licensed to preach in 1847, and shortly after was admitted to the Alabama Conference. His cultivated mind, his rare gifts in oratory, and his deep piety at once commended him to the love and confidence of the Conference. Enon Circuit was his first, and Marianna and Appalachicola his second appointment, when, in 1849, his health failed, and it became necessary for him to locate. By 1858 he had sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon his life-work, and he now consecutively served his church at Lowndesboro, Pineville, Prattville, and the Socapatoy Circuit. In the last-named place his health was again affected by the extent of the work and arduousness of its duties, and he retired from active work. He died in Coosa County, Ala., April 18, 1867. "In all the relations of life he sustained the character of a gentleman of the highest type. Possessing a rich fund of knowledge, and gifted with conversational powers that statesmen and courtiers might envy, he ever drew around him, by the affability of his manners and sweetness of his spirit, a large circle of friends, and held them by an indissoluble cord." As a preacher his word had power and unction. See *Minutes of Conferences of M. E. Church South*, iii, 128.

Lynde, Sir Humphrey, an English writer of note, was born in 1579, and was educated first at Westminster School, and then at Christ Church, Oxford; was made bachelor of arts in 1600. He was a member of several Parliaments, and enjoyed other national honors, but he deserves a place here only on account of his works, among which are *Via tuta* (Lond. 1628, 8vo, and often) and *Ancient Characters of the Visible Church*, etc. He died June 14, 1636. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Lyon, Asa, a Congregational minister, was born at Pomfret, Conn., Dec. 31, 1763, and graduated at Dart-

mouth College in 1790. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Sunderland, Mass., from Oct. 4, 1792, to Sept. 23, 1793; at South Hess, Vt., from Dec. 21, 1802, to March 15, 1840; and was a member of Congress from Vermont from 1815 to 1817. He was appointed chief judge of Grand Isle County in 1805, 1806, 1808, and 1813; and was during nine years a state representative. He was an able preacher. His published sermons and patriotic addresses show a high order of talent and scholarship.

Lyon, Hervey, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Walden, N. Y., Jan. 18, 1800, and was educated at Union College, pursued a course of theology at Princeton, N. J., and soon after removed to Ohio. Here, in 1828, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Huron, and ordained pastor of the Church in Vermilion. In 1830 he removed to Brownhelm, Ohio, and engaged in the occupation of teaching at the academy in Richfield, Ohio. He died March 7, 1863. Mr. Lyon was a superior teacher, and much beloved by his pupils; as a Christian, he enjoyed a spirit remarkable for its depth and intensity. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 309. (J. L. S.)

Lyon, John C., a noted German minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leonsberg, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, Germany, Feb. 11, 1802. His parents were of the Lutheran faith, and John received a Christian training. In 1817 he emigrated to this country, and some nine years later was brought nearer the cross, at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, after due preparation, entered the ministry, in which he continued for thirty-four years, preaching both to English and German congregations with great acceptance. He received consecutively the following appointments: 1828, Baltimore Conference, Huntington; 1829, Gettysburgh; 1830, Carlisle Circuit; 1831, Baltimore; 1832–33, Baltimore, Sharp Street, and Asbury; 1834, superannuated; 1835, Lexington; 1836, Lewisburgh Circuit; 1837–38, Rockingham; 1839–40, Augusta; 1841, York; 1842–45, New York Conference, Second Street German Church; 1846–48, Philadelphia; 1849–52, presiding elder of New York German District; 1853–54, East Baltimore; 1855–56, New York, Second Street; 1857, Fortieth Street; 1858–59, Philadelphia; 1860, Frederick City; 1861, East Baltimore. In 1862 he was superannuated, and died May 16, 1868. "Brother Lyon was an earnest, faithful worker in the Gospel, never tiring, esteeming all labor light which served to advance his Master's glory. . . . He was a mighty man of God in the pulpit, a devout and holy man in life, a pleasant companion, a kind husband, a good father, a sweet singer in Zion, a useful laborer, turning many to righteousness."—*Conf. Minutes*, 1869, p. 108.

Lyon, Mary, a teacher and female philanthropist, born in Buckland, Mass., Feb. 28, 1797, is noted as the founder of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary in South Hadley, over which she presided until her death, March 5, 1849. A feature of her plan (at first much opposed) was the performance of the institution's domestic labor by teachers and pupils, intending to give them independence of servants, self-denial, health, and interest in domestic duties. She set forth her views in *Tendencies of the Principles embraced and the System adopted in the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary* (1840), and in the *Missionary Offering* (1843). See Hitchcock, *Life and Labors of Mary Lyon* (1851); Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biography*, s. v.

Lyons, a city of France, situated on the Rhone, 316 miles by railway south-south-east of Paris, is noted in ecclesiastical history for two œcumenical councils which were held there:

I. In 1245, consisting of 140 bishops, and convened for the purpose of promoting the Crusades, restoring ecclesiastical discipline, and dethroning Frederick II, emperor of Germany. It was also decreed at this council that cardinals should wear red hats.

II. In 1274. There were 500 bishops and about 1000 inferior clergy present. Its principal object was the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches.—Hook, *Dictionary;* Smith, *Tables of Church History;* Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v.

Lyons, Israel, a noted English scholar of Jewish parentage, was born at Cambridge in 1709, and after the completion of his studies, mainly dependent upon his own efforts, he became instructor of Hebrew at the University in Cambridge. He died in 1770. Besides valuable contributions to mathematical science, he wrote *The Scholar's Instructor, or Hebrew Grammar* (1735, 8vo; 2d ed., greatly enlarged, 1757):—*Observations and Inquiries relating to various Parts of Scripture History* (1761). This last-named work is supposed by some to have been written, however, by his father. See *General Biographical Dictionary*, s. v.

Lyons, James Gilbourne, D.D., LL.D., an episcopal clergyman and educator, a native of England, emigrated to America in 1844, and began his clerical labors at St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J. In 1846 he removed to Philadelphia, and established himself as a teacher of the classics. His educational success secured him the position of principal of Haverford Classical School, which he held until his death, Feb. 3, 1868.

Lyra (also *Lyranus*), NICHOLAS DE, so called from Lyre, in Normandy, the place of his nativity, was born about 1270. He entered the Order of the Franciscans at Verneuil in 1291, and completed his studies in Paris. Here he studied successfully, was admitted to the degree of doctor, and became a distinguished lecturer on the Bible. Besides his studies at the university, he privately devoted himself to the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, and his association with converts of Jewish faith at this time has probably given rise to the opinion, even now held by some, that Nicholas de Lyra was born of Jewish parents, and was himself a convert to Christianity. His own writings, however, flatly contradict this report, as has been shown by Wolf (*Bibliotheca*, i and iii, s. v.); and Nicholas himself tells us, in one of his works (the polemical treatise), that he had but little association with Jews, and depended mainly upon the experience *of other Christians* for his delineation of Jewish character and customs (compare Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 513). His great learning, refined taste, and eminent worth, raised him to the principal offices of his order, and secured him the friendship of the most illustrious persons of his age. He died at Paris October 23, 1340. It is especially as a writer that Lyra is justly celebrated, and, as has been frequently asserted, he became, by his thorough expositions of the Scriptures, one of the greatest aids of the reformers of the 16th century, whence the couplet on Luther's exegetical labors by the enemies of the great German reformer:

> "Si Lyra non lyrasset
> Lutherus non saltasset."

Nicholas de Lyra's chef d'œuvre is his *Postillæ perpetuæ in universa Biblia* (Rome, 1471–72, 5 vols. fol.; best edit. Antw. 1634, 6 vols. fol.), which brought him the title of "doctor planus et utilis"—or, better, which immortalized the name of Lyra. The great merit of this commentary consists in the embodiment of the sober-spirited and ingenious explanations of Rashi, whose mode of interpretation Lyra regarded as his model, as he frankly states, "Similiter intendo non solum dicta doctorum Catholicorum, sed etiam Hebræorum maxime rabbi Salomonis, qui inter doctores Hebræos locutus est rationalibus, ad declarationem sensus literalis inducere." De Lyra even adopts the well-known Jewish four modes of interpretation denominated סוד=פרדם, mystical; דרוש, allegorical; רמז, spiritual; פשט, literal, which he thus expresses in verses in the same prologue (i. e. the first), from which the former quotation is made.

> "Litera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
> Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia."

He gives, however, the preference to the literal sense.

"All of them, says he, in the second prologue, "presuppose the literal sense as the foundation. As a building declining from the foundation is likely to fall, so the mystic exposition which deviates from the literal sense must be reckoned unbecoming and unsuitable." Even in the interpretation of the N. T., where Rashi failed him, acquaintance with the Rabbinical writings and Jewish antiquities enabled him to illustrate largely by allusion to the manners and customs of the Hebrews. He also wrote a treatise in defence of Christianity, and against Judaism, entitled *Tractatus fratris Nicolai de Lyra de Messia ejusque adventu, una cùm responsione ad Judæorum argumenta quatuordecim contra veritatem Evangeliorum*, which he finished in 1309. It is generally appended to his commentary, and is also given in the polemical work entitled the *Hebræomastix* of Hieronymus de Sancta-fide (Frankf. 1602, p. 148 sq.). For the different editions of De Lyra's works and translations into French and German, see Grässe, *Trésor des Livres rares et précieux*, s. v.; see also Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics* (ed. 1843), p. 175 sq.; Dr. Adam Clarke, *Sacred Lit.* s. v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* ii, s. v.

Lyre. See HARP.

Lysa'nias (Λυσανίας, a common Greek name) is mentioned by Luke, in chap. iii, 1, as tetrarch of Abilene, on the eastern slope of the anti-Lebanon, near Damascus, at the time when John the Baptist began his ministry, A.D. 25. See ABILA. It happens, however, that Josephus speaks of a prince named Lysanias who ruled over a territory in the neighborhood of Lebanon in the time of Antony and Cleopatra, and that he also mentions Abilene as associated with the name of a tetrarch Lysanias, while recounting events of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius. These circumstances have given to Strauss and others an opportunity for accusing the evangelist of confusion and error, but we shall see that this accusation rests on a groundless assumption.

(*a.*) What Josephus says of the Lysanias who was contemporary with Antony and Cleopatra (i. e. who lived sixty years before the time referred to by Luke) is, that he succeeded his father Ptolemy, the son of Mennæus, in the government of Chalcis, under Mt. Lebanon (*War*, i, 13, 1; *Ant.* xiv, 7, 4), and that he was put to death at the instance of Cleopatra (*Ant.* xv, 4, 1), who seems to have received a good part of his territory. It is to be observed that Abila is not specified here at all, and that Lysanias is not called tetrarch.

(*b.*) What Josephus says of Abila and the tetrarchy in the reigns of Caligula and Claudius (i. e. about twenty years after the time mentioned in Luke's Gospel) is, that the former emperor promised the "tetrarchy of Lysanias" to Agrippa (*Ant.* xviii, 6, 10), and that the latter actually gave to him "Abila of Lysanias" and the territory near Lebanon (*Ant.* xix, 5, 1; comp. *War*, ii, 12, 8).

Amid the obscurity which surrounds this name, several conjectures have been indulged in, which we will here notice.

1. According to Eusebius (whom others have followed, such as Bede and Adrichomius; see Corn. a Lapid. *in Luc.* iii, 1), Lysanias was a son of Herod the Great. This opinion (the untenableness of which is shown by Valesius, on Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 9, and by Scaliger, *Animadver. on Euseb. Chron.* p. 178) has no other foundation than the fact that the evangelist mentions Lysanias with Herod Antipas and Philip.

2. To the older commentators, such as Casaubon (*On Baronius, Ann.* xxxi, *Num.* 4), Scaliger (*loc. cit.*), and others (see Corn. a Lap. and Grotius, ad loc.), this difference of dates presented no difficulty. Allowing historical credit to Luke (on which subject see Dr. Mill, *Pantheistic Princip.* pt. ii, p. 16 sq.), no less than to Josephus, they at once concluded that two different princes of the same name, and possibly of the same family, were referred to by the two writers. (See also Kuinöl, *On Luke* iii, 1; Krebsius, *Observ.* p. 110–113; and Robinson, *Biblioth. Sacr.* v, 81).

3. This reasonable solution, however, was unsatisfactory to the restless critics of Germany. Strauss and others (whose names are mentioned by Bleek, *Synopt. Erkl.* i, 156, and Meyer, *Komment.* ii, 289) charge the evangelist with "a gross chronological error;" a charge which they found on the assumption that the Lysanias of Chalcis mentioned by Josephus is identical with the Lysanias of Abilene, whom Luke mentions. This assumption is supported by a hypothesis which is incapable of proof, namely, that Abilene, being contiguous to Chalcis, was united to the latter under the rule of Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy. It must, however, be borne in mind that Josephus nowhere speaks of Abilene in connection with this Lysanias; nor, indeed, does he mention it at all until many years after the notice by Luke. He calls Antony's victim simply ruler of Chalcis. Moreover, it is of importance to observe that the *tetrarchical* division of Palestine and neighboring districts was not made until after the death of Herod the Great; so that, in his haste to inculpate the evangelist, Strauss, in effect, attributes to the historian, whom he invidiously opposes to Luke as a better authority, an amount of inaccurate statement which, if true, would destroy all reliance on his history; for we have already seen that Josephus more than once speaks of a "tetrarchy of Lysanias," whereas there were no "tetrarchies" until some thirty years after the death of Ptolemy's son Lysanias. It is, therefore, a juster criticism to conclude (against Strauss, and with the earlier commentators) that in such passages as we have quoted above, wherein the historian speaks of "Abila of Lysanias" and "the tetrarchy of Lysanias," that a *later* Lysanias is certainly meant; and that Josephus is not only accurate himself, but a voucher also for the veracity of Luke. But there is yet stronger evidence to be found in Josephus of the untenableness of Strauss's objection and theory. In his *Jewish War* (ii, 12, 8) the historian tells us that the emperor Claudius "removed Agrippa [the second] from *Chalcis* [the kingdom, be it remembered, of Strauss's Lysanias] to a greater kingdom, giving him in addition *the kingdom of Lysanius*" (ἐκ δὲ τῆς Χαλκίδος Ἀγρίππαν εἰς μείζονα βασιλείαν μετατίθησι . . . προσέθηκε δὲ τήν τε Λυσανίου βασιλείαν). Ebrard exposes the absurdity of Strauss's argument by drawing from these words of Josephus the following conclusion—inevitable, indeed, on the terms of Strauss—that Agrippa was deprived of *Chalcis*, receiving in exchange a larger kingdom, *and also Chalcis!* (See Ebrard's *Gospel Hist.* [Clark], p. 145, 146) The effect of this *reductio ad absurdum* is well put by Dr. Lee (*Inspiration* [1st ed.], p. 394, note], "Hence, therefore, Josephus *does* make mention of a *later* Lysanias [on the denial of which Strauss has founded his assault on Luke], and, by doing so, fully corroborates the fact of the evangelist's intimate acquaintance with the tangled details of Jewish history in his day." Many eminent writers have expressly accepted Ebrard's conclusion, including Meyer (*loc. cit.*) and Bleek (*loc. cit.*). Patritius concludes an elaborate examination of the entire case with the discovery that "the later Lysanias, whom Luke mentions, was known to Josephus also, and that, so far from any difficulty accruing out of Josephus to the evangelist's chronology, as alleged by objectors to his veracity, the historian's statements rather confirm and strengthen it" (*De Evangeliis*, iii, 42, 25). It is interesting, also, to remark that, if the sacred writer gains illustration from the Jewish historian in this matter, he also repays him the favor, by helping to clear up what would otherwise be unintelligible in his statements; for instance, when Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 17, 4) mentions "Batanæa, with Trachonitis and Auranitis, *and a certain part* of what was called 'the house of Zenodorus,' as paying a certain tribute to Philip" (σύν τινι μέρει οἴκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου λεγομένου); and when it is remembered that "the house of Zenodorus" included other territory besides Abilene (comp. *Ant.* xv, 10, 3, with *War*, i, 20, 4), we cannot but admit the force of the opinion advanced by Grotius (as quoted by Dr. Hudson, *On the Antiq.* xvii, 11, 4), that

"when Josephus says *some part of the house or possession of Zenodorus* was allotted to Philip, he thereby declares that the larger part of it belonged to another. This other was Lysanias, whom Luke mentions" (see also Krebsius, *Observat.* p. 112).

4. It is not irrelevant to state that *other* writers besides Strauss and his party have held the identity of Luke's Lysanias with Josephus's son of Ptolemy, and have also believed that Josephus mentioned but one Lysanias. But (unlike Strauss) they resorted to a great shift rather than assail the veracity of the evangelist. Valesius (on Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 10), and, more recently, Paulus (*Comment.* ad loc.), suggested an alteration of Luke's text, either by an erasure of τετραρχοῦντος after Ἀβιληνῆς, or retaining the participle and making it agree with Φιλίππου as its subject (getting rid of Λυσανίου as a leading word by reducing it to a mere genitive of designation by its transposition with τῆς—q. d. τῆς Λυσανίου Ἀβιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος), as if Philip had been called by the evangelist "tetrarch of Ituræa, Trachonitis, and the Abilene of Lysanias." This expedient, however, of saving Luke's veracity by the mutilation of his words is untenable, not having any support from MS. authority.

5. Still others think it probable that the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus in the second instance is actually the prince referred to by Luke. Thus, instead of a contradiction, we obtain from the Jewish historian a confirmation of the evangelist; and the argument becomes very decisive if, as some think, Abilene is to be excluded from the territory mentioned in the story which has reference to Cleopatra.

In conclusion, it is worth adding, that in modern times a coin has been discovered bearing the inscription Λυσανίου τετράρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως, and Pococke also found an inscription on the remains of a Doric temple, called Nebi Abel, the ancient Abila, fifteen English miles from Damascus, which makes mention of *Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene.* Both the coin and the inscription refer to a period subsequent to the death of Herod (Pococke's *Description of the East*, II, i, 115, 116; and Sestini, *Lettere et Dissertationi numismatiche*, vi, 101, tab. 2, as quoted by Wiesceler, *Chronolog. Synops.* p. 183). Similarly, the geographer Ptolemy mentions an "Abila which bears the surname of Lysanias," Ἄβιλα ἐπικληθεῖσα Λυσανίου (v, 18). See Davidson's *Introduct. to N. T.* p. 218. See ABILENE.

Lyscznyski, CASIMIR, a martyr of philosophical atheism, descended from a noble family of Lithuania, was educated in the Jesuit college of Wilna, where he greatly distinguished himself by his talents, but from whence he was finally expelled on account of his singular religious views. He then commenced to study law, and in 1680 was appointed one of the judges of Brzeski, in Lithuania. He now turned his attention again to theology, and wrote, in the form of remarks on Alstedt's *Natural Theology*, a lengthy refutation of the proofs of the existence of God. He used in his arguments some incautious expressions, and on a journey to Warsaw he was arrested, Oct. 31, 1688, on the plea that, by denying the existence of God, the author of all law, Lyszczynski had become an outlaw. An ecclesiastical tribunal, presided over by the bishop of Livonia, was appointed to try his case. A former friend of Lyszczynski appeared as his accuser, and, after the incriminating books had been examined, he was sent before the diet to be punished. The states went again over the whole case. Brzeska repeated his charges, maintaining, among other things, that in using in his works the expression "ita non athei credimus," Lyszczynski had declared himself an atheist, and denied the existence of God by asserting that God did not create man, but that man invented God. Lyszczynski answered that he had intended his works as an examination of the proofs of the existence of God, mentioning the fundamental objections of unbelievers only as a preliminary argument, and that he meant to live and die in the communion of the Church in which he was brought up. His defence, however, was not deemed satisfactory, and the senate condemned him to suffer death at the stake. The royal verdict was that Lyszczynski's MSS. should be publicly burned by the executioner along with himself, and that the house in which he wrote his works should be torn down. The sentence was afterwards altered, and he was beheaded before being burned, March 31, 1689. See C. F. Ammon, *C. Lyszczynski, ein Beitrag z. Gesch. d. idealen Atheismus* (Götting. 1802); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 628. (J. N. P.)

Lyser (also LEISER or LEYSER), an eminent Lutheran theologian, was born at Winnenden, in Würtemberg, March 18, 1552, and was educated at the University of Tübingen. In 1573 he became pastor at Gellersdorf, in Austria, where he soon distinguished himself as a preacher. He often preached also in Vienna, and thus became acquainted with the emperor Maximilian II. He was made D.D. by the University of Tübingen July 16, 1576, being then under 25 years old. After remaining for two years at the court of the elector August of Saxony, he became pastor and professor at Wittenberg. After the adoption of the "Formula Concordiæ," he and J. Andrea devised a new organization for the university; he was also commissioned to revise the text of the Lutheran translation of the Bible, etc. After the death of the elector August in 1586, Calvinism began to regain the ascendency in Saxony, and Lyser left Wittenberg, generally regretted by the university and the community, to accept a call to Brunswick as coadjutor or vice-superintendent. He, however, returned to Wittenberg in 1592, and shortly after became preacher at the court of Dresden. Here he continued in the faithful discharge of his arduous duties, honored not only by the prince, but also by the emperor Rudolph. He died February 22, 1610. His principal works are a continuation of Chemnitz's *Harmonia IV Evangelistarum* (which was completed by John Gerhard), *Erläuterungen ü. drei Fragen* (1598), and a number of *Predigten*, particularly *Vier Landtags-predigten* (1605). See Polyc. Leyser III, *Officium pietatis, quod C. D. Polyc. Leysero debuit et persolvit pronepos* (Lpz. 1706); Gleich, *Annales ecclesiastici*; Adami, *Vit. theol.*; Spizel, *Templ. hon.*; Erdmanns, *Lebensbeschr. d. Wittenb. Theol.* etc.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* viii, 628 sq.

Lys'ias (Λυσίας, a common Greek name), the name of two men mentioned, one in the Apocrypha, and the other in the New Testament.

1. A Syrian "nobleman of the blood royal" whom Antiochus Epiphanes, when setting out for Persia, appointed guardian of his son, and regent of that part of his kingdom which extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt (1 Macc. iii, 32; 2 Macc. x, 11; compare Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 2; Appian, *De rebus Syr.* 46). Acting under the special orders of the king, Lysias collected a large force for the purpose of carrying on a war of extermination against the Jews. This army, under the command of the generals Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias, was surprised and put to flight by Judas Maccabæus near Emmaus (1 Macc. iii, 38–iv, 18; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 3, 4). In the following year, B.C. 165, Lysias himself invaded Judæa with a still larger army, and joined battle with Judas in the neighborhood of Bethsura. The Syrians were again defeated, and so decisively that Judas was able to accomplish his great purpose, the purification of the Temple, and the re-establishment of divine worship at Jerusalem (1 Macc. iv, 28–61; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 5–7). Lysias retired to Antioch, and, while preparing for a fresh campaign, the death of Epiphanes left him in virtual possession of the supreme power. Shortly afterwards (probably B.C. 163), with an army equal in number to the former two combined, with three hundred war-chariots and two-and-thirty elephants, and accompanied by the young king Antiochus Eupator, he again entered Judæa from the side of Idumæa. Having taken the fortified city of Bethsura, he advanced to Jerusalem and laid siege to the Temple. Meeting here with a stouter resistance than he had anticipated, and hearing

that Philip, a rival claimant to the guardianship of the king, was returning from Persia, he hastily concluded a peace with the Jews, and set out for Antioch. On reaching this city he found it in the possession of his rival. In the engagement which followed Philip was defeated and slain. Another and more formidable opponent, however, soon appeared in the person of Demetrius Soter, first cousin of the king, who, escaping from Rome, landed at Tripolis, and laid claim to the throne. The people rose in his favor, and Antiochus and Lysias were seized and put to death (1 Macc. vi–vii, 2; 2 Macc. xiii–xiv, 2; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 9, 10; Appian, *De rebus Syr.* 47).

In the second book of Maccabees an account is given at some length of an invasion of Judæa by Lysias, made *before* the final invasion, but *after* the death of Epiphanes (2 Macc. xi). It is scarcely possible to reconcile this with the more trustworthy narratives of the first book, and it is clear from 2 Macc. ix, 28–x, 10, that the writer is not following a strictly chronological order in this part of his history. Internal evidence seems to favor the opinion that this narrative has been compiled from separate and partial accounts of the two invasions referred to in 1 Macc. iv–vi, the writer too hastily inferring that they described the same event.—Kitto. "There is no sufficient ground for believing that the events recorded are different (Patritius, *De Consensu Macc.* § xxvii, xxxvii), for the mistake of date in 2 Macc. is one which might easily arise (compare Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* § lxvi; Grimm, on 2 Macc. xi, 1). The idea of Grotius that 2 Macc. xi and 2 Macc. xiii are duplicate records of the same event, in spite of Ewald's support (*Geschichte*, iv, 365, note), is scarcely tenable, and leaves half the difficulty unexplained."

2. Claudius Lysias, the chiliarch (χιλίαρχος, "chief captain") who commanded the Roman troops in Jerusalem during the latter part of the procuratorship of Felix, and by whom Paul was secured from the fury of the Jews, and sent under guard to the procurator Felix at Cæsarea (Acts xxi, 31-38; xxii, 24–30; xxiii, 17–30; xxiv, 7, 22). A.D. 55. Nothing more is known of him than what is stated in these passages. From his name, and from Acts xxii, 28, it may be inferred that he was a Greek who had become a Roman citizen. His proper rank appears to have been that of *military tribune*, and his note to his superior officer is an interesting specimen of Roman military correspondence (comp. Wernsdorf, *Cl. Lysiæ Oratio*, Helmst. 1743). See Paul.

Lysim'achus (Λυσίμαχος, a frequent Greek name), the name of two men mentioned in the Apocrypha.

1. "The son of Ptolemæus of Jerusalem," commonly supposed to be the translator into Greek of the Book of Esther (see the close of the Sept. version). The Apocryphal "rest of the Book of Esther," A.V., says, "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemæus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and Levite, and Ptolemæus his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemæus, that was at Jerusalem, had interpreted it" (xi, 1). There is, however, no reason to suppose that the translator was also the author of the additions made to the Hebrew text. See Esther, Apocryphal Additions to.

2. A brother of the Menelaus whom Antiochus appointed high-priest (B.C. cir. 171). Menelaus left him temporarily "in his stead in the priesthood," and encouraged him to commit many sacrileges. Thus he roused the indignation of the common people, who rose against him and killed him (2 Macc. iv, 29, 39). The Vulgate erroneously makes him the successor instead of the deputy of Menelaus.

Lysons, Daniel, an English divine and writer, eldest son of the Rev. Samuel Lysons, rector of Rodmarton, in Gloucestershire (1804–33), was educated at Gloucester and at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, at which university he attained the degree of M.A. in 1785. Later he filled the curacy of Putney. He died Jan. 3, 1834. He published a sermon or two, and a *History of the Origin and Progress of the Meeting of the three Choirs of Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford;* but his fame rests entirely upon his topographical works, which are excellent for their laborious research, accuracy of description, and useful record of matters which most probably would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. On this point consult the *English Cyclopædia*, s. v., and Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s. v.

Lys'tra (ἡ Λύστρα, Acts xiv, 6, 21; xvi, 1; τὰ Λύστρα, Acts xiv, 8; xvi, 2; 2 Tim. iii, 11), a city in Asia Minor, of much interest in the history of Paul and Timothy.

We are told in the 14th chapter of the Acts that Paul and Barnabas, driven by persecution from Iconium (ver. 2), proceeded to Lystra and its neighborhood, and there preached the Gospel. In the course of this service a remarkable miracle was worked in the healing of a lame man (ver. 8). This occurrence produced such an effect on the minds of the ignorant and superstitious people of the place that they supposed that the two gods, Mercury and Jupiter, who were said by the poets to have formerly visited this district in human form [see Lycaonia], had again bestowed on it the same favor, and consequently were proceeding to offer sacrifice to the strangers (ver. 13). The apostles rejected this worship with horror (ver. 14), and Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minds to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christian doctrine is not mentioned, but it is implied, inasmuch as a Church was founded at Lystra, which in post-apostolic times was so important as to send its bishops to the ecclesiastical councils (Hierocles, *Synecd.* p. 675). The adoration of the Lystrians was rapidly followed by a change of feeling. The persecuting Jews arrived from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (Acts xiv, 19). On his recovery, he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (ver. 20), but before long retraced his steps through Lystra (ver. 21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast. It is not absolutely stated that Paul was ever in Lystra again, but, from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (xviii, 23), it is almost certain that he was. See Paul.

It is evident from 2 Tim. iii, 10, 11, that Timothy was one of those who witnessed Paul's sufferings and courage on the above occasion; and it can hardly be doubted that his conversion to Christianity resulted partly from these circumstances, combined with the teaching of his Jewish mother and grandmother, Eunice and Lois (2 Tim. i, 5). Thus, when the apostle, accompanied by Silas, came, on his second missionary journey, to this place again (and here we should notice how accurately Derbe and Lystra are here mentioned in the inverse order), Timothy was already a Christian (Acts xvi, 1). Here he received circumcision, "because of the Jews in those parts" (ver. 3); and from this point began his connection with Paul's travels. We are doubly reminded here of Jewish residents in and near Lystra. Their first settlement, and the ancestors of Timothy among them, may very probably be traced to the establishment of Babylonian Jews in Phrygia by Antiochus three centuries before (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 4). Still it is evident that there was no influential Jewish population at Lystra: no mention is made of any synagogue, and the whole aspect of the scene described by Luke (Acts xiv) is thoroughly heathen. As to its condition in heathen times, it is worth while to notice that the words in Acts xiv, 13 (τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) would lead us to conclude that it was under the tutelage of Jupiter. Walch, in his *Spicilegium Antiquitatum Lystrensium* (*Dissert. in Acta Apostolorum*, Jena, 1766, vol. iii), thinks that in this passage a statue, not a temple, of the god is intended.

Pliny (v, 42) places Lystra in Galatia, and Ptolemy (v, 4, 12) in Isauria; but these statements are quite consistent with its being placed in Lycaonia by Luke, as it is by Hierocles (*Synecd.* p. 675). This

city was south of Iconium, but its precise site is uncertain, as well as that of Derbe, which is mentioned along with it. Col. Leake remarks that the sacred text appears to place it nearer to Derbe than to Iconium; for Paul, on leaving that city, proceeded first to Lystra, and thence to Derbe; and in like manner returned to Lystra, to Iconium, and to Antioch of Pisidia (see Walch, *Diss. in Act. Apost.* iii, 173 sq.). He also observes that this seems to agree with the arrangement of Ptolemy (v, 4, 12), who places Lystra in Isauria, and near Isaura, which seems evidently to have occupied some part of the valley of Sidy Shehr, or Bey Shehr. Under the Greek empire, Homonada, Isaura, and Lystra, as well as Derbe and Laranda, were all included in the consular province of Lycaonia, and were bishoprics of the metropolitan see of Iconium. Considering all the circumstances, Col. Leake inclines to think that the vestiges of Lystra may be sought with the greatest probability of success at or near *Wiran Khatûn*, or *Khatûn Serai*, about thirty miles to the south of Iconium. "Nothing," says this able geographer, "can more strongly show the little progress that has hitherto been made in a knowledge of the ancient geography of Asia Minor than that of the cities which the journey of St. Paul has made so interesting to us, the site of one only (Iconium) is yet certainly known" (*Tour and Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 102). Mr. Arundell supposes that, should the ruins of Lystra not be found at the place indicated by Col. Leake, they may possibly be found in the remains at *Karahissar*, near the lake Bey-shehr (*Discoveries in Asia Minor.*) Still more lately, Mr. Hamilton (*Researches in Asia Minor*, ii, 319) identifies its site with the ruins called *Bin-bir-Kilisseh* (the "Thousand and one churches"), at the base of a conical mountain of volcanic structure named the Karadagh (generally thought to be those of Derbe, but which, according to his arguments, must be sought elsewhere, perhaps at Divlè), as being more considerable (a bishop of Lystra sat in the Council of Chalcedon, according to Hierocles, *Synecd.* p. 675), and on the direct road from Iconium to Derbe. Another traveller ascended the mountain, and says, "On looking down I perceived churches on all sides of the mountain, scattered about in various positions. . . . Including those in the plain, there are about two dozen in tolerable preservation, and the remains of perhaps forty may be traced altogether" (Falkner in Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, i, 202). Comp. Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, ii, 189 sq.; Forbiger, *Handb.* ii, 322.

Lytle, David, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Presbyterian parentage, at Salem, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1826, was converted in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1847, joined the Church in 1848, was licensed to preach in 1854, and joined the Troy Conference. He successively preached at Granville, (1857) Argyle and North Greenwich, (1859) Whitehall, (1861) Mechanicsville, (1863) Third Street Church, Troy, (1865) Westport, (1867) North Chatham, and lastly at Rock City Falls, N. Y., where he died October 13, 1869. He "was possessed of a sound understanding, good judgment, and a kind and sympathizing nature. He was ardent and firm in his friendships, a kind husband and father, a faithful Christian, a good preacher, excelling as a pastor." During his second year at Argyle an epidemic broke out; but he continued at his post of duty, nursing the sick, and giving counsel and advice to the dying. See *Conf. Minutes*, 1870, p. 140.

Lyttleton, Charles, LL.D., an English divine, born at Hagley, Worcestershire, in 1714, was educated at Eton and at University College, Oxford; rector of Alvechurch, Worcester, in 1742; dean of Exeter in 1748; bishop of Carlisle in 1762, and president of the Society of Antiquaries in 1765. He died Dec. 22, 1768. He published one sermon (Lond. 1765, 4to), and left various interesting scientific works. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Lyttleton, George, Sir, an English peer and celebrated politician, who was born in Worcestershire in 1708–9, and educated at Eton and Christchurch, Oxford; entered Parliament in 1730, held several high political offices, was raised to the peerage in 1759, and died in 1773, is noted also as the author of *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul* (1747, 8vo, and often; last edit. 1854, 12mo), a work which elicited much praise for the able defence it furnishes for the truths of Christianity, or, as Leland (*Deistical Writers*, p. 156 sq.) says, constitutes of itself "a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." Another work of lord George Lyttleton of interest to us is his *Dialogues of the Dead* (1760). He had a son, Thomas, who died young, and who was as conspicuous for profligacy as his father for virtue. See Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, iii, 391–400; Phillimore, *Life of Lord Lyttleton*, (1845); *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1846 (June); *Monthly Review*, 1772 (April and May); 1774 (December); Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, ii, 1150.

M.

Ma'acah (Heb. *Maäkah'*, מַעֲכָה, *oppression*, Sept. Μααχά, but in Gen. xxii, 24, Μοχά; in 1 Chron. ii, 48; iii, 3, Μωχά; in 1 Chron. vii, 15, 16, Μοοχά; in 1 Chron. ix, 35, Μωχά; in 1 Chron. xi, 43, Μαχά; Vulg. *Maacha;* Auth. Vers. "Maacah" only 2 Sam. iii, 3; x, 6, 8), the name of a place and also of nine persons. See also Beth-maachah.

1. A city and region at the foot of Mount Hermon, not far from Geshur, a district of Syria (Josh. xiii, 13; 2 Sam. x, 6, 8; 1 Chron. xix, 7). Hence the adjacent portion of Syria is called Aram-Maacah, or Syria of Maachah ("Syria-Maachah," 1 Chron. xix, 6). It appears to have been situated at the southerly junction of Cœle-Syria and Damascene-Syria, being bounded by the kingdom of Rehob on the north, by that of Geshur on the south, and by the mountains on either side of the Upper Jordan, on the east and west. See Geshur. The little kingdom thus embraced the southern and eastern declivities of Hermon, and a portion of the rocky plateau of Ituræa (Porter's *Damascus*, i, 319; comp. *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 310). The Israelites seem to have considered this territory as included in their grant, but were never able to get possession of it (Josh. xiii, 13). In the time of David this petty principality had a king of its own, who contributed 1000 men to the grand alliance of the Syrian nations against the Jewish monarch (2 Sam. x, 6, 8). The lot of the half-tribe of Manasseh beyond the Jordan extended to this country, as had previously the dominion of Og, king of Bashan (Deut. iii, 14; Josh. xii, 5). The Gentile name is *Maacahthite* (מַעֲכָתִי, Sept. Μαχαθί, but Μααχαθί in 2 Sam. xxiii, 24, Μαχαθά in 1 Chron. iv, 19, Μιοχαθεί in Jer. xl, 8; Auth. Version "Maachathite," but "Maachathi" in Deut. iii, 14), which is also put for the people (Deut. iii, 14; Josh. xii, 5; xiii, 11, 13; 2 Kings xxv, 23). Near or within the ancient limits of the small state of Maacah was the town called for that reason Abel beth-maacah, perhaps its metropolis, which is represented by the modern *Abil el-Kamh*, situated on the west side of the valley and stream that descends from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh, and on a summit, with a large offset on the south. See Abel-beth-Maachah. Rosenmüller explains the name Maacah *to press, to press together*, which seems to denote a region inclosed and hemmed in by mountains, a land of valleys. The name of this region is Anglicized everywhere "Maachah" in the Auth. Vers., except in 2 Sam. iii, 3; x, 6, 8. Once (Josh. xiii, 13, second clause) it is

written in the original *Maacath* (Hebrew *Maäkath'*, מַעֲכָת, Sept. Μαχαθί, Vulg. *Machati*, Auth. Vers. "Maachathites"). The identification of the Chaldee version with the district of *Epicairus* (Ἐπίκαιρος), mentioned by Ptolemy (v, 16, 9) as lying between Callirrhoë and Livias, as also that of the Syriac (on 1 Chron.) with *Charan*, according to Rosenmüller (*Alterth.* I, ii) a tract in the district of the Ledja (Burckhardt, i, 350), is merely traditionary (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 118).

2. The last named of the four children of Nahor by his concubine Reumah, probably a son, although the sex is uncertain (Gen. xxii, 24). B.C. cir. 2040. Ewald arbitrarily connects the name with the district of Maachah in the Hermon range (*Gesch.* i, 414, note 1).

3. The sister of Hupham (Huppim) and Shupham (Shuppim), and consequently granddaughter of Benjamin; she married Machir, by whom she had two sons (1 Chron. vii, 15, 16). B.C. post. 1856. See GILEAD.

4. The second named of the concubines of Caleb (son of Hezron), by whom she had several children (1 Chron. ii, 48). B.C. ante 1658.

5. The wife of Jehiel and mother of Gibeon (1 Chron. viii, 29; ix, 35). B.C. cir. 1658.

6. A daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur; she became the wife of David, and mother of Absalom (2 Sam. iii, 3). B.C. 1053. In 1 Sam. xxvii, 8, we read of David's invading the land of the Geshurites, and the Jewish commentators (in Jerome, *ad Reg.*) allege that he then took the daughter of the king captive, and, in consequence of her great beauty, married her, after she had been made a proselyte according to the law in Deut. xxi. But this is a gross mistake, for the Geshur invaded by David was to the south of Judah, whereas the Geshur over which Talmai ruled was to the north, and was regarded as part of Syria (2 Sam. xv, 8). See GESHUR. The fact appears to be that David, having married the daughter of this king, contracted an alliance with him, in order to strengthen his interest against Ishbosheth in those parts. Josephus gives her name Μαχάμη (*Ant.* vii, 1, 4). See DAVID.

7. The father of Hanan, which latter was one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 43). B.C. ante 1046.

8. The father of Shephatiah, which latter was the military chief of the tribe of Simeon under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 16). B.C. ante 1014.

9. The father of Achish, which latter was the king of Gath, to whom Shimei went in search of his runaway servants, and thus forfeited his life by transcending the bounds prescribed by Solomon (1 Kings ii, 39). B.C. ante 1010. He appears to have been different from the Maoch of 1 Sam. xxvii, 2. See ACHISH.

10. A daughter of Abishalom, the wife of Rehoboam, and mother of Abijam (1 Kings xv, 2). B.C. 973–953. In verse 10 we read that Asa's "mother's name was Maachah, the daughter of Abishalom." It is evident that here "mother" is used in a loose sense, and means "grandmother," which the Maachah named in verse 2 must have been to the Asa of verse 10. It therefore appears to be a great error to make two persons of them, as is done by Calmet and others. The Abishalom who was the father of this Maachah is called Absalom in 2 Chron. xi, 20–22, and is generally supposed by the Jews to have been Absalom, the son of David; which seems not improbable, seeing that Rehoboam's two other wives were of his father's family (2 Chron. xi, 18). In 2 Chron. xiii, 2, she is called "Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah." But Josephus says that she was the daughter of Tamar, the daughter of Absalom (*Ant.* viii, 10, 1), and consequently his granddaughter. This seems not unlikely, and in that case this Tamar must have been the wife of Uriel. See ABIJAH. It would appear that Asa's own mother was dead before he began to reign; for Maachah bore the rank and state of queen-mother (resembling that of the sultaness Valide among the Turks), the powers of which she so much abused to the encouragement of idolatry, that Asa commenced his reforms by "removing her from being queen, because she had made an idol (lit. a *fright*) in a grove" (1 Kings xv, 10–13; 2 Chron. xv, 16).

Maacath. See MAACAH, 1.

Ma'ächah (Gen. xxii, 24; 1 Kings ii, 39; xv, 2, 10, 13; 1 Chron. ii, 48; iii, 2; vii, 15, 16; viii, 29; ix, 35; xi, 43; xix, 6, 7; xxvii, 16; 2 Chron. xi, 20, 21, 22; xv, 16). See MAACAH.

Maach'athi (Deut. iii, 14), **Maäch'athites** (Josh. xii, 5; xiii, 11, 13 [in the second occurrence it should be *Maacath*]; 2 Sam. xxiii, 34; 2 Kings xxv, 23; 1 Chron. iv, 19; Jer. xl, 8). See MAACAH, 1.

Ma'ädai (Heb. *Maädai'*, מַעֲדַי, *ornamental;* Sept. Μοοδία), one of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 34). B.C. 459.

Maädi'ah (Heb. *Maädyah'*, מַעַדְיָה, *ornament of Jehovah;* Septuag. Μααδίας, Vulg. *Madia*), one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 5); evidently the same with the MOADIAH (Heb. *Moädyah'*, מוֹעַדְיָה, *festival of Jehovah;* Sept. Μααδαί, Vulg. *Moadiu*), whose son Piltai is mentioned in verse 17 (where some connection with one Miniamin is obscurely noted); the true pointing being perhaps מִ֫עַדְיָה, *Moädyah'*, which will make both forms coincide. B.C. 536.

Ma'ai (Heb. *Maay'*, מָעַי, perhaps *compassionate;* Sept. has two names, Ἰαμά, Ἀΐα, the first syllable of the former being apparently taken from the last of the preceding name Gilalai; Vulg. *Maai*), one of the priests appointed to perform the music at the celebration of the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xii, 36). B.C. 446.

Maä'leh-acrab'bim (Heb. *Maäleh'-Akrabbim'*, מַעֲלֵה עַקְרַבִּים, the *ascent of* the *scorpions*, i. q. scorpion-hill; in Numb. xxxiv, 4, Septuag. *ἀνάβασις Ἀκραβείν*, Auth. Vers. "the ascent of Akrabbim;" in Josh. xv, 3, *προσανάβασις Ἀκραβίν*; in Judg. i, 36, *ἀνάβασις Ἀκραβίν*, "the going up to Akrabbim;" Vulg. everywhere *ascensus scorpionis*), a pass on the south-eastern border of Palestine. See AKRABBIM.

Maä'leh-adum'mim (Heb. *Maäleh'-Adummim'*, מַעֲלֵה אֲדֻמִּים, *ascent of Adummim;* Sept. *ἀνάβασις* [also *πρόσβασις* and *προσανάβασις*] Ἀδυμμίν, Vulg. *ascensio Adommim*, Auth. Vers. "the going up of Adummim"), a dangerous pass near Gilgal (Josh. xv, 7; xviii, 17). See ADUMMIM.

Maan, JOHN, a French historian and theologian, was born at Mans near the opening of the 17th century; was prebend of Tours in 1648; official and grand-vicar to the archbishop of Tours in 1651, and died about 1667. His works are *Antiqui Casus reservati in diœcesi Turonensi* (1648, 4to), written by order of the bishop of Tours:—*Sancta et Metropolitana Ecclesia Turonensis, sacrorum pontificum suorum ornata virtutibus*, etc. (1667). See Hœfer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ma'äni (Maavi v. r. Baavi), the ancestor of several who had married Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 34); evidently the BANI (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 38).

Ma'ärath (Heb. *Maärath'*, מַעֲרָת, *desolation;* Sept. Μααρώθ, Vulg. *Mareth*), a place in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anoth (Josh. xv, 59). De Saulcy suggests a place which he calls *Kharbet el-Merassas*, south-east of Jerusalem (*Narrative*, ii, 17); and Schwarz declares it is a village called *Magr*, west of Ekron (*Palest.* p. 107): both far from the indications of the text, which require a locality north of Hebron (Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.). It may be represented by the ruins marked as *Mersia* on Van de Velde's *Map* (1858), on the road from Hebron to Bethlehem, about half way between Bereikut and Solomon's Pools, at Urtas; but on the second edition of his *Map* (1865) this place disappears, and we have in the required re-

gion unappropriated only the ruins *Merîma*, on a little stream just north of Kufin, evidently the "ruined tower called Merrina, seen by him on the high ground south of wady Arub" (*Memoir*, p. 247).

Maäsei'ah (Heb. *Maäseyah'*, מַעֲשֵׂיָה, or [1 Chron. xv, 18, 20; xxiii, 1; 2 Chron. xxv, 11; xxviii, 7; xxxiv, 8; Jer. xxv, 4], *Maaseya'hu*, מַעֲשֵׂיָהוּ, the *work of Jehovah;* Sept. *Maasía*, with many slight various readings), the name of several men.

1. One of the Levites of the second class, appointed porters of the Temple under David (1 Chron. xv, 18), and also musicians "with psalteries upon Alamoth" (ver. 20). B.C. 1043.

2. The son of Adaiah, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiada associated with himself in restoring the young king Jehoash to the throne (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. 877.

3. A chieftain in the time of Uzziah, who had charge of the military in a subordinate rank (2 Chron. xxvi, 11). B.C. 808.

4. The "king's son," killed by Zichri, the Ephraimitish hero, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, king of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii, 7). The personage thus designated is twice mentioned in connection with the "governor of the city" (1 Kings xxii, 26; 2 Chron. xviii, 25), and appears to have held an office of importance at the Jewish court (perhaps acting as viceroy during the absence of the king), just as the queen dowager was honored with the title of "king's mother" (compare 2 Kings xxiv, 12 with Jer. xxix, 2), or *gebîrâh*, i. e. "mistress," or "powerful lady." See MALCHIAH. For the conjecture of Geiger, see JOASH, 4. Perhaps, however, the individual here referred to was literally one of the sons of Ahaz. B.C. cir. 738.

5. The "governor of the city," one of those sent by king Josiah to repair the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). B.C. 623. The date and rank render it not improbable that he was the Maaseiah (Heb. *Machseyah'*, מַחְסֵיָה, whose *refuge* is *Jehovah;* Sept. Μαασαίας v. r. Μασσαίας, etc.), the father of Neriah, and grandfather of Baruch and Seraiah, which latter were two persons of note to whom Jeremiah had recourse in his divine communications (Jer. xxxii, 12; li, 59): and in that case he is likewise probably identical with MELCHI, the son of Addi, and father of Neri, in Christ's maternal genealogy (Luke iii, 28).

6. The son of Shallum, apparently a priest, since he had a chamber in the Temple, and was one of its custodians (Jer. xxxv, 4). B.C. 606.

7. The father of the priest Zephaniah or Zedekiah, which latter was twice sent by the king with a message of inquiry to Jeremiah, and was denounced by the prophet for falsely encouraging the people (Jer. xxi, 1; xxxvii, 3; xxix, 21, 25). B.C. ante 589.

8. Son of Ithiel and father of Kolaiah, a Benjamite, one of whose descendants resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xi, 7). B.C. long ante 536.

9. One of the descendants of Judah who resided at Jerusalem after the captivity; he was the son of Baruch, and his genealogy is traced back to one Shiloni (Neh. xi, 5). B.C. 536. In the corresponding narrative of 1 Chron. ix, 5, apparently the same person is called ASAIAH.

10. One of the priests of the kindred of Jeshua, who agreed to divorce their Gentile wives after the captivity (Ezra x, 18). B.C. 459.

11. Another priest, one of the "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 21). B.C. 459. Perhaps it was he (apparently a priest) who formed one of the chorus that celebrated the completion of the new city walls (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

12. Still another priest, of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 459. Perhaps the same with one of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 41). B.C. 446.

13. An Israelite, of the "sons" of Pahath-moab, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian captivity (Ezra x, 30). B.C. 459.

14. The son of Ananiah, and father of Azariah, which last repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. iii, 23). B.C. ante 446.

15. One of the principal Israelites who stood on Ezra's right hand while he read and expounded the law to the people (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410. He is perhaps identical with one of the popular chiefs who joined in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 25). B.C. cir. 410.

16. One of the priests who assisted the Levites in expounding the law to the people as it was read by Ezra (Neh. viii, 7). B.C. cir. 410.

Maä'siai (Heb. *Masay'*, מַעֲשַׂי, or, as it probably should be pointed, *Maäsay'*, מַעֲשָׂי, *worker*, or perhaps contracted for *Maaseiah;* Sept. Μασαί v. r. Μαασαία; Vulg. *Maasai*), the son of Adiel, a descendant of Immer, and one of the priests resident at Jerusalem at or after the captivity (1 Chron. ix, 12). B.C. prob. 536.

Maäsi'as (Μαασαίας), the son of Sedecias and father of Baruch (Bar. i, 1); evidently the same as MAASEIAH (Jer. li, 59), 5 (q. v.).

Ma'äth (Μαάθ, of unknown, but prob. Heb. origin), a person named as the son of Mattathias and father of Nagge (Neariah), in Christ's maternal ancestry (Luke iii, 26); but, as no such name occurs in the pedigree in the O. T., and as it would here unduly extend the time of the lineage, we may reasonably conjecture this name has been accidentally interpolated from the *Matthat* of ver. 24. (See Dr. Barrett, in Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.)

Ma'äz (Heb. *Ma'äts*, מַעַץ, *wrath;* Sept. Μαάς), the first named of the three sons of Ram, the son of Jerahmeel, of the descendants of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 27). B.C. post 1658.

Maäzi'ah (Heb. *Maäzyah'*, מַעַזְיָה, Neh. x, 8, or *Maazya'hu*, מַעַזְיָהוּ, 1 Chron. xxiv, 18, *strength* [or perh. rather *consolation*, from the Arabic] *of Jehovah;* Sept. respectively Μααζία and Μααζάλ [v. r. Μασσαί]; Vulg. respectively *Maazia* and *Maazian*), the name of two priests.

1. The head of the last of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 18). B.C. 1014.

2. One of the priests who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 8). B.C. cir. 410. "From the coincidence between many of the names of the priests in the lists of the twenty-four courses established by David, of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. xii), it would seem either that these names were hereditary in families, or that they were applied to the families themselves. This is evidently the case with the names of the 'heads of the people' enumerated in Neh. x, 14–27."

Mab'daï (Μαβδαΐ), one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 34); evidently the BENAIAH (q. v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezra x, 35).

Mabillon, JEAN, a celebrated Benedictine preacher, and one of the most distinguished men of the 17th century, was born at St. Pierremont, in the diocese of Rheims, Nov. 23, 1632, studied at the college of Rheims, and joined the congregation of St. Maur in 1651. He began his literary career by assisting D'Achery in his labors upon his vast historic recueil entitled *Spicilegium*, and by an edition of the works of St. Bernard, "which attracted the notice of ecclesiastical scholars, and furnished a sure pledge of the value of his future labors" (Dowling). In 1668 he came forward with a part of his original production, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti* (completed in 1702), one of the greatest historical works

extant. He now became the general favorite of ecclesiastical students, and soon was brought to the notice also of his sovereign, Louis XIV, who sent him on literary missions, as the result of which we have from him *Museum Italicum* (1689), a kind of antiquarian itinerary of Italy. Besides descriptions of the towns and their attractions, it contains valuable dissertations on ecclesiastical history and palæography; also a very explicit commentary on the ritual of the various services, or liturgy, and rites of the Roman Church. (He had previously published *De Liturgia Gallicana libri tres* [1685], in which he compares the Gallican with the Mozarabic liturgy). Another work of great importance from the pen of Mabillon is the *Lettres et Écrits sur les Études Monastiques*, containing a curious controversy between the abbé De Rancé, the founder of the order of the *Trappists* (q. v.) and the *Benedictines*. De Rancé, in his ascetic enthusiasm, had forbidden his monks all scientific studies, and, indeed, all reading except the Breviary and a few monastic tracts. The rest of the clergy, both secular and regular, took the alarm, and Mabillon was requested to defend monastic studies and learning as perfectly compatible with piety and religious discipline, as the Benedictine order had fully proved. Mabillon promptly complied with the request, and published his *Traité* in 1691. It was received with great applause, and was at once translated into Latin and other languages. See RANCÉ for the reply. His fame spread rapidly, and he was recognised as one of the leading scholars of his day. In 1701 he was chosen member of the Academy of Inscriptions. In 1703 he came before the public with the first volume of his chef-d'œuvre, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*. Henceforth, until the day of his death (Dec. 27, 1707), Mabillon faithfully applied himself to the completion of this work, which all critics are agreed is "among the most important works which have been written on the history of the Church" (Dowling). It should certainly be found on the shelves of every real student of Church History. It commences with the year 480—that of the birth of St. Benedict—and goes down to 1157 (covering in all 6 vols. folio. Mabillon himself completed vols. i–iv, extending to 1066; Massuet completed vol. v [published in 1713], and Martene vol. vi [published in 1739]; for the different editions, see Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacrés*, xiv, 498). It contains an account of St. Benedict, discusses his rules, and everything in any way pertaining to the order. The work, besides including a somewhat complete history of the secular affairs of the times, contains a minute account of the doctrines, the ceremonies, the controversies of the Church age by age, with a statement of the writings of each individual whose life is depicted. Of the manner in which the work is done we will let Dowling (*Introd. to the Crit. Study of Eccles. History*, p. 144 sq.) speak. "His (Mabillon's) unbounded learning, and his penetrating and comprehensive mind, enabled him to discover new truths, and detect and expose inveterate errors. His amiable moderation and unaffected candor introduced into the discussion of ecclesiastical subjects a better tone and spirit. But this was not the full extent of the services which he rendered to Church History. The monastic habit could not restrain his mental independence, nor his religious peculiarities make him feel as a vulgar controversialist. He was the most prominent of a new race of scholars, who communicated to the whole subject a different character; who separated it from polemical theology, and assumed as a first principle that its subject-matter was not controversy, but facts. It was a new thing to see a congregation of monks taking a lead in a literary movement; but such was the case. The genius of Mabillon did much to purify and ennoble Church History. Excited by his example and precepts, the French Benedictines devoted themselves in an admirable spirit to the cultivation of ecclesiastical learning, and distinguished themselves in the republic of letters by the publication of a number of critical, philological, and antiquarian works connected with such studies, not more remarkable for their erudition than for their moderation and candor."

Mabillon, by the intended publication of a treatise, *De Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum*, came near being involved in a hot controversy with the authorities of his Church. The book, which aimed to point out some abuses concerning the worship of relics, was on the eve of anonymous publication when it was secured by the Congregation of the Index, and placed among the forbidden ones. He quietly submitted to the exceptions of the authorities, and prepared a new edition purged from the objectionable passages. In his new preface he says: "Hæc nova editio non temere nec proprio arbitrio a me facta est, sed ad Ejus nutum et imperium, penes quem residet summa præcipiendi auctoritas!" In return for his ready submission he was to be rewarded by the cardinal's hat, but the intended honor came too late to be of any service in Mabillon's terrestrial course. Mabillon wrote also *De Re Diplomaticâ libri sex, accedunt Commentarius de antiquis Regum Francorum Palatiis: Veterum Scripturarum varia Specimina*, etc., a work much esteemed. These and other later works were collected under the title *Ouvrages Posthumes de J. Mabillon et de Thierry Ruinart, Benedictines de la Congregation de St. Maur* (Paris, 1724, 3 vols. 4to). A complete list of all his works is given in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 635. See, besides the authorities already mentioned, Vieuville, *Bibl. historique d. Auteurs de la Congregation de S. Maur;* D. Tassin, *Hist. Littér. de la Cong. de S. Maur;* C. de Malan, *Hist. de Mabillon;* Valery, *Corresp. de Mabillon et de Montfaucon;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 437. (J. H. W.)

Mabon, JOHN SCOTT, an eminent educator of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1784; came to this country with his parents in 1796; graduated with high honors at Union College (1806), and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick (1812); was tutor in Union College 1814–15; rector of the grammar school of Rutgers College 1815–25; temporary professor of Hebrew in the theological seminary at New Brunswick 1818–19. From this time until his death he taught privately, the last fourteen years at Hackensack, N. J. Mr. Mabon was an exact scholar and a profound thinker, a rigid disciplinarian, and a skilful and enthusiastic instructor. His life was a battle with ill health and adversity. There was something truly heroic in his independent spirit, ever struggling for the mastery of unusual difficulties, and for the accomplishment of his life-work. His piety was chastened by almost continual trials. His religious life was one of profound convictions and broad and deep experience. Small of stature, with an intellectual head, and a frail, bent frame, courtly in his demeanor, and retiring in disposition, he was an old-fashioned Christian gentleman, and a teacher to whom many a minister of the Gospel and men of other professions still look up with veneration and thankfulness for their thorough training and ability. He died April 27, 1849. See Sprague's *Annals*, vol. ix; Corwin's *Manual; Personal Recollections of J. S. Mabon.* (W. J. R. T.)

Maboul, JACQUES, a French pulpit orator, born of a distinguished family in Paris in 1650, was a long time grand vicar of Poitiers, and from 1708 until his death in May, 1722, bishop of Alert. His works are *Oraisons funèbres* (1749, 12mo)—very eloquent:—*Mémoires* (on constitution *Unigenitus*) (1749, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Mac-, a frequent initial of Scotch and Irish names, being the Gælic for *son*. Those in which it is thus written in full are given below in order. For others, see under the abbreviated form M'- or Mc-.

Mac'alon (Μακάλων), a place whose natives to the number of 122 returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v, 21); evidently the MICHMASH (q. v.) of the Hebrew lists (Ezra ii, 27; Neh. vii, 31).

Macarius is the name of several distinguished

Christians of the early centuries. Among them the most important are,

1. Macarius Ægyptius, or, as he is sometimes surnamed, *the Great*, or the Elder, was born, according to Eusebius, in Upper Egypt, about the year 300. He was a disciple of St. Antonius (some say of St. Ephrem), and while yet a youth was distinguished for his asceticism, which won for him the surname of *παιδαριογέρων*. At the age of thirty he entered upon a life of asceticism, in the wilderness of Scete or Scetis, a part of the great Libyan desert, and there he remained until about 340, when he was ordained priest. He died about 390. Palladius relates several extraordinary miracles said to have been performed by this saint; among others, a resurrection which he accomplished for the purpose of confounding a heretic. During the persecution of the Egyptian monks by the Arian bishop Lucius of Alexandria, in the reign of Valens, Macarius was banished to an island of the Nile, but allowed to return afterwards. There is yet in Libya, according to Tischendorf (*Reise in d. Orient*), a convent which bears his name. He left 50 homilies (Greek edit. Morel, Paris, 1559; J. G. Pritius, Leipz. 1698), seven ascetic treatises, together with a number of apophthegmata (J. G. Pritius, Leipzig, 1699). Both these works have been translated into German by G. Arnold, under the title *Ein Denkmal d. alt. Christenthums* (Gosl. 1702), and by N. Casseder (Banb. 1819). H. J. Floss has published a very able criticism on them, together with several formerly unknown letters and fragments (Col. 1850). J. Hamberger gives a selection from them in his *Stimmen aus d. Heiligthum d. christl. Mystik u. Theosophie.*

2. Macarius of Alexandria, also called *πολιτικός*, *the townsman*, a contemporary of the preceding, was by trade a baker, but became subsequently a disciple of St. Antonius, having been baptized when about forty years of age. He also embraced an ascetic life, and became the spiritual adviser of over 5000 monks. Palladius relates a number of miracles said to have been wrought by him. He was likewise one of the victims of the persecution instituted by Valens, and died, according to Tillemont (*Mémoires*, viii, 626), in 394, but according to Fabricius (*Biblioth. Græca*, viii, 365), in 404, aged nearly a hundred years. He is said to have been the author of some regulations for monks contained in the *Codex regularum, collectus a sancto Benedicto Ananiensi, auctus a Holstenio* (Rome, 1661, 2 vols. 4to); and a homily, *περὶ ἐξόδου ψυχῆς δικαίων καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν* (J. Tollius, *Itinerar. Ital.* Traj. 1696; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i; Gallandi, vii), which latter, however, is by some ascribed to a monk called Alexander. Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* book ii, cent. iv, pt. ii, chap. iii) says of him and his work: "Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to Macarius, the Egyptian monk; from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a beautiful picture of real piety." He is commemorated by the Romish Church Jan. 12, and by the Greek Jan. 19. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* vol. ii, s. v.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vii, 709, 712.

3. Macarius of Antioch, a patriarch in the Church of Antioch in the 7th century, is noted for his avowal, at the third Constantinopolitan Council (A.D. 680–81), of his belief in the doctrine "that Christ's will was that of a God-man (*θεανδρικήν*)." See Monothelites. He and his followers (known as *Macarians*) were banished on this account. His *Travels* were written down by his attendant archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic, and were published in an English dress in 1829–37, in 2 vols. 4to. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* ii, 875 (4); Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv, 553.

4. Macarius of Ireland flourished about the close of the 9th century. He is said to have propagated in France the tenet, afterwards maintained by Averrhoes, that one individual intelligence or soul performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race.

5. Macarius of Jerusalem. There were two bishops by this name; one flourished in the 4th century, the other in the 6th. The former became bishop A.D. 313 or 314, and died in or before A.D. 333. He was present at the Council of Nice, and is said to have taken part in the disputations against the Arians. The latter was elected bishop A.D. 544, but the choice was disapproved by the emperor Justinian I, because he was accused of avowing the obnoxious opinions of Origen, and Eutychius was appointed instead. Macarius was, however, after a time, reinstalled (about A.D. 564), and died about 574. A homily of his, *De inventione Capitis Præcursoris*, is extant in MS. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 876.

Macassar, the most southern portion of Celebes, situated in lat. 4° 35′—5° 50′ S., and long. 119° 25′—120° 30′ E., and traversed by a lofty chain of mountains, formerly the greatest naval power among the Malay states, is divided into the Dutch possessions and Malay Proper; the latter, of little importance, is governed by a native king, who pays tribute to the Netherlanders. The Portuguese were the first Europeans to form a settlement in Macassar, but they were supplanted by the Dutch, who, after many contests with the natives, gradually attained to supreme power. In 1811 it fell into the hands of the British, who in 1814 defeated the king of Boni, and compelled him to give up the regalia of Macassar. In 1816 it was restored to the Dutch, and continues to enjoy a fair share of the mercantile prosperity of the Netherlands' possessions in the Eastern Archipelago.

The natives are among the most civilized and enterprising, but also the most greedy of the Malay race. See Malays. They carry on a considerable trade in tortoise-shell and edible nests, grow abundance of rice, and raise great numbers of horses, cattle, sheep, and goats; fishing is also one of the principal employments. They are chiefly adherents to Mohammedanism, which secured its hold in the Malay Archipelago in the 14th century, and to this day continues to proselyte the Macassars for the religion of the Crescent. For the difficulties in the way towards Christianizing the Malayan race, see Malay Archipelago.

Macaulay, Aulay, an English divine, was born near the opening of the 18th century, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. He was minister of the church and parish of Cardross, Dumbartonshire, and died in 1797. He published a sermon on the *Peculiar Advantages of Sunday Schools* (1792, 8vo); also other sermons. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* 1816 (June), p. 535 sq.

Macaulay, Zachary, F.R.S., an English philanthropist, of Scottish descent, born in 1768, father of the historian, a merchant, fought forty years with William Wilberforce in promotion of the British anti-slavery movement. He died May 13, 1838. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* (March, 1838, p. 323; Dec. 1838, p. 678); Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Macauley, Thomas, D.D., LL.D., a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in 1777, and was educated at Union College, where he afterwards filled a professor's chair. He subsequently entered the ministry, and died May 11, 1862, while pastor of the Murray Street Church in New York City.

Macbride, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A., an eminent English Oriental scholar and author, was born in Norfolk, England, in 1788, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he became a fellow. He was in 1813 appointed principal of Magdalen Hall, and nominated to the readership in Arabic, and kept these positions until his death in 1868. His principal works are, *Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels* (used in Oxford University):—*Mohammedanism:—Lectures on the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland* (1853):—*Lectures on the Epistles* (1858). See *New Am. Cyclop.* Annual for 1868, p. 445.

Mac'cabee (Maccabæ'us), a title (usually in the plural *οἱ Μακκαβαῖοι*, "the Maccabees"), which was

originally the surname of Judas, one of the sons of Mattathias (see below, § iii), but was afterwards extended to the heroic family of which he was one of the noblest representatives, and in a still wider sense to the Palestinian martyrs in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes [see 4 MACCABEES], and even to the Alexandrine Jews who suffered for their faith at an earlier time. See 3 MACCABEES. In the following account of the Maccabæan family and revolution we shall endeavor to fill up this interesting interval of inspiration.

I. *The Name.*—The original term *Maccabee* (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος) has been variously derived. Some have maintained that it was derived from the banner of the tribe of Dan, which contained the last letters of the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Others imagine that it was formed from the combination of the initial letters of the Hebrew sentence, "Who among the gods is like unto thee, Jehovah?" (Exod. xv, 11; Hebrew מִי כָמֹכָה בָּאֵלִם יְהוָה), which is supposed to have been inscribed upon the banner of the patriots; or, again, of the initials of the simply descriptive title, "Mattathias, a priest, the son of Johanan." But, even if the custom of forming such words was in use among the Jews at this early time, it is obvious that such a title would not be an individual title in the first instance, as Maccabee undoubtedly was (1 Macc. ii, 4), and still remains among the Jews (Raphall, *Hist. of the Jews*, i, 249). Moreover, the orthography of the word in Greek and Syriac (Ewald, *Geschichte*, iv, 352, note) points to the form מקבי, and not מכבי. Another derivation has been proposed, which, although direct evidence is wanting, seems satisfactory. According to this, the word is formed from מַקָּבָה, "a hammer" (like *Malachi*, Ewald, iv, 353, n.), giving a sense not altogether unlike that in which Charles *Martel* derived a surname from his favorite weapon, and still more like the *Malleus Scotorum* and *Malleus Hæreticorum* of the Middle Ages.

Although the name *Maccabees* has gained the widest currency, that of *Asmonæans*, or *Hasmonæans*, is the proper name of the family. The origin of this name also has been disputed; but the obvious derivation from Chashmon (חַשְׁמָן, Ἀσαμωναῖος; comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 534 *b*), great-grandfather of Mattathias, seems certainly correct. How it came to pass that a man, otherwise obscure, gave his name to the family, cannot now be discovered; but no stress can be laid upon this difficulty, nor upon the fact that in Jewish prayers (Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Jud.* i, 264) Mattathias himself is called *Hashmonai*. In Psa. lxviii, 32 we meet with a word חַשְׁמַנִּם, to the supposed singular of which, חַשְׁמָן, the name in question is commonly referred. In this case it might have been given to the priest of the course of Joarib to signify that he was a wealthy or a powerful person. In Josh. xv, 27 we find a town in the tribe of Judah called חַשְׁמוֹן, from which this name might equally be derived. Herzfeld's proposed derivation from חסם, "to temper steel," is fanciful and groundless. The word in the first instance appears more like a family than a personal name. The later Hebrew form is חשמונאי. See Zipser, *Benennung der Makkabäer* (in the *Ben-Chananjah*, 1860). See ASMONÆAN.

II. *Pedigree.*—The connection of the various members of the Maccabæan family will be seen from the table given below.

III. *History of the War of Independence, involving that*

THE ASMONÆAN FAMILY.


Chasmon ("of the sons of Joarib," comp. 1 Chron. xxiv, 7).
Johanan (Ἰωάννης).
Simeon (Συμεών, Simon. Comp. 2 Pet. i, 1).
Mattathias (Matthias, Joseph. *War*, i, 1, 3), † B.C. 167.
Johanan (Johannes) (Gaddis) ("Joseph" in 2 Macc. viii, 22), † B.C. 161.
Simon (Thassi), † B.C. 135.
Judas (Maccabæus), † B.C. 161.
Eleazar (Avaran), † B.C. 163.
Jonathan (Apphus), † B.C. 143.
Judas † B.C. 135.
Johannes Hyrcanus I, † B.C. 106.
Mattathias, † B.C. 135.
Daughter *to* Ptolemæus (1 Macc. xvi, 11, 12).
Salome (Alexandra) *to* Aristobulus I, † B.C. 105.
Antigonus, † B.C. 105.
Jannæus Alexander *to* Alexandra, † B.C. 78.
Son.
Son.
Hyrcanus II, † B.C. 30.
Aristobulus II, † B.C. 49.
Alexandra *to* Alexander, † B.C. 28.
† B.C. 49.
Antigonus, † B.C. 37.
Mariamne *to* Herod the Great, † B.C. 29.
Aristobulus, † B.C. 35.

of the Individuals of the Family.—1. The first of this family who attained distinction was the aged priest MATTATHIAS, who dwelt at Modin, a city west of Jerusalem and near the sea, of which the site has yet been but partly identified by modern research. He was the son of John, the son of Simon, the son of Asamonæus, as Josephus tells us, and was himself the father of five sons—John, otherwise called Gaddis; Simon, called Thassi; Judas, called Maccabæus; Eleazar, called Avaran; and Jonathan, surnamed Apphus. Ewald remarks that Simon and John were favorite names in this family. After the expulsion of Antiochus Epiphanes from Egypt by the Romans, that monarch proceeded to vent his rage and indignation on the Jews. B.C. 168. See ANTIOCHUS. He massacred vast numbers of them in Jerusalem on the Sabbath, took the women captives, and built a fortress on Mount Zion, which he used as a central position for harassing the people around. He ordered one Athenæus to instruct the inhabitants of Judæa and Samaria in the rites of the Grecian religion, with a view to abolishing all vestiges of the Jewish worship. Having succeeded in bringing the Samaritans to renounce their religion, he further went to Jerusalem, where he prohibited the observance of all Jewish ceremonies, obliged the people to eat swine's flesh and profane the Sabbath, and forbade circumcision. The Temple was

dedicated to Olympian Jove, and his altar erected upon the altar of burnt-offering, which the first book of Maccabees, apparently quoting Daniel, calls the setting up of the abomination of desolation. When, therefore, Apelles, the king's officer (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 6, 2), came to Modin to put in force the royal edict against the national religion, he made splendid offers to Mattathias if he would comply. The old man, however, not only refused, but publicly declared his determination to live and die in the religion of his fathers; and when a certain Jew came forward openly to sacrifice in obedience to the edict, he slew him upon the altar. He slew, moreover, the king's commissioner, and destroyed the altar. Then, offering himself as a rallying-point for all who were zealous for the law, he fled to the mountains. Many others, with their wives and children, followed his example, and fled. They were pursued, however, by the officers of Antiochus, and, refusing even to defend themselves on the Sabbath day, were slain to the number of 1000. On this occasion the greatness of Mattathias displayed itself in the wise counsel he gave his companions and countrymen, which passed subsequently into the ordinary custom, that they should not forbear to fight upon the Sabbath day in so far as to defend themselves. While in this position, he was joined by the more austere of the two parties which had sprung up among the Jews after the return from the captivity, viz. the Assidæans, i. e. the Hasidim, or pious [see CHASIDIM]; and the Puritans, who subsequently became the Pharisees. They not only observed the written law, but superadded the constitutions and traditions of the elders, and other rigorous observances. The other party were called the Tsaddikim, or righteous, who contented themselves with that only which was written in the Mosaic law. Thus strengthened, Mattathias and his comrades carried on a sort of guerrilla warfare, and exerted themselves as far as possible to maintain and enforce the observance of the national religion. Feeling, however, that his advancing age rendered him unfit for a life so arduous, while it warned him of his approaching end, he gathered his sons together like the patriarchs of old, exhorted them to valor in a speech of great piety and faithfulness, and having recommended Simon to the office of counsellor or father, and Judas to that of captain and leader, died in the year 166, and was buried in the sepulchre of his fathers at Modin. The speech which he is said to have addressed to his sons before his death is remarkable as containing the first distinct allusion to the contents of Daniel, a book which seems to have exercised the most powerful influence on the Maccabæan conflict (1 Macc. ii, 60; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 6, 3).

2. Mattathias himself named JUDAS, apparently his third son, as his successor in directing the war of independence (1 Macc. ii, 66). The energy and skill of "THE MACCABEE" (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος), as Judas is often called in 2 Macc., fully justified his father's preference. It appears that he had already taken a prominent part in the first secession to the mountains (2 Macc. v, 27, where Mattathias is not mentioned), and on receiving the chief command he devoted himself to the task of combining for common action those who were still faithful to the religion of their fathers (2 Macc. viii, 1). His first enterprises were night-attacks and sudden surprises, which were best suited to the troops at his disposal (2 Macc. viii, 6, 7), and, when his men were encouraged by these means, he ventured on more important operations, and met Apollonius (1 Macc. iii, 10–12), the king's general, who had gathered a large army at Samaria, of which place he was governor, in the open field. He totally defeated his army, and slew him. He then divided the spoils, and took the sword of Apollonius for a trophy, which he used all his life afterwards in battle. Exasperated at the defeat of Apollonius, Seron (1 Macc. iii, 13–24), who was general of the army of Cœle-Syria, got together a force, partly composed of Jews, and came against Judas as far as Bethhoron, where he pitched his camp. This place, which had been rendered memorable many centuries before as the site of Joshua's great victory over the allied forces of the Canaanites, was destined now to witness a victory scarcely less glorious, wrought by a small band of Jews, spent and hungry, against the disciplined troops of Syria. Seron was completely overthrown, and his army scattered. Antiochus, though greatly enraged at this dishonor to his arms, was nevertheless compelled, by the condition of his treasury, to undertake an expedition to Armenia and Persia, with a view to recruiting his exhausted finances (1 Macc. iii, 27–31). He therefore left Lysias, one of his highest lieutenants, to take charge of his kingdom, from the River Euphrates to the confines of Egypt, and having intrusted his son Antiochus to his care, and enjoined Lysias to conquer Judæa and destroy the nation of the Jews, he went into Persia. The success of Judas called for immediate attention. The governor of Jerusalem was urgent in his entreaties for assistance; Lysias therefore sent an army of 20,000 men, under the command of Nicanor and Gorgias, into Judæa. It was followed by another of the same number, with an addition of 7000 horse, under Ptolemy Macron, the son of Dorymenes, as commander-in-chief. The united forces encamped in the plains of Emmaus. To oppose this formidable host Judas could only muster 6000 men at Mizpeh. Here, as Samuel had done a thousand years before at a like period of national calamity, he fasted and prayed, and, in compliance with the Mosaic injunction, advised those who were newly married, or had built houses, and the like, to return to their homes. This reduced his number to one half. The heroic spirit of Judas, however, rose against every difficulty, and he marched towards Emmaus. B.C. 166. Having heard that Gorgias had been dispatched with a force of 6000 men to surprise him in the passes by night, he instantly resolved to attack the enemies' camp. He rushed upon them unexpectedly, and completely routed them; so that when Gorgias returned, baffled and weary, he was dismayed at finding his camp in flames. In the brief struggle which ensued the Jews were victorious, and took much spoil. The year following, Lysias gathered together an army of 60,000 chosen men, with 5000 horse, went up in person to the hill-country of Judæa, and pitched his camp at a place called Bethsura, the Bethzur of the Old Test. Here Judas met him with 10,000 men, attacked his vanguard, and slew 5000 of them, whereupon Lysias retreated with the remainder of his army to Antioch. After this series of triumphs Judas proceeded to Jerusalem. There he found the sanctuary desolate, shrubs growing in the courts of it, and the chambers of the priests thrown down; so he set to work at once to purify the holy places and restore the worship of God (1 Macc. iv, 36, 41–53) on the 25th of Kislev, exactly three years after its profanation (1 Macc. i, 59; Grimm on 1 Macc. iv, 59). In commemoration of this cleansing of the Temple, the Jews afterwards kept for eight days annually a festival which was called Lights, and was known as the Feast of Dedication (John x, 22). See DEDICATION, FEAST OF. Judas, having strongly fortified the citadel of Mount Zion, and placed a garrison at Bethsura, made an expedition into Idumæa. The Syrians meanwhile, frustrated in their efforts against Judæa, turned their attention to Galilee and the provinces beyond Jordan. A large army from Tyre and Ptolemais attacked the north, and Timotheus laid waste Gilead, whereupon Judas determined to divide his army into three. He himself, with Jonathan, led 8000 men across the Jordan into Gilead; his brother Simon he sent with 3000 into Galilee; and the rest he left behind, under the command of Joseph, the son of Zacharias, and Azarias, for the protection of Judæa, with strict injunctions to act only on the defensive. These orders, however, they imprudently violated by an attack upon the sea-port Jamnia, where they met with a signal repulse. But the Maccabees in Gilead and Galilee were triumphant as usual, and added to their renown.

Antiochus Epiphanes, meanwhile, had died in his Persian expedition, B.C. 164, and Lysias immediately pro-

claimed his son, Antiochus Eupator, king, the true heir, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus, being a hostage at Rome. One of the first acts of Lysias was directed against the Jews. He assembled an enormous army of 100,000 men and 32 elephants, and proceeded to invest Bethsura. The city defended itself gallantly. Judas marched from Jerusalem to relieve it, and slew about 5000 of the Syrians. It was upon this occasion that his brother Eleazar sacrificed himself by rushing under an elephant which he supposed carried the young king, and stabbing it in the belly, so that it fell upon him. The Jews, however, were compelled to retreat to Jerusalem, whereupon Bethsura surrendered, and the royal army advanced to besiege the capital. Here the siege was resisted with vigor, but the defenders of the city suffered from straitness of provisions, because of its being the sabbatical year. They would therefore have had to surrender; but Lysias was recalled to Antioch by reports of an insurrection under Philip, who, at the death of Antiochus, had been appointed guardian of the young king. He was consequently glad to make proposals of peace, which were as readily accepted by the Jews. He had no sooner, however, effected an entrance into the city than he violated his engagements by destroying the fortifications, and immediately set out with all haste for the north. There Demetrius Soter, the lawful heir to the Syrian throne, encountered him, and, after a struggle, Antiochus and Lysias were slain, leaving Demetrius in undisputed possession of the kingdom.

Menelaus, the high-priest at this time, had purchased his elevation to that rank by selling the sacred vessels of the Temple. Hoping to serve his own ends, he joined himself to the army of Lysias, but was slain by command of Antiochus. Onias, the son of the high-priest whom Menelaus had supplanted, fled into Egypt, and Alcimus or Jacimus, not of the high-priestly family, was raised to the dignity of high-priest. By taking this man under his protection, Demetrius hoped to weaken the power of the Jews. He dispatched Bacchides with Alcimus to Jerusalem, with orders to slay the Maccabees and their followers. Jerusalem yielded to one who came with the authority of the high-priest, but Alcimus murdered sixty of the elders as soon as he got them into his power. Bacchides also committed sundry atrocities in other parts. No sooner, however, had he left Judæa than Maccabæus again rose against Alcimus, and drove him to Antioch, where he endeavored as far as possible to injure Judas with the king. Upon this Demetrius sent Nicanor with a large army to reinstate Alcimus, and when he came to Jerusalem, which was still held by the Syrians, he endeavored to get Judas into his power by stratagem, but the plot being discovered, he was compelled to meet him in the field. They joined battle at Capharsalama, and Nicanor lost about 5000 men; the rest fled to the stronghold of Zion. Here he revenged himself with great cruelty, and threatened yet further barbarities unless Judas was delivered up. As the people refused to betray their champion, Nicanor was again compelled to fight. He pitched his camp ominously enough in Bethhoron; his troops were completely routed, and he himself slain. The next act of Judas was to make an alliance with the Romans, who entered into it eagerly; but no sooner was it contracted than the king made one more determined effort for the subjugation of Palestine, sending Alcimus and Bacchides, with all the flower of his army, to a place called Berea or Bethzetho, apparently near Jerusalem. The Roman alliance seems to have alienated many of the extreme Jewish party from Judas (*Midr. Hhanuka*, quoted by Raphall, *Hist. of Jews*, i, 325). Moreover, the terror inspired by this host was such that Judas found himself deserted by all but 800 followers, who would fain have dissuaded him from encountering the enemy. His reply was worthy of him: "If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honor." He fought with such valor that the right wing, commanded by Bacchides, was repulsed and driven to a hill called Azotus or Aza, but the left wing doubled upon the pursuers from behind, so that they were shut in, as it were, between two armies. The battle lasted from morning till night. Judas was killed, and his followers, overborne by numbers, were dispersed. His brothers Jonathan and Simon received his body by a treaty from the enemy, and buried it in the sepulchre of his fathers at Modin, B.C. 161. Thus fell the greatest of the Maccabees, a hero worthy of being ranked with the noblest of his country, and conspicuous among all, in any age or clime, who have drawn the sword of liberty in defence of their dearest and most sacred rights.

3. After the death of Judas the patriotic party seems to have been for a short time wholly disorganized, and it was only by the pressure of unparalleled sufferings that they were driven to renew the conflict. For this purpose they offered the command to JONATHAN, surnamed Apphus (חפוּשׁ, *the wary*), the youngest son of Mattathias. The policy of Jonathan shows the greatness of the loss involved in his brother's death. He was glad to seek safety from Bacchides among the pools and marshes of the Jordan (1 Macc. ix, 42), whither he was pursued by him. At the same time, also, his brother John was killed by a neighboring Arab tribe. Jonathan took occasion to revenge his brother's death upon a marriage-party, for which he lay in wait, and then repulsed an attack of Bacchides, and slew a thousand of his men. At this point Alcimus died, and Bacchides, after fortifying the strong towns of Judæa, returned to Antioch; but upon Jonathan again emerging from his hiding-place, Bacchides came back with a formidable army, and was for some time exposed to the desultory attacks of Jonathan, till weary of this mode of fighting, or for other reasons, he thought it fit to conclude a peace with him, and returned to his master. B.C. 158. The Maccabee was thus left in possession of Judæa (1 Macc. ix, 73), and had not long afterwards an opportunity offered him of consolidating his position; for there sprung up one Alexander Balas, who was believed to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and laid claim to the throne of Syria. Demetrius and Alexander mutually competed for the alliance of Jonathan, but Alexander was successful, having offered him the high-priesthood, and sent him a purple robe and a golden crown—the insignia of royalty—and promised him exemption from tribute as well as other advantages. Jonathan thereupon assumed the high-priesthood, and became the friend of Alexander, who forthwith met Demetrius in the field, slew him, usurped his crown, and allied himself (B.C. 150) in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt. Jonathan was invited to the wedding, and was made much of at court. In return, he attacked and defeated Apollonius, the general of Demetrius Nicator, who aspired to his father's throne, besieged Joppa, captured Azotus, and destroyed the temple of Dagon. The prosperity, however, of Alexander was of short duration, for Ptolemy, being jealous of his power, marched with a large army against him, and after putting him to flight, seized his crown, and gave his wife to Demetrius. On the other hand, the overthrow of Alexander was speedily followed by the death of Ptolemy, and Demetrius was left in possession of the throne of Syria. Jonathan, meanwhile, besieged Jerusalem, and, leaving it invested, repaired to Antioch. Demetrius not only welcomed, but entered into a treaty with him, upon terms that greatly augmented the power of the Maccabee. After this Demetrius disbanded the greater part of his army and lessened their pay, which being a course contrary to that pursued by former kings of Syria, who kept up large standing armies in time of peace, created great dissatisfaction, so that upon the occasion of Jonathan writing to him to withdraw his soldiers from the strongholds of Judæa, he not only complied, but was glad to ask for the assistance of 3000 men, who were forthwith sent to Antioch. Here they rendered him signal service in rescuing him from an insurrection of his own citizens which his behavior to them had

aroused. His friendship for Jonathan, however, was soon at an end, and, contrary to his promises, he threatened to make war upon him unless he paid the tribute which previous kings had exacted. This menace might have been carried out had not a formidable antagonist at home arisen in the person of Trypho, who had formerly been an officer of Alexander Balas, and had espoused the cause of his young son Antiochus Theos. This man attacked Demetrius, defeated him in battle, captured his city, drove him into exile, and placed his crown on the head of Antiochus, B.C. 144. One of the first acts of the new king was to ingratiate himself with Jonathan; he therefore confirmed him in the high-priesthood, and appointed him governor over Judæa and its provinces, besides showing him other marks of favor. His brother Simon he appointed to be general over the king's forces from what was called the Ladder of Tyre, viz., a mountain lying on the sea-coast between Tyre and Ptolemais, even to the borders of Egypt. Jonathan, in return, rendered good service to Antiochus, and twice defeated the armies of Demetrius. He then proceeded to establish his own power by renewing the treaty with Rome, entering into one also with Lacedæmon, and strengthening the fortifications in Judæa. He was destined, however, to fall by treachery, for Trypho, having persuaded him to dismiss a large army he had assembled to support Antiochus, decoyed him into the city of Ptolemais, and then took him prisoner. The Jews immediately raised Simon to the command, and paid a large sum to ransom Jonathan. Trypho, however, took the money, but, instead of releasing Jonathan, put him to death, and then, thinking that the main hinderance to his own ambitious designs was removed, caused Antiochus to be treated in the same manner. Thus fell the third of the illustrious Maccabæan race, who distinguished himself nobly in the defence of his country, B.C. 143. When Simon heard of his brother's death he fetched his bones from Bascama, where he had been buried, and had them interred at Modin. Here he erected to his memory a famous monument of a great height, built of white marble, elaborately wrought, near which he placed seven pyramids, for his father and mother and their five sons, the whole being surrounded with a stately portico. For many years afterwards this monument served the purpose of a beacon for sailors, and it was standing in the time of Eusebius. See MODIN.

4. The last remaining brother of the Maccabee family was thus SIMON, surnamed "Thassi" (*Θασσί, Θασσίς*; the meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Macc. ii] thinks that it represents the Chaldee חֲדַשַּׁי). As above related, when he heard of the detention of Jonathan in Ptolemais by Trypho, he placed himself at the head of the patriot party, who were already beginning to despond, and effectually opposed the progress of the Syrians. His skill in war had been proved in the lifetime of Judas (1 Macc. v, 17–23), and he had taken an active share in the campaigns of Jonathan, when he was intrusted with a distinct command (1 Macc. xi, 59). He was soon enabled to consummate the object for which his family had fought gloriously, but in vain. When Trypho, after having put Jonathan to death, murdered Antiochus, and seized the throne, Simon made overtures to Demetrius II (B.C. 143) against Trypho. He was consequently confirmed in his position of sovereign high-priest. He then turned his attention to establishing the internal peace and security of his kingdom. He fortified Bethsura, Jamnia, Joppa, and Gaza, and garrisoned them with Jewish soldiers. The Lacedæmonians sent him a flattering embassy, desiring to renew their treaty; to Rome also he sent a shield of gold of immense value, and ratified his league with that nation. See SPARTAN. He moreover took the citadel of Jerusalem by siege, which up to this time had always been occupied by the Syrian faction; and, besides pulling it down, even levelled the hill on which it was built, with immense labor, that so the Temple might not be exposed to attacks from it. Under the wise government of this member of the Asmonæan family Judæa seems to have attained the greatest height of prosperity and freedom she had known for centuries, or even knew afterwards. The writer of the first book of the Maccabees evidently rejoices to remember and record it. "The ancient men," he says, "sat all in the streets communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to fray them" (xiv, 9, 11, 12). This time of quiet repose Simon employed in administering justice and restoring the operation of the law. He also beautified the sanctuary, and refurnished it with sacred vessels.

In the mean time Demetrius had been taken prisoner in an expedition against the Parthians, whereupon his brother Antiochus Sidetes immediately endeavored to overthrow the usurper Trypho. Availing himself of a defection in his troops, he besieged him in Dora, a town upon the sea-coast a little south of Mount Carmel. Simon sent him 2000 chosen men, with arms and money, but Antiochus was not satisfied with this assistance while he remembered the independence of Palestine. He therefore refused to receive them, and, moreover, dispatched Athenobius to demand the restoration of Joppa, Gaza, and the fortress of Jerusalem, or else the payment of a thousand talents of silver; but when the legate saw the magnificence of the high-priest's palace at Jerusalem he was astonished, and as Simon deliberately refused to comply with the terms of the king's message, and offered by way of compensation only a hundred talents for the places in dispute, Athenobius was obliged to return disappointed and enraged. Trypho meanwhile escaped from Dora by ship to Orthosia, a maritime town in Phœnicia, and Antiochus, having deputed Cendebæus to invade Judæa, pursued him in person. The king's armies proceeded to Jamnia, and, having seized Cedron and fortified it, Cendebæus made use of that place as a centre from which to annoy the surrounding country. Simon at this time was too old to engage actively in the defence of his native land, and therefore appointed his two eldest sons, Judas and John Hyrcanus, to succeed him in the command of the forces. They forthwith set themselves at the head of 20,000 men, and marched from Modin to meet the king's general: they utterly discomfited and scattered his host, drove him to Cedron, and thence to Azotus, which they set on fire, and afterwards returned in triumph to Jerusalem. But destruction threatened their house from nearer home; for Ptolemy, the son of Abubus, who had married a daughter of Simon, and was governor in the district of Jericho, with plenty of money at his command, aspired to reduce the country under his dominion, and took occasion, upon a visit that Simon paid to that neighborhood, to invite him and two of his sons, with their followers, to a banquet, and then slew them (1 Macc. xvi, 11–16). John alone, whose forces were at Gaza, now survived to carry on the line of the Maccabees, and sustain their glory, B.C. 135. He likewise had been included in the treacherous designs of Ptolemy, but found means to elude them. With the death of Simon the narrative of the first book of the Maccabees concludes.

5. We trace now the fortunes of the next member of the family, JOHN HYRCANUS. Having been unanimously proclaimed high-priest and ruler at Jerusalem, his first step was to march against Jericho, and avenge the death of his father and brothers. Ptolemy held there in his power the mother of Hyrcanus and her surviving sons, and, shutting himself up in a fortress near to Jericho—which Josephus calls Dagon, and Ewald Dôk—he exposed them upon the wall, scourged and tormented them, and threatened to throw them down headlong unless Hyrcanus would desist from the siege. This had the effect of paralyzing the efforts of Hyrcanus, and, in spite of his heroic mother's entreaties to prosecute it with vigor, and disregard her sufferings, caused him to

protract it till the approach of the sabbatical year obliged him to raise the siege. Ptolemy, after killing the mother and brethren of Hyrcanus, fled to Philadelphia ("Rabbath, of the children of Ammon"), which is the last we hear of him. It is not easy to see why Milman calls this reason of the sabbatical year, which is the one assigned by Josephus, "improbable." Ewald assigns the approach of that year as a reason for the flight of Ptolemy to Zeno, the tyrant of Philadelphia, because it had already raised the price of provisions, so that it became impossible for him to remain. Antiochus meanwhile, alarmed at the energy displayed by John, invaded Judæa, burning up and desolating the country on his march, and at last besieging him in Jerusalem. He compassed the city with seven encampments and a double ditch, and Hyrcanus was reduced to the last extremities. On the recurrence, however, of the Feast of Tabernacles, Antiochus granted a truce for a week, and supplied the besieged with sacrifices for the occasion, and ended with conceding a peace, on condition that the Jews surrendered their arms, paid tribute for Joppa and other towns, and gave him 500 talents of silver and hostages. On this occasion Josephus says that Hyrcanus opened the sepulchre of David, and took out of it 3000 talents, which he used for his present needs and the payment of foreign mercenaries. This story is utterly discredited by Prideaux, passed over in silence by Milman, but apparently believed by Ewald. Some time afterwards, having made a league with Antiochus, he marched with him on an expedition to Parthia, to deliver Demetrius Nicator, the king's captive brother. This expedition proved fatal to Antiochus, who was killed in battle. Demetrius, however, made his escape, and succeeded him on the throne of Syria, whereupon Hyrcanus availed himself of the opportunity to shake off the Syrian yoke, and establish the independence of Judæa, which was maintained till the time of the subjugation by the Romans. He took two towns beyond the Jordan, Samega and Medaba, as well as the city of Sichem, and destroyed the hated Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, which for 200 years had been an object of abhorrence to the Jews. He then turned his arms towards Idumæa, where he captured the towns of Dora (Ewald spells it Adora) and Marissa, and forced the rite of circumcision on the Idumæans, who ever afterwards retained it. He proceeded further to strengthen himself by renewing a treaty, offensive and defensive, with the Romans. Demetrius, meanwhile, had little enjoyment of his kingdom. He was unacceptable to the army, who besought Ptolemy Physcon to send them a sovereign of the family of Seleucus, and he accordingly chose for them Alexander Zebina, a pretended son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius was beaten in the fight which ensued between them, and subsequently slain; whereupon Alexander took the kingdom and made a league with Hyrcanus. He found a rival, however, in the person of Antiochus Grypus, the son of Demetrius, who defeated and slew him. The struggle which now took place between the brothers Grypus and Cyzicenus, rivals for the throne, only tended to consolidate the power of Hyrcanus, who quietly enjoyed his independence and amassed great wealth. He likewise made an expedition to Samaria, and reduced the place to great distress by siege. His sons Antigonus and Aristobulus were appointed to conduct it; and when Antiochus Cyzicenus came to the relief of the Samaritans, he was defeated and put to flight by Aristobulus. Cyzicenus, however, returned with a re-enforcement of 6000 Egyptians, and ravaged the country, thinking to compel Hyrcanus to raise the siege. The attempt was unsuccessful, and he retired, leaving the prosecution of the Jewish war to two of his officers. They likewise failed, and, after a year, Samaria fell into the hands of Hyrcanus, who entirely demolished it, and, having dug trenches on the site, flooded it with water. After this, Hyrcanus, who himself belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, was exposed to some indignity from one of their party during a banquet, which exasperated him so far that he openly renounced them, and joined himself to the opposite faction of the Sadducees. This occurrence, however, does not seem to have prevented him from passing the remainder of his days happily. He built the palace or castle of Baris on a rock within the fortifications of the Temple. Here the princes of his line held their court. It was identical with what Herod afterwards called Antonia. There is some confusion as to the length of his reign. It probably lasted about thirty years. He left five sons. With him terminates the upper house of the Asmonæans or Maccabees, B.C. 107.

6. Aristobulus succeeded his father as high-priest and supreme governor. He was the first, also, after the captivity, who openly assumed the title of king. He threw his mother, who claimed the throne, into prison, and starved her to death. Three of his brothers, also, he held in bonds. Antigonus, the other one, by whose help he subdued Ituræa or Auranitis, a district at the foot of the Anti-Libanus, was killed by treachery; and, after a year of misery and crime, Aristobulus died. His wife, Salome or Alexandra, immediately released his brethren, and Alexander Jannæus was made king. One of his brothers, who showed signs of ambition, he slew, the other one he left alone. His first military act was the siege of Ptolemais, which was in the hands of the Syrians. The inhabitants sought help from Ptolemy Lathyrus, who governed Cyprus, but fearing the army of 30,000 men he brought with him, declined to open their gates to him, whereupon he attacked Gaza and Dora. Alexander pretended to treat with him for the surrender of these places, and at the same time sent to Cleopatra, the widow of Physcon, for a large army to drive him from Palestine. He detected the duplicity of this conduct, and took ample vengeance on Alexander by ravaging the country. He also defeated him with the loss of 30,000 men. Judæa was saved by a large army from Cleopatra, commanded by Chelcias and Ananias, two Jews of Alexandria. They pursued Ptolemy into Cœle-Syria, and besieged Ptolemais, which was reduced. Alexander next invaded the country beyond Jordan. Here, also, he was defeated, but not thereby discouraged from attacking Gaza, which, after some fruitless attempts, he captured and totally destroyed. His worst enemies, however, were the Pharisees, who had great influence with the people, and a sedition arose during the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the troops slew 6000 of the mob. He again invaded the trans-Jordanic country, and was again defeated. The Jews rose in rebellion, and for some years the land suffered the horrors of civil war. The rebels applied for aid to Demetrius Euchærus, brother of Ptolemy Lathyrus, and king of Damascus, who completely routed Alexander. A sudden change of fortune, however, put him at the head of 60,000 men, and he marched in triumph to Jerusalem, where he took signal vengeance on his subjects. The rest of his life was peaceful. After a reign of twenty-seven years he died, B.C. 79, solemnly charging his wife Alexandra to espouse the Pharisaic party if she wished to retain her kingdom. His eldest son, Hyrcanus II, became high-priest. Aristobulus, the younger son, espoused the opposite party to his mother. In order to employ his active mind, the queen sent him northwards to check the operations of Ptolemy, king of Chalcis. He got possession of Damascus, and won the affections of the army. After a reign of nine years his mother died, B.C. 70, and Aristobulus forthwith marched towards Jerusalem. Hyrcanus and the Pharisees seized his wife and children as hostages, and met his army at Jericho, but were discomfited, and Aristobulus entered Jerusalem and besieged his brother in the tower of Baris. At length they agreed that Hyrcanus should retire to a private station, and that Aristobulus should be king. This was a fatal blow to the Pharisees. But there was a worse enemy waiting for the conqueror. This was none other than Antipater, the Idumæan, who

had been made general of all Idumæa by Alexander Jannæus. He was wealthy, active, and seditious, and possessed, moreover, of great influence with the deposed Hyrcanus. Suspicious of the power, successes, and designs of Aristobulus, he persuaded his brother Hyrcanus to fly to Petra, to Aretas, king of Arabia, and with his help an army of 50,000 men was marched against Aristobulus. The Jews were defeated, and the usurper fled to Jerusalem, where he was closely besieged by Aretas, Antipater, and Hyrcanus. Here, however, deliverance was at length brought by Scaurus, the general of Pompey, who, having come to Damascus, and finding that the city had been taken by Metellus and Lollius, himself proceeded hastily into Judæa. His assistance was eagerly sought by both parties. Aristobulus offered him 400 talents, and Hyrcanus the same; but as the former was in possession of the treasure, Scaurus thought that his promises were the most likely to be fulfilled, and consequently made an agreement with Aristobulus, raised the siege, and ordered Aretas to depart. He then returned to Damascus; whereupon Aristobulus gathered an army, defeated Aretas and Hyrcanus, and slew 6000 of the enemy, together with Phalion, the brother of Antipater. Shortly after Pompey himself came to Damascus, when both the brothers eagerly solicited his protection. Antipater represented the cause of Hyrcanus. Pompey, however, who was intent on the subjugation of Petra, dismissed the messengers of both, and on his return from Arabia marched directly into Judæa. Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem, but, finding the city too distracted to make good its defence, offered to surrender. Gabinius was sent forward to take possession; meanwhile the soldiery had resolved to resist, and when he came he was surprised to find that the gates were shut and the walls manned. Pompey, enraged at this apparent treachery, threw Aristobulus into chains, and advanced to Jerusalem. The fortress of the Temple was impregnable except on the north, and, notwithstanding his engines, Pompey was unable to reduce it for three months; neither could he have done so then had it not been for the Jewish scruples about observing the Sabbath. The Romans soon found that they could prosecute their operations on that day without disturbance, and after a time the battering-rams knocked down one of the towers, and the soldiers effected an entrance (midsummer, B.C. 63) on the anniversary of the capture of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. Great was the astonishment of Pompey at finding the Holy of Holies empty, without an image or a statue. The wealth he found in the building he magnanimously left untouched; Hyrcanus he reinstated in the high-priesthood; the country he laid under tribute; the walls he demolished; Aristobulus and his family he carried captives to Rome. Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, on the journey made his escape, and, raising a considerable force, garrisoned Machærus, Hyrcania, and the stronghold of Alexandrion. Gabinius, however, subdued him, but had no sooner done so than Aristobulus likewise escaped from Rome, and intrenched himself in Alexandrion. He was taken prisoner, and sent in chains to Rome. At the entreaty of his wife, who had always espoused the Roman cause, Antigonus his son was released, but he remained a prisoner. Alexander, with 80,000 men, once more tried his strength with the Romans on the field of battle, but was put to flight. He was subsequently executed by Metellus Scipio at Antioch, B.C. 49. Thus Hyrcanus retained the sovereignty, but Antipater enjoyed the real power; he contrived to ingratiate himself with Cæsar, who made him a Roman citizen and procurator of all Judæa. He began to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and made his eldest son, Phasael, governor of that city; and his younger son, Herod, governor of Galilee. The latter soon began to distinguish himself against the banditti that invested the hills. He carefully contrived also to make friends with the Roman governor of Syria, as a step to his own aggrandizement. His riches enabled him to do this by means of enormous bribes. He found, however, a troublesome enemy in Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, who allied himself with the Parthians, and for a time held Jerusalem and kept Herod in check. At Masada, also, a city on the west coast of the Dead Sea, Antigonus was nearly successful, until Herod at last compelled him to raise the siege. He afterwards suffered a defeat by Herod, and was finally vanquished by the Roman general Sosius, who, in derision, called him by the female name Antigona, and sent him in chains to Antony, by whom, at the request of Herod, he was put to death, B.C. 37. Thus fell the last of the Maccabees, who seemed to inherit something of their ancient spirit. Hyrcanus, who, before this, had been incapacitated for the priesthood by having his ears cut off, was subsequently, B.C. 30, in his eightieth year, put to death by Herod. The latter, meanwhile, by Augustus and Antony, was made king of Judæa, and consolidated his throne by his marriage with Mariamne, a woman of incomparable beauty, the daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, by Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II, and therefore granddaughter to both brothers. In her the race of the Asmonæans came to an end, and by her marriage passed into the Idumæan line of the Herodians.

7. Two of the first generation of the Maccabæan family still remain to be mentioned. These, though they did not attain to the leadership of their countrymen like their brothers, shared their fate—Eleazar, by a noble act of self-devotion; John, apparently the eldest brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was complete, and probably history offers no parallel to the undaunted courage with which such a band dared to face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The Maccabees inspired a subject-people with independence; they found a few personal followers, and they left a nation.

III. *National Effects of the Maccabæan Revolution.*—1. The great outlines of the Maccabæan contest, which are somewhat hidden in the annals thus briefly epitomized, admit of being traced with fair distinctness, though many points must always remain obscure from our ignorance of the numbers and distribution of the Jewish population, and of the general condition of the people at the time. The disputed succession to the Syrian throne (B.C. 153) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two great periods. During the first period (B.C. 168–153) the patriots maintained their cause with varying success against the whole strength of Syria; during the second (B.C. 153–139) they were courted by rival factions, and their independence was acknowledged from time to time, though pledges given in times of danger were often broken when the danger was over. The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrilla bands, issuing from "the mountains" or "the wilderness" to make sudden forays on the neighboring towns. This was the first aspect of the war (2 Macc. vii, 1–7; comp. 1 Macc. ii, 45); and the scene of the early exploits of Judas was the hill-country to the north-east of Jerusalem, from which he drove the invading armies at the famous battle-fields of Beth-horon and Emmaus (Nicopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem closed the first act of the war (B.C. 165); and after this Judas made rapid attacks on every side—in Idumæa, Ammon, Gilead, Galilee—but he made no permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Bethsura was fortified as a defence of Jerusalem on the south; but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the influence of his name extended more widely (1 Macc. vii, 50, ἡ γῆ Ἰούδα). On the death of Judas the patriots were reduced to as great distress as at their first rising; and, as Bacchides held the keys of the "mountains of Ephraim" (ix, 50), they were forced to find a refuge in the lowlands of Jericho, and, after some slight

successes, Jonathan was allowed to settle at Michmash undisturbed, though the whole country remained absolutely under the sovereignty of Syria. So far it seemed that little had been gained when the contest between Alexander Balas and Demetrius I opened a new period (B.C. 153). Jonathan was empowered to raise troops: the Jewish hostages were restored, many of the fortresses were abandoned, and apparently a definite district was assigned to the government of the high-priest. The former unfruitful conflicts at length produced their full harvest. The defeat at Eleasa, like the Swiss St. Jacob, had shown the worth of men who could face all odds, and no price seemed too great to secure their aid. When the Jewish leaders had once obtained legitimate power they proved able to maintain it, though their general success was checkered by some reverses. The solid power of the national party was seen by the slight effect which was produced by the treacherous murder of Jonathan. Simon was able at once to occupy his place and carry out his plans. The Syrian garrison was withdrawn from Jerusalem, Joppa was occupied as a sea-port, and "four governments" (*τέσσαρες νομοί*, xi, 57; xiii, 37)—probably the central parts of the old kingdom of Judah, with three districts taken from Samaria (x, 38, 39), were subjected to the sovereign authority of the high-priest.

2. The war, thus brought to a noble issue, if less famous, is not less glorious than any of those in which a few brave men have successfully maintained the cause of freedom or religion against overpowering might. The answer of Judas to those who counselled retreat (1 Macc. ix, 10) was as true-hearted as that of Leonidas; and the exploits of his followers will bear favorable comparison with those of the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans. It would be easy to point out parallels in Maccabæan history to the noblest traits of patriots and martyrs in other countries; but it may be enough here to claim for the contest the attention which it rarely receives. It seems, indeed, as if the indifference of classical writers were perpetuated in our own days, though there is no struggle—not even the wars of Joshua or David—which is more profoundly interesting to the Christian student; for it is not only in their victory over external difficulties that the heroism of the Maccabees is conspicuous: their real success was as much imperilled by internal divisions as by foreign force. They had to contend on the one hand against open and subtle attempts to introduce Greek customs, and on the other against an extreme Pharisaic party, which is seen from time to time opposing their counsels (1 Macc. vii, 12–18). It was from Judas and those whom he inspired that the old faith received its last development and final impress before the coming of our Lord.

3. For that view of the Maccabæan war which regards it only as a civil and not as a religious conflict is essentially one-sided. If there were no other evidence than the book of Daniel—whatever opinion be held as to the date of it—that alone would show how deeply the noblest hopes of the theocracy were centred in the success of the struggle. When the feelings of the nation were thus again turned with fresh power to their ancient faith, we might expect that there would be a new creative epoch in the national literature; or, if the form of Hebrew composition was already fixed by sacred types, a prophet or psalmist would express the thoughts of the new age after the models of old time. Yet, in part at least, the leaders of Maccabæan times felt that they were separated by a real chasm from the times of the kingdom or of the exile. If they looked for a prophet in the future, they acknowledged that the spirit of prophecy was not among them. The volume of the prophetic writings was completed, and, as far as appears, no one ventured to imitate its contents. But the Hagiographa, though they were already long fixed as a definite collection [see CANON], were equally far removed from imitation. The apocalyptic visions of Daniel [see DANIEL] served as a pattern for the visions incorporated in the book of Enoch [see ENOCH, BOOK OF]; and it has been commonly supposed that the Psalter contains compositions of the Maccabæan date. This supposition, which is at variance with the best evidence that can be obtained on the history of the Canon, can only be received upon the clearest internal proof; and it may well be questioned whether the hypothesis is not as much at variance with sound interpretation as with the history of the Canon. The extreme forms of the hypothesis, as that of Hitzig, who represents Psa. i, ii, xliv, lx, and all the last three books of the Psalms (Psa. lxxiii–cl) as Maccabæan (Grimm, 1 *Macc. Einleit.* § 9, 3), or of Just. Olshausen (quoted by Ewald, *Jahrb.* 1853, p. 250 sq.), who is inclined to bring the whole Psalter, with very few exceptions, to that date, need only be mentioned as indicating the kind of conjecture which finds currency on such a subject. The real controversy is confined to a much narrower field; and the psalms which have been referred with the greatest show of reason to the Maccabæan age are Psa. xliv, lx, lxxiv, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxiii. It has been argued that all these speak of the dangers to which the house and people of God were exposed from heathen enemies, at a period later than the captivity; and the one ground for referring them to the time of the Maccabees is the general coincidence which they present with some features of the Greek oppression. But, if it were admitted that the psalms in question are of a later date than the captivity, it by no means follows that they are Maccabæan. On the contrary, they do not contain the slightest trace of those internal divisions of the people which were the most marked features of the Maccabæan struggle. The dangers then were as much from within as from without; and party jealousies brought the divine cause to the greatest peril (Ewald, *Psalmen*, p. 355). It is incredible that a series of Maccabæan psalms should contain no allusion to a system of enforced idolatry, or to a temporizing priesthood, or to a faithless multitude. While the obscurity which hangs over the history of the Persian supremacy from the time of Nehemiah to the invasion of Alexander makes it impossible to fix with any precision a date to which the psalms can be referred, the one glimpse which is given of the state of Jerusalem in the interval (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 7) is such as to show that they may well have found some sufficient occasion in the wars and disorders which attended the decline of the Persian power (comp. Ewald). It may, however, be doubted whether the arguments for a post-Babylonian date are conclusive. There is nothing in the psalms themselves which may not apply to the circumstances which attended the overthrow of the kingdom; and it seems incredible that the desolation of the Temple should have given occasion to no hymns of pious sorrow.

4. The collection of the so-called *Psalms of Solomon* furnishes a strong confirmation of the belief that all the canonical Psalms are earlier than the Maccabæan æra. This collection, which bears the clearest traces of unity of authorship, is, almost beyond question, a true Maccabæan work. There is every reason to believe (Ewald, *Geschichte*, iv, 343) that the book was originally composed in Hebrew; and it presents exactly those characteristics which are wanting in the other (conjectural) Maccabæan Psalms. "The holy ones" (*οἱ ὅσιοι*, חסידים [see ASSIDÆANS]; *οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον*) appear throughout as a distinct class, struggling against hypocrites and men-pleasers, who make the observance of the law subservient to their own interests (Psa. Sol. iv, xiii–xv). The sanctuary is polluted by the abominations of professing servants of God before it is polluted by the heathen (Psa. Sol. i, 8; ii, 1 sq.; viii, 8 sq.; xvii, 15 sq.). National unfaithfulness is the cause of national punishment; and the end of trial is the "justification" of God (Psa. Sol. ii, 16; iii, 3; iv, 9; viii, 7 sq.; ix). On the other hand, there is a holiness of works set up in some passages which violates the divine mean of Scripture (Psa. Sol. i, 2, 3; iii, 9); and, while the language

is full of echoes of the Old Testament, it is impossible not to *feel* that it wants something which we find in all the canonical writings. The historical allusions in the Psalms of Solomon are as unequivocal as the description which they give of the state of the Jewish nation. An enemy "threw down the strong walls of Jerusalem," and "Gentiles went up to the altar" (Psa. Sol. ii, 1–3; comp. 1 Macc. i, 31). In his pride "he wrought all things in Jerusalem, as the Gentiles in their cities do for their gods" (Psa. Sol. xvii, 16). "Those who loved the assemblies of the saints (*συναγωγὰς ὁσίων*), wandered (lege *ἐπλανῶντο*) in deserts" (Psa. Sol. xxvii, 19; comp. 1 Macc. i, 54; ii, 28); and there "was no one in the midst of Jerusalem who did mercy and truth" (Psa. Sol. xvii, 17; comp. 1 Macc. i, 38). One psalm (viii) appears to refer to a somewhat later period. The people wrought wickedly, and God sent upon them a spirit of error. He brought one "from the extremity of the earth" (viii, 16; compare 1 Macc. vii, 1—"Demetrius from Rome"). "The princes of the land met him with joy" (1 Macc. vii, 5–8); and he entered the land in safety (1 Macc. vii, 9–12—Bacchides, his general), "as a father in peace" (1 Macc. vii, 15). Then "he slew the princes and every one wise in counsel" (1 Macc. vii, 16), and "poured out the blood of those who dwelt in Jerusalem" (1 Macc. vii, 17). The purport of these evils, as a retributive and purifying judgment, leads to the most remarkable feature of the Psalms, the distinct expression of Messianic hopes. In this respect they offer a direct contrast to the books of Maccabees (1 Macc. xiv, 41). The sorrow and the triumph are seen together in their spiritual aspect, and the expectation of "an anointed Lord" (*χριστὸς Κύριος*, Psa. Sol. xvii, 36 [xviii, 8]; comp. Luke ii, 11) follows directly after the description of the impious assaults of Gentile enemies (Psa. Sol. xvii; comp. Dan. xi, 45; xii). "Blessed," it is said, "are they who are born in those days, to see the good things which the Lord shall do for the generation to come. [When men are brought] beneath the rod of correction of an anointed Lord (*or* the Lord's anointed, *ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ Κυρίου*) in the fear of his God, in wisdom of spirit, and of righteousness, and of might" . . . . then there shall be a "good generation in the fear of God, in the days of mercy" (Psa. Sol. xviii, 6–10).

5. Elsewhere there is little which marks the distinguishing religious character of the æra. The notice of the Maccabæan heroes in the book of Daniel is much more general and brief than the corresponding notice of their great adversary, but it is not, on that account, less important as illustrating the relation of the famous chapter to the simple history of the period which it embraces. Nowhere is it more evident that facts are shadowed forth by the prophet only in their typical bearing on the development of God's kingdom. In this aspect the passage itself (Dan. xi, 29–35) will supersede in a great measure the necessity of a detailed comment: "*At the time appointed* [in the spring of B.C. 168] *he* [Antiochus Epiph.] *shall return and come toward the south* [Egypt]; *but it shall not be as the first time, so also the last time* [though his first attempts shall be successful, in the end he shall fail]. *For the ships of Chittim* [the Romans] *shall come against him, and he shall be cast down, and return, and be very wroth against the holy covenant; and he shall do* [his will]; *yea, he shall return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant* (compare Dan. viii, 24, 25). *And forces from him* [at his bidding] *shall stand* [remain in Judæa as garrisons; comp. 1 Macc. i, 33, 34]; *and they shall pollute the sanctuary, the stronghold, and shall take away the daily* [sacrifice]; *and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate* [1 Macc. i, 45–47]. *And such as do wickedly against* (or rather *such as condemn*) *the covenant shall be corrupt* [to apostasy] *by smooth words; but the people that know their God shall be strong and do* [exploits]. *And they that understand* [know God and his law] *among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil* [some] *days* (1 Macc. i, 60–64). *Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help* (1 Macc. i, 28; 2 Macc. v, 27; Judas Macc. with nine others . . .); *and many shall cleave to them* [the faithful followers of the law] *with hypocrisy* [dreading the prowess of Judas: 1 Macc. ii, 46, and yet ready to fall away at the first opportunity, 1 Macc. vii, 6]. *And some of them of understanding shall fall, to make trial among them, and to purge and to make them white, unto the time of the end; because* [the end is] *yet for a time appointed.*" From this point the prophet describes in detail the godlessness of the great oppressor (ver. 36–39), and then his last fortunes and death (ver. 40–45), but says nothing of the triumph of the Maccabees or of the restoration of the Temple, which preceded the last event by some months. This omission is scarcely intelligible unless we regard the facts as symbolizing a higher struggle—a truth wrongly held by those who from early times referred ver. 36–45 only to Antichrist, the antitype of Antiochus—in which that recovery of the earthly temple had no place. At any rate, it shows the imperfection of that view of the whole chapter by which it is regarded as a mere transcription of history.

6. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much which illustrates in detail the religious or social progress of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called out elements which were latent in them. One doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection (2 Macc. xiv, 46), was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. "It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by him" (*πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*), was the substance of the martyr's answer to his judge; "as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life" (*ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν*, 2 Macc. vii, 14; comp. vi, 26; xiv, 46). "Our brethren," says another, "have fallen, having endured a short pain leading to everlasting life, being under the covenant of God" (2 Macc. vii, 36, *πόνον, ἀενάου ζωῆς*). As it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2 Macc. xii, 43–45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is in no way implied in it. On the other hand, it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been expected to be put forward more prominently (2 Macc. vii, 17, 19, 35, etc.), though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve (vi, 26). The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with his neglect of other nations, is another proof of the widening view of the spiritual world which is characteristic of the epoch (2 Macc. iv, 16, 17; v, 17–20; vi, 12–16, etc.). The lessons of the captivity were reduced to moral teaching; and in the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchal times. See 2 Maccabees. It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the spread of a hope which had been cherished in a material form; and a pause, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

7. The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period show, on the whole, a steady adherence to the Mosaic law. Probably the law was never more rigorously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the canon of the Old Testament has already been noticed. See Canon. The books of the law were specially sought out for destruction (1 Macc. i, 56, 57; iii, 48), and their distinctive

value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Macc., "the holy books" (*τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια τὰ ἐν χερσὶν ἡμῶν*) were felt to make all other comfort superfluous (1 Macc. xii, 9). The strict observance of the Sabbath (1 Macc. ii, 32; 2 Macc. vi, 11; viii, 26, etc.) and of the sabbatical year (1 Macc. vi, 53), the law of the Nazarites (1 Macc. iii, 49), and the exemptions from military service (1 Macc. iii, 56), the solemn prayer and fasting (1 Macc. iii, 47; 2 Macc. x, 25, etc.), carry us back to early times. The provision for the maimed, the aged, and the bereaved (2 Macc. viii, 28, 30), was in the spirit of the law; and the new Feast of the Dedication was a homage to the old rites (2 Macc. i, 9), while it was a proof of independent life. The interruption of the succession to the high-priesthood was the most important innovation which was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Jozadak (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabæan leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joarib, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king (1 Macc. x, 20), whose will was confirmed, as it appears, by the voice of the people (comp. 1 Macc. xiv. 35).

8. Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect which was established after the return: this was "their own language" (2 Macc. vii, 8. 21, 27; xii, 37); but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian officers. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Modin in memory of his family (1 Macc. xiii, 27–30) is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some features the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and the Curiatii (Pliny, *H. N.* xxxvi, 13), and perhaps to one still found in Idumæa. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 6, 5), supported "seven pyramids in a line ranged one against another," equal in number to the members of the Maccabæan family, including Simon himself. To these he added "other works of art (*μηχανήματα*), placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing trophies of arms and sculptured ships, which might be visible from the sea below." The language of 1 Macc. and Josephus implies that these columns were placed upon the basement, otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement supporting the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much, at least, is evident, that the characteristics of this work—and probably of later Jewish architecture generally—bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than to that of Egypt or the East, a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the commerce which Simon opened by the Mediterranean (1 Macc. xiv, 5). See Modin.

9. The only recognised relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of "Simon," or "Simon, prince (*nasi*) of Israel," in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus VII, Sidetes (1 Macc. xv, 6, *κόμμα ἴδιον νόμισμα τῇ χώρᾳ*); and numerous examples occur which have the dates of the first, second, third, and fourth years of the liberation of Jerusalem (Israel, Zion); and it is a remarkable confirmation of their genuineness, that in the first year the name Zion does not occur, as the citadel was not recovered till the second year of Simon's supremacy, while after the second year Zion alone is found (Bayer, *De Nummis*, p. 171). The privilege was first definitely accorded to Simon in B.C. 140, while the first year of Simon was B.C. 143 (1 Macc. xiii, 42); but this discrepancy causes little difficulty, as it is not unlikely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the last four years of his life. The emblems which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history—a vine-leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of manna?), a trifid flowering rod, a palm branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre (1 Macc. xiii, 51), a bundle of branches symbolic of the Feast of Tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war of independence by Bar-cochba repeat many of these emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabæan coins was impugned by Tychsen (*Die Unächtheit d. Jud. Münzen . . . bewiesen . . .* O. G. Tychsen, 1779), but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays (*De Nummis Hebr. Samaritanis*, Val. Ed. 1781; *Vindiciæ . . .* 1790) give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabæan. Eckhel (*Doctr. Numm.* iii, 455 sq.) has given a good account of the controversy, and an accurate description of the chief types of the coins. Compare De Saulcy, *Numism. Judaique;* Ewald, *Gesch.* vii, 366, 476. See Money.

IV. *Literature.*—The original authorities for the history of the Maccabees are extremely scanty; but for the course of the war itself the first book of Maccabees is a most trustworthy, if an incomplete witness. See Maccabees, Books of. The second book adds some important details to the history of the earlier part of the struggle, and of the events which immediately preceded it; but all the statements which it contains require close examination, and must be received with caution. Josephus follows 1 Macc., for the period which it embraces, very closely, but slight additions of names and minute particulars indicate that he was in possession of other materials, probably oral traditions, which have not been elsewhere preserved. On the other hand, there are cases in which, from haste or carelessness, he has misinterpreted his authority. From other sources little can be gleaned. Hebrew and classical literature furnishes nothing more than a few trifling fragments which illustrate Maccabæan history. So long an interval elapsed before the Hebrew traditions were committed to writing, that facts, when not embodied in rites or precepts, became wholly distorted. Classical writers, again, were little likely to chronicle a conflict which probably they could not have understood. Of the great work of Polybius—who alone might have been expected to appreciate the importance of the Jewish war—only fragments remain which refer to this period; but the omission of all mention of the Maccabæan campaign in the corresponding sections of Livy, who follows very closely in the track of the Greek historian, seems to prove that Polybius also omitted them. The account of the Syrian kings in Appian is too meagre to make his silence remarkable; but indifference or contempt must be the explanation of a general silence which is too widespread to be accidental. Even when the fall of Jerusalem had directed unusual attention to the past fortunes of its defenders, Tacitus was able to dismiss the Maccabæan conflict in a sentence remarkable for scornful carelessness. "During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews," he says, "were the most abject of their dependent subjects. After the Macedonians obtained the supremacy of the East, king Antiochus endeavored to do away with their superstition, and introduce Greek habits, but was hindered by a Parthian war from reforming a most repulsive people" (*terrimam gentem*, Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 8).

For a table of contemporary Syrian kings, see Antiochus; and for further information, see Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. ii; Prideaux, *Connection*, vol. ii (Oxford,

1838); Ewald, *Geschichte des V. Israel*, vol. iii, part ii; Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Volkes Isr.*; Raphall, *Hist. of the Jews*; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vol. iii; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*; Weber und Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel* (Leipsic, 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, ch. iii.

Maccabees, Books of (Μακκαβαίων α', β', etc.). Four books which bear the common title of "Maccabees" are found in some MSS. of the Sept.; a fifth is found in an Arabic version. Two of these were included in the early current Latin versions of the Bible, and thence passed into the Vulgate. As forming part of the Vulgate, they were received as canonical by the Council of Trent, and retained among the *Apocrypha* by the Reformed churches. The two other books obtained no such wide circulation, and have only a secondary connection with the Maccabæan history. But all the books, though they differ most widely in character, and date, and worth, possess points of interest which make them a fruitful field for study. If the historic order were observed, the so-called *third* book would come first, the *fourth* would be an appendix to the *second*, which would retain its place, and the *first* would come last; but it will be more convenient to examine the books in the order in which they are found in the MSS., which was probably decided by some vague tradition of their relative antiquity. In the following account of these books we adopt much of the matter found in the dictionaries of Kitto and Smith.

The controversy as to the mutual relations and historic worth of the first two books of Maccabees has given rise to much very ingenious and partial criticism. The subject was very nearly exhausted by a series of essays published in the last century, which contain, in the midst of much unfair reasoning, the substance of what has been written since. The discussion was occasioned by E. Frölich's *Annals of Syria* (*Annales . . . . Syriæ . . . . numis veteribus illustrati*, Vindob. 1744). In this great work the author—a Jesuit—had claimed paramount authority for the books of Maccabees. This claim was denied by E. F. Wernsdorf in his *Prolusio de fontibus historiæ Syriæ in Libris Macc.* (Lipsiæ, 1746). Frölich replied to this essay in another, *De fontibus hist. Syriæ in Libris Macc. prolusio . . . . in examen vocata* (Vindob. 1746), and then the argument fell into other hands. Wernsdorf's brother (Gli. Wernsdorf) undertook to support his cause, which he did in a *Commentatio historico-critica de fide librorum Maccab.* (Wratisl. 1747); and nothing has been written on the same side which can be compared with his work. By the vigor and freedom of his style, by his surprising erudition and unwavering confidence—almost worthy of Bentley—he carries his readers often beyond the bounds of true criticism, and it is only after reflection that the littleness and sophistry of many of his arguments are apparent. But, in spite of the injustice and arrogance of the book, it contains very much which is of the greatest value, and no abstract can give an adequate notion of its power. The reply to Wernsdorf was published anonymously by another Jesuit: *Auctoritas utriusque Libri Macc. canonico-historica adserta . . . a quodam Soc. Jesu sacerdote* (Vindob. 1749). The authorship of this was fixed upon J. Khell (Welte, *Einleit.* p. 23, note); and while in many points Khell is unequal to his adversary, his book contains some very useful collections for the history of the canon. In more recent times, F. X. Patritius (another Jesuit) has made a fresh attempt to establish the complete harmony of the books, and, on the whole, his essay (*De Consensu utriusque Libri Macc.* Romæ, 1856), though far from satisfactory, is the most able defence of the books which has been published.

For a copious list of original editions, translations, and commentaries on the first three books of Maccabees, see Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 316 sq.

MACCABEES, THE FIRST BOOK OF, the most important one of the five apocryphal productions which have come down to us under this common title.

I. *Title and Position of the Book.*—In the editions of the Sept. which we follow, this book is called *the first of Maccabees* (Μακκαβαίων α'), because in the MSS. it is placed at the head of those apocryphal books which record the exploits and merits of the Maccabæan family in their struggles for the restoration of their ancestral religion and the liberation of their Jewish compatriots from the Seleucidian tyranny. According to Origen, however (comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 25), the original Hebrew title of this book was Σαρβηθ Σαρβανὲ ἐλ. Great difficulty has been experienced in the endeavor to obtain the exact Hebrew equivalent to these words. They have been resolved—1. Into שרבת שרי (or שר) בני אל, *History of the Princes of the Sons of God*, that is, *of Israel* (Michaelis, *Orient. Biblioth.* xii, 115, and most modern commentators). 2. Into שרביט שר בני אל, *The Sceptre of the Prince of the Sons of God*, i. e. *of Simon*, who is called prince in 1 Macc. xiii, 41; xiv, 47 (Bochart, Buddeus, and Ewald, *Geschichte d. V. Israel* iv, 528). But this makes chapters xiii–xvi the principal part of the book, and the rest a mere introduction. 3. Into שר בית שר בני אל, *Princeps templi* (i. e. pontifex maximus), *Princeps filiorum Dei* (i. e. dux populi Judaici), based upon the words Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ἰουδαίων, 1 Macc. xiii, 42; and ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως ἐν Σαραμέλ, *ibid.* xiv, 27 (Wernsdorf, *Comment. de fide libb. Maccab.* p. 173). 4. Into שרביט סרבני אל, *Sceptrum rebellium Dei*, i. e. of the Syrian kings, who were regarded as rebelling against God because they persecuted the Jews (Junius, Huetius, etc.), or as Herzfeld, who espouses this solution of the words, explains it, *the chastising rod of the apostates*, which he submits is an appropriate appellation of the Maccabæans (*Geschichte d. V. Israel*, i, 265). We incline to the first explanation, because it escapes the censure which the second incurs, and is less artificial than the third and fourth. It must, however, be remarked that this title does not occur in the Hebrew literature, and that both the ancient and modern Jews call the book ספר החשמונאים, *The Book of the Hashmonæans*; ראשון לחשמונאי, *I. Hashmonæans*; מגלת בית חשמונאי, *The Scroll of the Family of the Hashmonæans*, or simply מגלת חשמונאי, *The Scroll of the Hashmonæans*, after the title *Hashmonæans*, or *Ashmonæans*, by which the Maccabæan family are denominated. See MACCABEE.

Though the book occupies the first position, it ought, according to the historic order, to be *the fourth* of Maccabees, inasmuch as its narrative commences at a later period than the other three books. Tradition, however, in determining the priority of position, was evidently guided by the age and the intrinsic value of these books, since 1 Macc. is obviously the oldest, and surpasses the other three books in importance. Cotton, in his translation of the Maccabees, has departed from this traditional and commonly accepted arrangement, and placed *the first* book as second in order.

II. *Contents and Division.*—This book contains a lucid and chronological history of the tyrannical proceedings of Antiochus Epiphanes, commencing with the year B.C. 175, and of the series of patriotic struggles against this tyranny, first organized by Mattathias, B.C. 168, down to settled sovereignty and the death of Simon, B.C. 135, thus embracing a period of forty years.

1. The *first part*, of which Mattathias is the hero, comprises chap. i–ii, 70, and embraces a period from the commencement of Antiochus Epiphanes's reign to the death of Mattathias, B.C. 175–167.

2. The *second part*, of which Judas Maccabæus is the hero, comprises chap. iii, 1–ix, 22, and describes the exploits and fame of this defender of the faith, B.C. 167–160.

3. The *third part*, of which Jonathan, the high-priest, surnamed Apphus (Ἀπφοῦς = חפוש, the *simulator*, the *sly* one), is the hero, comprises ch. ix, 23–xii, 53, and re-

cords the events which transpired during the period of his government, B.C. 160–143.

4. The *fourth part*, of which Simon, surnamed *Thassi* (Θασσί = חדשי, the *flourishing*) is the hero, comprises ch. xiii, 1–xvi, 24, and records the events which occurred during his period of government, B.C. 143–135.

III. *Historical and Religious Character.*—There is no book among all the Apocrypha which is distinguished by greater marks of trustworthiness than 1 Maccabees. Simplicity, credibility, and candor alike characterize its description of friends and foes, victories and defeats, hopes and fears. When the theme so animates the writer that he gives expression to his feelings in lyric effusions (e. g. i, 25–28, 37–40; ii, 7–13, 49–68; iii, 3–9, 18–22; iv, 8–11, 30–33, 38; vi, 10–13; vii, 37, 38, 41, 42), no poetic exaggerations and hyperboles deprive the description of its substantially historic character. When recording the victories of his heroes, struggling for their liberties and their religion, he wrests no laws of nature from their regular course to aid the handful of Jewish champions against the fearful odds of their heathen oppressors; and when speaking of the arch-enemy, Antiochus Epiphanes (i, 10, etc.), he indulges in no unjust and passionate vituperations against him. Yet he marks in one expressive phrase (*ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός*) the character of the Syrian type of Antichrist (comp. Isa. xi, 10; Dan. xi, 36). If no mention is made of the reckless profligacy of Alexander Balas, it must be remembered that his relations to the Jews were honorable and liberal, and these alone fall within the scope of the history. So far as the circumstances admit, the general accuracy of the book is established by the evidence of other authorities; but for a considerable period it is the single source of our information. Even the few historical and geographical inaccuracies in the description of foreign nations and countries, such as the foundation of the Greek empire in the East (1 Macc. i, 5–9), the power and constitution of Rome (viii, 1–16), "the great city Elymaias, in the country of Persia" (vi, 1), etc., so far from impairing the general truthfulness of the narrative when it confines itself to home and the immediate past, only show how faithfully the writer has depicted the general notions of the time, and for this reason are of intrinsic value and instructive. The subjugation of the Galatians, who were the terror of the neighboring people (comp. Livy, xxxviii, 37), and the conquest of Spain, the Tarshish (ch. viii, 3) of Phœnician merchants, are noticed, as would be natural from the immediate interest of the events; but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted (Josephus adds these in his narrative, *Ant.* xii, 10, 6). The errors in detail—as the capture of Antiochus the Great by the Romans (ver. 7), the numbers of his armament (ver. 6), the constitution of the Roman senate (ver. 15), the *one* supreme yearly officer at Rome (ver. 16; compare xv, 16)—are only such as might be expected in oral accounts; and the endurance (ver. 4, *μακροθυμία*), the good faith (ver. 112), and the simplicity of the republic (ver. 14, *οὐκ ἐπέθετο οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν διάδημα καὶ οὐ περιεβάλοντο πορφύραν ὥστε ἀδρυνθῆναι ἐν αὐτῇ*, contrast i, 9), were features likely to arrest the attention of Orientals.

That the writer used written sources and important official documents in his history is evident from viii, 2, etc.; x, 18, etc., 25–45; xi, 30–37; xii, 5–23; xiii, 36–40; xiv, 25, etc.; xv, 2–9; xvi, 23, 24; some of these passages being expressly described as *copies* (*ἀντίγραφα*). It is questionable whether the writer designed to give more than the substance of the originals. Some bear clear marks of authenticity (viii, 22–28; xii, 6–18), while others are open to grave difficulties and suspicion; but it is worthy of notice that the letters of the Syrian kings generally appear to be genuine (x, 18–20, 25–45; xi, 30–37; xiii, 36–40; xv, 2–9).

Though the strictly historical character of the book precludes any description of the religious and theological notions of the day, so that no mention is made in it of a coming Messiah or a future state, even in the dying speech of Mattathias, wherein he exhorts his sons to sacrifice their lives for the law of God and the covenant of their fathers, and recounts the faith and rewards of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, and Daniel (ii, 49–60), yet the whole is permeated with the true spirit of religion and piety. The writer mentions the time from which "a prophet was not seen among them" (1 Macc. ix, 27) as a marked epoch; and twice he anticipates the future coming of a prophet as of one who should make a direct revelation of the will of God to his people (iv, 46), and supersede the temporary arrangements of a merely civil dynasty (xiv, 41). God is throughout acknowledged as overruling all the machinations of the enemy, and prayer is offered up to him for success after all the preparations are made for battle, and before the faithful host encounter their deadly enemies (iii, 18, 19, 44, 48, 53, 60; iv, 10, etc., 24, 25, 30, etc.; v, 34, 54; vii, 36–38, 41, 42; ix, 45, etc.); and even the tyrant Antiochus Epiphanes is made to acknowledge in his dying hour that he is punished for profaning the Temple and destroying the inhabitants of Judæa (vi, 8–13). The absence of even the remotest allusion to a future state in the hour of death, or to a resurrection of the dead, it must be confessed, rather favors the conclusion of the ingenious but daring critic, Dr. Geiger, rabbi at Breslau, that the author of this book was a Sadducee (comp. *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel*, p. 216 sq.).

IV. *Author, Date, and Original Language.*—All that can be said with certainty about the author of this book is that he was a Palestinian Jew. This is indicated by the whole spirit which pervades the book, by the lively sympathies which the writer manifests for the heroes whom he describes, and by his intimate acquaintance with the localities of Palestine.

Not so certain, however, is its date. Prideaux, Michaelis, Hengstenberg, Bertheau, Welte, Scholtz, Keil, and others, though discarding the notion of Lapide, Huet, etc., that John Hyrcanus was the author, are yet of opinion that the concluding words, *τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ . . . ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ* (xvi, 24), plainly show that the book was written during the government of this high-priest, perhaps about B.C. 120–106, inasmuch as this passage only gives the *terminus a quo* of the high-priesthood of John, without the *terminus ad quem*, thus indicating that John was still living, and that his pontificate was not as yet terminated. After the close of the priesthood, or after the death of John, this remark would be superfluous, because no reader could take the words, "*diary of his priesthood*," in any other sense than that they denote a chronicle of the whole duration of it from the beginning to the end. Nor can the words *ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης*, in xiii, 30, be adduced as implying a later date; for it was something remarkable that, in those days of war and devastation, the sepulchre which Simon made for his family in Modin remained between twenty and thirty years unhurt. Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette, Ewald, Grimm, and others, however, maintain that the book was written after the death of John Hyrcanus, oscillating between B.C. 105 and 64.

The language of the book does not present any striking peculiarities. Both in diction and structure it is generally simple and unaffected, with a marked and yet not harsh Hebraistic character. The number of peculiar words is not very considerable, especially when compared with those in 2 Maccabees. Some of these are late forms, as *ψογέω* (*ψογίζω*), xi, 5, 11; *ἐξουδένωσις*, i, 39; *ὁπλοδοτέω*, xiv, 32; *ἀσπιδίσκη*, iv, 57; *δειλόομαι*, iv, 8, 21; v, 4; xvi, 6; *ὅμηρα*, viii, 7; ix, 53, etc.; *ἀφαίρεμα*, xv, 5; *τελωνεῖσθαι*, xiii, 39; *ἐξουσιάζεσθαι*, x, 70; or compounds, such as *ἀποσκορπίζω*, xi, 55; *ἐπισυστρέφω*, xiv, 44; *δειλόψυχος*, viii, 15; xvi, 5; *φονοκτονία*, i, 24. Other words are used in new or strange senses, as *ἀδρύνω*, viii, 14; *παράστασις*, xv, 32; *δια-*

σποδή, viii, 7. Some phrases clearly express a Shemitic idiom (ii, 48, *δοῦναι κέρας τῷ ἁμαρτ.* vi, 23; x, 62; xii, 23), and the influence of the Sept. is continually perceptible (e. g. i, 54; ii, 63; vii, 17; ix, 23; xiv, 9). Josephus undoubtedly made use of the Greek text (*Ant.* xii, 5 sq.).

That this book, however, was originally written in Hebrew is not only attested by Origen, who gives the Hebrew title of it (see above, § i), and by St. Jerome, who saw it ("Maccabæorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi"—*Prol. Gal. ad Libr. Reg.*), but is evident from the many Hebraisms which are literal translations of the Hebrew (comp. *καὶ ἡτοιμάσθη ἡ βασιλεία*=ותכן מלכות, i, 16, with Sept. 1 Sam. xx, 31; 1 Kings ii, 12; *εἰς διάβολον πονηρόν*=לשטן רע, i, 36; *ἐν τῷ ἐλέῳ αὐτοῦ*=בחסדו, ii, 57, with Jer. ii, 2; *ἀπολλυμένους*=אבדים, iii, 9; *ἀπὸ γένους τῆς βασιλείας*=מזרע ממלוכה, iii, 32, with Jer. xli, 1), as well as from the difficulties in the Greek text, which disappear on the supposition of mistakes made by the translator (compare *καὶ ἐσείσθη ἡ γῆ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν*=ותרעש הארץ על יושביה, i, 28; *ἐγένετο ὁ ναὸς αὐτῆς ὡς ἀνὴρ ἄδοξος*=ביתה כאיש נבזה, i. e. ביתה כבית איש נבזה, ii, 8; see also ii, 34; iii, 3; iv, 19, 24, etc.). The Hebrew of this book, however, like that of the later canonical writings of the O. T., had a considerable admixture of Aramaic expressions (compare i, 5; iv, 19; viii, 5; xi, 28; and Grimm's *Comment.* on these passages).

As to the Heb. *Megillath Antiochus* (מגלת אנטיוכס) still existing, which was first published in the editions of the Pentateuch of 1491 and 1505 along with the other *Megilloth;* is given in the Spanish and Italian Ritual for the Festivals (מחזורים) of 1555–56, etc.; is inserted, with a Latin translation, in Bartolocci's *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, i, 383; is printed separately, without the translation (Berlin, 1766); and which has recently been republished by Jellinek in his *Beth Ha-Midrash*, i, 142–146—this simply gives a few of the incidents of the Maccabæan wars, and makes John, the high-priest who it says slew Nicanor in the Temple, play the most conspicuous part. It tells us that Antiochus began persecuting the Jews in the 23d year of his reign and 218th after the building of the second Temple; and that the descendants of the Maccabees, who crushed the armies of this tyrant, ruled over Israel 206 years, thus following the chronology of the Talmud (comp. *Aboda Zara*, 9 a; *Seder Olam Sutta;* De Rossi, *Meor Enajim*, c. xxvi; Zunz, *Gottesdienst. Vorträge*, p. 134). That the Aramaic (Chaldee), which was for the first time published by Filipowski, together with the Hebrew and an English version (London, 1851), is the original, and that the Hebrew is a translation, may be seen from a most cursory comparison of the two texts. The Hebrew version slavishly imitates the phrases of the Aramaic original instead of giving the Hebrew idioms. Thus, for instance, the Chaldee בה שעתא is rendered in the Hebrew version by באותה שעה, instead of בעת ההיא; אלין לאלין by אלה לאלה, instead of איש אל אחיו or איש אל רעהו, etc. It is perfectly astonishing that this document, which was evidently got up about the 7th century of the Christian æra, to be recited on the Feast of Dedication in commemoration of the Maccabæan victories over the enemies of Israel, should be regarded by Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of Daniel*, English transl., p. 237) as the identical "Chaldee copy of the first book of Maccabees to which Origen and Jerome refer." Hengstenberg, moreover, most blunderingly calls *the Hebrew* version published by Bartolocci *the Chaldee.*

The date and person of the Greek translator of the first book of Maccabees are wholly undetermined, but it is unlikely that such a book would remain long unknown or untranslated at Alexandria.

V. *Canonicity and Importance of the Book.*—This book never formed a part of the Jewish canon, and is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, etc. In the Chronicle of Eusebius it is put in the same category as the writings of Josephus and Africanus, so as to distinguish it from the inspired writings. Still the book is cited with high respect, and as conducive to the edification of the Church, at a very early period (August. *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xviii, c. 36). The councils at Hippo and Carthage (A.D. 393 and 397) first formally received it into the canon, and in modern times the Council of Trent has settled for the Catholic Church all disputes about its canonical authority by putting it into the catalogue of inspired Scripture.

But, though the Protestant Church rejects the decisions of these councils, and abides by the ancient Jewish canon, yet both the leaders of the Reformation and modern expositors rightly attach great importance to this book. The great value of it will be duly appreciated when it is remembered that it is one of the very few surviving records of the most important, but very obscure period of Jewish history between the close of the O. T. and the beginning of the N. T. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that the far-seeing Luther remarks, in his introduction to the translation of this book—"This is another of those books not included in the Hebrew Scriptures, although in its discourses and description it almost equals the other sacred books of Scripture, and would not have been unworthy to be reckoned among them, because it is a very necessary and useful book for the understanding of the prophet Daniel in the eleventh chapter" (*Vorrede auf das erste Buch Maccabæorum*, German Bible, ed. 1536). It is rather surprising that the Anglican Church has not prescribed any lessons to be read from this book. A reference to 1 Macc. iv, 59, however, is to be found in the margin of the A. V., John x, 22.

VI. *Versions and Literature.*—The books of Maccabees were not included by Jerome in his translation of the Bible. "The first book," he says, "I found in Hebrew" (*Prol. Gal. in Reg.*), but he takes no notice of the Latin version, and certainly did not revise it. The version of the two books which has been incorporated in the Romish Vulgate was consequently derived from the old Latin current before Jerome's time. This version was obviously made from the Greek, and in the main follows it closely. Besides the common text, Sabatier has published a version of a considerable part of the first book (cap. i–xiv, 1) from a very ancient Paris MS. (*S. Germ.* 15) in 1751, which exhibits an earlier form of the text. Angelo Mai has also published a fragment of another Latin translation, comprising chap. ii, 49–64, which differs very materially from both texts (*Spicilegium Romanorum*, ix, 60 sq.). The old Syriac version given in the Paris and London Polyglots, and by De Lagarde, *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace* (Lond. 1861), is, like the Latin, made literally from the Greek.

Of commentaries and exegetical helps we specially mention the works of Drusius and Grotius, reprinted in the *Critici Sacri;* Calmet, *Commentaire Littéral*, etc., vol. viii (Paris, 1724); Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des 1 Maccab. B.'s mit Amerkk.* (Göttingen und Leipsic, 1778); Eichhorn, *Einleit. in die apokryphischen Schrift. d. A. T.* (Leipsic, 1795), p. 218–248; Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of Daniel* (English transl., Edinburgh, 1847), p. 235–239, 267–270; Cotton, *The five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832); Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv, 526 sq.; the masterly work of Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen* (Leipsic, 1853); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 206–219. See Apocrypha.

MACCABEES, the SECOND Book of, according to the order of the Sept., which is followed both by the ancient versions and modern expositors of the Apocrypha.

I. *Position.*—This book ought, according to the historic order, to be *the first* of the Maccabees, because its narrative begins with an event which occurred in the reign of Seleucus Philopator, about B.C. 180, i. e. four years earlier than the preceding book. Its being placed second in order is evidently owing to the fact that it is both of a later date and of less intrinsic worth than the one denominated *the first* of the Maccabees. Cotton, in his translation of the Maccabees, has put this book as the *third* of Maccabees.

II. *Design, Contents, and Division.*—The design of this book is to admonish and encourage the Jews to keep the religion of their fathers, and especially to inculcate in the Israelites resident in Egypt a reverence for the Temple in Jerusalem, urging them to take part in the celebration of the festivals instituted to commemorate the dedication of the Temple as the sacred and legitimate place for divine worship (x, 6), and the defeat of Nicanor (xv, 36). To effect this design, the writer gives a condensed history of the Maccabees' struggles for their religion and sanctuary, beginning with the attempts of Heliodorus to plunder the Temple, cir. B.C. 180, and terminating with the victory of Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor, B.C. 161. The whole narrative, therefore, which is partly (iii, 1–iv, 6) anterior to 1 Macc., partly (iv, 7–vii, 42) supplementary to the brief summary in 1 Macc. i, 10–64, and partly (vii, 1–xv) parallel with 1 Macc. iii, 1–vii, 48, embraces a period of about nineteen years, and is divided into three sections, each of which is made to terminate with the great event commemorated by the festival which the writer is so anxious that his Egyptian brethren should celebrate.

1. The first section (i, 1–ii, 32) comprises two epistles, the relation of which to the substance of the book is extremely obscure. The first (i, 1–9) is a solemn invitation to the Egyptian Jews to celebrate "the feast of tabernacles in the month Casleu" (i. e. the feast of the dedication, i, 9), as before they had sympathized with their brethren in Judæa in "the extremity of their trouble" (i, 7). The second (i, 10–ii, 18, according to the received division), which bears a formal salutation from "the council and Judas" to "Aristobulus . . . and the Jews in Egypt," is a strange, rambling collection of legendary stories of the death of "Antiochus," of the preservation of the sacred fire and its recovery by Nehemiah, of the hiding of the vessels of the sanctuary by Jeremiah, ending, if, indeed, the letter can be said to have any end—with the same exhortation to observe the feast of dedication (ii, 10–18). Then follows an account given by the writer of this book of the sources from which he derived his information, and of the trouble he had in compiling it (ii, 19–32).

2. The second section (iii, 1–x, 9) gives important information about the origin of the persecutions (iii, 1–vii, 42), which is simply hinted at in 1 Macc., and then describes and supplements (in viii, 1–ix, 29) the events recorded in 1 Macc., concluding with the dedication of the Temple (x, 1–9), which is the great object of the book, cir. B.C. 180–165.

3. The third section (x, 10–xv, 37) records the various victories of the Jews, terminating in the crowning success of Judas Maccabæus and the death of Nicanor, which led to the institution of the feast commemorating the victory over him, B.C. 164–161.

This is followed by an epilogue (xv, 38–40) which is wanting in Coverdale's (after the Zurich) Bible; in Matthew's, 1537; in Cranmer's, 1539; and in the various reprints of these editions; and which the Geneva Bible, 1560, followed by the Bishops', 1568, was the first to insert.

The latter two of the above sections, taken together, present several natural subdivisions, which appear to coincide with the "five books" of Jason on which it was based. The first (ch. iii) contains the history of Heliodorus, as illustrating the fortunes of the Temple before the schism and apostasy of part of the nation (cir. B.C. 180). The second (ch. iv–vii) gives varied details of the beginning and course of the great persecution—the murder of Onias, the crimes of Menelaus, the martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother with her seven sons (B.C. 175–167). The third (ch. viii–x, 9) follows the fortunes of Judas to the triumphant restoration of the Temple service (B.C. 166, 165). The fourth (x, 10–xiii) includes the reign of Antiochus Eupator (B.C. 164–162). The fifth (ch. xiv, xv) records the treachery of Alcimus, the mission of Nicanor, and the crowning success of Judas (B.C. 162, 161). Each of these divisions is closed by a phrase which seems to mark the end of a definite subject (iii, 40; vii, 42; x, 9; xiii, 26; xv, 37); and they correspond, in fact, with distinct stages in the national struggle.

III. *Author, Date, and original Language.*—The compiler of this book distinctly declares that the original author of it, or of the "five books" from which he condensed the narrative before us, was "*Jason of Cyrene*" (ii, 23). Herzfeld thinks that this Jason is the same as Jason, the son of Eleazar, whom Judas Maccabæus sent with Eupolemus as envoy to Rome after the defeat of Nicanor to conclude a treaty with the Romans (1 Macc. viii, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 10, 6); because it is only a Hellenistic Jew who, being master of the Greek language, would be qualified for such a mission to a foreign court. This hypothesis, moreover, explains the otherwise anomalous circumstance that this book, which records the Maccabæan struggles, goes no further in its history than the victory over Nicanor, inasmuch as up to this point Jason was an eye-witness to the exploits of Judas, and was sent to Rome after this most important event; and it is confirmed by the accurate knowledge which the writer displays of the events (iv, 21 sq.; viii, 1 sq.; ix, 29 sq.; x, 12, 13; xiv, 1; Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, i, 445 sq.). Accordingly, the original work must have been written about B.C. 160, immediately after the victory over Nicanor, and prior to the defeat and death of Judas (1 Macc. ix, 16–18), which brought new calamities upon the Holy City, and again transferred the power to the heathenishly-inclined Jews under the pontificate of Alcimus (1 Macc. ix, 23–29). The errors in the order of the events and of history must be ascribed to the epitomator, whose great object was not to narrate history faithfully, but to make the facts harmonize with his design.

As a Cyrenian Jew, Jason most naturally composed his work in Greek; and Jerome's testimony, "Secundus [Machabæorum liber] Græcus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasi probari potest" (*Prol. Gal.*), is fully borne out by the style of the epitome. (See below.) The epitomator or compiler of the present book was a Hellenistic Jew, residing in Palestine, and must have lived a considerable period after the events transpired. The date of the compilation is put within the limits B.C. 150–124. The two epistles with which the book begins do not proceed from Jason, and are of a much later date, though the first purports to have been written B.C. 124, or 188 of the Seleucidæ; and the second, by mentioning a recent deliverance from great perils, evidently implies that it was written after the news of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, i. e. 148 of the Seleucidæ. The original language of these letters seems to be Hebrew. Indeed, Geiger shows that the difficult passage, *ἀφ' οὗ ἀπέστη Ἰάσων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας γῆς καὶ τῆς βασιλείας* (i, 7), which is ambiguous, and, as commonly understood, represents Jason and his companions as apostatizing from *the land and the kingdom*, is, when retranslated into Hebrew, מיום סר יאסון ואשר אתו מאדמת חקדש והמלוכה, shown to mean, *from the time that Jason and those who sided with him from the holy land and the kingdom, apostatized;* חמלוכה either standing for זרע המלוכה, *royal descent* (comp. 2 Kings xxv, 25; Jer. xli, 1; Ezek. xvii, 13; Dan. i, 3), or referring back to אדמת in the sense of עיר המלוכה (2 Sam. xii, 26), i. e. those who call themselves after the sacred ground of the royal residence. The same is the

case with i, 9, 18, where *the Feast of Dedication* is most extraordinarily called *the Feast of Tabernacles*, which can only be explained when the passages are retranslated into Hebrew. Now the Hebrew for ἵνα ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ Χασελεῦ μηνός (i, 9) is למען תחגו ימי חג חדש כסלו; and for ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγητε τῆς σκηνοπηγίας (καὶ) τοῦ πυρός (i, 18) is למען תחגו גם אתם את חג האש. When it is borne in mind that the expression חג, which is the general term *for feast* in earlier Hebrew (Exod. x, 9; xii, 14; Lev. xxiii, 39), was afterwards used for the feast of tabernacles (1 Kings viii, 2; 2 Chron. v, 3; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 4, 1), it will at once be seen that the translator of these epistles, instead of rendering the word in question simply by *feast*, attached to it the later sense of the specific festival, which he was evidently led to do by the fact that both these festivals are of eight days' duration, and that the feast of tabernacles is mentioned in x, 6. So also διανοίξαι τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ (i, 4) is a translation of ויפתח לבבם בתורתו.

The style of the book is extremely uneven. At times it is elaborately ornate (iii, 15–39; v, 20; vi, 12–16, 23–28; vii, etc.), and, again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (xiii, 19–26); but it nowhere attains to the simple energy and pathos of the first book. The vocabulary corresponds to the style. It abounds in new or unusual words. Many of these are forms which belong to the decay of a language, as ἀλλοφυλισμός, iv, 13; vi, 24; Ἑλληνισμός, vi, 13 (ἐμφανισμός, iii, 9); ἐτασμός, vii, 37; ϑωρακισμός, v, 3; σπλαγχνισμός, vi, 7, 21; vii, 42; or compounds which betray a false pursuit of emphasis or precision: διεμπίμπλημι, iv, 40; ἐπευλαβεῖσϑαι, xiv, 18; κατευϑικτεῖν, xiv, 43; προσαναλέγεσϑαι, viii, 19; προσυπομιμνήσκω, xv, 9; συνεκκεντεῖν, v, 26. Other words are employed in novel senses, as δευτερολογεῖν, xiii, 22; εἰσκυκλεῖσϑαι, ii, 24; εὐαπάντητος, xiv, 9; πεφρενωμένος, xi, 4; ψυχικῶς, iv, 37; xiv, 24. Others bear a sense which is common in late Greek, as ἀκληρεῖν, xiv, 8; ἀναζυγή, ix, 2; xiii, 26; διάληψις, iii, 32; ἐναπερείδω, ix, 4; φρυάσσομαι, vii, 34; περισκυϑίζω, vii, 4. Others appear to be peculiar to this book, as διάσταλσις, xiii, 25; δυσπέτημα, v, 20; προσπυροῦν, xiv, 11; πολεμοτροφεῖν, x, 14, 15; ὁπλολογεῖν, viii, 27, 31; ἀπευϑανατίζειν, vi, 28; δοξικός, viii, 35; ἀνδρολογία, xii, 43. Hebraisms are very rare (viii, 15; ix, 5; xiv, 24). Idiomatic Greek phrases are much more common (iv, 40; xii, 22; xv, 12, etc.); and the writer evidently had a considerable command over the Greek language, though his taste was deformed by a love of rhetorical effect.

IV. *Historical and Religious Character.* — As the avowed design of the book is religio-didactic and parænetic, the aim of the writer was not to recount a series of dry facts in chronological order, but rather to select such events from the period on which he treats, and arrange, embellish, and comment upon them in such a manner as should most strikingly set forth to his Egyptian brethren the marvellous interposition of God to preserve the only legitimate and theocratic sanctuary in Jerusalem. Hence the desire to point out the signal punishment of the wicked according to the principle *in eo genere quisque punitur, in quo peccavit* (v, 9, 10; ix, 5, 6; xiii, 8; xv, 32, 33); the moral reflections (v, 17–20; vi, 12–16; ix, 8–10; xii, 43–45); the colored descriptions (iii, 14–23; v, 11–20); the exaggerated account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother, which king Antiochus, for the sake of effect, is made to witness in Jerusalem (vi, 18–vii, 42); the enormous numbers of the enemy slain by a handful of Jews (viii, 24, 30; x, 23, 31; xi, 11; xii, 16, 19, 23, 26, 28; xv, 27); the numerous and strange miracles (iii, 25–27; v, 2, 3; x, 29–31; xi, 8–10; xv, 12, etc.); the historical and chronological inaccuracies, e. g. making Antiochus witness the death of the Jewish martyrs (vii, 3); the death of Antiochus (ch. ix); the representing of the sacrifices as having been renewed after *two* years' interruption (2 Macc. x, 3, comp. with 1 Macc. iv, 52, 54; i, 54, 59); the description of the different battles which the Jews fought between the purification of the Temple and the death of Antiochus (2 Macc. viii, 30; x, 15–38; xii, 2–43, comp. with 1 Macc. v); the campaign of Lysias (2 Macc. xi, 12, comp. with 1 Macc. iv, 26–32); etc. But apart from these embellishments, traditional stories, inversions of events, etc., which, in accordance with ancient usage, the author adopted in order to carry out his design, and in spite of the fact that the two letters with which the book begins are now generally given up as spurious, the best critics accept the groundwork of the facts as true. Grimm, whose elaborate, thorough, and impartial comment on this book is unparalleled, has shown that there is no ground to question the historical import of the most important section (chap. iv–vi, 10), which is not only most consistent in itself, but fits most appropriately the space of 1 Macc. i, 10–64; or the truthfulness of ch. iii, when stripped of the miraculous. He says that its truthfulness, within the specified limits, is supported by the fact that, 1. Notwithstanding the many differences, it agrees in not a few portions with 1 Maccabees, though both these books are perfectly independent of each other; and, 2. In four events which it records anterior to 1 Maccabees, it agrees with Josephus, who is entirely independent of it, viz. the account of the Temple at Gerizim (vi, 2, comp. with Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 5); the execution of Menelaus at Berœa (xiii, 3–8, comp. with Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 9, 7); the landing of Demetrius at Tripolis (xiv, 1); and of the priestly intrigues (ch. iv) which were the cause of the protracted series of struggles between the Jews and the Syrian monarchs.

The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features. God is throughout recognised as ordaining even the most minute affairs of his people; the calamities which befel them are looked upon by the Jews as a temporary visitation for their sins (iv, 16, 17; v, 17–20; vi, 12–17; vii, 32, 33; xii, 40); and the sufferings which come upon the righteous in this common visitation are regarded as atoning for the sins of the rest of the people, and staying the anger of God (vii, 38). The book, moreover, shows that the interposition of angels for the salvation of the people (x, 29, etc.; xiii, 2, etc.), and supernatural manifestations (iii, 25; v, 2, etc.; xiii, 2, etc.), which play a very important part in the N. T., were of no common occurrence. What is, however, most striking, is, that not only did the Jews then believe in the surviving of the soul after the death of the body, in the resurrection of the dead, and in their reunion with those near and dear to them (vii, 6, 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36), but that God does not irrevocably seal the eternal doom of man immediately after his departure, and that the decision of our heavenly Father may be influenced by the prayers and sacrifices of the surviving friends of the departed (xii, 43–45). This passage also shows that the offering of sacrifices for the dead must have been common in those days, inasmuch as it is spoken of in very commendable terms. The striking distinction between the religious sentiments of this book and those of the former goes far to justify Geiger's conclusion that "the two books of Maccabees are party productions; the author of the first was a Sadducee, and a friend of the Maccabæan dynasty, while the author or epitomator of the second was a Pharisee, who looked upon the Maccabees with suspicion" (*Urschrift*, p. 206). Still the second book, like the first, contains no hopes about the coming of a Messiah.

V. *Canonicity.*—Though portions of this book are incorporated in the Jewish writings, and form a part of the ritual, viz., the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother (ch. vi, 1–42), which is not only mentioned in the Talmud (*Gittin*, 57, b), the Midrash of the ten commandments (ed. Jellinek, *Beth Ha-Midrash*, i,

70, etc.), Midrash Jalkut (*On Deut.* section תבא, 301, b), etc., but is interwoven in the service for the Feast of Dedication (compare *The Jozer*, אורך כי אנפת); the martyrdom of Eleazar (ch. vi, 18-31), also embodied in the same service, and described by Josippon, who also speaks of the wonderful appearance of the horsemen, and other circumstances narrated in 2 Macc. (compare *Josippon*, lib. ii, c. ii-iv, ed. Breithaupt, p. 172 sq.), yet the book was never part of the Jewish canon. Hence, even if it could be shown more unquestionably that the apparent parallels between 2 Macc. and diverse passages in the N. T. (compare 2 Macc. i, 4, with Acts xvi, 14; 2 Macc. v, 19, with Mark ii, 27; 2 Macc. vi, 19; vii, 2, etc., with Heb. xi, 35; 2 Macc. vii, 14, with John v, 29; 2 Macc. vii, 22, etc.; xiv, 46, with Acts xvii, 24-26; 2 Macc. vii, 36, with Rev. vi, 9; 2 Macc. viii, 2, with Luke xxi, 24; Rev. xi, 2; 2 Macc. x, 7, with Rev. vii, 9; 2 Macc. xv, 3-5, with Eph. vi, 9) are actual quotations, it would only prove that the apostles, like the rest of their Jewish brethren, alluded to the incidents recorded in this book without regarding the book itself as canonical. The only references, however, to be found in the A. V. are from Heb. xi, 35, 36, to 2 Macc. vi, 18, 19; vii, 7, etc.; and vii, 1-7; but even these are disputed, and it is quite possible that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the sufferings of the Essenes (compare Ginsburg, *The Essenes*, etc., Longman, 1864, p. 36). In harmony with the decisions of the Jewish Church, this book is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, etc. (compare Du Pin, *History of the Canon*, London, 1699, i, 12). Jerome emphatically declares: "*Maccabæorum* libros *legit* quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit" (*Præf. in Prov.*); and Augustine, though stating that this book, like 1 Macc., was regarded by the Christians as not unuseful, yet expressly states that the Jews did not receive it into the canon (*Contra ep. Gaudent.* i, 31), and draws a distinction between it and the canonical Scriptures (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii, 36). The Council of Trent, however, has settled (April 8, 1546) the canonicity of it for the Roman Church. The Protestant Church generally agrees with Luther, who remarks, "We tolerate it because of the beautiful history of the Maccabæan seven martyrs and their mother, and other pieces. It is evident, however, that the writer was no great master, but produced a patchwork of various books; he has likewise a perplexing knot in ch. xiv, in Razis, who committed suicide, which was also troublesome to Augustine and other fathers. For such example is of no use, and is not to be commended, though it may be tolerated and charitably explained. It also describes the death of Antiochus, in ch. i, differently from 1 Macc. To sum it all up: Just as 1 Macc. deserves to be adopted in the number of sacred Scriptures, so 2 Macc. deserves to be thrown out, though there is something good in it" (*Vorrede auf das Zweite Buch Maccabæorum*, in the German Bible, ed. 1536).

VI. *Versions and Literature.*—There are two ancient versions of this book, a Latin and a Syriac. The Latin, which was current before Jerome, and does not always follow closely the Greek, is now incorporated in the Roman Vulgate, while the Syriac, which is still less literal, is given both in vol. iv of the London Polyglot and by De Lagarde, *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace* (Lond. 1861). The Arabic so-called version of 2 Macc. is really an independent work. See MACCABEES, FIFTH BOOK OF.

Of commentaries and exegetical helps, we may mention Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture*, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1849), p. 93-102; Whiston, *A Collection of Authentick Records* (London, 1727), i, 200-232; Hasse, *Das and. Buch der Makk. neu übers. m. Anmerk.* (Jena, 1786); Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apok. Schriften d. Alten Test.* (Leipzig, 1795), p. 249-278; Bertheau, *De Secundo Maccabæor. libro* (Götting. 1829); Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832), p. 148-217; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv, 530 sq.; Schlünkes, *Epistolæ que Secundo Maccab. libro*, cap. i-ii, 9, *legitur explicatio, commentat. crit.* (Colon. 1854); Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1854), i, 443-456; Patritius, *De Consensu utriusque libri Maccabæor.* (Rom. 1856); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 219-230; and, above all, the valuable work of Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu d. Apokryphen d. Alten Testaments*, pt. iv (Leipz. 1857). See APOCRYPHA.

MACCABEES, THE THIRD BOOK OF, not given in the Romish Vulgate, the Apocrypha of the A. V., nor in Protestant versions generally, but still read in the Greek Church.

I. *Title and Position.*—This book is improperly called the "third of Maccabees," since it does not at all record the exploits of the Maccabæan heroes, but narrates events of an earlier date. It, however, derives its name from the fact that this appellation, which originally belonged to Judas, was afterwards used in the sense of *martyrs*, and was extended to the Alexandrian Jews who suffered for their faith's sake either immediately before or after the Maccabæan period. In the *Synopsis* of the Pseudo-Athanasius, it is apparently also called *Ptolemaïca*, from the name of the royal hero (compare Μακκαβαϊκὰ βιβλία δ' Πτολεμαϊκά, p. 432, ed. Migne, for which Credner, Grimm, etc., suggest that the true reading is Μακκαβαϊκὰ καὶ Πτολεμαϊκά, and that this book is to be understood by Πτολεμ.—Grimm, *Comment.* p. 220). Properly speaking, this book ought to precede the two former productions, and occupy *the first* position, since it is prior in time to both the first and second Maccabees. But tradition has assigned to it a third position, because it came into circulation later than the others, and was regarded as being of third-rate importance. Cotton, in his edition of the *Five Books of Maccabees*, has placed it as "1 Maccabees."

II. *Design and Contents.*—The design of this book is to comfort the Alexandrian Jews in their sufferings for their faith in the God of Abraham, and to encourage them to steadfastness and perseverance by recounting to them the experience of the past, which most unquestionably shows that the theocracy cannot perish; that, though tyrants might vent their rage on the chosen people, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will appear for their deliverance, and avenge himself on their persecutors, as well as put to confusion those of the Israelites who have apostatized from their ancestral religion. To illustrate this, the writer narrates the following incident from the dealings of Providence with his covenant people: Ptolemy IV (Philopator), on returning from his victory over Antiochus the Great (B.C. 217), was waited upon by envoys from Jerusalem to congratulate him on his success, which made him visit the Holy City and offer sacrifices in the Temple; but he was seized with a desire to penetrate into the Holy of Holies (i, 1-11), and as the entreaties of the people failed to make the king relinquish his outrageous desire, the high-priest Simon prayed to the King of kings, who immediately chastised this insolent heathen by throwing him down paralyzed on the ground (ii, 1-23). Enraged at this, the king wreaked his vengeance, on his arrival in Egypt, on the Alexandrian Jews, ordering that they should be deprived of their citizenship and be branded with an ivy leaf unless they agreed to be initiated into the orgies of Bacchus (ver. 24-30). See DIONYSUS. A few complied, but the bulk of the chosen people refused to apostatize from their ancestral religion (ver. 31, 32). Not content with this order, which was thus generally evaded or despised, he commanded all the Jews in the country to be arrested and sent to Alexandria (ch. iii). This was done as well as might be, though the greater part escaped (iv, 18), and the gathered multitudes were confined in the Hippodrome outside the city (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 5). The resident Jews, who showed sympathy for their country-

men, were imprisoned with them, and the king ordered the names of all to be taken down preparatory to their execution. Here the first marvel happened: the scribes to whom the task was assigned toiled for forty days from morning till evening, till at last reeds and paper failed them, and the king's plan was defeated (ch. iv). However, regardless of this, the king ordered the keeper of his elephants to drug the animals, five hundred in number, with wine and incense, that they might trample the prisoners to death on the morrow. The Jews had no help but in prayer, and here a second marvel happened: the king was overpowered by a deep sleep, and when he awoke the next day it was already time for the banquet which he had ordered to be prepared, so that the execution was deferred. The Jews still prayed for help; but when the dawn came, the multitudes were assembled to witness their destruction, and the elephants stood ready for their bloody work. Then was there another marvel: the king was visited by deep forgetfulness, and chided the keeper of the elephants for the preparations which he had made, and the Jews were again saved. But at the evening banquet the king recalled his purpose, and with terrible threats prepared for its immediate accomplishment at daybreak (ch. v). Then Eleazar, an aged priest, earnestly prayed for his people (vi, 1–15), and, just as he finished praying, the royal train and the elephants arrived at the Hippodrome, when suddenly two angels appeared in terrible form, visible to all but the Jews, making the affrighted elephants go backwards and crush the soldiers (ver. 16–21). This changed the king's anger into pity, and, with tears in his eyes, he at once "set free the sons of the Almighty, heavenly, living God," and made a great feast for them (ver. 22–30). To commemorate this marvellous interposition of their heavenly Father, the Jews instituted an annual festival, to be celebrated "through all the dwellings of their pilgrimage for after generations" (ver. 31–41). The faithful Jews had not only their mourning turned into joy, and the royal protection for the future, but were permitted by the king to inflict condign punishment on those of their brethren who had forsaken the religion of their fathers in order to escape the temporary sufferings; "thus the most high God worked wonders throughout for their deliverance" (vii, 1–23).

III. *Historical Character.*—Though the parænetic design of the book made the writer so modify and embellish the facts which he records as to render them most subservient to his object, yet the assertion of Dr. Davidson, that "the narrative appears to be nothing but an absurd Jewish fable" (*Introduction to the O. T.* iii, 454), is far too sweeping. *That the groundwork of it is true,* as Prideaux rightly remarks (*The O. and N. Test. connected,* part ii, book ii, anno 216), is attested by collateral history. 1. The account it gives of Ptolemy's expedition to Cœle-Syria, and his victory over Antiochus at Raphia (i, 1–7), is corroborated both by Polybius (v, 40, 58–71, 79–87) and Justin (xxx, 1). 2. The character which it ascribes to Ptolemy—that he was cruel, vicious, and given to the orgies and mysteries of Bacchus—is literally confirmed both by Plutarch, who, in his essay *How to distinguish Flatterers from Friends,* says, "Such praise was the ruin of Egypt, because it called the effeminacy of Ptolemy, his wild extravagances, loud prayers, his marking with an ivy leaf (κρίνων), and his drums, piety" (cap. xii; compare also *In Cleomene,* cap. xxxiii and xxxvi), and by the author of the Greek *Etymologicon,* who tells us that Philopator was called *Gallus* because he was marked with the leaf of an ivy, like the priests called Galli, for in all the Bacchanalian solemnities they were crowned with ivy (Γάλλος ὁ φιλοπάτωρ Πτολεμαῖος διὰ τὸ φύλλα κισσοῦ κατασίχθαι ὡς οἱ Γάλλοι, etc.). 3. Josephus's deviating account (*Apion,* ii, 5) of the events here recorded, which shows that he has derived his information from an independent source, proves that something of the sort did actually take place, although at a different time, namely, in the reign of Ptolemy VII (Physcon). "The king," as he says, "exasperated by the opposition which Onias, the Jewish general of the royal army, made to his usurpation, seized all the Jews in Alexandria, with their wives and children, and exposed them to intoxicated elephants. But the animals turned upon the king's friends, and forthwith the king saw a terrible visage which forbade him to injure the Jews. On this he yielded to the prayers of his mistress, and repented of his attempt; and the Alexandrine Jews observed the day of their deliverance as a festival." The essential points of the story are the same as those in the second part of 3 Maccabees, and there can be but little doubt that Josephus has preserved the events which the writer adapted to his narrative. 4. The statement in vi, 36, that they instituted an annual festival to commemorate the day of their deliverance, to be celebrated in all future time, the fact that this festival was actually kept in the days of Josephus (comp. *ib.* ii, 5), and the consecration of a pillar and synagogue at Ptolemais (vii, 20), are utterly unaccountable on the supposition that this deliverance was never wrought. The doubts which De Wette (*Einleitung,* sec. 305), Ewald (*Gesch. d. V. I.* iv, 535 sq.), Grimm (*Comment.* p. 217), and Davidson (*Introd.* iii, 455) raise against the historic groundwork of this narrative, are chiefly based upon the fact that Dan. xi, 11, etc., does not allude to it. Those critics, therefore, submit that the book typically portrays Caligula, who commanded that his own statue should be placed in the Temple, under the guise of a current tradition respecting the murderous commands of Ptolemy VII (Physcon) against the Jews, transferred by mistake to Ptolemy Philopator. If it be true that Ptolemy Philopator attempted to enter the Temple at Jerusalem, and was frustrated in his design —a supposition which is open to no reasonable objection—it is easily conceivable that tradition may have assigned to him the impious design of his successor, or the author of 3 Maccabees may have combined the two events for the sake of effect. The writer, in his zeal to bring out the action of Providence, has colored his history, so that it has lost all semblance of truth. In this respect the book offers an instructive contrast to the book of Esther, with which it is closely connected both in its purpose and in the general character of its incidents. In both a terrible calamity is averted by faithful prayer; royal anger is changed to royal favor, and the punishment designed for the innocent is directed to the guilty. But here the likeness ends. The divine reserve, which is the peculiar characteristic of Esther, is exchanged in 3 Maccabees for rhetorical exaggeration, and once again the words of inspiration stand ennobled by the presence of their later counterpart.

IV. *Author, Original Language, Integrity, and Date.*—It is generally admitted that the author of this book was an Alexandrian Jew, and that he wrote in Greek. This, indeed, is evident from its ornate, pompous, and fluent style, as well as from the copious command of expression which the writer possessed. Though this book resembles 2 Maccabees in the use of certain expressions (e. g. ἀγέρωχος, 3 Macc. i, 25; ii, 3, comp. with 2 Macc. ix, 7) in the employment of purely Greek proper names to impart a Greek garb to Jewish things and ideas (3 Macc. v, 20, 42; vii, 5, comp. with 2 Macc. iv, 47), etc., yet the style of the two books is so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author. The author of this book surpasses 2 Maccabees in offensively seeking after artificial, and hence very frequently obscure phrases (e. g. i, 9, 14, 17, 19; ii, 31; iii, 2; iv, 5, 11; v, 17; vii, 5), in poetic expression and ornamental turns (i, 8; ii, 19, 31; iii, 15; iv, 8; v, 26, 31, 47; vi, 4, 8, 20), in bombastic sentences to designate very simple ideas (e. g. δρόμον συνίστασθαι=τρέχειν, i, 19; ἐν πρεσβείῳ τὴν ἡλικίαν λελογχώς, vi, 1), in using rare words or such as occur nowhere else (e. g. i, 20; ii, 29; iv, 20; v, 25; vi, 4, 20), or using ordinary words in strange senses (e. g. i, 3, 5; iii, 14; iv, 5; vii, 8; compare Grimm, *Comment.* p. 214). There is also an abruptness about the

book (e. g. its beginning with ὁ δὲ Φιλοπάτωρ, and its reference, in τῶν προαποδεδειγμένων, ii, 25, to some passage not contained in the present narrative), which has led to the supposition that it is either a mere fragment of a larger work (Ewald, Davidson, etc.), or that the beginning only has been lost (Grimm, Keil, etc.). Against this, however, Grätz rightly urges that it most thoroughly and in a most complete manner carries through its design.

All the attempts to determine *the age* of the book are based upon pure conjecture, and entirely depend upon the view entertained about its contents, as may be seen from the two extremes between which its date has been placed. Thus Allin (*Judgment of the Jewish Church*, p. 67) will have it that "it was written by a Jew of Egypt, under Ptolemy Philopator, i. e. about B.C. 200;" while Grimm places it about A.D. 39 or 40.

V. *Canonicity.*—Like the other Apocrypha, this book was never part of the Jewish canon. In the Apostolic canons, however, which are assigned to the 3d century, it is considered as *sacred* writing (*Can.* 85); Theodoret, too (died cir. A.D. 457), quotes it as such (*in Dan.* xi, 7). Still it was never accepted in the Western churches, and formed no part of the Roman Vulgate; it was therefore not received into the canon of the Catholic Church, nor inserted as a rubric in the Apocrypha contained in the translation of the Bible made by the Reformers.

VI. *Versions and Literature.*—The Greek is contained in the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS., and is given in Valpy's edition of the Sept. The oldest version of it is the Syriac, which is very free, and full of mistakes; it is given in the London Polyglot, and has lately been published by De Lagarde, *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi* (London, 1861). The first Latin version of it is given in the Complutensian Polyglot; another Latin version, by F. Nobilius, is given in the London Polyglot; the first German translation, as far as we can trace it, is given in the Zurich Bible printed by Froschover (1531); another, by Joachim Cireмberger, appeared in Wittenberg (1554); De Wette, in the first edition of his translation of the Bible, made conjointly with Augusti (1809-14), also gave a version of this book, which is now excluded from his Bible; and another German version is given in Gutmann's translation of the Apocrypha (Altona, 1841). The first English version was put forth by Walter Lynne in 1550, which was appended, with some few alterations, to the Bible printed by John Daye (1551), and reprinted separately in 1563; a new and better version, with some notes, was published by Whiston, *Authentick Records* (Lond. 1727), i, 162-208; a third version, made by Crutwell, is *the Bible with Bp. Wilson's Notes* (Bath, 1785); and a fourth version, with brief but useful notes, was made by Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832).

Of exegetical helps we mention Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. apokr. Schriften d. A. T.* (Leips. 1795), p. 278-289; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv, 535 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, 457, etc.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (2d edition, Leips. 1863), iii, 444, etc.; Gaab, *Handbuch zum philologischen Verstehen der apokryphischen-Schriften d. A. T.* (Tübing. 1818), ii, 614 sq.; and especially Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen d. A. T.* (Leips. 1857), p. 213 sq.

MACCABEES, THE FOURTH BOOK OF (*a*), though not given in the Roman Vulgate, and therefore not inserted in the Apocrypha contained in the Bibles translated by the Reformers, yet exists in Greek in two leading texts. One, which, on account of its more extensive circulation, may be called *the received* or *common* text, is contained in the early edition of the Sept. printed at Strasburg, 1526, Basel, 1545 and 1550, Frankfurt, 1597, Basel, 1582, and in the editions of Josephus's work, and is given in its purest form in Bekker's edition of Josephus (Leips. 1855-56, 6 vols.). The other is the Alexandrian, or that of the Codex Alexandrinus, and is the more ancient and preferable one; it is contained in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger, and is adopted, with some few alterations after the common text, in Apel's edition of the Apocrypha (Leipsic, 1837). See Schaack, *De libro εἰς Μακκαβαίους qui Josepho tribuitur* (Kopenhagen, 1814).

I. *Title.*—This book is called 4 *Maccab.* (Μακκαβαίων δ' ἡ τετάρτη τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν βίβλος) in the various MSS., in the Codex Alexandrinus, by Philostorgius and Syncellus (p. 529, 4, and 530, 17, ed. Dind.); in Cod. Paris. A, it is denominated 4 *Maccab., a Treatise on Reason* (Μακκαβαίων τέταρτος περὶ σώφρονος λογισμοῦ), by Eusebius (*Hist. Ecclesiast.* iii, 10, b) and Jerome (*Catal. Script. Ecclesiast.*) it is called *On the Supremacy of Reason* (περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), and in the editions of Josephus's works, *Josephus's Treatise on the Maccabees* (Φλαβ. Ἰωσήπου εἰς Μακκαβαίους λόγος).

II. *Design, Division, and Contents.*—The design of this book is to encourage the Jews, who—being surrounded by a philosophical heathenism, and taunted by its moral and devout followers with the trivial nature and apparent absurdity of some of the Mosaic precepts—were in danger of being led astray from their faith, to abide faithfully by the Mosaic law, and to stimulate them to observe in every way their ancestral religion, by convincing them of the reasonableness of their divine law, and its unparalleled power to control the human passions (comp. xviii, 1, 2). To carry out this design the book is divided into *two parts*, opening with an introduction, as follows:

1. *The introduction*, comprising ch. i, 1–12, contains the résumé of the whole book, and the grand problem for discussion, viz. whether the rational will, permeated and regulated by true piety, has perfect mastery over the passions (ὅτι αὐτοδέσποτός [αὐτοκράτωρ] ἐστι τῶν παθῶν εὐσεβὴς λογισμός).

2. *The first part*, comprising ch. i, 13–iii, 19, contains a *philosophical* disquisition on this problem, giving a definition of reason, or the rational will, and of the wisdom which is to be gained by studying the Mosaic law, and which shows itself in the four cardinal virtues—discernment, justice, prudence, and fortitude; describes the different passions, and shows that reason, pervaded by piety, has the mastery over them all, except forgetfulness and ignorance.

3. The *second part*, comprising chap. iii, 20–xviii, 20, demonstrates the proposition that sanctified reason has the mastery over the passions by giving a summary of the Maccabæan martyrdoms (iii, 20–iv, 26) narrated in 2 Macc. iii; iv, 7–17; v, 1–vi, 11; describes the martyrdom of Eleazar (v, 1–vii, 19) and the seven brothers (viii, 1–xii, 16), with moral reflections on it (xiii, 1–xiv, 10), as well as the noble conduct and death of their mother (xiv, 11–xvii, 6), and then deduces the lessons to be learned from the character and conduct of these martyrs (xvii, 7–xviii. 2), showing that the Israelites alone are invincible in their struggles for virtue (ὅτι μόνοι παῖδες Ἑβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἰσιν ἀνίκητοι). Ch. xviii, 21–23, is evidently a later addition.

III. *Author, Date, and Original Language.*—In harmony with the general tradition, Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 10), Jerome (*Catalog. Script. Eccles.* s. v. Josephus), Photius (ap. Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* i), Suidas (s. v. Ἰώσηπος,), many MSS., and the early editions of the Sept. (Strasburg, 1526; Basle, 1545; Frankfurt, 1595), as well as the editions of Josephus's works, ascribe the authorship of this book to the celebrated Jewish historian *Flavius Josephus.* But this is utterly at variance with the style and structure of the book itself, and has most probably arisen from a confusion of names, as the work may have been written by some one of the name of Josephus, or from the fact that it was regarded as supplementing this historian, and hence was appended to his writings. Not only is the language quite different from that of Josephus's writings, but—1. In 4 Macc. all the proper names in the Bible, except Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἐλεάζαρος, are retained in their Hebrew form, and treated as indeclinable (e. g. Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Νῶε), whereas Josephus gives them a Greek termination. 2.

Fourth Macc. derives its historical matter from 2 Macc., as we have seen in the preceding section, or perhaps from the original work of Jason; while Josephus manifests utter ignorance about the existence of this work. 3. The historical blunders contained in this book (iv, 15, 26; v, 1; xvii, 22, 23, etc.) are such as Josephus would never have committed. 4. The form and tone of the book unquestionably show that the writer was an Alexandrian Jew, who resided in Egypt or somewhere far away from the Holy Land—comp. iv, 5, 20, etc., where the writer speaks of "*our fatherland*," i. e. the Holy Land far away. From this and other passages in which the Temple is spoken of as still existing, and from the fact that xiv, 9 speaks of the Egyptian Jews as having enjoyed external peace and security at the time when this book was written, Grimm dates it before the fall of Jerusalem and the persecutions of the Egyptian Jews by Caligula, i. e. B.C. 39 or 40.

That the Greek is the original language of the book requires no proof. The style is very pompous, flowing, vigorous, and truly Greek. The author's eloquence, however, is not the spontaneous outburst of a heart inspired with the grandeur of the divine theme (*εὐσέβεια*) upon which he discourses, but is produced artificially by resorting to exclamations and apostrophes (v, 33, etc.; vii, 6, 9, 10, 15; viii, 15, 16; xi, 14, etc.), dialogues and monologues (viii, 16–19; xvi, 5–10), far-fetched figures and comparisons (vii, 1, etc.; xiii, 6; xvii, 3, 5, 7), and he abounds in *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* (i, 27, 29; ii, 9; iv, 18; vi, 6, 17; vii, 11; viii, 15; xi, 4; xiii, 24; xiv, 15, 18; xv, 26; xvii, 5).

IV. *Canonicity and Importance.* — Among the Jews this book is hardly known, and though some of the fathers were acquainted with it, and Gregory of Nazianzum, Augustine, Jerome, etc., quoted with respect its description of the Maccabæan martyrs, yet it was never regarded as canonical or sacred. As a historical document the narrative is of no value. Its interest centres in the fact that it is a unique example of the didactic use which the Jews made of their history. Ewald (*Geschichte*, iv, 556) rightly compares it with the sermon of later times, in which a scriptural theme becomes the subject of an elaborate and practical comment. The philosophical tone of the book is essentially stoical, but the stoicism is that of a stern legalist. The dictates of reason are supported by the remembrance of noble traditions, and by the hope of a glorious future. The prospect of the life to come is clear and wide. The faithful are seen to rise to endless bliss; the wicked to descend to endless torment, varying in intensity. But while the writer shows, in this respect, the effects of the full culture of the Alexandrian school, and in part advances beyond his predecessors, he offers no trace of that deep spiritual insight which was quickened by Christianity. The Jew stands alone, isolated by character and by blessing (comp. Gfrörer, *Philo*, etc., ii, 173). Still the book is of great importance, inasmuch as it illustrates the history, doctrines, and moral philosophy of the Jewish people prior to the advent of Christ. It shows that the Jews believed that human reason, in its natural state, has no power to subdue the passions of the heart, and that it is only able to do it when sanctified by the religion of the Bible (v. 21, 23; vi, 17; x, 18); that the souls of all men continue to live after the death of the body; that all will rise, both righteous and wicked, to receive their judgment for the deeds done in the body (v, 35; ix, 8; xii, 13, 14; xvi, 22; xvii, 17, 18); that this is taught in the Pentateuch (comp. xvii, 18, with Deut. xxxiii, 3); and that the death of the righteous is a vicarious atonement (vi, 29). Allusion seems also to be made in the N. T. to some passages of this book (comp. vii, 18, with Luke xx, 37; Matt. xxii, 32; Mark xii, 26; Rom. vi, 10; xiv, 8; Gal. xi, 19: 4 Macc. xii, 11, with Acts xvii, 26: 4 Macc. xiii, 14, with Luke xvi, 22, 23: 4 Macc. xvi, 22, with Luke xx, 37).

V. *Versions and Exegetical Helps.* — The book was translated into Syriac, the MS. of which is in the Ambrosian Library of Milan; into Latin, but loosely, by Erasmus; and again, greatly improved, by Combefis, *Bibliothecæ Græcorum patrum auctorium novissimum* (pars i, Paris, 1672). This version is in the editions of Josephus by Havercamp, Oberthür, and Dindorf. Both a Latin and French version are given by Calmet, *Comment. literal. in Scripturam V. et N. Test.* iii, 702 sq.; a very loose English version was first published by L'Estrange in his *Translation of Josephus* (Lond. 1702); and an improved translation is given by Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832).

Of exegetical helps we mention Reutlinger, *Thèse d'exégese sur le iv livre des Maccabées* (Strasburg, 1826); Gfrörer, *Philo u. d. Alex.-Theosophie*, ii, 175 sq.; Dähne, *Jud.-Alex. Relig.-Philos.* ii, 190 sq.; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv, 554 sq.; the elaborate commentary of Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handb. z. d. Apokr. d. A. T.* (pt. iv, Leips. 1857), p. 285 sq.; Keil, *Einleitung in d. A. T.* (1859), p. 69 b, sq.

MACCABEES, THE FOURTH BOOK OF (*b*).— Though it is certain that the foregoing book is that which old writers described, Sixtus Senensis (*Bibliа Sancta*, p. 37, ed. 1575) gives a very interesting account of another fourth book of Maccabees which he saw in a library at Lyons, which was afterwards burnt. It was in Greek, and contained the history of John Hyrcanus, continuing the narrative directly after the close of the first book. Sixtus quotes the first words: *Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ἰωάνης υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀντ' αὐτοῦ*, but this is the only fragment which remains of it. The history, he says, was nearly the same as that in Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, though the style was very different from his, abounding in Hebrew idioms. The testimony is so exact and explicit that we can see no reason for questioning its accuracy, and still less for supposing (with Calmet) that Sixtus saw only the so-called fifth book, which is at present preserved in Arabic. See MACCABEES, FIFTH BOOK OF.

MACCABEES, THE FIFTH BOOK OF, an important chronicle of Jewish affairs, which was for the first time printed in Arabic in the Paris Polyglot (1645), and was thence copied into the London Polyglot (1657).

I. *Title.*—The name, *the fifth* book of Maccabees, has been given to this production by Cotton, who placed it as *fifth* in his order of the books of Maccabees. According to the remark at the end of chap. xvi, the first part of this book, i. e. chap. i, 1–xvi, 26, is entitled *The second Book of Maccabees according to the Translation of the Hebrews*, while the second part, i. e. chap. xvii, 1–lix, 96, is simply called *The second Book of Maccabees*. The fact that this second part gives the history of John Hyrcanus (ch. xx) has led Calmet (*Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Maccabees) and others to suppose that it is the same as the so-called *fourth book of Maccabees*, a unique MS. of which, written in Greek, Sixtus Senensis saw in the library of Sanctes Pagninus, at Lyons, and which was afterwards destroyed by fire, so that the fifth of Maccabees is sometimes also called *the fourth*. The description of the MS. given by Sixtus Senensis (*Bibl. Sancta*, lib. i, sec. 3) has been printed in English by Whiston (*Authentic Records*, i, 206, etc.) and Cotton, *The five Books of Maccabees*, Introd. p. xxxviii, etc. See MACCABEES, FOURTH BOOK OF (*b*).

II. *Contents.*—This book contains the history of the Jews from Heliodorus's attempt to plunder the treasury at Jerusalem till the time when Herod revelled in the noblest blood of the Jews, and completed the tragedy of the Maccabæan princes by slaughtering his own wife Mariamne, her mother Alexandra, and his own two sons Alexander and Aristobulus, i. e. B.C. 184 to B.C. 6, thus embracing a period of 178 years. The subjoined table shows the parallelism between the narrative recorded in this book and the accounts contained in 1 and 2 Macc. and the works of Josephus.

III. *Historical and Religious Character.* — It will be seen from the annexed table that the first part of this production (i–xix), which embraces the Maccabæan

5 Macc.	1 Macc.	2 Macc.	Joseph. *Antiq.*	5 Macc.	Josephus. *Antiq.*	Josephus. *War.*
i		iii		xxvii	xiii, 19	i, 3
ii			xii, 2	xxviii	xiii, 20, 21	i, 3
iii	i	v	xii, 6, 7	xxix	xiii, 21, 22	i, 3
iv		vi, 18–31	[4 Macc. v, vi]	xxx	xiii, 23	
				xxxi	xiii, 24	i, 4
v		vii	[4 Macc. viii–x, 12; xv, 13–23]	xxxii	xiii, 24	i, 4
				xxxiii	xiii, 24	i, 4
				xxxiv	xiv, 1	i, 5
vi	ii		xii, 8 [*War*, i, 2]	xxxv	xiv, 2, 3	i, 5
				xxxvi	xiv, 4–8	i, 5
vii	ii, 49–iv	viii	xii, 8–11	xxxvii	xiv, 8	i, 5
viii	vi	ix	xii, 13	xxxviii	xiv, 9, 10	i, 6
ix	iv, 36, etc.	x	xii, 11	xxxix	xiv, 10	i, 6
x	v	x	xii, 12	xl	xiv, 11	i, 6, 7
xi		xi, xii		xli	xiv, 12	
xii				xlii	xiv, 14, 15	i, 7
xiii	viii, 24, etc.		xii, 17	xliii	xiv, 15	i, 8
xiv		xii, 32–37		xliv	xiv, 16, 17	
xv	vi	xiii	xii, 14	xlv	xiv, 17, 18	i, 9
xvi	vii, 3	xiv, xv	xii, 7	xlvi	xiv, 19	i, 9
xvii	ix, 1–22		xii, 18, 19	xlvii	xiv, 19, 20	i, 9
xviii	ix, 28–72		xiii, 1–10	xlviii	xiv, 22, 23	i, 10
xix	xiii–xvi		xiii, 11–14	xlix	xiv, 24, 25	i, 11
xx			xiii, 15	l	xiv, 26, 27	i, 11, 12
xxi			xiii, 16, 17	li	xiv, 27	i, 12
xxii			xiii, 17	lii	xiv, 27	i, 13
			xiii, 18	liii	xv, 1	i, 13
xxiii			xiii, 8, 20	liv	xv, 1, 2, 9	
xxiv			vii, 9; xvii, 3;	lv	xv, 2, 3	
xxv			xviii, 2	lvi	xv, 6–8	i, 14
			[*War*, ii, 7]	lvii	xv, 9, 10	i, 15
xxvi			xiii, 18	lviii	xv, 11	i, 17
			[*War*, i, 3]	lix	xvi, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11. 12, 16, 17	i, 17

period, is to a great extent parallel with 1 and 2 Macc., whilst the second part, which records the post-Maccabæan history down to the birth of Christ (xx–lix), is parallel with Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 15–xvi, 17; *War*, i, 3–17. The historical worth of 5 Macc. is therefore easily ascertained by comparing its narrative with that of 1 and 2 Macc., and with the corresponding portions of Josephus. By this means it will be seen that, notwithstanding its several historical and chronological blunders (compare 5 Macc. x, 16, 17, with 2 Macc. x, 29; 5 Macc. ix, with 1 Macc. vii, 7; 5 Macc. viii, 1–8, with 1 Macc. ix, 73; xii, 48; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 11; 5 Macc. xx, 17, with *Ant.* xiii, 15; 5 Macc. xxi, 17, with *Ant.* vii, 12), especially when recording foreign history (comp. 5 Macc. xii), it is a trustworthy and valuable narrative. There can be no question that some of its blunders are owing to mistakes committed by transcribers (e. g. the name *Felix*, which stands *five* times for *three* different persons, 5 Macc. iii, 14; vii, 8, 34, comp. with 1 Macc. iii, 10; 2 Macc. v, 22; viii, 33; the name *Gorgias*, 5 Macc. x, is a mistake for *Timotheus*, as is evident from 2 Macc. x; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 11; so also *two* for *nine*, 5 Macc. xix, 8); and that, as a whole, it is far more simple and natural, and far less blundering and miraculous, and therefore more credible than 2 Macc. As to its religious character, the book shows most distinctly that the Jews of those days firmly believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body, in a general resurrection of the dead, and in a future judgment (v, 12, 13, 17, 22, 43, 48–51; lix, 14, etc.).

IV. *Author, Date, and Original Language*—This book is a compilation, made in Hebrew, by a Jew who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem, from ancient Hebrew memoirs or chronicles, which were written shortly after the events transpired. This is evident from the whole complexion of the document, even in the translation—for the original has not as yet come to light—as may be seen from the few features here offered for consideration: 1. When speaking of the dead (xv, 11, 15; xii, 1; xxi, 17) the compiler uses the well-known euphemisms, *God be merciful to him* = אלהים ירחם עליו; *to whom be peace* = עליו השלום, which came into vogue among the Jews in the Talmudic period (comp. *Tosiphta Chullin*, 100, a; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 338), and are used among the Jews to the present day, thus showing that the compiler was a Jew, and lived after the destruction of the Temple. 2. He calls the Hebrew Scriptures (iii, 3, 9) *the twenty-four books* = עשרים וארבע, a name which is thoroughly Jewish, and came into use long after the close of the Hebrew canon; leaves *Torah* (תורה), the Hebrew name for the Pentateuch, untranslated (xxi, 9), in accordance with the Jewish custom; speaks of the deity as *the great and good God* = אל גדול וטוב (i, 8, 13, 15; v, 27; vii, 21, 22; viii, 5, 11; ix, 4; x, 15; xi, 8; xii, 1; xv, 4; xvi, 24; xxviii, 4; xxxv, 9; xlviii, 14; lvii, 35; lix, 58); and names Jerusalem *the city of the holy house* (xx, 17; xxi, 1; xxiii, 5; xxviii, 23, 34, 37; xxx, 8; xxxv, 4, 33; xxxvi, 6, 38, 39; xxxvii, 3, 5; xxxviii, 5; lii, 7, 24; lix, 68); *city of the holy house of God* (xxxi, 10); or simply *holy city* (xvi, 11, 17; xx, 18; xxi, 26; xxxiv, 7; xxxv, 32; xxxvi, 9, 19, 25; xxxviii, 3; xli, 15; xliii, 12; xlix, 5; l, 16; liv, 13, 26; lv, 27; lvii, 22; lix, 2); *holy house* (xx, 7, 17; xxiii, 3; xxxvi, 35; l, 8; lii, 19; liii, 6; lvi, 17, 44; lix, 35, 68); *house of God* (vii, 21; ix, 7; xi, 7; xv, 14; xvi, 16, 17; xxi, 11; xxvii, 4; xxxiv, 10; li, 5; lii, 31; liv, 13; lv, 20); the Temple he calls *the house of the sanctuary* = בית המקדש (viii, 11), in accordance with the later Hebrew idiom. 3. This later date of the compilation of the book is corroborated by the fact that the compiler refers to the destruction of Jerusalem (xxi, 30), and to the period of the second Temple, as something past (xxii, 9). 4. He speaks of the original author of the book as a distinct person (xxv, 5; lv, 25), and explains the original writer's allusions (lvi, 45). 5. The original writer of the work must have lived *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, for he terminates his narrative six years before this catastrophe, and does not know of any of the calamities which befel his brethren after the conquest of Palestine by Titus. His name is unknown; all that we can gather from this book is that he is also the author of other historical works which are now lost, as he himself refers to them (lix, 96), and, judging from his terse and experienced style, it is not at all improbable that he was the public chronographer. The book is entirely devoid of *the Hagadic* legends which form a very striking characteristic of the Jewish productions of a later age. Grätz (*Geschichte der Juden*, v, 281) identifies it with an Arabic chronicle written about A.D. 900, entitled "Torich al Makkabain, Jussuff Ibn-G'org'on," *History of the Maccabees*, or *Joseph b.-Gorion*, a part of which he says is printed in the London Polyglot under the title of *Arabic Book of Maccabees*, and the whole of which, extending to the time of Titus, is in two Bodleian MSS. (Uri, Nos. 782, 829). He moreover tells us that it is this work which the well-known Hebrew chronicler called *Josippon* [see JOSIPPON BEN-GORION] translated into Hebrew, and supplemented, and this he has promised to prove at some future time. We must confess that we are unable to trace the identity; and we are astonished at Dr. Davidson's confident assertion that "it is another form or recension of our book [i. e. 5 Macc.] which exists in the work of Joseph ben-Gorion or Josippon, a legendary Jewish history" (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, iii, 466).

V. *Versions and Literature.*—Though this book is in our estimation as important as 2 Macc., yet there has hardly anything been done to elucidate its narrative. In the absence of the original Hebrew, the Arabic version of it, printed in the Paris and London Polyglots, is the text upon which we must rely. The editors of this version have not even given any account of the MS. from which it has been taken. A Latin translation of it by Gabriel Sionita is given in both Polyglots; a French translation is given in the appendix to De Sacy's Bible; another French translation, by M. Baubrun, is given in vol. iii of Le Maitre's Bible; and Calmet translated chapters xx–xxvi, containing the history of John Hyrcanus, which he thought Sixtus Senensis had taken for the legitimate 4 Macc. The only English version of it is that by Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832).

Maccabees, Festival of the. In the 4th century, when fasts and festivals had greatly multiplied, not only were festivals of Christian martyrs celebrated, but also those of some of the more eminent martyrs of the Old Testament. The conduct of the Maccabees (q.

v.) in opposing Antiochus Epiphanes (q. v.), and dying in defence of the Jewish law, seems to have been generally celebrated at this time. The authors of that period are extravagant in their commendations of these patriots. Chrysostom has three homilies on the subject. At Antioch there was a church called by the name of the Maccabees; and Augustine, who wrote two sermons on their festival, calls them Christian martyrs. The reason assigned for the adoption of this festival was that, as these men had suffered martyrdom so bravely before Christ's coming, what would they not have done had they lived after him, and been favored with the death of Christ for their example? The Roman Martyrology places this festival on August 1st. Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen allude to this feast. —Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.

Maccarthy, Nicholas Tuite de, a noted Roman Catholic pulpit orator, was born of a noble family at Dublin, Ireland, May 19, 1769. His parents removed to France on account of religious persecution, and Nicholas was educated at the Collège du Plessis, later at the Collège de France, and then at the Sorbonne. During the Revolution he returned to his parents at Toulouse, and lived there in great retirement, his time devoted mainly to study. In 1814 he became a priest, and early gained for himself distinction as a pulpit orator. In 1819 he entered the "Society of Jesus." Thereafter he travelled from place to place, preaching everywhere with great success. His name had already, in 1819, been regarded at court, and he had then declined a bishopric, preferring his association with the Jesuits to an official position. In 1826 he was invited to preach before the royal household, and created quite a sensation. Now his name was placed among the foremost of the nation. After the fall of Charles X, Maccarthy moved to Savoy, and thence to Rome, where he died, May 3, 1833. His sermons, which were published in 2 vols. 8vo (Paris, 1836), were translated into German and other modern languages. See the excellent article in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 482; *Regensburg Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Maccarty, Thaddeus, a Congregational minister, was born in Boston in 1721; graduated from Harvard University in 1739; studied theology three years, and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Kingston, Mass., on Nov. 3, 1742. When Whitefield appeared in that region in 1745, he appointed a committee "to prevent the intrusion of roving exhorters." A false report spread that Whitefield was to open communion for him, whereupon his parishioners nailed the doors and windows, and Maccarthy's request for dismission was granted. He then preached in Worcester, Mass., from Nov. 27, 1746, until the time of his death, July 20, 1784. His publications are, *Farewell Sermon at Kingston* (1745): —*Two Discourses on the Day of the Annual Fast* (before the expedition into Canada, 1759); and other sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 423.

Macclintock, Samuel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 1, 1732, at Medford, Mass.; graduated at Princeton in 1751, and in 1756 was ordained pastor in Greenland, N. H., where he labored until his death, April 27, 1804, excepting only the Revolutionary period, when he acted as chaplain. He was a participant in the battle of Bunker Hill, and figures prominently in Trumbull's picture of that great event. He published *A Sermon on the Justice of God in the Mortality of Man* (1759):—*The Artifices of Deceivers detected, and Christians warned against them*, a sermon (1770):—*Herodias, or Cruelty and Revenge the Effects of unlawful Pleasure*, a sermon (1772):—*A Sermon at the Commencement of the new Constitution of New Hampshire* (1784):—*An Epistolary Correspondence with Rev. John C. Ogden* (1791): —*The Choice*, a sermon (1798):—*An Oration commemorative of Washington* (1800). See Sprague, *Annals*, i, 525; *Christian Examiner*, 1844, p. 404.

Maccovius or **Makowsky**, John, a Polish Reformed theologian and writer, was born at Lobzenic in 1588; studied at the principal German universities; was received doctor of theology at Franecker in 1614; appointed extraordinary professor of theology in that university in 1615; ordinary professor in 1616; and died in 1644. He was particularly renowned as an opponent of the Jesuits, Socinians, and Arminians, and by his severity against the latter created many enemies. In his own Church he caused much disturbance by his attempts to restore the use of the scholastic method in the treatment of dogmatics. He used it first in his lectures, and afterwards also in his writings. See his *Collegia theologica* (Amstelod. 1623, 1631):—*Loci communes theologici* (Fran. 1626):—*Distinctiones et regulæ theologicæ et philosophicæ* (published by Nicholas Arnold, Amsterd. 1656; Geneva, 1661). He was thereupon accused of heresy before the States of Friesland, at the instigation, it is said, of his colleague Sibrand Lubbertus. The affair was brought by Maccovius himself before the Synod of Dort, and a commission, having been appointed to investigate the case, reported that "Maccovium nullius Gentilismi, Judaismi, Pelagianismi, Socinianismi, aut alterius cujuscunque hæreseos reum teneri; immeritoque illum fuisse accusatum. Peccasse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris phrasibus Scholasticis usus sit; quod Scholasticum docendi modum conetur in Belgicis Academiis introducere; quod eas selegerit quæstiones disceptandas, quibus gravantur Ecclesiæ Belgicæ. Monendum esse eum, ut cum Spiritu sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio. Hoc vitio vertendum ipsi, quod distinctionem sufficientiæ et efficientiæ mortis Christi asseruerit esse futilem; quod negaverit, humanum genus lapsum esse objectum prædestinationis; quod dixerit, Deum velle et decernere peccata; quod dixerit, Deum nullo modo velle omnium hominum salutem; quod dixerit, duas esse electiones" (see *Epp. eccl. et theol. præst. et erud. viror.* [Amst. 1684], p. 572 sq.). The synod adopted the report, and acted accordingly. Still this did not purge the Reformed Church of the scholastic method, as neither Maccovius himself nor his disciples abandoned it. See J. Cocceji *Or. hab. in funere J. M.* (1644); Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et. Crit.* iii, 290 sq.; Heinrichs, *Versuch einer Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenswahrheiten*, p. 355; Schröckh, *Christl. K. G. s. d. Ref.* v, 148; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 745; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* ii, 170 sq.; Gass, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 441 sq. See Scholasticism.

Macdill, David, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in South Carolina, studied under the celebrated American Presbyterian pulpit orator and theologian Dr. John Mason, of New York, and commenced preaching in Ohio. Macdill spent the latter part of his life in successfully performing the duties of an editor and director in collegiate and theological institutions. He died June 15, 1870.

Macé, François, a French theologian and Biblical writer, was born in Paris in 1640, and became successively canon and curate of Sainte-Opportune. He was also counsellor and almoner to the king. He died in Paris Feb. 5, 1721. His works are, *Psaumes et Cantiques de l'Église* (Paris, 1677):—*Abrégé historique, chronologique, et moral de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament* (Par. 1704, 2 vols. 12mo):—*La Science de l'Écriture Sainte, reduite en quatre tables générales* (Paris, 1708, 8vo), containing a comparison of the Old with the New Testament:—*Les Testaments des douze Patriarches* (Par. 1713, 12mo):—*Méditations* (of Busée, 2 vols. 12mo):—*L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ* (Par. 1698–9):—*Épîtres et Évangiles des dimanches et fêtes, et pour le Carême et l'Avent* (2d ed. Par. 2 vols. 12mo):—*Mélanie, ou la veuve charitable:* — *L'Esprit de Saint Augustin, ou analyse de tout les ouvrages de ce père* (5007 pages 8vo):— *Explication des Propheties de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament qui prouvent que Jésus-Christ est le Fils de Dieu, le véritable Messie et que la Religion Chrétienne est la vraie et seule religion, ouvrage en deux parties et destiné "à confondre les athées, les impies, les libertins, les Juifs, les hé-*

rétiques:" — Histoire critique des papes depuis Saint Pierre jusqu'à Alexandre VII. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Macedo, Antonio, a Portuguese Jesuit and writer, was born at Coimbra in 1612. He was regent and instructor among the Jesuits, and passed two years in the African missions. He had charge of the confessional of the Vatican church until 1671, from which time he directed the College of Evora, and afterwards that of Lisbon. He died at Lisbon in 1693. His works are, among others, *Elogia nonnulla et descriptio Coronationis Christinæ, reginæ Sueciæ* (Stockholm, 1650):—*Lusitania infulata et purpurata, seu pontificibus et cardinalibus illustrata* (Paris, 1663, 1673, 4to):—*De Vita et Moribus Joannis de Almeida* (Padua, 1669; Rome, 1671):—*Divi tutelares orbis Christiani* (Lisbon, 1687).

Macedo, Francisco de, a Portuguese Jesuit and prolific writer, was born at Coimbra in 1596, entered the Jesuit order at fourteen, and became successively teacher of rhetoric, philosophy, and chronology. In 1630 he left the Jesuits and entered the order of Cordeliers, with the surname *François de Saint-Augustin*, under which most of his works are published. He was called to the professorship of polemic theology in the College of the Propaganda at Rome, and afterwards (1657) visited Venice, lecturing *de omni re scibili*. He occupied the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Padua from 1667 until the time of his death in May, 1680. In 1675 he had composed 53 panegyrics, 60 Latin discourses, 32 funeral orations, 123 elegies, 115 epitaphs, 212 dedicatory epistles, 700 familiar epistles, 2600 epic poems, 110 odes, 3000 epigrams, 4 Latin comedies, 2 tragedies, and 1 Spanish satire. He had a sharp discussion with cardinal Bona on the subject of consubstantiation, and with cardinal Noris on the monachism of St. Augustine. Among his writings are *Apotheosis S. Francisci Xaverii* (Lisbon, 1620, 8vo), an epic poem:—*Thesaurus Eruditionis pro sole, Viridarium eloquentiæ* (denoting the author's vanity):—*Scrinium S. Augustini de prædestinatione gratiæ et libero arbitrio* (Paris, 1648, 4to; 3d edit. Lond. 1654):—*Controversia ecclesiastica inter F. F. Minores* (1653, 8vo):—*Lituus Lusitanus, contra tubam Anglicanam* (Lond. 1652, 4to):—*Encyclopædia in Agonem litteratorum producta* (Rome, 1657):—*De clavibus Patri*, iv lib. (Rome, 1660):—*Theatrum Meteorologicum* (Rome, 1661, 8vo):—*Scholæ Theologiæ positivæ* (Rome, 1664):—*Medulla historiæ ecclesiasticæ emaculata:—Collationes doctrinæ S. Thomæ et Scoti, cum differentiis inter utrumque* (Padua, 1671, 2 vols.):—*Joannis Bona Doctrina de usu fermentati in sacrificio missæ* (Ingolstadt [Venice], 1673, 8vo; reprint Verona):—*Disquisitio de ritu azymi et fermentati* (Verona, 1673, 4to):—*Myrothecium morale documentorum xiii* (Padua, 1675, 4to):—*Schema Congregationis S. Officii Romani cum elogiis cardinalium et corollarium de infallibili auctoritate summi pontificis in mysteriis fidei proponendis* (Padua, 1676, 4to):—*Elogia poetica in Remp. Venetam, cum iconibus* (Padua, 1680);—*De Incarnationis Mysterio* (Padua, 1681), containing also *Itinerarium sancti Augustini*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 748.

Macedo'nia (Μακεδονία, from a supposed founder *Macednus* or *Macedon*), a name originally confined to the district lying north of Thessaly, east of the Cardanian mountains (a prolongation of Mount Pindus), and west of the River Axius; but afterwards extended to the country lying to the north of Greece Proper, having on the east Thrace and the Ægæan Sea, on the west the Adriatic and Illyria, on the north Dardania and Mœsia, and on the south Thessaly and Epirus. "In a rough and popular description it is enough to say that Macedonia is the region bounded inland by the range of Hæmus or the Balkan northwards and the chain of Pindus westwards, beyond which the streams flow respectively to the Danube and Adriatic; that it is separated from Thessaly on the south by the Cambunian hills, running easterly from Pindus to Olympus and the Ægæan; and that it is divided on the east from Thrace by a less definite mountain boundary running southwards from Hæmus. Of the space thus inclosed, two of the most remarkable physical features are two great plains, one watered by the Axius, which comes to the sea at the Thermaic Gulf, not far from Thessalonica; the other by the Strymon, which, after passing near Philippi, flows out below Amphipolis. Between the mouths of these two rivers a remarkable peninsula projects, dividing itself into three points, on the farthest of which Mount Athos rises nearly into the region of perpetual snow." The whole region was intersected by mountains (among these were the famous Olympus and Athos), which supplied numerous streams (especially the Strymon and Axius), rendering the intervening valleys and plains highly fruitful (Pliny, iv, 17; Mela, ii, 3; Ptol. iii, 13). The natives were celebrated from the earliest times for their hardy independence and military discipline. The country is supposed to have been first peopled by Chittim or Kittim, a son of Javan (Gen. x, 4), and in that case it is probable that the Macedonians are sometimes intended when the word CHITTIM occurs in the Old Testament. Macedonia was the original kingdom of Philip and Alexander, by means of whose victories the name of the Macedonians became celebrated throughout the East. The rise of the great empire formed by Alexander is described by the prophet Daniel under the emblem of a goat with one horn (Dan. viii, 3–8). As the horn was a general symbol of power, the oneness of the horn implies merely the unity of that power. It is, however, curious and interesting to know that Daniel did describe Macedonia under its usual symbol, as gems and other antique objects still exist in which that country is represented under the figure of a one-horned goat. (See Murray's *Truth of Revelation Illustrated*, and the art. Macedonia, in Taylor's Calmet.) See GOAT. Monuments are still extant in which this symbol occurs, as one of the pilasters of Persepolis, where a goat is depicted with one immense horn on his forehead, and a Persian holding the horn, by which is

Persepolitan emblem of Macedon.

intended the subjection of Macedon by Persia. In Esth. xvi, 10, Haman is described as a Macedonian,

and in xvi, 14 he is said to have contrived his plot for the purpose of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. This sufficiently betrays the late date and spurious character of these apocryphal chapters; but it is curious thus to have our attention turned to the early struggle of Persia and Greece. Macedonia played a great part in this struggle, and there is little doubt that Ahasuerus is Xerxes. The history of the Maccabees opens with vivid allusions to Alexander, the son of Philip, the Macedonian king (Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Μακεδών), who came out of the land of Chettiim and smote Darius, king of the Persians and Medes (1 Macc. i, 1), and who reigned first among the Grecians (ib. vi, 2). A little later we have the Roman conquest of Perseus, "king of the Citims," recorded (ib. viii, 5). Subsequently in these Jewish annals we find the term "Macedonians" used for the soldiers of the Seleucid successors of Alexander (2 Macc. viii, 20). In what is called the Fifth Book of Maccabees this usage of the word is very frequent, and is applied not only to the Seleucid princes at Antioch, but to the Ptolemies at Alexandria (see Cotton's *Five Books of Maccabees*, Oxf. 1832). When subdued by the Romans (Livy, xliv) under Paulus Æmilius (B.C. 168), Macedonia was divided into four provinces (Livy, xlv, 29). Macedonia Prima was on the east of the Strymon, and had Amphipolis for the capital. Macedonia Secunda stretched between the Strymon and the Axius,

Coins of Macedonia.

with Thessalonica for its metropolis. The third and fourth districts lay to the south and the west. Of two, if not three of these districts, coins are still extant (Akerman, *Numismatic Illust. of the N. T.* p. 43). Afterwards (B.C. 142) the whole of Greece was divided into two great provinces, Macedonia and Achaia. See Achaia; Greece. Macedonia therefore constituted a Roman province, governed by a proprætor, with the title of proconsul (*provincia proconsularis;* Tacit. *Annal.* i, 76; Sueton. *Claud.* 26), in the time of Christ and his apostles. (See fully in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.) The apostle Paul being summoned in a vision, while at Troas, to preach the Gospel in Macedonia, proceeded thither, and founded the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi (Acts xvi, 9), A.D. 48. This occasions repeated mention of the name, either alone (Acts xviii, 5; xix, 21; Rom. xv, 26; 2 Cor. i, 16; xi, 9; Phil. iv, 15), or along with Achaia (2 Cor. ix, 2; 1 Thess. i, 8). The principal cities of Macedonia were Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella, and Pelagonia (Livy, xlv, 29); the towns of the province named in the New Testament are Philippi, Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Neapolis, Apollonia, and Berœa. When the Roman empire was divided, Macedonia fell to the share of the emperor of the East, but in the 15th century it fell into the hands of the Turks. It now forms a part of Turkey in Europe, and is called *Makdonia*. It is inhabited by Wallachians, Turks, Greeks, and Albanians. The south-eastern part is under the pasha of Salonika; the northern under beys or agas, or forms free communities. The capital, Salonika, the ancient Thessalonica, is a commercial town, and the only one of any consequence, containing about 70,000 inhabitants. (See Cellarii *Notit.* ii, 828 sq.; Mannert, vii, 420 sq.; Conybeare and Howson, i, 315.) On the question whether Luke includes Thrace in Macedonia, see Thrace. "Nothing can exceed the interest and impressiveness of the occasion (Acts xvi, 9) when a new and religious meaning was given to the well-known *ἀνὴρ Μακεδών* of Demosthenes (*Phil.* i, p. 43), and when this part of Europe was designated as the first to be trodden by an apostle. The account of St. Paul's first journey through Macedonia (Acts xvi, 10–xvii, 15) is marked by copious detail and well-defined incidents. At the close of this journey he returned from Corinth to Syria by sea. On the next occasion of visiting Europe, though he both went and returned through Macedonia (Acts xx, 1–6), the narrative is a very slight sketch, and the route is left uncertain except as regards Philippi. Many years elapsed before St. Paul visited this province again; but from 1 Tim. i, 3, it is evident that he did accomplish the wish expressed during his first imprisonment (Phil. ii, 24). The character of the Macedonian Christians is set before us in Scripture in a very favorable light. The candor of the Berœans is highly commended (Acts xvii, 11); the Thessalonians were evidently objects of St. Paul's peculiar affection (1 Thess. ii, 8, 17–20; iii, 10); and the Philippians, besides their general freedom from blame, are noted as remarkable for their liberality and self-denial (Phil. iv, 10, 14–19; see 2 Cor. ix, 2; xi, 9). It is worth noticing, as a fact almost typical of the change which Christianity has produced in the social life of Europe, that the female element is conspicuous in the records of its introduction into Macedonia. The Gospel was first preached there to a small congregation of women (Acts xvi, 13); the first convert was a woman (ib. ver. 14); and, at least at Philippi, women were prominent as active workers in the cause of religion (Phil. iv, 2, 3). It should be observed that, in St. Paul's time, Macedonia was well intersected by Roman roads, especially by the great Via Egnatia, which connected Philippi and Thessalonica, and also led towards Illyricum (Rom. xv, 19)." For the antiquities of this region, see Cousinéry, *Voyage dans le Macédoine* (Paris, 1831); Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece* (London, 1835); compare also Holland, *Travels in the Ionian Isles*, etc. (Lond. 1812–13).

Macedo'nian (*Μακεδών*) occurs in the A. V. of the N. T. only in Acts xxvii, 2. In the other cases (Acts xvi, 9; xix, 29; 2 Cor. ix, 2, 4) our translators render it "of Macedonia." The "Macedonians" are also mentioned in the Apocrypha (Esth. xvi, 10, 14; 1 Macc. i, 1; 2 Macc. viii, 20). See Macedonia.

Macedonians. See Macedonius.

Macedonius, a patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 4th century. After the death of bishop Alexander, of Constantinople, in 336, Macedonius and Paulus became candidates for his succession. The latter was elected by the Athanasian party, but was soon after (338)

deposed by the emperor Constance, who put Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place. Upon the death of Eusebius, Paulus was reinstated, but was again deposed by the Semi-Arian emperor, who in 342 pronounced Macedonius patriarch, notwithstanding the opposition of the people, who rose in insurrection, resulting in great bloodshed (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [Milman's ed.], ii, 357 sq.). The orthodox rival, however, succeeded, after a time, in making his influence felt throughout the country, and Macedonius was finally obliged to yield him the patriarchate. In 350, after having thoroughly reorganized his party, Macedonius returned, and by the aid of the civil authorities regained the superintendence over the churches. His decided connection with the Semi-Arians, and the widening of the gulf between the Arians and Semi-Arians, proved, however, fatal to his credit, and in 360 his enemies succeeded in securing his deposition by a synod at Constantinople. He is supposed to have died soon after. His followers at once adopted his name. The *Macedonians* are generally regarded as Semi-Arians of that period, especially those in and around Constantinople, in Thrace, and in the surrounding provinces of Asia Minor (Sozomen, iv, 27). There is, however, one point in which the Macedonians, although not opposed to, are yet distinguished from the Semi-Arians; it is their idea of the antagonism of the divinity and the homoousia of the Holy Spirit. On this point the Macedonians are identical with the Pneumatomachians, and therefore the latter finally joined the former. They professed that the Holy Spirit is a divine energy diffused throughout the universe, but denied its being distinct, as a *person*, from the Father and the Son (Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 74; Augustine, *De Hæres.* c. 52). In 381 Theodosius the Great assembled a council of one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople (second œcumenical), which condemned this doctrine, and the *Macedonians* soon after disappeared. See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 305 sq. (N. Y. 1854, 3 vols. 8vo); Hase, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, p. 115 (N. York, 1855); Basilius, *De Spiritu S. opp.* (ed. Garn.), iii, 1 sq.; Thilo, *Bibl. pp. Gr. dogm.* i, 666 s.; ii, 182 s.; A. Maji, *Nov. patr. bibl.* t. iv (Rom. 1847); Didymus, *De Spir. Scto. interpr. Hier.* (in *Opp.* Hier. ed. Mart. IV, i, 494 sq.); Walch, *Ketzergeschichte*, vol. iii; Bauer, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, vol. i; Neander, *Hist. of Christ. Dogmas*, i, 350 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, i, 334, 338 sq. (J. H. W.)

Mac Gill, Stevenson, D.D., a Scotch divine of considerable note, was born at Port Glasgow Jan. 19, 1765, of pious parents. He early chose the service of his Master, and conducted all his studies with a view to the ministry. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, and was licensed to preach in 1790; was appointed minister at Eastwood in 1791; was transferred in 1797 to the Tron Church, Glasgow, and later (1814) was also made a professor of theology in his alma mater. He died Aug. 18, 1839. Dr. Mac Gill "commended himself to every man's conscience" not only by his ability in the pulpit, and his laborious visitations of his congregation and parish, but by the Christian interest he took in the public institutions and charities of the city—in the active direction he assumed of the Infirmary, the Prisons, the Magdalene and Lunatic Asylums. His services were also most zealously and actively rendered to "the Society for benefiting the Highlands and Islands of Scotland by means of Gælic Schools," "the Propagation of the Gospel in India," and "the Missions on behalf of the Jews." In 1800 Dr. Mac Gill originated a clerical literary society, to which for many years he acted as secretary. It was after receiving the full approbation and friendly criticism of this literary society that he favored the world with *Considerations addressed to a Young Clergyman* (1809, 12mo), a work which, on its first appearance, obtained an extensive circulation, and from the perusal of which no young minister can fail to derive great and permanent advantage. His sermons were published in 1839. See Robt. Burns, *Memoir of Dr. Mac Gill* (Edinb. 1842, 12mo); Jamieson, *Dictionary of Religious Biography*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Machærus (Μαχαιροῦς), a strong fortress of Peræa, first mentioned by Josephus in connection with Alexander, the son of Hyrcanus I, by whom it was built (*Ant.* xii, 16, 3; *War*, vii, 6, 2). It was delivered by his widow to her son Aristobulus, who first fortified it against Gabinius (*Ant.* xiv, 5, 2), to whom it afterwards surrendered, and by whom it was dismantled (*ib.* 4; compare Strabo, xvi, 762). Aristobulus, on his escape from Rome, again attempted to fortify it, but it was taken after two days' siege (*War*, vii, 6). In his account of this last capture by Bassus, Josephus gives a detailed description of the place. It was originally a tower built by Alexander Jannæus as a check to the Arab marauders. It was on a lofty point, surrounded by deep valleys, and of immense strength, both by nature and art (compare Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 15). After the fall of Jerusalem it was occupied by the Jewish banditti. The Jews say that it was visible from Jerusalem (Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 54). Its site was identified in 1806 by Seetzen with the extensive ruins now called *Mkrauer*, on a rocky spur jutting out from Jebel Attarus towards the north, and overhanging the valley of Zerka Main (*Reise*, i, 330–4). Josephus expressly states that it was the place of John the Baptist's beheading (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 2), although he had said immediately before (*ib.* 2) that it was at the time in the possession of Aretas. See John the Baptist.

Machar, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brechin, Scotland, in 1798. He was educated at King's College, Aberdeen, and afterwards at the University of Edinburgh. On receiving license to preach, he became assistant to the parish minister, and in 1828 emigrated to Canada, and took charge of the Church in Kingston, C. W. In 1833 he was moderator of the synod; and at a meeting of lay delegates, assembled from all parts of the province, he was nominated commissioner to proceed to Britain, and attend to the interests of the Canadian branch of the Church of Scotland in one of the crises of her history. From 1846 to 1853 he was acting principal of Queen's College, Kingston, in which institution, during several sessions, he taught the Hebrew classes, and examined the candidates for license in the Oriental tongues. He died Feb. 7, 1863. Dr. Machar's attainments both in sacred and secular learning were exact and varied; he was familiar with English literature, and could read with ease Hebrew, Greek, and the modern languages. He was always a close student, an earnest preacher, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 388.

Machault, Jacques, a French Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1600; entered the order at eighteen, and afterwards taught ethics and philosophy, and was rector at Alençon, Orleans, and Caen. He died in 1680 at Paris. His works are, *De Missionibus Paraguariæ et aliis in America meridionali* (Paris, 1636, 8vo):—*De Rebus Japonicis* (Paris, 1646, 8vo):—*De Regno Cochinchinensi* (Paris, 1652, 8vo):—*De Missionibus in India* (Paris, 1659, 8vo):—*De Missionibus religiosorum Soc. Jesu in Perside* (Paris, 1659, 8vo):—*De Regno Madurensi* (Paris, 1663, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Machault, Jean de, a French Jesuit, was born at Paris Oct. 25, 1561; was admitted into the order in 1579; became professor of rhetoric at the College de Clermont, Paris, and afterwards rector of the College of Rouen. He died as provincial of Champagne March 25, 1619, at Paris. He published *In Jacobi Thuani historiarum libros notationes lectoribus utiles et necessariæ* (Ingolstadt, 4to), which was condemned to be burned. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Machault, Jean-Baptiste de, a French scholar and Jesuit, nephew of the foregoing, was born at Paris in 1591. He taught rhetoric at Paris, and directed successively the colleges of Rouen and Nevers. He died at Pontoise May 22, 1640. His works are, among others,

S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiep. de Felicitate Sanctorum Dissertatio, ex scriptore Eadinero Anglo, canon. regulari (Paris, 1639, 8vo):—*Histoire des évêques d'Evreux:*—*Gesta a Soc. Jes. in Regno Sinensi, Æthiopico, et Tibetino.* See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Mach'banai (Heb. *Makbannay'*, מַכְבַּנַּי, *binding*, or perhaps *clad with a mantle;* Sept. Μαχαβαναί v. r. Μελχαβαναί; Vulg. *Machbanai*), the eleventh of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness of Adullam (1 Chron. xii, 13). B.C. cir. 1061.

Mach'benah (Heb. *Makbena'*, מַכְבֵּנָא, something *bound* on, perh. a *cloak;* Sept. Μαχαβηνά v. r. Μαχαμηνά; Vulg. *Machbena*), apparently a place in the tribe of Judah founded by (a person of that name, the son of) Sheva (1 Chron. ii, 49), and probably situated in the vicinity of Gibeah, in connection with which it is mentioned. It is thought to have been the same with CABBON (Josh. xv, 40).

Machet, GERARD or GIRARD, a French cardinal, confessor of Charles VII, was born at Blois in 1380; entered the College de Navarre, Paris, in 1391; was made doctor of divinity in 1411; attached himself to the College de Navarre as professor, was made vice-chancellor of that institution, and as such addressed the emperor Sigismond in 1416. Driven from his college by the Burgundian invasion (May 30, 1418), he became the confessor of his pupil, the future emperor, Charles VII. He lived a while at Lyons. Machet was one of the clergy who conducted the examination of the Maid of Orleans. His influence in Troyes, Champagne, was powerful in opening that city and province to the army of Charles VII. Machet was successively canon of Paris, Chartres, Tours, and in 1432 bishop of Castres. He died at Tours July 17, 1448. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ma'chi (Heb. *Maki'*, מָכִי, *smiting;* Sept. Μακχί, Vulg. *Machi*), the father of Geuel, which latter was the commissioner on the part of the tribe of Gad to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii, 15). B.C. ante 1657.

Ma'chir (Heb. *Makir'*, מָכִיר, *sold;* Sept. Μαχείρ and Μαχίρ), the name of two men.

1. The oldest son of Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 1), who even had children born to him during the lifetime of Joseph (Gen. l, 23). B.C. 1802. His descendants were called MACHIRITES (מָכִירִי, Sept. Μαχειρί, Numb. xxvi, 29), being the offspring of Gilead (1 Chron. vii, 17), whose posterity settled in the land taken from the Amorites (Numb. xxxii, 39, 40; Deut. iii, 15; Josh. xiii, 31; 1 Chron. ii, 23), but required a special enactment as to their inheritance, owing to the fact that the grandson Zelophehad had only daughters (Numb. xxvii, 1; xxxvi, 1; Josh. xvii, 3). Once the name of Machir is put poetically as a representative of the tribe of Manasseh east (Judg. v, 14). His daughter became the mother of Segub by Hezron in his old age (1 Chron. ii, 21). The mother of Machir was an Aramitess, and his wife was Maachah, the granddaughter of Benjamin, by whom he had several sons (1 Chron vii, 14–16). "The family of Machir come forward prominently in the history of the conquest of the trans-Jordanic portion of the Promised Land. In the joint expedition of Israel and Ammon, their warlike prowess expelled the Amoritish inhabitants from the rugged and difficult range of Gilead, and their bravery was rewarded by Moses by the assignment to them of a large portion of the district, 'half Gilead' (Josh. xiii, 31), with its rich mountain pastures, and the towns of Ashtaroth and Edrei, the capitals of Og's kingdom (Numb. xxxii, 39, 40; Deut. iii, 15; Josh. xiii, 31; xvii, 1). The warlike renown of the family of Machir is given as the reason for this grant (Josh. xvii, 1), and we can see the sound policy of assigning a frontier land of so much importance to the safety of the whole country, exposed at the same time to the first brunt of the Syrian and Assyrian invasions, and to the never-ceasing predatory inroads of the wild desert tribes, to a clan whose prowess and skill in battle had been fully proved in the subjugation of so difficult a tract (Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 327)." "The connection with Benjamin may perhaps have led to the selection by Abner of Mahanaim, which lay on the boundary between Gad and Manasseh, as the residence of Ishbosheth (2 Sam. ii, 8); and that with Judah may have also influenced David to go so far north when driven out of his kingdom."

2. A descendant of the preceding, son of Ammiel, residing at Lo-debar, who maintained the lame son of Jonathan until provision was made for him by David's care (2 Sam. ix, 4, 5), and afterwards extended his hospitality to the fugitive monarch himself (2 Sam. xvii, 27). B.C. 1037–1023. Josephus calls him the chief of the country of Gilead (*Ant.* vii, 9, 8). See DAVID.

Ma'chirite (Numb. xxvi, 29). See MACHIR, 1.

Mach'mas (Μαχμάς), 1 Macc. ix, 73; elsewhere MICHMASH (q. v.).

Machnad'ebai (Heb. *Maknadbay'*, מַכְנַדְבַּי, perh. *what* is *like* the *liberal?* other copies read מַכְנַדְבָּי, *Mabnadbay';* Sept. Μαχναδααβού v. r. Μαχαδναβού; Vulg. *Mechnedebai*), an Israelite of the sons of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 40). B.C. 459.

Machpe'lah (Heb. *Makpelah'*, מַכְפֵּלָה, probably a *portion*, but, according to others, *double*, and so the Sept. διπλοῦς, Vulg. *duplex*), the name of the plot of ground in Hebron containing the cave which Abraham bought of Ephron the Hittite for a family sepulchre (Gen. xxiii, 9), where it is described as being located in one extremity of the field, and in ver. 17 it is stated to have been situated "before Mamre," and to have likewise contained trees. See MAMRE. The only persons mentioned in Scripture as buried in this cemetery are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxv, 9; xlix, 30; l, 13). "Beyond the passages already cited, the Bible contains no mention either of the name Machpelah or of the sepulchre of the patriarchs. Unless this was the sanctuary of Jehovah to which Absalom had vowed, or pretended to have vowed, a pilgrimage, when absent in the remote Geshur (2 Sam. xv, 7), no allusion to it has been discovered in the records of David's residence at Hebron, nor yet in the struggles of the Maccabees, so many of whose battles were fought in and around it" (Smith). "It is a remarkable fact that none of the sacred writers refer to this celebrated tomb after the burial of Jacob, though it was unquestionably held in reverence by the Jews in all ages. Josephus, in his short notice of the burial of Sarah, says that 'both Abraham and his descendants *built themselves sepulchres* at' Hebron (*Ant.* i, 14), and in another passage he states that the monuments of the patriarchs 'are *to this very time* shown in Hebron, the structure of which is of beautiful marble, wrought after the most elegant manner' (*War*, iv, 9, 7). Jerome mentions the *mausoleum* of Abraham at Hebron as standing in his day (*Onomast.* s. v. Arboch); and in the *Jerusalem Itinerary*, a work of the 4th century, it is described as a quadrangular structure built of stones of wonderful beauty (*Itin. Hieros.* ed. Wessel. p. 599). It is also mentioned by Antoninus Martyr in the beginning of the 7th century (*Itin.* 30); by Arculf towards its close (*Early Travels in Pal.*, Bohn, p. 7); by Willibald in the 8th (*ib.* p. 20); by Sæwulf in the 12th (*ib.* p. 45); and by numerous others (see Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* iii, 237 sq.). From these notices, it appears to be certain that the venerable building which still stands is the same which Josephus describes. Hebron lies in a narrow valley which runs from north to south between low ridges of rocky hills. The modern town is built partly in the bottom of the vale and partly along the lower slope of the eastern ridge. On the hill-side, above the latter section of the town, rise the massive walls of the Haram, forming the one distinguishing feature of Hebron, con-



Mosque at Hebron.

spicuous from all points. The building is rectangular, about 200 feet long by 115 wide, and 50 high. The walls are constructed of massive stones varying from 12 to 20 feet in length, and from 4 to 5 in depth. Dr. Wilson mentions one stone 38 feet long and 3 feet 4 inches in depth, of ancient workmanship (*Lands of the Bible*, i, 366). The edges of the stones are grooved to the depth of about two inches, so that the whole wall has the appearance of being formed of raised panels, like the Temple-wall at Jerusalem. See MASONRY. The exterior is further ornamented with pilasters, supporting without capitals a plain moulded cornice. The building is thus unique; there is nothing like it in Syria. The style of its architecture, independent even of the historical notices above given, proves it to be of Jewish origin; and it cannot be much, if at all, later than the days of Solomon. The interior of this massive and most interesting building was described about fifty years ago by a Spaniard, who conformed to Islamism and assumed the name of Ali Bey (*Travels*, i, 232). The Rev. J. L. Porter was assured when at Hebron, and subsequently by a mollah of rank who had visited the tombs of the patriarchs, that there is an entrance to the cave, which consists of two compartments, and that the guardian can on special occasions enter the outer one (*Handbook*, p. 69). With this agree the statements of M. Pierotti, of Benjamin of Tudela, who gives a description of the caves (*Itin.* by Asher, p. 76 sq.), and of others (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, i, 364 sq.). We cannot doubt that the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs were buried, is beneath this venerable building, and that it has been guarded with religious jealousy from the earliest ages; consequently, it is quite possible that some remains of the patriarchs may still lie there. Jacob was embalmed in Egypt, and his body deposited in this place (Gen. l, 2–13). It may still be there perfect as an Egyptian mummy. The Moslem traditions and the cenotaphs within the Haram agree exactly with the Biblical narrative, and form an interesting commentary on Jacob's dying command—'And he charged them . . . bury me with my fathers . . . in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre. . . . *There they buried Abraham*, and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah' (Gen. xlix, 29–31). There also they buried Jacob. Now within the inclosure are the six cenotaphs only, while the belief is universal among the Mohammedans that the real tombs are in the cave below. Projecting from the west side of the Haram is a little building containing the tomb of Joseph—a Moslem tradition states that his body was first buried at Shechem, but was subsequently transferred to this place (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 498). The Jews cling around this building still, as they do around the ruins of their ancient Temple—taking pleasure in its stones, and loving its very dust. Beside the principal entrance is a little hole in the wall, at which they are permitted at certain times to pray." "A belief seems to prevail in the town that the cave communicates with some one of the modern sepulchres at a considerable distance outside of Hebron (Löwe, in *Zeitung des Judenth.*, June 1, 1839). The ancient Jewish tradition ascribes the erection of the mosque to David (*Jichus ha-Aboth* in Hottinger, *Cippi Hebr.* 30), thus making it coeval with the pool in the valley below; but, whatever the worth of this tradition, it may well be of the age of Solomon, for the masonry is even more antique in its character than that of the lower portion of the south and south-western walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, which many critics ascribe to Solomon, while even the severest allows it to be of the date of Herod. The date must always remain a mystery, but there are two considerations which may weigh in favor of fixing it very early. 1. That, often as the town of Hebron may have been destroyed, this, being a tomb, would always be spared. 2. It cannot, on architectural grounds, be later than Herod's time, while, on the other hand, it is omitted from the catalogue given by Josephus of the places which he rebuilt or adorned." The fullest historical notices of Machpelah will be found in Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* vol. iii, and Robinson, *Bib. Res.* vol. ii. The chief authorities are Arculf (A.D. 700); Benjamin of Tudela (A.D. cir. 1170); the Jewish tract *Jichus ha-Aboth* (in Hottinger, *Cippi Hebraici;* and also in Wilson, i, 365); Ali Bey (*Travels*, A.D. 1807, ii, 232, 233); Giovanni Finati (*Life* by Bankes, ii, 236); Monro (*Summer Ramble* in 1833, i, 243); Löwe, in *Zeitung des Judenth.*, 1839, p. 272, 288. In a note by Asher to his edition of Benjamin of Tudela (ii, 92), mention is made of an Arabic MS. in the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris, containing an account of the condition of the mosque under Saladin. This MS. has not yet been published. The travels of Ibrahim el-Khijari in 1669–70, a small portion of which, from the manuscript in the Ducal Library at Gotha, has been published by Tuch, with translation, etc. (Leipzig, 1850), are said to contain a minute description of the mosque (Tuch, p. 2).

The best description of the interior is that of Stanley, *Jewish Church* and *Sermons in the East* (the two are identical), in which he gives the singular narrative of rabbi Benjamin, and a letter of M. Pierotti, which appeared in the *Times* immediately after the prince of Wales's visit. A plan of the mosque is attached to Stanley's narrative. The description given by Ali Bey (*Travels*, vol. ii) is substantially the same as that of Dean Stanley. A few words about the exterior, a sketch of the masonry, and a view of the town, showing the inclosure standing prominently in the foreground, will be found in Bartlett's *Walks*, etc., p. 216–219. A photograph of the exterior, from the East (?), is given as No. 63 of *Palestine as it is*, by Rev. G. W. Bridges. A ground-plan exhibiting considerable detail, made by two Moslem architects who lately superintended some repairs in the Haram, and given by them to Dr. Barclay of Jerusalem, is engraved in Osborn's *Palestine, Past and Present*, p. 364. Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 385 sq., gives some additional particulars; also Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 393 sq. See HEBRON.

Machzor (מַחְזוֹר, i. e. *cycle*) is the title of that part of Jewish liturgy which contains generally the prayers used in the synagogues on the Sabbath and feast-days, but principally those of the three most important festivals. They are usually rythmical, and are the productions of the most eminent Jewish writers. Unfortunately, many of the modern Jews cannot understand them in the original, and are obliged to have recourse to translations. The first author of such a collection of Sabbath and feast-day prayers, Piutim (פִּיּוּטִים), is R. Eleazar ben-Jacob Kalir, usually known only as Kalir (קַלִּיר), who lived in the second half of the 10th century. This was followed by others (Peitanim, פִּיְּטָנִים, *ποιηταί*). The time of the Peitanim really closes with the 12th century, although fragmentary works still appeared in the 13th and 14th centuries. These collections vary generally according to the nationality of the author, as divers rites and liturgies obtained in the synagogues of different countries. Thus there are Machzors according to the rites of the German, Polish, Spanish, and Italian Jews, and also translations from the Hebrew into the different languages, the use of which translations in the synagogues is, however, not general. The first scientific work on the Machzor is that of W. Heidenheim, published in 1800. This author corrected the text by means of ancient MSS., according to the German and Polish rites, and added to it a commentary and a historical introduction. His work gave rise also to further researches on the Peitanim and liturgies by other modern Jewish writers. Among them may be mentioned Rapoport (*Biographie Kalirs*, etc., in *Bikkure Haïttim*, Vienna, 1829–32), Zunz (*Gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Juden*, p. 380–395), S. D. Luzzatto (כמנהג בני רומא טבריא למחזור, *Einleit. z. Machsor nach röm. Ritus*, Livorno, 1856), and L. Landshuth (עמודי העבודה, *Onomasticon auctorum hymnorum Hebræorum eorumque carminum*, fasciculus i, Berol. 1857). There is a beautiful edition of the Machzor, and a masterly version of it in German by the late Dr. Sachs, of Berlin. See Bartolocci, *Biblioth, Magna Rabbin.* i, 672; iv, 307 sq., 322 sq.; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii, 1334–49; iii, 1200 sq.; iv, 1049 sq. See LITURGY.

Mac Ilvaine. See MCILVAINE.

Mackee, C. B., a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born in Indiana County, Pa., March 28, 1792; was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, studied theology in the Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1819, and ordained in 1821. By untiring self-application he made himself a thorough and critical scholar, especially in the ancient classics, ecclesiastical history, Biblical literature, and theology. In 1824 he was chosen professor of languages in Cincinnati College, Ohio, which position he held until 1835, when he accepted a call as pastor of a church in Rochester, N. Y.; in 1861 he removed to Washington, D. C., to accept an appointment in the government service. He died June 5, 1866. Mr. Mackee was a man of great conscientiousness, a profound scholar, a close thinker, and an instructor with rare capabilities for imparting knowledge. He published a small volume entitled *A Critical Examination of the Offices of Christ*. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 117.

Mackellar, ANGUS, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland near the close of the 18th century, was ordained to the charge of Carmunnock, in the west of Scotland, in 1812, accepted a call to Pencaitland in 1814, was moderator of the Church of Scotland in 1840, and when the disruption came was one of the acknowledged leaders of the Free Church. On leaving his country parish he removed to Edinburgh, and for some years exercised a sort of general superintendence over the missionary and educational interests of the Church. He was moderator of the Assembly of the Free Church in Scotland in 1852. He died May 11, 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 263.

Mackenzie, Charles Frederick, D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, and one of the noblest characters of our day, was born at Harcus Cottage, Peebleshire, Scotland, April 10, 1825, and was educated at Cambridge University, where he graduated with honor in 1848. After lecturing for a time at his alma mater, he decided upon the ministry, and was ordained by the bishop of Ely, and labored for some time in England as a parish minister. In 1854, bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, returned to England, and pleaded earnestly for more laborers in the missionary field. Mackenzie felt persuaded that his duty lay in this direction, and in 1855 he accepted the position of archdeacon of Natal, and went out with the noted Colenso. His zeal in this new field, and his exemplary piety, are attested by all who knew Mackenzie at this time. In 1859 he returned to England to propose the establishment of other missions in Africa. Livingstone had just preceded him on a visit to England, and personally, as well as by the publication of his book on Central Africa, had awakened an unprecedented enthusiasm for that country. The establishment of a mission on the ground lately explored by Livingstone had just been determined upon, and Mackenzie's arrival at this time led to his appointment as the head of it. He was consequently consecrated bishop at Cape Town Jan. 1, 1861; four days after he sailed for the Zambesi, and, after some necessary explorations, settled for his work at a village named Magomero. The climate, which in his former work he had withstood so well, here soon undermined his health, and he died Jan. 31, 1862. "In any calling Mackenzie would have been distinguished for his fine natural qualities. His cheerfulness, gentleness, and simplicity, supported as they were by manly candor and enduring firmness of purpose, and guided by an innate purity and integrity that shrank from the faintest touch of wrong, could not fail to excite the admiration of the most worldly-minded. Consecrated as these qualities were to the service of religion, and warmed by a glowing zeal that had nothing in common with fanaticism, they assume something like heroic proportions. Nor are the battles he fought, the victories he won, the sacrifices he made, for the great objects to which he devoted his life, and the sufferings he endured, unworthy of a record among the achievements of England's illustrious sons." The Christian spirit which the bishop manifested towards his Christian brethren of other churches is worthy of special mention. He labored in concurrence with them with cordiality and good will. His opposition to the slave-trade was decided, and made him many enemies. See Goodwin, *Memoir of Bishop Mackenzie* (Cambr. 1864, 8vo); *Spectator* (Lond.), March 5, 1864, p. 269; Mrs. Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders* (Lond. 1871, 12mo), p. 285 sq. (J. H. W.)

Mackenzie, Sir **George**, an eminent Scotch lawyer and politician, was born at Dundee in 1636, and was

educated at St. Leonard's College. He deserves our notice, first, for his *Religio Stoici, or a short Discourse upon several Divine and Moral Subjects* (1663); his *Moral Essay upon Solitude* (1665); and his *Moral Gallantry* (1667); and also on account of his unhappy connection with the government of Charles II as criminal prosecutor in the memorable days of the Covenant. By his severity in this position he earned for himself the ugly name of the "bluidy Mackenzie;" nor, we fear, can it be disproved—in spite of his liberal antecedents—that he became a willing instrument of despotism. He has, however, written a defence of himself, entitled *A Vindication of the Government of Charles II.* After the Revolution Sir George retired to Oxford. He died in London May 2, 1691. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Auth.* ii, 1175, where many references are to be found.

Mackey, James Love, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Jan. 26, 1820. His early educational privileges were few, but, being fond of study, he struggled hard to qualify himself for teaching. When fourteen years old he opened a school in his father's house; subsequently he taught public school in the neighborhood, attended Hopewell Academy and New London Academy, Pa., and taught in the latter. He entered the seminary at Princeton, N. J., resolved to do work in foreign missions. In 1849 he sailed for Corisco Island. In April of 1851 he founded the Evangasimba Mission, after surmounting many obstacles. In June of 1865 he returned to reside at home, and soon after became principal of the academy at New London, Pa. He died April 30, 1867. Mr. Mackey was a man thoroughly qualified for missionary labors; his mental training, varied and accurate information, and scientific attainments, prepared him for the great work. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almn.*, 1868, p. 119.

Mackie, Josias, one of the earliest Presbyterian ministers who came to America, was born in Donegal County, Ireland. The year of his arrival in this country is uncertain, but the first notice hitherto found of him bears date June 22, 1692. His first settlement appears to have been on the Elizabeth River, Va., where in all probability he became the successor of Francis Mackemie, the first regular Presbyterian minister in America. After a formal oath in 1692, made publicly, and in confirmation of his belief in the Articles of Religion, as allowed in the case of Dissenters, he was licensed. He selected three different places for public worship, many miles apart, on Elizabeth River. These were in the Eastern Branch, in Tanner's Creek precincts, and in the Western Branch, to which was added, in 1696, the Southern Branch. Here, with the care of a farm and a store, he found time to preach, but the record of his labors has not as yet been discovered.—Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 5.

Mackintosh, Sir James, one of the most celebrated literary characters of the 19th century, distinguished alike as a philosopher, jurist, statesman, and historian was born at Aldourie, in the county of Inverness, Scotland, October 24, 1765. His early instruction and training fell into the hands of his grandfather, a man of great excellence. In 1783 he entered King's College, Aberdeen, where he formed an intimate acquaintance with the celebrated Robert Hall—a happy association which told upon the whole career of Mackintosh. He himself records the great influence which Hall's society and conversation had on his mind. They lived in the same house, were constantly together, and led each other into controversies on the most abstruse points of theology and metaphysics. By their fellow-students they were regarded as the intellectual leaders of the university, and under their auspices a society was formed in King's College, which was commonly designated "The Hall and Mackintosh Club." In 1784 he quitted King's College as M.A., and removed to Edinburgh. His own inclinations were to the bar; family circumstances, however, obliged him to enter upon the study of medicine. But he by no means confined himself to his professional studies. "He mingled freely with the intellectual society of the place; divided his studious hours between medicine, metaphysics, and politics, intermingling with each excursions into its lighter literature and passing or past controversies, and he became a prominent speaker in the medical, physical, and speculative societies." Three years had been thus pleasantly spent when the time for his examination came, and, with diploma in hand, he turned southwards, and settled at London. It was a season of great political excitement when Mackintosh arrived in the great English metropolis, and, as the political arena was much more to his taste and inclination than walking the wards of a hospital, he improved the opportunity, and determined upon a strictly literary life. He supported himself for a while by writing for the newspapers, at the same time engaged in philosophical studies. In 1791 he finally published his *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, in reply to Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution*—a work which, though containing juvenile errors, at once gave him great renown; three editions were sold within the first year of its appearance before the public. "In sober philosophic thought, sound feeling, and common sense, it greatly surpassed the splendid philippic against which it was directed, and was enthusiastically lauded." The leading statesmen of England, among them Fox, Sheridan, and others, sought the author's acquaintance; and when the "Association of the Friends of the People" was formed, he was appointed secretary. Encouraged by this success, he turned to the legal profession in 1789, was called to the bar in 1795, and attained high eminence as a forensic lawyer. In 1799 he delivered a course of lectures on the *Law of Nature and of Nations* before the benchers of Lincoln's Inn, which were attended by audiences of the most brilliant description. Later he was made recorder of Bombay, and in 1806 was appointed judge of the Admiralty Court. His Indian career was highly creditable to his capacity and honorable to his character. After his return to England he entered Parliament as Whig member for Nairn (1813). In 1818 he accepted the professorship of law in the college of Haileybury, continuing, however, to take an active part in the political affairs of his country, as the representative of Knaresborough in the nation's council. In 1822, and again in 1823, he filled the honorable position of lord-rector of the University of Glasgow. In 1828, his great attainments as a philosopher were acknowledged by his selection to complete Dugald Stewart's unfinished dissertation on the "Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy since the Revival of Letters in Europe" for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Sir James Mackintosh (he was knighted in 1803) at once set to work, and in 1830 completed his part of the task, entitled *Dissert. on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy chiefly during the 18th and 19th Centuries.* Unfortunately, however, his professional and other duties, as well as sickness, had prevented him from treating the subject as carefully and completely as he might have desired, and so far curtailed the original plan that a survey of political philosophy and the history of the ethical philosophy of the Continent were left unnoticed. But, "notwithstanding these deficiencies," says our distinguished late countryman, Alexander H. Everett (*N. Am. Review*, xxxv, 451), "it will be read with deep interest by students of moral science, and by all who take an interest in the higher departments of intellectual research, or enjoy the beauties of elegant language applied to the illustration of 'divine philosophy.' It gives us, on an important branch of the most important of the sciences, the reflection of one of the few master-minds that are fitted by original capacity and patient study to probe it to the bottom." See the article Ethics in vol. iii, p. 322 sq. He died May 22, 1832.

We have thus far sketched the life of Sir James Mackintosh somewhat more in detail than the limited space of our Cyclopædia really warrants, in order to enable

our readers fully to appreciate the valuable services of this master-mind in the department of philosophy, not only so far as they were exerted directly, but also indirectly. It is not without reason that his distinguished friend Robert Hall said "that if Sir James Mackintosh had enjoyed leisure, and had exerted himself, he would have completely outdone Jeffrey and Stewart, and all the metaphysical writers of our time" (*Works* [Gregory's edition, New York, 1833, 3 vols. 8vo], iii, 80). Neither can we afford to pass hastily by the man whom so eminent an authority as Morell (*Hist. and Crit. View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the 19th Century* [N. Y. 1849, 8vo], p. 405) points out as one of the most eminent moralists of our day. "The ardor, the depth, and the learning," says Morell, "with which he combated the selfish systems, and pleaded for the authority and sanctity of the moral faculty in man, contributed perhaps more than any single cause, not of a religious nature, to oppose the bold advances of utilitarianism, and infuse a healthier tone into the moral principles of the country. Without signifying our adherence to his peculiar theory respecting conscience [viz. "that conscience, or the moral faculty, is not an original part of our constitution, but a 'secondary formation,' created at a later period of life by the effect of the association of ideas out of a variety of elements existing in the mind" (comp. *N. A. Rev.* xxxv, 451; also M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 253)], we still regard his thoughts and speculations as taking eminently the right direction, and had he obtained leisure to mature his views, and give them to the world in his own forcible and glowing style, it is the opinion of some best able to judge upon the subject (e. g. Robert Hall and Dr. Chalmers) that he would have placed the whole theory of morals upon a higher and more commanding position than it had ever occupied before in this country [England]." Besides this work on *Ethical Philosophy* (republished Philad. 1834, 8vo), Mackintosh's chief metaphysical writings were published in the *Edinburgh Review*, to which he frequently contributed (for a list of them, see Allibone). His *Miscellaneous Works*, including the contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, were published in 1846, 3 vols. 8vo, and also in a single volume sq. crown 8vo. See *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Hon. Sir James Mackintosh*, edited by his son, Robert James Mackintosh, Esq. (1835, 2 vols. 8vo); *Edinb. Rev.* 1835 (Oct.); *Brit. Quart. Rev.* 1846 (Nov.); *North Am. Rev.* 1832 (Oct.); and especially the very elaborate and able article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, ii, 1179–1188. (J. H. W.)

Macklaurin, JOHN, an eminent Scotch divine, was born in October, 1693, at Glendaruel, Argyleshire, where his father was then pastor. John was unfortunately early made an orphan, and he was taken in care by his uncle, the Rev. David Macklaurin, who educated John for the ministry, first at Glasgow, and later at Leyden, Holland. In 1717 he was licensed by the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and two years after was appointed minister at Luss, on the west bank of Loch Lomond. In 1723 he was promoted to a more responsible charge, the north-west parish of Glasgow. Here he died, Sept. 8, 1754, "deeply regretted by a numerous and attached congregation, as well as by the general community of Christians in Britain." His sermons and essays, many of which have been published, have received the highest commendations, and are even in our day in general favor with the clergy of Great Britain. The most valuable are *An Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, and three Sermons* (Edinb. 1773, 8vo), said to have been the germ of the large and valuable work of bishop Hurd *On Prophecy; Prejudices against the Gospel;* and his sermons *On the Sins of Men not chargeable to God*, and *Glorying in the Cross of Christ*, all contained in his *Sermons and Essays*, published by the Rev. John Gillies (2d ed. London, 1772, 12mo), where may also be found an account of the life of John Macklaurin. See Jamieson, *Cyclopædia of Religious Biography*, s. v.; Brown, *Introductory Essay* in *Works of Macklaurin* (1824).

Macklin, ALEXANDER, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Lambeg Parish, Down County, Ireland, Jan. 15, 1808. After receiving a good academical training, he graduated at Belfast College, Ireland; studied theology in Hill Hall School, Belfast, under Dr. John Edgar; was licensed by Belfast Presbytery in 1830, and ordained in 1831. During this same year he emigrated to America, and in 1832 was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Clinton, N. J.; in 1835 he accepted a call to the Scotch Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he labored with great success until near his death, July 6, 1859. Dr. Macklin was a man of quick apprehension and sound judgment, and of noble and generous impulses. He wrote a *Tribute to the Memory of Archibald Robertson, Esq.*, a ruling elder, which was published in a pamphlet in 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 96.

Macknight, JAMES, D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Ayrshire in 1721. He studied in the University of Glasgow, but, like many of the Presbyterian divines both of his own country and of England, went abroad, and finished his studies at Leyden. On his return he entered the ministry in the Scotch Church (in 1753) as pastor of Maybole, in Ayrshire. Here he spent sixteen years, during which time he prepared three works: *A Harmony of the Gospels* (Lond. 1756, 2 vols. 4to), with copious illustrations, being, in fact, a life of Christ, embracing everything which the evangelists have related concerning him:—*A new Translation of the Epistles* (published in 1795 in 4 vols. 4to, and later in 6 vols. 8vo):—and *Truth of Gospel History* (1763, 4to). These works were favorably received, and are to this day highly esteemed. The *Harmony* has been repeatedly printed, and to the later editions there are added several dissertations on curious points in the history or antiquities of the Jews. The theology of them is what is called moderately orthodox. For these his valuable services to sacred literature Dr. Macknight received the rewards in the power of the Presbyterian Church to give. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Edinburgh. In 1769 he was removed from Maybole to the more desirable parish of Jedburgh, and in 1772 he became one of the ministers at Edinburgh. Here he continued for the remainder of his life, useful in the ministry and an ornament of the Church. He died Jan. 13, 1800. Of Dr. Macknight's translation of the epistles, universally regarded as his best production, Horne says that it is "a work of theological labor not often paralleled. If we cannot always coincide with the author in opinion, we can always praise his diligence, his learning, and his piety—qualities which confer no trifling rank on any scriptural interpreter or commentator." Dr. W. L. Alexander, however, is not quite so commendatory of Dr. Macknight's scholarship: "This work, which was the result of thirty years' labor, soon obtained and long kept a high reputation. Of late years it has perhaps sunk into unmerited neglect, for there is much in it well deserving the attention of the Biblical student. Its greatest defects are traceable to two causes—the author's imperfect knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and the want of fixed hermeneutical principles. In tracing out, however, the *connection* of a passage, especially of an argumentative kind, he often shows great ability." See *Life*, by his son, prefixed to the *Epistles* (in the editions since 1806); Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Maclaine, ARCHIBALD, D.D., an Irish divine, was born at Monaghan, Ireland, in 1722. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, was minister of the English Church at the Hague from 1745–94, and afterwards settled at Bath, in England. He died at Bath, Nov. 25, 1804. He published a *Sermon* (1752, 8vo), *Letters to Soame Jenyns* (1772, 12mo), in defence of Christianity,

and a very imperfect translation of Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*.

Maclay, Archibald, D.D., or, as he was familiarly known by Christians of all denominations, "Father Maclay," a noted Baptist minister, was born in Killearn, Scotland, May 14, 1778, and in 1802 entered the ministry at Kirkaldy, in Fifeshire. In 1804 he was appointed a missionary to the East Indies, but the government objected, and he was obliged to stay at home. By advice of his friends he quitted his native land, and in 1805 emigrated to this country. Immediately after his arrival he commenced to preach, and built up a Church in Rose Street, New York. Hitherto his connection was with the Established Church of Scotland, but in 1808 he united with the Baptists, and, most of his congregation following his example, a new Church was organized, known as the "Mulberry Street Church" (now the Tabernacle, Second Avenue Church), where he remained until 1837. He then resigned to become agent of the "American and Foreign Bible Society" just organized, and served this body to great advantage until 1850, when he was called within the domain of his own denomination to succeed the late Dr. Cone as the second president of the "American Bible Union." In this capacity he made an official tour of England, presenting the claims of the Bible Union and collecting funds for the revision of the Bible, in which work that society is now engaged. In this mission he was very successful, owing, no doubt, to his fame as an eminent Baptist divine. One of the addresses made while abroad was translated into several languages, and circulated in more than 100,000 copies. On his return to this country he made a similar tour South, and with his usual success. In 1856 he resigned his presidency of the Bible Union on account of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the internal affairs of the Bible Union were conducted. He continued to preach, and labored for his Master till within a few months of his death, May 2, 1860. Dr. Maclay enjoyed the respect of his brethren in the ministry, and the affection of all Christian people who knew him. "He was surpassed by no man in zeal, friendliness, and good sense. He was a safe counsellor, a cheery, hearty, healthy soul, as incapable of cant as of frivolity. It was evident to all who approached him that he was a man as well as a clergyman. He retained to the last that strong, homely, Scottish common-sense which renders the sons of old Scotia indomitable and victorious all over the world. A man of more absolute and immovable honesty never breathed." (J. H. W.)

Maclean, Archibald, an English Baptist minister, was born May 1, 1733 (O. S.), at East Kilbride, in Lanarkshire. He was for many years pastor of the Baptist Church in Edinburgh, and was founder of the Baptist congregations in Scotland. He died in Edinburgh Dec. 12, 1812. Mr. Maclean published *Paraphrase and Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinb. 1811–17, 2 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 12mo; Aberdeen, 1847, 2 vols, 12mo). A collective edition of Maclean's works, including the above work, sermons, etc., with a memoir of his life and writings by Rev. W. Jones, was published (Lond. 1823, 6 vols. 8vo; vol. vii, 1852, 18mo; Edinb. 6 vols. 12mo). — Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, s. v.

Maclennan, James, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, a native of Scotland, came to the United States in early manhood, furnished with a good classical education. He had been brought up in the bosom of the Established Church of Scotland, and fully believed all its doctrines, but, owing to his Calvinistic views, had given himself no personal concern about his salvation. He was, however, awakened and converted during a revival of religion in Pontotoc, Miss., joined the Methodists, and, feeling it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, entered the Mississippi Conference Dec. 3, 1840. He took position at once in the Conference on account of his educational advantages. His first appointment was Jackson Station, then he preached in Lake Washington country, on the Mississippi River, and in 1849 was elected secretary of the Conference. For several years following he located; from 1863 to 1867 he was presiding elder of the Granville District, and in 1865 was elected a delegate to the General Conference held in New Orleans in 1866. At the time of his death, in 1870, he was supernumerary on the Lake Lee and Leota Circuit. "Brother Maclennan was a man of strong character, . . . a simple-hearted Christian, dearly loved the Church of his choice, and literally laid his life a 'living sacrifice upon her altars.'"—*Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870.

Macmillanites. See Scotland, Reformed Presbyterian Church in.

Macneile, Hugh, D.D., an Irish divine of note, was born in 1793, at Ballycastle, in the county of Antrim, Ireland; was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he received both the degree of A.M. and D.D.; also the appointment of canon of Chester. In 1822 he married the daughter of Dr. Magee, late archbishop of Dublin, in whose family he had been tutor. After preaching for some years in London, where he attracted large congregations, chiefly at Charlotte-Street Chapel, Fitzroy Square, he became successively incumbent of St. Jude's, Liverpool, and of St. Paul's, Prince's Park, near Liverpool. In 1868 he was made dean of Ripon. He died in 1872. He published *The Church and the Churches, or the Church of God in Christ militant here on Earth* (1847, 8vo):—*Lectures on the Church of England* (12mo):—*Lectures on the Prophecies of the Jews* (1842, 12mo):—*Lectures on the Sympathies, etc., of our Saviour* (12mo):—*Letters on Seceding from the Church* (12mo):—*Sermons on the Second Advent* (12mo):—*Seventeen Sermons* (12mo). He also published several separate sermons, addresses, and controversial pamphlets.

Macon, Councils of (*Concilium Matisconense*). Ecclesiastical councils were held in this city of Burgundy in 584 and 585. At the former there were enactments to regulate the clerical dress, and forbidding Jews "to appear in the streets from Maunday Thursday until Easter Monday;" at the latter, over which Priscus, archbishop of Lyons, presided, enactments were passed—memorial in the history of the Church—on the conduct of the laity towards the clergy. Among other things, it was required that whenever one of the laity met one of the clergy in the public streets, the former should make a lowly and reverent bow; if both parties are on horseback, then the layman should take off his hat; but if the layman be on horseback and the clergy on foot, the former is to dismount and make his obeisance. See Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, i, 240; Landon, *Man. of Councils*, i, 386–9.

Macrobius, an ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the first half of the 4th century. He was a preacher in the Church in Africa after Gennadius became entangled in the Donatist heresy, and as a Donatist bishop secretly labored at Rome at one time. Before his separation from the orthodox he composed a discourse, *Ad confessores et virgines*, in which he insisted principally upon the beauty and the sanctity of chastity. After his union with the Donatists he addressed a letter to the laity of Carthage, *De Passione Maximiani et Isaaci Donatistarum* (published by Mabillon, *Analecta* [Paris, 1675], iv, 119, and *Optatus* [Paris, 1700, Amst. 1701, Antwerp, 1702]).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 607.

Ma'cron (Μάκρων, i. e. *long-head;* Vulg. *Macer*), the surname of Ptolemæus or Ptolemee, the son of Dorymenes (1 Macc. iii, 38), and governor of Cyprus under Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc. x, 12).

Macurdy, Elisha, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Carlisle, Pa., Oct. 15, 1763; was educated at the Academy of Cannonsburg, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Ohio about 1799. His first labors were as a missionary in the regions bordering on Lake Erie. In

June, 1800, he was ordained and installed pastor of the united congregations of Cross Roads and Three Springs. During this connection he had an important agency in the revival in Western Pennsylvania, and was one of those who formed the "Western Miss. Society." In 1823 he went on a mission to Maumee, and on his return was obliged, from ill health, to resign his charge of the church of Three Springs, and to confine himself to that of Cross Roads. He died July 22, 1845. See Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 241.

Macwhorter, Alexander, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, born in Newcastle County, Delaware, July 15, 1734; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1757; settled near Newark in 1759; was employed as a missionary to North Carolina in 1764–6; was chaplain to Knox's Brigade in 1778; settled in Charlotte, N. C., in 1779, but removed in 1780 to Newark, N. J., where he preached until his death, July 20, 1807. In 1788 he was prominent in settling the Confession of Faith and forming the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Yale College in 1776. See Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 208 sq.

Mad. See Madness.

Madagascar, an island situated to the south-east of the African continent, in lat. 11° 57′—25° 38′ S., and longitude about 43°—51°; length, 1030 miles; greatest breadth, 350 miles; area estimated at 240,000 square miles, therefore covering a territory larger than the British Isles, contains a population of nearly five millions.

History up to the Introduction of Christianity.—The early history of this interesting island is involved in the deepest mystery. It is supposed to have been known to the ancients, by whom it was generally considered as an appendage to the main land, and was probably discovered by the Phœnicians. As an island, we find it first mentioned by Marco Polo, in the 13th century, as *Magascar* or *Madagascar;* but its discoverer is now admitted to have been the Portuguese Antao Gonçalves, who named it *Isla de San Lourenço.* The unhealthy climate made the stay of Europeans for a long time impossible. In 1774, Europeans attempted to establish a colony at Antongil Bay, on the eastern side of the island; it was mainly composed of Frenchmen; but, failing to receive encouragement and assistance from the French government, the settlement proved a failure. With the Christian missionaries (1818) skilful mechanics and tradesmen entered Madagascar, and to-day the island contains, in spite of its unhealthfulness of climate, quite a number of Europeans.

The natives consist of many tribes, of which the *Hovas* inhabit the centre and northern portion of the island, and are at present so powerful as to hold in subjection most of the others. The features of the inhabitants of this section present a striking resemblance to those of the South Sea Islanders; they are evidently of different extraction from the other and darker tribes, whose features are wholly African. The men are generally well made, having finely-proportioned limbs, and usually present a high type of physiological development. The women are well formed and active, but by no means so prepossessing in feature as the other sex. The complexion of the Hovas is a ruddy brown or tawny color, while that of the other tribes is much darker. Another and very peculiar distinction is the long, straight hair of the former as compared to the woolly growth of their neighbors. The principal article of dress in use among the Hovas is the lamba, a garment very similar to the Roman toga, and made of cotton or linen materials.

The religion of these natives, not converts to Christianity, is strictly heathen. Mohammedanism never made its way to them, and has no converts among them. Aside from Christianity, they have no accurate conception of God. The Supreme Being they style *Fragrant Prince.* "Their ideas of a future state, and, indeed, their whole religious system, is indefinite, discordant, and puerile; it is a compound of heterogeneous elements, borrowed in part from the superstitious fears and practices of Africa, the opinions of the ancient Egyptians, and the prevalent idolatrous systems of India, blended with the usages of the Malayan Archipelago. There are no public temples in honor of any divinity, nor any order of men exclusively devoted to the priesthood, but the keeper of idols receives the offerings of the people, presents their requests, and pretends to give the response of the god. They worship also at the grave or the tomb of their ancestors" (Newcomb, p. 521). They practice circumcision, have the division of weeks into seven days, abstain from swine's flesh, and follow other Jewish practices. Marriage is general, but polygamy prevails, and conjugal fidelity scarcely exists among the non-Christianized.

Introduction of Christianity.—In 1816, Radama, the king of the Hovas, virtually even then the prince of all Madagascar, entered into diplomatic and commercial relations with the English. Only two years later—in 1818—Protestant missionaries set out for it, and ultimately this African isle became "one of the countries where the rapid and easy triumph of Christianity equals the most brilliant episodes in the history of Christian propagandism," and a lasting rebuke to those Roman Catholics who have dared to pronounce Protestant missions a *failure.* The first Protestant missionaries were sent out by the London Missionary Society; and their mission, from the beginning, was very successful. The whole Bible was circulated in the native language; about one hundred schools were established, and from ten to fifteen thousand persons received Christian instruction. Suddenly, however, Radama died (July 27, 1828), and was succeeded by Ranavala Manjaka, a woman of great cruelty, and inimical to Europeans. With her accession to the throne of Madagascar opened a fiery ordeal of persecution, lasting for nearly thirty years. Europeans were banished from the isle; the public profession of Christianity was forbidden; churches and schools were closed, and many of the members of the churches were persecuted to death. The conduct of the converts was most exemplary; by their constancy, and many by their death, they refuted the slanders of Romanists that the converts of the Protestant mission churches consist, for a large part, of men who seek to obtain a lucrative position. In 1862 queen Ranavala Manjaka died, and her son was proclaimed king under the title of Radama II. With his accession to the throne of Madagascar the period of religious toleration recommenced, and, although for a moment the assassination of the king (in 1863; he was strangled, and his own wife selected as his successor, the government having been modified into a constitutional form) spread alarm among the Christians, the missionaries of the London Society resumed their labors, and they were agreeably surprised in seeing that, in spite of all persecution, the Christian congregations had maintained themselves. In 1867, the erection of four memorial churches on places where the first martyrs of Christianity fell a prey to heathen superstitions of Madagascar was projected; three of these have already been completed, and the fourth is in progress. (See *Christian Advocate,* Nashville, Tenn., Dec. 2, 1871.) But the greatest triumph the Gospel achieved in Madagascar in 1869 was when the now reigning queen, Ranavala II (she succeeded to the throne April 1, 1868), and, with her, a majority of the natives, threw away their idols, and embraced Christianity much in the same way as the ancient Britons did many centuries ago. See the *Missionary Advocate* (N. Y., Feb. 15, 1870).

Among those particularly worthy of praise, for services rendered in the missionary efforts in Madagascar, is the Rev. William Ellis (died in July, 1872). By years of missionary labors performed in the South Sea Islands he had become thoroughly acquainted with the missionary work; and when, by the death of Ranavala Manjaka, Madagascar seemed again open to the Europeans, he was selected by the *London Missionary Society* to visit the country, in company with Mr. Cameron, in order to ascertain the actual condition of things, with a

view to resuming missionary labor. The manner in which Mr. Ellis conducted the most delicate negotiations with the government of Madagascar, so as to secure an entrance for the Christian teachers to the country, and the influence he exerted in high places, are well known to all persons acquainted with modern missionary enterprise. On three occasions he visited Madagascar, always on important missions, and always with signal success. He went before, and prepared the way for those who have gone in and occupied the field. On each occasion of his return to England he had marvellous things to tell of Madagascar and the prospects that were opening for the Church of God there. His *Martyr Church of Madagascar*, *Madagascar Revisited* (London, 1867, 8vo), and *Three Visits to Madagascar*, give a history of that mission-field which leaves nothing to be desired (compare, however, *Westminster Rev.* April, 1867, p. 249). It was he, too, who completed and revised the translation of the Scriptures into the Malagasy language.

The number of Christians in Madagascar is now estimated at more than 325,000. In 1888, the English missionaries (Episcopalians, Methodists, and Friends), who have their head-quarters at the adjoining island of Mauritius (an English possession), had in operation 924 schools, attended by 93,388 pupils. The Roman Catholics have, since 1861, missionaries (Jesuits) in the island, but they are mainly at the capital, Tamatave, and vicinity, and in the French possessions, the adjoining island of Réunion. See, besides the works of Ellis, already mentioned, M'Leod, *Madagascar and its People* (London, 1865); Oliver, *Madagascar and the Malagasi* (London, 1866); J. Sibree, *Madagascar and its People* (London, 1870); Chambers's *Cyclop.* s. v.: Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s. v.; *Edinb. Rev.* 1867, p. 212; Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, No. 17; *N. Y. Methodist*, 1867; *N. Y. Christian Intelligencer*, July 11, 1872.

Ma'dai (Heb. *Maday'*, מָדַי, Sept. *Maδoi*, Gen. x, 2, a MEDE [q. v.], as elsewhere rendered), the third son of Japhet (Gen. x, 2), from whom the Medes, etc., are supposed to have descended. B.C. post 2514. See ETHNOLOGY.

Madan, Martin, an Anglican divine, was born near Hertford, England, in 1726. He first studied law, but finally entered the ministry, and was for a number of years chaplain to the Lock Hospital, London. He died in 1790. Mr. Madan gained great notoriety by a work which he published in 1780, entitled *Thelypthora*, a treatise on female ruin, in which he stoutly advocated the practice of polygamy. The pamphlets which his work elicited he replied to in a number of tracts. Madan's object in advocating polygamy was the removal of seduction. He was quite a pulpit orator; several of his sermons have been published.—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclopœdia Bibliog.* ii, 1920.

Madan, Spencer (1), D.D., an Anglican prelate, was born about the middle of the 18th century; became bishop of Bristol in 1792, and of Peterborough in 1794. He died in 1813. Bishop Madan published several occasional *Sermons* (London, 1792, 8vo, and often), and a translation of Grotius's *De Veritate Christianæ Religionis* (1781–83, 1813). See *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1837, i, 206.

Madan, Spencer (2), D.D., an English divine, son of the preceding, was born in 1759; was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; was rector first of Ibstock, Leicestershire, and later of Thorp, in Staffordshire. He was also chaplain for the king about thirty years, and prebend of Peterborough. He died in 1836. He published several sermons.

Madeira (a Portuguese word signifying *wood*, and given because of the unusual abundance of timber) is an island in the North Atlantic Ocean, off the N.W. coast of Africa, in lat. 32° 43′ N., long. 17° W., with an area of 345 sq. miles, and a population in 1885 of 125,841, and belongs to Portugal. It constitutes a part of a group of islands sometimes called "the Northern Canaries," which were discovered in 1419. The coasts of Madeira are steep and precipitous, rising from 200 to 2000 feet above sea-level, comprising few bays or landing-places, and deeply cut at intervals by narrow gorges, which give to the circumference the appearance of having been *crimped*. From the shore the land rises quickly to a height of 5000 feet; its highest point, the Pico Ruivo, is 6050 feet high. It is of volcanic origin, and slight earthquakes occasionally occur. The lower portions of the island abound in tropical plants, as the date-palm, plantain, sweet potato, Indian corn, coffee, sugar-cane, pomegranate, and fig. The fruits and grains of Europe are somewhat cultivated, but the country has until lately been mainly devoted to the cultivation of the vine and sugar-cane. Funchal, with a population of 25,000, is both the capital and port of the island. The climate is remarkable for its constancy. There is only 10° difference between the temperatures of summer and winter, the thermometer in Funchal showing an average of 74° in summer and of 64° in winter. At the coldest season the temperature is rarely less than 60°, while in summer it seldom rises above 78°; but sometimes a waft of the *lesté*, or east wind, raises it to 90°. The natives of Madeira are of a mixed race, principally of Portuguese, Moorish, and negro blood. "They are meagre, sallow, and short-lived, which is attributed to their want of wholesome food [the poorer classes chiefly subsist on the eddoc-root, sweet potatoes, and chestnuts], a life of drudgery, and a total disregard of cleanliness."

The Roman Catholic Church is the established religion of Madeira, and until recently none other was tolerated. In 1839, Dr. Kalley, a physician, began to disseminate Protestant doctrines, and ultimately the Scotch Church took up the work most successfully began by Dr. Kalley. The spirit of persecution, so general in Romish countries, was not wanting here, and there was great opposition to Protestantism. The first missionary to the island was the Rev. W. Hewitson, who arrived there in 1845, but for a long time the opposition of the government was so severe that he was obliged to confine his labors mainly to Dr. Kalley's converts. So uncomfortable were natives who chose the Protestant communion, that in 1846 some 800 of them left for Trinidad and for the United States. At present the Protestants have quite a hold on the country. Besides an English Church, there are other places of worship, including a Presbyterian Church in connection with the Free Church of Scotland. The educational institutions comprise the Portuguese College, and Lancasterian and government schools. See White, *Madeira, its Climate and Scenery*; Schultze, *Die Insel Madeira* (Stuttg. 1864); Chambers's *Encyclop.* s. v.; Newcomb, *Cyclopœdia of Missions*, s. v.

Mâdhava is one of the names of the deity *Vishnu* (q. v.) in Hindu mythology and in Sanskrit poetry.

Mâdhavâchârya (i. e. Mâdhava, the Achârya or *spiritual teacher*), one of the greatest Hindu scholars and divines of the mediæval literature of India, is said to have been born at Pampa, a village situated on the bank of the river Tungabhadrâ, probably near the beginning of the 14th century. He was prime minister of Sangama, the son of Kampa, whose reign at Vijayanagara commenced about 1336, and also under king Bukka I, who succeeded Harihara I about 1361. He died at the age of ninety, probably towards the close of the 14th century. Mâdhavâchârya is famed for his numerous and important works on Vedic, philosophical, legal, and grammatical writings of the ancient Hindus. The most important of these are his great commentaries on the Rig-, Yajur-, and Sâma-veda [see VEDA]; an exposition of the Mîmânsâ philosophy; a summary account of fifteen religious and philosophical systems of Indian speculation; some treatises on the Vedânta philosophy; another on salvation; a history of Sankara's (q. v.) polemics against multifarious misbelievers and heretics; a

commentary on Parâsara's code of law; a work on determining time, especially in reference to the observation of religious acts; and a grammatical commentary on Sanscrit radicals and their derivatives. The chief performance of Mâdhava is doubtless the series of his great commentaries on the Vedas, for without them no conscientious scholar could attempt to penetrate the sense of those ancient Hindu works. In these commentaries Mâdhava labors to account for the grammatical properties of Vedic words and forms, records their traditional sense, and explains the drift of the Vedic hymns, legends, and rites. So great was Mâdhavâchârya's learning and wisdom that popular superstition assigned them a supernatural origin. He was supposed to have received them from the goddess Bhuvaneswari, the consort of Siva, who, gratified by his incessant devotions, became manifest to him in a human shape, conferred on him the gift of extraordinary knowledge, and changed his name to *Vidyâranya* (the "Forest of Learning"), a title by which he is sometimes designated in Hindu writings.

Madi'abun ([Ἰησοῦ] Ἡμαβαδούν v. r. Μαδιαβούν; Vulg. omits), a name interpolated in 1 Esdr. v, 38 as that of a Levite whose "sons" assisted at the restoration of the Temple under Zorobabel; but the Heb. list (Ezra iii, 9) has nothing resembling or corresponding to it.

Ma'dian (Judith ii, 26; Acts vii, 29). See MIDIAN.

Madison, JAMES, D.D., an early Episcopal prelate in America, was born near Port Republic, Rockingham County, Va., Aug. 27, 1749; passed A.B. in the College of William and Mary in 1772; was soon after admitted to the bar, which he abandoned for the ministry; in 1773 became professor of mathematics in his alma mater; in 1775 proceeded to England for ordination, was licensed for Virginia, but on his return resumed his duties as professor in his alma mater, of which he became president in 1777. He afterwards revisited England to see Cavallo and other scientific men. In 1784 he was changed to the chair of natural and moral philosophy. In 1788 he was chosen bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, and in 1790 was consecrated in England. Under his care the College of William and Mary advanced steadily in reputation. He discharged his duties with zeal and fidelity until his death, March 6, 1812. In his theology bishop Madison was much of a rationalist, and is charged by bishop Coxe (*Am. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 35 and 46) with having given "something worse than a negative support" to this dangerous element in the Church. He published some *Sermons, Letters, and Addresses;* also *A Eulogy on Washington* (1800). See Sprague, *Annals*, v, 318; Drake, *Dict. of Am. Biog.* s. v.

Madman. See MADNESS.

Madmann'nah (Hebrew *Madmannah'*, מַדְמַנָּה, *dunghill;* Sept. Μεδεμηνά and Μαδμηνά v. r. Μαχαρίμ and Βέδ; Vulg. *Medemena* and *Madmena*), a town in the extreme south of Judah (Josh. xv, 31, where it is mentioned between Ziklag and Sansannah), hence included in the territory afterwards assigned to Simeon. From 1 Chron. ii, 49, it appears to have been founded or, rather, occupied by Shaaph (or perhaps by a son of his whose name it bore), the son of Caleb's concubine Maachah. Eusebius and Jerome identify it with a town of their time called *Menois* (Μηνωΐς), near the city of Gaza (*Onomast.* p. 89). See MADMENAH. Instead of Madmannah and Sansannah of Josh. xv, 31, the parallel passage (Josh. xix, 5; comp. 1 Chron. iv, 31), enumerating the Simeonitish cities, has BETH-MARCABOTH and Hazar-susim, probably the same respectively (Keil's *Joshua*, ad loc.). Schwarz thinks (*Palestine*, p. 101) that it was the Levitical city *Mandah*, in which, according to the "Book of Jasher," Simeon was buried; but this locality is wholly apocryphal. The first stage southward from Gaza is now *el-Minyây* (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 563), which, in default of a better, is suggested by Kiepert (in his *Map*, 1856) as the modern representative of Menois, and therefore of Madmannah. A more plausible identification, however, is that of Van de Velde (*Travels*, ii, 130) of the modern ruined village *Mirkib*, west of the south end of the Dead Sea, as a representative of the ancient Beth-marcaboth.

Mad'men (Heb. *Madmen'*, מַדְמֵן, *dunghill;* Sept. παῦσις v. r. Μαδαιβημά, Μαδαμημά, and Μαδενηβά; Vulg. *silens*), a Moabitish town, threatened with destruction by the sword from the Babylonian invasion in connection with the neighboring Heshbon (Jer. xlviii, 2). Some (as Hitzig, after the Sept., Vulg., etc.) regard it as an appellative; and in some editions of the Auth. Vers. it is actually printed "O *madmen!*" The slight notice only affords an approximate location opposite the northern extremity of the Dead Sea. See MADMENAH.

Madme'nah (Heb. *Madmenah'*, מַדְמֵנָה, *dunghill;* Sept. Μαδεβηνά, Vulg. *Medemena*), a town named in Isa. x, 31, where it is placed on the route of the Assyrian invaders, in the northern vicinity of Jerusalem, between Nob and Gibeah. It has been confounded by Eusebius and Jerome with MADMANNAH, which is much too far southward to suit the context. "Gesenius (*Jesaias*, p. 414) points out that the verb in the sentence is active—'Madmenah flies,' not, as in the A. Vers., 'is removed' (so also Michaelis, *Bibel für Ungelehrten*). Madmenah is not impossibly alluded to by Isaiah (xxv, 10) in his denunciation of Moab, where the word rendered in the Auth. Vers. 'dunghill' is identical with that name. The original text (or *Kethib*), by a variation in the preposition (במו for במר), reads the 'waters of Madmenah.' If this is so, the reference may be either to the Madmenah of Benjamin—one of the towns in a district abounding with corn and threshing-floors—or, more appropriately still, to MADMEN, the Moabitish town. Gesenius (*Jesaias*, p. 786) appears to have overlooked this, which might have induced him to regard with more favor a suggestion that seems to have been first made by Joseph Kimchi."

Madness. The words rendered by "mad," "madman," "madness," etc., in the A. Vers., vary considerably in the Hebrew of the O. T. In Deut. xxviii, 28, 34; 1 Sam. xxi, 13, 14, 15, etc. (μανία, etc., in the Sept.), they are derivatives of the root שָׁגַע, *shaga'*, "to be stirred or excited;" in Jer. xxv, 16; l, 38; li, 7; Eccles. i, 17, etc. (Sept. περιφορά), from the root הָלַל, *halal'*, "to flash out," applied (like the Greek φλέγειν) either to light or sound; in Isa. xliv, 25, from סָכַל, *sakkel'*, "to make void or foolish" (Sept. μωραίνειν); in Zech. xii, 4, from תָּמַהּ, *tamah'*, "to wander" (Sept. ἔκστασις). In the N. T. they are generally used to render μαίνεσθαι or μανία (as in John x, 20; Acts xxvi, 24; 1 Cor. xiv, 23); but in 2 Pet. ii, 16 the word is παραφρονία, and in Luke vi, 11, ἄνοια. The term is used in Scripture in its proper and old sense of a raving maniac or demented person (Deut. xxviii, 34; 1 Sam. xxi, 13; John x, 20; 1 Cor. xiv, 23), and may be medically defined to be delirium without fever. Our Lord cured by his word several who were deprived of the exercise of their rational powers, and the circumstances of their histories prove that there could neither be mistake nor collusion respecting them. See LUNATIC. How far madness may be allied to, or connected with dæmoniacal possession (as implied in one passage, John x, 20), is a very intricate inquiry; and whether in the present day (as perhaps anciently) evil spirits may not take advantage from distemperature of the bodily frame to augment evils endured by the patient is more than may be affirmed, though the idea seems to be not absolutely repugnant to reason (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 213). See DÆMONIAC. The term "mad" is likewise applied in Scripture, as in common life, to any subordinate but violent disturbance of the mental faculties, whether springing from a disordered intellect (as by over-study,

Acts xxvi, 24, 25; from startling intelligence, Acts xii, 15; from preternatural excitement, Hos. ix, 7; Isa. xliv, 25; from resistance of oppression, Eccles. vii, 7; from inebriety, Jer. xxv, 16; li, 7; or simple fatuity, 2 Kings ix, 11; Jer. xxix, 26), or from irregular and furious passion (e. g. as a persecutor, Acts xxvi, 11; Psa. cii, 8; from idolatrous hallucination, Jer. l, 38; or wicked and extravagant jollity, Eccles. ii, 2). In like manner, "madness" expresses not only proper insanity (Deut. xxviii, 28, and so "madman," 1 Sam. xxi, 15; Prov. xxvi, 18), but also a reckless state of mind (Eccles. x, 13), bordering on delirium (Zech. xii, 4), whether induced by overstrained intellectual efforts (Eccles. i, 17; ii, 12), from blind rage (Luke vi, 12), or the effect of depraved tempers (Eccles. vii, 25; ix, 3; 2 Pet. ii, 6). David's madness (1 Sam. xxi, 13) is by many supposed not to have been feigned, but a real epilepsy or falling sickness; and the Sept. uses words which strongly indicate this sense (ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας). It is urged in support of this opinion that the troubles which David underwent might very naturally weaken his constitutional strength, and that the force he suffered in being obliged to seek shelter in a foreign court would disturb his imagination in the highest degree. A due consideration, however, of the context and all the circumstances only serves to strengthen the opinion that it was feigned for obvious reasons (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustr.* ad loc.). "It is well known that among Oriental, as among most semi-civilized nations, madmen were looked upon with a kind of reverence, as possessed of a quasi-sacred character (see Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 346). This arises partly, no doubt, from the feeling that one on whom God's hand is laid heavily should be safe from all other harm, but partly also from the belief that the loss of reason and self-control opened the mind to supernatural influence, and gave it therefore a supernatural sacredness. This belief was strengthened by the enthusiastic expression of idolatrous worship (see 1 Kings xviii, 26, 28), and (occasionally) of real inspiration (see 1 Sam. xix, 21–24; comp. the application of 'mad fellow' in 2 Kings ix, 11, and see Jer. xxix, 26; Acts ii, 13)."

Ma'don (Heb. *Madon'*, מָדוֹן, *strife*, as in Prov. xv, 18, etc.; Sept. Μαδών v. r. Μαρών), a Canaanitish city in the north of Palestine, ruled over by a king named Jobab in the time of Joshua, who captured it (Josh. xi, 1; xii, 19). Calmet (*Dict.* s. v.), arbitrarily conjecturing that *Maron* is the true reading, refers to *Maronia*, a small village of Syria thirty miles east of Antioch (Jerome, *Vit. Mal.* 2), probably the place alluded to by Ptolemy (v, 15, 8, Μαρωνιάς) as lying in the province of Chalcidice. Schwarz infers (*Palest.* p. 90, 173) from Rabbinical notices (chiefly a statement of the early Jewish traveller hap-Parchi in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 430) that the site is that of the present *Kefr Menda*, a considerable village at the foot of the hills north of Diocæsarea, containing a very deep well and some traces of antiquity, which Dr. Robinson (new edit. *of Researches*, iii, 109–111) is inclined to regard as marking the place of the Asochis of Josephus (*Life*, 41, 45, 68; *War*, i, 4, 2; *Ant.* xiii, 12, 4), although admitting that the latter may be referred to Tell ed-Bedawiyeh, in the vicinity.

"In the Sept. version of 2 Sam. xxi, 20, the Hebrew words אִישׁ מָדוֹן, 'a man of stature,' are rendered ἀνὴρ Μαδών, 'a man of Madon.' This may refer to the town Madon, or may be merely an instance of the habit which these translators had of rendering literally in Greek letters Hebrew words which they did not understand. Other instances will be found in 2 Kings vi, 8; ix, 13; xii, 9; xv, 10, etc."

Madonna (Italian, *My Lady*), a term applied in the language of art to representations of the Virgin Mary. Such representations first made their appearance after the 5th century, when the Virgin was declared to be the "Mother of God." The face of the mother is generally full, oval, and of a mild expression; a veil adorns the hair. At first the lineaments of the Virgin's countenance were copied from the older pictures of Christ, according to the tradition which declared that the Saviour resembled his mother. A chronological arrangement of the pictures of the Virgin would exhibit in a remarkable manner the development of the Roman Catholic doctrine on this subject. The Madonna has been a principal subject of the pencils of the great masters. The grandest success has been achieved by Raphael (q. v.), in whose pictures of the Madonna there prevails now the loving mother, now the ideal of feminine beauty, until in that of St. Sixtus there is reached the most glorious representation of the "Queen of Heaven." Murillo's "Conceptions" also should be noticed here. See Murillo. One of these has lately been presented to the American public in chromo by the American art publisher Prang, of Boston.

Among symbolic representations may be mentioned Mary with the white mantle, i. e. the mantle of love under which she receives the faithful; and the Virgin with the half-moon or with the globe under her feet, according to the meaning put upon the twelfth chapter of Revelation. The Virgin was never represented without the Child until comparatively recent times. See Mrs. Jameson's delightful work, *Legends of the Madonna* (3d ed. Lond. 1863, 8vo); *Christian Remembrancer*, 1868 (July), p. 130; *Old and New*, 1872 (April).

Madox, Isaac, D.D., an English divine, was born in London in 1697; was educated at one of the universities of Scotland, and at Queen's College, Cambridge; was successively curate of St. Bride's, domestic chaplain to Dr. Waddington, bishop of Chichester; rector of St. Vedast, in Foster Lane, London. In 1729 he was appointed clerk of the closet to queen Caroline; in 1733 became dean of Wells; in 1736, bishop of St. Asaph; was translated to the see of Worcester in 1743, and died in 1759. Dr. Madox published a number of *Sermons* (London, 1734–53), and a review of the first volume of Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, entitled *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1733, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vii, 208.

Madras, one of the three presidencies of the Indian Empire, occupies the greater part of the south of the peninsula of Hindustan, including the coast lands, Malabar, the Laccadive Islands, and the Coromandel coast, in all covering an area of 138,856 square miles, with 31,672,613 inhabitants in 1885 (according to Behm. *Geogr. Jahrbuch*, 1870, eleven twelfths are Hindus, and some 80,000 adherents of Mohammedanism). The tributary states Mysore, Cochin, Travancore, Pudocotta, and Djayapur are virtually a part of Madras, and are therefore included in our statistics of Madras. The capital of this presidency is a city of like name, and is situated on the Coromandel coast, the western shore of the Bay of Bengal, in lat. 13° 5′ N. It stretches along the coast, with its nine suburbs, for nine miles, with an average breadth of three and one half miles. Its inhabitants number 405,948 (1887), among them about 30,000 native Christians. Madras was the first hold of the English secured by the occupation of Fort George (situated on the coast midway between the north and south extremities of the city) in 1639. It is now truly an Indo-European city. Like Calcutta and Bombay, it is a gathering-place for the missionaries of the different denominations and associations, and the basis for all missionary enterprise in southern India. Madras is the seat of the Anglican see of Madras, established in 1835. The missionary societies at work there are the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," the "London Missionary Society," the "Church Missionary Society" (which started in 1805), the "Wesleyan Missionary Society," the "Church of Scotland," the "American Board" (commenced there in 1836), and the "Free Church of Scotland." Its principal buildings and institutions are the Government House, a handsome edifice, though much

inferior to the similar establishments in Calcutta, and even in Bombay; one of the finest light-houses in the world; the Scotch Church of St. Andrew, founded in 1818, a stately and beautiful edifice; a university, with three European professors, and numerous teachers both European and native, and containing a valuable museum and a library; St. George's Cathedral, from which a magnificent view of the city and its vicinity may be obtained, and containing several monuments by Chantrey (including one of bishop Heber), and some figures by Flaxman. There are also male, military, and female orphan asylums, a medical school, a branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, the Madras Polytechnic Institution, the Government Observatory, a mint, eight established Episcopal churches, among them a cathedral, besides numerous places of worship of other Christian denominations, and the Madras Club, to which members of the Bengal and Bombay clubs are admitted as honorary members. See Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, No. 14 and 15; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s. v., also under Hindostan; Wheeler, *Madras in the Olden Times* (Madras, 1861–62, 3 vols. 8vo); Aikman, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 148, 272. See INDIA.

Madruzzius, CHRISTOPHER, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic of note, was born at Bologna in 1512, and was educated at the high-schools of Bologna and Padua. He was ambassador of Ferdinand at Bologna, and in 1539 became prince-bishop of Trent. In 1543 the bishopric of Brixen was added to his livings. Later he became cardinal. He died in 1578.—*Regensburg Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. ix, s. v.

Madura (1), an island in the Indian Ocean, the possession of the Netherlands, separated from Java on the north-east by the strait of Madura, contains about ninety-seven square miles, and is inhabited by 763,724 people, who adhere either to the religion of Brahma, or are of the Mohammedan faith—about evenly divided. The remains of Hindu temples, however, would lead us to the belief that Hinduism was once the prevailing religion. As in Java, probably Brahmanism was crowded out by the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 14th century, when the Arabs invaded the country. Madura is governed by natives, tributary to the Netherlands, and is divided into three kingdoms. The products of the islands, which are included in the trade-returns of Java (q. v.), are sugar, tobacco, indigo, cocoa-nut oil, edible birds' nests, etc.; but, owing to the extortions of the princes, agriculture is not flourishing.

Madura (2), a maritime district in the south of British India, in the presidency of Madras (q. v.), has an area of about 10,700 square miles, and a population of 1,790,000. Eastward from the shore runs a narrow ridge of sand and rocks, mostly dry, and which almost connects Ceylon with the continent. Cotton is the chief commercial crop; and sugar-cane, betel-nut, and tobacco are also grown. In this district the "American Board" began its labors in 1834, and now sustains a very successful mission in fourteen stations. The Roman Catholics gained a strong hold here by the accommodation theory of Roberto dei Nobili in the opening of the 17th century. A vicariate, formerly a part of Pondicherry, was established for Madura in 1846, and is in the care of the Jesuits, who recommenced labors there in 1836. The principal town is Madura, on the river Vygat, with several noteworthy public buildings, and the seat of a Roman Catholic and a Protestant mission. Madura, in former days, was the capital of a kingdom, the centre of South Indian culture and learning. See Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, No. 14 and 15. See also INDIA.

Maë'jus (Μαῆλος v. r. Μίλης, Vulg. *Michelus*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 26) as the name of an Israelite whose posterity returned from Babylon, in place of the MIAMIN (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x, 25).

Maffei, Bernard, a cardinal, and secretary of pope Paul III, was born at Bergamo in 1514, and died in 1553. He wrote a commentary on Cicero's Letters, and some other works, which were highly esteemed in his time.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 660.

Maffei, Francesco Scipione de, a noted Italian scholar, known chiefly as a dramatic writer, was born at Verona June 1, 1675; studied at the Jesuit college of Parma, there led a literary life, went to Rome in 1698, and afterwards entered the army, and distinguished himself in the war of the Spanish Succession; resumed his literary pursuits, and died Feb. 11, 1755. Aside from his merely literary productions, he wrote some theological works, such as *Istoria teologica delle dottrine, e delle opinione corse ne, cinque primi secoli della chiesa in proposito della divina grazia, del libero arbitrio e della predestinazione* (Tridenti, 1712; translated into Latin by the Jesuit Frederick Reissenberg [Francf. ad. M. 1736]):—*Giansenismo nuovo dimonstrato nelle conseguenze il medesimo* (Venet. 1732). Among his works on morals, the most important is *Della scienza chiamata cavallaresca* (Rom. 1720, and often), in which he condemns duelling. His *De teatri antiche e moderni* (Verona, 1753) is a defence of the theatre as a moral institution. His collected works were published at Venice (1790, 18 vols. 8vo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 661; *Life and Times of Palleario* (Rome, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. i and ii.

Maffei, Giovanni Pietro, a noted Italian Jesuit, was born at Bergamo about 1536; was for a time professor at Genoa, became in 1564 secretary of the government at that place, and in 1565 joined the Jesuits, among whom he gained a great reputation. Brought to the notice of cardinal Henry, of Portugal, he was called to Lisbon. He died in Tivoli in 1603. Maffei wrote *De vita et moribus Sancti Ignatii Loyolæ* (Venet. 1585, and Berg. 1747):—*Historiarum indicationum libri xvi; rerum a Societate Jesu in Oriente gestarum volumen* (Florentiæ, 1588; often reprinted):—*De rebus Japonicis libri v.* At the request of Gregory XIII he wrote a history of the reign of that pope, which remained in MS. until 1743, when it was published at Rome by Carlo Coquetines. A History of India, written by request of cardinal Henry, was published without Maffei's name, though he was its author. His collected works, accompanied by a biographical sketch, were published under the style *J. P. Maffei Opera omnia Latine scripta nunc primum in unum corpus collecta* (Verona, 1747, 2 vols. 4to).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 660.

Maffei, Vegius, an Italian priest, canon of St. John of Lateran, was born at Lodi, in Lombardy, in 1407, and died at Rome in 1458. He enjoyed great reputation as a theologian and writer. His most important work is *Tractatus de educatione liberorum et claris eorum studiis ac moribus* (Paris, 1511). It was often reprinted, and was considered in its day one of the best on the subject of education. He also wrote *Philalethes seu de amore veritatis invisæ et exulantis dialogus; de perseverantia religionis; de quatuor homines rebus novissimis;* also biographies of St. Bernard of Sienna, St. Peter Celestin, Augustine, and Monica, and a continuation of Virgil's *Æneid* in 13 vols., etc.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 660.

Maffit, JOHN NEWLAND, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born of Episcopal parentage at Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 28, 1794; was destined for the mercantile profession by his parents, but, joining the Wesleyans in 1813, he determined upon the ministry. Opposed by his friends and family at home, he emigrated to this country in 1819, and not long after his arrival became a member of the New England Conference. For twelve succeeding years he was stationed in the different cities of New England, then removed to New York, acting thereafter only as a local preacher, moving at his own discretion, and preaching and lecturing at such points as offered. In 1835, conjointly with Rev. Lewis Garrett, he issued in Nashville, Tenn., the first number of *The Western Methodist* (now *The Christian Advocate*, the central organ of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church South). In 1836–1837 he was agent for La Grange College, in Alabama, and subsequently was elected to the chair of elocution and belles-lettres in that institution; but he gave little attention to its duties, and the chair was soon discontinued. In 1841 he was chaplain of the lower house of Congress. His advent West and South-west was marked by a quickened religious interest in the popular mind. Vast assemblies gathered to hear him, and thousands, directly through his instrumentality, were added to the Church. Returning to New York, he became somewhat lax in his Church relations, and consequently lost his membership. In 1847 he removed to Arkansas, and there joined the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and was licensed to preach *de novo*. After laboring for a year or two with a success small in comparison with his previous history, he left Arkansas for the Gulf cities. His last days were spent in carrying on a religious meeting in a small chapel of a suburban villa of Mobile, Ala. Public interest could no more be evoked by him who had been its master in the wilderness and in the city, as well as the street-preacher, the lecturer, or the camp-meeting leader. The spell was broken, or—the spirit of the man. He died suddenly, of heart rupture, near Mobile, May 28, 1850. "Though amiable, he had the appearance of vanity, which provoked criticisms; and, though forgiving and gentle, his zeal in the prosecution of his Master's cause and his boldness in the rebuke of sin often waked up enemies. His social relaxations were thought by many to run into indiscretions and follies that marred his character and his influence in private life. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. vii.

Mag. See RAB-MAG.

Magalhæus, Gabriel de, a Portuguese missionary, was born at Pedrogaõ, near Coïmbre, in 1609; was admitted to the "Society of Jesus" when only sixteen, and, desiring to enter the missionary work, departed for Goa, India, in 1634. On his way he stopped at Macao, and was led to make an extended tour through China, and so great became his interest in that country that he abandoned his intention of proceeding to India, and preached Christianity in the Chinese empire with zeal and apparent success. At first he was in favor at court, but he fell into displeasure during the Christian persecutions, and barely saved his life. He died a peaceful death, May 6, 1677. He wrote several works on *China*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 662.

Magalhæus, Pedro de, a Portuguese theologian, was born at Torres-Vedras about 1592; was for some time instructor in theology at the convent of the Dominican order to which he himself belonged; and died in 1677. He published *De Scientia Dei* (Lisbon, 1866, 4to):—*De Prædestinationis Exæquatione* (ibid. 1667, 4to; Lyons, 1674):—*De Voluntate et de Trinitate* (ibid. 1669, 4to). He also left several valuable works in MS.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Magarita, Magarites, names given by some writers of the Middle Ages to the apostates from Christianity, especially to such as became Mohammedans. The origin of the name is unknown. See Du Cange, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 661.

Mag'bish (Hebrew *Magbish'*, מַגְבִּישׁ, *gathering;* Sept. Μαγεβίς, Vulg. *Megbis*), a man whose descendants (so Clericus, ad loc., who compares the Persian name *Megabyzus*, Herod. ii, 70, 160) to the number of 156 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 30). It is omitted in the parallel list (Neh. vii, 33, 34). Most interpreters regard it as the name of a place, probably in Palestine, and if so, doubtless in Benjamin, as the associated names are those of localities in that tribe. But it was perhaps rather another form for that of the *Magpiash* (q. v.) of Neh. x, 20, where some of the same names are mentioned in a similar connection.

Mag'dala (Μαγδαλά [v. r. Μαγαδάν], prob. the Chald. emphatic form of the Hebrew מִגְדָּל, *Migdal, a tower;* see Paulus, *Comm.* ii, 437 sq.), a town in Galilee opposite the Sea of Tiberias (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 401). It is mentioned only in Matt. xv, 39, as a place to which Jesus repaired after having crossed the lake, "though the best MSS. (Sin., Vat., D.) read *Magadan*, which, Alford observes, 'appears to have been the original reading, but the better-known name Magdala was substituted for it.' It is not unusual, however, for Syrian villages to have two names, and for the same name to have different forms. The parallel passage in Mark viii, 10 has *Dalmanutha* (Δαλμανουθά), though here also some MSS. read *Magdala* and some *Magada* (Alford, ad loc.). A close examination of the Gospel narrative, and a comparison of the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark (Matt. xv, 39; xvi, 1–13, with Mark viii, 10–27), prove that Magdala or Magadan must have been situated on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, and Dalmanutha was probably a village near it, for the whole shore of the lake was then lined with towns and villages. Eusebius and Jerome locate this place, which they call *Magedan*, on the east of the Sea of Galilee, and they say there was in their day a district of *Magedena* around Gerasa (καί ἐστι νῦν ἡ Μαγαιδανὴ περὶ τὴν Γεράσαν; *Onomast.* s. v. Magedan). They also state that Mark (viii, 10) reads Μαγαιδάν, though Jerome's version has *Dalmanutha*. The old Latin version has *Magada*. In some editions of Josephus a *Magdala* is mentioned on the east side of the lake (*Life*, p. 24), but the best MSS. read *Gamala* (Robinson, *B. R.* ii, 397; *Josephus*, by Hudson, ad loc.). Lightfoot places Magdala beyond Jordan, but his reasons are not satisfactory (*Opera*, ii, 413)" (Kitto). The above position on the western shore, although it has usually been located on the eastern (see Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 278; Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels*, § 70), is confirmed by the Jerusalem Talmud (compiled at Tiberias), which several times speaks of Magdala as being adjacent to Tiberias and Hamath, or the hot springs (Lightfoot, *Chorog. Cent.* cap. lxxvi). It was a seat of Jewish learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the rabbins of Magdala are often mentioned in the Talmud (Lightfoot, *l. c.*). M. De Saulcy, however, takes an opposite view on all these points (*Narrative*, ii, 355–357), as Pococke had done before (*Observations*, ii, 71). In the Gospels it is principally referred to as probably the birthplace of Mary Magdalen, i. e. the *Magdalene* (q. v.), or of Magdala. A small Moslem village, bearing the name of *Mejdel*, is now found on the shore of the lake about three miles north by west of Tiberias, and the name and situation are very strongly in favor of the conclusion that it represents the Magdala of Scripture. It evidently (like the ancient town) derived its name from a tower or castle, and here Buckingham found the ruins of an old structure of this kind (*Trav.* i, 404). He speaks of it as being a small village close to the edge of the lake, beneath a range of high cliffs, in which small grottoes are seen, with the remains of an old square tower, and some larger buildings of rude construction, apparently of great antiquity. "A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation, otherwise unmarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the south-west, perforated with caves, recalling, by a curious though doubtless unintentional coincidence, the scene of Correggio's celebrated picture. These caves are said by Schwarz (p. 189)—though on no clear authority—to bear the name of Teliman, i. e. Talmanutha. 'A clear stream rushes past the rock into the sea, issuing in a tangled thicket of thorn and willow from a deep ravine at the back of the plain' (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 382, 383). Jerome, although he plays upon the name Magdalene—'recte vocatam Magdalenen, id ist Turritam, ob ejus singularem fidei ac ardoris constantiam'—does not appear to connect it with the place in question. By the Jews the word מגדלא is used to denote a person who platted or twisted hair, a practice then much in use among women of loose character. A certain 'Miriam Magdala' is mentioned by the Talmudists, who is probably intended for Mary Magdalene. (See Otho, *Lex.*

Rudb. s. v. Maria; and Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 389, 1459.) Magdalum is mentioned as between Tiberias and Capernaum as early as by Willibald, A.D. 722; since that time it is occasionally named by travellers, among others Quaresmius, *Elucidatio*, p. 866 *b*; Sir R. Guylforde, *Pylgrymage*; Breydenbach, p. 29; Bonar, *Land of Promise*, p. 433, 434, and 549. Buchanan (*Clerical Furlough*, p. 375) describes well the striking view of the northern part of the lake which is obtained from el-Mejdel." This was probably also the MIGDAL-EL (q. v.) in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned in Josh. xix, 38. See Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 559; Seetzen, in *Monat. Corresp.* xviii, 349; Fisk, *Life*, p. 316; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 46; Schubert, iii, 250.

Mag'dalen (or **Magdaléne**) (Μαγδαληνή, fem. adj. from *Magdala*), a surname regularly applied to one of the Marys in the Gospels, derived from her place of nativity or former residence, in order to distinguish her from the other Marys (Matt. xxvii, 56, 61; xxviii, 1; Mark xv, 40, 47; xvi, 1, 9; Luke viii, 2; xxiv, 10; John xix, 25; xx, 1, 18). See MAGDALA.

Magdalen, RELIGIOUS Order of, a denomination given to divers communities of nuns, consisting generally of reformed prostitutes; sometimes also called *Magdalenettes*. They were established at Naples in 1324, at Paris in 1492, at Mentz in 1542, and at Rouen and Bordeaux in 1618. In each of these monasteries there were three kinds of persons and congregations: (1) nuns proper and under vow, bearing the name of *St. Magdalen*; (2) the congregation of St. Martha, composed of those not yet fully avowed; (3) the congregation of St. Lazarus, composed of such as were detained by force. The Order of St. Magdalen at Rome was established by pope Leo X. Clement VIII settled a revenue on them, and further appointed that the effects of all public prostitutes dying intestate should fall to them, and that the testaments of the rest should be invalid unless they bequeathed to them a portion of their effects, at least a fifth part. The term originated in the mistaken notion that Mary Magdalen, of whom we read in the Gospel, was a woman of bad character; a notion which is still very prevalent, notwithstanding the increased attention that has been given to the interpretation of holy Scripture. See MARY MAGDALEN.

Magdalena DE PAZZI, a saint of the Romish Church, was born at Florence April 2, 1566. She belonged to one of the highest families in Tuscany: was educated in the convent of the Hospitable Nuns of St. John the Little; refused to marry, and, May 27, 1584, took the veil in the Carmelite convent of St. Mary of the Angels. Her name, hitherto *Catharine de Gere de' Pazzi*, was now changed to Maria Magdalena. She became wild in her religious enthusiasm, claimed to have visions, and to hold converse with the angels, with the Virgin, and even with Christ himself. She filled divers offices in her convent, and died May 25, 1607. Pope Urban VIII in the same year beatified her, and in 1669 she was canonized by Alexander VII. Her biography was written by her confessor Puccini, and her works were collected by the Carmelite Salvi of Bologna (Ven. 1739). See Bolland, *ad* 25 *Maii*; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*; Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 662; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.*, xxxii, 615.

Magdeburg Centuries. See CENTURIES OF MAGDEBURG.

Mag'diël (Heb. *Magdiël'*, מַגְדִּיאֵל, *endowed of God*; Sept. Μαγεδιήλ and Μεδιήλ v. r. Μεσοδιήλ), the successor of Mibzar, and predecessor of Iram among the Edomitish chiefs who held sway along with the native princes in Mount Seïr (Gen. xxxvi, 43; 1 Chron. i, 54). B.C. ante 1619.

Ma'ged (Μακέδ, Vulg. *Mageth*), a false Anglicizing (1 Macc. v, 36) of the name MAKED (1 Macc. v, 26).

Magee, Thomas, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Limerick, Ireland, March 11, 1822; was brought to America at nine years of age; was converted near Whitehall, Green Co., Ill., in 1841; joined the Illinois Conference in 1843; was very successful as a minister, and in 1852 signally so as agent of the Illinois Wesleyan University. In 1852–3 he was stationed at Springfield. He died at Bloomington, Ill., Mar. 23, 1854. From orphanage and neglected wickedness, and after majority by the transforming power of grace and strenuous effort, Mr. Magee became in fourteen years one of the foremost ministers of his Conference. His powerful frame, decided talents, and indomitable energy enabled him to labor mightily for God.—*Minutes of Conferences*, v, 476.

Magee, William, D.D., a noted Anglican prelate, was born March 18, 1766, in the county of Fermanat, Ireland, and was educated at the University of Dublin (Trinity College). He obtained all the college honors, and graduated A.B. in 1785, and in 1788 was elected a fellow. His friends desired him to enter the legal profession, but he himself inclined to the ministry, and in 1790 he was ordained, acting at this time as a tutor in his alma mater; later he became assistant professor of the Oriental languages, and in 1806 senior fellow and professor of mathematics. In 1812 he retired from the university, and accepted the livings of Kappagh, in Tyrone, and Killyleagh, in Down; in 1814 he was appointed dean of Cork, and there became greatly celebrated as a pulpit orator. Notwithstanding the length of his discourses (he never preached less than one hour) he was followed by crowds, though no man less courted popularity. His sermons, his biographer says, "might be characterized as solid Gospel truth, strongly and plainly enforced in simplicity and sincerity." Bishop Barrington, a contemporary, thus comments upon Dr. Magee's eloquence: "I have often heard and admired Mr. Pitt, but while I am listening to my friend dean Magee I feel that if I were to shut my eyes I could fancy that Mr. Pitt was speaking." In 1819 Dr. Magee was promoted to the bishopric of Raphoe; in 1821, when George IV visited Dublin, he was appointed by the king dean of the Viceregal Chapel at the castle; and in 1822, after declining the archbishopric of Cashel, he became archbishop of Dublin. He died Aug. 18, 1831. Archbishop Magee is noted particularly for his opposition to Romanism and Unitarianism. Against the latter he sent forth his *Discourses on the Atonement and Sacrifice* (1811, 8vo; 2d edit. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 1816, 3 vols. 8vo; 7th edit. 1841, 1 vol. royal 8vo), universally pronounced one of the ablest critical and controversial works of modern times. His *Works* were published in 1842, in 2 vols. 8vo, with a memoir of his life by Arthur H. Kinney, D.D. See, besides this Memoir in *Works*, the *Dublin University Magazine*, xxvi, 480 sq.; xxvii, 750 sq.; *Christian Observer*, 1843 (May and June); *Christian Examiner*, xxviii, 63 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Maghrebi. See AARON HA-RISHON.

Magi is the Latin form of the Greek term *μάγοι*, *magians*, rendered "wise men" in Matt. ii, 1, 7, 16, and occurring likewise in the singular *μάγος*, "sorcerer," with reference to Elymas (Acts xii, 6, 8). Compare the epithet Simon *Magus*. The term is still extant on the cuneiform inscriptions (see Olshausen, ad loc. Matt.). It corresponds to the Heb. מָג, *Mag*. The term magi was used as the name for priests and wise men among the Medes, Persians, and Babylonians. So the word *Rab-mag*, in our version of Jer. xxxix, 3, used as a proper name, properly signifies *the prince magus* or *chief of the magi*. While the priests and literati were known by the general name of magi, they were also known by the name of *wise men*, and likewise *Chaldæans* (Isa. xliv, 52; Jer. l, 35; Dan. ii, 12–27; iv, 6, 18; v, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15). To their number doubtless belonged the astrologers and star-gazers (Isa. xlvii, 13). So, also, the Chaldee soothsayers and dream-interpreters either denote various orders of magi, or they are merely different names of the

same general class (Dan. i, 20; ii, 2; x, 27; iv, 7; v, 7, 11). See MAGICIAN. In the following account of this important and interesting class, we supplement what we have elsewhere said upon the subject.

I. *Etymology of the Name.*—In the Pehlvi dialect of the Zend, *mogh* means *priest* (Hyde, *Relig. Vet. Pers.* c. 31); and this is connected by philologists with the Sanscrit *mahat* (great, μέγας, and *magnus;* Anquetil du Perron's *Zend-Avesta*, ii, 555). The coincidence of a Sanscrit *mâya*, in the sense of "illusion, magic," is remarkable; but it is probable that this, as well as the analogous Greek word, is the derived rather than the original meaning (comp. Eichhoff, *Vergleichung der Sprache*, ed. Kaltschmidt, p. 231). Hyde (*l. c.*) notices another etymology given by Arabian authors, which makes the word =cropt-eared (*parvis auribus*), but rejects it. Prideaux, on the other hand (*Connection*, under B.C. 522), accepts it, and seriously connects it with the story of the pseudo-Smerdis who had lost his ears in Herod. iii, 69. Spanheim (*Dub. Evang.* xviii) speaks favorably, though not decisively, of a Hebrew etymology.

II. *Their Original Seat.*—This name has come to us through the Greeks as the proper designation of the priestly class among the Persians (Herod. i, 132, 140; Xenoph., *Cyrop.* viii, 1, 23; Plato, *Alcib.* i, 122; Diog. Laert. *Proœm.* 1, 2; Cicero, *De Divin.* i, 41; Apul. *Apol.* p. 32 ed. Casaubon, p. 290 ed. Elmenhorst; Porphyr. *De Abst.* l. iv.; Hesych. s. v. Μάγος). It does not appear, however, that Magism was originally a Persian institution, and it may be doubted if in its original form it ever existed among the Persians at all.

The earliest notice extant of the magi is in the prophecies of Jeremiah (xxxix, 3, 13), where mention is made of Rab-mag, a term which, though regarded in the A.V. as a proper name, is a compound of רב and מג, and signifies *chief magus*, after the analogy of such terms as רַב־סָרִיס (*chief eunuch*), רַב־שָׁקֶה (*chief butler*), etc. (See below, § iv.) The Rab-mag of Jeremiah is the same as the *Rab Signin al kol Chakimin* (רב סגנין על כל חקמין) of Daniel (ii, 48); the τῶν ἱερέων ἐπισημότατος οὓς Βαβυλώνιοι καλοῦσι Χαλδαίους of Diodorus Sic. (ii, 24); and the ἀρχίμαγος of the later Greek writers (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 13). This indicates the existence among the Chaldæans of the magian institute in a regular form, and as a recognised element in the state, at a period not later than 600 years B.C. In Jer. l, 35, it is evidently the same class that is referred to under the designation of the "wise men of Babylon." In the time of Daniel we find the institute in full force in Babylon (Dan. ii, 2, 12, 18, 24; iv, 3, 15; v, 7, 8). From him we learn that it comprised five classes—the *Chartummim*, expounders of sacred writings and interpreters of signs (i, 20; ii, 2; v, 4); the *Ashaphim*, conjurors (ii, 10; v, 7, 11; comp. xlvii, 9, 12); the *Mekashephim*, exorcists, soothsayers, magicians, diviners (ii, 2; comp. Isa. xlvii, 9, 13; Jer. xxvii, 9); the *Gozerim*, casters of nativities, astrologists (ii, 27; v, 7, 11); and the *Chasdim*, Chaldæans in the narrower sense (ii, 5, 10; iv, 4; v, 7, etc.; compare Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, i, 343 sq.; Hävernick, *Comment üb. Daniel*, p. 52; Gesenius, *Thes.* ad voc.). So much was Magism a Chaldæan institution that the term *Chaldæan* came to be applied as a synonym for the class (Diod. Sic. ii, 29 sq.; Strabo, xvi, 762; Diog. Laertius, *Proœm.* 1; Cicero, *de Divinat.* i, 1; Curtius, *Hist.* iii, 3, 6; Josephus, *War*, ii, 7, 3; Aul. Gellius, xv, 20, 2; Apuleius, *Asin.* ii, 228, etc.).

Whether Magism was indigenous in Chaldæa, and was thence carried to the adjacent countries, or was derived by the Chaldæans from Assyria, it is impossible now to determine with any certainty. In favor of its Assyrian origin it has been urged that the word מג is found as the name of the Assyrian fire-priest (Movers, i, 64, 240), and that the priests of the Assyrian Artemis at Ephesus were called Meg-Abyzi (Strabo, xiv, 641). But on this nothing can be built, as we find the syllable Meg or Mag occurring in names and titles belonging to other peoples, as *Mag-Etzer* (fire-priest), the father of Artemis among the Phœnicians; *Teker-Mag*, Teker the Magus (on a Cilician coin), etc. When it is considered that the Chaldæan was the older nation, and that the Assyrians derived many of their religious beliefs and institutions from the Chaldæans (Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies*, i, 308; ii, 228), the probability is that they derived the institution of the magi also. That the institution was originally Shemitic is further confirmed by the Phœnician tradition preserved by Sanchoniathon (ap. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* i, 10), that Magos was a descendant of the Titans, and, with his brother Amynos, made men acquainted with villages and flocks. It must be confessed, however, that the word מג has more obvious affinities in the Indo-Germanic than in the Shemitic tongues (see above, § i); but this can hardly be allowed to weigh much against the historical evidence of the existence of the magi in Shemitic nations anterior to their existence among those of the Aryan stock.

That Magism was not, as commonly stated, a Persian institution, is shown from several considerations: 1. The word does not appear to have existed in the Zend language; at any rate, it does not occur in the Zend-Avesta. 2. The religious system of the ancient Persians was a system of Dualism, as the most ancient documents concur with the monumental evidence to prove (see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 426), but with this Magism had no affinity. 3. In the Zend-Avesta, the *Yâtus*, the practicer of magical arts, is vehemently denounced, and men are enjoined to pray and present offerings against his arts, as an invention of the Dews. 4. Xenophon informs us (*Cyrop.* viii, 1, 23) that the magi were first established in Persia by Cyrus (comp. also Ammian. Marc. xxiii, 6; Porphyr. *De abstin.* iv, 16, etc.), a statement which can be understood only, as Heeren suggests (I, i, 451 sq.), as intimating that the magian institute, which existed long before this among the Medes, was introduced by Cyrus among the Persians also. 5. Herodotus (i, 101) states that the magi formed one of the tribes of the Medes; and he also attributes the placing of the pseudo-Smerdis on the Persian throne to the magi, who were moved thereto by a desire to substitute the Median for the Persian rule (iii, 61 sq.; compare Ctesias, *Persica*, c. 10–15; Justin, *Hist.* i, 9; and the Behistun inscription as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson; see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 427). 6. Herodotus mentions that, after this attempt of the magi had been frustrated, it became a usage among the Persians to observe a festival in celebration of the overthrow of the magi, to which they gave the name of Magophonia (*μαγοφονία*), and during which it was not safe for any magus to leave the house (iii, 79; Agathias, ii, 25), a usage which could have had its origin only at a time when Magism was foreign to Persian beliefs and institutions. 7. We find no allusion to the magi in connection with any of the Medo-Persian kings mentioned in Scripture, a circumstance which, though not of itself of much importance, falls in with the supposition that Magism was not at that time a predominant Persian institution. The probability is, that this system had its source in Chaldæa, was thence propagated to Assyria, Media, and the adjoining countries, and was brought from Media into Persia, where it came at first into collision both with the national prejudices and with the ancient religious faith of the people. With this accord the traditions which impute to Zoroaster, after he came to be regarded as the apostle of Magism, sometimes a Parthian and sometimes a Bactrian origin. See ZOROASTER. Eventually, however, Magism seems to have been adopted into or reconciled with Zoroasterism, perhaps by losing its original theosophic character, and taking on a more practical or thaumaturgic phase.

III. *Profane Accounts of the Order.*—The magi were originally one of the six tribes (Herod. i, 101; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 29) into which the nation of the Medes was divided, who, like the Levites under the Mosaic institutions, were intrusted with the care of religion, an

office which naturally, in those early times, made this caste likewise the chief depositaries of science and cultivators of art. Little in detail is known of the magi during the independent existence of the Median government; but under the Medo-Persian sway the magi formed a sacred caste or college, which was very famous in the ancient world (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* viii, 1, 23; Ammian. Marcell. xxiii, 6; Heeren, *Ideen*, i, 451; Schlosser, *Universal Uebers.* i, 278). Porphyry (*Abst.* iv, 16) says, "The learned men who are engaged among the Persians in the service of the Deity are called magi;" and Suidas, "Among the Persians the lovers of wisdom (φιλόσοφοι) and the servants of God are called magi." According to Strabo (ii, 1084, ed. Falcon.), the magi practiced different sorts of divination—1, by evoking the dead; 2, by cups or dishes (Joseph's divining-cup, Gen. xliv, 5); 3, by means of water. By the employment of these means the magi affected to disclose the future, to influence the present, and to call the past to their aid. Even the visions of the night they were accustomed to interpret, not empirically, but according to such established and systematic rules as a learned priesthood might be expected to employ (Strabo, xvi, 762; Cicero, *De Divin.* i, 41; Ælian. *V. H.* ii, 17). The success, however, of their efforts over the invisible world, as well as the holy office which they exercised, demanded in themselves peculiar cleanliness of body, a due regard to which and to the general principles of their caste would naturally be followed by professional prosperity, and this, in its turn, conspired with prevailing superstition to give the magi great social consideration, and make them of high importance before kings and princes (Diog. Laert. ix, 7, 2)—an influence which they appear to have sometimes abused, when, descending from the peculiar duties of their high office, they took part in the strife and competitions of politics, and found themselves sufficiently powerful even to overturn thrones (Herod. iii, 61 sq.). These abuses were reformed by Zoroaster, who appeared, according to many authorities, in the second half of the 7th century before Christ. He was not the founder of a new system, but the renovator of an old and corrupt one, being, as he himself intimates (Zend-Avesta, i, 43), the restorer of the word which Ormuzd had formerly revealed, but which the influence of Dews had degraded into a false and deceptive magic. After much and long-continued opposition on the part of the adherents and defenders of existing corruptions, he succeeded in his virtuous purposes, and caused his system eventually to prevail. He appears to have remodelled the institute of the magian caste, dividing it into three great classes: 1, Herbeds, or learners; 2, Mobeds, or masters; 3, Destur Mobeds, or perfect scholars (Zend-Av. ii, 171, 261). The magi alone he allowed to perform the religious rites; they possessed the forms of prayer and worship; they knew the ceremonies which availed to conciliate Ormuzd, and were obligatory in the public offerings (Herod. i, 132). They accordingly became the sole medium of communication between the Deity and his creatures, and through them alone Ormuzd made his will known; none but them could see into the future, and they disclosed their knowledge to those only who were so fortunate as to conciliate their good will. Hence the power which the magian priesthood possessed. The general belief in the trustworthiness of their predictions, especially when founded on astrological calculations, the all but universal custom of consulting the will of the divinity before entering on any important undertaking, and the blind faith which was reposed in all that the magi did, reported, or commanded, combined to create for that sacerdotal caste a power, both in public and in private concerns, which has probably never been exceeded. Indeed the soothsayer was a public officer, a member, if not the president, of the privy council in the Medo-Persian court, demanded alike for show, in order to influence the people, and for use, in order to guide the state. Hence the person of the monarch was surrounded by priests, who, in different ranks and with different offices, conspired to sustain the throne, uphold the established religion, and conciliate or enforce the obedience of the subject. The fitness of the magi for, and their usefulness to, an Oriental court were not a little enhanced by the pomp of their dress, the splendor of their ceremonial, and the number and gradation of the sacred associates. Well may Cyrus, in uniting the Medes to his Persian subjects, have adopted, in all its magnificent details, a priesthood which would go far to transfer to him the affections of his conquered subjects, and promote, more than any other thing, his own aggrandizement and that of his empire. Neither the functions nor the influence of this sacred caste were reserved for peculiar, rare, and extraordinary occasions, but ran through the web of human life. At the break of day they had to chant the divine hymns. This office being performed, then came the daily sacrifice to be offered, not indiscriminately, but to the divinities whose day in each case it was—an office, therefore, which none but the initiated could fulfil. As an illustration of the high estimation in which the magi were held, it may be mentioned that it was considered a necessary part of a princely education to have been instructed in the peculiar learning of their sacred order, which was an honor conceded to no other but royal personages, except in very rare and very peculiar instances (Cicero, *De Divin.* i, 23; Plutarch, *Themistocles*). This magian learning embraced everything which regarded the higher culture of the nation, being known in history under the designation of "the law of the Medes and Persians." It comprised the knowledge of all the sacred rites, customs, usages, and observances, which related not merely to the worship of the gods, but to the whole private life of every worshipper of Ormuzd—the duties which, as such, he had to observe, and the punishments which followed the neglect of these obligations, whence may be learned how necessary the act of the priest on all occasions was. Under the veil of religion the priest had bound himself up with the entire public and domestic life. The judicial office, too, appears to have been, in the time of Cambyses, in the hands of the magi, for from them was chosen the college or bench of royal judges, which makes its appearance in the history of that monarch (Herod. iv, 31; vii, 194; comp. Esther i, 13). Men who held these offices, possessed this learning, and exerted this influence with the people, may have proved a check to Oriental despotism no less powerful than constitutional, though they were sometimes unable to guarantee their own lives against the wrath of the monarch (Herod. vii, 194; compare Dan. ii, 12); and they appear to have been well versed in those courtly arts by which the hand that bears the sword is won to protect instead of destroying. Thus Cambyses, wishing to marry his sister, inquired of the magi (like Henry VIII) if the laws permitted such a union: "We have," they adroitly answered, "no law to that effect; but a law there is which declares that the king of the Persians may do what he pleases" (Heeren, *Ideen*, I, i, 451 sq.; Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Persarum*, ch. xxxi, p. 372 sq.; Brisson, *Princip. Pers.* p. 179 sq.).

Among the Greeks and Romans they were known under the name of Chaldæans (Strabo, xvi, 762; Diog. Laert. *Proœm.* 1), and also of magi (Diog. Laert. viii, 1, 3). They lived scattered over the land in different places (Strabo, xvi, 739; compare Dan. ii, 14), and had possessions of their own. The temple of Belus was employed by them for astronomical observations, but their astronomy was connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies practiced by the Babylonians (Diod. Sic. ii, 31; Ephraem Syrus, *Op.* ii, 488; consult Ideler, in the *Transactions of the Berlin Academy for* 1824–25), and was specially directed to vain attempts to foretell the future, predict the fate of individuals or of communities, and sway the present, in alliance with augury, incantation, and magic (Aul. Gell. iii, 10. 9; xiv, 1; Am. Marcell. xxiii, 6; p. 352, ed. Bipont; Diod. Sic. ii, 29; comp. Isa. xlvii, 9, 13; Dan. ii).

IV. *Position occupied by the Magi in the period covered by the History of the O. T.*—In the Hebrew text the word occurs but twice, and then only incidentally. In Jer. xxxix, 3 and 13 we meet, among the Chaldæan officers sent by Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem, one with the name or title of Rab-Mag (רַב־מָג). This word is interpreted, after the analogy of Rab-shakeh and Rab-saris, as equivalent to chief of the magi (Ewald, *Propheten*, and Hitzig, ad loc., taking it as the title of Nergal-Sharezer), and we thus find both the name and the order occupying a conspicuous place under the government of the Chaldæans. It is clear that there were various kinds of wise men, and it is probable that these were classes belonging to one great order, which comprised, under the general name of magi, all who were engaged in the service of religion; so that we find here an ample priesthood, a sacred college, graduated in rank and honor (see Bertholdt, 3 *Excurs. zum Dan.*; Gesenius, *Comment. on Isa.* ii, 354 sq.). The word Rab-Mag (if the received etymology of magi be correct) presents a hybrid formation. The first syllable is unquestionably Shemitic, the last is all but unquestionably Aryan. The problem thus presented admits of two solutions: (1.) If we believe the Chaldæans to have been a Hamitic people, closely connected with the Babylonians [see CHALDÆAN], we must then suppose that the colossal schemes of greatness which showed themselves in Nebuchadnezzar's conquests led him to gather round him the wise men and religious teachers of the nations which he subdued, and that thus the sacred tribes of the Medes rose under his rule to favor and power. His treatment of those who bore a like character among the Jews (Dan. i, 4) makes this hypothesis a natural one: and the alliance which existed between the Medes and the Chaldæans at the time of the overthrow of the old Assyrian empire would account for the intermixture of religious systems belonging to two different races. (2.) If, on the other hand, with Rénan (*Histoire des Langues Shémitiques*, p. 66, 67), following Lassen and Ritter, we look on the Chaldæans as themselves belonging to the Aryan family, and possessing strong affinities with the Medes, there is even less difficulty in explaining the presence among the one people of the religious teachers of the other. It is likely enough, in either case, that the simpler Median religion which the magi brought with them, corresponding more or less closely to the faith of the Zend-Avesta, lost some measure of its original purity through this contact with the darker superstitions of the old Babylonian population. From this time onward it is noticeable that the names both of the magi and Chaldæans are identified with the astrology, divination, and interpretation of dreams, which had impressed themselves on the prophets of Israel as the most characteristic features of the old Babel religion (Isa. xliv, 25; xlvii, 13). The magi took their places among "the astrologers, and stargazers, and monthly prognosticators."

It is with such men that we have to think of Daniel and his fellow-exiles as associated. They are described as "ten times wiser than all the magicians (Sept. μάγους) and astrologers" (Dan. i, 20). Daniel himself so far sympathizes with the order into which he is thus, as it were, enrolled, as to intercede for them when Nebuchadnezzar gives the order for their death (Dan. ii, 24), and accepts an office which, as making him "master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldæans, soothsayers" (Dan. v, 11), was probably identical with that of the Rab-Mag who first came before us. May we conjecture that he found in the belief which the magi had brought with them some elements of the truth that had been revealed to his fathers, and that the way was thus prepared for the strong sympathy which showed itself in a hundred ways when the purest Aryan and the purest Shemitic faiths were brought face to face with each other (Dan. vi, 3, 16, 26; Ezra i, 1–4; Isa. xliv, 28), agreeing as they did in their hatred of idolatry and in their acknowledgment of the "God of Heaven?" The acts which accompanied his appointment serve as illustrations of the high reverence in which the magi were held: "Then the king, Nebuchadnezzar, fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him" (verse 46; see also verse 48). From the 49th verse it would seem not unlikely that the administration of justice in the last resort belonged to this priestly order, as we know it did to the hierarchy of northern and more modern courts. (See Münter, *Antiq. Abhandlung.* p. 144; Bleek, in Schleiermacher's *Theol. Zeitschr.* iii, 277; Hengstenberg's *Daniel*, p. 341.)

The name of the magi does not meet us in the Biblical account of the Medo-Persian kings. If, however, we identify the Artaxerxes who stopped the building of the Temple (Ezra iv, 17–22) with the pseudo-Smerdis of Herodotus [see ARTAXERXES] and the Gomates of the Behistun inscription, we may see here also another point of contact. (Compare Sir Henry Rawlinson's translation of the Behistun inscription: "The rites which Gomates the magian had introduced I prohibited. I restored to the state the chants, and the worship, and to those families which Gomates the magian had deprived of them" [*Journ. of Asiatic Soc.* vol. x, and Blakesley's *Herodotus*, Excurs. on iii, 74]). The magian attempt to reassert Median supremacy, and with it probably a corrupted Chaldaized form of Magianism, in place of the purer faith in Ormuzd of which Cyrus had been the propagator, would naturally be accompanied by antagonism to the people whom the Persians had protected and supported. The immediate renewal of the suspended work on the triumph of Darius (Ezra iv, 24; v, 1, 2; vi, 7, 8) falls in, it need hardly be added, with this hypothesis. The story of the actual massacre of the magi throughout the dominions of Darius, and of the commemorative magophonia (Herod. iii, 79), with whatever exaggerations it may be mixed up, indicates in like manner the triumph of the Zoroastrian system. If we accept the traditional date of Zoroaster as a contemporary of Darius, we may see in the changes which he effected a revival of the older system. It is, at any rate, striking that the word magi does not appear in the Zend-Avesta, the priests being there described as *atharva* (guardians of the fire), and that there are multiplied prohibitions in it of all forms of the magic which, in the West, and possibly in the East also, took its name from them, and with which, it would appear, they had already become tainted. All such arts, auguries, necromancy, and the like, are looked on as evil, and emanating from Ahriman, and are pursued by the hero-king Feridoun with the most persistent hostility (Du Perron, *Zend-Avesta*, vol. i, part ii, p. 269, 424).

The name, however, kept its ground, and with it probably the order to which it was attached. Under Xerxes the magi occupy a position which indicates that they had recovered from their temporary depression. They are consulted by him as soothsayers (Herod. vii, 19), and are as influential as they had been in the court of Astyages. They prescribe the strange and terrible sacrifices at the Strymon and the Nine Ways (Herod. vii, 114). They were said to have urged the destruction of the temples of Greece (Cicero, *De Legg.* ii, 10). Traces of their influence may perhaps be seen in the regard paid by Mardonius to the oracles of the Greek god that offered the nearest analogue to their own Mithras (Herod. viii, 134), and in the like reverence which had previously been shown by the *Median* Datis towards the island of Delos (Herod. vi, 97). They come before the Greeks as the representatives of the religion of the Persians. No sacrifices may be offered unless one of their order is present chanting the prescribed prayers, as in the ritual of the Zend-Avesta (Herod. i, 132). No great change is traceable in their position during the decline of the Persian monarchy. The position of Judæa as a Persian province must have kept up some measure of contact between the two religious systems. The histories of Esther and Nehemiah point to the influence which might be exercised by members of the subject-race. It might well be that the religious minds

of the two nations would learn to respect each other, and that some measure of the prophetic hopes of Israel might mingle with the belief of the magi. As an order they perpetuated themselves under the Parthian kings. The name rose to fresh honor under the Sassanidæ. The classification which was ascribed to Zoroaster was recognised as the basis of a hierarchical system, after other and lower elements had mingled with the earlier dualism, and might be traced even in the religion and worship of the Parsees.

V. *Transition-stages in the History of the Word and of the Order between the close of the O. T. and the time of the N. T.*—In the mean while the title magi was acquiring a new and wider signification. It presented itself to the Greeks as connected with a foreign system of divination, and the religion of a foe whom they had conquered, and it soon became a by-word for the worst form of imposture. The rapid growth of this feeling is traceable perhaps in the meanings attached to the word by the two great tragedians. In Æschylus (*Persæ*, 291) it retains its old significance as denoting simply a tribe. In Sophocles (*Œd. Tyr.* 387) it appears among the epithets of reproach which the king heaps upon Tiresias. The fact, however, that the religion with which the word was associated still maintained its ground as the faith of a great nation, kept it from falling into utter disrepute, and it is interesting to notice how at one time the good and at another the bad side of the word is uppermost. Thus the *μαγεία* of Zoroaster is spoken of with respect by Plato as a *θεῶν θεραπεία*, forming the groundwork of an education which he praises as far better than that of the Athenians (*Alcib.* i, 122 *a*). Xenophon, in like manner, idealizes the character and functions of the order (*Cyrop.* iv, 5, 16; 6, 6). Both meanings appear in the later lexicographers. The word magos is equivalent to *ἀπατέων καὶ φαρμακευτής*, but it is also used for the *θεοσεβὴς καὶ θεόλογος καὶ ἱερεύς* (Hesych.). The magi, as an order, are *οἱ παρὰ Περσαῖς φιλόσοφοι καὶ φιλόθεοι* (Suidas). The word thus passed into the hands of the Sept., and from them into those of the writers of the N. T., oscillating between the two meanings, capable of being used in either. The relations which had existed between the Jews and Persians would perhaps tend to give a prominence to the more favorable associations in their use of it. In Daniel (i, 20; ii, 2, 10, 27; v, 11) it is used, as has been noticed, for the priestly diviners with whom the prophet was associated. Philo, in like manner (*Quod omnis probus liber*, p. 792), mentions the magi with warm praise, as men who gave themselves to the study of nature and the contemplation of the divine perfections, worthy of being the counsellors of kings. It was perhaps natural that this aspect of the word should commend itself to the theosophic Jew of Alexandria. There were, however, other influences at work tending to drag it down. The swarms of impostors that were to be met with in every part of the Roman empire, known as "Chaldæi," "Mathematici," and the like, bore this name also. Their arts were "artes magicæ." Though philosophers and men of letters might recognise the better meaning of which the word was capable (Cicero, *De Divin.* i, 23, 41), yet in the language of public documents and of historians they were treated as a class at once hateful and contemptible (Tacitus, *Ann.* i, 32; ii, 27; xii, 22, 59), and, as such, were the victims of repeated edicts of banishment. See Lenormant, *Chaldæan Magic* (Lond. 1877).

VI. *The Magi as they appear in the N. T.*—We need not wonder, accordingly, to find that this is the predominant meaning of the word as it appears in the N. T. The noun, and the verb derived from it (*μαγεία* and *μαγεύω*), are used by Luke in describing the impostor, who is therefore known distinctively as Simon Magus (Acts viii, 9). Another of the same class (Bar-jesus) is described (Acts xiii, 8) as having, in his cognomen Elymas, a title which was equivalent to Magus. See Elymas.

In one memorable instance, however, the word retains (probably, at least) its better meaning. In the Gospel of Matthew, written (according to the general belief of early Christian writers) for the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, we find it, not as embodying the contempt which the frauds of impostors had brought upon it through the whole Roman empire, but in the sense which it had had of old, as associated with a religion which they respected, and an order of which one of their own prophets had been the head. In spite of patristic authorities on the other side, asserting that the *Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν* of Matt. ii, 1 were sorcerers whose mysterious knowledge came from below, not from above, and who were thus translated out of darkness into light (Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Theophylact, in Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* xix; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Matt. ii), we are justified, not less by the *consensus* of later interpreters (including even Maldonatus) than by the general tenor of Matthew's narrative, in seeing in them men such as those that were in the minds of the Sept. translators of Daniel, and those described by Philo —at once astronomers and astrologers, but not mingling any conscious fraud with their efforts after a higher knowledge. The vagueness of the description leaves their country undefined, and implies that probably the evangelist himself had no certain information. The same phrase is used as in passages where the express object is to include a wide range of country (compare *ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν*, Matt. viii, 11; xxiv, 27; Luke xiii, 29). Probably the region chiefly present to the mind of the Palestinian Jew would be the tract of country stretching eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates, the land of "the children of the East" in the early period of the history of the O. T. (Gen. xxix, 1; Judg. vi, 3; vii, 12; viii, 10). It should be remembered, however, that the language of the O. T., and therefore probably that of Matthew, included under this name countries that lay considerably to the north as well as to the east of Palestine. Balaam came from "the mountains of the East," i. e. from Pethor, on the Euphrates (Numb. xxiii, 7; xxii, 5). Abraham (or Cyrus?) is the righteous man raised up "from the East" (Isa. xli, 2). The Persian conqueror is called "from the East, from a far country" (Isa. xlvi, 11).

We cannot wonder that there should have been very varying interpretations given of words that allowed so wide a field for conjecture. Some of these are, for various reasons, worth noticing. (1) The feeling of some early writers that the coming of the wise men was the fulfilment of the prophecy which spoke of the gifts of the men of Sheba and Seba (Psa. lxxii, 10, 15; compare Isa. lx, 6) led them to fix on Arabia as the country of the magi (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Cyprian, in Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* l. c.), and they have been followed by Baronius, Maldonatus, Grotius, and Lightfoot. (2) Others have conjectured Mesopotamia as the great seat of Chaldæan astrology (Origen, *Hom. in Matt.* vi and vii), or Egypt as the country in which magic was most prevalent (Meyer, ad loc.). (3) The historical associations of the word led others again, with greater probability, to fix on Persia, and to see in these magi members of the priestly order, to which the name of right belonged (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Olshausen), while Hyde (*Rel. Pers.* l. c.) suggests Parthia, as being at that time the conspicuous Eastern monarchy in which the magi were recognised and honored.

It is, perhaps, a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matt. ii that in these magi we may recognise, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in Acts xiii, 8 to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet "from the East" was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the Western magi, Jews, and others, who swarmed over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem, it is to ask, not after "our king" or "the king of Israel," but, as the men of another race might do, after "the king of the Jews." The language of the O.-T. prophets and

the traditional interpretation of it are apparently new things to them. The narrative of Matt. ii supplies us with an outline which we may legitimately endeavor to fill up, as far as our knowledge enables us, with inference and illustration. Some time after the birth of Jesus there appeared among the strangers who visited Jerusalem these men from the far East. They were not idolaters. Their form of worship was looked upon by the Jews with greater tolerance and sympathy than that of any other Gentiles (compare Wisd. xiii, 6, 7). Whatever may have been their country, their statement indicates that they were watchers of the stars, seeking to read in them the destinies of nations. They said that they had seen a star in which they recognised such a prognostic. They were sure that one was born king of the Jews, and they came to pay their homage. It may have been simply that the quarter of the heavens in which the star appeared indicated the direction of Judæa. It may have been that some form of the prophecy of Balaam, that a "star should rise out of Jacob" (Numb. xxiv, 17), had reached them, either through the Jews of the Dispersion, or through traditions running parallel with the O. T., and that this led them to recognise its fulfilment (Origen, *c. Cels.* i; Hom. *in Num.* xiii; but the hypothesis is neither necessary nor satisfactory; comp. Ellicott, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 77). It may have been, lastly, that the traditional predictions ascribed to their own prophet Zoroaster, leading them to expect a succession of three deliverers, two working as prophets to reform the world and raise up a kingdom (Tavernier, *Travels*, iv, 8), the third (Zosiosh), the greatest of the three, coming to be the head of the kingdom, to conquer Ahriman and to raise the dead (Du Perron, *Zend-Av.* i, 2, p. 46; Hyde, c. 31; Ellicott, *Hulsean Lect.* l. c.), and in strange fantastic ways connecting these redeemers with the seed of Abraham (Tavernier, *l. c.*; and D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s. v. Zerdascht), had roused their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews the Oshanderbegha ("Homo Mundi," Hyde, *l. c.*) or the Zosiosh whom they expected. In any case they shared the "vetus et constans opinio" which had spread itself over the whole East, that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined once again to give a ruler to the nations. It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of Destur-Mobeds in the later Zoroastrian hierarchy, as the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They came, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold, and frankincense, and myrrh which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. Gen. xliii, 11; Psa. lxxii, 15; 1 Kings x, 2, 10; 2 Chron. ix, 24; Cant. iii, 6; iv, 14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (Luke ii, 25, 38). "Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." The Sanhedrim was convened, and the question where the Messiah was to be born was formally placed before them. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were necessary to crush them. See HEROD. The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of Mic. v, 2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the Christ, determined the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It remained to determine the time: with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he could not be far wrong. The magi accordingly were sent on to Bethlehem, as if they were but the forerunners of the king's own homage. As they journeyed they again saw the star, which for a time, it would seem, they had lost sight of, and it guided them on their way. (See STAR IN THE EAST for this and all other questions connected with its appearance.) The pressure of the crowds, which a fortnight, or four months, or well-nigh two years before, had driven Mary and Joseph to the rude stable of the caravanserai of Bethlehem, had apparently abated, and the magi, entering "the house" (Matt. ii, 11), fell down and paid their homage and offered their gifts. Once more they received guidance through the channel which their work and their studies had made familiar to them. From first to last, in Media, in Babylon, in Persia, the magi had been famous as the interpreters of dreams. That which they received now need not have involved a disclosure of the plans of Herod to them. It was enough that it directed them to "return to their own country another way." With this their history, so far as the N. T. carries us, comes to an end.

It need hardly be said that this part of the Gospel narrative has had to bear the brunt of the attacks of a hostile criticism. The omission of all mention of the magi in a Gospel which enters so fully into all the circumstances of the infancy of Christ as that of Luke, and the difficulty of harmonizing this incident with those which he narrates, have been urged as at least throwing suspicion on what Matthew alone has recorded. The advocate of the "mythical theory" sees in this almost the strongest confirmation of it (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i, 272). "There must be prodigies gathering round the cradle of the infant Christ. Other heroes and kings had had their stars, and so must he. He must receive in his childhood the homage of the representatives of other races and creeds. The facts recorded lie outside the range of history, and are not mentioned by any contemporary historian." The answers to these objections may be briefly stated. (1) Assuming the central fact of the early chapters of Matthew, no objection lies against any of its accessories on the ground of their being wonderful and improbable. It would be in harmony with our expectations that there should be signs and wonders indicating its presence. The objection therefore postulates the absolute incredulity of that fact, and begs the point at issue (compare Trench, *Star of the Wise Men*, p. 124). (2) The question whether this, or any other given narrative connected with the nativity of Christ, bears upon it the stamp of a *mythus*, is therefore one to be determined by its own merits, on its own evidence; and then the case stands thus: A mythical story is characterized for the most part by a large admixture of what is wild, poetical, fantastic. A comparison of Matt. ii with the Jewish or Mohammedan legends of a later time, or even with the Christian mythology which afterwards gathered round this very chapter, will show how wide is the distance that separates its simple narrative, without ornament, without exaggeration, from the overflowing luxuriance of those figments (comp. § VII, below). (3) The absence of any direct confirmatory evidence in other writers of the time may be accounted for, partly at least, by the want of any full chronicle of the events of the later years of Herod. The momentary excitement of the arrival of such travellers as the magi, or of the slaughter of some score of children in a small Jewish town, would easily be effaced by the more agitating events that followed. The silence of Josephus is not more conclusive against this fact than it is (assuming the spuriousness of *Ant.* xviii, 4, 3) against the fact of the crucifixion and the growth of the sect of the Nazarenes within the walls of Jerusalem. (4) The more perplexing absence of all mention of the magi in Luke's Gospel may yet receive some probable explanation. So far as we cannot explain it, our ignorance of all, or nearly all, the circumstances of the composition of the Gospels is a sufficient answer. It is, however, at least possible that Luke, knowing that the facts related by Matthew were already current among the churches, sought rather to add what was not yet recorded. Some-

thing, too, may have been due to the leading thoughts of the two Gospels. Matthew, dwelling chiefly on the kingly office of Christ as the Son of David, seizes naturally on the first recognition of that character by the magi of the East (comp. on the fitness of this, Mill, *Pantheistic Principles*, p. 375). Luke, portraying the Son of Man in his sympathy with common men, in his compassion on the poor and humble, dwells as naturally on the manifestation to the shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem. It may be added further that everything tends to show that the latter evangelist derived the materials for this part of his history much more directly from the *mother* of the Lord, or her kindred, than did the former; and, if so, it is not difficult to understand how she might come to dwell on that which connected itself at once with the eternal blessedness of peace, good will, salvation, rather than on the homage and offerings of strangers, which seemed to be the presage of an earthly kingdom, and had proved to be the prelude to a life of poverty, and to the death upon the cross.

VII. *Later Traditions which have gathered round the Magi of Matt. ii.*—In this instance, as in others, what is told by the Gospel writers in plain, simple words has become the nucleus for a whole cycle of legends. A Christian mythology has overshadowed that which itself had nothing in common with it. The love of the strange and marvellous, the eager desire to fill up in detail a narrative which had been left in outline, and to make every detail the representative of an idea—these, which tend everywhere to the growth of the mythical element within the region of history, fixed themselves, naturally enough, precisely on those portions of the life of Christ where the written records were the least complete. The stages of this development present themselves in regular succession.

(1) The magi are no longer thought of as simply "wise men," members of a sacred order. The prophecies of Psa. lxxii; Isa. xlix, 7, 23; lx, 16, must be fulfilled in them, and they become princes ("reguli," Tertull. *c. Jud.* 9; *c. Marc.* 5). This tends more and more to be the dominant thought. When the arrival of the magi, rather than the birth or the baptism of Christ, as the first of his mighty works, comes to be looked on as the great epiphany of his divine power, the older title of the feast receives as a synonym, almost as a substitute, that of the Feast of the Three Kings. (2) The number of the wise men, which Matthew leaves altogether undefined, was arbitrarily fixed. They were *three* (Leo Magn. *Serm. ad Epiph.*), because thus they became a symbol of the mysterious trinity (Hilary of Arles), or because then the number corresponded to the threefold gifts, or to the three parts of the earth, or the three great divisions of the human race descended from the sons of Noah (Bede, *De Collect.*). (3) Symbolic meanings were found for each of the three gifts. The gold they offered as to a king. With the myrrh they prefigured the bitterness of the passion, the embalmment for the burial. With the frankincense they adored the divinity of the Son of God (Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. Μάγοι; *Brev. Rom. in Epiph.* passim). (4) Later on, in a tradition which, though appearing in a Western writer, is traceable probably to reports brought back by pilgrims from Italy or the East, the names are added, and Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar take their place among the objects of Christian reverence, and are honored as the patron saints of travellers. The passage from Bede (*De Collect.*) is in many ways interesting, and as it is not commonly quoted by commentators, though often referred to, it may be worth while to give it: "Primus dicitur fuisse Melchior, qui senex et canus, barbâ prolixâ et capillis, aurum obtulit regi Domino. Secundus, nomine Gaspar, juvenis imberbis, rubicundus, thure, quasi Deo oblatione dignâ, Deum honoravit. Tertius fuscus, integre barbatus, Baltassar nomine, per myrrham filium hominis moriturum professus." The treatise *De Collectaneis* is, in fact, a miscellaneous collection of memoranda in the form of question and answer. The desire to find names for those who have none given them is very noticeable in other instances as well as in that of the magi; e. g. it gives those of the penitent and impenitent thief. The passage quoted above is followed by a description of their dress, taken obviously either from some early painting, or from the decorations of a miracle-play (comp. the account of such a performance in Trench, *Star of the Wise Men*, p. 70). The account of the offerings, it will be noticed, does not agree with the traditional hexameter of the Latin Church: "Gaspar fert myrrham, thus Melchior, Balthasar aurum." We recognise at once in the above description the received types of the early pictorial art of Western Europe. It is open to believe that both the description and the art-types may be traced to early quasi-dramatic representations of the facts of the nativity. In any such representations names of some kind would become a matter of necessity, and were probably invented at random. Familiar as the names given by Bede now are to us, there was a time when they had no more authority than Bithisarca, Melchior, and Gathaspar (Moroni, *Dizionar.* s. v. Magi); Magalath, Pangalath, Saracen; Appellius, Amerius, and Damascus, and a score of others (Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* ii, 288).

In the Eastern Church, where, it would seem, there was less desire to find symbolic meanings than to magnify the circumstances of the history, the traditions assume a different character. The magi arrive at Jerusalem with a retinue of 1000 men, having left behind them, on the further bank of the Euphrates, an army of 7000 (Jacob. Edess. and Bar-hebræus, in Hyde, *l. c.*). They have been led to undertake the journey, not by the star only, or by expectations which they shared with the Israelites, but by a prophecy of the founder of their own faith. Zoroaster had predicted that in the latter days there should be a mighty One and a Redeemer, and that his descendants should see the star which should be the herald of his coming. According to another legend (*Opus imperf. in Matt. ii apud Chrysost.* t. vi, ed. Montfaucon) they came from the remotest East, near the borders of the ocean. They had been taught to expect the star by a writing that bore the name of Seth. That expectation was handed down from father to son. Twelve of the holiest of them were appointed to be ever on the watch. Their post of observation was a rock known as the Mount of Victory. Night by night they washed in pure water, and prayed, and looked out on the heavens. At last the star appeared, and in it the form of a young child bearing a cross. A voice came from it and bade them proceed to Judæa. They started on their two years' journey, and during all that time the meat and the drink with which they started never failed them. The gifts they bring are those which Abraham gave to their progenitors the sons of Keturah (this, of course, on the hypothesis that they were Arabians), which the queen of Sheba had in her turn presented to Solomon, and which had found their way back again to the children of the East (Epiphan. *in Comp. Doctr.* in Moroni, *Dizion.* l. c.). They return from Bethlehem to their own country, and give themselves up to a life of contemplation and prayer. When the twelve apostles leave Jerusalem to carry on their work as preachers, St. Thomas finds them in Parthia. They offer themselves for baptism, and become evangelists of the new faith (*Opus imperf. in Matt. ii*, l. c.). The pilgrim-feeling of the 4th century includes them also within its range. Among other relics supplied to meet the demands of the market which the devotion of Helena had created, the bodies of the magi are discovered somewhere in the East, are brought to Constantinople, and placed in the great church which, as the Mosque of St. Sophia, still bears in its name the witness of its original dedication to the divine Wisdom. The favor with which the people of Milan had received the emperor's prefect Eustorgius called for some special mark of favor, and on his consecration as bishop of that city he obtained for it the privilege of being the rest-

ing-place of the precious relics. There the fame of the three kings increased. The prominence given to all the feasts connected with the season of the Nativity—the transfer to that season of the mirth and joy of the old Saturnalia—the setting apart of a distinct day for the commemoration of the Epiphany in the 4th century—all this added to the veneration with which they were regarded. When Milan fell into the hands of Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1162), the influence of the archbishop of Cologne prevailed on the emperor to transfer them to that city. The Milanese, at a later period, consoled themselves by forming a special confraternity for perpetuating their veneration for the magi by the annual performance of a "Mystery" (Moroni, *l. c.*); but the glory of possessing the relics of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ remained with Cologne. (For the later mediæval developments of the traditions, comp. Joan. von Hildesheim, in *Quart. Rev.* lxxviii, 433.) In that proud cathedral which is the glory of Teutonic art the shrine of the Three Kings has for six centuries been shown as the greatest of its many treasures. The tabernacle in which the bones of some whose real name and history are lost forever lie enshrined in honor, bears witness, in its gold and gems, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron saints of travellers they have given a name to the inns of earlier or later date. The names of Melchior, Gaspar, and Balthasar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* xxi).

Compare, in addition to authorities already cited, Trench, *Star of the Wise Men* (Lond. 1850); Upham, *Wise Men of the East* (N.Y. 1869); J. F. Müller, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. Magi; Triebel and Miegius, in *Crit. Sacri* (*Thes. Nov.* ii, 111, 118); and Rhoden, in *Crit. Sacri* (*Thes. Theol. Phil.* ii, 69). For the Talmudic views of the magi, see Lakemeyer, *Observ.* ii. 132 sq.

Other monographs on the general subject have been written by Nothnagel (Viteb. 1652), Müller (Tigur. 1660), Stolberg (Viteb. 1663), Olearius (Lips. 1671), and Moller (Altd. 1688).

Magic (only occurs in the A. V. at Wisd. xvii, 7, *μαγικὴ* s. v. *τεχνή*, "art magic;" but the term "magician" [q. v.] is frequent), a word used to designate the power or art of working wonders beyond the range of science or natural skill. It is derived from the Greek, and refers ultimately to the *magi* (q. v.), who were anciently regarded as its depositaries or experts. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Egyptians, the Canaanites, and their neighbors, the Hebrews, the Chaldæans, and probably the Greeks. In all ages and parts of the world they have played an important part in popular superstition (q. v.).

I. *Position of Magic in relation to Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Times.*—The degree of the civilization of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men—and the analogy of Plato in the "Republic" is not always false—the feelings on which magic fixes its hold are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time, inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

1. With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigritians, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eyes but as having a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family—we use the word white for a group of nations mainly yellow, in contradistinction to black—incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, Shamanism characterizing their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the Nigritians and the Caucasian population of North Africa was what it now is. In his remarkable account of the journey of the Nasamonian young men—the Nasamones, be it remembered, were "a Libyan race," and dwellers on the northern coast, as the historian here says—we are told that the adventurers passed through the inhabited maritime region, and the tract occupied by wild beasts, and the desert, and at last came upon a plain with trees, where they were seized by men of small stature, who carried them across marshes to a town of such men black in complexion. A great river, running from west to east, and containing crocodiles, flowed by that town, and all that nation were sorcerers (*ἐς τοὺς οὐτοι ἀπικοντο ἀνθρώπους, γόητας εἶναι πάντας*, ii, 32, 33). It little matters whether the conjecture that the great river was the Niger be true, which the idea adopted by Herodotus that it was the upper Nile seems to favor: it is quite evident that the Nasamones came upon a nation of Nigritians beyond the Great Desert, and were struck with their fetishism. So, in our own days, the traveller is astonished at the height to which this superstition is carried among the Nigritians, who have no religious practices that are not of the nature of sorcery, nor any priests who are not magicians, and magicians alone. The strength of this belief in magic in these two great divisions of the lowest race is shown in the case of each by its having maintained its hold in an instance in which its tenacity must have been severely tried. The ancient Egyptians show their partly-Nigritian origin not alone in their physical characteristics and language, but in their religion. They retained the strange, low nature-worship of the Nigritians, forcibly combining it with more intellectual kinds of belief, as they represented their gods with the heads of animals and the bodies of men, and even connecting it with truths which point to a primeval revelation. The Ritual, which was the great treasury of Egyptian belief, and explained the means of gaining future happiness, is full of charms to be said, and contains directions for making and for using amulets. As the Nigritian goes on a journey hung about with amulets, so amulets were placed on the Egyptian's embalmed body, and his soul went on its mysterious way fortified with incantations learned while on earth. In China, although Buddhism has established itself, and the system of Confucius has gained the power its positivism would insure it with a highly-educated people of low type, another belief still maintains itself which there is strong reason to hold to be older than the other two, although it is usually supposed to have been of the same age as Confucianism; in this religion magic is of the highest importance, the distinguishing characteristic by which it is known.

2. With the Shemites magic takes a lower place. Nowhere is it even part of religion, yet it is looked upon as a powerful engine, and generally unlawful or lawful according to the aid invoked. Among many of the Shemitic peoples there linger the remnants of a primitive fetishism. Sacred trees and stones are reverenced from an old superstition, of which they do not always know the meaning, derived from the nations whose place they have taken. Thus fetishism remains, although in a kind of fossil state. The importance of astrology with the Shemites has tended to raise the character of their magic, which deals rather with the discovery of supposed existing influences than with the production of new influences. The only direct association of magic with religion is where the priests, as the educated class, have taken the functions of magicians; but this is far different from the case of the Nigritians, where the magicians are the only priests. The Shemites, however, when depending on human reason alone, seem never to have doubted the efficacy of magical arts, yet recourse to their aid was not usually with them the first idea of a man in doubt. Though the case of Saul cannot be taken as applying to the whole race, yet, even with the heathen Shemites, prayers must have been held to be of more value than incantations.

The Iranians assign to magic a still less important position. It can scarcely be traced in the relics of old nature-worship, which they with greater skill than the Egyptians interwove with their more intellectual beliefs, as the Greeks gave the objects of reverence in Arcadia and Crete a place in poetical myths, and the Scandinavians animated the hard remains of primitive superstition. The character of the ancient belief is utterly gone with the assigning of new reasons for the reverence of its sacred objects. Magic always maintained some hold on men's minds, but the stronger intellects despised it, like the Roman commander who threw the sacred chickens overboard, and the Greek who defied an adverse omen at the beginning of a great battle. When any, oppressed by the sight of the calamities of mankind, sought to resolve the mysterious problem, they fixed, like Æschylus, not upon the childish notion of a chance-government by many conflicting agencies, but upon the nobler idea of a dominating fate. Men of highly sensitive temperaments have always inclined to a belief in magic, and there has therefore been a section of Iranian philosophers in all ages who have paid attention to its practice; but, expelled from religion, it has held but a low and precarious place in philosophy.

The Hebrews had no magic of their own. It was so strictly forbidden by the law that it could never afterwards have any recognised existence save in times of general heresy or apostasy, and the same was doubtless the case in the patriarchal ages. The magical practices which obtained among the Hebrews were therefore borrowed from the nations around. The hold they gained was such as we should have expected with a Shemitic race, making allowance for the discredit thrown upon them by the prohibitions of the law. From the first entrance into the Land of Promise until the destruction of Jerusalem we have constant glimpses of magic practiced in secret, or resorted to, not alone by the common, but also by the great. The Talmud abounds in notices of contemporary magic among the Jews, showing that it survived idolatry notwithstanding their original connection, and was supposed to produce real effects. The Koran in like manner treats charms and incantations as capable of producing evil consequences when used against a man. It is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible that from first to last it warrants no such trust or dread. In the Psalms, the most personal of all the books of Scripture, there is no prayer to be protected against magical influences. The believer prays to be delivered from every kind of evil that could hurt the body or the soul, but he says nothing of the machinations of sorcerers. Here and everywhere magic is passed by, or, if mentioned, mentioned only to be condemned (comp. Psa. cvi, 28). Let those who affirm that they see in the Psalms merely human piety, and in Job and Ecclesiastes merely human philosophy, explain the absence in them, and throughout the Scriptures, of the expression of superstitious feelings that are inherent in the Shemitic mind. Let them explain the luxuriant growth, in the after-literature of the Hebrews and Arabs, and notably in the Talmud and the Koran, of these feelings with no root in those older writings from which that after-literature was derived. If the Bible, the Talmud, and the Koran be but several expressions of the Shemitic mind, differing only through the effect of time, how can this contrast be accounted for?—the very opposite of what obtains elsewhere: for superstitions are generally strongest in the earlier literature of a race, and gradually fade, unless a condition of barbarism restore their vigor. Those who see in the Bible a divine work can understand how a God-taught preacher could throw aside the miserable fears of his race, and boldly tell man to trust in his Maker alone. Here, as in all matters, the history of the Bible confirms its doctrine. In the doctrinal Scriptures magic is passed by with contempt, in the historical Scriptures the reasonableness of this contempt is shown. Whenever the practisers of magic attempt to combat the servants of God, they conspicuously fail. Pharaoh's magicians bow to the divine power shown in the wonders wrought by Moses and Aaron. Balaam, the great enchanter, comes from afar to curse Israel, and is forced to bless them.

II. *Biblical Notices.*—In examining the references to magic in the Bible, we must keep in view the curious inquiry whether there be any reality in the art. We would at the outset protest against the idea, once very prevalent, that the conviction that the seen and unseen worlds were often more manifestly in contact in the Biblical ages than now necessitates a belief in the reality of the magic spoken of in the Scriptures. We do indeed see a connection of a supernatural agency with magic in such a case as that of the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination mentioned in the Acts; yet there the agency appears to have been involuntary in the damsel, and shrewdly made profitable by her employers. This does not establish the possibility of man being able at his will to use supernatural powers to gain his own ends, which is what magic has always pretended to accomplish. Thus much we premise, lest we should be thought to hold latitudinarian opinions because we treat the reality of magic as an open question.

Without losing sight of the distinctions we have drawn between the magic of different races, we shall consider the notices of the subject in the Bible in the order in which they occur. It is impossible in every case to assign the magical practice spoken of to a particular nation, or, when this can be done, to determine whether it be native or borrowed, and the general absence of details renders any other system of classification liable to error.

1. The theft and carrying away of Laban's *teraphim* (תְּרָפִים) by Rachel seems to indicate the practice of magic in Padan-aram at this early time. It appears that Laban attached great value to these objects from what he said as to the theft and his determined search for them (Gen. xxxi, 19, 30, 32–35). It may be supposed, from the manner in which they were hidden, that these teraphim were not very small. The most important point is that Laban calls them his "gods" (ver. 30, 32), although he was not without belief in the true God (ver. 24, 49–53); for this makes it almost certain that we have here, not an indication of the worship of strange gods, but the first notice of a superstition that afterwards obtained among those Israelites who added corrupt practices to the true religion. The derivation of the name "*teraphim*" is extremely obscure. Gesenius takes it from an "unused" root, תָּרַף, which he supposes, from the Arabic, probably signified "to live pleasantly" (*Thesaur.* s. v.). It may, however, be reasonably conjectured that such a root would have had, if not in Hebrew, in the language whence the Hebrews took it or its derivative, the proper meaning "to dance" corresponding to this, which would then be its tropical meaning. We should prefer, if no other derivation be found, to suppose that the name teraphim might mean "dancers" or "causers of dancing," with reference either to primitive nature-worship or its magical rites of the character of Shamanism, rather than that it signifies, as Gesenius suggests, "givers of pleasant life." There seems, however, to be a cognate word, unconnected with the "unused" root just mentioned, in ancient Egyptian, whence we may obtain a conjectural derivation. We do not, of course, trace the worship of teraphim to the sojourn in Egypt. They were probably those objects of the pre-Abrahamite idolatry, put away by order of Jacob (Gen. xxxv, 2–4), yet retained even in Joshua's time (Josh. xxiv, 14); and, if so, notwithstanding his exhortation, abandoned only for a space (Judg. xvii, xviii); and they were also known to the Babylonians, being used by them for divination (Ezek. xxi, 21). But there is great reason for supposing a close connection between the oldest language and religion of Chaldæa and the ancient Egyptian language and religion. The

Egyptian word *ter* signifies "a shape, type, transformation," and has for its determinative a mummy: it is used in the Ritual, where the various transformations of the deceased in Hades are described (*Todtenbuch*, ed. Lepsius, ch. lxxvi sq.). The small mummy-shaped figure, *shebti*, usually made of baked clay covered with a blue vitreous varnish, representing the Egyptian as deceased, is of a nature connecting it with magic, since it was made with the idea that it secured benefits in Hades; and it is connected with the word *ter*, for it represents a mummy, the determinative of that word, and was considered to be of use in the state in which the deceased passed through transformations, *teru*. The difficulty which forbids our doing more than conjecture a relation between *ter* and teraphim is the want in the former of the third radical of the latter; and in our present state of ignorance respecting the ancient Egyptian and the primitive language of Chaldæa in their *verbal* relations to the Shemitic family, it is impossible to say whether it is likely to be explained. The possible connection with the Egyptian religious magic is, however, not to be slighted, especially as it is not improbable that the household idolatry of the Hebrews was ancestral worship, and the *shebti* was the image of a deceased man or woman, as a mummy, and therefore as an Osiris, bearing the insignia of that divinity, and so in a manner as a deified dead person, although we do not know that it was used in the ancestral worship of the Egyptians. It is important to notice that no singular is found of the word teraphim, and that the plural form is once used where only one statue seems to be meant (1 Sam. xix, 13, 16): in this case it may be a "plural of excellence." If the latter inference be true, this word must have become thoroughly Shemiticized. There is no description of these images; but, from the account of Michal's stratagem to deceive Saul's messengers, it is evident, if only one image be there meant, as is very probable, that they were at least sometimes of the size of a man, and perhaps in the head and shoulders, if not lower, of human shape, or of a similar form (ver. 13–16).

The worship or use of teraphim after the occupation of the Promised Land cannot be doubted as having been one of the corrupt practices of those Hebrews who leaned to idolatry, but did not abandon their belief in the God of Israel. Although the Scriptures draw no marked distinction between those who forsook their religion and those who added to it such corruptions, it is evident that the latter always professed to be orthodox. Teraphim, therefore, cannot be regarded as among the Hebrews necessarily connected with strange gods, whatever may have been the case with other nations. The account of Micah's images in the book of Judges, compared with a passage in Hosea, shows our conclusion to be correct. In the earliest days of the occupation of the Promised Land, in the time of anarchy that followed Joshua's rule, Micah, "a man of Mount Ephraim," made certain images and other objects of heretical worship, which were stolen from him by those Danites who took Laish and called it Dan, there setting up idolatry, where it continued the whole time that the ark was at Shiloh, the priests retaining their post "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Judg. xvii, xviii, esp. 30, 31). Probably this worship was somewhat changed, although not in its essential character, when Jeroboam set up the golden calf at Dan. Micah's idolatrous objects were a graven image, a molten image, an ephod, and teraphim (xvii, 3, 4, 5; xviii, 17, 18, 20). In Hosea there is a retrospect of this period where the prophet takes a harlot, and commands her to be faithful to him "many days." It is added: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image [or "pillar," מַצֵּבָה], and without an ephod, and teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king; and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days" (iii, esp. 4, 5). The apostate people are long to be without their spurious king and false worship, and in the end are to return to their loyalty to the house of David and their faith in the true God. That Dan should be connected with Jeroboam "who made Israel to sin," and with the kingdom which he founded, is most natural; and it is therefore worthy of note that the images, ephod, and teraphim made by Micah, and stolen and set up by the Danites at Dan, should so nearly correspond with the objects spoken of by the prophet. It has been imagined that the use of teraphim and the similar abominations of the heretical Israelites are not so strongly condemned in the Scriptures as the worship of strange gods. This mistake arises from the mention of pious kings who did not suppress the high places, which proves only their timidity, and not any lesser sinfulness in the spurious religion than in false systems borrowed from the peoples of Canaan and neighboring countries. The cruel rites of the heathen are indeed especially reprobated, but the heresy of the Israelites is too emphatically denounced, by Samuel in a passage soon to be examined, and in the repeated condemnation of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin," to render it possible that we should take a view of it consistent only with modern sophistry.

We pass to the magical use of teraphim. By the Israelites they were consulted for oracular answers. This was apparently done by the Danites, who asked Micah's Levite to inquire as to the success of their spying expedition (Judg. xviii, 5, 6). In later times this is distinctly stated of the Israelites where Zechariah says, "For the teraphim have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams" (x, 2). It cannot be supposed that, as this first positive mention of the use of teraphim for divination by the Israelites is after the return from Babylon, and as that use obtained with the Babylonians in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, therefore the Israelites borrowed it from their conquerors; for these objects are mentioned in earlier places in such a manner that their connection with divination must be intended, if we bear in mind that this connection is undoubted in a subsequent period. Samuel's reproof of Saul for his disobedience in the matter of Amalek associates "divination" with "vanity," or "idols" (אָוֶן), and "teraphim," however we render the difficult passage where these words occur (1 Sam. xv, 22, 23). (The word rendered "vanity," אָוֶן, is especially used with reference to idols, and even in some places stands alone for an idol or idols.) When Saul, having put to death the workers in black arts, finding himself rejected of God in his extremity, sought the witch of Endor, and asked to see Samuel, the prophet's apparition denounced his doom as the punishment of this very disobedience as to Amalek. The reproof would seem, therefore, to have been a prophecy that the self-confident king would at the last alienate himself from God, and take refuge in the very abominations he despised. This apparent reference tends to confirm the inference we have indicated. As to a later time, when Josiah's reform is related, he is said to have put away "the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols" (2 Kings xxiii, 24); where the mention of the teraphim immediately after the wizards, and as distinct from the idols, seems to favor the inference that they are spoken of as objects used in divination.

The only account of the act of divining by teraphim is in a remarkable passage of Ezekiel relating to Nebuchadnezzar's advance against Jerusalem. "Also, thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain [two swords] shall come forth out of one land: and choose thou a place, choose [it] at the head of the way to the city. Appoint a way, that the sword may come to Rabbath of the Ammonites, and to Judah in Jerusalem the defenced. For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divina-

tion: he shuffled arrows, he consulted with teraphim, he looked in the liver. At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem" (xxi, 19–22). The mention together of consulting teraphim and looking into the liver may not indicate that the victim was offered to teraphim and its liver then looked into, but may mean two separate acts of divining. The former explanation seems, however, to have been adopted by the Sept. in its rendering of the account of Michal's stratagem, as if Michal had been divining, and on the coming of the messengers seized the image and liver and hastily put them in the bed. The accounts which the Rabbins give of divining by teraphim are worthless. See TERAPHIM.

2. Joseph, when his brethren left after their second visit to buy corn, ordered his steward to hide his silver cup in Benjamin's sack, and afterwards sent him after them, ordering him to claim it, thus: "[Is] not this [it] in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth?" (Gen. xliv, 5). The meaning of the latter clause has been contested, Gesenius translating "he could surely foresee it" (ap. Barrett, *Synopsis*, ad loc.), but the other rendering seems far more probable, especially as we read that Joseph afterwards said to his brethren, "Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?" (xliv, 15)—the same word being used. If so, the reference would probably be to the use of the cup in divining, and we should have to infer that here Joseph was acting on his own judgment [see JOSEPH], divination being not alone doubtless a forbidden act, but one of which he, when called before Pharaoh, had distinctly disclaimed the practice. Two uses of cups or the like for magical purposes have obtained in the East from ancient times. In one use either the cup itself bears engraved inscriptions, supposed to have a magical influence (see D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Giam), or it is plain, and such inscriptions are written on its inner surface in ink. In both cases water poured into the cup is drunk by those wishing to derive benefit, as, for instance, the cure of diseases, from the inscriptions, which, if written, are dissolved (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* ch. xi). This use, in both its forms, obtains among the Arabs in the present day, and cups bearing Chaldæan inscriptions in ink have been discovered by Mr. Layard, and probably show that this practice existed among the Jews in Babylonia in about the 7th century of the Christian æra (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 509, etc. There is an excellent paper on these bowls by Dr. Levy, of Breslau, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, ix, 465, etc.). In the other use the cup or bowl was of very secondary importance. It was merely the receptacle for water, in which, after the performance of magical rites, a boy looked to see what the magician desired. This is precisely the same as the practice of the modern Egyptian magicians, where the difference that ink is employed and is poured into the palm of the boy's hand is merely accidental. A Gnostic papyrus in Greek, written in Egypt in the earlier centuries of the Christian æra, now preserved in the British Museum, describes the practice of the boy with a bowl, and alleges results strikingly similar to the alleged results of the well-known modern Egyptian magician, whose divination would seem, therefore, to be a relic of the famous magic of ancient Egypt. (See Lane, *Mod. Egyptians*, ch. xii, for an account of the performances of this magician, and Mr. Lane's opinion as to the causes of their occasional apparent success.) As this latter use only is of the nature of divination, it is probable that to it Joseph referred. The practice may have been prevalent in his time, and hieroglyphic inscriptions upon the bowl may have given color to the idea that it had magical properties, and perhaps even that it had thus led to the discovery of its place of concealment, a discovery which must have struck Joseph's brethren with the utmost astonishment. See CUP.

3. The magicians of Egypt are spoken of as a class in the histories of Joseph and Moses. When Pharaoh's officers were troubled by their dreams, being in prison they were at a loss for an interpreter. Before Joseph explained the dreams he disclaimed the power of interpreting save by the divine aid, saying, "[Do] not interpretations [belong] to God? tell me [them], I pray you" (Gen. xl, 8). In like manner, when Pharaoh had his two dreams, we find that he had recourse to those who professed to interpret dreams. We read: "He sent and called for all the scribes of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream; but [there was] none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh" (xli, 8; comp. ver. 24). Joseph, being sent for on the report of the chief of the cup-bearers, was told by Pharaoh that he had heard that he could interpret a dream. Joseph said, "[It is] not in me: God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace" (ver. 16). Thus, from the expectations of the Egyptians and Joseph's disavowals, we see that the interpretation of dreams was a branch of the knowledge to which the ancient Egyptian magicians pretended. The failure of the Egyptians in the case of Pharaoh's dreams must probably be regarded as the result of their inability to give a satisfactory explanation, for it is unlikely that they refused to attempt to interpret. The two words used to designate the interpreters sent for by Pharaoh are חַרְטֻמִּים, "scribes" (?) and חֲכָמִים, "wise men."

We again hear of the magicians of Egypt in the narrative of the events before the exodus. They were summoned by Pharaoh to oppose Moses. The account of what they effected requires to be carefully examined, from its bearing on the question whether magic be an imposture. We read: "And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, Show a miracle for you: then thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast [it] before Pharaoh, [and] it shall become a serpent." It is then related that Aaron did thus, and afterwards: "Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and the enchanters: now they, the scribes of Egypt, did so by their secret arts: for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods" (Exod. vii, 8–12). The rods were probably long staves like those represented on the Egyptian monuments, not much less than the height of a man. If the word used mean here a serpent, the Egyptian magicians may have feigned a change: if it signify a crocodile, they could scarcely have done so. The names by which the magicians are designated are to be noted. That which we render "scribes" seems here to have a general signification, including wise men and enchanters. The last term is more definite in its meaning, denoting users of incantations. On the occasion of the first plague, the turning of the rivers and waters of Egypt into blood, the opposition of the magicians again occurs. "And the scribes of Egypt did so by their secret arts" (vii, 22). When the second plague, that of frogs, was sent, the magicians again made the same opposition (viii, 7). Once more they appear in the history. The plague of lice came, and we read that when Aaron had worked the wonder the magicians opposed him: "And the scribes did so by their secret arts to bring forth the lice, but they could not: so there were lice upon man and upon beast. And the scribes said unto Pharaoh, This [is] the finger of God: but Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said" (viii, 18, 19 [Heb. 14, 15]). After this we hear no more of the magicians. All we can gather from the narrative is that the appearances produced by them were sufficient to deceive Pharaoh on three occasions. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression "the scribes did so by their secret arts" is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonders wrought by Aaron they saw the finger of God any proof that they recognised a power superior to the native objects of worship they invoked, for we find that the Egyptians frequently spoke of a supreme being as God. It seems rather as if they had said, "Our juggles are of

no avail against the work of a divinity." There is one later mention of these transactions, which adds to our information, but does not decide the main question. St. Paul mentions Jannes and Jambres as having "withstood Moses," and says that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii, 8, 9). The Egyptian character of these names, the first of which is, in our opinion, found in hieroglyphics, is not inconsistent with the opinion that the apostle cited a prevalent tradition of the Jews. See JANNES and JAMBRES.

We turn to the Egyptian illustrations of this part of the subject. Magic, as we have before remarked, was inherent in the ancient Egyptian religion. The Ritual is a system of incantations and directions for making amulets, with the object of securing the future happiness of the disembodied soul. However obscure the belief of the Egyptians as to the actual character of the state of the soul after death may be to us, it cannot be doubted that the knowledge and use of the magical amulets and incantations treated of in the Ritual was held to be necessary for future happiness, although it was not believed that they alone could insure it, since to have done good works, or, more strictly, not to have committed certain sins, was an essential condition of the acquittal of the soul in the great trial in Hades. The thoroughly magical character of the Ritual is most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (*Todtenbuch*, ch. c, cxxix, cxxxiv), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. cxxxiii). The later chapters of the Ritual (clxiii–clxv), held to have been added after the compilation or composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (*Le Papyrus Magique Harris*, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of revisiting the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the British Museum (*Select Papyri*, part ii), and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of mediæval fictions, both Eastern and Western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the case of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual; and the perils encountered by the soul in Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of king Mencheres, four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the southern slopes of snowy Atlas, full of fierce beasts; the vast desert, untenanted save by harmful reptiles, swept by sand-storms, and ever burning under an unchanging sun; the marshes of the south, teeming with brutes of vast size and strength, are the several zones of the Egyptian Hades. The creatures of the desert and the plains and slopes, the crocodile, the pachydermata, the lion, perchance the gorilla, are the genii that hold this land of fear. In what dread must the first scanty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder, then, that the imaginative Nigritians were struck with a superstitious fear which certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the generalization which led us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, "the West;" and that the wild regions west of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of mediæval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.

Like all nations who have practiced magic generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chabas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicted and punished with death (p. 169 sq.).

A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from a remarkable ancient calendar (*Select Papyri*, part i) and the evidence of writers of antiquity. A religious prejudice, or the occurrence of some great calamity, probably lay at the root of this observance of days. Of the former the birthday of Typhon, the fifth of the Epagomenæ, is an instance. Astrology was also held in high honor, as the calendars of certain of the tombs of the kings, stating the positions of the stars and their influence on different parts of the body, show us; but it seems doubtful whether this branch of magical arts is older than the xviiith dynasty, although certain stars were held in reverence in the time of the ivth dynasty. The belief in omens probably did not hold an important place in Egyptian magic, if we may judge from the absence of direct mention of them. The superstition as to "the evil eye" appears to have been known, but there is nothing else that we can class with phenomena of the nature of animal magnetism. Two classes of learned men had the charge of the magical books: one of these, the name of which has not been read phonetically, would seem to correspond to the "scribes," as we render the word, spoken of in the history of Joseph; whereas the other has the general sense of "wise men," like the other class there mentioned.

There are no representations on the monuments that can be held to relate directly to the practice of this art, but the secret passages in the thickness of the wall, lately opened in the great temple of Denderah, seem to have been intended for some purpose of imposture.

4. The Mosaic law contains very distinct prohibitions of all magical arts. Besides several passages condemning them, in one place there is a specification which is so full that it seems evident that its object is to include every kind of magical art. The reference is to the practices of Canaan, not to those of Egypt, which indeed do not seem to have been brought away by the Israelites, who, it may be remarked, apparently did not adopt Egyptian idolatry, but only that of foreigners settled in Egypt. See REMPHAN.

The Israelites are commanded in the place referred to not to learn the abominations of the peoples of the Promised Land. Then follows this prohibition: "There shall not be found with thee one who offereth his son or his daughter by fire, a practicer of divinations (קֹסֵם קְסָמִים), a worker of hidden arts (מְעוֹנֵן), an augurer (מְנַחֵשׁ), an enchanter (מְכַשֵּׁף), or a fabricator of charms (חֹבֵר חָבֶר), or an inquirer by a familiar spirit (שֹׁאֵל אוֹב), or a wizard (יִדְּעֹנִי), or a consulter of the dead (דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים)." It is added that these are abominations, and that on account of their practice the

nations of Canaan were to be driven out (Deut. xviii, 9–14, esp. 10, 11). It is remarkable that the offering of children should be mentioned in connection with magical arts. The passage in Micah, which has been supposed to preserve a question of Balak and an answer of Balaam, when the soothsayer was sent for to curse Israel, should be here noticed, for the questioner asks, after speaking of sacrifices of usual kinds, "Shall I give my first-born [for] my transgression, the fruit of my body [for] the sin of my soul?" (vi, 5–8). Perhaps, however, child-sacrifice is specified on account of its atrocity, which would connect it with secret arts, such as we know were frequently, in later times, the causes of cruelty. The terms which follow appear to refer properly to eight different kinds of magic, but some of them are elsewhere used in a general sense. 1. קֶסֶם קְסָמִים is literally "a diviner of divinations." The verb קָסַם is used of false prophets, but also in a general sense for divining, as in the narrative of Saul's consultation of the witch of Endor, where the king says "divine unto me (קָסְמִי־נָא לִי בָּאוֹב), I pray thee, by the familiar spirit" (1 Sam. xxviii, 8). 2. מְעוֹנֵן conveys the idea of "one who acts covertly," and so "a worker of hidden arts." The meaning of the root עָנַן is *covering*, and the supposed connection with fascination by the eyes, like the notion of "the evil eye," as though the original root were "the eye" (עַיִן), seems untenable. The ancient Egyptians seem to have held the superstition of the evil eye, for an eye is the determinative of a word which appears to signify some kind of magic (Chabas, *Papyrus Magique Harris*, p. 170 and note 4). 3. מְנַחֵשׁ, which we render "an augurer," is from נָחַשׁ, which is literally "he or it hissed or whispered," and in Piel is applied to the practice of enchantments, but also to divining generally, as in the case of Joseph's cup, and where, evidently referring to it, he tells his brethren that he could divine, although in both places it has been read more vaguely with the sense *to foresee* or make trial (Gen. xliv, 5, 15). We therefore render it by a term which seems appropriate, but not too definite. The supposed connection of נָחַשׁ with נָחָשׁ, "a serpent," as though meaning serpent-divination, must be rejected, the latter word rather coming from the former, with the signification "a hisser." The name Nahshon (נַחְשׁוֹן), of a prince of Judah in the second year after the exodus (Numb. i, 7; Exod. vi, 23; Ruth iv, 20, etc.), means "enchanter:" it was probably used as a proper name in a vague sense. 4. מְכַשֵּׁף signifies "an enchanter:" the original meaning of the verb was probably "he prayed," and the strict sense of this word "one who uses incantations." 5. חֹבֵר חֶבֶר seems to mean "a fabricator of material charms or amulets," if חָבַר, when used of practicing sorcery, means to bind magical knots, and not to bind a person by spells. 6. שֹׁאֵל אוֹב is "an inquirer by a familiar spirit." The second term signifies a bottle, a familiar spirit consulted by a soothsayer, and a soothsayer having a familiar spirit. The Sept. usually render the plural אבות by ἐγγαστριμύθοι, which has been rashly translated ventriloquists, for it may not signify what we understand by the latter, but refer to the mode in which soothsayers of this kind gave out their responses: to this subject we shall recur later. The consulting of familiar spirits may mean no more than invoking them; but in the Acts we read of a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination (xvi, 16–18) in very distinct terms. This kind of sorcery—divination by a familiar spirit—was practiced by the witch of Endor. 7. יִדְּעֹנִי, which we render "a wizard," is properly "a wise man," but is always applied to wizards and false prophets. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s. v.) supposes that in Lev. xx, 27 it is used of a familiar spirit, but surely the reading "a wizard" is there more probable. 8. The last term, דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים, is very explicit, meaning "a consulter of the dead:" necromancer is an exact translation if the original signification of the latter is retained, instead of the more general one it now usually bears. In the law it was commanded that a man or woman who had a familiar spirit, or a wizard, should be stoned (Lev. xx, 27). An "enchantress" (מְכַשֵּׁפָה) was not to live (Exod. xxii, 18 [Heb. 17]). Using augury and hidden arts was also forbidden (Lev. xix, 26). See Divination.

5. The history of Balaam shows the belief of some ancient nations in the powers of soothsayers. When the Israelites had begun to conquer the Land of Promise, Balak, the king of Moab, and the elders of Midian, resorting to Pharaoh's expedient, sent by messengers with "the rewards of divination (קְסָמִים) in their hands" (Numb. xxii, 7) for Balaam the diviner (הַקּוֹסֵם, Josh. xiii, 22), whose fame was known to them, though he dwelt in Aram. Balak's message shows what he believed Balaam's powers to be: "Behold, there is a people come out from Egypt: behold, they cover the face of the earth, and they abide over against me: come now therefore, I pray thee, curse me this people; for they [are] too mighty for me: peradventure I shall prevail, [that] we may smite them, and [that] I may drive them out of the land: for I wot that he whom thou blessest [is] blessed; and he whom thou cursest is cursed" (Numb. xxii, 5, 6). We are told, however, that Balaam, warned of God, first said that he could not speak of himself, and then by inspiration blessed those whom he had been sent for to curse. He appears to have received inspiration in a vision or a trance. In one place it is said, "And Balaam saw that it was good in the eyes of the Lord to bless Israel, and he went not, now as before, to the meeting of enchantments (נְחָשִׁים), but he set his face to the wilderness" (xxiv, 1). From this it would seem that it was his wont to use enchantments, and that when on other occasions he went away after the sacrifices had been offered, he hoped that he could prevail to obtain the wish of those who had sent for him, but was constantly defeated. The building of new altars of the mystic number of seven, and the offering of seven oxen and seven rams, seem to show that Balaam had some such idea; and the marked manner in which he declared "there is no enchantment (נַחַשׁ) against Jacob, and no divination (קֶסֶם) against Israel" (xxiii, 23), proves that he had come in the hope that they would have availed, the diviner here being made to declare his own powerlessness while he blessed those whom he was sent for to curse. The case is a very difficult one, since it shows a man who was used as an instrument for declaring God's will trusting in practices that could only have incurred his displeasure. The simplest explanation seems to be that Balaam was never a true prophet but on this occasion, when the enemies of Israel were to be signally confounded. This history affords a notable instance of the failure of magicians in attempting to resist the divine will. See Balaam.

6. The account of Saul's consulting the witch of Endor is the foremost place in Scripture of those which refer to magic. The supernatural terror of which it is full cannot, however, be proved to be due to this art, for it has always been held by sober critics that the appearing of Samuel was permitted for the purpose of declaring the doom of Saul, and not that it was caused by the incantations of a sorceress. As, however, the narrative is allowed to be very difficult, we may look for a moment at the evidence of its authenticity. The details are strictly in accordance with the age: there is a simplicity in the manners described that is foreign to a later time. The circumstances are agreeable with the rest of the history, and especially with all we know of Saul's character. Here, as ever, he is seen resolved to gain his ends without caring what wrong he does: he wishes to consult a prophet, and asks a witch to call up his shade.

Most of all, the vigor of the narrative, showing us the scene in a few words, proves its antiquity and genuineness. We can see no reason whatever for supposing that it is an interpolation.

"Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa." That the Philistines should have advanced so far, spreading in the plain of Esdraelon, the garden of the Holy Land, shows the straits to which Saul had come. Here, in times of faith, Sisera was defeated by Barak, and the Midianites were smitten by Gideon, some of the army of the former perishing at En-dor itself (Psa. lxxxiii, 9, 10). "And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, [there is] a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor. And Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night." En-dor lay in the territory of Issachar, about seven or eight miles to the northward of Mount Gilboa. Its name, the "fountain of Dor," may connect it with the Phœnician city Dor, which was on the coast to the westward. If so, it may have retained its stranger-population, and been therefore chosen by the witch as a place where she might with less danger than elsewhere practice her arts. It has been noticed that the mountain on whose slope the modern village stands is hollowed into rock-hewn caverns, in one of which the witch may probably have dwelt. See En-dor. Saul's disguise, and his journeying by night, seem to have been taken that he might not alarm the woman, rather than because he may have passed through a part of the Philistine force. The Philistines held the plain, having their camp at Shunem, whither they had pushed on from Aphek: the Israelites were at first encamped by a fountain at Jezreel, but when their enemies had advanced to Jezreel they appear to have retired to the slopes of Gilboa, whence there was a way of retreat either into the mountains to the south, or across Jordan. The latter seems to have been the line of flight, as, though Saul was slain on Mount Gilboa, his body was fastened to the wall of Bethshan. Thus Saul could scarcely have reached En-dor without passing at least very near the army of the Philistines. "And he said, divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me [him] up whom I shall name unto thee." It is noticeable that here witchcraft, the inquiring by a familiar spirit, and necromancy, are all connected as though but a single art, which favors the idea that the prohibition in Deuteronomy specifies every name by which magical arts were known, rather than so many different kinds of arts, in order that no one should attempt to evade the condemnation of such practices by any subterfuge. It is evident that Saul thought he might be able to call up Samuel by the aid of the witch, but this does not prove what was his own general conviction, or the prevalent conviction of the Israelites on the subject. He was in a great extremity; his kingdom in danger; himself forsaken of God: he was weary with a night-journey, perhaps of risk, perhaps of great length to avoid the enemy, and faint with a day's fasting: he was conscious of wrong as, probably for the first time, he commanded unholy rites and heard in the gloom unholy incantations. In such a strait no man's judgment is steady, and Saul may have asked to see Samuel in a moment of sudden desperation, when he had only meant to demand an oracular answer. It may even be thought that, yearning for the counsel of Samuel, and longing to learn if the net that he felt closing about him were one from which he should never escape, Saul had that keener sense that some say comes in the last hours of life, and so, conscious that the prophet's shade was near, or was about to come, at once sought to see and speak with it, though this had not before been purposed. Strange things we know occur at the moment when man feels he is about to die, and if there be any time when the unseen world is felt while yet unentered, it is when the soul first comes within the chill of its long-projected shadow. "And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die? And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, [As] the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." Nothing shows Saul's desperate resolution more than his thus swearing when engaged in a most unholy act, a terrible profanity that makes the horror of the scene complete. Everything being prepared, the final act takes place. "Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou [art] Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What [is] his form? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he [is] covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it [was] Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted [or "disturbed"] me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me, for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, [even] to David: because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow [shalt] thou and thy sons [be] with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel: and there was no strength in him; for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night" (1 Sam. xxviii, 3–20). The woman clearly was terrified by an unexpected apparition when she saw Samuel. She must, therefore, either have been a mere juggler, or one who had no power of working magical wonders at will. The sight of Samuel at once showed her who had come to consult her. The prophet's shade seems to have been preceded by some majestic shapes which the witch called gods. Saul, as it seems interrupting her, asked his form, and she described the prophet as he was in his last days on earth, an old man, covered either with a mantle, such as the prophets used to wear, or wrapped in his winding-sheet. Then Saul knew it was Samuel, and bowed to the ground from respect or fear. It seems that the woman saw the appearances, and that Saul only knew of them through her, perhaps not daring to look, else why should he have asked what form Samuel had? The prophet's complaint we cannot understand, in our ignorance as to the separate state: thus much we know, that state is always described as one of perfect rest or sleep. That the woman should have been able to call him up cannot be hence inferred; her astonishment shows the contrary; and it would be explanation enough to suppose that he was

sent to give Saul the last warning, or that the earnestness of the king's wish had been permitted to disquiet him in his resting-place. Although the word "disquieted" need not be pushed to an extreme sense, and seems to mean the interruption of a state of rest, our translators wisely, we think, preferring this rendering to "disturbed," it cannot be denied that, if we hold that Samuel appeared, this is a great difficulty. If, however, we suppose that the prophet's coming was ordered, it is not unsurmountable. The declaration of Saul's doom agrees with what Samuel had said before, and was fulfilled the next day, when the king and his sons fell on Mount Gilboa. It may, however, be asked, Was the apparition Samuel himself, or a supernatural messenger in his stead? Some may even object to our holding it to have been aught but a phantom of a sick brain; but, if so, what can we make of the woman's conviction that it was Samuel, and the king's horror at the words he heard, or, as these would say, that he thought he heard? It was not only the hearing his doom, but the hearing it in a voice from the other world that stretched the faithless strong man on the ground. He must have felt the presence of the dead, and heard the sound of a sepulchral voice. How else could the doom have come true, and not the king alone, but his sons, have gone to the place of disembodied souls on the morrow? for to be with the dead concerned the soul, not the body: it is no difficulty that the king's corpse was unburied till the generous men of Jabesh-gilead, mindful of his old kindness, rescued it from the wall of Bethshan. If, then, the apparition was real, should we suppose it Samuel's? A reasonable criticism would say it seems to have been so; for the supposition that a messenger came in his stead must be rejected, as it would make the speech a mixture of truth and untruth; and if asked what sufficient cause there was for such a sending forth of the prophet from his rest, we may reply that we know not the reason for such warnings as abound in the Bible, and that, perhaps, even at the eleventh hour, the door of repentance was not closed against the king, and his impiety might have been pardoned had he repented. Instead, he went forth in despair, and, when his sons had fallen and his army was put to the rout, sore wounded, he fell on his own sword.

From the beginning to the end of this strange history we have no warrant for attributing supernatural power to magicians. Viewed reasonably, it refers to the question of apparitions of the dead as to which other places in the Bible leave no doubt. The connection with magic seems purely accidental. The witch is no more than a by-stander after the first: she sees Samuel, and that is all. The apparition may have been a terrible fulfilment of Saul's desire, but this does not prove that the measures he used were of any power. We have examined the narrative very carefully, from its detail and its remarkable character: the result leaves the main question unanswered. See INCANTATION.

7. In the later days of the two kingdoms magical practices of many kinds prevailed among the Hebrews, as we especially learn from the condemnation of them by the prophets. Every form of idolatry which the people had adopted in succession doubtless brought with it its magic, which seems always to have remained with a strange tenacity that probably made it outlive the false worship with which it was connected. Thus the use of teraphim, dating from the patriarchal age, was not abandoned when the worship of the Canaanitish, Phœnician, and Syrian idols had been successively adopted. In the historical books of Scripture there is little notice of magic, except that wherever the false prophets are mentioned we have, no doubt, an indication of the prevalence of magical practices. We are especially told of Josiah that he put away the workers with familiar spirits, the wizards, and the teraphim, as well as the idols and the other abominations of Judah and Jerusalem, in performance of the commands of the book of the law which had been found (2 Kings xxiii, 24). But in the prophets we find several notices of the magic of the Hebrews in their times, and some of the magic of foreign nations. Isaiah says that the people had become workers of hidden arts (עֹנְנִים) like the Philistines, and apparently alludes in the same place to the practice of magic by the Bene-Kedem (ii, 6). The nation had not only abandoned true religion, but had become generally addicted to magic in the manner of the Philistines, whose Egyptian origin [see CAPHTOR] is consistent with such a condition. The origin of the Bene-Kedem is doubtful, but it seems certain that as late as the time of the Egyptian wars in Syria, under the xixth dynasty, B.C. cir. 1300, a race, partly at least Mongolian, inhabited the valley of the Orontes, among whom, therefore, we should again expect a national practice of magic, and its prevalence with their neighbors. Balaam, too, dwelt with the Bene-Kedem, though he may not have been of their race. In another place the prophet reproves the people for seeking "unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter" (viii, 19). The practices of one class of magicians are still more distinctly described where it thus said of Jerusalem: "And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, [and] shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust" (xxix, 3, 4). Isaiah alludes to the magic of the Egyptians when he says that in their calamity "they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers [אַשְׁפִּים?], and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards" (xix, 3). And in the same manner he thus taunts Babylon: "Stand now with thy charms, and with the multitude of thine enchantments, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth; if so be thou shalt be able to profit, if so be thou mayest prevail. Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the viewers of the heavens [or astrologers], the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from [these things] that shall come upon thee" (xlvii, 12, 13). The magic of Babylon is here characterized by the prominence given to astrology, no magicians being mentioned excepting practicers of this art; unlike the case of the Egyptians, with whom astrology seems always to have held a lower place than with the Chaldæan nation. In both instances the folly of those who seek the aid of magic is shown.

Micah, declaring the judgments coming for the crimes of his time, speaks of the prevalence of divination among prophets who most probably were such pretended prophets as the opponents of Jeremiah, not avowed prophets of idols, as Ahab's seem to have been. Concerning these prophets it is said, "Night [shall be] unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded; yea, they shall all cover their lip; for [there is] no answer of God" (iii, 6, 7). Later it is said as to Jerusalem, "The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, [Is] not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us" (ver. 11). These prophets seem to have practiced unlawful arts, and yet to have expected revelations.

Jeremiah was constantly opposed by false prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord, saying that they had dreamed, when they told false visions, and who practiced various magical arts (xiv, 14; xxiii, 25, ad fin.; xxvii, 9, 10—where the several designations applied to those who counselled the people not to serve the king of Babylon may be used in contempt of the false prophets—xxix, 8, 9).

Ezekiel, as we should have expected, affords some remarkable details of the magic of his time, in the clear and forcible descriptions of his visions. From him we learn that fetishism was among the idolatries which the Hebrews, in the latest days of the kingdom of Judah, had adopted from their neighbors, like the Romans in the age of general corruption that caused the decline of their empire. In a vision, in which the prophet saw the abominations of Jerusalem, he entered the chambers of imagery in the Temple itself: "I went in and saw; and behold, every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about." Here seventy elders were offering incense in the dark (viii, 7–12). This idolatry was probably borrowed from Egypt, for the description perfectly answers to that of the dark sanctuaries of Egyptian temples, with the sacred animals portrayed upon their walls, and does not accord with the character of the Assyrian sculptures, where creeping things are not represented as objects of worship. With this low form of idolatry an equally low kind of magic obtained, practiced by prophetesses who for small rewards made amulets by which the people were deceived (xiii, 17, ad fin.). The passage must be allowed to be very difficult, but it can scarcely be doubted that amulets are referred to which were made and sold by these women, and perhaps also worn by them. We may probably read: "Woe to the [women] that sew pillows upon all joints of the hands [elbows or armholes?], and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls!" (xiii, 18). If so, we have a practice analogous to that of the modern Egyptians, who hang amulets of the kind called hegáb upon the right side, and of the Nubians, who hang them on the upper part of the arm. We cannot, in any case, see how the passage can be explained as simply referring to the luxurious dress of the women of that time, since the prophet distinctly alludes to pretended visions and to divinations (ver. 23), using almost the same expressions that he applies in another place to the practices of the false prophets (xxii, 28). The notice of Nebuchadnezzar's divination by arrows, where it is said "he shuffled arrows" (xxi, 21), must refer to a practice the same or similar to the kind of divination by arrows called El-Meysar, in use among the pagan Arabs, and forbidden in the Koran. See AMULET.

8. The references to magic in the book of Daniel relate wholly to that of Babylon, and not so much to the art as to those who used it. Daniel, when taken captive, was instructed in the learning of the Chaldæans, and placed among the wise men of Babylon (ii, 18), by whom we are to understand the magi (חַכְמֵי בָבֶל), for the term is used as including magicians (חַרְטֻמִּים), sorcerers (אַשָּׁפִים), enchanters (מְכַשְּׁפִים), astrologers (גְּזָרִין), and Chaldæans, the last being apparently the most important class (ii, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 18, 24, 27; comp. i, 20). As in other cases, the true prophet was put to the test with the magicians, and he succeeded where they utterly failed. The case resembled Pharaoh's, excepting that Nebuchadnezzar asked a harder thing of the wise men. Having forgotten his dream, he not only required of them an interpretation, but that they should make known the dream itself. They were perfectly ready to tell the interpretation if only they heard the dream. The king at once saw that they were impostors, and that if they truly had supernatural powers they could as well tell him his dream as its meaning. Therefore he decreed the death of all the wise men of Babylon; but Daniel, praying that he and his fellows might escape this destruction, had a vision in which the matter was revealed to him. He was accordingly brought before the king. Like Joseph, he disavowed any knowledge of his own. "The secret which the king hath demanded, the wise men, the sorcerers, the magicians, the astrologers, cannot show unto the king; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets" (ver. 27, 28). "But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for [any] wisdom that I have more than any living" (ver. 30). He then related the dream and its interpretation, and was set over the province as well as over all the wise men of Babylon. Again the king dreamed; and, though he told them the dream, the wise men could not interpret it, and Daniel again showed the meaning (iv, 4 sq.). In the relation of this event we read that the king called him "chief of the scribes," the second part of the title being the same as that applied to the Egyptian magicians (iv, 9 [Chald. 6]). A third time, when Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall, the wise men were sent for, and, on their failing, Daniel was brought before the king and the interpretation given (chap. v). These events are perfectly consistent with what always occurred in all other cases recorded in Scripture when the practicers of magic were placed in opposition to true prophets. It may be asked by some how Daniel could take the post of chief of the wise men when he had himself proved their imposture. If, however, as we cannot doubt, the class were one of the learned generally, among whom some practiced magical arts, the case is very different from what it would have been had these wise men been magicians only. Besides, it seems almost certain that Daniel was providentially thus placed that, like another Joseph, he might further the welfare and ultimate return of his people. See MAGI.

9. After the Captivity, it is probable that the Jews gradually abandoned the practice of magic. Zechariah speaks indeed of the deceit of teraphim and diviners (x, 2), and foretells a time when the very names of idols should be forgotten, and false prophets have virtually ceased (xiii, 1–4), yet in neither case does it seem certain that he is alluding to the usages of his own day.

10. In the Apocrypha we find indications that in the later centuries preceding the Christian æra magic was no longer practiced by the educated Jews. In the Wisdom of Solomon, the writer, speaking of the Egyptian magicians, treats their art as an imposture (xvii, 7). The book of Tobit is an exceptional case. If we hold that it was written in Persia or a neighboring country, and, with Ewald, date its composition not long after the fall of the Persian empire, it is obvious that it relates to a different state of society from that of the Jews of Egypt and Palestine. If, however, it was written in Palestine about the time of the Maccabees, as others suppose, we must still recollect that it refers rather to the superstitions of the common people than to those of the learned. In either case its pretensions make it unsafe to follow as indicating the opinions of the time at which it was written. It professes to relate to a period of which its writer could have known little, and borrows its idea of supernatural agency from Scripture, adding as much as was judged safe of current superstition.

11. In the N. Test. we read very little of magic. The coming of magi to worship Christ is indeed related (Matt. ii, 1–12), but we have no warrant for supposing that they were magicians from their name, which the A. V. not unreasonably renders "wise men." See MAGI. Our Lord is not said to have been opposed by magicians, and the apostles and other early teachers of the Gospel seem to have rarely encountered them. Philip the deacon, when he preached at Samaria, found there Simon, a famous magician, commonly known as Simon Magus, who had had great power over the people; but he is not said to have been able to work wonders, nor, had it been so, is it likely that he would have soon been admitted into the Church (Acts viii, 9–24). When Barnabas and Paul were at Paphos, as they preached to the proconsul Sergius Paulus, Elymas, a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet (*τινὰ ἄνδρα μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην*) withstood them, and was struck blind for a time at the word of Paul (xiii, 6–12). At Ephesus, certain Jewish exorcists signally failing, both Jews and Greeks were afraid, and abandoned their practice of magical arts. "And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used

curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all: and they counted the price of them, and found [it] fifty thousand [pieces] of silver" (xix, 18, 19). Here both Jews and Greeks seem to have been greatly addicted to magic, even after they had nominally joined the Church. See EPHESUS. In all these cases it appears that though the practicers were generally or always Jews, the field of their success was with Gentiles, showing that among the Jews in general, or the educated class, the art had fallen into disrepute. Here, as before, there is no evidence of any real effect produced by the magicians. We have already noticed the remarkable case of the "damsel having a spirit of divination" (*ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα*) "which brought her masters much gain by foretelling" (*μαντευομένη*), from whom Paul cast out the spirit of divination (xvi, 16–18). This is a matter belonging to another subject than that of magic. See PROPHECY.

Our examination of the various notices of magic in the Bible gives us this general result: They do not, as far as we can understand, once state positively that any but illusive results were produced by magical rites. They therefore afford no evidence that man can gain supernatural powers to use at his will. This consequence goes some way towards showing that we may conclude that there is no such thing as real magic; for, although it is dangerous to reason on negative evidence, yet in a case of this kind it is especially strong. Had any but illusions been worked by magicians, surely the Scriptures would not have passed over a fact of so much importance, and one which would have rendered the prohibition of these arts far more necessary. The general belief of mankind in magic, or things akin to it, is of no worth, since the holding of such current superstition in some of its branches, if we push it to its legitimate consequences, would lead to the rejection of faith in God's government of the world, and the adoption of a creed far below that of Plato.

From the conclusion at which we have arrived, that there is no evidence in the Bible of real results having been worked by supernatural agency used by magicians, we may draw this important inference that the absence of any proof of the same in profane literature, ancient or modern, in no way militates against the credibility of the miracles recorded in Scripture.

III. During the Middle Ages, and down almost to the 18th century, magic was greatly studied in Europe, and could boast of distinguished names, who attempted to treat it as a grand and mysterious science, by means of which the secrets of nature could be discovered, and a certain godlike power acquired over the "spirits" (or, as we should now say, the "forces") of the elements. The principal students and professors of magic during the period referred to were pope Sylvester II, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lully, Pico della Mirandola, Paracelsus, Cornelius Agrippa, Trithemius, Van Helmont, and Jerome Cardan. See Horst's *Von der Alten und Neuen Magie, Ursprung, Idee, Umfang und Geschichte* (Mentz, 1820), and Ennemoser's *Geschichte der Magie* (2d edit. Leips. 1844; transl. into English by W. Howitt, 2 vols. Lond. 1854). For an interesting account of the discipline and ceremonies of the "art," consult the *Dogme et Rituel de la Haute Magie* (2 vols. Paris, 1856), by Eliphas Levi, one of its latest adherents. For monographs on the general subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 160. Many curious notices have been collected by Thomson in his *Philosophy of Magic* (translated from the French of Salverte, Lond. 1846, 2 vols.). See also Maury, *La Magie et l'Astrologie* (Paris, 1860). The *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* is well known as a classical text-book on Oriental views of magic. For other literature, compare NECROMANCER; SORCERER. For the legendary wonder-working, which seems to have been the basis of the traditionary fame of free-masonry, see SOLOMON. Alchemy and astrology (q. v.) have likewise furnished their quota of interest to the subject. For the mediæval thaumaturgic practices, see ROSICRUCIANS; for the later superstitions, see WITCHCRAFT; for the modern, see SPIRITUALISM.

Magician (Chald. חַרְטֹם, *chartom'*; Heb. plural חַרְטֻמִּים, *chartummim'*, thought by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 520, to be of Heb. origin, signifying "sacred *scribe*"), a title "applied to the 'wise men' of Egypt (Gen. xli, 8, 22; Exod. vii, 11; viii, 7, 18, 19; ix, 11) and of Babylon (Dan. i, 20; ii, 2). The word '*magicians*' is not in either case properly applied, as the *magi* proper are usually assigned to Persia rather than to Babylon or Egypt, and should be altogether avoided in such application, seeing that it has acquired a sense different from that which it once bore. The term rather denotes 'wise men,' as they called themselves and were called by others; but, as we should call them, 'men eminent in learning and science,' their exclusive possession of which in their several countries enabled them occasionally to produce effects which were accounted supernatural by the people. Pythagoras, who was acquainted with Egypt and the East, and who was not unaware of the unfathomable depths of ignorance which lie under the highest attainable conditions of human knowledge, thought the modest title of philosopher (*φιλόσοφος*), 'lover of wisdom,' more becoming, and accordingly he brought it into use; but that of 'wise men' still retained its hold in the East. It is thought that the Egyptian *chartummim* were those of the Egyptian priests who had charge of the sacred records. There can be little doubt that they belonged to some branch of the priesthood, seeing that the more recondite departments of learning and science were cultivated exclusively in that powerful caste." See MAGI. See Jablonski, *Proleg. in Panth. Ægypt.* p. 91 sq.; Creuzer, *Mythologie und Symbolik*, i, 245; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 316 sq.; Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, i, 382. See MAGIC.

Magicians. The early Christians were derided by this name. Celsus and others pretended that our Saviour, because he wrought miracles, practiced magic, which he had learned in Egypt. Augustine speaks of a popular belief among the enemies of the Christian faith that our Saviour had written books on magic, which he delivered to Peter and Paul for the use of his disciples. One of the Roman historians calls the Christians *genus hominum superstitionis malificæ*, which may be understood to mean "men of the magical superstitions." In the martyrdom of Agnes, the people cried out, "Away with the sorceress! Away with the enchantress!"

Magid'do (*Μαγεδδώ*, 1 Esdr. i, 29). See MEGIDDO.

Magie, DAVID, D.D., a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in Elizabeth, N. J., March 13, 1795; became a subject of renewing grace at the age of eighteen; two years after united with the Presbyterian Church; soon after entered Princeton College, and, subsequent to his graduation from the theological seminary, was for two years tutor in the college. In 1821 he was installed pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth, "to which he was bound as by a golden chain, giving them the services of his life, till, with bleeding and grateful hearts, they yielded him, at the call of God, to enter his eternal joy," May 10, 1865. Dr. Magie declined many calls to other stations of responsibility and eminence, believing the pastoral relation too sacred to be dissolved but at the unquestionable bidding of the great Master. "He was indeed 'a model pastor.' . . . . Combining temperance, charity, humility, prudence, sound judgment, simplicity, and earnestness, he was a faithful, persevering, successful laborer in the vineyard committed to his charge. He preached and prayed with a power and unction which sank deep into the hearts of his hearers. None went from any sermon without having had the way of salvation by Christ affectionately and clearly presented to them." He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey; a pillar in the

Theological Seminary; a member of the American Board of Foreign Missions, also of the Publishing Committee of the American Tract Society, etc. Besides several able published discourses, Dr. Magie was the author of *The Spring-time of Life* (an excellent volume of 350 pages, published by the American Tract Society, N. York, 1852, 16mo; 1855, 16mo), "in which his own character, and especially his care and counsels for the young, are happily perpetuated." See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 128.

Magill, Charles Beatty, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wellsville, Ohio, Oct. 3, 1840; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1858; studied divinity at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa., and was licensed to preach in April, 1861. The winter of 1862–63 he spent at Princeton, N. J.; subsequently he preached in Virginia and Illinois; and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, Iowa. He afterwards spent a short time in the service of the Christian Commission in Georgia, where he contracted the illness of which he died, Aug. 28, 1864. Mr. Magill was thoroughly educated and devoutly pious. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 98.

Maginnis, John Sharp, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Butler Co., Pa., June 13, 1805; was licensed to preach May 25, 1827; studied afterwards at Waterville College, Me., Brown University, and the theological seminary in Newton, Mass.; was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Portland, Me., in Oct. 1832, and there remained until ill health compelled him to remove. In the winter of 1837–38 he was pastor of the Pine Street Church of Providence, R. I.; later he became professor of Biblical theology in the literary and theological institution at Hamilton, N. Y. (now Madison University); in 1850, professor of Biblical and pastoral theology in the new theological school connected with the Rochester University, and also professor of intellectual and moral philosophy in the university. He was made M.A. by Waterville College while at Hamilton, and D.D. by Brown University in 1844. Failing health finally compelled him to resign his professorship in the University, but he continued his labors in the theological school until his death, Oct. 15, 1852. Dr. Maginnis published only a few detached articles, among them one on the philosophy of Cousin (published in the *Christian Review*), which attracted much attention. See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 766; *Christian Rev.* vol. xviii (Jan.).

Magister Disciplinæ (*master of discipline*) was the title of a certain ecclesiastical officer in the ancient Church. It was a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 5th century, for parents to dedicate their young children to the service of the Church. They were taken for this purpose into a bishop's family, and educated, under his supervision, by a discreet and grave person, who was generally a presbyter, and was called *magister disciplinæ*. The second and fourth councils of Toledo prescribed the duties of this master, the chief of which were, that he should vigilantly watch over the moral character and behavior of the young, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church.

Magister Sacri Palatii (*master of the sacred palace*). This office was created in 1218 by pope Honorius III, and was first held by St. Dominic. The latter, during his residence at Rome, had noticed that the persons employed by the cardinals and authorities made a bad use of their unemployed time. He therefore had commenced, with the consent of the pope, to give them religious instruction during their leisure time, and was rewarded by Honorius with the above office. The task assigned was like that which Dominic had previously chosen for himself, but the pope increased it by directing that the employés of the papal household should also attend these instructions. The office was made perpetual to the Dominicans. Many privileges were gradually attached to it. Thus a bull of pope Eugenius IV, of 1436, ordered that in the papal chapel the *Magister s. palatii* should be placed next to the dean of the Auditore della Rota; no one was to preach in the chapel without his permission; and on his being temporarily absent from Rome, he was to invest his substitute with the same privileges. These prerogatives were confirmed by Calixtus III in 1456, who gave also the right to the *Magister s. palatii* of reproving the preacher in the papal chapel, even in the presence of the pope. Leo X, in 1515, decided that nothing should be printed in the diocese of Rome without the consent of that official and of the cardinal-vicar. In 1625 Urban VIII went further, and forbade the reprinting of works published in the States of the Church without this authorization. Pius V, in 1570, connected with the office a canonicate of St. Peter, which was, however, taken from it in 1586 by Sixtus V. Finally, Alexander VII gave the *Magister s. palatii* the precedence before all the other clergy composing the Roman cabinet. These privileges, however, were gradually taken back, and the censorship of books now alone remains to the *Magister s. palatii*. See Musson, *Pragm. Geschichte d. Mönchsorden*, viii, 33; Helyot, *Gesch. d. geistl. Klöster- u. Ritterorden* (Leipzig, 1754), iii, 252; Schröckh, *K. G.* xxxiii, 95; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 685.

Magistrate (the representative in the Auth. Vers. of several Heb. and Gr. words, as below), a public civil officer invested with authority. Among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, the corresponding terms had a much wider signification than the term magistrate has with us. The Hebrew שֹׁפְטִים, *shophetim'*, or judges, were a kind of magistrates (Deut. i, 16, 17; Ezra vii, 25). See Judge. The phrase in Judges xviii, 7, "And there was no *magistrate* in the land, that might put them to shame in any thing," ought to be rendered, "And there were none to harm (כָּלַם) at all in the land; and they were *possessed* (יוֹרֵשׁ, *yoresh'*) of wealth." So, also, the terms שָׁפְטִין וְדַיָּנִין, *shaphetin' ve-dayanin'*, rendered "magistrates and judges" (Ezra vii, 25), would be better rendered "judges and rulers." The סְגָנִים, *seganim'*, rendered "rulers," properly *nobles*, were Babylonian magistrates, *præfects* of provinces (Jer. li, 23, 28, 57; Ezek. xxiii, 6). The same name was borne by the Jewish magistrates in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra ix, 2; Neh. ii, 16; iv, 14; xiii, 11). The word ἄρχων, *archon*, rendered magistrate (Luke xi, 58; Tit. iii, 1), properly signifies *one first in power, authority;* hence "*a prince*" (Matt. xx, 25; 1 Cor. ii, 6, 8); "*a ruler*" (Acts iv, 26; Rom. xiii, 3). The term is also used of the Messiah as "the prince of the kings of the earth" (Rev. i, 5); and of Moses as the judge and leader of the Hebrews (Acts vii, 27, 35). It is spoken of magistrates of any kind, e. g. the high-priest (Acts xxiii, 5); of civil judges (Luke xii, 58; Acts xvi, 19); also of a ruler of the synagogue (Luke viii, 41; Matt. ix, 18, 23; Mark v, 22); and of persons of weight and influence among the Pharisees and other sects at Jerusalem, who also were members of the Sanhedrim (Luke xiv, 1; xviii, 18; xxiii, 13, 35; xxiv, 20; John iii, 1; vii, 26, 48; xii, 42; Acts iii, 17; iv, 5, 8; xiii, 27; xiv, 5). The term is also used of Satan, the *prince* or *chief* of the fallen angels (Matt. ix, 34; xii, 24; Mark iii, 22; Luke xi, 15; John xii, 31; xiv, 30; xvi, 11; Eph. ii, 2). So likewise the kindred ἀρχή (Luke xii, 11; Tit. iii, 1). The word στρατηγός, rendered "magistrate," properly signifies *leader of an army, commander, general.* So of the ten Athenian commanders, with whom the *polemarch* was joined. Afterwards only one or two were sent abroad with the army, as circumstances required, and the others had charge of military affairs at home, i. q. *war-minister.* In other Greek cities the στρατηγός was the chief magistrate, *præfect.* The term is also used of Roman officers, the *consul* and the *prætor.* In Roman colonies and municipal towns, the chief magistrates were usually two in number, called *duumviri;* oc-

casionally four or six, *quatuorviri, seviri*, who also were sometimes styled *prætors*, the same as the Greek στρατηγοί. Hence, in the New Testament, this term is used for the Roman *duumviri, prætors*, magistrates of Philippi, which was a Roman colony (Acts xvi, 20, 22, 35, 36, 38). The word ἐξουσίαι is also used collectively for those invested with power, as in English we might say "*the powers*" for *rulers, magistrates* (Luke xii, 11; Rom. xiii, 2, 3; Tit. iii, 1). The "higher powers" (Rom. xiii, 1) are "the ruling authorities"—the magistrates in office—all invested with civil power, from the emperor or king, as supreme, to the lowest civil officer—all who are employed in making and executing the laws. The Roman emperor and some of the subordinate magistrates wore a small sword or dagger, the symbol of punishment, as a part of their official costume. See GOVERNOR.

In the earliest periods of Jewish history the magistrates were the hereditary chieftains, but afterwards the judicial office became elective. In the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number, and the heads of these families, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members; but the subdivisions afterwards were more numerous, and the number of heads of families greater, for we find no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank included in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The שֹׁטְרִים, *shoterim'*, or genealogists, are mentioned in connection with the elders—that is, the princes of tribes and heads of families. See OFFICER. They kept the genealogical tables. Under Joshua, they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiers; and in the time of the Kings, the chief *shoter* had a certain control over the army, although he was not a military commander. The *shoterim*, who were superintended by this chief, were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for it and the surrounding district. As they kept the genealogical tables, they had an accurate list of the people, and were acquainted with the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; but they are not to be confounded with another officer who kept the muster-rolls, and whose name had a similar etymology. Moses added a new class of magistrates for the administration of justice, which, he informs us, was not of divine appointment, but was suggested by his father-in-law Jethro. He divided the people into tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, and placed wise and prudent judges over each of these divisions. They were selected, for the most part, from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank (Exod. xviii, 13, 26). Difficult questions were brought before Moses himself, and, after his death, before the chief magistrate of the nation. These judges Moses included among the rulers, and Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned, in one instance, before the genealogists (Deut. xxxi, 28; Josh. viii, 33). When the magistrates of all the cities belonging to any one tribe were collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes were convened together, they formed the general council of the nation, and could legislate conjointly for all the tribes they represented. After the settlement in Canaan, although the chief magistrate of the Jewish state was, in reality, Jehovah, the invisible King, a supreme ruler for the whole community could be legally chosen when the necessities of the state required it, who was denominated a judge, or governor. See JUDGE. In the book of Deuteronomy (xvii, 14, 15) we find Jehovah telling the Hebrews that if, when they arrived in the Promised Land, they wished to have a king like the other nations round about them, they were to receive one whom he would appoint, and not a stranger. Josephus and others have correctly understood this passage not to mean that God commanded the Israelites to desire a king when they were settled in Canaan, but that, if they would have a king, he was to be appointed by God, and that he should invariably be a Hebrew, and not a Gentile. See KING. Judges, genealogists, the heads of families or clans, and those who, from the relation they sustained to the common class of people, may be called the princes of the tribes, retained their authority after as well as before the introduction of a monarchical form of government, and acted the part of a legislative assembly to the respective cities in or near which they resided (1 Kings xii, 1–24; 1 Chron. xxiii, 4; xxvi, 29). The headship of the tribes and families was hereditary, though probably subject to the royal approbation; but the judges and genealogists were appointed by the king. Besides these, we read of certain great officers, as "the royal counsellors" (1 Kings xii, 6–12; 1 Chron. xxvii, 32; Isa. iii, 3), among whom the prophets were included by pious kings (2 Sam. vii, 2; 1 Kings xxii, 7, 8; 2 Kings xix, 2–20); while others of a different character imitated the example of heathen princes, and called in to their aid soothsayers and false prophets (1 Kings xviii, 22; xxii, 6; Dan. i, 20). The secretary or "scribe" (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 1 Kings iv, 3) committed to writing not only the edicts and sayings of the king, but everything of a public nature that related to the kingdom; and it was likewise his business to present to the king in writing an account of the state of affairs. The high-priest may be also reckoned among those who had access to the king in the character of counsellors (2 Sam. viii, 17; 1 Chron. xviii, 16). See COUNSELLOR. During the Captivity and after that period the Hebrews continued among them that class of officers denominated heads of families, and perhaps likewise the princes of the tribes, who, under the direction of the royal governors, ruled their respective tribes (Ezra i, 5; iv, 3, 5; Neh. ii, 16; vi, 17, 18; Ezek. xiv, 1); but it is most probable that Jehoiachin, and afterwards Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, held the first rank among them, or, in other words, were their princes. After their return to their native country the Hebrews obeyed their פֶּחָה, *pachah'*, or president. Such were Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who were invested with ample powers for the purposes of government (Ezra vii, 25). When, from any cause, there was no person authorized by the civil government to act as president, the high-priest commonly undertook the government of the state. This state of things continued while the Jews were under the Persians and Greeks, until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in whose reign they appealed to arms, shook off the yoke of foreign subjugation, and, having obtained their freedom, made their high-priests princes, and at length kings. The Jews, likewise, who were scattered abroad, and had taken up their residence in countries at a distance from Palestine, had rulers of their own. The person who sustained the highest office among those who dwelt in Egypt was denominated *alabarch* (q. v.); the magistrate at the head of the Syrian Jews was denominated *archon*. See RULER. While the Jews were under the Roman government they enjoyed the privilege of referring litigated questions to referees, whose decisions in reference to them the Roman prætor was bound to see put in execution.

After the subjugation of the Jews by the Romans, certain provinces of Judæa were governed by that class of magistrates denominated *tetrarchs*, an office said to have originated among the Gauls; and this appellation, although originally applied to the chief magistrate of the fourth part of a tribe, subject to the authority of the king, was afterwards extended in its application, and applied to any governors, subject to some king or emperor, without reference to the fact whether they ruled or not precisely the fourth part of a tribe of people. See TETRARCH. Herod Antipas, accordingly, and Philip, although they did not rule so much as a fourth part of Judæa, were denominated tetrarchs (Matt. xiv, 1; Luke ix, 7; Acts xiii, 1). Although this class of rulers were dependent upon Cæsar, that is, the Roman emperor, they nevertheless governed the people who were committed to their immediate jurisdiction as much according to their own choice and discretion as if they had not been

thus dependent. They were inferior, however, in point of rank, to the ethnarchs, who, although they did not publicly assume the name of king, were addressed with that title by their subjects, as was the case with respect to Archelaus (Matt. ii, 22). A class of magistrates well known among the Romans, termed *procurators*, are denominated in the New Testament ἡγεμόνες, but it appears that they are called by Josephus ἐπίτροποι. Judæa, after the termination of the ethnarchate of Archelaus, was governed by rulers of this description, and likewise during the period which immediately succeeded the reign of Herod Agrippa. Augustus made a new partition of the provinces of the Roman empire into *provinciæ senatoriæ*, which were left under the nominal care of the senate, and *provinciæ imperatoriæ* vel *Cæsarum*, which were under the direct control of the emperor. To their provinces the senate sent officers for one year, called proconsuls, with only a civil power, and neither military command nor authority over the taxes: those sent to command in the imperial provinces were called *legati Cæsaris pro consule*, etc., and had much greater powers. In each of these provinces, of both kinds, there was, besides the president, an officer called *procurator Cæsaris*, who had the charge of the revenue, and who sometimes discharged the office of a governor or president, especially in a small province, or in a portion of a large one where the president could not reside; as did Pilate, who was procurator of Judæa, which was annexed to the *provincia imperatoria* of Syria; hence he had the power of punishing capitally, which the procurators did not usually possess; so also Felix, Festus, and the other procurators of Judæa. Some of the procurators were dependent on the nearest proconsul or president; for instance, those of Judæa were dependent on the proconsul, governor, or president of Syria. They enjoyed, however, great authority, and possessed the power of life and death. The only privilege, in respect to the officers of government, that was granted by the procurators of Judæa to the nation was the appointment from among them of persons to manage and collect the taxes. In all other things they administered the government themselves, except that they frequently had recourse to the counsel of other persons (Acts xxiii, 24–35; xxv, 23). See PROVINCE.

The military force that was granted to the procurators of Judæa consisted of six cohorts, of which five were stationed at Cæsarea, where the procurator usually resided, and one at Jerusalem, in the tower of Antonia, which was so situated as to command the Temple (Acts x, 1; xxi, 32). It was the duty of the military cohorts to execute the procurator's commands and to repress seditions (Matt. viii, 5; xxvii, 27; Mark xv, 16; John xix, 23). On the return of the great festivals, when there were vast crowds of people at Jerusalem, the procurators themselves went from Cæsarea to that city in order to be at hand to suppress any commotions which might arise (Matt. xxvii, 2–65; John xviii, 29; xix, 38). See GOVERNMENT.

Magistrates. In the early Church, magistrates, whatever the grade of their office, were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy; and if they were impious or profane, they were subject to censure and excommunication. The Council of Arles, called by Constantine, ratified this ecclesiastical power. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, excommunicated Andronicus, the governor, for his blasphemies and cruelties, and with him all his accomplices. Athanasius pronounced a similar sentence on the governor of Libya. Ambrose denied the communion to the emperor Theodosius. But such a spiritual sentence did not deprive the magistrate of his lawful civil authority. The Church rendered allegiance to the rightful governor, whether heathen or heretic; but she had a perfect right to exclude from her fellowship any magistrate of erroneous creed or depraved life. She did not attempt to interfere with a magistrate's authority while she refused him ecclesiastical fellowship. The Roman Catholic Church has sought, in this practice of the early Church, an authority for her interference in temporal affairs. See KEYS, POWER OF THE; TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE. In Protestant Churches that are united with the state, these Romish views are manifest, though in a somewhat different form. The state controlling the Church, the magistrate is clothed with authority even in matters really pertaining to the domain of the ecclesiastic. Thus in Scotland the *Westminster Confession* gives to the magistrate extraordinary power in or about sacred things. The earlier Scottish Reformers went still further, as in the first Confession. The *Books of Discipline* are no less explicit. The First Book says, "We dare not prescribe unto you what penalties shall be required of such; but this we feare not to affirme, that the one and the other deserve death; for if he who doth falsifie the seale, subscription, or coine of a king, is judged worthy of death, what shall we think of him who plainly doth falsifie the seales of Christ Jesus, Prince of the kings of the earth? If Darius pronounced that a balk should be taken from the house of that man, and he himselfe hanged upon it, that durst attempt to hinder the re-edifying of the materiall temple, what shall we say of those that contemptuously blaspheme God, and manifestly hinder the temple of God, which is the soules and bodies of the elect, to be purged by the true preaching of Christ Jesus from the superstition and damnable idolatry in which they have bene long plunged and holden captive? If ye, as God forbid, declare your selves carelesse over the true religion, God will not suffer your negligence unpunished; and therefore more earnestly we require that strait lawes may be made against the stubborne contemners of Christ Jesus, and against such as dare presume to minister his sacraments not orderly called to that office, least while that there be none found to gainstand impiety, the wrath of God be kindled against the whole." Nay, blasphemy was to be tried by the civil judge, but false weights and measures by the kirk. The Scottish Parliament, in 1560, enacted not only that the power and jurisdiction of the pope should cease in Scotland, but that all who either assisted or were present at mass should be punished, for the first offence, by confiscation of goods; for the second, by banishment; for the third, by death. It was believed that the magistrate had the same power in regard to the first table as to the second, a theory which, restoring the Jewish theocracy, would justify persecution, and put an end to toleration. For example, the Scottish Parliament in 1579 passed an act ordaining every householder worth three hundred merks of yearly rent, and every burgess or yeoman worth £500 stock, to have a Bible and psalm-book in their houses, under a penalty of £10.

Magistris, SIMONE DE, a noted Italian Orientalist, was born at Serra di Scopamene (Corse), Feb. 28, 1728; went to Rome while yet a youth, entered the congregation of the Oratory of St. Philippe of Neri, and soon made a name for himself by his unusual proficiency in the ancient languages. Popes Clement XIV and Pius VI employed him in the research of ecclesiastical antiquities; he was made bishop of Cyrene, in partibus, and secretary of the congregation for the correction of works by the Oriental Church. In this last position his vast erudition displayed itself to the advantage of the Church of Rome. He died Oct. 6, 1802. He wrote *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex tetraplis Origenis, nunc primum editus* (Greek and Latin, Rome, 1772, fol.). This text of Daniel, after the Sept., had been given up for lost. Magistris, finding it in the library of the prince of Chigi, added to it the Greek interpretation of Theodotius; also a part of the book of Esther in Chaldee, and five dissertations:—*Acta Martyrum ad Ostia Tiberina, ex codice regiæ bibliothecæ Taurinensis* (Rome, 1795, fol.):—*S. Dyonisii Alexandrini episcopi, cognomento Magni. Opera quæ supersunt* (Rome, 1776, fol.):—*Gli Alti di cinque Martiri nelle Corea, coll origine della fide in quel regno* (Rome, 1801, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxii, 706.

Magnanimity, *greatness of soul*, a disposition of

mind exerted in contemning dangers and difficulties, in scorning temptations, and despising earthly pomp and splendor.—Cicero, *De Offic.* lect. i, ch. xx; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, ii, 268; Steele, *Christian Hero;* Watts, *Self-murder;* Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v. See COURAGE; FORTITUDE.

Magnentius, FLAVIUS MAGNUS, a Roman general, for a short period emperor of the West, was born in Gaul about A.D. 300. Partly by courage and partly by flattery, he gained the confidence of the emperor Constans, and was intrusted with the command of the imperial guards, the famous Jovian and Herculean battalions. He afterwards, together with Marcellinus, chancellor of the imperial exchequer, conspired against Constans and caused himself to be elected emperor by the soldiers in 350. He was recognised as such by Italy, Spain, Brittany, and Africa, but the Illyrian legions elected Vetranio, who was soon joined by Constantius, brother of the late emperor. The war between Magnentius and Constantius ended in the defeat of the former at Mursa, Sept. 28, 352. As Magnentius saw that his soldiers would deliver him up to his enemies, he committed suicide at Lyons about the middle of August, 353. Zosimus, ii, 54, represents him as overbearing in his prosperity, and weak and irresolute in adversity. He is shown to have been a Christian by the cross being stamped on his coins. The only part he took in ecclesiastical affairs was to prevent, for two years, Constantius from favoring Arianism. As for himself, he looked upon religion from a political stand-point; in order to conciliate the West, he gave more freedom to the heathen worship. He had relied on Athanasius to win over Egypt to his side, but in this he was mistaken, as Athanasius upheld the rights of the legitimate successor of Constans.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* viii, 686; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* ii, 900.

Magni, John, a Swedish prelate, was born at Wexioe in 1583; travelled extensively on the Continent, especially in Germany, and on his return home became professor of history at his alma mater, the University of Upsala. Queen Christina, who succeeded her noble husband, Gustavus Adolphus, the great defender of the Protestant faith, in the government of Sweden (1632), frequently availed herself of the counsels of John Magni, and created him bishop of Skara. He died in 1651, three years previous to Christina's abdication of the throne. See SWEDEN. Magni took a great interest in the educational affairs of Sweden, and did much to afford his countrymen far superior advantages than they had enjoyed previous to his day. His writings are of a secular nature. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 718; *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

Magni, Valerian, a celebrated Italian ecclesiastic, was born in Milan, Italy, in 1586; was appointed by pope Urban VIII apostolical missionary to the Northern kingdoms; influenced the pope to imprison the Jesuitesses in 1631; was himself imprisoned in Vienna some time afterwards, through the influence of the Jesuits, for having said that the pope's primacy and infallibility were founded on tradition and not on Scripture, but regained his liberty through the favor of the emperor Ferdinand III, after having written warmly against the Jesuits. He died at Saltzburg in 1661. Magni was celebrated as a controversial writer against the Protestants; also for his philosophical works in favor of Des Cartes and against Aristotle. One of his apologetical letters may be found in the collection called *Tuba Magna*, vol. ii. —Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vii, 209.

Magnifĭcat, a song in praise of the Virgin used in the evening service of the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and Anglican churches. Its name Magnificat it obtained from its first words in the Vulgate, "My soul doth *magnify* the Lord," etc. It was introduced into the public worship of the Church about the year 506. In the 6th century it was chanted in the French churches. In the English Church it is to be said or sung after the first lesson, at every prayer, unless the 98th Psalm, called "*Cantate Domino*," is sung.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.

Magnus. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates several saints of this name.

1. ST. MAGNUS, *Magnoald, Maginald, Mangold,* of whom we possess two biographical notices, one by Perth, ii, according to which he was an Alleman by birth, and became the pupil, companion, and successor of St. Gall in the convent of that name. The other, to be found in the Bollandists, Sept. iii, 700 sq., states that he was a native of Ireland, built the convent of Füssen after the destruction of St. Gall, converted the inhabitants of Augsburg and surrounding parts, and finally died about 655. He is commemorated Sept. 6. See Koch-Sternfeld, *Der h. Mangold in Oberschwaben* (Passau, 1825); F. B. Tafrathshofer, *Der h. Magnus* (Kempten, 1842); F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, ii, 148 sq.; Friedrich, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands* (Bamb. 1868), ii (see Index); J. H. Kurtz, *Handbuch d. allg. K. Gesch.* ii, 1, p. 115 sq.

2. ST. MAGNUS, the apostle of the Orkneys. The inhabitants of these islands possessed a large goblet which he is said to have drained: it was offered at once to every new bishop as he arrived, and it was considered a happy omen if he emptied it.

3. ST. MAGNUS, of Altinum, in Venicia, became bishop of Odessa about 638; transmitted his episcopal charge to Heraclea, and died about 660. He is commemorated Oct. 6.

4. ST. MAGNUS flourished in the early half of the 6th century, as bishop of Milan (522–529). He is commemorated Nov. 5.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 687; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* x, 718. (J. N. P.)

Magnus, John or **Jonas,** a noted Swedish prelate, was born at Linköping March 19, 1488, of noble parentage. When only eighteen years old he obtained a canonicate at his native place; later he continued his theological studies at Louvain, afterwards in several universities of Germany and Italy, and resided several years at Rome, where he gained the favor of the papal court. In 1520 Perusa honored him with the doctorate of theology. A short time after, probably in 1523 (the year of Vasa's ascension to the throne), he was dispatched to his native country by pope Adrian VI to stem the inroads of the reformed doctrines in that northern country. Gustavus Vasa received Magnus kindly, and elevated him to the archbishopric of Upsal; but later, when Gustavus Vasa himself inclined towards Protestantism, Magnus made himself unpopular, and was finally obliged to quit the country, after Lutheranism and religious liberty had been established in Sweden (1527). Several later attempts to stem the progress of the reformed doctrines proved unsuccessful, and he returned disheartened to Rome in 1541. He died at Rome March 22, 1544. One of his works deserves our notice, *Historia Metropolitana seu episcoporum et archiepiscoporum Upsaliensium* (Rome. 1557, 1560, fol.). See Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xxxv, s. v.; Chauffepié, *Diction. Hist.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 732.

Magnus, Olaus, a Swedish prelate, brother of the preceding, was born at Linköping, near the close of the 15th century; was provost of the church at Stregnes when Gustavus I sent him to Rome to secure the papal confirmation to the appointment of his brother John to the archiepiscopal see of Upsal. It is not exactly known when Olaus returned to Sweden, but it is certain that after 1527 he was constantly with his brother as his secretary. After John's decease Olaus was appointed by the pope to succeed to the archbishopric of Upsal, but the Reformation had in the meanwhile changed the ecclesiastical relations in Sweden, and he never filled the archiepiscopal chair. He attended the Council of Trent by order of pope Paul III. Hence the mistake on the part of some writers of making John Magnus a member of the Tridentine gathering, which took place two years

after his decease (1544). Olaus returned to Rome from Trent, and died there in 1568. His works, which are of minor interest, are given in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 734.

Ma'gog (Heb. *Magog'*, מָגוֹג, *region of Gog* [see below]; Sept. Μαγώγ, Vulg. *Magog*), the second son of Japhet (Gen. x, 2; 1 Chron. i, 5). B.C. post 2514. "Various etymologies of the name have been suggested. Knobel (*Völkert.* p. 63) proposes the Sanscrit *mah* or *maha*, 'great,' and a Persian word signifying 'mountain,' in which case the reference would be to the Caucasian range. The terms *ghogh* and *moghef* are still applied to some of the heights of that range. This etymology is supported by Von Bohlen (*Introd. to Gen.* ii, 211). On the other hand, Hitzig (*Comm. in Ez.*) connects the first syllable with the Coptic *ma*, 'place,' or the Sanscrit *maha*, 'land,' and the second with a Persian root, *koka*, 'the moon,' as though the term had reference to moon-worshippers." In Ezekiel (xxxviii, 2; xxxix, 6) it occurs as the name of a nation, and, from the associated names in all the passages where it occurs, it is supposed to represent certain Scythian or Tartar tribes descended from the son of Japhet. See ETHNOLOGY. Thus, in Genesis, it is coupled with Gomer (the Cimmerians) and Madai (the Medes), among the Japhetites, while Ezekiel joins it with Meshech and Jubal (נְשִׂיא רֹאשׁ, "chief prince," should be *prince of Rosh*), as the name of a great and powerful people, dwelling in the extreme recesses of the north, who are to invade the Holy Land at a future time. Their king is there called Gog. The people of Magog further appear as having a force of cavalry (xxxviii, 15), and as armed with the bow (xxxix, 3). The oldest versions give the word unchanged; but Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 3) interprets it by *Scythians* (Σκύθαι), and so Jerome; but Suidas renders it *Persians*. "Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* 1471), Rosenmüller (*Scholia in Gen.* x, 2), and Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s. v.) adopt the view that the Scythians generally are intended. Bochart (*Phaleg*, iii, 19) suggests that the name *Gog* appears in Γωγαρηνή, the name of a district near to that through which the Araxes flows (Strabo, p. 528); and this falls in with the supposition that the Magogites were Scythians, for the traditions of the latter represent their nation as coming originally from the vicinity of the Araxes (Diod. Sic. ii, 43). Since Bochart's time the general consent of scholars has been in favor of regarding the eastern Scythians as the Magog of Genesis; but Kiepert 'associates the name with *Macija*, or *Maka*, and applies it to Scythian nomad tribes which forced themselves in between the Arian or Arianized Medes, Kurds, and Armenians' (Keil and Delitzsch, *Bibl. Comment. on the O. T.* [Clark], i, 163); while Bunsen places Magog in Armenia; though in the map accompanying his *Bibelwerk* it is placed to the north of the Euxine. Knobel also places Magog there, and connects the Scythian tribes thus named with those which spread into Europe, and were allied to the Sarmatians, who gave their name ultimately to the whole north-east of Europe, and are the ancestors of the Slavic nations now existing" (Kitto). It is certain that the term *Scythian* was a collective title of the remote savage tribes of the north in a similar manner to the use of Magog (Cellarii *Notit.* ii, 753 sq.). See SCYTHIAN. There appears to have been from the earliest times a legend that the enemies of religion and civilization lived in that quarter (*Haxthausen's Tribes of the Caucasus*, p. 55). From the accounts found among the Arabians, Persians, and Syrians, some of which are embellished with various fables, we learn that they comprehended under the designation *Yajuj and Majuj* all the less known barbarous people of the north-east and north-west of Asia. (See the Koran, xviii, 94–99; xxi, 96; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, ii, 16, 17, 20; Hylander, *Spec. op. cosmog.* pt. 20–22 [Lond. 1803]; Klaproth, *Asiat. Magaz.* i, 138 sq.; Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* ii, 281 sq.; Flügel, in the *Halle Encycl.* II, xiv, 78 sq.) Yet, though the Gog and Magog of the Hebrews may have had an equally vague acceptation, it nevertheless seems to have pointed more precisely to the *northern tribes of the Caucasus*, between the Euxine and the Caspian Seas. The people of that region, it seems, were a terror to middle Asia; and they have often been named the Scythians of the East. Jerome says of Magog that it means "Scythian nations, fierce and innumerable, who live beyond the Caucasus and the lake Mæotis, and near the Caspian Sea, and spread out even onward to India." The people dwelling among the Caucasian Mountains have preserved their original character down to the present hour, as is evident from their recent long-continued contests with the Russians. The famous Caucasian wall, probably erected by some of the successors of Alexander the Great, as a defence against the incursions of the northern barbarians, and which extended from Derbend, on the western shore of the Caspian, to near the Euxine or Black Sea, is still called "*the wall of Gog and Magog*." (See Reinegg, *Beschr. d. Caucasus*, ii, 79.) The traveller Gmelin visited this wall in 1770, in the course of the scientific mission upon which he was sent by the Russian government. From Derbend, on the Caspian Sea, the head-quarters of the Russian military guard in that country, Gmelin directed his course westward, towards the Euxine, and he soon met with some ruins of the ancient wall, which he describes as in some places thirty feet high, and for large distances nearly entire, and in other places partially or wholly fallen down. There are watch-towers along the wall at signal distances; two of these he ascended, and from their tops he could descry the snowy ridges of Caucasus. This wall seems to have been built in almost a straight line from the Caspian to the Euxine, and the watch-towers and fortresses were probably erected as a means of keeping up communication between Derbend, the garrison at the eastern extremity, and the fastnesses in the mountains. (See Bayer, *De Muro Caucasio*, in *Acta Acad. Scientiar. Petropol.* i, 425; Ker Porter, *Travels*, ii, 520; Ritter, *Erdk.* ii, 834 sq.) In Rev. xx, 7, 9, the terms Gog and Magog are evidently used tropically, as names of the enemies of Christianity, who will endeavor to extirpate it from the earth, but will thereby bring upon themselves signal destruction. But that Ezekiel, in his prophecy, meant to be understood as predicting the invasion of Palestine by Gog and Magog in the literal sense, is hardly credible. He uses these names to designate distant and savage nations; and in the same way John employs them. Just in the same manner we now employ the word *barbarians*. That both writers should employ these two names in a tropical way is no more strange than that we should employ the words Scythian, Tartar, Indian, etc., in the same manner. Nothing could be more natural than for Ezekiel, who lived in Mesopotamia, to speak of Gog and Magog, since they were the formidable enemies of all that region; and that John, writing on the same subject, should retain the same names, was equally natural. (See Stuart's *Comment. on the Apoc.* ad loc.) See GOG.

Ma'gor-mis'sabib (Hebrew, *Magor' mis-sabib'*, מָגוֹר מִסָּבִיב, *terror from round about*; Sept. Μάτοικος κυκλόθεν, Vulg. *Pavor undique*), an epithet applied at the divine instance by Jeremiah to the persecuting Pashur (q. v.), emblematical of his signal fate, as explained in the context (Jer. xx, 3). "It is remarkable that the same phrase occurs in several other passages of Jeremiah (vi, 25; xx, 10; xlvi, 5; xlix, 29; Lam. ii, 22), and is only found besides in Psa. xxxi, 13" (Smith).

Mag'piash (Heb. *Magpiash'*, מַגְפִּיעָשׁ, perhaps for מַגֵּפִי דֶשׁ, *moth-killer*; Sept. Μαγαφής v. r. Μεγαφής, Vulg. *Megphias*), one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant instituted on the return from Babylon (Neh. x, 20). B.C. cir. 410. Some suppose the name, however, to be the same as MAGBISH (q. v.) of Ezra ii, 30.

Magyars. See HUNGARY.

Maha-bharata (from the Sans. *mahat*—changed

to *mahâ*—great, and *Bhârata*, a famous Hindu prince) is the name of a great epic poem of ancient India. As its main story relates to the contest between two rival families, both descendants of a king, Bharata, the title probably implies "the great history of the descendants of Bharata." In its present shape the poem consists of upwards of 100,000 verses, each containing 32 syllables, and is divided into 18 parvans or books. That this huge composition was not the work of one single individual, but a production of successive ages, clearly appears from the multifariousness of its contents, from the difference of style which characterizes its various parts, and even from the contradictions which disturb its harmony. Hindu tradition ascribes it to *Vyâsa;* but as Vyâsa means "the distributer or arranger," and as the same individual is also the reputed compiler of the Vedas, Purânas, and several other works, it is obvious that no historical value can be assigned to this generic name.

The contents of the poem may be distinguished into the leading story and the episodical matter connected with it. The former is probably founded on real events in the oldest history of India, though in the epic narrative it will be difficult to disentangle the reality from the fiction. The story (which covers about one fourth of the whole poem) comprises the contest of the celebrated families called the Kauravas and Pandavas, ending in the victory of the latter, and in the establishment of their rule over the northern part of India. Of course no unimportant part is assigned in the contest to the deities, and, consequently, Hindu mythology is pretty extensively interwoven with these events of semi-historical Hindu antiquity. This episodical matter, as it were, incidentally linked with the main story, may be distributed under three principal heads. One category of such episodes comprises narratives relating to the ancient or mythical history of India, as, for instance, the episodes of Nala and Sakuntalâ; a second is more strictly mythological, comprising cosmogony and theogony; a third is didactic or dogmatic—it refers to law, religion, morals, and philosophy, as in the case of the celebrated Bhagavadgitâ, and the principal portions of the 12th and 13th books. By means of this episodical matter, which at various periods, and often without regard to consistency, was superadded to the original structure of the work, the Mahabharata gradually became a collection of all that was needed to be known by an educated Hindu; in fact, it became the encyclopædia of India, notwithstanding that the Brahmanic authors themselves intended it mainly for the Kshattriya, or military caste, whose history, interests, religion, and deities it specially dwells upon. The text of the Mahabharata has been published at Calcutta (5 vols. 4to, 1834–1839. Vol. v is a table of contents). Two other editions are in course of publication at Bombay. The best researches on it are those by Lassen, in his *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (1837 sq.), and in his *Indische Alterthumskunde*. A sort of analysis of the leading story of the Mahabharata (not of the episodes) has lately been given by F. G. Eichhoff (*Poésie Héroïque des Indiens*, Paris, 1860), and by Professor Monier Williams (*Indian Epic Poetry*, London, 1863). See also Schack, *Stimmen vom Ganges* (Berl. 1856); Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Maha-deva (*i. e.* "the great god") is one of the names by which the Hindu god Siva is called. In Buddhistic history, Mahadeva, who lived 200 years after the death of the Buddha Sâkyamuni, or 343, is a renowned teacher who caused a schism in the Buddhistic Church. His adversaries accuse him of every possible crime; but, as he is ranked among the Arhats, his eminence cannot be matter of doubt. The school founded by him is called *Pûrvas, aila.* See W. Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus*, etc. (St. Petersburg, 1860).

Mahadi or **Mehdi** (Arab. *director, sovereign,* or *pontiff*) is the surname, by way of excellence, of the twelfth and last imam (q. v.) of the race of Ali. This Mahadi, who bore the same name with the false prophet, being called Abulcassem Mohammed, was born in the year of the Hegira 255, and, according to Persian tradition, when nine years old, was shut up in a cave or cistern by his mother, and is there kept till he shall appear at the end of the world, and Jesus Christ shall destroy Antichrist, and make of the two laws, the Mussulman and Christian, but one. Some among them believe that this imam was twice hidden; the first time from his birth to the age of 74 years, during which interval he secretly conversed with his disciples without being seen by others, because most of the imams who preceded him had been poisoned by the caliphs, who knew their pretensions, and feared a revolt in their favor. The second retreat of this imam is from the time his death was made known to the time which Providence has appointed for his manifestation. The disciples of this Mahadi give him the title of *Motebatthen*, the *secret* or *concealed.* There is in Chaldæa, in a little province called by the Arabians *Ahvaz*, a castle named *Hesn Mahadi*, where all the waters of that country join and form a marsh, which runs into the sea. It is here, according to the Shiites, that Mahadi will make his appearance. See D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* s. v.; Broughton, *Eibl. Hist. Sac.* vol. ii, s. v.; Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, ii, 345, note.

Maha-Kala is another name of the Hindu divinity Siva (q. v.).

Maha-Kali. See Kali.

Maha-kasyapa is the name of one of the most renowned disciples of the Buddha *Sâkyamuni* (q. v.). He arranged metaphysically the portion of the sacred writings of the Buddhists called Abhidharma; and tradition ascribes to him also the origin of the *Sthavira* division of the *Vaibhâshika* school of Buddhistic philosophy. Many legends are connected with his life. See E. Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien* (Paris, 1844), and his posthumous work, *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi* (Paris, 1852).

Ma'halah (1 Chron. vii, 18). See Mahlah.

Mahal'aleël (Heb. *Mahalalel'*, מַהֲלַלְאֵל, *praise of God;* Sept. and N. T. Μαλελεήλ), the name of two men.

1. The son of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan, of the line of Seth, born when his father was seventy years old; he became the father of Jared at sixty-five years of age, and lived to the age of eight hundred and ninety-five years (Gen. v, 12–17; 1 Chron. i, 2; Luke iii. 37, in which last passage the name is Anglicized "Maleleël"). B.C. 3777–2881. "Ewald recognises in Mahalaleel the sun-god, or Apollo of the antediluvian mythology, and in his son Jared the god of water, the Indian Varuna (*Gesch.* i, 357), but his assertions are perfectly arbitrary."

2. A Judaite of the family of Pharez, father of Shephatiah, and ancestor of one Athaiah, who resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xi, 4). B.C. much ante 536.

Ma'halath (Heb. *Machalath'*, מָחֲלַת, a *lute*, otherwise the title of a song), the name of two women. See below.

1. (Sept. Μαελέθ, Vulg. *Maheleth.*) The daughter of Ishmael, and third wife of Esau (Gen. xxviii, 9); elsewhere called Bashemath (Gen. xxxvi, 3); but the Samar. Pent. has Mahalath in both passages. See Esau.

2. (Septuag. Μολαθ v. r. Μοολαθ, Vulg. *Mahalath.*) The daughter of Jerimoth, granddaughter of David, and wife of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 18). B.C. 973. "She was thus her husband's cousin, being the daughter of king David's son, who was probably the child of a concubine, and not one of his regular family. Josephus, without naming Mahalath, speaks of her as 'a kinswoman' (συγγενῆ τινα, *Ant.* viii, 10, 1). No children are attributed to the marriage, nor is she again named. The ancient Hebrew text (*Kethib*) in this passage has 'son' instead of 'daughter.' The latter, however, is the correction of the *Keri*, and is adopted by the Sept., Vulg., and Targum, as well as by the A. V."

Ma'halath Mas'chil occurs in the title of Psa. liii, and MA'HALATH LEAN'NOTH MAS'CHIL in the title of Psa. lxxxviii. For these latter names, see each in its alphabetical order. The term MAHALATH (Heb. *Machalath'*, מַחֲלַת, Sept. Μαελέθ, Vulg. *Maeleth, Maheleth*) is thought by Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 476) to be for מַחֲלָה, from חָלָה, *to be sweet*, spoken of musical sounds; hence signifying a stringed instrument, e. g. a lute or *guitar*, accompanied by the voice. Fürst, however, denies (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.) that it denotes an instrument at all, and maintains that it was the title of an old *air* to which the psalms in question were to be sung. Ludolph (p. 272) compares the equivalent Æthiopic, signifying a song or hymn. The use of Leannoth in the same connection would perhaps favor the reference to some kind of instrument; but the versions render no assistance as to the meaning of either word, and most interpreters resort either to vague conjecture or mystical allusions. The use of the particle עַל, "*upon*," before "Mahalath," in each case, seems to indicate some kind of instrument. See PSALMS.

Ma'hali (Exod. vi, 19). See MAHLI.

Maha-maya is the name of the mother of BUDDHA. See GAUTAMA.

Mahana'ïm (Hebrew *Machana'yim*, מַחֲנַיִם, *two camps*, as often, and explained in Gen. xxxii, 2 as meaning the heavenly *army* of God; where the Sept. has Παρεμβολαι, Vulg. *Mahanaim, id est Castra;* elsewhere Μααναΐμ or Μααναΐμ, once Μαναέμ, sometimes παρεμβολαί; Vulg. *Manaim*, but usually *castra*), a place beyond the Jordan, north of the river Jabbok, which derived its name from Jacob's having been there met by the angels (Josephus, Θεοῦ στρατόπεδον, *Ant.* i, 20, 1) on his return from Padan-aram (Gen. xxxii, 2). See JACOB. The name was eventually extended to the town which then existed, or which afterwards arose in the neighborhood. This town was on the confines of the tribes of Gad and Manasseh, as well as on the southern boundary of Bashan (Josh. xiii, 26, 30), and was a city of the Levites (Josh. xxi, 38; 1 Chron. vi, 80). It was in this city that Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, reigned (2 Sam. ii, 8, 12) during David's reign at Hebron, and here he was assassinated (ch. iv). The choice of this place was probably because he found the influence of David's name less strong on the east than on the west of the Jordan; at least, it seems to show that Mahanaim was then an important and strong place (comp. 2 Sam. ii, 29; xix, 32). Hence, many years after, David himself repaired to Mahanaim, where he was entertained by Barzillai, the aged sheik of that district, when he sought refuge beyond the Jordan from his son Absalom (2 Sam. xvii, 24, 27; 1 Kings ii, 8). In this vicinity also appears to have been fought the decisive battle in the wood of Ephraim, between the royal troops and the rebels (2 Sam. xviii). See DAVID. We only read of Mahanaim again as the station of one of the twelve officers who had charge, in monthly rotation, of raising the provisions for the royal establishment under Solomon (1 Kings iv, 14). Some find an allusion to the place in Cant. vi, 13 ("companies of two armies," lit. dance of Mahanaim), but this is doubtful. "On the monument of Sheshonk (Shishak) at Karnak, in the 22d cartouch—one of those which are believed to contain the names of Israelitish cities conquered by that king—a name appears which is read as *M^a-ha-n-m^a*, that is, Mahanaim. The adjoining cartouches contain names which are read as Bethshean, Shunem, Megiddo, Beth-horon, Gibeon, and other Israelitish names (Brugsch, *Geogr. der nachbarländer Ægyptens*, p. 61). If this interpretation may be relied on, it shows that the invasion of Shishak was more extensive than we should gather from the records of the Bible (2 Chron. xii), which are occupied mainly with occurrences at the metropolis. Possibly the army entered by the plains of Philistia and Sharon, ravaged Esdraelon and some towns like Mahanaim just beyond Jordan, and then returned, either by the same route or by the Jordan valley, to Jerusalem, attacking it last. This would account for Rehoboam's non-resistance, and also for the fact, of which special mention is made, that many of the chief men of the country had taken refuge in the city. It should, however, be remarked that the names occur in most promiscuous order, and that none has been found resembling Jerusalem." In Dr. Eli Smith's Arabic list of names of places in Jebel Ajlun (Robinson's *Bib. Researches*, iii, Append. p. 166), we find a ruined site under the name of *Mahneh*, which is probably that of Mahanaim (comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 231; Keil's *Comment.* on Josh. xiii, 26). The same identification was pointed out by the Jewish traveller Hap-Parchi, according to whom it lies about half a day's journey due east of Bethshan (Zunz, in Asher's edit. of *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 40), the same direction as in Kiepert's *Map*, but only half as far. Its distance from the Jabbok is a considerable but not fatal objection. Tristram visited the place which he defends at length as the site of Mahanaim, and describes it as well situated for a large town, with considerable remains and a fine pond (*Land of Israel*, p. 483).

Ma'haneh-dan (Heb. *Machaneh'-Dan*, מַחֲנֵה־דָן, *camp of Dan;* Septuag. Παρεμβολὴ Δάν, Vulg. *Castra Dan*), a name given to a spot west of Kirjath-jearim, in consequence of its having been the encampment of the party of Danites on their way to capture Laish (Judg. xviii, 12). Mr. Williams suggests a site called Beit *Mahanem*, on the north side of wady Ismail, and N.N.E. of Deir el Howa (*Holy City*, i, 12, note); but the name appears on no map, and occurs in no other traveller.

Maha-Pralya (i. e. the "great end" or "great destruction"), a term applied by the Hindus to the final consummation of all things, which they suppose will take place after a hundred years of Brahma have elapsed (each Brahmanic day, with its night, is reckoned as 8640 millions of our years). At the time referred to, all the gods, including Brahma, as well as all creatures, will be annihilated; Brahm, the eternal, self-existent Spirit, will alone remain. See Moor, *Hindoo Pantheon;* Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Ma'harai (Hebrew *Maharay'*, מַהְרַי, *hasty;* Sept. Μαχαραΐ and Μοοραί v. r. Μαραΐ and Μηρί), a Netophathite, and one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 28; 1 Chron. xi, 30); being a descendant of Zerah, and the tenth captain of a contingent of 24,000 men (1 Chron. xxvii, 13). B.C. 1014.

Maha-Rudra is another name of SIVA (q. v.). See RUDRA.

Maha-sanghika is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Buddhistic Church which arose about two hundred years after the death of the Buddha Sâkyamuni, or about 343. See STHAVIRA. Out of this school arose, in the course of the next centuries, numerous sects. For the tenets common to all, and for those peculiar to each of these sects, the special student of the Buddhist religion will at present most advantageously consult the work of Prof. W. Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1860).

Ma'hath (Heb. *Ma'chath*, מַחַת, prob. for מַחֲתָה, *grasping;* Sept. Μαάθ), the name of two Levites.

1. A Kohathite, son of Amasai and father of Elkanah (1 Chron. vi, 35); apparently the same elsewhere (1 Chron. vi, 25) called AHIMOTH (q. v.). B.C. cir. 1375. See SAMUEL.

2. Another Kohathite, one of those who cleansed the Temple in the reformation instituted by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 12), and was appointed by that king one of the subordinate overseers of the sacred revenues (2 xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

Maha-vansa is the title of two celebrated works written in Pâli, and relating to the early history of Ceylon (q. v.). The older work was probably composed

by the monks of the convent Uttaravihâra at Anurâdhâpura, the capital of Ceylon. Its date is uncertain, but it apparently preceded the reign of Dhâtusena (459–477), as that monarch ordered it to be read in public, a circumstance which seems to prove the celebrity it already enjoyed in his time. The later work of the same name is an improved edition and continuation of the former. Its author, *Mahânâma*, was the son of an aunt of the king Dhâtusena, and he brings down the history of Ceylon, like his predecessor, to the death of Mahâsena. A first volume of the text of the latter work, "in Roman characters, with a translation subjoined, and an introductory essay on Pâli Buddhistic literature," was published by the Hon. George Turnour (Ceylon, 1837). See also Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, ii, 15 sq. (Bonn, 1852).

Mahâ-vîra (literally "the great hero"), also called *Vîra* and *Vardhamâna*, is the twenty-fourth or last Jina, or deified saint, of the Jainas (q. v.), described as of a golden complexion, and having a lion for his symbol. His legendary history is given in the *Kalpa-Sûtra* (q. v.) and the *Mahâvîra-Charitra*. According to these, Mahâvîra's birth occurred at a period infinitely remote; it was as *Nayasâra*, the head man of a village, that he first appeared in the country of Vijaya, subject to Satrumardana. He was next born as *Marîchi*, the grandson of the first Jaina saint Rishabha; he then came to the world of Brahmâ, was reborn as a worldly-minded Brâhmana, and after several other births—each being separated from the other by an interval passed in one of the Jaina heavens, and each period of life extending to many hundreds of thousands of years—he quitted the state of a deity to obtain immortality as a saint, and was incarnate towards the close of the fourth age (now past), when seventy-five years and eight and a half months of it remained. After he was thirty years of age he renounced worldly pursuits, and departed, amid the applause of gods and men, to practice austerities. Finally, he became an Arhat or Jina; and at the age of seventy-two years, the period of his liberation having arrived, "he resigned his breath," and his body was burned by Indra and other deities, who erected a splendid monument on the spot, and then returned to their respective heavens. At what period these events occurred is not stated, but, judging from some of the circumstances narrated, the last Jina expired about five hundred years before the Christian æra. Other authorities make the date of this event about a century and a half earlier.

The works above referred to state, with considerable detail, the conversions worked by Mahâvîra. Among the pupils were Indrabhûti (also called Gautama, and for this reason, but erroneously, considered as the same with the founder of the Buddhist religion), Agnibhûti, Vâyubhûti—all three sons of Vasubhûti, a Brâhmana of the Gotama tribe, and others. These converts to Jaina principles are mostly made in the same manner: each comes to the saint prepared to overwhelm him with shame, when he salutes them mildly, and, as the Jainas hold, solves their metaphysical or religious doubts. Thus Indrabhûti doubts whether there be a living principle or not; Vâyubhûti doubts if life be not body; Mandita has not made up his mind on the subjects of bondage and liberation; Achalabhrâtri is sceptical as to the distinction between vice and virtue, and so on. Mahâvîra removes all their difficulties, and, by teaching them the Jaina truth, converts them to the doctrine of his sect. For a summary account of the life of this saint, see H. T. Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, ii, 213 sq.; H. H. Wilson's *Works*, i, 291 sq.

Ma'havite (Hebrew only in the plur. *Machavim'*, מַחֲוִים, *reviving;* Sept. Μαωείν v. r. Μαωΐ, Vulg. *Mahumites*, Auth. Vers. "Mahavite;" probably by erroneous transcription for the sing. מַחֲוִי), apparently a patrial attribute of Eliel, one of David's body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 46); but no place or person *Mahavah* or *Mahavai* is anywhere else alluded to from which the title could have been derived. There is doubtless some corruption in the text. "The Targum has מִדְּמָן מַחֲוָיָא, 'from Machavua.' Kennicott (*Dissert.* p. 231) conjectures that originally the Hebrew may have stood מִהוֹחִים, 'from the Hivites.' Others have proposed to insert an N and read 'the Mahanaimite' (Fürst, *Handwb.* p. 721 *a;* Bertheau, *Chronik.* p. 136)."

Maha'zioth (Heb. *Machazioth'*, מַחֲזִיאוֹת, *visions;* Sept. Μαζιώθ v. r. Μεαζιώθ), the last named of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (1 Chron. xxv, 4), and leader under him of the twenty-third division of the Temple musicians as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxv, 30). B.C. 1014.

Ma'her-sha'lal-hash-baz (Heb. *Maher'-Shalal'-Chash-Baz*, מַהֵר שָׁלָל חָשׁ בַּז, *speeding* for *booty he hastes* to the *spoil;* Sept. ἐξέως προνομὴν ποιῆσαι σκύλων and Ταχέως σκύλευσον, ὀξέως προνόμευσον, Vulg. *Velociter spolia detrahe, cito prædare* and *Accelera spolia detrahere, festina prædari;* for the grammatical construction, see Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.), words which the prophet Isaiah was first commanded to write in large characters upon a tablet, and afterwards to give as a symbolical name to a son that was to be born to him (Isa. viii, 1, 3), as prognostic of the sudden attack of Damascus and Syria by the Assyrian army (see Henderson's *Comment.* ad loc.). The child in question was evidently the prophet's son by "the prophetess" whom he espoused in pursuance of the divine mandate, and appears to have been the same with the one whose birth under the more Messianic title of IMMANUEL was at once a token to Ahaz of the coming defeat of his enemies (Isa. vii, 14–16), and an illustrious type of Gospel deliverance. B.C. 739.

Mahes(h)a and **Meheswara** are names by which Siva is sometimes called. See SIVA.

Mah'lah (Heb. *Machlah'*, מַחְלָה, another form for מָחֳלָה, *disease*, as in Exod. xv, 26, etc.), the name of two persons.

1. (Sept. Μοολά v. r. Μαελά, Vulg. *Mohola*, Auth. Vers. "Mahalah.") Apparently a son (but perhaps a daughter) of Hamoleketh, a female descendant of Manasseh; the father's name is not given, but two brothers are mentioned (1 Chron. vii, 18). B.C. prob. cir. 1658.

2. (Sept. Μαελά, Vulg. *Melcha.*) The first named of the five daughters and heiresses of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh west, who married among their kindred (Numb. xxvi, 33; xxvii, 1; xxxvi, 11; Josh. xvii, 13). B.C. 1618.

Mah'li (Heb. *Machli'*, מַחְלִי, *sick;* Sept. Μοολί, Vulg. *Moholi;* but in Exod. vi, 19, Μοολεί, Auth. Vers. "Mahali;" see also MAHLITE), the name of two Levites.

1. A son of Merari, and grandson of Levi (Exod. vi, 19; Numb. iii, 20; 1 Chron. vi, 19; xxiii, 21; xxiv, 26, 28; Ezra viii, 18). Among his sons was one named Libni (1 Chron. vi, 29). His descendants were named after him (Numb. iii, 33; xxvi, 58). B.C. post 1856.

2. A son of Mushi, and nephew of the preceding (1 Chron. xxiii, 23; xxiv, 30). He had a son named Shamer (1 Chron. vi, 47). B.C. ante 1658.

Mah'lite (Heb. only in the singular collectively, *Machli'*, מַחְלִי, patronymic of the same form from MAHLI; Sept. Μοολί, Vulg. *Moholitæ;* but in Numb. xxvi, 58, Sept. omits, Vulg. *Moholi;* A. Vers. constantly "Mahlites"), the descendants of Mahli, the son of Merari (Numb. iii, 33; xxvi, 58).

Mah'lon (Hebrew *Machlon'*, מַחְלוֹן, *sickly;* Sept. Μαελών, Vulg. *Mahalon*), the elder of the two sons of Elimelech the Bethlehemite by Naomi; they removed with him to Moab, where this one married Ruth, and died childless (Ruth i, 2, 5; iv, 9, 10). B.C. cir. 1360. See RUTH. "It is uncertain which was the elder of the two. In the narrative (i, 2, 5) Mahlon is mentioned

first, but in his formal address to the elders in the gate (iv, 9), Boaz says 'Chilion and Mahlon.' Like his brother, Mahlon died in the land of Moab without offspring, which in the Targum on Ruth (i, 5) is explained to have been a judgment for their transgression of the law in marrying a Moabitess. In the Targum on 1 Chron. iv, 22, Mahlon is identified with Joash, possibly on account of the double meaning of the Hebrew word which follows, and which signifies both 'had dominion' and 'married.'"

Mahmûd, Abul-Kasim Yemîn ed-Dowlah, one of the most celebrated of the Mohammedan sovereigns, the founder of the Gaznevide dynasty, and the first who established a permanent Moslem empire in India, was born at Gazna (or Ghizni) in A.D. 967. His father was originally a Turkish slave, but having become governor, under the sovereign of Persia, of the province of Kandahar, he finally secured for his own possession the whole of the Punjab (q. v.), besides the Affghan dominions. Mahmûd came to the throne A.D. 997. Already, during the reign of his father, Mahmûd had distinguished himself by superior warlike qualities. Ill treated by Mansûr, the Samanide sovereign of Persia, he made war against him, resulting in the overthrow of the Samanide dynasty, and the establishment of Mahmûd himself as the most powerful monarch in Asia. A devout Mussulman, he aspired to the character of an apostle of his religion. "His chief ambition was to extend his religion throughout the rich provinces of India, a task to which he was stimulated by a belief, cherished from his early boyhood, that he was intrusted with a divine mission to extirpate idolatry from the land of the Hindus." In twelve successive expeditions into India, during a reign of thirty-five years, he carried fire and sword among the idolaters, dethroned and slew several princes, plundered and burned their cities, stormed the forts, massacred the garrisons, ravaged the fields, and carried away so many natives into captivity, that the price of a slave was reduced at Gazna to a couple of rupees; and all this notwithstanding that all India regarded the contest with Mahmûd in the light of a holy war, and that no sacrifice of money or men was spared to defend the religion of their forefathers (compare Moore's poem *Paradise and the Peri*). Mahmûd extended his conquests not only over the whole of the Punjab, but penetrated as far as Bundelcund on the east, and Guzerat on the south. It has frequently been charged that these incursions to India were made by Mahmûd rather for the sake of spoil than to extend the Mussulman faith (comp. Trevor, *India*, p. 72), but there is every evidence, both in the fact that his arms were constantly directed against the religion rather than the people, and in his lavish expenditure at Gazna of the treasures brought from India, and in the encouragement he gave to learning, that Mahmûd believed in his divine mission. He founded a university in Gazna, with a vast collection of curious books, in various languages, and a museum of natural curiosities. He appropriated a large sum for the maintenance of this establishment. He also set aside £10,000 a year for pensions to learned men. He died in 1030. The great Mussulman poet Firdûsi flourished at this time. See Ferishta, *History of the Rise of the Mohammedan Power in India* (translated by general Briggs); Wilken, *Historia Ghasnevidarum*; *History of British India*, vol. i (Harper's Family Library); Von Hammer, *Gemählde saal grosser Moslemischer Herrscher*; Trevor, *India*, p. 69 sq.; *India, Pictorial, Descript. and Hist.* (London, Bohn, 1854, 12mo), p. 54 sq.; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 544 sq.; and the excellent article in Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Mahnenschmidt, John Peter, a pioneer of the German Reformed Church in Ohio, was born probably in Somerset or in Westmoreland Co., Pa., in 1783; first taught school for a number of years, and was finally, in 1812, licensed to preach, and soon after removed to Ohio, where he performed missionary labors in the counties of Columbiana and Trumbull. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations, which he lived to see grow and prosper. He died in Canfield, Mahoning Co., Ohio, July 11, 1857. Mahnenschmidt was a modest, childlike, and earnest man. See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the German Ref. Ch.* (Lancaster, Pa., 1872, 12mo), iii, 207 sq.

Ma'hol (Heb. *Machol'*, מָחוֹל, a sacred *dance*, as in Psa. xx, 12, etc.; Sept. Μαχώλ; Josephus Ἡμαών, *Ant.* viii, 2, 5), a person apparently named as the father of the famous wise men Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda (or at least of the last two), prior to the time of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 31); but if these be the same with those enumerated as sons of Zerah (1 Chron. ii, 6), the word must be taken as elsewhere to denote simply their pursuit, as musical composers (see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc. Kings), an art with which dancing has ever been intimately connected. See Ethan.

Mahomet. See Mohammed.

Mahrattas, a people of Central India, south of the River Ganges, inhabiting the mountains from Gwalior to Goa, and by many supposed to be the descendants of a Persian or North Indian people who had been driven southwards by the Mongols. They are a vigorous and active race, and though, like many Eastern nations, diminutive and ill formed, are distinguished for their courage. Most of the Mahrattas are Hindus in religious belief, but, unlike the devout followers of Brahma, they do not adhere to the distinction of caste very closely. Mohammedanism and Parseeism also have many followers among this people, and Judaism counts a few adherents, though so distorted by heathen practices that some ethnologists have identified the *Beni Israel* of the Mahratta land with the *Pattans* (q. v.).

History.—The Mahrattas are first mentioned in history about the middle of the 17th century. They then inhabited a narrow strip of territory on the west side of the peninsula, extending from 15° to 21° N. lat., and are spoken of as for three centuries the subjects of Mohammedanism. The founder of the Mahratta power was Sevaji (died in 1680), a freebooter or adventurer, whose father was an officer in the service of the last king of Bejapûr. By policy or by force, he eventually succeeded in compelling the several independent chiefs to acknowledge him as their leader, and, with a large army at his command, overran and subdued a vast portion of the emperor of Delhi's territory. He was crowned as king in 1674. His son and successor, Sambaji, after vigorously following out his father's policy, was taken prisoner by Aurungzebe in 1689, and put to death. The incapacity of the subsequent rulers who reigned under the title of *Ramrajah* ("great king"), tempted the two chief officers of state, the *Peishwa*, or prime minister, and the paymaster-general, to divide, about 1749, the empire between them, the former fixing his residence at Pûna, and retaining a nominal supremacy over the whole nation, while the latter made Nagpûr his capital, and founded the empire of the Berar Mahrattas. Later, however, the Mahratta kingdom was divided into a great number of states, more or less powerful and independent, chief among which were, besides the two above mentioned, Gwalior, ruled by the Rao Scindiah; Indore, by the Rao Holkar; and Baroda, by the Guicowar. Intestine wars followed this subdivision, and ultimately the East India Company was compelled to interfere. After many long and bloody contests with the British and their allies, the Mahrattas were reduced to a state of dependence. The only exception was Scindiah, a powerful chief, who had raised a powerful army, officered by Frenchmen, and disciplined after the European method. He continued the contest until 1843. The dignity of peishwa was abolished in 1818, and his territories were occupied by the British. Nagpûr and Sattara subsequently also came to the British, but the other chiefs still possess extensive dominions under British protection.

Missions.—The earliest missions of the Christian

Church in India date with the settlement of the Portuguese in Goa, where the Roman Catholics established the first bishopric in 1534. The second important hold the Romish Church secured at the two Salsettes, the peninsula and island near Bombay. From these the work was gradually pressed through the Mahratta-land. At Goa there are claimed to be 312,000, and at Bombay 20,300 Roman Catholics. See INDIA. The first Protestant mission was commenced in the Mahratta-land by the American Board in 1811. For about twenty years it was confined to the territory this side of the Ghauts. Mahim, Tannah, and Chowul (Choule) were occupied for a time, but abandoned in 1826. In 1836, however, the work began to show signs of vigor and promise. At this time a mission was established on the high lands of Ahmednuggur, a city of 30,000 inhabitants, and by 1842 it became an independent mission centre. For the success of this work and its present status, see the article INDIA, vol. iv, p. 555, col. 2. The Anglican Church first began missionary labors in Bombay in 1820, and gradually gained a hold at Tannah, Bandora, and Bassein. In 1832, Nasik, the most celebrated centre of Brahminism in all Deccan, was secured; in 1846 the work was extended to the station Junir, and in 1848 to Malligaum. The attempt made a few years ago, at Yeolat, to Christianize exclusively by the aid of native helpers failed completely. Neither did the effort among the Illangs, in the neighborhood of Aurangabad (stations Buldana, etc.), prove successful. In Bombay and vicinity the Church Missionary Society sustains many schools, and Christian influences are moulding the character of the rising generation. A special missionary for the Mohammedans is sustained here. See BOMBAY. The Scotch Mission commenced at Konkan in 1823; the first stations were Bankot and Suvarndrug, but these were abandoned when the laborers were needed at Bombay. Here both the "Established Church" and the "Free Church" sustain schools. The Scotch Mission at Poonah, which originated in 1839, belongs to the Free Church. Of late years the Free Church has established missions among the Waralies (aborigines) near Daman. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has labored in this field since 1840, but confined mainly to Bombay. Very lately the Medical Missionary Society has established an institute which will prove of valuable service to the mission work. See Sprengel, *Geschichte der Mahratten* (Halle, 1786); Duth, *History of the Mahrattas* (London, 1826, 3 vols. 8vo); Grundemann, *Missionsatlas*, No. 12; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Mai, ANGELO, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the 19th century, was born at Schilpario (province of Bergamo), Italy, March 7, 1782. As a youth he arrested the attention of his instructor, the ex-Jesuit father Lewis Mozzi de' Caspitani, by the unusual taste and capacity which he displayed for classical learning. The father, determined to lead Angelo's inclination towards the service of the Church, finally induced him to enter, in 1799, the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, which, although elsewhere suppressed, the Duke of Parma, with the sanction of Pius VI, was just re-establishing at Colorno, a small city of his duchy. In this community Mai resided till the provisional restoration of the society in Naples (1804), whither he was sent as Professor of Greek and Latin literature. About the end of 1805 he was transferred to Rome for the completion of his theological studies, and soon afterwards to Orvieto, and was there admitted to priest's orders. It was at this place that he acquired great familiarity with the Hebrew language, his accurate knowledge of palæography, and his skill in deciphering ancient manuscripts. He returned to Rome in 1808, just about the time when the contest of Pius VII with Napoleon was reaching the crisis; an order issued by the viceroy, commanding all subjects of the kingdom of Italy to return to their respective provinces, had compelled him to change his residence once again. Happily for the interests of literature, he settled at Milan. The Ambrosian Library of that city had long been known as rich in manuscripts of the highest interest—the remnant of the treasures of the old monastic libraries, especially those of Bobbio and Lucca, and of some of the suppressed Benedictine convents of the Protestant cantons of Switzerland. Many of its best treasures had been made public by Muratori, Mabillon, and the Benedictine editors; but there yet remained a department entirely unexplored, which Mai soon appropriated to himself, and which has since come to be regarded as exclusively his own—that of palimpsest or re-written manuscripts, in which the original writing has been effaced in order to make room for a later work written over it. Mai was admitted an associate, and eventually a doctor of this celebrated library, and labored in this novel editorial career with a zeal and success not unworthy of the traditional glories of his country. From the Society of Jesus, to which he had not yet avowed himself, he now withdrew, with the consent and approval of the authorities at Rome. His first essay as an author was a Latin translation (with a commentary) of Isocrates, *De Permutatione* (1813), the original of which had been published by a Greek named Andrew Mustoxidi in the previous year; but this was only the prelude of his far more remarkable successes in the decipherment and publication of palimpsest manuscripts. Up to this period, with the exception of Küster and Wetstein's readings of the Old and New Testament from the *Codex Ephremi*, Knittel's portions of the Gothic Bible of Ulphilas, Peter Bruns's fragment of the ninety-first book of Livy, and Barrett's palimpsest of the Gospels, palimpsest literature was entirely untried. Within a few years Mai deciphered and published from palimpsest sources writings of several classical authors, besides two works then supposed to be by Philo Judæus, but afterwards recognised as the productions of Georgius Gemistus. In 1819 Mai was called to Rome as chief keeper of the Vatican Library, canon of the Church of St. Peter's, and domestic prelate of the pope, Pius VII. Here he continued the publication of palimpsest manuscripts, and in 1820 brought out the work by which he is best known out of Italy—a large and interesting portion of the long-lost *De Republica* of Cicero, the fragments of which he arranged with consummate skill in their respective order, and interwove with all the known extracts of the work which had been preserved in the collections of ancient authors. The whole text he illustrated by a critical commentary of exceeding interest, which at once established his reputation as one of the first scholars of the age.

From these comparatively desultory labors he turned to a project not unworthy of the palmiest days of Italian editorship. Selecting from the vast and till then imperfectly explored manuscript treasures of the Vatican, he prepared his *Scriptorum veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus edita* (Rome, 1825, and later, 10 vols. 4to), on the plan of the various *Anecdota*, published under different titles by Mabillon, Pez, Montfaucon, Muratori, and others. It is a work of immense labor and research, and of a most miscellaneous character—Greek and Latin, sacred and profane, theological, historical, patristical, and philosophical. Next, he published *Classici Scriptores ex Codicibus Vaticanis editi* (completed in 1838, in 10 vols. 8vo), which included some of the editor's earlier publications (especially the *De Republica*); although, with the exception of about two volumes, its contents were entirely new Scarcely was this collection finished when he entered upon the preparation of the *Spicilegium Romanum* (1839–44, 10 vols. 8vo), equally interesting and various in its contents, and a fourth collection entitled *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (1845–53, 6 vols. 4to), thus completing a series unparalleled since the days of Muratori, and, indeed, far more extraordinary than the older collections, from the circumstance that it was compiled from the mere gleanings which had escaped the research of the earlier generations of editors and collectors. In addition to all these labors, and while

they were still on his hands, he commenced an edition of the well-known *Codex Vaticanus* of the Old and New Testament, with various readings and prolegomena, which, however, he never entirely completed; or if he did, as some suppose, he destroyed a greater part of his manuscript on the Old Testament, lest it should ever see the light of day in an incomplete and imperfect state. The text of the New Testament was published in 1858, and in a thoroughly revised form in 1859, under the title *Nov. Test. ex vetustissimo codice Vat., secundis curis editum studio Angeli Maii;* but even in a revised form the work does not deserve the name of Mai on its title-page. Comp. Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1859 (Oct.), p. 166 sq.

While engaged in these vast literary enterprises Mai held the laborious and responsible post of secretary of the Propaganda, to which he had been appointed in 1833; and it was observed with wonder that his other engagements were never suffered to interfere with the duties of the secretaryship. In 1838 he was rewarded for his great services to the Church with the cardinal's hat, at the same time with his friend and successor in the Vatican Library, Mezzofanti; and soon afterwards was appointed to several important and confidential offices in the Roman court, chiefly of a literary character. He was named successively prefect of the Congregation for the Supervision of the Oriental Press; prefect of the Congregation of the Index; and prefect of the Congregation of the Council of Trent. In 1853 he was appointed to the still more congenial post of librarian of the Roman Church. He died September 9, 1854.

"Cardinal Mai's abilities as an editor," says his biographer in the *English Cyclopædia*, "were of the very highest order. While his collections comprise an infinite variety of authors of every age, of every country, of every variety of style, and in every department of literature, he appears in all equally the master. Whether the subject be theology, or history, or law, or languages, or general literature, his learning is never at fault, and his critical sagacity never fails. In the many delicate and difficult questions which so often arise—in assigning an anonymous manuscript to its true author, in collecting fragments of the same work and dovetailing them together into intelligible order, in selecting from a heap of unknown materials all that is unpublished, and deciding upon the question of its genuineness or its intrinsic value—in a word, in all the thousand investigations which fall to the lot of a critical editor treading upon untried ground, he possessed a skill and acuteness which can hardly be described as other than instinctive, and which, taking into account the vast variety of subjects which engaged him, must be regarded as little short of marvellous. The private character of Cardinal Mai has been well described as the very ideal of a Christian scholar. Earnestly devoted to the duties of his sacred calling, he yet loved literature for its own sake also, and he was ever foremost in every project for its advancement. He was a member of all the leading literary societies of Italy, and not unfrequently read papers in those of Rome and Milan. His charities were at all times liberal, and, indeed, munificent; and at his death he bequeathed the proceeds of the sale of his noble library to the poor of his native village of Schilpario. A monument has been erected to his memory in the church of St. Anastasia, from which he derived his title as cardinal." See Mutti, *Elogio di Angelo Mai* (1828); Rabbe, *Biog. Univ. des Contemporains;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 857 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. xii, s. v.

Maia'neas (Μαάνναϛ, Vulg. omits), given (1 Esdr. ix, 48) in place of the MAASIAS (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Neh. viii, 7).

Maid or MAIDEN (prop. נַעֲרָה, *παιδισκη*, a *girl*, as corresponding to נַעַר, *παῖϛ*, a young man; also בְּתוּלָה, *κορασιον*, a *virgin;* for which the usual term is עַלְמָה; but אָמָה and שִׁפְחָה, like *δούλη*, are a *maid-servant*). See HANDMAID; VIRGIN.

Maignan, EMANUEL, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, noted as a philosopher, was born at Toulouse, in France, in 1601; was educated at the College of the Jesuits in that place, where he evinced extraordinary ability as a mathematician and philosopher. A strong inclination to a religious life led him to seek the monastery for his retreat. In 1636, however, he was called to fill a professor's chair of mathematics in Rome; returned from Rome to Toulouse in 1650, and was created by his countrymen provincial in the same year. He died in 1676. Maignan published *De Perspectiva Horaria* (Toulouse, 1648), and a *Course of Philosophy* (Toulouse, 1652, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d edit. 1673, folio), enlarged by two *Treatises* on the same subject in 1673. He opposed Des Cartes in his theory of the Creation, and to refute it the more completely, he invented a machine "which showed by its movements that Des Cartes's supposition concerning the manner in which the universe was formed, or might have been formed, and concerning the centrifugal force, was entirely without foundation." See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* ix, 1, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Maigrot, CHARLES, a French Jesuit and missionary, was born at Paris in 1652; entered the order and prepared for missionary labors in foreign parts. In 1681 he was sent to Siam, and in 1683 he was placed in charge of the missions of China. In 1698 pope Innocent XII created him, for his zeal in propagating Christianity among the inhabitants of the "Middle Kingdom," bishop in partibus of Conon. In 1699 he was visited with the displeasure of his order for his opposition to the peculiar manner in which the Jesuits sought to advance the interests of Christianity among the Chinese. He was even at one time in danger of his life. Supported by the Dominicans, he appealed to pope Clement XI, who, June 20, 1702, gave his approval to the attitude of the bishop of Conon; and, to make known his will, dispatched cardinal De Tournon to the emperor of China, who, as we have seen in the article on China, was greatly displeased with the conduct of the Christian missionaries, and issued an edict ordering them all from his domains. Maigrot at first refused to obey the imperial command, and only quitted the country when his life was imperilled. He went to Rome by way of Ireland, and died in the Eternal City Feb. 18, 1730. He only wrote one work, and that is still in MS. form; it is entitled *De Sinica Religione* (4 vols. fol.). See Le Gobien, *Hist. de l'Edit de l'empereur de Chine en faveur de la religion Chrétienne* (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Berault-Bercastel, *Hist. de l'Église* (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Mailla, *Hist. Générale de la Chine*, vol. ix; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 867.

Mail (קַשְׂקֶשֶׂת, *kaske'seth*, a "*scale*," as of fish, Lev. xi, 9, etc.), spoken of as a cuirass composed of plates of

Ancient Egyptian Cuirass.

metal attached to a bodice like scales, so as to be impervious to the sword (1 Sam. xvii, 5). Another term, rendered "coat of mail," is שִׁרְיוֹן, *shiryon'*, which signifies the corselet or garment thus encased (1 Sam. xvii, 38). At other times metallic rings were employed instead of scales (see Kitto, *Pict. Dict.* note at 1 Sam. xvii). See ARMOR.

Mailduff, an Irish monk, who flourished about the middle of the 7th century, established a monastery in Wiltshire, England, A.D. 650, long called Mailduffburgh, now known as Malmesbury. It was richly endowed by Athelstan and other kings of England, and became the alma mater of some of the first educated Saxons in England in either Church or State. Among them was Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, who acknowledged "that Mailduff had thoroughly instructed him in Latin and Greek." Camden says that Aldhelm was the first Saxon who wrote in Latin, or who made Latin verses; his style, however, was pedantic, and full of alliterations. William of Malmesbury, the first Saxon historian, received his education in this school, the first one among the twelve which Montalembert says the Irish monks established in England (*Monks of the West*, 1864). The period from the 7th to the 10th century was a very dark one in England. Alfred the Great, speaking of his own times (A.D. 870), said, "There were few churchmen on this side of the Humber who could understand their dayly prayer in English, or who could translate a letter in Latin" (*Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons*, book v). And William of Malmesbury said "that, a few years before the Norman invasion, a clergyman who understood grammar was considered a prodigy" (*ibid.*). During this dark period, a large number of Irish scholars, impelled by a devotion to literature, or, as some say, driven out by the Danes, went over to England and established a great many schools, and, among others, that also of Glastonbury. It was often called "Glastonbury of St. Patrick" merely because the disciples of that saint had founded it and for a long time sustained it. In this school were educated many of the most distinguished English divines, scholars, and statesmen of that period. The noted and eccentric Dunstan was educated in it. William of Malmesbury, who wrote his life, says, "Under the discipline of these Hibernians, he [Dunstan] partook of the very marrow of scriptural learning, as well as the knowledge of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music." Mailduff wrote, according to Bale, *De Paschæ Observationibus, Regulus Artium Diversarum*, besides hymns, dialogues, and epistles. He died A.D. 675, and was interred in his own monastery. See *Illustrious Men of Ireland*, i, 137; *Moore's History of Ireland; Pict. Hist. of England*, i, 277 sq. (D. D.)

Maillard, OLIVIER, a celebrated French pulpit orator, was born in Bretagne in the 15th century. His early history is somewhat obscure. He became a doctor of the Sorbonne, professor of theology in the order of the "Minor Brethren," and court preacher to Louis XI and to the duke of Burgundy. In 1501 he was intrusted by the papal legate with the reform of the Paris convents of the order of "Gray Friars," and he discharged this task so energetically and independently that he incurred the displeasure of the "Gray Friars." His reputation, however, rests mainly on the wonderful power of oratory and independence of thought he displayed in his pulpit utterances. In many respects he may be likened to Bossuet, but in one he even excelled him—in dealing out truth, in criticising the faults and failings of his hearers. It is related of him that his royal master, Louis XI, having one day been subjected by him to unusual severity, sent word that if Olivier Maillard would suffer himself to speak thus severely a second time, he should do it at the loss of his life. But Olivier was ready to return a prompt reply even to the royal messenger. "Tell the king that I will thus only arrive sooner in Paradise, and make the way for the king so much the harder." Louis XI never again molested Maillard, though he continued in his former course unabated. If only a moderate part of the picture Maillard has drawn of his contemporaries be true, the French of the 15th century have never had their equals in moral corruption. He died near Toulouse, according to some, June 13, 1502; but his death must have occurred much later, if it be true that he preached at Paris in 1508, as is reported. His principal works are *Sermones de Adventu declamati Parisiis in ecclesia S. Johannis in Gravia anno* 1493 (Paris, 1498, 4to; 1511, 8vo):—*Quadragesimale Opus* (Paris, 1498, 4to; 1512, 8vo):—*Sermones dominicales et alii* (1515, 8vo):—*Sermones de sanctis* (1513, 8vo):—*La Recolation de la très-pieuse Passion des Notre-Seigneur, représentée par les Saints et sacrés mystères de la Messe* (also under the title *Le Mystère de la Messe*, etc.):—*L'Exemplaire de Confession avec la Confession générale* (Rouen and Cayen, 4to; Lyons, 1524, 8vo):—*Traité envoyé à plusieurs religieuses pour les instruire et exhorter à se bien gouverner* (8vo):—*Contemplatio ad salutationem angelicam* (1607). See Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxiii, s. v.; Le Bas, *Dict.-Encyclop. de la France*, s. v.; Gérusey, *Essai d'hist. littér.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 871 sq.

Maillat, JOSEPH ANNE MARIE DE MOYRIA DE, a French Jesuit and missionary, was born in 1679, at the ancestral castle near Nantua. He entered the order quite young. In 1701 he was appointed to take a part in the mission to China, and embarked in 1703 for Maçao, and thence for China. He quickly mastered the Chinese language, and as readily familiarized himself with the institutions of China, so that he became of great service to the Celestial empire. In 1708 a map of China and Tartary was prepared for the Chinese government under his superintendence, and he secured not only approval for his services, but was actually invited to take office at court. He died June 28, 1748, at Pekin. His studies were mainly in the history and archæology of China, and his works are of the same department. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 877.

Maillé de Breze, SIMON DE, a French prelate, was born in 1515; became a religious of the order of Cîteaux, was made abbot of Loroux, then bishop of Viviers, and in 1554 archbishop of Tours. He was a member of the Council of Trent, and took decided ground against the Reformers, who had given him no little trouble in his archiepiscopal dominions. He was at one time obliged to quit his see, in all probability because the Calvinists had made a strong case of immorality against him. He died Jan. 11, 1597. He published a Latin translation of several homilies of St. Basil (Paris, 1558, 4to), and *Discours au peuple de Touraine* (ibid. 1574, 16mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 878.

Maim. See ABEL-MAIM; MISREPHOTH-MAIM.

Maimbourg, Louis, a celebrated French ecclesiastic and defender of Gallican liberty, was born at Nancy in 1620; entered the "Society of Jesus" in 1636; was by them sent to Rome to study theology; was, on his return to France, for six years professor of rhetoric in the College of Rouen; then began preaching, and soon attained great eminence. Having, however, in his *Traité Historique de l'Église de Rome* (Paris, 1685; new ed., Nevers, 1831) come out boldly in favor of the liberty of the Gallican Church, he was expelled from the Order of the Jesuits. The king took sides with Maimbourg and indemnified him by a pension. He retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, in Paris, where he wrote the history of schism of England, and died Aug. 13, 1686. He had entirely disconnected himself from the Jesuits, and did not spare them much in his writings; yet in his *Histoire du Calvinisme* (Paris, 1682, 4to), dedicated to the king, one can readily distinguish the influence of his former associations when he called Calvinism "the most rabid and dangerous of all the enemies France ever had to contend against." Bossuet's interpretation of the *doctrines* of the Roman Catholic Church [see BOSSUET] Maimbourg pronounced against. (Compare Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.*

vii, 280 sq.; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 200 [15].) As a historian Maimbourg is inaccurate and untrustworthy, receiving all the calumnies of the Jesuits against Protestantism as facts, and giving them as such. The ephemeral success of his works is to be attributed only to a pleasing and ornate style and to their romantic garb. His first collection of sermons is uninteresting and insipid, and his controversial works have long been forgotten. His historical works, consisting of *Histoire de l'Arianisme* (1682, 2 vols. 4to); *Des Iconoclastes* (1674-1679, 4to); *Du Schisme des Grecs* (1677, 4to); *Des Croisades* (1675, 2 vols. 4to); *De la Décadence de l'Empire, depuis Charlemagne* (1679, 4to); *Du Grand Schisme de l'Occident* (1677, 4to); *Du Luthéranisme* (1680, 4to, and 2 vols. 8vo); *Du Calvinisme* (1682, 4to); *De la Ligne* (1683, 4to; 1684, 2 vols. 12mo); *Du Pontificat de St. Grégoire le Grand* (1686, 4to); *Du Pontificat de St. Leon* (1687, 4to)—the two latter of which are considered the best—have been collected and published in 14 vols. 4to (Paris, 1686). See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* s. v.; Dupin, *Biblioth. Eccles.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 891 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 758 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.

Maimbourg, Theodore, a relative of the distinguished Louis Maimbourg (q. v.), flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He embraced the Reformed doctrine, and in 1659 published a letter addressed to Louis justifying his course. In 1664 he returned to the Romish Church, and subsequently left it again. He then retired to England, and died at London in 1693.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* viii, 390.

Maimon, Solomon, a Jewish rabbi and philosopher, one of the ablest expounders of the Kantian school, was born in Lithuania in 1753. He was of very humble parentage, and in his youth was confined in his educational advantages to the study of Hebrew. Yet his talent for speculation manifested itself at a very early age, when still confined to the expounding of Talmudic lore. In his very youth, Moses Maimonides's *Moreh Nebuchim* fell into his hands; but while to Moses Mendelssohn it became the guide to truth, it became to Maimon a guide to a labyrinth of speculation from which no open-sesame gave him an outlet until, in advanced life, he fell in with the writings of Kant, to become one of his most ardent students and ablest expounders. In the despair which the *Moreh Nebuchim* prepared for him, he turned to the Cabala for relief, determined to become a Jewish Faust. Plagued by the disadvantages of Russo-Jewish society, he finally quitted his native land and went to Germany to study medicine and thus gain a livelihood. He was 25 years old when he arrived at Königsberg, in West Prussia. His condition in this, the old capital of Prussia, the seat of a university at that time in the very zenith of her glory, was much like that of a man who, after having suffered starvation for days, is suddenly placed at a table filled with the daintiest food. Partaking too greedily of the food set before him, he became a great sufferer mentally—i. e. he was lost in wild speculation. In 1779 he went to Berlin, and became an intimate associate of the German Jewish savant, Moses Mendelssohn. It was not, however, until years had been passed in a roving life that he finally, in 1788, on his return to Berlin, gave himself to the study of Kantian philosophy, was recommended to Kant, and soon made a great name for himself. Both Schiller and Goethe, it is said, sought his society; the latter, we are told, desired Maimon to take up his residence near his side (*Maimoniana*, p. 197; Varnhagen's *Nachlass, Briefwechsel zwischen Rahel u. David Veit*, i, 243 sq., 247 et al.; ii, 23). In his last years count Kalkreuth gave Maimon a home on one of his estates in Silesia. He died in 1800. From an admirer of Kant, Maimon finally changed to a decided opponent, and, to make good his claims, presented the world with a new system of philosophy, which was written in the interests of scepticism. According to Maimon, there is no knowledge strictly objective except pure mathematics, and all empirical knowledge is only an illusion. He traces all the forms of thought, categories, and judgments to a general and unique principle, that of determinability, of reality, of substance; but he contends that we have no right to suppose that our thought has for its object a thing without ourselves, existing independently of the thought, which determines it. "He admits, with Kant," says Wilson (*Hist. of German Philosophy*, ii, 186), "that there are conceptions and principles *a priori*, a pure knowledge which applies itself to an object of thought in general, and to objects of knowledge *a priori;* but he denies that this very pure knowledge absolutely applies itself to experience. The philosophy of the Kritik admits this application as a fact of conscience. This fact, according to Maimon, is simply an illusion, and he declares that the categories are destined only to apply to objects of pure mathematics. Maimon's objections were not without influence on the ulterior development of general philosophy, and Fichte paid much regard to them; but the great objection, the one which bears upon the application of category to reality, Fichte destroyed in one word when he said that the right of this application cannot be deducted until it is absolute" (compare Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, vol. ii). Among his best works are, besides his numerous essays and treatises on various philosophical themes in the "Berliner Monatsschrift" and the "Magazin" from 1789 to 1800, in themselves a small library, and besides ten books on all departments of philosophy, published between 1790 and 1797, the *Gilbath ha-Moreh*, a Hebrew commentary and a remarkable introduction to the three volumes of Maimonides's *Moreh Nebuchim* (Berlin, 1791), in which he proved himself master of the philosophical field; also *Versuch über die Transcendentalphilosophie* (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); *Versuch einer neuen Logik, oder Theorie des Denkens*, etc. (Berlin, 1794, 8vo); and *Kritische Untersuchungen über den menschlichen Geist* (1797), and a memoir of his own life entitled "*Lebensgeschichte*" (2 vols. 1792–93). See Wolf, "*Rhapsodien zur Characteristik S. Maimons*" (1813); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 142 sq. (Leipzig, 1870, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual of Philosophy*, p. 411 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.; Dr. Wise in the *Israelite* (Cincinnati, Ohio), Jan. 1871. (J. H. W.)

Maimonides (i. e. *son of Maimon*), Moses, also called by the Jews *Rambam*, from the initial letters רׄ׳ משה בן מימון = רמ"בם, *R. Moses b.-Maimun*, and by the Arabians *Abu Amram Musa b.-Maimun Obeid Allah*, one of the greatest of the Jews since the exile—the great luminary, the glory of Israel, the second Moses, the reformer of Judaism, as he is called, was born at Cordova, March 30, 1135. As a youth, he received his instruction in the Heb. Scriptures, the Talmud, and Jewish literature from his father, R. Maimon, who held the dignity of judge of the Jews, as also his forefathers had held it for some centuries previous, and was himself renowned as a scholar and author of a commentary on *Esther*, a work on the laws of the Jewish prayers and festivals, a commentary on the Talmud, etc., etc. But for instruction in the Arabic, then the predominant language of Spain, as the country was in the hands of the Mohammedans, and mathematics, and astronomy, Moses was handed over to the care of the renowned Arabian philosophers Averroës and Ibn-Thofeil (compare Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, vi, 168). Spain, in which the Jews had found an early home (some say as early as the days of Solomon; compare Rule, *Karaites*, p. 146 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, p. 1 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 211), is by Milman (*History of the Jews*, iii, 155) spoken of as the country in which "the golden age of the Jews shone with the brightest and most enduring splendor." In the early days of Christianity we find the Jew alluded to by Church councils [see Elvira], and legislation enacted in his behalf; but, to the shame of Christianity be it said, the Jew enjoyed his greatest privileges in the Iberian peninsula

under Mussulman rule, and "from the conquest by the Moors till towards the end of the 10th century, when, while Christian Europe lay in darkness, Mohammedan Cordova might be considered the centre of civilization, of arts, and of letters, ... the Jews, under the enjoyments of equal rights and privileges, rivalled their masters, or, rather, their compatriots, in their advancement to wealth, splendor, and cultivation" (Milman). In Spain alone, and only under Mussulman reign, the Jews in the Middle Ages enjoyed religious liberty and the privilege of their own jurisdiction, and it was in Spain alone that the Jews, since their Babylonian exile, developed a nobility which to this day is considered the aristocracy of the dispersed people of Israel (compare Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 204). Need we wonder that under such very favorable conditions, which became endangered only now and then, the Spanish Jews developed a very active spiritual life, and a desire for culture and science which produced noteworthy fruits? "The Jews in the Arabic provinces," says Da Costa (p. 223), in speaking of the Saracen rule in Spain, "were rarely bankers, but merchants, trading on a large scale to different parts of the East. They acted as treasurers to the califs, but more frequently as physicians, philosophers, poets, theologians—in a word, as *savans* and men of letters." Especially worthy to be called the golden age of Spanish Judaism was the age that gave birth to Moses Maimonides. While the Jews, who at that time lived under less favorable circumstances in France and Germany, were disinclined to all scientific endeavors, and all their spiritual activity became absorbed in the study of the Talmud, the Spanish Jews vied in all sciences—in philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and in poetry, with the flower of the Arabian genius. Formerly the Jews of the Iberian peninsula had derived their learning of the Biblical writings and their commentators from the famous schools of Babylon and Persia, whither the young were sent for theological instruction; but when, by sheer accident, a noted Eastern rabbi of the 10th century found a home in these Western coasts (see Rabbi Moses, "clad in sackcloth:" compare Milman, iii, 156, and other histories of the Jews), and "the light of learning, which, by the rapid progress of the iron age of Judaism in Babylonia, by the extinction of the authority of the prince of the captivity, the dispersion of the illustrious teachers, and the final closing of the great schools, seemed to have set forever, it suddenly rose again in the West in renewed and undismayed splendor." From this time (A.D. 990) the schools of the Spanish Rabbanim (at Cordova, Toledo, Barcelona, and Granada) not only became the centre of Jewish civilization and learning, but the auxiliaries of the Arabian philosophers in their endeavor to keep alive the flame of learning during the deep darkness of the Middle Ages, and the Jews became the communicators of Arabian philosophy to the Christian world, or, as Tennemann (*Manual of Philosophy*, transl. by Morell, p. 231) has it, "the interpreters between the Saracens and the Western nations." It was at such a time—when the heaven of Spanish Judaism was resplendent with stars of its greatest magnitude—Solomon Ibn-Gebirol (1021–1070), Jehudah Halevi (1086–1142), Aben-Ezra (1092–1167), David Kimchi (1160–1240), a galaxy of great and learned men of which any nation might well be proud—that Moses Maimonides lived, wrote, and flourished as the brightest ornament of them all.

As we noticed above, Moses was born in 1135. The *Almoravides*—i. e. men devoted to the service of God—who were then the masters of Mohammedan Spain [see MOHAMMEDANS], like the Ommiades, were tolerant and kind to the Jews. But just at this time the power of the Almoravides was fast declining, and by the middle of the 12th century the Almohades, a fanatical Mohammedan sect [see IBN-TUMART], landing in Southern Spain, soon gained the upper hand, and superseded the Almoravides altogether. With the accession of these Almohades to power in Southern Spain begins a new chapter in the history of the Jews. On the Seine, on the Rhine, on the Danube, and in the steppes of Africa and Southern Spain, "as if by previous arrangement, a bloody chase was now inaugurated, in the name of religion, against the Hebrew tribe both by Mohammedans and Christians, quite unmindful of the fact that whatever of the good and Godlike had found a place in their confession had been derived from the teachings of this very tribe. Hitherto persecutions of the Jew had been only occasional; with the year 1146 they begin to be more frequent, usual, consequent, and severe, as if to make the period in which the light of intelligence began to dawn among men surpass in inhumanity the days of dark barbarism" (Grätz, vi, 175). In that part of Spain controlled by the Almohades no other religion than that of the Crescent was to be tolerated, and Jew and Christian alike were obliged either to abjure the faith of their fathers or to quit the country within a month. To remain and yet to adhere faithfully to the teachings of the Old or New Testament was to incur the penalty of death. Maimonides's family, like many others to whom emigration was well-nigh impossible, embraced the Mohammedan faith, or rather, for the time being, renounced the public profession of Judaism, all the while, however, remaining faithful to it in secret, and keeping up a close communication with their co-religionists abroad (compare Carmoly, *Annalen*, 1839, p. 395 sq.; Munk, *Archives Israélites*, 1851, p. 319 sq.). For more than sixteen years Maimonides thus lived, together with his family, under the assumed character of Mohammedans; but when the death of the reigning sovereign brought no change in the system of religious intolerance, they, with the greater part of the Jewish community, resolved to emigrate and travel about, as he himself tells us, "by land and by sea," without finding a resting-place for the sole of his foot. Their first landing-place was Acco, in Palestine; from thence they went *via* Jerusalem to Cairo; then to Hebron, and next into Egypt, stopping first a short time at Alexandria, but finally settling at Fostât (compare *Israelit. Annalen*, 1840, p. 45 sq.). On their journey Maimonides had lost his father (at Cairo), and, to earn a livelihood for his father's household, he engaged with his younger brother in the jewelry trade; the care of the business mainly falling to David, while Moses devoted most of his time to literary pursuits and to the study of medicine, which he afterwards practiced, and in which profession he attained to great eminence.

Life and Labors.—During his boyhood, Moses Maimonides is said to have manifested anything but a promise of those great abilities which were unfolded in his manhood. He was indolent, and so disinclined to study that his father sent him, at a very early age, from his paternal roof. During his absence from home, however, an earnest desire for knowledge was manifested by him, and, by study and intercourse with learned co-religionists and Arabians, he acquired a great treasure of knowledge in the different provinces of science, which his clear, penetrating, and methodical mind mastered with a marvellous power. An elegant oration, delivered by him at fourteen, reconciled father and son. Acquainted with all the writings of ancient philosophers, he became the most eminent of his age. He was an able mathematician and metaphysician. When only 23 years old (1158), he proved the possession of extraordinary powers of comprehension and elucidation in a treatise on the Jewish calendar, based on astronomical principles (חשבון חיעבור), which he composed for a friend. In the same year also, whilst wandering about from place to place, and deprived of the aid of a library, he yet began his stupendous *Commentary on the Mishna* (פירוש המשניות). At this time also (about 1160) he composed the *Letter on Religious Persecution* (אגרת השמד), or *A Treatise on Glorifying God* (מאמר קידוש השם)—i. e. by suffering martyrdom—a most ingenious plea for those who have not

the courage to lay down life for their religion, and who, having outwardly renounced their faith, continue secretly to practice it—which was provoked by the attack of a zealous co-religionist against Moses's public profession of Mohammedanism and private devotion to Judaism. (It was published by Geiger, *Moses ben-Maimon*, part i [Bresl. 1850].) The sudden loss of his brother David and of their possessions threw upon Moses the responsibility of providing alone for his own, his father's, and his brother's family. Without means to continue in mercantile life, he now entered the medical profession; at the same time he also delivered lectures on philosophy. But his mind was mainly upon the work in which he had engaged years ago. Neither misfortune, nor bodily infirmities, nor even misinterpretation, could turn Moses Maimonides from the goal he was striving to reach. He had assigned to himself the task of harmonizing religion with science, Judaism with philosophy; to exhibit Judaism in such a light that it might become not only endeared to its thinking adherents, but that it might claim the respect also of other religionists, and even of philosophers; and though the wants of so many dependent upon him obliged him to labor assiduously as a physician, he yet found time for the completion of his commentary on the Mishna, and, in 1168, finally brought it before the public under the title *The Book of Light* (Arabic כתאב אלסראג, Hebrew ספר המאור). This remarkable production, which he wrote in Arabic (for editions, see below), is designed to simplify the study of the exposition of the Law or Pentateuch, handed down by tradition, rendered exceedingly difficult by the super-commentaries and discussions which had accumulated thereon since the close of the Mishna to the days of Maimonides. It is preceded by a general elaborate introduction, in which he discourses on the true nature of prophecy, shows its relationship to the law given on Sinai, treats of the figurative language occurring in the Pentateuch and the Prophets, etc. In the special introduction to the *Tract Sanhedrin* he, for the first time, defined and formally laid down the Jewish creed (see our article JUDAISM, in vol. iv, p. 1057). In consequence of this work—which has now for more than 500 years been deemed so essential a part of the Talmud itself that no edition of the latter is considered complete without it—Maimonides gradually became the great oracle in all matters of religion. He was appealed to (in 1175) by the Jews from different parts of the world for his opinion on difficulties connected with the law, and in 1177 was called to the rabbiship of Raheia.

Though constantly beset by crowds who came to consult him on all questions, philosophical, medical, and religious, yet, by intruding on the night for his profounder studies, he was able, after ten years' further labor (1170–80), to complete (Nov. 7, 1180) another work, of even greater magnitude than the foregoing, which he called *Deuteronomy, Second Law* (משנה תורה), or *Jad Hachezaka = The Mighty Hand* (יד החזקה, in allusion to Deut. xxxiv, 12, and because the work consists of fourteen books, יד=14), which created a new epoch in Judaism. The fourteen books, subdivided into eighty-two Tractates (הלכות), of which the work consists, form a cyclopædia comprising every department of Biblical and Judaistic literature. When it is added that Maimonides has given in every article a lucid abstract of the ancient traditional expositions of those who were regarded as the oracles in their respective departments, the immense importance of this remarkable production to the Biblical student can hardly be overrated. It is written in very clear and easy Hebrew, as Maimonides was anxious that it should be accessible to the Jewish people generally. Within a few years after its appearance the work was copied and circulated most extensively in Arabia, Palestine, Africa, Southern France, and Italy, and throughout the world wherever Jews resided. It soon became the text-book of the Jewish religion, and was regarded as a new Bible or Talmud. A detailed account of its contents is given by Wolf, *Bibliotheca Heb.* i, 840 sq. Most of the young Israelites of his days were spending their best time in acquiring a mediocre knowledge of the sixty books of the Talmud, to the neglect and exclusion of all secular science and philosophy. To obviate this, Maimonides wrote these systematical works, comprising the main contents of the whole Talmud. "If the Talmud," says Grätz (vi, 339), "may be likened to a Dædalic structure, in which one can scarcely find his way even with the aid of an Ariadne thread, Maimonides has transformed it into a well-regulated edifice, with side-wings, halls, apartments, chambers, and closets, in which the stranger, led by the fitting superscriptions and numbers, may make his way without a guide, and gain a view of all the contents of the Talmud. . . . One might almost say that Maimonides created a new Talmud. It is true these are the old elements; we know their origin, their rise, their original connection; but in his hands it looks like another work; the mist is removed; the disfiguring addenda done away with; it appears remoulded, smoother, fresher, and newer. The Mishna, the foundation-structure of the Talmud, opens by propounding the question on the law: 'At what time of the night is the chapter Shema to be read?' and closes with the discussion, when this or that thing becomes levitically unclean. Maimonides, on the other hand, thus opens his Talmudical codex: 'The foundation of foundations, and the pillar of wisdom, is to know that there exists a first Being which called all other beings into existence, and that all things existing in heaven or on earth, and whatever is between them, exist only through the medium of this first Being,' and closes with the words, 'The earth will one day be covered with knowledge as the ocean's ground is by water.' The whole work is permeated by a peculiar savor; it breathes the spirit of complete wisdom, cool reflection, and deep morality. Maimonides, so to speak, has Talmudized philosophy and metaphysicized the Talmud. He has admitted philosophy within the precincts of the religious codex, and there conceded her a citizenship of equality beside the Halacha. Though philosophy had, previous to his day, been cultivated by Jewish thinkers (here comp. Sachs, *Religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, p. 185 sq.), and applied to Judaism from Philo down to Abraham Ibn-David [see CHAYUG], she had always been regarded as something outside of the Jewish camp —as a something which had nothing in common with practical Judaism as exercised daily and hourly. Maimonides, however, introduced her into the very holiest of Judaism, and, so to speak, gave Aristotle a place by the side of the sages of the Talmud." "The master-mind of Maimonides only," says Dr. Wise (*Israelite*, Dec. 1, 1871), "could accomplish such a gigantic task, and codify that immense mass of laws and customs as systematically and linguistically exact as he did. Nobody before or even after him has been able to do it so well and completely as he has done it. He alone has brought the rabbinical law within a compass, to be mastered in a few years, and under a system to find particular laws or customs without roaming over a mass of rabbinical sources, thereby affording students an opportunity to master the rabbinical laws, and to save time for other studies." His fame now became world-wide. Not only, however, as a law-giver in Judah did he advance to the first place among the great and learned; as a physician also he excelled his colleagues, and for his attainments in this field of labor his name was carried to many foreign lands. Richard Cœur de Lion, learning of his medical skill, anxiously sought to secure the services of this noted Jew as his court physician. Maimonides, however, preferred to remain in the land of his adoption, and declined the proffered honor (compare Weil, *Chalifen*, iii, 423 sq.). It was about this time that the vizier of Saladin, the Kadhi al-Fâdhel, who had taken Maimonides under his protection, appointed Moses chief (*Reïs*, נגיד) of all the congregations in Egypt (about 1187).

The numerous and onerous duties now put upon him as the spiritual head of Judaism, and the constant demand for his great medical skill, were, however, alike unable to overcome the powers of his intellect, which he had consecrated to the elucidation of the Bible and the traditional law, and to the harmonizing of revelation with philosophy, and in the midst of all his engagements Maimonides entered upon the preparation of a third religio-philosophical work, which became, of all his productions, the most valued and important. Its object was to reclaim one of his disciples, Ibn-Aknin (q. v.), from the prevailing scepticism about a future world, the destiny of man, sin, retribution, revelation, etc. The design of the work is explained by Maimonides himself in the following terms: "I have composed this work, not for the common people, neither for beginners, nor for those who occupy themselves only with the law as it is handed down without contemplating its principle. The design of my work is rather to promote the true understanding of the real spirit of the law, to guide those religious persons who, adhering to the truth of the Torah, have studied philosophy, and are embarrassed by the contradictions between the teachings of philosophy and the liberal sense of the Torah." The work, consisting of three parts in 204 sections, and entitled in Arabic דלאלת אל חאירין, in Heb. מורה הנבוכים, *Moreh Nebuchim* (*The Guide of the Perplexed*), in allusion to Exod. xiv, 3, and, according to Grätz (vi, 363), "constituting the summit of the Maimonical mind and the justification of his inmost convictions," created a new epoch in the philosophy of the Middle Ages. "Ce livre," says Frank (*Études Orientales*, p. 360), "inspire également le respect par les puissantes facultés de l'auteur, la prodigieuse souplesse de son esprit, la variété de ses connaissances, l'élévation de son spiritualisme enfin par la lumière qu'il répand sur quelques-uns des points les plus obscurs de l'histoire de l'esprit humain." Not only did Mohammedans write commentaries upon it, but the Christian schoolmen learned from it how to harmonize the conflicts between religion and philosophy (compare Joel, *Einfluss d. Jüd. Philos. auf die christl. Scholastik*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift* [Bresl. 1860, p. 210 sq.]; Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 486). The contents of this great and noble work, which has become for Jewish thinkers, as it were, a "touchstone of philosophy," are, in the three parts into which it is divided, as follows: The first part is especially devoted to the explanation of all sensual expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God; this is really but a mere detailed explication of what Maimonides had already laid down in the first book of his aforementioned code, namely, that such expressions must be taken only in a spiritual and figurative sense; this part contains also the rational arguments by which philosophy proves the existence, the unity, and spirituality of God. The second part treats, first, of natural religion and its deficiencies; secondly, of the creation of the world and the different graduations of the world's system; and, thirdly, of revelation, prophecy, and of the excellence and perfectness of the divine law. The third part, after giving an explanation of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, treats of the opposition of good and evil in the world, of God's providence and omniscience, and their relation to the free will of man; a number of chapters of this last part are taken up in explaining the general design of the Mosaic law, and the reason for each separate law.

But while, on the one hand, the *Moreh Nebuchim* contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science—carrying out, as it did, to its last consequences the broad principle that "the Bible must be explained metaphorically by established fundamental truths in accordance with rational conclusions." So bitter, indeed, was the contest which broke out between the subsequent spiritualistic Maimonidian and the "literal Talmudistic" schools, that the fierce invectives were speedily followed by anathemas and counter-anathemas issued by both camps; and, finally, about the middle of the 13th century, the decision was transferred into the hands of the Christian authorities, who commenced by burning Maimonides's books, continued by bringing to the stake all Hebrew books on which they could lay their hands, and followed this decision up by a wholesale slaughter of thousands upon thousands of Jews—men, women, and children—irrespective of their philosophical views. Under these circumstances, the antagonistic parties, chiefly through the influence of David Kimchi and others, came to their senses, and gladly enough withdrew their mutual anathemas; they even went so far as to send a deputation (in 1232) to Maimonides's grave at Saphet "to ask pardon of his ashes" (Lindo, p. 65); and, as time wore on, the name of Moses Maimonides became the pride and glory of the nation. Moses, himself, however, never witnessed the end of the conflict into which he had the mortification to see his nation plunged, caused by his own labors, which had been intended solely for their good. In the midst of the conflict (the opposition begun by Samuel ben-Ali, the gaon of Bagdad, was particularly strong in Southern France and Spain, see Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vol. vii, chap. ii), "the Great Luminary" of the Jewish nation was extinguished Dec. 13, 1204. Both Jews and Mohammedans of Fostat had public mourning for three days. At Jerusalem the Jews proclaimed a day of extraordinary humiliation, reading publicly the threatenings of the law (Deut. xxviii) and the history of the capture of the ark by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv, etc.), for they regarded Maimonides as the ark containing the law. His remains, in accordance with a personal request before his decease, were conveyed to Tiberias; and the reverence which the Jewish nation still cherish for his memory is expressed by the well-known saying, ממשה ועד משה לא קם כמשה, "From Moses, the lawgiver, to Moses (Maimonides), no one hath arisen like Moses," in allusion to Deut. xxxiv, 10. "No man since Ezra had exercised so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as Moses Maimonides. His theologico-philosophical works gained an authority among the progressive thinkers equal to his Mishna-Torah among rabbinical students. All Jewish thinkers up to date — Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included—are more or less the disciples of Maimonides; so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after A.D. 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides form not a prominent part" (Dr. Wise).

Maimonides as a Jewish Theologian and Philosopher.—His importance for the religion and science of Judaism, and his influence upon their development, is so great that he truly deserves to be placed second only to Moses, the great lawgiver, himself. Maimonides first of all brought order into those almost boundless receptacles of tradition, and the discussions and decisions to which they had given rise, which, without the remotest attempt at system or method, lie scattered up and down the works of Haggada and Halacha—Midrash, Mishna, Talmuds. Imbued with the spirit of lucid Greek speculation, and the precision of logical thought of the Arabic Peripatetics, aided by an enormous knowledge, he became the founder of rational scriptural exegesis. The Bible, and all its written as well as implied precepts, he endeavored to explain by the light of reason, with which, as the highest divine gift in man, nothing really divine could, according to his theory, stand in real contradiction. The fundamental idea in his works is that the law was given to the Jews, not merely to train them to obedience, but also as a revelation of the highest truths, and that, therefore, fidelity to the law in action is by no means sufficient, but that the knowledge of the truth is also a religious duty. By this teaching he offered a powerful incitement to speculation in religious philosophy, yet he also contributed by his enunciation of definite articles of faith to a nar-

row determination of Jewish dogmas, although his own investigations bear throughout a rationalizing character. Maimonides is no friend to astrological mysticisms. We are only to believe that which is either attested by the senses, or strictly demonstrated by the understanding, or transmitted to us by prophets and godly men. In the province of *Science* he regards Aristotle as the most trustworthy leader, and only differs from him when the dogma requires it, as, especially, in the doctrine of the creation and providential guidance of the world. Maimonides holds firmly to the belief (without which, in his opinion, the doctrines of inspiration and of miracles, as suspensions of natural laws, could not be maintained) that God called into existence out of nothing not only the form but also the matter of the world, the philosophical proofs to the contrary not appearing to him conclusive. If these proofs possessed mathematical certainty, it would be necessary to interpret those passages in the Bible which appear to oppose them allegorically, which is now not admissible. Accordingly Maimonides condemns the hypothesis of the eternity of the world in the Aristotelian sense, or the doctrine that matter is eternal *ab initio*, and has always been the substratum of an order or form arising from the tendency of all things to become like the eternal and divine Spirit; "the Bible," he says, "teaches the temporal origin of the world." Less discordant with the teachings of the Bible, according to Maimonides, is the Platonic theory, which he interprets with the exactest strictness according to the literal sense of the dialogue *Timæus*. He understands the theory as assuming that matter is eternal, but that the divinely-caused order, by the addition of which to matter the world was formed, had a beginning in time. Yet he does not himself accept this theory, but adheres to the belief that matter was created by God. In *Ethics*, Maimonides, holding reason in man —if properly developed and tutored by divine revelation—to be the great touchstone for the right or wrong of individual deeds, fully allows the freedom of will, and, while he urges the necessity, nay, the merit of listening, to a certain degree, to the promptings of nature, rigorously condemns a life of idle asceticism, and dreamy, albeit pious contemplation. No less is it, according to him, right and praiseworthy to pay the utmost attention to the healthy and vigorous development of the body, and the care of its preservation by the closest application to hygienic rules. Providence, he argues, reigns in a certain—broad—manner over humanity, and holds the sway over the destinies of nations; but he utterly denies its working in the single event that may befall the individual, who, subject above all to the great physical laws, must learn to understand and obey them, and to shape his mode of life and action in accordance with existing conditions and circumstances —the study of natural science and medicine being therefore a thing almost of necessity to everybody. The soul, and the soul only, is immortal, and the reward of virtue consists in its—strictly unbodily—bliss in a world to come; while the punishment of vice is the "loss of the soul." "Do not," says Maimonides, "allow thyself to be persuaded by fools that God predetermines who shall be righteous and who wicked. He who sins has only himself to blame for it, and he can do nothing better than speedily to change his course. God's omnipotence has bestowed freedom on man, and his omniscience foreknows man's choice without guiding it. We should not choose the good, like children and ignorant people, from motives of reward or punishment, but we should do good for its own sake, and from love to God; still retribution does await the immortal soul in the future world." The *resurrection of the body* is treated by Maimonides as being simply an article of faith, which is not to be opposed, but which cannot be explained.

Exception continues to be taken to Maimonides's theologico-philosophical views even in our day, by many who recognise his ability and the importance of his labors. The great Italian Jewish theologian, the late David Luzatto (q. v.), is quite decided in his opposition. Maimonides, he holds, brought trouble with all his philosophy. What the Talmud left indefinite, he fastened by irons. His creed is an invention, of which the ancients had no idea. With more of a Mohammedan than a Jewish and Talmudic despotism, he constructed a codex, in order that all articles of faith and practices of the least consequence should be regulated and decided upon by its decisions (see *Israelitische Annalen*, 1839, p. 6, 405). No less decided is Isaac Reggio (q. v.), who approves of Luzatto's critique, and demands the removal of the yoke which Maimonides put upon the Israelites, and which robs of all freedom in thinking (*ibid*, p. 22). As unjust as these criticisms must appear to a careful and unprejudiced student of Maimonides, they are not the most weighty charges brought against him. There are some who even charge him with extreme Rationalism. Says Da Costa (p. 273, 274), "The system of Maimonides, by its arbitrary explanations and inventions, attacked the authority, not of tradition only, but also of Holy Scripture. . . . Learned Jews have not hesitated to suspect Maimonides of a design to weaken the basis of the two fundamental doctrines of the Jewish religion—the resurrection of the dead, and the expectation of a Messiah." Not only is this statement refuted by the fact that Maimonides inserted these dogmas in the thirteen articles of his *Creed* [see JUDAISM], but when, in his later productions, he has occasion to treat of them, he does so with great consideration of his relation to the synagogue, as we have seen above.

Editions and Translations of the principal Works of Maimonides.—(1) His כתאב אלסראג was translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic by a number of contemporary literati, and is now printed with the text of the Mishna (ed. Naples, 1492; Venice, 1546; Sabionetta, 1559; Mantua, 1561–62, etc.), and the Talmud (ed. Soncino, 1484; Vienna, 1520–30, 1540–50; Basle, 1578–80; Cracow, 1603–1606; Lublin, 1617–28; Amsterdam, 1644 –47, etc.). Milman incorrectly states that this "great work on the Mishna, the *Porta Mosis*, was translated by Pococke" (*History of the Jews* [3d edit. Lond. 1863], iii, 150). This celebrated Orientalist only translated portions of it, chiefly consisting of the introductions to the different Tractates (*Theological Works* [ed. Twells, London, 1740], vol. i). The Arabic original of these portions is given for the first time with this translation. Surenhusius has given an abridged version of the whole commentary in his edition of the Mishna (Amsterdam, 1678). There are also extant Spanish versions of the whole, and German translations of various parts of this work. (2) The *Sefer Hammizwoth*, or Book of the Precepts, in Arabic (translated into Hebrew by Abr. Ibn-Chasdai, and, from the author's second edition, by Moses Ibn-Tibbon), which contains an enumeration of the 613 traditional laws of the Halacha, together with fourteen canons on the principle of numbering them, chiefly directed against the authors of certain liturgical pieces called *Asharoth* (Warnings); besides thirteen articles of belief, and a psychological fragment. This book is to be considered chiefly as an introduction to the *Mishna Torah*. (3) *The Mishna Torah* or *Jad Hachazaka*.—The first edition of the text appeared in Italy, in the printing-office of Solomon b.-Jehuda and Obadja b.-Moses, about 1480, two vols. folio; then in Soncino, 1499; the text, with different commentaries, Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1524, 1550–51, 1574–75; with an alphabetical index and many plates, 4 vols. folio, Amsterdam, 1702. It is to this edition that the references in this Cyclopædia are made. Translations of portions of this work in Latin have been published, and also two in English; one by H. H. Bernard, *Main Principles of the Creed and Ethics of the Jews exhibited in Selections from the Yad-Hachazakah of Maimonides* (Cambr. 1832, 8vo). (4) *The Moreh Nebuchim*, or *The Guide of the Perplexed*, was, till lately, read in the Hebrew translation of Ibn-Tibbon, first published about 1480; then in Venice, 1551; Sabionetta, 1553; Berlin, 1791–96; Sulzbach, 1828, etc.

It was translated into Latin by Justinian, bishop of Nebio, *R. Mossei Ægyptii Dux sive Director dubitantium* (Paris, 1520); then again by Buxtorf jun., *Doctor Perplexorum* (Basle, 1629). The first part was translated into German by Fürstenthal (Krotoschin, 1839); the second by M. E. Stein (Vienna, 1864); and the third by Scheyer (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1838). Part iii, 26–49, has been translated into English by Dr. Townley, *The Reasons of the Laws of Moses* (Lond. 1827). The original Arabic, with a French translation and elaborate notes, was published by Munk (Paris, 1856–66, 3 vols. 8vo). Commentaries on *Moreh Nebuchim*, or parts of it, have been written, in particular, by Ibn-Falaguera (1280; Pressburg, 1837); Ibn-Caspi (about 1300; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1848); Moses b.-Josua of Norbonne (1355–62; edited by Goldenthal, Vienna, 1852); and Is. Abrabanel (15th century; edited by Landau, Leips. 1863). Of his smaller works, we may enumerate, in conclusion, a translation of Avicenna's *Canon;* an extract from Galen; several medical, mathematical, logical, and other treatises, spoken of with the highest praise by Arabic writers; legal decisions, theological disquisitions, etc., for which see Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, s. v.

Literature.—Besides the authorities already quoted, see O. Celsius, *De Maimonide* (1727); *Revue Orientale* (Brux. 1841); Beer, *Leben und Wirken des Maimonides* (Prag. 1844); Lebrecht, in *Magazin f. d. Liter. d. Auslandes*, 1844, No. 45, p. 62 sq.; Scheyer, *Psychol. Syst. des Maimonides* (Frankfort, 1845); Stein, *M. Maimonides* (1846); R. M. Maimonides, *Life*, etc., *of M. Maimonides* (Lond. 1837); Edelmann, *Cheruda Gewusa;* Joël, *Religions-philosophie d. Maimonides*, in the Programme of the Jewish theol. sem. at Breslau (1859); Jarac-Zewsky, in *Zeitschr. f. Philos. u. philos. Kritik*, new ser. xlvi (Halle, 1865), p. 5 sq.; Franck, *Dict. des Sciences Philosoph.* iv, 31 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Jud.* vi, ch. x and xi; vii, ch. i and ii; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, ii, 428 sq.; ibid. in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.* (translated by Prof. Morris), i, 97; Dr. Milziener, in the *Jewish Times* (N. Y. 1872), p. 765 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Main-sail is the rendering in the Auth. Version of the nautical term ἀρτέμων (from ἀρτάω, to *suspend* or "hoist"), which occurs only in this sense in Acts xxvii, 40. It is explained by some critics, *the largest sail of the poop*, answering to our "mizzen-sail," and even yet called by the Venetians *artimone*. Some regard it as the "top-sail," Lat. *supparum*. Others understand by it a small sail or "jib" near the prow, called by the Romans the *dolon*. The term may thus be understood to signify properly the *fore-sail*, which, in the opinion of those qualified to judge, would be most useful in bringing a ship to head to the wind under the circumstances narrated by Luke (see Hackett's *Comment.* ad loc.). The vessels of that time had one, two, or three masts; the largest was in the stern (Smith's *Dict. of Ant.* s. v. Malus). Hence, if Paul's ship had but one, the sail in question would have been that now called the *jib*, being fastened to a "boom" or spar projecting from the bowsprit; but if, as is more probable from its size, it had at least two masts, this sail would be the one attached to the front mast, that is, the "fore-sail." "A sailor will at once see that the fore-sail was the best possible *sail* that could be set under the circumstances" (Smith, *Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 3d edit. p. 139, note). See SHIP.

Maine de Biran, MARIE FRANÇOIS PIERRE GOUTHIER, one of the most eminent French philosophers of our age, "the modern Malebranche," as he has been aptly termed, was born near Bergerac Nov. 29, 1766. Upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered the army, and was engaged in the stormy days of the first French Revolution. Later he devoted himself to politics, and in 1795 became a member of the department of Dordogne, from which, in 1797, he was deputed to the Council of the Five Hundred. From 1809 to 1814 he was a member of the legislative body; after the Restoration of 1816 he became a moderate royalist, and represented the people as such. All this time he was deeply engaged also in philosophical studies. In 1800 the National Institute offered a prize for the best essay "On the Influence of Habit upon the Faculty of Thinking;" he wrote for it, and secured the prize. In 1803 he bore off another prize for an essay "On the Decomposition of the Faculty of Thinking;" and in 1807 he was awarded a third prize, this time from the Berlin Academy of Science, for a memoir on the question "Whether there is in man an inordinate internal intuition, and in what it differs from the perception of the senses." Further honors he gained shortly after from Copenhagen, for an exposition of "The Mutual Relation of Man's Moral and Physical Constitution." In these different contributions to philosophical literature, Maine de Biran had gradually brought a new philosophy to maturity. To give his system to the public in a more completed form, he published a short work entitled *L'Examen de la Philosophie de Laromiguière;* and finally crowned his philosophical labors by his magnificent article on *Leibnitz*, in the *Biographie Universelle;* and died, "too soon for the interest of philosophy," in 1824, leaving behind, however, many traces of extraordinary philosophical genius, not only in France, but in various parts of Europe besides.

His Philosophy.—The principal point in M. Maine de Biran's philosophy was the distinguishing of the *will*, as a faculty, from the emotions. He argues that "the soul is a *cause*, a force, an active principle," and that "the phenomena of consciousness can never be explained until we clearly apprehend the *voluntary* nature of its thoughts and impulses." "In order," says Morell, "to unfold the fact and expound the nature of man's natural activity (the hinge upon which the entire system turns), M. Maine de Biran analyzes the whole of what is contained or implied in a given action; for example, a movement of the arm. When I move my arm there are three things to be observed: 1. The consciousness of a voluntary effort; 2. The consciousness of a movement produced; and, 3. A fixed relation between the effort, on the one hand, and the movement, on the other. Now, the source or cause of the whole movement is the *will*, and this term *will* we now use as virtually synonymous with self. Whether we say, I moved my arm, or my will moved it, the sentiment is exactly identical. Hence the notions of *cause*, of *will*, of *self*, we find to be fundamentally the same; and several truths are by this means brought to light of great importance in metaphysical science (Preface to the *Nouvelles Considerations* [a posthumous work of Maine de Biran], p. 10). First, it becomes evident that we possess a natural activity, the seat of which is in the will, so that whether we regard man as a thinking or an acting being, yet it is the will which alike presides over and regulates the flow of our thoughts or the course of our actions. Secondly, we infer that the will is the foundation of personality; that my will is virtually myself. And, thirdly, we infer that to will is to *cause*, and that from the inward consciousness of volition, viewed in connection with the effect produced, we gain our first notion of causality. These three points, as Cousin has shown us, embrace in a small compass the whole philosophy of Maine de Biran. He first seizes, with admirable sagacity, the principle of all human activity as resident in the power of the will, exemplifying it even in the case of those muscular movements which may appear to the unreflecting to be simply the result of nervous excitement. Having established the principle of activity, as residing in the will, he proceeds to identify the will with our very personality itself, showing that the soul is in its nature a force, the very essence of which is not to be acted upon, but to act. Finally, he proves that we gain our first notion of causality from the consciousness of our own personal effort, and that having once observed the conjunction of power exerted and effect produced in this particular case, we transfer the notion of cause thus originated into the objective world, and conclude by analogy the ne-

cessity of a sufficient power existing for every given effect" (*Hist. of Mod. Phil.* p. 639, 640; compare the mémoire *De la Décomposition de la Pensée;* preferable even, *Nouvelles Considérations*, part i, sec. 1, and part ii, sec. 1 and 3; also the *Examen des Leçons de Philosophie*, sec. 8 and 9). "In the whole of the process by which our author had gradually advanced from the ideology of Cabanis to the absolute dynamical spiritualism of Leibnitz, he had relied simply upon his own power of reflection. Disciple of none, he had philosophized simply within the region of his own consciousness; so that whatever merit some may deny him, there are none, assuredly, who can reject the claim to that of complete originality" (Morell, p. 638–9). "Of all the masters of France," says Cousin, "Maine de Biran, if not the greatest, is unquestionably the most original. M. Laromiguière only continued the philosophy of Condillac, modifying it in a few important points. M. Royer-Collard came from the Scottish philosophy, which, with the vigor and natural power of his reason, he would have infallibly surpassed, had he completely followed out the labors which form only the least solid part of his glory. As for *myself*, I come at the same time from the Scottish and German school. M. Maine de Biran alone comes from himself, and from his own meditations" (Preface to the *Fragmens Philosophiques*). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Ernest Naville, *Maine de Biran, sa vie et ses Pensées* (1857); Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au dix-neuvième Siècle; Brit. Qu. Rev.* 1866 (Oct.); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v.; *The Academy* (Lond.), Sept. 15, 1872. (J. H. W.)

Maintenon, *Madame de*, a very noted character in the history of France, both in secular and ecclesiastic affairs, was born of a noble Protestant family in the prison at Niort, France, Nov. 27, 1635; came with her parents to this country, but returned to France in 1646; married the poet Scarron in 1651, and after his death (1660) was about to remove to Portugal, when she was secured by Madame Montespan, the favorite of Louis XIV, as governess of the duke of Maine, the illegitimate son of the king. The large estate of Maintenon was presented to her, until now *Françoise D'Aubigné*, and hereafter she assumed the name of the estate. Later she became a formidable rival of Madame Montespan. It was by the influence of Madame de Maintenon that Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, and that he established the educational institution in the abbey of St. Cyr. In the last-named place she spent her days after the death of the king. She died April 15, 1719. It is difficult to describe Madame de Maintenon's relation to Louis XIV. She was married to him some eighteen months after the death of the queen. She is never believed to have been the king's *mistress*, in the ordinary sense of the term, but her association with him was surely of a very intimate character long before they were joined in wedlock. She certainly exercised an uncommon influence over him. She had a passion to be regarded as "a mother of the Church;" but while she confessed the strength of her desire to Romanize the Huguenots, she earnestly denied that she approved of the detestable *dragonnades*. Her pretended Memoirs are spurious, but her *Letters* (Amst. 1759, 9 vols.; best edit. by Lavallec, Paris, 1865 sq.) are genuine. See Noailles, *Histoire de Mad. de Maintenon* (1858–59, 4 vols. 8vo); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, iv; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1850 (Feb.); *Fraser's Magazine*, 1849 (March). See Louis XIV.

Mair, Hugh, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Mylus, Ayrshire, Scotland, July 16, 1797; graduated at the college in Glasgow in 1817; studied theology in Edinburgh; was licensed in 1822; was employed for some time as a missionary in the Orkneys, and other parts of Scotland; came to America in 1828, and was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Fort Miller and Northumberland, N. Y.; in 1830 became pastor of the Church at Johnstown; resigned in 1843, and went to Brockport, where he officiated, as a stated supply, for several months; subsequently supplied at Warsaw for a year, and in 1847 went to Upper Canada, and became pastor at Fergus, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and there continued till the close of life, Nov. 1, 1854. Mair published *Four Miscellaneous Sermons*. A *Memoir*, with a selection from his MS. sermons, was published in 1856 by A. Dingwall Fordyce.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 744.

Mairs, George, an Irish minister, was born at Drumbeg, Monaghan County, Ireland, in 1761; received his classical education at the University of Glasgow; next studied theology; was licensed to preach by an associate presbytery in Ireland, and, after laboring as a probationer for eighteen months, was ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of Cootehill, Cavan Co. Interested in the work of evangelizing in America, he left Ireland in May, 1793, and arrived in New York in August of the same year. Soon after his arrival he was installed pastor of the churches in the towns of Hebron and Argyle; six years after he confined his labors to the Church in Argyle alone, and held this position until old age interrupted his active labors. He died in 1841. —Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. ix.

Maistre de Sacy. See Sacy.

Maistre, Joseph (*count*) **de,** an eminent French Roman Catholic writer, the greatest advocate of Ultramontanism in the 19th century, was born at Chambéry April 1, 1753. His father was president of the senate of Savoy, and he became himself a member of that body in 1787. When the French armies invaded Savoy in 1792 he retired to Piedmont, where he wrote his *Considérations sur la France* (1796, 8vo; three editions in one year). Charles Emanuel IV called De Maistre to Turin, where he remained until the downfall of that prince, Nov. 19, 1798; he then retired to Venice, and lived there one year in great poverty. In 1799 he was created grand chancellor of Sardinia, and in September, 1802, was sent by that country as ambassador to Russia. While there he published (in 1810) his *Essai sur le principe régénérateur des constitutions politiques*, a full exposition of his political views, advocating the principle of divine right, and declaring the rights of the people derived from the sovereign—withal a sort of theocratic form of government more adapted to the Middle Ages than to the 19th century. "M. de Maistre," in this work, "represents men as connected with God by a chain which binds them to his throne, and holds them without enslaving them. To the full extent of this chain we are at liberty to move; we are slaves indeed, but we are freely slaves (*librement esclaves*); we must necessarily work out the purposes of the Supreme Being, and yet the actions by which we work out these purposes are always free. So far so good; but here come the peculiarities of our author's system. He does not consider men as individually responsible before God; he takes them as nations, and the nation, for M. de Maistre, is made up of the king and the aristocracy. Even considering each order separately, he asserts that all the members of the same order are indissolubly bound together, each bearing a share of the mutual and joint responsibility which weighs on the whole order. Now let us suppose the case of a revolution. In those terrible events which follow the disregard of all the laws of right and wrong, although the persons who fall victims to the fury of the multitude may sometimes be those whose very crimes have called down the divine vengeance, yet very often, nay, in most cases, the individually innocent suffer most. But, then, although individually innocent, they must come in for the share of the solidarity which belongs to the whole order. This results from the fact that the doctrine of atonement is the principle on which rests the constitution of society; the sins of the guilty are visited on the innocent, and the blood of the innocent, in its turn, atones for the guilty. Here is to be found

the key-stone of count De Maistre's theory; the Savoyard publicist develops it with all the resources of logic and erudition." It has been well remarked that a system such as this is fatalism of the very worst description. Not only does it take away the free agency of men considered as individuals, but it effectually proclaims the validity of the maxim that *might is right*. "Wishing to transform all *earthly* governments into one homogeneous *theocracy*, he proposed, as a control over absolutism, an absolutism of a much more dangerous character. M. de Maistre's leading idea is a good one: he wishes to appeal from the passions and depraved will of man to the Deity itself as to the eternal source of right and good; but not being, of course, able to receive immediately from God the counsel and the laws he wishes to reduce into practice for the good of society, he traces them to the pope, as the vicegerent of Heaven!—an error common to all reactionary movements—from the fear of allowing anything like vagueness to exist in the minds of men respecting their connection with the Almighty. He is not satisfied with anything short of what is really tangible, visible, perceptible to the senses, thus forgetting the character of the true Mediator. Failing to understand that both divinity and humanity have met together only in the man Christ Jesus, he would fain make us believe that the pope is 'God made manifest in the flesh.'" With such views, he could not but condemn severely the charter of 1814, which introduced new institutions into France, and he turned his face towards Russia with a view of making it his home. By a ukase of December, 1815, Russia expelled the Jesuits. To them De Maistre and his family were much attached, and being on this account himself suspected of proselytism, he quitted the country and returned to Savoy in 1817, and became minister of state. He died Feb. 26, 1821.

Among the principal works of De Maistre, our special consideration is claimed also by his *Du Pape* (Lyons, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; second and improved edition, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he treats of the papacy, 1, in its relation to the Romish Church; 2, to the temporal powers; 3, to civilization; and, 4, to the dissenting churches. It is a daring apology of the spiritual and temporal power of the pope. He starts from the principle that modern nations need a guarantee against the abuses of sovereign power. Such guarantee, he claims, is not to be found either in written charters, which are always useless, nor in assemblies, which are powerless when they are not anarchic. He can find it only in a sovereignty superior to all others, at once independent and disinterested, and interfering to promote the cause of justice, which has been intrusted to it by God himself. The Savoyard publicist's *beau ideal* of government is the constitution of the Middle Ages. He describes it in exulting language, and crowds his margins with quotations from Bellarmine, Baronius, and the Tridentine fathers, never suspecting that, after all, he has only been painting a *tableau de fantaisie*, a piece of historical inaccuracy which will match the dreamy theories of Boulainvilliers and Dubos. We are invited, seriously, to return to those happy times when royalty, while it retained its full volition, and was endowed with an independent patrimony, was restrained in the exercise of legislative power by the clergy, the nobility, and the commons, each resting on its own foundation, and acting within its allotted sphere, while above was the papacy, which, by its sublime umpirage, maintained, in cases of collision, the harmonious co-operation of the members of all the body politic. We are told to admire the noble, temperate monarchy which had grown up under the shelter of the Christian Church, and which, though never brought to perfection (this is, at least, a candid acknowledgment), had yet secured to the mediæval nations so long a career of happiness and freedom, prosperity and glory. It would be a task both useless and unprofitable to point out all the misstatements which occur in the description just given. The futility of his scheme was demonstrated by the conduct of De Maistre himself. In 1804 pope Pius VII crowned Napoleon emperor. This, according to the theory of the work *Du Pape*, was one of those judgments by which the papal infallibility settled political difficulties. Yet De Maistre speaks of this decision in the following disrespectful terms: "The pope's journey and the coronation are for the present the great subject of conversation. . . . All in the French Revolution is wonderfully bad, but this is the *ne plus ultra*. The crimes of an Alexander VI are less frightful than this hideous apostasy of his weak-minded successor. . . . I wish with all my heart that the unfortunate pontiff would go to St. Domingo to crown Dessalines. When once a man of his rank and character so far forgets both, all that is to be hoped for is that he may completely degrade himself until he becomes but an insignificant puppet" (*Corresp. diplom.* p. 138, 139). It was thus the great ultramontane writer respected papal infallibility when not in accordance with his own views or his passions. *De l'Église Gallicane dans ses rapports avec le souverain pontife* (Paris, 1821, 8vo; Lyons, 1822) is a sort of continuation of the preceding work. It attacks the privileges of semi-independence claimed by the Church of France. This book, in which Bossuet and Fleury are somewhat roughly handled, was not well received at first by the French clergy. Abbé Baston published an answer to it under the title *Réclamations pour l'Église de France, et pour la vérité, contre M. de Maistre* (1821, 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); still, in the course of time, it was greatly instrumental in causing the triumph of the ultramontane doctrine. *Les soirées de St. Pétersbourg, ou Entretiens*, etc. (Paris, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), "the best known and certainly the most readable work of the author," treats of retribution, both here and hereafter. We cannot give here the details of De Maistre's theory, but its most important features may be summed up thus: the thorough badness of human nature, the necessity of atonement, the reversion of the merits of the innocent paying for the guilty, and salvation through blood. These views, in which excellent Christians have found a daring perversion of the most holy Christian principles, led De Maistre to justify the Inquisition. His apology, entitled *Lettres à un gentilhomme Russe sur l'Inquisition Espagnole* (Paris, 1822, 8vo), is, however, but a very lame defence of that atrocious institution. His violent attack against Bacon, *Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon* (Paris, 1836, 2 vols. 8vo) is not much better. His works are very original, but more in the form than in the ideas. Carrying often a true principle to its fullest extent, he arrives at a paradox which he then proclaims as evident. "As a pamphlet writer," says Dr. M'Clintock (in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1856, p. 218), "De Maistre may be compared, in some respects, to Paul Louis Courier; he had the same point, the same *finesse*, the same elegance of style, and an apparent simplicity, which only set off with greater effect the home-truths he addressed to his readers; but finished as these minor works decidedly were, true both as to sentiment and language, they were merely suggested by the events of the times, and, as such, were likely to lose most of their point as the course of things moved in a new direction. The *Considérations*, on the contrary, will ever retain their interest, for they discuss principles; they belong to the philosophy of history. Whatever view we may take of the conclusions adopted by De Maistre, we cannot but admire both the extent of his learning and the depth of his thoughts; the work fully deserves to be placed by the student on the same shelf as Bossuet's *Discourse on Universal History*."

Here we would notice also one or two peculiarities in the method of count De Maistre, which mark out his originality amid all the writers of his age. The first is that continual reference to God and to the providential superintendence of man's life here below, of which we have before spoken. From this point of view he is admirably placed to discuss the most serious questions, and he does so with a power and an eloquence to which

everything must yield (compare Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, i, 200). Another remarkable point is the soundness of his judgment and the sagacity with which he assigns, both to events and to men, their proper influence over the whole course of contemporary history. Many views, many principles now generally admitted, may be traced back to the *Considérations*, and have been borrowed from that extraordinary book, often without any acknowledgment. See Raymond, *Éloge du comte Jos. de Maistre* (Chambéry, 1827, 8vo); Rodolphe de Maistre, *Notice biog. sur le comte Joseph de Maistre* (in the preface to J. de M.'s *Correspondance et Opuscules* (Par. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo; 1853, 2 vols. 12mo); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, vol. iv, and his *Portraits Contemporains*, vol. ii; Villeneuve-Arifat, *Éloge du comte Jos. de Maistre* (1853); Damiron, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au 19e siècle;* Taine, *Les Philosophes Français du xixe siècle; Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1852; Albert Blanc, *Introduction à la Correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre;* Migne, *Nouv. Encyclopédie Théologique*, ii, 1326; *Edinb. Review*, April, 1849; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1857, art. vii; and especially the article by Dr. M'Clintock in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1856, art. iii. (J. H. W.)

Maitland, Samuel Roffey, D.D., an English divine of some note, was born in London in 1792; was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; entered the law profession in 1816, but shortly after turned towards the ministry; was ordained deacon and priest in 1821; perpetual curate of Christ Church, Gloucester, in 1823–29; keeper of the Lambeth MSS., and librarian to the archbishop of Canterbury, in 1837. He died at Lambeth Palace, London, Jan. 19, 1866. His principal theological publications are as follows: *An Inquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of* 1260 *Years* (Lond. 1826, 8vo): —*A Second Inquiry*, etc. (1829, 8vo):—*An Attempt to elucidate the Prophecies concerning Antichrist* (1830, 8vo): —*Tracts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses and Waldenses* (1832, 8vo):—*The Dark Ages; a series of Essays intended to illustrate the state of Religion and Literature in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries* (reprinted from the *British Magazine*, with corrections and some additions, 1844, 8vo; 2d edit. 1845, 8vo):—*Essays on the Subjects connected with the Reformation in England* (reprinted, with additions, from the *British Magazine*, 1849, 8vo; see *London Athenæum*, 1849, p. 834, 835):—*Illustrations and Inquiries relating to Mesmerism*, parts i–vi (1849, 8vo):—*Erwin, or Miscellaneous Essays on Subjects connected with the Nature, History, and Destiny of Man* (2d edit. 1850, sm. 8vo):—*An Essay on the Mystical Interpretation of Scripture:—Strictures on Milner's Church History* (London, 1834, 8vo):—*Review of Fox's History of the Waldenses.*—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biography and Mythology*, s. v.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Maitland, William, a noted Scotch politician of the Reformation period, better known as "Secretary Lethington," was born about 1525, and was educated both at St. Andrews and on the Continent. He had great influence as a political leader, and though he became a convert to the Reformed doctrines about 1555, he was in 1558 appointed secretary of state by Mary of Guise. In the following year, however, he openly joined the lords of the Congregation, and was one of the Scotch commissioners who met the duke of Norfolk at Berwick, to arrange the conditions on which queen Elizabeth would give them assistance. In 1561, after the arrival of queen Mary from France, he was made an extraordinary lord of Session. He strongly objected to the ratification of Knox's *Book of Discipline*, and in 1563 conducted the prosecution raised against Knox for treason. From this time he appears to have lost his influence with the reformers. In 1564 he held a long debate with Knox on the claims of the Reformed Church to be independent of the state. In 1566 he took part in the conspiracy against Rizzio, after whose assassination he was proscribed, and obliged to seek shelter for some months in obscurity. After queen Mary's imprisonment (1567) in England he played a most unenviable part, pretending to Elizabeth to be one of her admirers, but really seeking all the while to protect the cause of Mary, and it is evident that he really never deserted her, although he was present at the coronation of king James VI, and although he fought on the side of her opponents on the field of Langside. He took part in 1568 in the conference held at York, and there displayed such unmistakable sympathy for Mary that the Scottish lords marked him as a dangerous enemy to the commonwealth, and in 1569 he was arrested at Stirling, but was liberated shortly after by an artifice of Kirkaldy of Grange. In 1570 he openly declared for Mary, and became the soul of the queen's party, in consequence of which he was declared a rebel, deprived of his offices and lands by the regent Morton, and besieged, along with Kirkaldy, in Edinburgh Castle. After a long resistance, the castle surrendered, and he was imprisoned in Leith, where he died (in 1573), "some," says Melville, "supposing he took a drink and died, as the auld Romans were wont to do." Buchanan has drawn his character with a severe pen in his Scottish tract entitled *The Chameleon*. Froude (x, 474) believes that Maitland died a natural death. Burton (*Hist. of Maitland*, iv, 55–57) says of Maitland that "his name was a byword for subtlety and statecraft. Yet . . . if we look at his life and doings, we do not find he was one of those who have left the mark of their influence upon their age. . . . He had great abilities, but they were rather those of the wit and rhetorician than of the practical man." In the estimation of Knox, Maitland had greatly lowered himself by his unkindness and vacillation, and the great reformer, in his dying hours even, was called upon to pronounce against the wary Scotch politician: "I have na warrant that ever he shall be well," alluding to Maitland's state in the hereafter. See Froude, *Hist. of England*, vol. x, ch. xix and xxiii; Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland* (see Index).

Maitreya, a Buddhistic divinity, according to the Buddhists was a disciple of the Buddha Sâkyamuni, and a Bodhisattwa, or a man of pre-eminent virtue and sanctity. He is classed among the gods called Tushitas, or "the happy," and has generally the epithet *Ajita*, or *unconquered*. The Buddhists believe that he will become incarnate, and succeed Gotama (q. v.) as their future Buddha. In Tibetan he is called *Jampa*. A faithful representation of this Buddha, surrounded by the (Tibetan) goddesses Dolma, the Mantas or Buddhas of medicine, two ancient priests, and various saints, will be found in the atlas of Emil Schlagintweit's *Buddhism in Tibet* (London and Leipzig, 1863), where an interesting sketch is given (p. 207 sq.) of the characteristic types of Buddha images, and of the measurements of Buddha statues made by his brothers in India and Tibet. See also Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism* (Index, s. v. Maitri).

Majolists. See Somasker.

Majolus. See Clugny.

Major, Georg, a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg, April 25, 1502. He studied theology under Luther and Melancthon, and was successively rector at Magdeburg (1529), superintendent at Eisleben (1536), and professor of theology and court-preacher at Wittenberg (1539). In 1544 he was made doctor of divinity, and two years later he was one of the representatives (with Bucer and Brenz) of the Protestants at the colloquy at Regensburg. On the breaking out of the Smalcald war, Major left Wittenberg, and received (1547) the appointment of superintendent and court-preacher at Merseburg; but on the close of the war, next year, he returned to Wittenberg. After rejecting the offer of prominent positions, made by the king of Denmark and the duke of Holstein, he became, in 1552, superintendent of the Mansfeld churches. In the mean time he

had been active in supporting the Leipzic Interim, which asserted that good works are necessary to salvation, and had thus excited the suspicion of the strict Lutherans, who denied that proposition. Towards the close of 1551 Amsdorf assailed Major on these grounds, and the clergy of the district soon joined him in opposing the new superintendent, as having corrupted the doctrine of justification by faith. Major replied to the charge of Amsdorf in 1552, denying its truth, and asserting his acceptance of the doctrine of the Church; but, as he still insisted on the necessity of good works, the controversy continued to rage, and, as the count of Mansfeld held with the orthodox party, Major finally removed to Wittenberg. He then sought to give an unobjectionable form to his views by teaching that while faith alone is essential to salvation, good works are necessary as a consequent on saving faith. But, despite every effort at reconciliation, his opponents persisted, and even went to the length of asserting that good works are *detrimental* to salvation. The doctrines advocated by Major were finally branded as heretical in the *Corpus doctrinæ Prutenicum*, and were rejected by the compilers of the *Formula Concordiæ*. Towards the close of his life he became involved in the *Crypto-calvinistic controversy* (q. v.), and, together with the Wittenberg and Leipzic theologians, was compelled to subscribe to the *Torgau articles* (q. v.). He died at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1574, before the Majoristic controversy was concluded. A portion of his works, comprising homilies and commentaries on the Gospels and on the Pauline epistles was published at Wittenberg in 1569, in three folio volumes. See Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation*, iv, 547 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. des Prot. Lehrbegriffs*, iv, 468 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. iv, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s. v.; Krauth, *Conservative Ref.* p. 147 et passim; Kurtz, *Manual Ch. Hist.* ii, 135; Smith's Gieseler, *Eccles. History*, vol. iv, § 37; Thomasius, *Confess. der Evang. Luth. Kirche* (Nuremb. 1848), p. 100 sq. (G. M.)

Major, Johann, a humanistic poet at Wittenberg during the latter half of the 16th century, deserves a place here as the greatest satirist among the *Philippists*, as the followers of Melancthon were called. He was born in 1533 at Joachimsthal, where Johann Mathesius (q. v.) became his tutor and friend. At the age of sixteen he went to Wittenberg, and formed a most intimate connection with Melancthon. To the influence of this association may doubtless be attributed his future course. After attaining to the degree of M.A. he removed to Würzburg, with a view to succor the university at that place. Towards the close of 1557 the degree of D.D. was conferred on him, and in the following year he was honored with the title of crown poet. Returning to Wittenberg, he was, in 1560, admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university, and, besides lecturing on poetry and the interpretation of Latin poets, he wrote occasional poems. In 1574 the Philippist party was overthrown in Electoral Saxony, and its heads imprisoned. It is certain that Major suffered in this reverse, and he is said to have been three times imprisoned—at one time (from 1579 to 1581) was under sentence of death, although his opponents charge this, not to his connection with the Philippists, but to his conviction for criminal offences.

The prominence with which Andreä at this time advocated the *Formula Concordiæ* opened a new and wide field to the vexation and sarcastic power of Major. He had not subscribed to the Formula, and made it and its originators the subject of his spleen. When he ventured to do this in an official address, he was, at the beginning of 1587, expelled from the university; but when the elector Christian I ascended the throne, the Philippist party was restored to favor, and Major was soon recalled. He did not refrain from venting his satirical humor on his opponents, but when, in 1591, the elector died, and a new policy was initiated, our poet, with many others, was again imprisoned. So bitter was the feeling against him that a Wittenberg mob pelted him with stones and dirt, and even children railed at him as a "Calvinistic rogue." He was released in 1593, and spent the remainder of his life in a private station, writing only an occasional poem. He died in the Calvinistic faith at Zerbst, March 16, 1600. Major's contemporaries were united in their estimate of his poetic talent and of the worth of his writings. His ideal as a poet was Virgil. He introduced Christian thought, under Virgilian forms, into his non-controversial poems, while his satire, after the manner of the *Præceptor Germaniæ*, often degenerated into ridicule of the anti-Philippists that was even cruel. See Frank, *Johann Major, der Wittenberger Poet* (Halle, 1863); and the same in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xx, 75 sq. (G. M.)

Major, John, a Scottish historian and theologian, was born at Gleghorn, East Lothian, Scotland, in 1469; was educated at Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris. After teaching a number of years in Paris, as professor of scholastic philosophy, he became professor of divinity, and subsequently provost at St. Andrews, in Scotland. He died in 1547. He published *Commentaries on the Scriptures*, besides works of a secular character.—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Majŏres, a name given to Jewish ministers in the Theodosian Code, and also by Augustine and others to a party called *Coelicolæ*, made up of Jewish apostates. The laws were specially severe against them, three statutes of Honorius being aimed at them.

Majorinus. See Donatists.

Majoristic Controversy, named after Georg Major—his followers holding that good works are essential to salvation; his opponent, Amsdorf, reprobating them as prejudicial to it. See Major, Georg.

Majorists. See Major, Georg.

Majorĭtas (*Precedence*) is the form in ecclesiastical law to denote the preference of the clergy over the laity, as well as the rank of the Church officers. In the Roman Catholic Church the distinction between the clergy and the laity is greater than in the Protestant churches. In the former there is also greater distinction in the ranks of the clergy itself. Thus an older ordination has precedence over a more recent ordination, and a higher over a lower order (c. i, 15, X, *De maj. et obed.* i, 33), excepting only an ordination conferred by the pope himself, as his act takes precedence in any case (c. vii, X, eod). In ordinations equal in rank the secular clergy precede the regulars; and again, among the secular clergy, the canons of the chapter-house those of the collegiate; among the orders, the regular canons the monks, and all other orders the mendicants; and among the latter the Dominicans precede all others (compare Benedict XIV, *De Syn. diœc.* lib. iii, c. x). This term expresses also the official authority, the legal power of the Church office. Persons who are invested with such offices are denominated in the Protestant churches *officials* (q. v.). In the Roman Catholic Church they are called Church superiors (*superiores ecclesiastici*), and as a body they make up the hierarchical rank (*status hierarchicus*). The Romish Church authority requires obedience not only of its subjects, i. e. non-officials, but also of its officials, who, on entering upon their office, vow submission and obedience to their superiors by a formal oath. Hence arose the dispute whether the pope should be accepted as the highest authority, or whether even he was subject to a council. See Infallibility; Papacy.

Makarij, a noted Russian prelate, was born in the Moscovite province near the end of the 15th century. He early entered the monastic state; became archimandrite (abbot) of the Lus-hezkian monastery at Mos-haisk; in 1526, archbishop of Novgorod Velikiz; and in 1542, finally, metropolitan of all Russia. He died at Moscow Dec. 31, 1564. By reason of his talents, scholarship, ecclesiastic authorship, eloquence, zeal for Chris-

tian missions among the heathen, extensive activity and influence, and patriotism, and by reason of the sincerity of his character, Makarij figures prominently in Russian history. When yet archbishop, he converted the Ishudian tribes in the north of the empire, and is justly styled the "apostle of the Ishuds." When a metropolitan, he gathered around himself numerous scholars from Russia as well as from abroad, with whose aid he compiled many books. His celebrated "Book of Legends" went through more than a dozen editions, and was translated into German.—Wagner, *Staats and Gesellsch. Lex.* vol. xii, s. v.

Ma'kaz (Heb. *Ma'kats*, מַקֵּץ, *boundary;* Septuag. Μακές v. r. Μαχμᾶς), a place first named among those designating the district of Ben-Dekar, one of Solomon's purveyors (1 Kings iv, 9). The associated names, Shaalbim, Beth-shemesh, and Elon-beth-hanan, would seem to indicate a locality in the tribe of Dan, perhaps in the plain east of Ekron.

Ma'ked (Μακέδ v. r. Μακέβ; Syr. *Mokor;* Vulg. *Mageth*), one of the "strong and great cities" of Gilead —Josephus says Galilee, but this must be an error—into which the Jews were driven by the Ammonites under Timotheus, and from which they were delivered by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. v, 26, 36; in the latter passage the name is given in the A. V. as MAGED). By Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 8, 3) it is not mentioned. Some of the other cities named in this narrative have been identified, but no name corresponding to Maked has yet been discovered, and the conjecture of Schwarz (p. 230), that it is a corruption of MINNITH (מגת for מנת), though ingenious, can hardly be accepted without further proof.

Makemie, FRANCIS, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, was born near Rathmelton, Donegal Co., Ireland, about the middle of the 17th century. After completing his academical and theological course, he was licensed by the presbytery of Laggan in 1681. He undertook a mission to Barbadoes soon after, and was ordained *sine titulo*, with a view to coming to America. From Barbadoes he went to Somerset Md., Ind., where he is supposed to have founded the Church in Snow Hill, and from thence he removed to Virginia. In 1699 he obtained a formal license to preach agreeably to the requisitions of the Toleration Act, and was very successful in his labors. He went to London in 1704, to make arrangements for the supply of his Church, and returned with two ministers from Ireland. In 1705 he obtained with difficulty the certificates required for the exercise of his ministry, and aided, in 1706, in the formation of the Philadelphia presbytery, of which he was moderator. He died in 1708. Makemie published *A Catechism* (1691):—*An Answer to George Keith*, etc. (1692):—*Truths in a New Light*, etc. (1699):—*A plain and loving Persuasive to the Inhabitants of Indiana and Virginia*, etc. (1704):—*A Letter to Lord Cornbury* (Boston, 1707):—*An Account of his Imprisonment and Trial* (N. Y. 1755, and since). See Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 1.

Makhe'loth (Heb. *Makheloth'*, מַקְהֵלֹת, *assemblies*, as in Psa. lxviii, 27; Sept. Μακηλώθ), the twenty-sixth station of the Israelites in the desert, between Haradah and Tahath (Numb. xxxiii, 25, 26); probably situated on the summit north-west of Jebel el-Mukrah. See EXODE.

Mak'kedah (Heb. *Makkedah'*, מַקֵּדָה, *herdsman's place;* Sept. Μακηδά, Josephus Μακχιδά, *Ant.* v, 1, 17), a royal city of the ancient Canaanites (Josh. xii, 16), in the neighborhood of which was the cave where the five kings who confederated against Israel took refuge after their defeat (Josh. x, 10–29). It afterwards belonged to Judah (Josh. xv, 41). Makkedah is placed by Eusebius and Jerome eight Roman miles to the east of Eleutheropolis (*Onomast.* s. v. Maceda), which would bring it among the mountains, as Keil observes, who therefore locates it to the *west* (*Comment.* on Josh. x, 10), since it was situated in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 41), north of Libnah (Josh. x, 29, 31) and west of Azekah (Josh. x, 10). De Saulcy (*Narrat.* i, 438) is disposed to fix its site at a place which he names *el-Merked*, on the way from Hebron to the Dead Sea, a little east of Jenbeh; but this is at least twenty-five miles from Eleutheropolis, and the spot itself was not heard of by Dr. Robinson, who passed along the same route. Porter suggests a ruin bearing the slightly similar name *el-Klediah*, on the northern slope of wady el-Surnib, about eight miles north-east of Eleutheropolis, with large caves adjacent (*Handbook*, p. 224, 251); but Van de Velde's selection (*Memoir*, p. 332) of *Sumeil*, a village on a hillock in the plain, about two and a half hours north-west of Beit-Jibrin (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 368), seems more probable, as it has ancient remains, especially a cavern (Van de Velde, *Narrat.* ii, 173), although somewhat remote from Beth-horon, where Joshua's battle was fought. See JOSHUA. The suggestion of captain Warren (*Quarterly Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," April, 1871, p. 91), that Makkedah is the present "village of *El-Mughar* (the cave)" (meaning, doubtless, the *Mogharah* of Van de Velde's *Map*, though Robinson writes it *Mughar*, in *Researches*, iii, 22, note), is quite too far north for the narrative in Joshua, as well as for the associated names, his proposed identification of which would place some, at least, of them (e. g. Beth-dagon, at Beit-Dejan) clearly within the tribe of Dan.

Makkoth. See TALMUD.

Makowski. See MACCOVIUS.

Makrina. The Roman Catholic Church recognises two saints by this name.

1. A Cappadocian lady, grandmother of Gregory of Nyssa, who suffered persecution under the reign of Maximian, and wandered for a long time through the woods, together with her husband. She is commemorated on the 14th of January.

2. The sister of St. Basil and of St. Gregory of Nyssa; after the death of her father she withdrew into solitude, and afterwards induced her mother to establish a convent in Pontus, into which she retired. She died in 379, after performing a great number of miracles, etc. Her life was written by her brother, St. Gregory. She is commemorated on the 19th of July.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 746; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 764; Migne, *Nouv. Encyclopédie Théologique*, ii, 1298.

Mak'tesh (Heb. *Maktesh'*, מַכְתֵּשׁ [but with the art.], a *mortar*, as in Prov. xxvii, 12, or the *sockets* of a tooth, as in Judg. xv, 19; Sept. renders κατακεκομμένη, Vulg. *Pila*), a place in or near Jerusalem, mentioned as inhabited, apparently by silver-merchants (Zeph. i, 11). Gesenius regards it as the name of a valley, so called from its mortar-like shape (*Thesaurus*, p. 725). The rabbins understand the Kedron and other less likely places to be meant. Ewald conjectures (*Propheten*, p. 364) that it was the "Phœnician quarter" of the city, in which the traders of that nation—the Canaanites (A. Vers. "merchants"), who in this passage are associated with Maktesh—resided, after the custom in Oriental towns. Dr. Barclay (*City of the Great King*, p. 100, 157, 173) ingeniously suggests that it may have been a quarter devoted to minting operations, and therefore situated near the goldsmith's bazaar, which was doubtless located somewhere in Acra or the lower city, but whether in the Tyropœon adjoining the Temple, where he places it, is uncertain.

Malabar, a tract of country extending along the western coast of India, from Cape Comorin to the River Chandragri, in N. lat. 12° 30′. Frequently the name Malabar, however, is erroneously applied to the whole country from Bombay to the southern extremity. British Malabar is situated between the 10th and 13th degrees of N. lat., belongs to the presidency of Madras, and has a population of 2,261,250. By far the most extensive portion of Malabar lies in the vicinity of the Ghaut

Mountains, and consists of low hills, separated by narrow but fertile valleys. The upland is barren, and the cultivation much neglected; and it is in the valleys, and extensive ravines, and upon the banks of the rivers that the inhabitants chiefly reside. Until a recent period slavery existed in Malabar, but in 1843 a legislative enactment was passed by the British government, by the provisions of which slavery has been abolished throughout the whole extent of the British possessions in the East. The country is distinguished by the neatness of its villages, which are superior to any in India, being built of mud, neatly smoothed, and either whitewashed or painted; their picturesque effect is heightened by the beauty and elegant dresses of the Brahmin girls. The villages, as well as the bazaars, are the work of foreigners, the aboriginal natives of Malabar living in detached houses surrounded with gardens. The higher ranks use little clothing, but are remarkably clean in their persons, and all ranks are free from cutaneous distempers excepting the very lowest castes.

History.—It is supposed that Malabar was, at a very early period, conquered by a king from above the Ghauts. The Nairs may have been established at the same time by the conqueror, or called in by the Brahmins, as a military body to support the government. In process of time they obtained settlements in the land, and the chiefs, taking every opportunity to aggrandize themselves, became rajahs, and from a remote period continued to govern Malabar like independent princes. In 1760 the Mohammedans first effected an entry here under Hyder Ali, who subdued the country in 1761, and expelled all the rajahs except such as conciliated him by immediate submission. Disturbances were occasioned by these proceedings, but he succeeded in establishing his authority, and in 1782 appointed a deputy, who made still further progress in subduing and settling the country. In 1788 Tippoo Sahib, his son, attempted forcibly to supersede Hinduism by his own faith, Mohammedanism. This produced a serious rebellion, which, however, was soon quelled by his vigorous administration, but in the mean time the country was laid waste by his tyrannical proceedings. On the breaking out of the war between Tippoo and the British in 1790, the refractory rajahs and Nairs joined the British, and Tippoo was driven from the country; Malabar became a portion of the British possessions of India, and, with slight disturbances, has since remained in the hands of the English. Under the management of the British the country is said to be advancing in prosperity.

Religion.—The original manners and peculiar customs of the Hindus have been preserved in Malabar in much greater purity than in other parts of India. Besides the Hindus, who form the greater proportion of the inhabitants, the population consists of Moplays or Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews. The Hindus are divided into the following castes, namely, Namburies, or Brahmins; the Nairs of various denominations; the Leers, or Liars, who are cultivators of the land, and freemen; and, lastly, the Patiars, who were slaves or bondmen. Of these castes the most remarkable are the Nairs, the pure Sudras of Malabar, who all lay claim to be born soldiers, though they are of various ranks and professions. There are altogether eleven ranks of Nairs, who form the militia of Malabar, under the Brahmins and rajahs. They are proud and arrogant to their inferiors, and in former times a Nair was expected instantly to cut down a cultivator or fisherman who presumed to defile him by touching his person, or a Patiar who did not turn out of his road as a Nair passed. It is a remarkable custom among this class that a Nair never cohabits with the person whom he calls his wife; he gives her all proper allowances of clothing and food, but she remains in her mother's or brother's house, and cohabits with any person or persons she chooses of equal rank; so that no Nair knows his own father, and the children all belong to the mother, whose claim to them admits of no doubt. This state of manners also prevails in neighboring countries. The native Mussulmans (Moplays) form about one fourth of the population; they are descended from Hindu mothers by Arab fathers, who settled in Malabar about the 7th or 8th century.

Christianity appears at a very early period to have made considerable progress on the Malabar coast, and there is a greater proportion of persons professing that religion in this country than in any other part of India. The accommodation theory of the Jesuits was practiced here in the 17th century by Pater Nobili. See INDIA. Three ecclesiastical chiefs—two appointed by the Portuguese Church at Goa, and one by the see of Rome—rule over this establishment, besides the Babylonish bishops, who preside over the Nestorian community. The last-named Christians consider themselves descendants of converts made by the apostle Thomas in the 1st century. At the landing of Vasco de Gama, the native Christians are said to have numbered 200,000 souls. Dr. Buchanan, in his *Journey from Madras*, etc., however, computes them to number now only 40,000, with 44 churches. The total number of Christians on the Malabar coast, including the Syrians, or Nestorians, is estimated at 200,000; 90,000 of them are settled at Travancore. There are also some 30,000 Jews in Malabar. See *Cyclop. Britannica*, s. v. See MADRAS.

Malacca, an extensive region, situate in Southern India, consisting of a large peninsula connected by the isthmus of Kraw, extends from the 1st to the 12th degrees of N. lat., and from the 98th to the 104th degrees of E. long., and is 775 miles in length by 125 in average breadth. The country is a long, narrow strip of land, traversed by a chain of lofty mountains, and covered with extensive forests and marshes, so that it is very difficult to penetrate into the interior. A range of extremely bleak mountains, running through it from one extremity to the other, gives rise to innumerable streams, the courses of which, from the proximity of the mountains to the sea, are short, and are so obstructed at the mouths by bars and sand-banks that they can not be ascended by vessels of any size. At the southern extremity of the continent are the islands of Bintang, Batang, and Singapore, with many others, so thickly clustered together that they are only separated from the continent by narrow straits, and seem to be a prolongation of the land. On the west coast also there are numerous islands.

History.—The political state of Malacca has been subject to many revolutions, having been occasionally dependent on Siam when that monarchy was in the height of its power, and when its supremacy was owned by the whole peninsula. But, since the Siamese have yielded to the increasing power of the Burmans, all the southern portion of the peninsula has shaken off the yoke, and the northern states pay only a moderate tribute. The whole of the sea-coast from that latitude to Port Romania is still possessed by the Malays, who are mixed in some places with the burgesses from Celebes, and who have a small settlement at Salengore. The northern and inland parts of the peninsula are inhabited by the Patany people, who appear to be a mixture of the Siamese and Malays, and who occupy independent villages. The negro race is found in the interior among the aboriginal natives. The great majority of the inhabitants are, however, of the Malay race, who are well known and widely diffused among all the eastern islands. The origin of this remarkable race is not distinctly known; they are understood, however, not to be natives of this country, but to have come originally from the district of Palembang, in the interior of Sumatra, situate on the banks of the River Malaya. Having crossed over about the end of the 12th century to the opposite continent, they, in 1252, founded the city of Malacca. Sultan Mohammed Shah, who ascended the throne in the 13th century, was the first Mussulman prince who extended his rule over Malacca. During part of the 15th century Malacca was under Siamese sovereigns. In 1509 sultan Mahmud repelled the aggression of the

king of Siam, but in 1511 he was conquered by the Portuguese under Albuquerque. In 1642 it became the possession of the Dutch, and in 1824 it was finally transferred to the British among the cessions made by the king of Netherlands in exchange for the British possessions on the island of Sumatra, E. long. 100°, N. lat. 5° (comp. *Cyclop. Brit.* s. v.).

Religion.—Until the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 13th century, the inhabitants of Malacca were pagans or followed some corrupt form of Hindu idolatry. With the Mussulman reign the religion of the Crescent became the predominating belief. Christianity was introduced in the 16th century by the Portuguese. One of the earliest laborers here was the renowned Spanish Jesuit, Francis Xavier (q. v.). Unfortunately, however, for the success of the Gospel truth, the conduct of the Romish priesthood and of the Portuguese authorities was very unkind toward the natives. Not much better was the influence of the Dutch. Though Protestantism, with their entrance, superseded Romanism in a measure, the government hesitated to encourage the Christian missions, and gave great liberty to Mohammedans, lest the latter should be tempted to insurrection, and Holland be deprived of these valuable possessions. To this day the Mussulmen continue to make converts in Malacca. The Romanists maintain a suffragan bishop at the capital (of like name as the country). For further details on the success of Christianity in Malacca at present, see the articles INDIA; MALAYS. See also Grundemann, *Missionsatlas*, No. 7, 21, and 24; Cameron, *Our Trop. Possess. in Malayan India* (Lond. 1865).

Mal'achi (Heb. *Malaki'*, מַלְאָכִי, *messenger;* Sept. in the title Μαλαχίας, but in ch. i, 1 it renders ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ, Vulg. *Malachias*), the last of the minor prophets, and the latest writer in the canon of the O. T. (comp. ch. iv, 4, 5, 6). What is known of him is so intimately connected with his prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider the whole subject together. In doing so we will, at the same time, treat any doubtful questions involved.

I. *Personal Account.*—The name Malachi is rendered by some *my angel*, but it is usually regarded as contracted from Malachijah, "messenger of Jehovah," like Abi (2 Kings xviii, 2) from Abijah (2 Chron. xxix, 1). The traditionists regard the name as having been given to the prophet on account of the beauty of his person and his unblemished life. The name means an *angel*, angels being, in fact, the messengers of God; and, as the prophets are often styled angels or messengers of Jehovah, it is supposed by some that "Malachi" is merely a general title descriptive of this character, and not a proper name. So Hengstenberg, *Christol.* iii, 372 sq. Of his personal history nothing is known (see Dr. Davidson in *Horne's Introd.* new ed. ii, 894 sq.). A tradition preserved in Pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis Proph.*) relates that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebulun, and born after the captivity at Sopha (Σοφᾶ, ? Saphir) in the territory of that tribe. According to the same apocryphal story he died young, and was buried with his fathers in his own country. Jerome, in the preface to his *Commentary on Malachi*, mentions a belief which was current among the Jews, that Malachi was identical with Ezra the priest, because the circumstances recorded in the narrative of the latter are also mentioned by the prophet. The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, on the words "by the hand of Malachi" (i, 1), gives the gloss "whose name is called Ezra the scribe." With equal probability Malachi has been identified with Mordecai, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel. The Sept., as above noted, renders "by Malachi" (Mal. i, 1), "by the hand of his angel;" and this translation appears to have given rise to the idea that Malachi, as well as Haggai and John the Baptist, was an angel in human shape (comp. Mal. iii, 1; 2 Esdr. i, 40; Jerome, *Comm. in Hag.* i, 13). Cyril alludes to this belief only to express his disapprobation, and characterizes those who hold it as romancers (οἱ μάτην ἐρραψῳδήκασιν, κ. τ. λ.). The current opinion of the Jews is that of the Talmud, in which this question is mooted, and which decides, it seems to us rightly, that this prophet is not the same with Mordecai, or Ezra, or Zerubbabel, or Nehemiah, whose claims had all been advocated by different parties, but a distinct person named Malachi (*Bab. Megillah*, xv, 1). Another Hebrew tradition associates Malachi with Haggai and Zechariah as the companions of Daniel when he saw the vision recorded in Dan. x, 7 (Smith's *Select Discourses*, p. 214; A.D. 1660), and as among the first members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 elders (Isidore, *De Vita et Morte Sanct.* ch. li). For a notice of prophecy of the succession of the Roman pontiffs attributed to him, see the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1857, p. 555 sq.). See MALACHY, ST.

II. *Date of his Prophecies.*—Although there has been a faint disposition to regard Zechariah as the last of the prophets (Lactant. *De Vera Sapent.* iv, 5), the received opinion decides for Malachi. Accordingly Aben-Ezra calls him "the end of the prophets;" Kimchi, "the last of them;" and not seldom he is distinguished by the rabbins as "the seal of the prophets." Cyril makes him contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah, or a little later. Syncellus (p. 240 B) places these three prophets under Joshua the son of Josedec. That Malachi was contemporary with Nehemiah is rendered probable by a comparison of ii, 8 with Neh. xiii, 15; ii, 10–16 with Neh. xiii, 23, etc.; and iii, 7–12 with Neh. xiii, 10, etc. That he prophesied after the times of Haggai and Zechariah is inferred from his omitting to mention the restoration of the Temple, and from no allusion being made to him by Ezra. The captivity was already a thing of the long past, and is not referred to. The existence of the Temple-service is presupposed in i, 10; iii, 1, 10. The Jewish nation had still a political chief (i, 8), distinguished by the same title as that borne by Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 26), to which Gesenius assigns a Persian origin. Hence Vitringa concludes that Malachi delivered his prophecies after the second return of Nehemiah from Persia (Neh. xiii, 6), and subsequently to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. cir. 420), which is the date adopted by Kennicott and Hales, and approved by Davidson (*Introd.* p. 985). The date B.C. 410 cannot be far from correct. It may be mentioned that in the Seder Olam Rabba (p. 55, ed. Meyer) the date of Malachi's prophecy is assigned, with that of Haggai and Zechariah, to the second year of Darius; and his death in the Seder Olam Zuta (p. 105) is placed, with that of the same two prophets, in the fifty-second year of the Medes and Persians. The principal reasons adduced by Vitringa, and which appear conclusively to fix the time of Malachi's prophecy as contemporary with Nehemiah, are the following: The offences denounced by Malachi as prevailing among the people, and especially the corruption of the priests by marrying foreign wives, correspond with the actual abuses with which Nehemiah had to contend in his efforts to bring about a reformation (comp. Mal. ii, 8 with Neh. xiii, 29). The alliance of the high-priest's family with Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh. xiii, 4, 28) and Sanballat the Horonite had introduced neglect of the customary Temple-service, and the offerings and tithes due to the Levites and priests, in consequence of which the Temple was forsaken (Neh. xiii, 4–13) and the Sabbath openly profaned (ver. 15–21). The short interval of Nehemiah's absence from Jerusalem had been sufficient for the growth of these corruptions, and on his return he found it necessary to put them down with a strong hand, and to do over again the work that Ezra had done a few years before. From the striking parallelism between the state of things indicated in Malachi's prophecies and that actually existing on Nehemiah's return from the court of Artaxerxes, it is on all accounts highly probable that the efforts of the secular governor were on this occasion seconded by the preaching of "Jehovah's messenger," and that Malachi occupied the same posi-

tion with regard to the reformation under Nehemiah as Isaiah held in the time of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah in that of Josiah. The last chapter of canonical Jewish history is the key to the last chapter of its prophecy. See Noel Alexander, *De Malachia Propheta*, in his *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 642 sq.; Vitringa, *idem*, in his *Observationes Sociæ*, vol. ii; Hebenstreit, *Disp. in Mal.* (Lips. 1731 sq.).

III. *Contents of the Book.*—The prophecies of Malachi are comprised in four chapters in our version, as in the Sept., Vulgate, and Peshito-Syriac. In the Hebrew the 3d and 4th form but one chapter. The whole prophecy naturally divides itself into three sections, in the first of which Jehovah is represented as the loving father and ruler of his people (i, 2–ii, 9); in the second, as the supreme God and father of all (ii, 10–16); and in the third, as their righteous and final judge (ii, 17–end). These may be again subdivided into smaller sections, each of which follows a certain order: first, a short sentence; then the sceptical questions which might be raised by the people; and, finally, their full and triumphant refutation. The formal and almost scholastic manner of the prophecy seemed to Ewald to indicate that it was rather delivered in writing than spoken publicly. But though this may be true of the prophecy in its present shape, which probably presents the substance of oral discourses, there is no reason for supposing that it was not also pronounced orally in public, like the warnings and denunciations of the older prophets, however it may differ from them in vigor of conception and high poetic diction.

1. The first section of the prophet's message consists of two parts; the first (i, 1–8) addressed to the people generally, in which Jehovah, by his messenger, asserts his love for them, and proves it, in answer to their reply, "Wherein hast thou loved us?" by referring to the punishment of Edom as an example. The second part (i, 6–ii, 9) is addressed especially to the priests, who had despised the name of Jehovah, and had been the chief movers of the defection from his worship and covenant. They are rebuked for the worthlessness of their sacrifices and offerings, and their profanation of the Temple thereby (i, 7–14). The denunciation of their offence is followed by the threat of punishment for future neglect (ii, 1–3), and the character of the true priest is drawn as the companion picture to their own (ii, 5–9).

2. In the second section (ii, 10–16) the prophet reproves the people for their intermarriages with the idolatrous heathen, and the divorces by which they separated themselves from their legitimate wives, who wept at the altar of Jehovah, in violation of the great law of marriage which God, the father of all, established at the beginning.

3. The judgment, which the people lightly regard, is announced with all solemnity, ushered in by the advent of the Messiah. The Lord, preceded by his messenger, shall come to his Temple suddenly, to purify the land from its iniquity, and to execute swift judgment upon those who violate their duty to God and their neighbor. The first part (ii, 17–iii, 5) of the section terminates with the threatened punishment; in the second (iii, 6–12) the faithfulness of God to his promises is vindicated, and the people are exhorted to repentance, with its attendant blessings; in the third (iii, 13–iv, 6) they are reproved for their want of confidence in God, and for confusing good and evil. The final severance between the righteous and the wicked is then set forth, and the great day of judgment is depicted, to be announced by the coming of Elijah, or John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ (Matt. xi, 14; xvii, 10–13).

IV. *Style.*—The diction of Malachi offers few, if any, distinguishing characteristics. His language is suitable to the manner of his prophecy. Smooth and easy to a remarkable degree, it is the style of the reasoner rather than of the poet. The rhythm and imagery of his writings are substantially those of the old prophets, but they possess no remarkable vigor or beauty. We miss the fiery prophetic eloquence of Isaiah, and have in its stead the calm and almost artificial discourse of the practiced orator, carefully modelled upon those of the ancient prophets. His phraseology is accounted for by his living during that decline of Hebrew poetry which we trace more or less in all the sacred writings posterior to the captivity. In general the language is concise, clear, and polished, and the manner of introducing a new line of argument or a new range of thought is most striking. Here the peculiarity is to be noticed, that there is no longer the ancient dramatic manner displayed, but a kind of dialogue has taken its place, which is carried on between God and the people or the priests, whose half-mocking questions are enlarged upon and finally answered with scorn by the mouth of the messenger. He seems fully aware of being the last of the sacred bards (iii, 1 and 22), and the epoch of transition from the glowing energetic fulness of the inspired seer, who speaks to the people as the highest power suddenly and forcibly moves him, to the carefully studied and methodically constructed written discourse, becomes strangely apparent in him. We find both the ancient prophetic improvised original exhortation, with its repetitions and apparent incongruities, and the artificially composed address, with its borrowed ideas well arranged and its euphonious words well selected. This circumstance has probably also given rise to the notion that we have only in his book a summary of his orations: a work containing, as it were, the substance only of his addresses, written out by himself from his recollections —an opinion which we do not share. Of peculiarities of phraseology we may notice the occurrence of passages like ונשא אתכם אליו (ii, 3), כסה חמס על-לבושו (ii, 16), etc.

V. *Canonicity and Integrity.*—The claim of the book of Malachi to its place in the canon of the Old Testament has never been disputed, and its authority is established by the references to it in the New Testament (Matt. xi, 10; xvii, 12; Mark i, 2; ix, 11, 12; Luke i, 17; Rom. ix, 13). Philo, Josephus, Melito, Jerome, and other ancient authorities, mention it, and quote from it as in accordance with our present copies. Nor is there anything, either in its language or the circumstances of its time, the manners and customs touched upon, or its topographical and geographical allusions, that could give rise to the slightest critical suspicion.

Its text is one of the purest and best preserved, and no glosses to it are to be found in the Codd., such as had to be added to correct the corruptions of other books. The differences in the various ancient versions arise only from the differences of the vowels assumed or found by the translators in their copies. The few variants which occur in the different texts are so unimportant that they do not call for any detailed remark.

VI. *Commentaries.*—Special exegetical helps on the whole book are as follows, a few of the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Ephraem Syrus, *Explanation* (in Syriac, in his *Opp.* v, 312); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Mal.* (in his *Opp.* i, 520); D. Kimchi and S. Jarchi's commentaries, tr. into Latin by De Muis (Paris, 1618, 4to); Aben-Ezra's and other Jewish commentaries, tr. into Latin by Hebenstreet (Lips. 1746, 4to); D. Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries, in Latin by Bohle (Rost. 1637, 4to); Kimchi's alone, by Carpzov (Lips. 1679, 8vo), by Münster (Basil. 1530, 8vo); Aben-Ezra's alone, by Münster (ib. 1530, 8vo), by Borgwall (Upsal. 1707, 8vo); Abrabanel's, by Meyer (Hammon. 1685, 4to); Luther, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.*, Wittenb. edit., iv, 520; in German, by Agricola, 1555); Melancthon, *Explicationes* (Vitemb. 1553; also in *Opp.* ii, 541); Draconis, *Explanationes* (Lips. 1564, folio); Chytræus, *Explicatio* (Rost. 1568, 8vo; also in *Opp.* ii, 455); Moller, *Expositio* (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* [including Cant., Hag., and Zech.] (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Grynæus, *Hypomnemata* (Gen. 1582, 8vo; Basil. 1583, 1612, 4to); Polanus, *Analysis* (Basil. 1597, 1606,

8vo); Baldwin, *Commentarius* [includ. Hag. and Zech.] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); De Quiros, *Commentarii* [includ. Nah.] (Hispal. 1622; Lugd. 1623, fol.); Tarnow, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1624, 4to); Stock and Torshell, *Commentary* (Lond. 1641, fol.); Acosta, *Commentarius* [including Ruth, etc.] (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Sclater, *Commentary* (London, 1650, 4to); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1652, 8vo); Martinus, *Observationes* (Groning. 1647, 4to; 1658, 8vo); Varenius, *Trifolium* [including Hag. and Zech.] (Rost. 1662, 4to); Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1677, fol.; also in *Works*, i, 19); Van Til, *Commentarius* (L.B. 1701, 4to); Köppen, *Observationes* (Gryph. 1708, 4to); Wessel, *Enucleatio* (Lub. 1729, 4to); *Venema, *Commentarius* (Leon. 1759, 4to); Fischer, *Prolusio* (Lips. 1759, etc.); Bahrat, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1768, 8vo); *Faber, *Commentatio* (Onold. 1779, 4to); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1828, 8vo); *Reinke, *Commentar* (Giessen, 1856, 8vo); *Moore, *Commentary* [including Hag. and Zech.] (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Köhler, *Erklärung* (Erlang. 1865, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

Mal'achy (Vulg. *Malachias*), a familiar form (2 Esdr. i, 40) of the name of the prophet MALACHI.

Malachy, ST., archbishop of Armagh, one of the most noted characters in Irish Church History, was born of a noble family at Armagh about 1195. While yet a youth he retired from the world to subject himself to a most rigid asceticism under the abbot Imar of Armagh. His humility and fervor soon gained him a great reputation for sanctity, and, quite contrary to the canonical rule, he was ordained priest when only twenty-five years old, by Celsus, then archbishop of Armagh, who took a special interest in Malachy, and favored him in many ways. He also employed Malachy as assistant in the discharge of the archiepiscopal office, Celsus intending thus gradually to introduce Malachy to the archiepiscopal duties, with a view of securing him as successor. Of these opportunities Malachy availed himself for the furtherance of a plan he had long cherished, that of bringing the Irish Church, which since the conquest of the south-western provinces by the Normans had remained independent of Rome, into subjectivity to the papal chair. Malachy gradually introduced the Roman method of reciting the hours, and also established the rites of confession, confirmation, ecclesiastical marriage, etc., in the several convents. Then, in order to become better acquainted with the details of the Roman Catholic ritual, he resided for some years with bishop Malchus of Lismore, also a native of Ireland, but who had been a monk of Winchester, England, and had there become thoroughly acquainted with the practices of Rome. Upon his return to his native land, Malachy was engaged by his friends for the restoration of the Bangor monastery, which had remained in ruins since its destruction by the Danes, and which was now the possession of Malachy's uncle. Assisted by ten monastic associates, he erected an oratory and a small house for their accommodation, and, as their superior, remained there until about 1225, when he was called away to preside over the see of Connereth (Connor), where, by unwearied exertions, he built up the cause of Christianity. About 1129 he was further promoted by a call to the archbishopric of Armagh, the place for which Celsus had long intended him. Malachy accepted the position, however, only upon condition that he should be permitted to resign it "as soon as it was rescued from its present unbecoming situation." Hitherto, by custom, the archiepiscopacy had been hereditary, and in consequence, though Celsus had himself nominated Malachy, the latter had not undisputed possession of the primatial see until about 1135, when he at once applied himself most earnestly and zealously to perfecting the reforms he had inaugurated while yet with Celsus. Previous to Malachy's accession to the arch-see there never had been a hierarchy or a legalized support for religion in the Irish Church. The ministry had been sustained by voluntary offerings, and in some instances by the donation of Tremon, or free lands, the rents of which were to be appropriated annually to the bishop and the poor. These lands, however, were neither large nor numerous. During the commotions of the 10th and 11th centuries those which had been given to Armagh were again claimed by the lineal descendants of the original donors as their rightful inheritance. At this time they had been thus held for eight successive generations. Malachy's great endeavor was to do away with this abuse. See IMPROPRIATION. But he failed to accomplish this object, and in consequence resigned the primatial office and retired to the bishopric of Down, hitherto a part of his former see of Connor.

Malachy untiringly devoted himself to the one great object likely to be successfully accomplished—the Romanizing of the Irish Church. To accomplish this object—the greatest task which could have been undertaken by any person in his day, and which in consequence has made the name of Malachy one of the most prominent connected with the ecclesiastical annals of Ireland—he first travelled extensively in his own country, and then all the way to the Imperial City, where he was affectionately received by the pope (Innocent II), bishops, and cardinals, all vying with each other in their attentions to him. The pallium, or pontifical investure, however, for which he had come, the pope refused to grant until a request for union with Rome should come from one of the Irish synods. Malachy received, however, a sure proof of the pleasure of his holiness with the proposed scheme in his appointment to the legateship for all Ireland, and returned to his native land expectant of the immediate realization of his life-long dream. On his way homeward he became intimately acquainted with Bernard of St. Clairvaux, whom he had already visited on his way towards the Eternal City, and so charmed was he with the order and rule of the Cistercian monastery that he determined to establish the order also in his country, and in 1142 opened the first Cistercian monastery in Ireland. In the mean time, however, Malachy busily employed himself, his legative power also, in behalf of union, and in 1148 at last succeeded in moving a synod to make the request which Rome demanded previous to the bestowal of the pallium on the Irish clergy. It is, however, not a little remarkable that the synod from which this very important request emanated was not one convened in any province or principal city. It was held in Inis Padrig (Patrick's Island), a small, inconsiderable island near the Sherries, in the northern channel of Ireland (Haverty's *History of Ireland* [New York, 1866], p. 161). Could no more conspicuous place be found? From this and other internal evidences there is abundant reason to infer that the Irish clergy were not then in favor of union with Rome. The request, however, was issued, and St. Malachy set off immediately with it, expecting to meet the pope (now Eugene III) at Clairvaux; but, having been long delayed in England by the jealousy of king Stephen, Malachy, to his sore disappointment, did not reach there till the pope had left. Shortly afterwards he was taken ill, and died (1148) in the arms of his friend and future biographer, St. Bernard. Although Malachy did not personally obtain the cherished wish of his heart, he yet inaugurated and put in train the measures which brought the pallium a few years later.

St. Malachy was by far the most prominent and powerful native ecclesiastic of Ireland in her early days. "His personal influence," says Todd (*Irish Ch.* p. 116), "was so great that he was able to direct the minds of his countrymen as he saw fit;" and for this he was admirably fitted by his descent, his learning, his eloquence, and his fascinating address. In A.D. 1152 St. Bernard wrote his Life in elegant mediæval Latin. Previous to an acquaintance with the Irish saint, Bernard had written many hard things against the Irish, calling them "a stiff-necked, intractable, and ungovernable race;" but, in reference to Malachy, he declared that he could not find words to express his admiration of the saint.

A curious *Prophecy concerning the Future Roman Pontiffs* is extant under the name of Malachy. It designates, by a few brief phrases, the leading characteristics of each successive reign, and in some instances these descriptive characteristics have proved so curiously appropriate as to lead to some discussion. The characteristic of Pio Nono, *Crux de Cruce* (cross after cross), was the subject of much speculation. That the prophecy really dates from the time of St. Malachy no scholar now supposes; it was unknown not only to his biographer, St. Bernard (*Liber de vita S. Mal.*), but neither does any other author allude to this work until the beginning of the 17th century. It may be a sufficient indication of its worth to state that neither Baronius nor any of his continuators deemed it deserving of attention. It is now supposed to have been prepared in the conclave of 1590 by the friends of cardinal Simoncelli, who is clearly described in the work (comp. Döllinger, *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages*, edited by Prof. H. B. Smith [Dodd and Mead, N. Y., 1872, 12mo], p. 150 sq.). See Menestrier, *Traité sur les prophéties attribuées à saint Malachie;* John Germano, *Vita gesti e predizioni del padre san Malachia* (Naples, 1670, 2 vols. 4to); Brenan, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 267 sq.; Todd, *Hist. Anc. Ch. in Ireland*, p. 106–117; Inett, *Origines Anglicanæ* (see Index); *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1871, p. 564. (J. H. W.)

Malagrida, Gabriele, an Italian theologian and preacher, who flourished in Portugal in the first half of the 18th century, was born in the Milanese in 1689. He entered the Order of the Jesuits, removed to Portugal, and became popular as a pulpit orator and a theological writer. In 1758, when an attempt at assassination was made on Joseph I, the then reigning monarch of Portugal, the Jesuits were charged with the crime (they were shortly after expelled from the kingdom); Malagrida was suspected of complicity, and arrested forthwith. Freed from this charge, he was accused of spreading heretic doctrines, and suffered death at the stake in 1761. A list of his writings is given in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxii, s. v. See Platel, *Relazione della Condemna ed Esecuzione del Gesuita G. Malagrida* (1761).

Malakans, or Milk-eaters (Russian *Molocani*, i. e. those who, contrary to the rule of the Eastern Church, take milk on fast-days), is the name of a religious sect in the Russo-Greek Church. The name Malakans is a term of contempt applied to these religionists, and originated, as the word Shaker, Methodist, etc., among those who did not approve of the movement. They themselves like to be called *Gospel-Men.* They were first brought into notice by the zeal of a Prussian prisoner of war, about the middle of last century. He settled in a village of southern Russia, and spent his life in explaining the Scriptures to the villagers, and in visiting from house to house. After his death they acknowledged him as the founder of their new religious belief. The Malakans acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God, and the Trinity of the Godhead. They admit the fall of Adam, and the resurrection of Christ. They teach that Adam's soul only, and not his body, was made after God's image. The Ten Commandments are received among them. Idolatry and the worship of images are forbidden. It is considered sinful to take an oath, and the observance of the Sabbath is strictly enjoined; so much so that, like many of the Oriental sects, they devote Saturday evening to preparation for the Sabbath. They are firm believers in the Millennium, and are improperly described as followers of the fanatic Teranti Beloreff, who was, in fact, a member of their body. He announced in 1833 the coming of the Lord within two years and a half. Many Malakans, in consequence, abandoned their callings, and waited the event in prayer and fasting. Beloreff persuaded himself that, like Elijah, he should ascend to heaven on a certain day in a chariot of fire. Thousands of the Milk-eaters came from all parts of Russia to witness this miracle. Beloreff appeared, majestically seated in a chariot, ordered the multitude to prostrate themselves, and then, opening his arms like an eagle spreading his wings, he leapt into the air, but, dropping down on the heads of the gaping multitude, was instantly seized and dragged off to prison as an imposter. He died soon after, no doubt in a state of insanity, declaring himself to be the prophet of God. But many of the Malakans still believe in his divine mission. A considerable number of his followers afterwards emigrated to Georgia, and settled in sight of Mount Ararat, expecting the Millennium. They spend whole days and nights in prayer, and have all their goods in common. See Millenarians *in Russia.* These milk-people deny the sanctity and use of fasts, holding that men who have to work require good food, to be eaten in moderation all the year round—no day stinted, no day in excess. They prefer to live by the laws of nature, asking and giving a reason for everything they do. They set their faces against monks and popes. In Russia they suffered sore persecution under the late emperor Nicholas. Sixteen thousand men and women were seized by the police, arranged in gangs, and driven with rods and thongs across the dreary steppes and yet more dreary mountain crests into the Caucasus. In that fearful day a great many of the Milk-eaters fled across the Pruth into Turkey, where the Sultan gave them a village called Tulcha for their residence. The Methodist mission at that place, under the leadership of Mr. Flocken, labored among them for some time; at present, however (1872), the mission is discontinued. See Dixon, *Free Russia*, p. 138 sq.; Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects*, ii, 234; Le Raskol, *Essai historique et critique sur les sectes religieuses de la Russe* (Paris, 1854, 8vo). See Russia. (J. H. W.)

Malan, Abraham Henri Cæsar, D.D., one of the most noted of Swiss Protestant divines of our day, was born at Geneva July 7, 1787. When but an infant of three years Malan exhibited great powers of intellectual superiority, and the hopes which he awakened while yet an inmate of the cradle by securing a prize for reading at the Geneva Academy were more than realized in his manhood and hoary age. The poverty of his parents induced him to turn aside from an intellectual career to which he so much inclined, and to enter the mercantile profession at eighteen, but he soon returned again to his former mode of life, and decided upon the ministry. In 1810 he was consecrated for this sacred work by the *Vénérable Compagnie*, or Presbytery of Geneva, and he at once made a name for himself as a pulpit orator of unusual eloquence. He was appointed preacher at the Geneva cathedral, and from the pulpit whence formerly the immortal Calvin had thundered forth the unalterable decrees of the Holy One, Malan now taught the Word of God in a most brilliant oratory. Unfortunately, however, the spiritual life built up by Calvin and his successors in the hearts of their forefathers had been suffered to die out, and in the hearts of the hearers of Malan, as well as in the heart of the preacher himself, there was a lukewarmness, aye a coldness, to all religion—rationalism sat enthroned in the pulpit and the pew of Geneva; the forms of the Church founded by Calvin remained, but the spiritual life had departed. The young preacher endeavored to infuse the vitality of his own fervid spirit into the lifeless forms and the latitudinarian creed of the "Vénérable Compagnie," but in vain; both the preacher and the auditor lacked that most essential element of a Christian life, the possession of the truly orthodox belief and trust in a *divine* Saviour. In the midst of his despair Malan was brought under the influence of those noble-hearted Scotchmen, the Haldane brothers, and by them and our late Dr. John M. Mason (q. v.), and Matthias Bruen, was led to see the error of a faith built on a human Saviour, and brought to acknowledge the divinity of Jesus the Christ. From this time forward Malan became a champion of the orthodox faith. The first opportunity to display his ability as a polemic he found against the Vénérable Compagnie itself. This

body had issued for circulation among the masses an edition of the N. T. in which all passages bearing on the divinity of Christ were so altered as to favor the Socinian belief; this translation Malan denounced with the most vehement eloquence, and from his pulpit expounded these self-same passages in the spirit of their intended declaration to the multitudes who crowded around him. (For a review of the Church at Geneva, see Hurst, *Rationalism*, chap. xviii.) By 1818 the rupture between him and the Church authorities of Geneva had become so great that reconciliation was an impossibility, and Malan was consequently dismissed from the Established Church. Besides his relation to the cathedral, Malan had been regent of the academy; in this post also he was now superseded by a divine of Socinian tendency. Not in the least daunted, he now followed the example of the Haldane brothers, and preached the truth wherever an opportunity would offer to address the multitudes and press forward the interests of Christ his master. No church accessible to him, he preached in his own house, for preach he would. The most eminent of Geneva's inhabitants gathered regularly, and by 1820 he was enabled to rear a church upon his own ground. He named it "The Testimonial Chapel" ("*La Chapelle du Témoignage*"). But not only was his tongue active in building up Christ's kingdom among men, to his pen also he gave no rest; now busy in the defence of Christ's divinity or the sovereignty of divine grace, tomorrow exposing and attacking Romish error, and next rushing forth in print to reach the masses by religious tracts, clear, simple, and practical. With these manifold duties upon him, he was yet far from content. He organized a school of theology, and himself became one of the instructors; founded a tract society, and a Magdalen asylum or penitentiary. He has also the honor to have been the first to introduce the Sabbath-school into Switzerland. Not even all this toil could prevent him in the least from fostering also a joy in the development of æsthetical talents which he possessed. As a sacred poet he will live as long as the language in which he wrote shall be known. He has been pronounced the French Dr. Watts. As a composer he likewise displayed unusual endowments, and as a painter and sculptor masters of art delighted to enjoy his friendship and counsel. Thorwaldsen was his intimate friend, and more than once intrusted him with the completion of his choicest groups. Surely a master mind was that of Malan's. With untiring industry maintaining his position in the pulpit almost to the last, he died at his native place, May 8, 1864. No better comment on such a life can be given than that by E. de Pressensé: "César Malan a été un homme d'indomptable conviction; il a toujours suivi les impulsions de sa conscience sans hésitation" (*Revue Chrétienne*, Aug. 5, 1869, p. 502). His appearance at the age of fifty is thus described by an American divine who had the pleasure of being his guest: "His *personnel* was noble and imposing; a little above the medium height, stout built, and, having something of a military bearing, he was still natural and easy in his manners. His broad shoulders supported a superb head; his open and lofty brow gave one an idea of his mental power; his eyes were full of intellect and fire, and at the same time his loving look won your heart; his fine mouth indicated an iron will, combined with great tenderness; a profusion of white hair fell upon his shoulders" (*The Observer* [N. Y.], April 22, 1869). The degree of D.D. was conferred on Malan by the University of Edinburgh. Of his works, many of which have appeared also in an English dress both in England and in the United States, the following deserve special mention, *The Ch. of Rome* (N. Y. 1844):—*Les Môtiers sont-ils invisibles?* (1828); his followers were called *Môtiers:*—*Les Chants de Sion* (1826, 12mo, and often), a collection of his hymns:—*Le Témoignage de Dieu* (1833, 8vo). See, besides the excellent article in the *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 495, and Bost, *Mémoires du Reveil rel. des églises protest. de la Suisse et de la France* (see Index); the *Life, Labors, and Writings of Cæsar Malan*, by one of his sons (1869, post 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Malay Archipelago, also called the INDIAN or EASTERN ARCHIPELAGO and MALAISIA, by far the largest, if not the most important island group, or rather system of island groups in the world, of which the principal are the Sunda Islands (embracing Sumatra, Java, etc.), the Philippines, and the Moluccas, or Spice Islands. They are treated severally under the respective names of the different islands. See JAVA; MACASSAR; MALACCA; MOLUCCAS; PHILIPPINES; SUMATRA, etc. "The whole of these islands together, comprising an area of 170,000 square miles, contain about 20,000,000 of human beings of all grades of color and stature. The most ancient appear to be the Papoos, who are the only inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, but who are found farther eastward as a people driven into the forests, mountains, and defiles, and are not found again as a leading population till we reach New Guinea. They are among the most degenerate of the human race. They were supplanted more immediately by the Malays, who, having many centuries ago emigrated from India beyond the Ganges, have become a mysteriously heterogeneous people by mixture with Papoos, Hindus, Arabs, Chinese, Siamese, and even with Europeans. The shores have of late years been more and more covered with Chinese emigrants, who threaten the same fate to the Malays which they have inflicted upon the Papoos. The religions are as various as the nations, and tribes, and languages. Here we may still meet with aboriginal sorcery, together with the divine worship paid to mountains, rocks, woods, storms, volcanoes; then with Brahminism and Buddhism, the Chinese worship of ancestors exalted into demigods, the Mohammedan delusions, and the saint worship of the Romish communion. The worship of God in spirit and in truth has hitherto been to those wretched natives a thing unknown, and what has been attempted for these forty or fifty years past by about seventy or eighty missionaries is as yet but little more than a beginning of what remains to be done." See Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 479; Grundemann, *Missionsatlas*, No. 17. See MALAYS.

Malays (properly *Malayus*, a Malay word, the derivation of which has not yet been satisfactorily ascertained) is the name given to a great branch of the human family dwelling in the Malay peninsula, in the islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in Madagascar, and in the numerous islands of the Pacific. In the fivefold division of mankind laid down by Blumenbach, the Malays are treated as a distinct race, while in the threefold division of Latham they are regarded as a branch of the Mongolidæ. Prichard, however, subdivides the various representatives of the Malay family into three branches, viz.: (1.) the Indo-Malayan, comprehending the Malays proper of Malacca, and the inhabitants of Sumatra, Java, Celebes, the Moluccas, and the Philippines, with whom, perhaps, may be associated the natives of the Caroline Islands and the Ladrones; (2.) the Polynesians; and (3.) the Madecasses, or people of Madagascar. Following Latham, we shall here confine ourselves to the Malays proper, the natives of Madagascar having been already noticed under that heading, and reserving the Polynesians generally and the Maori in particular for distinct articles. In physical appearance the Malays are a brown-complexioned race, rather darker than the Chinese, but not so swarthy as the Hindus; they have long, black, shining, but coarse hair; little or no beard; a large mouth; eyes large and dark; nose generally short and flat; lips rather thicker than those of Europeans; and cheek-bones high. In stature, the Indo-Malays are for the most part below the middle height, while the Polynesians generally exceed it; the Indo-Malays have also slight, well-formed limbs, and are particularly small about the wrists and ankles. "The profile," according to Dr. Pickering, "is usually more vertical than in the white race, but this may be owing in part to the mode of carriage, for the skull does

not show a superior facial angle." This people must, however, be classified, as there is a great distinction among them from a civilized stand-point. There is a class of Malays who have a *written* language (the spoken language is essentially the same with all the Malays), and who have made some progress in the arts of life; then there are the sea-people, *orang-laut*, literally "men of the sea," a kind of sea-gipsies or robbers; and there are also the *orang banua* or *orang utan*, "wild men" or "savages," dwelling in the woods or forests, and supposed to be the aborigines of the peninsula and islands.

Origin and Language.—The name of *Malaya* seems to have been first used about the middle of the 12th century. The first settlement is by themselves stated to have been Menangkabo, in the island of Sumatra, rather than the peninsula itself. Even the Malays of Borneo claim to have come from Menangkabo. Palembang, however, also in Sumatra, has been mentioned as the original seat of Malay civilization; while others, again, point to Java as the source from which both Menangkabo and Palembang received their first settlers. "The Javanese," says Crawfurd, "would seem to have been even the founders of Malacca. Monuments have been discovered which prove the presence of this people in the country of the Malays. Thus Sir Stamford Raffles, when he visited Menangkabo, found there inscriptions on stone in the ancient character of Java, such as are frequent in that island; and he was supported in his conclusion by the learned natives of Java who accompanied him in his journey. The settlement of the Javanese in several parts of Sumatra is, indeed, sufficiently attested. In Palembang they have been immemorially the ruling people; and, although the Malay language is the popular one, the Javanese, in its peculiar written character, is still that of the court." According to Wallace the Malays are found in Malacca, Sumatra, Borneo, Tidore, Temata, Macian, and Obi. The northern peninsula of Gilolo and the island Ceram are inhabited by Alfuri; Timor and the neighboring isles as far to the west as Flores and Sandalwood, and as far to the east as Timorlant, are inhabited by a people more akin to the Papoos than to the Malays, the Timorese being strictly distinguished from both; the inhabitants of the island Buru are partly Malays, partly Alfuri; while the Papoos inhabit New Guinea, the Kay and Aru isles, Meisol, Salwatty, and Weigim, and all the country eastward as far as the Fiji Isles. (Comp. F. Müller, *Linguistische Ethnographie*, in Behm, *Geograph. Jahrbuch* [Gotha], 1868, vol. ii.) The Malay language is simple and easy in its construction, harmonious in its pronunciation, and easily acquired by Europeans. It is the *lingua Franca* of the Eastern Archipelago. Of its numerous dialects, the Javanese is the most refined, a superiority which it owes to the influence upon it of Sanscrit literature. From the Arabians (who gave the Malays Mohammedanism) their characters are borrowed, and many Arabic words have also been incorporated with the Malay language, by means of which the Javanese are able to supply the deficiency of scientific terms in their own tongue.

Religion.—The civilized Malays are generally Mohammedans in religious belief; they embraced the faith of the Crescent in the 13th or 14th century. The tribes in the interior and the "men of the sea" have either no religion at all, or only the most debased superstition. In the years 1805–38 a sect of wild fanatics, the Padris-Priests, also called Orang-Patih, white men (after their dress), sought to re-establish their superstitious creed by fire and sword. They did much mischief until the Hollanders found that their own safety as rulers was threatened, and, after a short war, subdued the Padris and broke their power most substantially. The moral character of the Indo-Malays generally is not high; they are passionate, treacherous, and revengeful. But it must be said that the cruelty and persecution which the Malays suffered at the hands of the Portuguese, who became their conquerors in the 16th century, and afterwards under the sway of the Hollanders, greatly moulded the present character of this people. Little is done, even in our day, to ameliorate the forlorn condition of this unfortunate people. Polygamy is practiced only among the affluent and in the large towns. Marriage can be effected in three ways: either by purchase of the woman, who, upon the decease of her husband, becomes the property of his nearest blood-relation; by entering upon a life of servitude with the proposed father-in-law, a custom reminding us of the patriarchal days of the Bible; by an equal tax borne by both contracting parties. They practice the right of circumcision upon the male child between the ages of 6 and 10. The N. Testament was translated into the Malay language as early as the middle of the 17th century (1668), by Brower; the O. T. only three fourths of a century later (1735); the whole Bible was published at Batavia in 1758 in 5 vols., and often since, e. g. by Willmet (1824, 3 vols. 8vo). Comp. Dulaurier, *Mémoires, lettres et rapports relatifs du cours de langues Malaye et Javanaise* (Par. 1843); Grey and Bleek, *Handbook of African, Australian, and Polynesian Theology* (Cape City, 1858 sq., 3 vols. 8vo). See Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (Leipsic, 1869, 5 vols.); Wallace, *Studies of Man and Nature* (London, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v. See MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

Mal'cham (Heb. *Malkam'*, מַלְכָּם, *their king*, as often [and as it should be rendered in Zeph. i, 5, instead of the Auth. Vers. "Malcham," i. e. MOLOCH]; Septuag. Μελχάμ v. r. Μελχάς, Vulg. *Molchom*), the fourth-named of the seven sons of Shaharaim by his wife Hodesh (1 Chron. viii, 9). B.C. prob. 1612. See MILCOM.

Malchi'ah (Heb. *Malkiyah'*, מַלְכִּיָּה, and [in Jer. xxxviii, 6] *Malkiya'hu*, מַלְכִּיָּהוּ, *king of Jehovah*; Sept. Μελχία or Μελχίας, but in Neh. v. r. Μελχεία or Μελχείας; Auth. Version "Malchijah," in 1 Chron. ix, 12; xxiv, 9; Neh. iii, 11; x, 3; xii, 42; Ezra x, 25, last occurrence; "Melchiah" in Jer. xxi, 1), the name of at least ten persons near the time of the Babylonian exile.

1. The son of Ethni, and father of Baasciah. Levites of the family of Gershom (1 Chron. vi, 40). B.C. much ante 1014.

2. The head of the fifth division of the sacerdotal order in the distribution appointed by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 9). B.C. 1014.

3. A priest, the father of Pashur (1 Chron. ix, 12; Neh. xi, 12), which latter was one of those who proposed to execute the prophet Jeremiah on a charge of treason (Jer. xxxviii, 1), although he had but unfavorably answered his inquiry respecting the fate of the city (Jer. xxi, 1). B.C. ante 589. He is very possibly the same with the son of Hammelech (lit. *the king's son*), and owner or constructor of the private dungeon into which Jeremiah was cruelly thrown (Jer. xxxviii, 6). See JEREMIAH. "The title *ben-ham-Melek* is applied to Jerahmeel (Jer. xxxvi, 26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners Jeremiah and Baruch; to Joash, who appears to have held an office inferior to that of the governor of the city, and to whose custody Micaiah was committed by Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 26); and to Maasciah, who was slain by Zichri, the Ephraimite, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, in the reign of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii, 7). It would seem from these passages that the title 'king's son' was official, like that of 'king's mother,' and applied to one of the royal family, who exercised functions somewhat similar to those of Potiphar in the court of Pharaoh."

4. One of the Israelites, former residents (or descendants) of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 25). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of the same place (or parentage) who did likewise (Ezra x, 25). B.C. 459. In the Sept. (ad loc. and 1 Esd. ix, 26) his name appears as Ἀσυβίας.

6. One of the former residents (or descendants) of Harim, who assisted in reconstructing the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. iii, 11). B.C.

446. He was one of the Israelites who had previously divorced his Gentile wife (Ezra x, 31). B.C. 459.

7. Son of Rechab, and ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, who repaired the dung-gate of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. iii, 14). B.C. 446.

8. The son of a "goldsmith," and the repairer of part of the wall of Jerusalem opposite Ophel (Neh. iii, 31). B.C. 446.

9. One of the priests appointed as musicians, apparently vocal, to celebrate the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

10. One of those who supported Ezra on the left hand while reading the law to the people assembled at Jerusalem (Neh. viii, 4); probably the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant entered into on the same occasion (Neh. x, 3). B.C. cir. 410.

Mal'chiel (Heb. *Malkiel'*, מַלְכִּיאֵל, *king of God;* Sept. Μελχιήλ), the second of the two sons of Beriah, son of Asher (Gen. xlvi, 17); he became the "father" (? founder) of Birzavith (1 Chron. vii, 31), and his descendants bore his name (Numb. xxvi, 45). B.C. 1856. "Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 7, 4) reckons him with Heber among the six sons of Asher, thus making up the number of Jacob's children and grandchildren to seventy, without reckoning great-grandchildren."

Mal'chielite (Heb. *Malkieli'*, מַלְכִּיאֵלִי, patronymic from *Malchiel*, used collectively; Sept. Μαλχιηλί, Auth. Vers. "Malchielites"), a descendant of MALCHIEL (Numb. xxvi, 45).

Malchi'jah (in several passages, for different men). See MALCHIAH.

Mal'chiram (Heb. *Malkiram'*, מַלְכִּירָם, *king of height;* Sept. Μελχιράμ), the second son of king Jehoiachin, born to him (according to Jewish tradition, by Susannah) during his captivity (1 Chron. iii, 18), and apparently himself without issue (see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. post 598.

Malchi-shu'a (Heb. *Malki-Shu'a*, מַלְכִּי־שׁוּעַ, *king of help*, twice as one word, מַלְכִּישׁוּעַ, 1 Sam. xiv, 49; xxxi, 2; where the Auth. Vers. Anglicizes "Melchi-shua;" Septuag. and Vulg. everywhere Μαλχισουέ, *Melchisua*), the second or third named of the four sons of king Saul (1 Chron. viii, 33; ix, 39), apparently by Ahinoam (1 Sam. xiv, 49); he perished in the battle at Gilboa with his father (1 Sam. xxxi, 2; 1 Chron. x, 2). B.C. 1053. "In the fact that the name of Saul's eldest son was Jehovistic in form (*Jehovah hath given*), whereas no such peculiarity is found in the names of the other sons, some writers (e. g. Mr. F. Newman) have seen a trace of Saul's gradual apostasy. Josephus only mentions Malchishuah once, *after* his brothers (Μελχισός, *Ant.* vi, 14, 7)."

Mal'chus (Μάλχος, from the Heb. מֶלֶךְ, *king*, or מַלּוּךְ, *counsellor*), a slave of the high-priest Caiaphas, and the individual among the party sent to arrest Jesus whose right ear was cut off by Peter in the garden of Gethsemane (John xviii, 10), but which was cured by a touch from Christ (Luke xxii, 51). He had a kinsman, another slave of the same master (John xviii, 26). A.D. 29. The name of Malchus was not unfrequent among the Greeks (see Wetstein, ad loc.; Gesenius, *Monum. Phœn.* p. 409), but it was usually applied to persons of Oriental countries, as to an Arab chieftain (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 5, 1; xiv, 14, 1; xv, 6, 2). This Malchus "was the personal servant (δοῦλος) of the high-priest, and not one of the bailiffs or apparitors (ὑπηρέτης) of the Sanhedrim. The high-priest intended is Caiaphas, no doubt (though Annas is called ἀρχιερεύς in the same connection), for John, who was personally known to the former (John xviii, 15), is the only one of the evangelists who gives the name of Malchus. This servant was probably stepping forward at the moment, with others, to handcuff or pinion Jesus, when the zealous Peter struck at him with his sword. The blow was undoubtedly meant to be more effective, but reached only the ear. It may be, as Stier remarks (*Reden Jesu*, vi, 268), that the man, seeing the danger, threw his head or body to the left, so as to expose the right ear more than the other. The allegation that the writers are inconsistent with each other, because Matthew, Mark, and John say either ὠτίον or ὠτάριον (as if that meant the lappet or tip of the ear), while Luke says οὖς, is groundless. The Greek of the New Testament age, like the modern Romaic, often made no distinction between the primitive and diminutive. In fact, Luke himself exchanges the one term for the other in this very narrative. The Saviour, as his pursuers were about to seize him, asked to be left free for a moment longer (ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου), and that moment he used in restoring the wounded man to soundness. The ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου may indicate (which is not forbidden by ἀφεῖλεν, ἀπέκοψεν) that the ear still adhered slightly to its place. It is noticeable that Luke, the physician, is the only one of the writers who mentions the act of healing" (Smith). "Some think Peter's name was omitted by the synoptists, lest the publication of it in his lifetime should expose him to the revenge of the unbelieving Jews, but, as the gospels were not *published*, this seems improbable."

Maldive Islands, a chain of low coral islands in the Indian Ocean, about 400 miles west-south-west of Ceylon, some 500 miles in length by 45 in average breadth, consist of 17 groups or atolls, each atoll surrounded by a coral reef. The entire number, including the islets, is estimated at about 50,000. Mali, the largest of the chain, seven miles in circumference, with a population of 2000, is the residence of the native prince, "the sultan of the Twelve Thousand Islands," who is a tributary prince to the governor of Ceylon. The population of all the islands is estimated at 150,000. The larger and inhabited islands are clad with palm, fig, citron, and bread-fruit trees. Grain is also abundantly produced. Wild-fowl breed in prodigious numbers; fish, rice (imported from Hindustan), and cocoa-nuts, constitute the food of the inhabitants. These people are strict Mohammedans in their religion.

Maldonatus, Joannes (1), a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Las Casas-de-la-Reina, in Estremadura, in 1534; studied at the University of Salamanca, and afterwards taught Greek, philosophy, and theology with great success; the lecture-rooms of the college were often too small to accommodate his numerous pupils. He subsequently removed to Poitiers, France, from whence the cardinal of Lorraine brought him to the University of Pont-à-Mousson. Later he came to Paris, and there created an unprecedented enthusiasm. His exegetical lectures were attended not only by Romanists, but even by Protestants, and the renown of his teaching reminds one of the history of Abelard. His brilliant course was checkered by accusations against him of having induced the president, Montbrun, to will away all his fortune to the Order of the Jesuits, and of teaching false doctrines touching the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. He was acquitted, however, on both charges, but left Paris, and retired to Bourges, where he devoted himself to exegetical studies, and prepared several of the works (see list below) which have made his name celebrated. He was called to Rome by pope Gregory XIII, to take a part in the publication of the Greek Septuagint. He died in that city in 1583. His principal works are *Commentarii in præcipuos Sacræ Scripturæ libros Veteris Testamenti* (Paris, 1643, fol.):—*Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas*, etc. (Lugd. 1615; Mayence, 1841–45, 5 vols. 8vo). "Though condemned by some, and procuring for its author the title of 'virulentissimus et maledicentissimus,' this work has received from Catholic and Protestant writers a just meed of praise (see Bayle, Richard Simon, Schlichtingius, M. Poole, and Jackson). In this work Maldonatus collates the opinions of the fathers with great ability, and does not hesitate to differ even from Augustine, when sound exegesis demands it. He shows acquaintance with the Vatican MS. of the N. T.,

and with the Sept. version of the O. T., and with the original Hebrew." The critical Simon (*Hist. crit. des princip. commentateurs du N. T.* p. 618 sq.) says he succeeded better than any one else in explaining the literal sense of the sacred writers. He also wrote *Traité des Sacrements* (Lyon. 1614, 4to) :—*Traité de la grâce*, etc. (Paris, 1677, fol.) :—*Traité des anges et des démons* (Paris, 1617) :—*Tractatus de cæremoniis* (*Bibliotheca ritualis*, Rome, 1781, 4to). *Summula casuum conscientiæ* has been, we believe, unjustly accredited to Maldonatus. It is a work of doubtful morality, and very unlike the productions of Maldonatus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, s. v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s. v.; Prat, *Maldonat et l'Université de Paris* (1857); *Theol. Quarterly*, 1860 (iv), p. 682.

Maldonatus, Joannes (2), a Spanish Jesuit, who, according to Aubertus Miræus, was a priest of Burgos, and is stated by Zeller to have ordered the lessons of the Roman Breviary, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. In 1549 he published a treatise, *De Senectute Christiana*, and an elegant abridgment of the lives of the saints.—Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. iii, s. v.

Male (Heb. זָכָר, *zakar'*, Gen. i, 27; vi, 19; xxxiv, 25), applied to the male of either man or beasts. The superior estimation in which male children were held among the Hebrews is testified by numerous passages of Scripture, and we find the same feeling, expressed almost in the same words, still existing in Eastern countries (see Job iii, 3; and comp. Roberts, *Observ.* ad loc.). See CHILD.

Malebranche, NICHOLAS, a French Jesuit, distinguished for his peculiar philosophical views, and for the brilliancy and fascination of the style in which they were expounded. He was one of the most illustrious of the Cartesians, aiming by his speculations to correct the dangerous tendencies of Des Cartes's philosophy [see SPINOZA], and occupies an eminent, though not a controlling, position in the history of the higher philosophy. Some knowledge of his system is required for the just estimation of the doctrines both of Locke and of Leibnitz, and for the illustration of the views of Berkeley.

Life.—Malebranche was born of respectable parents in Paris, Aug. 6, 1638. Feeble and sickly from his birth, and deformed by a curvature of the spine, he was reared with the tenderest care, and was educated mainly at home. His ill health and his deformity confirmed the natural shyness of his disposition. He avoided the companionship of robust, sanguine, and active playmates, and spent most of his time in solitary meditation. He found his world within himself. Eager for seclusion from the turmoil of life, he sought a refuge in the Society of Jesuits, and joined the Congregation of the Oratory in the twenty-second year of his age. His studies were at first ecclesiastical history and antiquities, but these he soon abandoned in consequence of the weakness of his memory. He was next induced by the learned Richard Simon to prosecute sacred criticism and the Oriental languages. They had few attractions for him. In this wavering mood he picked up the then recently published treatise of Des Cartes *On Man*. To this newly-acquired treasure he devoted himself assiduously, and sought the mastery of the Cartesian doctrines and of philosophical problems. Thus he busied himself for the next ten years of his life, and became one of the most earnest and eminent of the Cartesians. His perspicacity discerned the weak point of the Cartesian system; and he was too honest and too independent to be "addictus jurare in verba magistri." He meditated intently—closing the windows of his room that he might not be distracted by the light and noise of the outer world; and he revolved in silence and solitude the arduous questions which presented themselves for solution. He read little, thinking the knowledge of man, of mind, and of God the all-sufficient realm of speculation; and considering that such knowledge was to be attained only by diligence, introspection, and abstract reasoning. Fortified and enriched by such silent and solitary labors, Malebranche proposed his modifications of Cartesianism in a work entitled *Récherche de la Vérité*, the first volume of which appeared at Paris in 1673; the second and third were published in the course of the ensuing year. An improved and enlarged edition was brought out, towards the close of his life, in 1712. This is his principal work; it is that which determines his position in the history of philosophic opinion. Besides other interesting topics discussed, it, in a manner less open to objection, propounded his celebrated doctrine of *Seeing all things in God*. The treatise itself was an examination of the nature and characteristics of knowledge, of the origin of ideas, of the mode of avoiding error and arriving at truth, of the precautions required to guard against delusions of various kinds, and especially the fallacies which arise from the senses and from prejudice. Malebranche has been accused of unacknowledged obligations to Bacon. In this he only imitated the example of his illustrious master Des Cartes. Nor did he deviate from his exemplar in the attention bestowed upon the literary execution of the book. The style was so exquisite that it exercised an irresistible fascination over all its readers. Many who rejected his principles and deductions were charmed by their exposition; and many were beguiled into the acceptance of his reveries by the plausiblity of their presentation, and by the beauty of their expression. His ornate style disguised his dogmas even to himself. His language wanted philosophical precision, and offered many salient points for attack. His system was assailed by Foucher, by Antoine Arnauld, and by Locke. The Jesuit Du Tertre, at the instigation of his order, reluctantly impugned it. Hardouin, in his *Atheists Unmasked*, accused it of atheistic characteristics. Leibnitz, in defending it against such charges, admitted that the looseness of the brilliant presentation rendered it liable to misapprehension and misrepresentation, but maintained that the real opinions of the author were very different from those attributed to him by his opponents (*Lettre à M. Remond*, Nov. 4, 1715). The whole system of Malebranche, so far as it is a departure from Cartesianism, is centred in the doctrine of his "Vision in God," and this doctrine led by a logical development to those views of free will and grace which resulted in the controversy with Arnauld (1680). His inquiries were, however, actuated throughout by an earnest religious desire for the purification and elevation of his fellow-men, and were not confined to metaphysical speculation, but were extended to practical topics. With this design he composed his *Consolations Chrétiennes* (1676), and his *Traité de la Morale* (1684). The latter is one of the landmarks in ethical philosophy, and has merited the high commendation of Sir James Mackintosh. Besides these noted treatises, Malebranche was the author of several essays, on various scientific topics, published in the Journal of the Academy of Sciences. Whatever opposition was excited by the peculiarity, or the extravagance, or the apparent peril of his metaphysical speculations, he was always held in the highest esteem for his amiability, his intelligence, his simple goodness, and his unaffected piety.

The life of a valetudinarian so retired, and bound by the restraints of a rigid religious order, offers few incidents for curious investigation. The calm and equable tenor of Malebranche's frail existence was prolonged till he had entered his seventy-eighth year, when, in another form of existence, he may be believed to have entered upon that "vision of all things in God" which, with pious enthusiasm, he had endeavored to anticipate on earth. He died in Paris Oct. 13, 1715, a year and a month before his great contemporary Leibnitz.

Philosophy.—The cardinal tenet of the philosophy of Malebranche, which contradistinguishes it from that of Des Cartes, of Spinoza, of Leibnitz, etc., of the reforming and of the acquiescing acolytes of the Cartesian

school, is the doctrine of *seeing all things in God*, to which such frequent reference has already been made. The motive, the meaning, the genesis of this doctrine, and its relation to antecedent, contemporary, and subsequent speculation, are unintelligible, unless it is contemplated in connection with the dogmas of Des Cartes and their development. Des Cartes (q. v.) recognised only two essences in the universe, thought and extension, which with him were the equivalents of mind and matter.

The mystery, the enigma, which presents itself in such endless forms, and which inevitably returns with all the Protean changes of metaphysical speculation—which cannot be evaded in the study of that strange microcosm, *Man*, in which body and soul are so intimately, and, apparently, so everlastingly united—which cannot be overlooked in ascertaining the interaction of the *mens sana* or *insana*, and the *corpus sanum* or *insanum*, or in determining the grounds of moral obligation —the wondrous riddle is, how can mind act upon matter, or matter act upon mind, and the one regulate or affect the other. The diversity of the unsatisfactory solutions will be seen by comparing the explanations propounded by Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and Herbert Spencer. Des Cartes, recognising the impossibility of any solution in the relations of the transitory creation, as he had arbitrarily conceived it, and with the absolute divorce of the two existences postulated by him, introduced a *Deus ex machina*, and imagined a divine interposition to effect concurrent action on every occasion where the joint operation of intellectual and physical nature was manifested. To this hypothesis has been given the name of the doctrine of *Assistancy*. This scheme is assuredly obnoxious to the sharp censure of Aristotle on some of his precursers, and renders the active intelligence of the human race a mere collection of intrusive episodes, like a miserable tragedy (*Metaph.* xi, x–xiii. iii). The explanation was soon discovered to be not merely a presumption, but utterly inefficacious, and of most pernicious tendency. Obviously, it made the creating and sustaining God the direct agent in man's actions in all cases where inward contemplation proceeded to outward act, and it made the universe a complicated piece of puppetry, whose motions were communicated by a hidden personage constantly jerking at the strings. The logical inconsistency of maintaining an entire separation between the grand constituents of human nature, and of requiring divine intervention for all effective manifestation of human thought, offended the acute perspicacity of Spinoza. He sought to restore harmony and congruity to the philosophical interpretation of the intelligible world, by considering thought and action, mind and matter, as only effluences, phenomenal coruscations, from the one, sole, independent, self-sustaining, eternal, all-embracing Existence, which did not so much support and regulate, as constitute and contain alike the whole creation and the Creator. This, of course, pushed Cartesianism to the absurdity of its logical extreme, but annihilated all moral responsibility, all distinctions of nature, annulled all individual existence, establishing, in short, a pure Pantheism. But Pantheism, whether Stoic, Platonic, Spinozistic, or Schellingistic, is the negation of a personal God, of all separable existence, and of all the duties, the hopes, and the fears that spring from human obligations to a heavenly Father, and to a divine Creator and beneficent Governor of the universe.

About the same time that Spinoza was secretly engaged in transmuting Cartesianism into Pantheism, and probably independently of any impulse from his investigations, Malebranche endeavored to uphold and enforce the obligations which were nullified by the Spinozistic system, to preserve all the dogmas of revealed religion, to fortify the sense of religious duty, to escape the hazards and aberrations of the Cartesian theory, are yet to uphold the Cartesian doctrine in its essential characteristics, by correcting its excesses, and by indicating the means of conciliation between the two widely separated constituents of his creation. The Cartesian fantasy of assistancy he supplanted by his own celebrated hypothesis of *Occasional Causes*. Instead of supposing all material motion, in accordance with the movements of the apparently moving mind, to be due to a mechanical impulse of the Divinity, disconnected from human intelligence, he imagined that all such phenomena were provoked by images of change reflected from the divine mind, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from *seeing all things in God*.

A half-truth is the most dangerous, because it is the most seductive form of delusion. The moiety of truth which is present usually precludes the suspicion of deception. Such a half-truth was Malebranche's devout imagination of the vision of the universe in the divine mind. It was, however unwittingly to himself, the Pantheism of Spinoza, contemplated from a different point of view, and disguised by a brilliant but very translucent veil. It is an indubitable, because it is a revealed truth, that "in God we live, and move, and have our being;" that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding;" that "the Lord giveth wisdom, out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding;" but how this quickening and illuminating power of the Almighty is so exercised as not to infringe upon the independent action of the human mind, and the free agency of the human will, is one of the most bewildering problems of transcendental speculation. Our finite capacities can attain a definite solution only by a violent severance of the Gordian knot, and mutilation of the truth. We may throw aside one half, and accept the other half as complete and exclusive, thus welcoming Fatalism on the one side, and Pantheism, in all the various shades of idealistic subtlety, on the other. That every moment of our continuous existence must be ascribed to the unintermittent support of the original creating power; that all our thoughts and actions, and our capacity for thought and action, require the same upholding agency; that this is the divine action of grace on our will and conscience; the divine guidance and providence in shaping our ends and the issues of our conduct; the divine impulse and irradiation in our best decisions, and in our intuitive apprehensions of recondite truths—these are positions earnestly entertained and asserted by the clearest and strongest thinkers, of all schools and vocations, in every age. A cloud of witnesses to these conclusions might be summoned, more numerous than those convoked by Sir William Hamilton in support of the doctrine of common-sense, and rendering much less questionable testimony. "Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est;" "a Deo projecta et sapientia" (Ecclus. i, 1; xv, 10). "Mihi autem Deus dedit dicere ex sententia, et præsumere digna horum quæ mihi dantur: quoniam ipse sapientiæ dux est et sapientiam emendatur. In manu enim illius et nos et sermones nostri, et omnis sapientia, et operum scientia, et disciplina. Ipse enim dedit mihi horum quæ sunt scientiam veram" (Wisd. vii, 15–17). "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." "Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino umquam fuit" (Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* ii, lxvi, § 167). This tenet may have been borrowed by Cicero from Plato, or even from Homer, but it has been recently approved by Whewell, Blackie, and Dallas. "Sacer intra nos spiritus sedet; malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos. Hic, prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vero vir sine deo nemo est; an potuit aliquis supra fortunam nisi ab illo adjustus exsurgere? Ille dat consilia magnifica et erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum, quis deus incertum est, habitat deus" (Seneca, *Epist. Mor.* iv, xii [xlii], § 2). Similar declarations are to be found in Thales, Democritus, Plato, Proclus, Plotinus, and a very remarkable one in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* v, 14). S. Augustin says, "Initium ergo ejus figmentum est Dei: non enim est ulla natura etiam in extremis infimisque vestiolis, quam non ille constituit,

a quo est omnis modus, omnis species, omnis ordo; sine quibus nihil rerum inveniri vel cogitari potest" (*De Civ. Dei*, xi, xv). The thesis has been amply commented upon, elucidated and expanded, by S. Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and the better half of the schoolmen. It is confirmed by lord Bacon, John Millin, bishop Berkeley, and many of the most distinguished moderns, out of Germany as well as in that land of golden mists. "In this, at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, reason is pre-eminently spiritual, and a spirit, even our spirit, through an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say, *Our Father*" (Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*); and the same author cites with approval a still stronger utterance to the like effect from that easily distinguishable personage, John Smith, 1660.

Leibnitz might well say that Malebranche's doctrine was no novelty. It was, indeed, both very old and very generally accredited, but in a form and with an application widely different from what was contemplated by him in its new presentation. The long citation of the evidences of its general acceptance—and not the tenth part accessible has been given—may be pardoned as being necessary to exhibit its familiarity to the greatest intellects, and its inclusion of actual and important truth. The doctrine is true, but it is most perilous. It must be received with habitual caution, and with most circumspect limitations. It runs along a sharp crest, with precipices on either hand stretching sheer down into unfathomable abysses. On this narrow path, at this giddy elevation, Malebranche was unable to preserve his balance, however pure and lofty was his design. His speculation topples over into the yawning gulf of Pantheism, and is distinguished from Spinozism rather by its motive and spirit than by its tendency or result. "The vision of all things in God" becomes a new because a changed doctrine in the hands of the philosophical Jesuit. He is carried away from all safe landmarks by his own noble but misguiding enthusiasm, and justifies the censure of Brucker, "non multum ab enthusiasmo, vel etiam a Quackerorum illuminatione immediata abesse videtur."

In the theory of Malebranche, body and spirit, being totally disjoined from each other, and incapable of intercommunication, can be brought into harmonious—and, indeed, into possible—co-operation only by the intervention of a higher nature. As knowledge, according to the postulate of Des Cartes, is the substance and the evidence of intelligible existence, supreme knowledge or omniscience must be the attribute and exclusive property of the only Absolute Existence. All things, therefore, primarily exist in the Divine Mind and in the Divine Contemplation; and their genuine, as well as their original, reality is as the archetypal idea of the Divine Intelligence. Temporal existences, with their alterations and combinations, proceed from the divine aspiration. All their forms, modes, habits, changes—separately, and in the intricate dance of spiritual and material mutations and complications—are presented and revealed to the gaze of other intelligences only in the mirror of God's mind. This is not very remote from the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz, but it is much nearer to the infinite effluxes of the Godhead in Spinoza. It is only in their divine types that we contemplate the marvels of sublunary change, receive impressions from without, and regulate our actions accordingly. We see all things in God—and all material motions concurrent with our will are produced, as on the Cartesian system, by divine intervention. All our perceptions and sensations, apparently excited by extrinsic stimulations, are due to divine action. The extrinsic object is perceived, not in itself, nor even in its sensible image; but the sensible image is only the reflection of the idea abiding in the mind of God. Thus man, and man's sensibilities, are not the cause, the immediate cause at least, of his perceptions or of his actions; but they are only the *occasion* of God's revealing that perception through the idea subsisting in himself, or of his impelling to the action which may ensue from the conception, but without actual dependence upon it. "Non sentement les hommes ne sont point les véritables causes des mouvements qu'ils produisent dans leurs corps; il semble même qu'il y ait contradiction qu'ils puissent l'être. . . . Il n'y a que Dieu qui soit véritable cause, et qui est véritablement la puissance de mouvoir les corps" (*Traité de Morale*, liv. vi, p^tie^ ii, ch. iii).

The cardinal doctrine of Malebranche is all that preserves enduring interest, and that needs concern us here. It gained only a very limited and temporary acceptance. Its invalidity was almost immediately and intuitively recognised, and it was soon supplanted by other schemes of like character and of like frailty, or was hustled out of consideration by wholly contradictory doctrines. It may again return unexpectedly in other forms, but in its own Cartesian garb it has passed away forever. Its applications and developments, ingenious as they are, and animated as they are with a spirit of pure and deep devotion, have few special claims to attention. Many valuable counsels, many stimulating and comforting exhortations, many precious exhortations for the guidance of our investigations, our feelings, and our conduct, are presented in the graceful and perspicuous expositions of the serene-tempered and heavenly-minded philosopher, whose heart saw all things in God, if his metaphysics failed to prove that vision of the divinity to be the sole possible mode of finite thought and action. His moral system was directly founded on his cardinal tenet, and fell with it. He referred all virtue to the recognition and love of the universal order as it exists eternally in the Divine Reason, where every created reason contemplates it. There is some analogy between this view and the ennobling reflections of Donoso Cortes; but it is open to the objections made by Sir James Mackintosh, and to others which he has not made. Malebranche, however, merits the praise of the same just and discriminating critic, that "he is perhaps the first philosopher who has precisely laid down and rigidly adhered to the principle that virtue 'consists in pure intentions and dispositions of mind, without which actions, however conformable to rules, are not truly moral'"—a thesis developed, and perhaps degraded, by Paley.

The further criticism of Malebranche's writings is unnecessary, though they merited a formal refutation by Locke, a rectification and a partial acceptance by Leibnitz. "Quod ad controversiam attinet, utrum omnia videamus in Deo (quæ utique vetus est sententia, et, si sano sensu intelligatur, non omnino spernenda), an vero proprias ideas habeamus, sciendum est, et si omnia in Deo videamus, necesse tamen est ut habeamus et ideas proprias" . . . . (*Meditationes*, 1684; *Opera Ed. Dutens.* tom. ii, p^s^ i, p. 12; comp. *Lettre a M. Montmort*, Nov. 4, 1715; ibid. p. 217).

Thus Malebranche is admitted into honorable and lasting conjunction with the illustrious names of Spinoza, Locke, and Leibnitz; and, sharing in the light in which they lived, he participated in moulding the influences which formed the succeeding generation of bold and curious metaphysical inquirers, and left behind the memory and the example of an earnest, sincere, and irreproachable existence. The other productions of Malebranche were partly controversial and partly religious. Of the latter we may mention the *Entretiens d'un Philosophe Chrétien et d'un Philosophe Chinois sur la Nature de Dieu* (Paris, 1708):—*De la Nature et de la Grâce* (Amsterdam, 1680):—*Entretiens sur la Metaphysique et sur la Religion* (Rotterd. 1688; of a mystical character, blending religion with metaphysics). A complete edition of his works was published at Paris, 1712, in 11 vols. 12mo; new edition by Genoude and Lourdoucix, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo.

Literature.—The works of Malebranche are probably sufficient of themselves to supply all that is necessary to be known of the peculiarities of his system, and to be indicated in regard to its tendencies. Besides Brucker

and the other historians of philosophy, the following may be consulted with advantage: Arnauld, *Des Idées Vraies et Fausses;* Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Critique;* Norris, *Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intellectual World* (Lond. 1701, 2 vols. 8vo); Leibnitz, *Examen des Sentiments de Malebranche*, in Raspe, *Œuvres Philosophiques de M. Leibnitz* (Amst. 1765); Leibnitz, *Théodicée* and *Epistola ad Remondum;* Locke, *Examination of M. Malebranche's Opinion;* Fontenelle, *Hist. du Renouvellement de l'Académie Royale des Sciences;* Dug. Stewart, *Philosophy of the Human Mind*, and *Dissertation I, Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica;* Mackintosh, *Dissertation, Supplem. Encycl. Britann.;* Sir William Hamilton, *Lectures on Metaphysics* (Boston, 1859); Blakey, *History of the Philosophy of Mind* (London, 1850), vol. ii; Saisset, *Panthéisme*, i, 66 sq.; and the same in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 1, 1862; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. xx, s. v.; Erdmann, *Malebranche, Spinoza, die Skeptiker und Mystiker des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1836); Relstab, *Dissertatio de Malebranchio Philosopho* (1846); Hallam, *Introd. to the Lit. of Europe* (Harpers' edition), ii, 91 sq.; Blampignon, *Étude sur Malebranche* (Paris, 1862, 8vo). (G. F. H.)

Malec (*king*). So the Mohammedans call the principal angel in care of hell. In the Koran it is said (speaking of the infidels), "And they shall call aloud, saying, O Malec, intercede for us, that the Lord would end us by annihilation. And he shall answer, Verily, ye shall remain here forever. We brought you the truth heretofore, and ye abhorred the truth." Some of the Mohammedan doctors say this answer will be given a thousand years after the final dissolution of this world. —Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* vol. ii, s. v.; Sale, *Koran*, p. 401.

Malekites, the second of the four orthodox Mohammedan sects. The founder of the Malekites was Malek Ibn-Ansa, born at Medina about the year of the Hegira 95. He was remarkable for strenuously insisting on the literal acceptation of the prohibitory precepts. Tradition will have it that when visited in his last illness by a friend, who found him in tears, and asked him the cause of his affliction, he replied, "Who has more reason to weep than I? Would God that for every question decided by me according to my own opinion I had received so many stripes, then would my account be easier. Would to God I had never given any decision of my own." The Malekites are chiefly found in Barbary and other parts of Africa.—Sale's *Koran*, Prel. Disc. § 8; Taylor, *Hist. of Mohammedanism*, p. 288; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* vol. ii, s. v. See Mohammedanism.

Mal'eleël (Luke iii, 37). See Mahalaleel.

Malevolence is that disposition of mind which inclines us to wish ill to any person. It discovers itself in frowns and a lowering countenance, in uncharitableness, in evil sentiments, hard speeches to or of its object, in cursing and reviling, and doing mischief either with open violence or secret spite, as far as there is power. See Malice.

Maley, George W., an American Methodist minister, was born in western Pennsylvania in 1799; was educated at an academy in Butler, Pennsylvania; was converted in 1819; was licensed to preach and recommended to the Ohio Conference in 1821, and was appointed to the Mad River Circuit; in 1822, to London; in 1823, to Piqua; in 1824, to White Oak; in 1825, to Piqua; in 1826–7, to Union; in 1828–9, to Wilmington; in 1830–1, to Hillsboro; in 1832–3, to White Oak; in 1834, to Madison; in 1835, to New Richmond; in 1836–7, to Milford; in 1838, to Franklin; in 1839–40, to Germantown; in 1841, agent for Springfield and Germantown Academy; in 1842, to Franklin; in 1843, to Eaton; in 1844–5, to Cincinnati City Mission. In 1846 he joined the Kentucky Conference, M. E. Church South; in 1846–7, was presiding elder of Covington District; in 1848 was appointed to Soule Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio; the next ten years was supernumerary, and the remainder of his life superannuated. He died in Urbana, Champaign Co., Ohio, Dec. 14, 1866. In his last illness, though suffering, he was uncomplaining and happy, and sent his love and greetings to his ministerial associates: "Tell my brethren of the Kentucky Conference that I die in the *faith*, and in full fellowship with the whole Church, East, West, North, and South."—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1867.

Malice is a settled or deliberate determination to revenge or do hurt to another. It more frequently denotes the disposition of inferior minds to execute every purpose of mischief within the more limited circle of their abilities. It is a most hateful temper in the sight of God, strictly forbidden in his holy Word (Col. iii, 8–12), disgraceful to rational creatures, and every way inimical to the spirit of Christianity (Matt. v, 44). See Malevolence.

Malignity, a disposition obstinately bad or malicious. Malignancy and malignity are words nearly synonymous. In some connections, malignity seems rather more pertinently applied to a radical depravity of nature, and malignancy to indications of this depravity in temper and conduct in particular instances. See Malevolence.

Mallary, Charles Dutton, D.D., an American Baptist minister, was born at Poultney, Vermont, Jan. 23, 1801. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1821, and in 1822 removed to Columbia, South Carolina; was ordained, and preached six years. He afterwards resided in Georgia, and was a principal founder of Mercer University. In the division of the denomination in 1835, on the missionary question, he advocated that system. He died July 31, 1864. Dr. Mallary published a *Life of Mercer*, and *Soul Prosperity*.—Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* p. 593.

Malleolus. See Hemmerlin.

Mal'los, a town of Asia Minor, whose inhabitants (Μαλλώται, Vulg. *Mallotæ*, A. V. "they of Mallos"), with the people of Tarsus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes because he had bestowed them on one of his concubines (2 Macc. iv, 30). The absence of the king from Antioch to put down the insurrection gave the infamous Menelaus, the high-priest, an opportunity of purloining some of the sacred vessels from the Temple of Jerusalem (ver. 32, 39), an act which finally led to the murder of the good Onias (ver. 34, 35). Mallos was an important city of Cilicia, lying at the mouth of the Pyramus (Seihun), on the shore of the Mediterranean, north-east of Cyprus, and about twenty miles from Tarsus (Tersûs). (See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geography.*)

Mal'lothi (Hebrew *Mallo'thi*, מַלֹּתִי, perhaps for מַלֵּאתִי, *my fulness;* Septuag. Μαλλιθί v. r. Μεαλωθί, Μελληθί, Μελλωθί; Vulg. *Mellothi*), one of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (1 Chron. xxv, 4), and head of the nineteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxv, 26). B.C. 1014.

Mallows (מִלּוּחַ, *mallu'ach, salted;* Sept. ἅλιμον, Vulg. *herba*) occurs only in the passage where Job complains that he is subjected to the contumely of the meanest people, those "who cut up *mallows* by the bushes for their meat" (Job xxx, 4). The proper meaning of the word *malluach* has been a subject of considerable discussion among authors, in consequence, apparently, of its resemblance to the Greek μαλάχη, signifying "mallow," and also to *maluch*, which is said to be the Syriac name of a species of *Orache*, or *Atriplex*. It is difficult, if not impossible, to say which is the more correct interpretation, as both appear to have some foundation in truth, and seem equally adapted to the sense of the above-quoted passage. (See Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 791). The *malache* of the Greeks is distinguished by Dioscorides into two kinds, of which he states that the cultivated is more fit for food than the wild kind. Arabic authors apply the description of Dioscor-

ides to *khûb-bazí*, a name which in India is applied both to species of *Malva rotundifolia* and of *M. sylvestris*, which extend from Europe to the north of India, and which are still used as food in the latter country, as they formerly were in Europe, and probably in Syria. That some kind of mallow has been so used in Syria we have evidence in the quotation made by Mr. Harmer from Biddulph, who says, "We saw many poor people collecting *mallows* and three-leaved grass, and asked them what they did with it; and they answered, that it was all their food, and that they boiled it, and did eat it." Dr. Shaw, in his *Travels*, on the contrary, observes that "*Mellou-keah*, or *mulookiah*, מלוחיא, as in the Arabic, is the same with the *melochia* or *corchorus*, being a podded species of mallows, whose pods are rough, of a glutinous substance, and used in most of their dishes. *Mellou-keah* appears to be little different in name from מלוח (Job xxx, 4), which we render 'mallows,' though some other plant, of a more saltish taste, and less nourishing quality, may be rather intended." The plant alluded to is *Corchorus olitorius*, which has been adopted and figured in her *Scripture Herbal* (p. 255) by lady Calcott, who observes that this plant, called Jews' Mallow, ap-

Jews' Mallow (*Corchorus Olitorius*).

pears to be certainly that mentioned by the patriarch. Avicenna calls it *olus Judaicum;* and Rauwolf saw the Jews about Aleppo use the leaves as potherbs; "and this same mallow continues to be eaten in Egypt and Arabia, as well as Palestine." But there are so many plants of a mild mucilaginous nature which are used as articles of diet in the East, that it is hardly possible to select one in preference to another, unless we find a similarity in the name. Thus species of *Amaranthus*, of *Chenopodium*, of *Portulacca*, as well as the above *Corchorus*, and the *mallow*, are all used as food, and might be adduced as suitable to the above passages, since most of them are found growing wild in many parts of the countries of the East.

The learned Bochart, however, contends (*Hieroz.* part i, t. iii, c. 16) that the word *malluach* denotes a saltish plant called ἅλιμος by the Greeks, and which with good reason is supposed to be the *Atriplex halimus* of botanists, or tall shrubby *Orache*. The Sept., indeed, first gave ἄλιμα as the interpretation of *malluach*. Celsius adopts it (*Hierobot.* ii, 96 sq.), and many others consider it as the most correct. A good abstract of Bochart's arguments is given by Dr. Harris. In the first place the most ancient Greek translator interprets *malluach* by *halimos*. That the Jews were in the habit of eating a plant called by the former name is evident from the quotation given by Bochart from the Talmudical tract *Kiddusin* (c. iii, 65). By Ibn-Buetar, *malûkh* is given as the synonym of *al-kutuf al-buhuri*, i. e. the sea-side *Kutuf* or *Orache*, which is usually considered to be the *Atriplex marinum*, now *A. halimus*. Bochart, indeed, remarks that Dioscorides describes the *halimus* as a shrub with branches, destitute of thorns, with a leaf like the olive, but broader, and growing on the sea-shore. This notice evidently refers to the ἅλιμος (Dioscor. i, 121), which, as above stated, is supposed to be the *Atriplex halimus* of botanists, and the *Kutuf buhurî* of the Arabs, while the ἀτράφαξις of the same author (ii, 145) is their *kutuf* and *Atriplex hortensis*, Linnæus. Bochart quotes Galen as describing the tops of the former as being used for food when young. Dioscorides also says that its leaves are employed for the same purpose. (Comp. Theophrast. *Plant.* iv, 17; Athen. *Deipn.* iv, 161; Horace, *Ep.* i, 12, 7; Pliny, xxi, 55; Tournefort, *Trav.* i, 41.) What the Arab writers state as to the tops of the plants being eaten corresponds to the description of Job, who states that those to whom he refers *cropped upon the shrub*—which by some is supposed to indicate that the *malluach* grew near hedges. These, however, do not exist in the desert. There is no doubt that species of *Orache* were used as articles of diet in ancient times, and probably still are so in the countries where they are indigenous; but there are many other plants, similar in nature, that is, soft and succulent, and usually very saline, such as the *Salsolas*, *Salicornias*, etc., which, like the species of *Atriplex*, belong to the same natural family of *Chenopodeæ*, and which, from their saline nature, have received their respective names. Many of these are well known for yielding soda by incineration. In conformity with this, Mr. Good thinks that "the real plant is a species of *Salsola*, or 'salt-wort;' and that the term ἅλιμα, employed in the Greek versions, gives additional countenance to this conjecture." Some of these are shrubby, but most of them are herbaceous, and extremely common in all the dry, desert, and saline soils which extend from the south of Europe to the north of India. Most of them are saline and bitter, but some are milder in taste and mucilaginous, and are therefore employed as articles of diet, as spinach is in Europe. *Salsola Indica*, for instance, which is common on the coasts of the Peninsula of India, Dr. Roxburgh states, saved the lives of many thousands of the poor natives of India during the famine of 1791–2–3; for, while the plant lasted, most of the poorer classes who lived near the sea had little else to eat; and, indeed, its green leaves ordinarily form an essential article of the food of those natives who inhabit the maritime districts. For other

Sea-purslane (*Atriplex Halimus*).

interpretations, see Rosenmüller (ad loc. Job.). Mr. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 466) decides in favor of the above species of sea-purslane (*Atriplex halimus*), which he says "grows abundantly on the shores of the Mediterranean, in salt marshes, and also on the shores of the Dead Sea still more luxuriantly. We found thickets of it of considerable extent on the west side of the sea, and it exclusively supplied us with fuel for many days. It grows there to the height of ten feet—more than double its size on the Mediterranean. It forms a dense mass of thin twigs without thorns, has a very minute purple flower close to the stem, and small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten, as is the *Atriplex hortensis*, or Garden Orache, but it would be very miserable food."

Malluach. See MALLOWS.

Mal'luch (Heb. *Malluk'*, מַלּוּךְ, *reigned* over, or from the Syr. a *counsellor*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Μαλώχ, Vulg. *Maloch.*) A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Hashabiah and father of Abdi (1 Chron. vi, 44). B.C. much ante 1014.

2. (Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. *Melluch.*) An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Bani who renounced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 29). B.C. 459.

3. (Sept. Μαλούχ v. r. Βαλούχ, Vulg. *Maloch.*) Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Harim, who did the same (Ezra x, 32). B.C. 459.

4. (Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. *Melluch.*) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 4). B.C. 536. The associated names would appear to indicate that he was the same with one of those who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 4); although that would imply a very advanced age. B.C. cir. 410. He is probably the same with the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called MELICU (Neh. xii, 14, מַלִּיכוּ, Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. *Milicho*).

5. (Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. *Melluch.*) One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the same covenant (Neh. x, 27). B.C. cir. 410.

Malmesbury, WILLIAM OF, an English monastic and historian of the early period of his country's history, was born near the close of the 11th century, probably in Somersetshire, was educated at Oxford, and afterwards entered the Benedictine monastery whence he derived his name, and of which he became librarian. He died some time after 1142, but the exact date is not known. He wrote (in Latin) *De Gestis Regum*, a history of the kings of England from the Saxon invasion to the twenty-sixth year of Henry I (translated into English by the Rev. John Sharpe [Lond. 1815]; also in Bohn's Library, edited by Dr. Giles [1847]):—*Historiæ Novellæ*, extending from the twenty-sixth year of Henry I to the escape of the empress Maud from Oxford; and *De Gestis Pontificum*, containing an account of the bishops and principal monasteries of England from the conversion of Ethelbert of Kent by St. Augustine to 1123:—*Antiquities of Glastonbury*, and *Life of St. Wulstan* (printed in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*). Malmesbury gives proof in his writings of great diligence, good sense, modesty, and a genuine love of truth. His style is much above that of his contemporaries. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* (s. v. William of Malmesbury); *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1856 (Jan.), p. 295 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Malou, JEAN BAPTISTE, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ypern; studied theology at the University of Louvain, where in 1835 he became a professor; in 1848 was made bishop of Bruges, and died March 23, 1864. He wrote *La lecture de la Ste. Bible en langue vulgaire* (Louv. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo). His brother JULE is the author of *Recherches sur le véritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ* (Louv. 1848).

Malta. See MELITA.

Malta, Knights of. See KNIGHTHOOD; TEMPLARS.

Maltbie, EBENEZER DAVENPORT, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., Jan. 20, 1799; graduated at Hamilton College, New York, in 1824, and studied theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., which he left in 1826 to become tutor in Hamilton College. He was licensed to preach in 1832, and ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Hamilton, N. Y. In 1841 he took charge of the Hudson River Academy, and in 1843 became principal of a literary institution in Lansingburg, N. Y., which position he resigned eight years after on account of failing health. He died at Syracuse, N. Y., in 1859. Mr. Maltbie was an excellent teacher, beloved and honored as a pastor, and energetic and unwearied in his labors of charity and piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 74.

Maltby, Edward, D.D., an English prelate, was born at Norwich, England, in 1770; was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; in 1831 was made bishop of Chichester, and in 1836 was transferred to Durham. He died July 3, 1859. Dr. Maltby published several volumes of *Sermons* (1819, 1822, 1831):—*Occasional Sermons*:—*Illustration of the Truth of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1802, 8vo; 2d ed. 1803, 8vo):—*Psalms and Hymns* (32 mo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii; Thomas, *Dictionary of Biography*, s. v.

Maltby, Henry, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paris, N. Y., October 5, 1806, and graduated at Hamilton College, N. Y., in 1836. For some years he devoted himself to teaching in his native state, and subsequently built up a flourishing school in Flemingsburg, Ky. He studied theology privately, was licensed in 1847, and ordained pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Oxford, Ohio, in 1848. He was also a professor in Oxford Female College. He died May 22, 1860. Mr. Maltby was very successful as a teacher, and greatly beloved as a pastor; his sermons were characterized by systematic arrangement and fulness of thought, and his intercourse with the people was courteous and refined. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 97.

Malthus, THOMAS ROBERT, an English clergyman, was born at Rookery, Surrey County, England, in 1766; was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, graduating B.A. in 1788 and M.A. in 1791; soon after took holy orders, and obtained a curacy in Surrey, and identified himself with the "High-Church" party. In 1805 he was appointed professor of modern history and political economy at the East India College at Haileybury, in Hertfordshire, which position he held until his death, Dec. 29, 1834. Mr. Malthus devoted himself more particularly to the study of political economy and secular history, and received his professorship on this account. (For a résumé of the "Malthusian theory," concerning the relation of population to the means of sustenance, see Chambers. *Cyclop.* s. v.) He preached frequently, however, while in this position, and was an earnest laborer for the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom among men. His works are exclusively of a secular character; a complete list of them may be found in Allibone, *Dict. of Auth.*, and *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Malvenda, THOMAS, a learned Spanish exegete, was born at Xativa in 1566, and entered the Dominican convent of Lombay in 1582. A good Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, he now applied his philological talents to the study of the divers texts of the Bible, at the same time devoting much attention also to dogmatics and to ecclesiastical history. In 1585 he wrote a treatise to prove that St. Anna was only once married, and that St. Joseph always held fast to the rule of abstinence. From 1585 to 1600 he taught first philosophy, and afterwards theology. In 1600 he addressed to cardinal Baronius a memoir on some parts of the *Annales ecclesiastici*, and of the *Martyrologium Romanum*, which he deemed incorrect. Baronius, struck by the knowledge exhibited in this memoir, called Malvenda to Rome, where the general of his order intrusted him with the correcting

of the breviary, the missal, and the martyrology of the Dominicans. This work was completed in 1603. The congregation of the Index then submitted to him for revision the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of La Vigne (Par. 1575, 1589, 9 vols. fol.). His critical annotations on this work appeared at Rome in 1607, and were afterwards published together with the *Biblioth. Patr.* (Paris, 1609, 1624). About the same time he commenced *Annales ordinis fratrum prædicatorum*, which he never completed; the existing fragment, extending over a period of thirty years, was subsequently published by Gravina (Naples, 1627, 2 vols. fol.). In 1610 Malvenda was recalled to Spain, where the grand inquisitor appointed him a member of the Spanish congregation of the *Index librorum prohibitorum*. He died at Valencia in 1628. His principal work, to which the later years of his life were devoted, was a literal translation of the Bible, with commentaries; he was unable to finish it, and left it at the 16th chapter of Ezekiel (published in this incomplete state by the general of the Dominicans, under title *Commentaria in sacram Scripturam una cum nova de verbo ad verbum ex Hebræo translatione, variisque lectionibus* [Lyon, 1650, 5 vols. fol.]). The translation is so literal as to be very inelegant and sometimes unintelligible. The notes are mostly grammatical, and though perhaps valuable at the time, are now considered unimportant. Among his other works, which are very numerous, we notice *Libri novem de Antichristo* (Rome, 1604, often reprinted):—*Commentarius de Paradiso voluptatis* (Rome, 1605, 4to):—*Vida de san Pedro Martir* (Saragossa, 1613, 8vo). A complete list of his works is given in Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii, 454 sq. See Antonio, *Bibl. Hispana nova*, vol. ii.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 771; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 122; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 806. (J. N. P.)

Mamachi, Thomas Maria, a distinguished Dominican, was born on the island of Chio Dec. 3, 1713; was brought to Italy when yet a youth, and joined the Dominicans. He became professor of theology at Florence, and in 1740 was called to Rome as a member of the college of the Propaganda. Benedict XIV made him a doctor of divinity, and appointed him member of the congregation of the Index, of which he became secretary in 1779. Under Pius VI he was appointed *Magister palatii*. He died in 1792, at Corneto, near Montefiascone. His principal works are *Ad Joh. D. Mansium de ratione temporum Athanasiorum deque aliquot Synodis iv sæculo celebratis Epistolæ iv* (Flor. 1748), against Mansi, who, in his *De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensium, cæterumque in causa Arianorum, hac occasione simul rerum potissimarum S. Athanasii Chronologiam restituit* (Lucæ, 1746), asserted, contrary to general opinion, that the Council of Sardica was held in 344, and that the return of Athanasius to Alexandria took place in 346. His *Originum et antiquitatum Christianarum Libb. xx* (Rom. 1749–55), of which only five books, however, were completed, is a very important work, holding the same position among the Roman Catholics as Bingham's *Origines ecclesiasticæ* among the Protestants; it is written in view of the later work, which it often attempts to refute. *De Costumi de primitivi Christiani libri tres* (Rome, 1753; Venice, 1757) is an interesting work on the early ages of Christianity, and contains some valuable and curious information. *Epistolarum ad Justinum Febronium, de ratione regendæ Christianæ reipublicæ, deque legitima Romani Pontificis potestate, Liber primus* (Rom. 1776), in answer to Justinus Febronius's (J. N. von Hontheim, q. v.) *De statu Ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis*, etc. (Bullioni, 1763), is but a weak production compared to that which it attacked. See *Neue theol. Bibliothek*, lv, 392 sq.; *Acta historico-ecclesiastica nostri temporis*, xxxix, 888; *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1757, p. 1189 sq.; 1759, p. 595; Richard et Giraud, *Biblioth. sacrée.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 123; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 772; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 806.

Mamai'as (Σαμαία, Vulg. *Samea*), given (1 Esdr. viii, 14) in place of the Shemaiah (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 16).

Mamas, a saint of the Romish Church, a native of Paphlagonia, flourished in the 3d century. He was born in prison, his mother, Russina, having been arrested on account of her adherence to Christianity. He was brought up by a Christian widow named Ammia, and while a boy was already persecuted for his faith, but wonderfully escaped death. He subsequently preached the Gospel in Cæsarea, and died a martyr in 274. He is commemorated on the 17th of August. Mamas was highly honored in the ancient Church. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Walafrid Strabo make mention of him. See C. Baronii *Martyrologium Romanum* (Moguntiæ, 1631), p. 507; Th. Ruinart, *Acta primorum Martyrum* (Amst. 1713), p. 264 sq.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 774. (J. N. P.)

Mamertus, St., archbishop of Vienna, was a brother of Claudianus Ecdicius Mamertus [see Claudianus], author of the celebrated work *De statu animæ*. St. Mamertus is especially known for having, on the occasion of a great fire, and other accidents which befell the city of Vienna, instituted the *Rogations*, i. e. penitential prayers for the three days preceding the ascension. Baronius, in his *Martyrologium Romanum* (Moguntiæ, 1631), p. 255 sq. and 296, denies that Mamertus was the first to organize these rogations, claiming that they were an old institution which had fallen into disuse, and which he merely revived. Bingham in his *Origin. eccles.* (iii, 80 sq.; v, 29), subsequently took the same view. However, it is certain that the example of Mamertus induced the Council of Orleans, in 511, to introduce the rogations throughout France. They were subsequently adopted by the whole Western Church, by order of Gregory the Great, in 591. Mamertus is generally believed to have died in 475. He is commemorated on the 11th of May.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 774; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxiii, 129.

Mamertus, Claudianus. See Claudianus.

Mammæa, Julia. See Severus, Alexander.

Mammillarians, the name of a branch of the Anabaptists which arose in Haarlem, Holland. Its origin is as follows. A young man having taken undue liberties with a young woman whom he intended to marry, was accused of it before the Church; the Church authorities, however, did not agree on the subject, some desiring to expel the offender from their society, and others opposing so severe a measure. This caused a separation, and those who were on the young man's side were visited by their opponents with the reproachful name of Mammillarians (from the French word *Mammelle*, a woman's breast). See Bayle, *Dict. Historique*, s. v.; Micrælius, *Syntag. Hist. Eccl.* (ed. 1679) p. 1012.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 774.

Mam'mon (μαμμωνᾶς or μαμωνᾶς, from the Chald. מָמוֹן or מָמוֹנָא, that in which one *trusts*; see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1217 sq.), a term pre-eminently, by a technical and invidious usage (see Suidas in his *Lex.* s. v.), "signifying *wealth* or *riches*, and bearing that sense in Luke xvi, 9, 11; but also used by our Saviour (Matt. vi, 24; Luke xvi, 13) as a personification of the god of riches: 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' Gill, on Matt. vi, 24, brings a very apt quotation from the Talmud Hieros. (*Yoma*, fol. 38), in confirmation of the character which Christ in these passages gives of the Jews in his day: 'We know that they believed in the law, and took care of the commandments, and of the tithes, and that their whole conversation was good—only that they *loved the Mammon*, and hated one another without cause.'" "The word often occurs in the Chaldee Targums of Onkelos, and later writers, and in the Syriac Version, in the sense of 'riches.' This meaning of the word is given by Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 33, and by Augustine and Jerome commenting on Matthew. Augustine adds that it was in use as a Punic, and Jerome adds that it was a Syriac

word. There is no reason to suppose that any idol received divine honors in the East under this name. It is used in Matthew as a personification of riches. The derivation of the word is discussed by A. Pfeiffer, *Opera*, p. 474." The phrase "mammon of unrighteousness" as used in Luke xvi, 9, probably refers to gain which is too often unjustly acquired (as by the publicans), but which may be sanctified by charity and piety so as to become a passport, in some sense, to final blessedness. See Grünenberg, *De mammona iniquitatis* (Jen. 1700); Wakins, *De μαμ. ἀδικίας* (Jen. 1701). In Rabbinical language the word is used to denote *confidence*.

Mamnitanai'mus (Μαμνιτάναιμος v. r. Μαματνάαιμος, Vulg. *Mathaneus*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 34) by corruption for the two names "Mattaniah, Mattenai," of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 37).

Mam(o)un, Al, Abbas-Abdallah, a celebrated Mussulman ruler, was born at Bagdad in A.D. 786; was the son of Haroun-al-Raschid; and ascended the throne as the seventh Abasside caliph in 813. By his determination to enforce the heretical doctrine *that the Koran was created and not eternal*, he became very unpopular among the Moslem doctors and gave strength to the house of Ali. See Mohammedanism; Mohammedan Sects. Mamoun was a patron of science and literature, and is praised by Eastern writers for his talents and liberality. His capital, Bagdad, was in his day the great centre of the world of learning and science. He died in 833. See Weil, *Gesch. d. Chalifen*, II, chap. vii; Hammer-Purgstall, *Literaturgesch. d. Araber*.

Mam're (Heb. *Mamre'*, מַמְרֵא, *fat;* Sept. Μαμβρῆ; Josephus Μαμβρῆς, *Ant.* i, 10, 2; Vulg. *Mambre*), the name of an Amoritish chief who, with his brothers Aner and Eschol, was in alliance with Abraham (Gen. xiv, 13, 24). B.C. cir. 2080. In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to undergo the pain of circumcision, from which his brothers would have dissuaded him, by a reference to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials—the furnace of Nimrod and the sword of Chedorlaomer (Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, p. 36). Hence (אֵלוֹנֵי מַמְרֵא, Sept. ἡ δρῦς ἡ Μαμβρῆ), in the Auth. Vers., "the oaks of Mamre," "plain of Mamre" (Gen. xiii, 18; xviii, 1), or simply "Mamre" (xxiii, 17, 19; xxxv, 27), a grove in the neighborhood of Hebron. It was here that Abraham first dwelt after separating from Lot (Gen. xiii, 18); here the divine angel visited him with the warning of Sodom's fate (Gen. xviii, 1); it was in the cave in the corner of the field opposite this place that he deposited the remains of Sarah (Gen. xxiii, 17, 19); where he was himself buried (Gen. xxv, 9), as was likewise Jacob (Gen. xlix, 30; l, 13). In later times the spot is said to have lain six stadia from Hebron, still marked by a reputedly sacred terebinth (Joseph. *War*, iv, 9, 7; Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* v, 9; Sozomen, *Hist. Ev.* i, 18; Eusebius, *Onomast.* s. v. Ἀρχώ, Arboch); and later travellers likewise (Sanutus, *Secret. fidel.* iii, 14, 3, in the *Gesta Dei per. Franc.* ii, 248; Troilo, *Trav.* p. 418) speak of a very venerable tree of this kind near the ruins of a church at Hebron (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 712 sq.). Dr. Robinson found here, at a place called *Ramet el-Khulîl*, one hour distant from Hebron, some ancient remains, which he regards (in accordance with the local tradition) as probably marking the site of Abraham's sepulchre (*Researches*, i, 318). He saw the venerable oak near Hebron which still passes with the Mohammedans for the tree under which Abraham pitched his tent (*Researches*, ii, 429), but which he states is not a terebinth (*ib.* 443). See Oak. According to Schwarz, "North of Hebron, and sideward from Halhul, is a plain about two and one half miles in length, which the Arabs call *Elon*, no doubt the ancient dwelling-place of Abraham" (*Palestine*, p. 109). See Hebron. "Mamre is stated to have been *at* Hebron, for we read that 'Jacob came unto Isaac his father, *to Mamre, to Kirjath-Arbah, which is Hebron*, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned' (xxxv, 27). The relative positions of Machpelah and Mamre are also described with great exactness. Five times Moses states that Machpelah lay '*before* Mamre' (עַל־פְּנֵי; Sept. ἀπέναντι; Vulg. *quæ respiciebat*); which may mean either that it was to the east of Mamre, or that it lay facing it. The latter seems to be the true meaning. Machpelah is situated on the shelving bank of a little valley, and probably the oak-grove of Mamre stood on the other side of the valley, facing the cave, while the town of Hebron lay a little farther up to the north-west (comp. xxiii, 17, 19; xxv, 9; xlix, 30; l, 13). The identity of Machpelah with the modern *Haram* being established [see Machpelah], there can be little difficulty in fixing the position of Mamre; it must have been within sight of or 'facing' Machpelah, and so near the town of Hebron that it could be described as *at* it. The *Jerusalem Itinerary* places it *two miles* from Hebron (p. 599), and Sozomen (*H. E.* ii, 4) says it lay on the north towards Jerusalem. It is evident that all these notices refer to the above ruin, *Ramet el-Khulîl*. The Jews of Hebron call it 'the house of Abraham,' and regard it as the site of Mamre (Porter, *Handbook*, i, 72; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 141). The position, however, does not accord with the notices in Genesis, and cannot, therefore, be the true site of Mamre. The sacred grove and the place of the patriarch's tent were doubtless on the face of the hill facing

Vicinity of Abraham's Cemetery. (The sites are marked according to tradition.)

the great Haram, which covers the cave of Machpelah (Stanley, *Sermons in the East*, p. 166 sq.; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* iii, 222 sq.). The tradition which identified Mamre with Ramet el-Khulîl may have originated in the existence of a grove of venerable oaks on that spot, just as now the great oak a mile or more west of the town is called 'Abraham's Oak' (Porter, *Handbk.* i, 70)." See Abraham.

Mamu'chus (Μαμοῦχος, Vulg. *Maluchus*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 20) by corruption for Malluch (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 29).

Man is the rendering mostly of four Hebrew and two Greek words in the English Version. They are used with as much precision as the terms of like import in other languages. Nor is the subject merely critical; it will be found connected with accurate interpretation. In our treatment of the subject we thus supplement what we have stated under the article Adam.

1. אָדָם, *adam'*, is used in several senses. (*a.*) It is the proper name of the first man, though Gesenius thinks that when so applied it has the force rather of an appellative, and that, accordingly, in a translation, it would be better to render it *the man*. It seems, however, to be used by Luke as a proper name in the genealogy (iii, 38), by Paul (Rom. v, 14; 1 Tim. ii, 13, 14), and by Jude (ver. 14). Paul's use of it in 1 Cor. xv, 45 is remarka-

bly clear: "the first man Adam." It is so employed throughout the Apocrypha without exception (2 Esdr. iii, 5, 10, 21, 26; iv, 30; vi, 54; vii, 11, 46, 48; Tobit viii, 6; Ecclus. xxxiii, 10; xl, 1; xlix, 16), and by Josephus (*ut infra*). Gesenius argues that, as applied to the first man, it has the article almost without exception. It is doubtless often thus used as an appellative, but the exceptions are decisive: Gen. iii, 17, "to Adam he said," and see Sept., Deut. xxxii, 8, "the descendants of Adam;" "if I covered my transgressions as Adam" (Job xxxi, 33); "and unto Adam he said," etc. (Job xxviii, 28), which, when examined by the context, seems to refer to a primeval revelation not recorded in Genesis (see also Hos. vi, 7, Heb. or margin). Gesenius further argues that the woman has an appropriate name, but that the man has none. But the name Eve was given to her by Adam, and, as it would seem, under a change of circumstances; and though the *divine* origin of the word Adam, as a proper name of the first man, is not recorded in the history of the creation, as is that of the day, night, heaven, earth, seas, etc. (Gen. i, 5, 8, 10), yet its divine origin as an appellative is recorded (comp. Heb., Gen. i, 26; v, 1); from which state it soon became a proper name, Dr. Lee thinks from its frequent occurrence, but we would suggest, from its peculiar appropriateness to "the man," who is the more immediate *image* and glory of God (1 Cor. xi, 7). Other derivations of the word have been offered, as אָדַם, "to be red" or "red-haired;" and hence some of the rabbins have inferred that the first man was so. The derivation is as old as Josephus, who says that "the first man was called Adam because he was formed from the red earth," and adds, "for the true virgin earth is of this color" (*Ant.* i, 1, 2). The following is a simple translation of the more detailed (Jehovistic) account given by Moses (Gen. ii, 4–7, 18–25) of the creation of the first human pair, omitting the paragraph concerning the garden of Eden. See Cosmogony.

> This [is the] genealogy of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day [that] Jehovah God made earth and heavens. Now no shrub of the field had yet been [grown] on the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprung up—for Jehovah God had not [as yet] caused [it] to rain upon the earth, nor [was there any] man to till the ground; but mist ascended from the earth, and watered all the face of the ground. Then Jehovah God formed the man, dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; so the man became a living creature.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> But Jehovah God said, "[It is] not good [that] the man be alone; I will make for him a help as his counterpart." Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living [thing] of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and he brought [each] towards the man to see what he would call it: so whatever the man called it [as] a living creature, that [was] its name; thus the man called names to every beast, and to the bird of the heavens, and to every living [thing] of the field: yet for man [there] was not found a help as his counterpart. Then Jehovah God caused a lethargy to fall upon the man, so he slept; and he took one of his ribs, but closed flesh instead of it: and Jehovah God built the rib which he took from the man for a woman, and brought her towards the man. Thereupon the man said, "This now [is] bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh; this [being] shall be called Woman [*isháh*, vira], because from man [*ish*, vir] this [person] was taken: therefore will a man leave his father and his mother, and cling to his wife; and they shall become one flesh." Now they were both of them naked, the man and his wife: yet they were not mutually ashamed [of their condition].

(*b.*) It is the generic name of the human race as originally created, and afterwards, like the English word man, person, whether man or woman, equivalent to the Latin *homo* and Greek ἄνθρωπος (Gen. i, 26, 27; v, 2; viii, 21; Deut. viii, 3; Matt. v, 13, 16; 1 Cor. vii, 26), and even without regard to age (John xvi, 21). It is applied to women only, "the *human* persons or women" (Numb. xxxi, 35), Sept. ψυχαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν. Thus ἡ ἄνθρωπος means a woman (Herod. i, 60), and especially among the orators (comp. 1 Macc. ii, 28). (*c.*) It denotes man in opposition to woman (Gen. iii, 12; Matt. xix, 10), though more properly, the husband in opposition to the wife (compare 1 Cor. vii, 1). (*d.*) It is used, though very rarely, for those who maintain the dignity of human nature, a *man*, as we say, meaning one that deserves the name, like the Latin *vir* and Greek ἀνήρ: "One man in a thousand have I found, but a woman," etc. (Eccles. vii, 28). Perhaps the word here glances at the original uprightness of man. (*e.*) It is frequently used to denote the more degenerate and wicked portion of mankind: an instance of which occurs very early, "The sons (or worshippers) of God married the daughters of men (or the irreligious)" (Gen. vi, 2). We request a careful examination of the following passages with their respective contexts: Psa. xi, 4; xii, 1, 2, 8; xiv, 2, etc. The latter passage is often adduced to prove the *total* depravity of the *whole human race*, whereas it applies only to the more abandoned Jews, or possibly to the more wicked Gentile adversaries of Israel. It is a description of "the fool," or wicked man (ver. 1), and of persons of the same class (ver. 1, 2), "the workers of iniquity, who eat up God's people like bread, and called not upon the name of the Lord" (ver. 4). For the true view of Paul's quotations from this psalm (Rom. iii, 10), see M'Knight, ad loc.; and observe the use of the word "man" in Luke v, 20; Matt. x, 17. It is applied to the Gentiles (Matt. xxvii, 22; comp. Mark x, 33, and Mark ix, 31; Luke xviii, 32; see Mounteney, *ad Demosth. Phil.* i, 221). (*f.*) The word is used to denote other men, in opposition to those already named, as "both upon Israel and other men" (Jer. xxxii, 20), i. e. the Egyptians. "Like other men" (Psa. lxxiii, 5), i. e. common men, in opposition to better men (Psa. lxxxii, 7); men of inferior rank, as opposed to אִישׁ, men of higher rank (see Hebrew, Isa. ii, 9; v, 15: Psa. xlix, 3; lxii, 10; Prov. viii, 4). The phrase "son of man," in the Old Testament, denotes man as frail and unworthy (Numb. xxiii, 19; Job xxv, 6; Ezek. ii, 1, 3); as applied to the prophet, so often, it has the force of "O mortal!"

2. אִישׁ, *ish*, is a man in the distinguished sense, like the Latin *vir* and Greek ἀνήρ. It is used in all the several senses of the Latin *vir*, and denotes a man as distinguished from a woman (1 Sam. xvii, 33; Matt. xiv, 21); as a husband (Gen. iii, 16; Hos. ii, 16); and in reference to excellent mental qualities. A beautiful instance of the latter class occurs in Jer. v, 1: "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find *a man*, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it." This reminds the reader of the philosopher who went through the streets of Athens with a lighted lamp in his hand, and being asked what he sought, said, "I am seeking to find a man" (see Herodot. ii, 120; Homer, *Il.* v, 529). It is also used to designate the superior classes (Prov. viii, 4; Psa. cxli, 4, etc.), a courtier (Jer. xxxviii, 7), the male of animals (Gen. vii, 2). Sometimes it means men in general (Exod. xvi, 29; Mark vi, 44).

3. אֱנוֹשׁ, *enosh'*, mortals, βροτοί, as transient, perishable, liable to sickness, etc.: "Let not man [margin, 'mortal man'] prevail against thee" (2 Chron. xiv, 11). "Write with the pen of the common man" (Isa. viii, 1), i. e. in a common, legible character (Job xv, 14; Psa. viii, 5; ix, 19, 20; Isa. li, 7; Psa. ciii, 15). It is applied to women (Josh. viii, 25).

4. גֶּבֶר, *ge'ber*, *vir*, man, in regard to strength, etc. All etymologists concur in deriving the English word "man" from the superior powers and faculties with which man is endowed above all earthly creatures; so the Latin *vir*, from *vis*, *vires;* and such is the idea conveyed by the present Hebrew word. It is applied to man as distinguished from woman: "A man shall not put on a woman's garment" (Deut. xxii, 5), like ἄνθρωπος in Matt. viii, 9; John i, 6; to men as distinguished from children (Exod. xii, 37); to a male child, in opposition to a female (Job iii, 3; Sept. ἄρσεν). It is much used in poetry: "Happy is the man" (Psa. xxxiv, 9; xl, 5; lii, 9; xciv, 12). Sometimes it denotes the species at large

(Job iv, 17; xiv, 10, 14). For a complete exemplification of these words, see the lexicons of Gesenius and Schleusner, etc.

5. מְתִים, *methim'*, "men," always masculine. The singular is to be traced in the antediluvian proper names Methusael and Methuselah. Perhaps it may be derived from the root *mûth*, "he died," in which case its use would be very appropriate in Isa. xli, 14, "Fear not, thou worm Jacob, ye men of Israel." If this conjecture be admitted, this word would correspond to *βροτός*, and might be rendered "mortal."

Other Heb. words occasionally rendered man in the A. V. are בַּעַל, *báal*, a master (husband), נֶפֶשׁ, *néphesh*, an animate being, etc. The Greek words properly thus rendered are *ἄνθρωπος*, *homo*, a human being, and *ἀνήρ*, *vir*, a man as distinguished from a woman.

Some peculiar uses of the word in the New Testament remain to be noticed. "The Son of Man," applied to our Lord only by himself and St. Stephen (Acts vii, 56), is the Messiah in human form. Schleusner thinks that the word in this expression always means woman, and denotes that he was the promised Messiah, born of a virgin, who had taken upon him our nature to fulfil the great decree of God, that mankind should be saved by one in their own form. Ὁ *παλαιός*, "the old man," and *ὁ καινός*, "the new man"—the former denoting unsanctified disposition of heart, the latter the new disposition created and cherished by the Gospel; *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, "the inner man;" *ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος*, "the hidden man of the heart," as opposed to the *ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος*, "the external, visible man." "A man of God," first applied to Moses (Deut. xxxiii, 1), and always afterwards to a person acting under a divine commission (1 Kings xiii, 1; 1 Tim. vi, 11, etc.). Finally, angels are styled men (Acts i, 10). "To speak after the manner of men," i. e. in accordance with human views, to illustrate by human examples or institutions, to use a popular mode of speaking (Rom. iii, 5; 1 Cor. ix, 8; Gal. iii, 15). "The number of a man," i. e. an ordinary number, such as is in general use among men (Rev. xiii, 18); so also "the measure of a man," an ordinary measure, in common use (Rev. xxi, 17).

Man of Sin (*ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας*), an impersonation of the sinful principle spoken of by the apostle Paul in an emphatic manner (2 Thess. ii, 3). The context (ver. 3, 4) gives the following attributes or synonymous titles: (1.) *apostasy* (*ἡ ἀποστασία*, "a [rather *the*] falling away"), which precedes (*πρῶτον*) the appearance (*ἀπακαλυφθῇ*); (2.) *son of perdition* (*ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, i. e. one sprung from the fall (compare "that wicked"), and doomed to its penalty (comp. ver. 8); (3.) a *persecutor* (*ὁ ἀντικείμενος*), especially of God's cause and government; (4.) a *blasphemer* (*ὑπεραιρόμενος*, etc.), i. e. one arrogating divine honors, and claiming to work miracles (verse 9, 10). This is evidently an assemblage of the most striking characteristics of former Antichrists in Scripture, especially the "little horn" of Daniel. As that prophecy referred particularly to Antiochus Epiphanes, this passage must be understood as employing the conventional Scriptural language symbolically to indicate a then (and perhaps still) future effort on the part of some hostile power to overthrow Christianity, and induce its professors to renounce it. Such a peril is clearly intimated in several other passages of the N. T. (e. g. Mark xiii, 22; 2 Tim. iii, 1, 13; Rev. xx, 8). But we are not to confine the prophecy to any one type of Antichrist; "in whomsoever these distinctive features are found—whoever wields temporal or spiritual power in any degree similar to that in which the Man of Sin is here described as wielding it—he, be he pope or potentate, is beyond all doubt a distinct type of Antichrist" (Ellicott, note, ad loc.). For a history of opinion on this passage, see Alford, *Gr. Test.* iii, proleg. p. 55 sq. See Antichrist.

MAN, Preadamite. See Preadamites.

Man. See Manna.

V.—X x

Man'aën (*Μαναήν*, prob. i. q. Menahem; comp. *Μανάημος*, Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 11, 1), a Christian teacher at Antioch, who had been educated with Herod Antipas (Acts xiii, 1; see Kuinöl, ad loc.). A.D. 44. He was evidently a Jew, but nothing else is known of him beyond this passage, in which the epithet *σύντροφος* may mean either *playmate* (Herod was brought up, however, at Rome, Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3) or *foster-brother*, as having the same nurse (see Walch, *Dissert. ad Act.* p. 234). Some identify him with the person above named by Josephus, others with a Menahem mentioned in the Talmud (see Lightfoot, *Harm. of N. Test.* ad loc.), but in either case on very slender grounds.

Managers, a committee of members appointed annually in many Presbyterian churches, intrusted with all merely secular affairs as to property and finance.

Man'ahath (Heb. *Mana'chath*, מָנַחַת, *rest*), the name of a man and of a place.

1. (Sept. *Μαναχάθ*.) The second named of the five sons of Shobal, the son of Seir the Horite (Gen. xxxvi, 23; 1 Chron. i, 40). B.C. cir. 1927.

2. (Sept. *Μαναχαθί* v. r. *Μαχαναθί*.) A town or region to which certain descendants of Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, appear to have been exiled from Geba by an act of his father Bela (1 Chron. viii, 6). The context would seem to indicate some locality in the land of Moab. See Shaharaim. Some refer it to the Menuchah of Judah (Judg. ix, 43, A. Vers. "with ease;" comp. 1 Chron. ii, 52, 54), but with little probability. See Menuchite.

Man'ahethite (1 Chron. ii, 52). See Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth.

Manasse'äs (*Μανασσήας* v. r. *Μανασσίας*, Vulg. *Manasses*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 31) in place of the Manasseh (q. v.), 4, of the Hebrew list (Ezra x, 30).

Manas'seh (Heb. *Menashsheh'*, מְנַשֶּׁה, *who makes to forget*; see Gen. xli, 51; Sept., Josephus, and N.T. *Μανασσῆς*; "Manasses" in Matt. i, 10; Rev. vii, 6), the name of four men and of a tribe descended from one of them; also of another man mentioned by Josephus.

1. The elder of the two sons of Joseph, born in Egypt (Gen. xli, 51; xlvi, 20) of Asenath, the priest's daughter of Heliopolis. B.C. 1882. He was afterwards, together with his brother, adopted by Jacob as his own (xlviii, 1), by which act each became the head of a tribe in Israel. B.C. 1856. See Jacob. The act of adoption was, however, accompanied by a clear intimation from Jacob that the descendants of Manasseh, although the elder, would be far less numerous and powerful than those of the younger Ephraim. The result corresponded remarkably with this intimation. See Ephraim. He married a Syrian concubine, by whom he had several children (1 Chron. vii, 14). See Machir. The only thing subsequently recorded of him personally is that his grandchildren were "brought up on Joseph's knees" (Gen. l, 23). "The ancient Jewish traditions are, however, less reticent. According to them Manasseh was the steward of Joseph's house, and the interpreter who intervened between Joseph and his brethren at their interview; and the extraordinary strength which he displayed in the struggle with and binding of Simeon first caused Judah to suspect that the apparent Egyptians were really his own flesh and blood (see Targums Jerusalem and Pseudojon. on Gen. xlii, 23; xliii, 15; also the quotations in Weil's *Bibl. Legends*, p. 88, note)."

MANASSEH, Tribe of.—On the prophetic benediction of Jacob, above referred to, although Manasseh, as the representative of his future lineage, had, like his grand-uncle Esau, lost his birthright in favor of his younger brother, he received, as Esau had, a blessing only inferior to the birthright itself. Like his brother, he was to increase with the fertility of the fish which swarmed in the great Egyptian stream, to "become a people, and also to be great"—the "thousands of Manas-

seh," no less than those of Ephraim, indeed more, were to become a proverb in the nation; his name, no less than that of Ephraim, was to be the symbol and the expression of the richest blessings for his kindred.

The position of the tribe of Manasseh during the march to Canaan was with Ephraim and Benjamin on the west side of the sacred tent. The standard of the three sons of Rachel was the figure of a boy, with the inscription "The cloud of Jehovah rested on them until they went forth out of the camp" (Targ. Pseudojon. on Numb. ii, 18). The chief of the tribe at the time of the census at Sinai was Gamaliel ben-Pedahzur, and its numbers were then 32,200 (Numb. i, 10, 35; ii, 20, 21; vii, 54–59). The numbers of Ephraim were at the same date 40,500. Forty years later, on the banks of the Jordan, these proportions were reversed. Manasseh had then increased to 52,700, while Ephraim had diminished to 32,500 (Numb. xxvi, 34, 37). On this occasion it is remarkable that Manasseh resumes his position in the catalogue as the eldest son of Joseph. Possibly this is due to the prowess which the tribe had shown in the conquest of Gilead, for Manasseh was certainly at this time the most distinguished of all the tribes. Of the three who had elected to remain on that side of the Jordan, Reuben and Gad had chosen their lot because the country was suitable to their pastoral possessions and tendencies. But Machir, Jair, and Nobah, the sons of Manasseh, were no shepherds. They were pure warriors, who had taken the most prominent part in the conquest of those provinces which up to that time had been conquered, and whose deeds are constantly referred to (Numb. xxxii, 39; Deut. iii, 13, 14, 15) with credit and renown. "Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the tract of Argob . . . sixty great cities" (Deut. iii, 14, 4). "Nobah took Kenath and the daughter-towns thereof, and called it after his own name" (Numb. xxxii, 42). "Because Machir was a man of war, therefore he had Gilead and Bashan" (Josh. xvii, 1). The district which these ancient warriors conquered was among the most difficult, if not the most difficult, in the whole country. It embraced the hills of Gilead, with their inaccessible heights and impassable ravines, and the almost impregnable tract of Argob, which derives its modern name of Lejah from the secure "asylum" it affords to those who take refuge within its natural fortifications. Had they not remained in these wild and inaccessible districts, but gone forward and taken their lot with the rest, who shall say what changes might not have occurred in the history of the nation, through the presence of such energetic and warlike spirits? The few personages of eminence whom we can with certainty identify as Manassites, such as Gideon and Jephthah—for Elijah and others may with equal probability have belonged to the neighboring tribe of Gad—were among the most remarkable characters that Israel produced. Gideon was, in fact, "the greatest of the judges, and his children all but established hereditary monarchy in their own line" (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 230). But, with the one exception of Gideon, the warlike tendencies of Manasseh seem to have been confined to the east of the Jordan. There they throve exceedingly, pushing their way northward over the rich plains of Jaulân and Jedûr—the Gaulanitis and Ituræa of the Roman period—to the foot of Mount Hermon (1 Chron. v, 23). At the time of the coronation of David at Hebron, while the western Manasseh sent 18,000, and Ephraim itself 20,800, the eastern Manasseh, with Gad and Reuben, mustered to the number of 120,000, thoroughly armed—a remarkable demonstration of strength, still more remarkable when we remember the fact that Saul's house, with the great Abner at its head, was then residing at Mahanaim, on the border of Manasseh and Gad. But, though thus outwardly prosperous, a similar fate awaited them in the end to that which befel Gad and Reuben; they gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants of the country—they "transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a-whoring after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them" (ver. 25). They relinquished, too, the settled mode of life and the definite limits which befitted the members of a federal nation, and gradually became Bedouins of the wilderness, spreading themselves over the vast deserts which lay between the allotted possessions of their tribe and the Euphrates, and which had from time immemorial been the hunting-grounds and pastures of the wild Hagarites, of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab (1 Chron. v, 19, 22). On them first descended the punishment which was ordained to be the inevitable consequence of such misdoing. They, first of all Israel, were carried away by Pul and Tiglath-Pileser, and settled in the Assyrian territories (ver. 26). The connection, however, between east and west had been kept up to a certain degree. In Bethshean, the most easterly city of the cis-Jordanic Manasseh, the two portions all but joined. David had judges or officers there for all matters sacred and secular (1 Chron. xxvi, 32); and Solomon's commissariat officer, Ben-Geber, ruled over the towns of Jair and the whole district of Argob (1 Kings iv, 13), and transmitted their productions, doubtless not without their people, to the court of Jerusalem.

Map of the half-tribe of Manasseh—East.

The genealogies of the tribe are preserved in Numb. xxvi, 28–34; Josh. xvii, 1, etc.; and 1 Chron vii, 14–19. But it seems impossible to unravel these so as to ascertain, for instance, which of the families remained east of Jordan, and which advanced to the west. From the fact that Abi-ezer (the family of Gideon), Hepher (possibly Ophrah, the native place of the same hero), and Shechem (the well-known city of the Bene-Joseph) all occur among the names of the sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, it seems probable that Gilead, whose name is so intimately connected with the eastern, was also the immediate progenitor of the western half of the tribe.

Nor is it less difficult to fix the exact position of the territory allotted to the western half. In Josh. xvii, 14–18, a passage usually regarded by critics as an exceedingly ancient document, we find the two tribes of Joseph complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them, viz. Mount Ephraim (ver. 15), and that they could not extend into the plains of Jordan or Es-

draelon, because those districts were still in the possession of the Canaanites, and scoured by their chariots. In reply Joshua advises them to go up into the forest (ver. 15, A. V. "wood")—into the mountain which is a forest (ver. 18). This mountain clothed with forest can surely be nothing but the various spurs and offshoots of Carmel, the "mountain" closely adjoining the portion of Ephraim whose richness of wood was so proverbial. It is in accordance with this view that the majority of the towns of Manasseh—which, as the weaker portion of the tribe, would naturally be pushed to seek its fortunes outside the limits originally bestowed—were actually on the slopes either of Carmel itself or of the contiguous ranges. Thus Taanach and Megiddo were on the northern spurs of Carmel; Ibleam appears to have been on the eastern continuation of the range, somewhere near the present Jenîn. En-Dor was on the slopes of the so-called "Little Hermon." The two remaining towns mentioned as belonging to Manasseh formed the extreme eastern and western limits of the tribe: the one, Bethshean (Josh. xvii, 11), was in the hollow of the Ghôr, or Jordan Valley; the other, Dor (ibid.), was on the coast of the Mediterranean, sheltered behind the range of Carmel, and immediately opposite the bluff or shoulder which forms its highest point. The whole of these cities are specially mentioned as standing in the allotments of other tribes, though inhabited by Manasseh; and this, with the absence of any attempt to define a limit to the possessions of the tribe on the north, looks as if no boundary-line had existed on that side, but as if the territory faded off gradually into those of the two contiguous tribes from whom it had borrowed its fairest cities. On the south side the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim is more definitely described, and may generally be traced with tolerable certainty. Their joint possessions were bounded by the territory of Asher on the north and Issachar on the north-east (xvii, 10), but the division line between the two kindred tribes is defined by a place called Ashet (ver. 7), now Yasîr, twelve miles north-east of Nablûs. Thence it ran to Michmethah, described as facing Shechem (Nablûs); then went to the right, i. e. southward, to the spring of Tappuah, and so doubtless to the Jordan. In the opposite direction it fell in with the watercourses of the torrent Kanah—probably the Nahr Falaik—along which it ran to the Mediterranean. See TRIBE.

From the indications of the history, it would appear that Manasseh took very little part in public affairs. They either left all that to Ephraim, or were so far removed from the centre of the nation as to have little interest in what was taking place. That they attended David's coronation at Hebron has already been mentioned. When his rule was established over all Israel, each half had its distinct ruler—the western, Joel ben-Pedaiah; the eastern, Iddo ben-Zechariah (1 Chron. xxvii, 20, 21). From this time the eastern Manasseh fades entirely from our view, and the western is hardly kept before us by an occasional mention. Such scattered notices as we do find have almost all reference to the part taken by members of the tribe in the reforms of the good kings of Judah—the Jehovah-revival under Asa (2 Chron. xv, 9)—the Passover of Hezekiah (xxx, 1, 10, 11, 18), and the subsequent enthusiasm against idolatry (xxxi, 1)—the iconoclasm of Josiah (xxxiv, 6), and his restoration of the buildings of the Temple (ver. 9). It is gratifying to reflect that these notices, faint and scattered as they are, are all colored with good, and exhibit none of the repulsive traits of that most repulsive heathenism into which other tribes of Israel fell.

A positive connection between Manasseh and Benjamin is implied in the genealogies of 1 Chron. vii, where Machir is said to have married into the family of Huppim and Shuppim, chief houses in the latter tribe (ver. 15). No record of any such relation appears anywhere else.

The following are all the Biblical localities in both

Map of the half-tribe of Manasseh—West.

sections of the tribe, with their preserved modern representatives:

MANASSEH EAST.

Aphek.	Town.	*Fik.*
Ashtaroth.	do.	*Tell Ashterah?*
Ashteroth-karnaim or Beeshteroth.	do.	*Mezareib?*
Bethsaida.	do.	[El-Araj]?
Edrei.	do.	*Dera?*
Gadara [or Gergesa].	do.	*Um-Keis.*
Geshur.	District.	*Jedur.*
Golan.	City.	[*Tell el-Feras*]?
Havoth-Jair.	District.	N. part of Gilead?
Judah-on-Jordan.	do.	S. of Banias?
Karnaim.	Town.	See ASHTAROTH.
Kenath or Nobah.	do.	*Kunewat?*
Tob.	do.	*Es-Sumrah?*

MANASSEH WEST.

Abel-meholah.	Town.	[*Khurbet-esh-Shuk*]?
Adam.	do.	[N. of Bethshean]?
Ænon.	Springs.	*Bir* of Sheik Salim?
Aner.	Town.	See TAANACH.
Armageddon.	Valley.	See MEGIDDO.
Asher.	Town.	*Yasir.*
Beth-barah.	Ford.	[Near Jisr-Damieh]?
Beth-shean.	Town.	*Beisan.*
Beth-shittah.	do.	*Shuttah?*
Bezek.	do.	[*Khurbet-Maleh*]?
Bileam.	do.	See IBLEAM.
Cæsarea.	do.	*Kaisariyeh.*
Dor.	do.	*Tantura.*
Dothan.	do.	*Tell Dothan.*
Endor.	do.	*Endur.*
En-tappuah.	do.	See TAPPUAH.
Gilboa.	Mount.	*Jebel Fukua.*
Gilead.	do.	See GILBOA.
Hadad-rimmon.	Town.	*Rummaneh.*
Harod.	Fount.	*Ain-Jalud.*
Hermon (Little).	Mount.	[*Jebel ed-Duhy*]?
Jehovah-shalom.	Altar.	See OPHRAH.
Megiddo.	Town.	*El-Lejjun.*
Moreh.	Hill.	See HERMON.
Ophrah.	Town.	*Erfai?*
Shamir.	do.	*Sammir?*
Taanach.	do.	*Tanuk.*
Taanath-shiloh.	do.	*Ain Tana?*
Tabbath.	do.	[*Tell-Hamah*]?
Tabor.	Mount.	*Jebel Tur.*
Tappuah.	District.	Around *Alaf?*
Zarethan or Zartanah; also Zereda or Zeredatha, Zererath.	Town.	[S. of wady Osheb]?

2. According to the usual reading of the text in Judg. xviii, 30, Manasseh was the father of Gershom, who is named as the father of Jonathan that acted as priest to the Danites at Laish; but besides that this would not make him a Levite, and, in addition to the fact that Gershom is a Levitical name, the reading is marked as suspicious (מְנַשֶּׁה, Sept. Μανασσῆ), and should doubtless be corrected to "Moses," as in the Vulg. and many copies of the Sept. See JONATHAN.

3. The fourteenth separate king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah, who began to reign at the early age of twelve years, and reigned fifty-five years. B.C. 697–642. For the synchronisms with profane history, especially of Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt, see CHRONOLOGY. The reign of this monarch is thus longer than that of any other of the house of David. There is none of which we know less. In part, it may be, this was the direct result of the character and policy of the man. In part, doubtless, it is to be traced to the abhorrence with which the following generation looked back upon it as the period of lowest degradation to which their country had ever fallen. Chroniclers and prophets pass it over, gathering from its horrors and disasters the great, broad lessons in which they saw the foot-prints of a righteous retribution, the tokens of a divine compassion, and then they avert their eyes and will see and say no more. This is in itself significant. It gives a meaning and a value to every fact which has escaped the sentence of oblivion. The very reticence of the historians of the O. T. shows how free they were from the rhetorical exaggerations and inaccuracies of a later age. The struggle of opposing worships must have been as fierce under Manasseh as it was under Antiochus, or Decius, or Diocletian, or Mary. Men must have suffered and died in that struggle of whom the world was not worthy, and yet no contrast can be greater than that between the short notices in Kings and Chronicles, and the martyrologies which belong to those other periods of persecution.

1. The birth of Manasseh is fixed (B.C. 709) twelve years before the death of Hezekiah (2 Kings xxi, 1). We must, therefore, infer either that there had been no heir to the throne up to that comparatively late period in his reign, or that any that had been born had died, or that, as sometimes happened in the succession of Jewish and other Eastern kings, the elder son was passed over for the younger. There are reasons which make the former the more probable alternative. The exceeding bitterness of Hezekiah's sorrow at the threatened approach of death (2 Kings xx, 2, 3; 2 Chron. xxxii, 24; Isa. xxxviii, 1–3), is more natural if we think of him as sinking under the thought that he was dying childless, leaving no heir to his work and to his kingdom. When, a little later, Isaiah warns him of the captivity and shame which will fall on his children, he speaks of those children as yet future (2 Kings xx, 18). This circumstance will explain one or two facts in the contemporary history. Hezekiah, it would seem, recovering from his sickness, anxious to avoid the danger that had threatened him, of leaving his kingdom without an heir, married, at or about this time, Hephzibah (2 Kings xxi, 1), the daughter of one of the citizens or princes of Jerusalem (Joseph. *Ant.* x, 3, 1). The prophets, we may well imagine, would welcome the prospect of a successor named by a king who had been so true and faithful. Isaiah (in a passage clearly belonging to a later date than the early portions of the book, and apparently suggested by some conspicuous marriage), with his characteristic fondness for tracing auguries in names, finds in that of the new queen a prophecy of the ultimate restoration of Israel and the glories of Jerusalem (Isa. lxii, 4, 5; compare Blunt, *Scriptural Coincid.* part iii, 5). The city, also, should be a Hephzibah, a delightsome one. As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so would Jehovah rejoice over his people. See HEPHZIBAH. The child that is born from this union is called Manasseh. This name, too, is strangely significant. It appears nowhere else in the history of the kingdom of Judah. The only associations connected with it were that it belonged to the tribe which was all but the most powerful of the hostile kingdom of Israel. How are we to account for so singular and unlikely a choice? The answer is, that the name embodied what had been for years the cherished object of Hezekiah's policy and hope. To take advantage of the overthrow of the rival kingdom by Shalmaneser, and the anarchy in which its provinces had been left, to gather round him the remnant of the population, to bring them back to the worship and faith of their fathers, this had been the second step in his great national reformation (2 Chron. xxx, 6). It was at least partially successful. "Divers of Asher, *Manasseh*, and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem." They were there at the great passover. The work of destroying idols went on in Ephraim and *Manasseh* as well as in Judah (2 Chron. xxxi, 1). What could be a more acceptable pledge of his desire to receive the fugitives as on the same footing with his own subjects than that he should give to the heir to his throne the name in which one of their tribes exulted? What could better show the desire to let all past discords and offences be forgotten than the name which was itself an amnesty?

The last twelve years of Hezekiah's reign were not, however, it will be remembered, those which were likely to influence for good the character of his successor. His policy had succeeded. He had thrown off the yoke of the king of Assyria, which Ahaz had accepted, had defied his armies, had been delivered from extremest danger, and had made himself the head of an independent kingdom, receiving tribute from neighboring princes instead of paying it to the great king, the king of As-

syria. But he goes a step further. Not content with independence, he enters on a policy of aggression. He contracts an alliance with the rebellious viceroy of Babylon against their common enemy (2 Kings xx, 12; Isa. xxxix). He displays the treasures of his kingdom to the ambassadors, in the belief that this will show them how powerful an ally he can prove himself. Isaiah protested against this step, but the ambition of being a great potentate continued, and it was to the results of this ambition that the boy Manasseh succeeded at the age of twelve.

2. The accession of the youthful king appears to have been the signal for an entire change, if not in the foreign policy, at any rate in the religious administration of the kingdom. At so early an age he can scarcely have been the spontaneous author of so great an alteration, and we may infer accordingly that it was the work of the idolatrous, or Ahaz party, which had been repressed during the reign of Hezekiah, but had all along, like the Romish clergy under Edward VI in England, looked on the reform with a sullen acquiescence, and thwarted it when they dared. The change which the king's measures brought about was, after all, superficial. The idolatry which was publicly discountenanced was practiced privately (Isa. i, 29; ii, 20; lxv, 3). The priests and the prophets, in spite of their outward orthodoxy, were too often little better than licentious drunkards (Isa. xxviii, 7). The nobles of Judah kept the new moons and sabbaths much in the same way as those of France kept their Lents when Louis XIV had made devotion a court ceremonial (Isa. i, 13, 14). There are signs that even among the king's highest officers of state there was one, Shebna the scribe (Isa. xxxvii, 2), the treasurer (Isa. xxii, 15) "over the house," whose policy was simply that of a selfish ambition, himself possibly a foreigner (comp. Blunt's *Script. Coinc.* iii, 4), and whom Isaiah saw through and distrusted. It was, moreover, the traditional policy of "the princes of Judah" (compare one remarkable instance in the reign of Joash, 2 Chron. xxiv, 17) to favor foreign alliances and the toleration of foreign worship, as it was that of the true priests and prophets to protest against it. It would seem, accordingly, as if they urged upon the young king that scheme of a close alliance with Babylon which Isaiah had condemned, and, as the natural consequence of this, the adoption, as far as possible, of its worship, and that of other nations whom it was desirable to conciliate. The morbid desire for widening the range of their knowledge and penetrating into the mysteries of other systems of belief may possibly have contributed now, as it had done in the days of Solomon, to increase the evil (Jer. ii, 10–25; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii, 666). The result was a debasement which had not been equalled even in the reign of Ahaz, uniting in one centre the abominations which elsewhere existed separately. Not content with sanctioning their presence in the Holy City, as Solomon and Rehoboam had done, Manasseh defiled with it the sanctuary itself (2 Chron. xxxiii, 4). The worship thus introduced was, as has been said, predominantly Babylonian in its character. "He observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards" (ver. 6). The worship of "the host of heaven," which each man celebrated for himself on the roof of his own house, took the place of that of the Lord God of Sabaoth (2 Kings xxiii, 12; Isa. lxv, 3, 11; Zeph. i, 5; Jer. viii, 2; xix, 13; xxii, 29). With this, however, there was associated the old Molech worship of the Ammonites. The fires were rekindled in the valley of Ben-Hinnom. Tophet was (for the first time, apparently) built into a stately fabric (2 Kings xvi, 3; Isa. xxx, 33, as compared with Jer. vii, 31; xix, 5; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii, 667). Even the king's sons, instead of being presented to Jehovah, received a horrible fire-baptism dedicating them to Molech (2 Chron. xxxiii, 6), while others were actually slaughtered (Ezek. xxiii, 37, 39). The Baal and Ashtaroth ritual, which had been imported under Solomon from the Phœnicians, was revived with fresh splendor, and, in the worship of the "queen of heaven," fixed its roots deep into the habits of the people (Jer. vii, 18). Worse and more horrible than all, the Asherah, the image of Astarte, or the obscene symbol of a phallic worship (comp. ASHERAH, and, in addition to the authorities there cited, Mayer, *De Reform. Josiæ*, etc., in the *Thes. Theo. philol.* Amstel. 1701) was seen in the house of which Jehovah had said that he would there put his name forever (2 Kings xxi, 7). All this was accompanied by the extremest moral degradation. The worship of those old Eastern religions has been well described as a kind of "sensuous intoxication," simply sensuous, and therefore associated inevitably with a fiendish cruelty, leading to the utter annihilation of the spiritual life of men (Hegel, *Philos. of History*, i, 3). So it was in Jerusalem in the days of Manasseh. Rival priests (the Chemarim of Zeph. i, 4) were consecrated for this hideous worship. Women dedicating themselves to a *cultus* like that of the Babylonian Mylitta wove hangings for the Asherah as they sat there (Mayer, cap. ii, § 4). The Kadeshim, in closest neighborhood with them, gave themselves up to yet darker abominations (2 Kings xxiii, 7). The awful words of Isaiah (i, 10) had a terrible truth in them. Those to whom he spoke were literally "rulers of Sodom and princes of Gomorrah." Every faith was tolerated but the old faith of Israel. This was abandoned and proscribed. The altar of Jehovah was displaced (2 Chron. xxxiii, 16). The very ark of the covenant was removed from the sanctuary (2 Chron. xxxv, 3). The sacred books of the people were so systematically destroyed that fifty years later men listened to the Book of the Law of Jehovah as a newly-discovered treasure (2 Kings xxii, 8). It may well be, according to a Jewish tradition, that this fanaticism of idolatry led Manasseh to order the name Jehovah to be erased from all documents and inscriptions (Patrick, ad loc.). All this involved also a systematic violation of the weekly sabbatic rest and the consequent loss of one witness against a merely animal life (Isa. lvi, 2; lviii, 13). The tide of corruption carried away some even of those who, as priests and prophets, should have been steadfast in resisting it (Zeph. iii, 4; Jer. ii, 26; v, 13; vi, 13).

It is easy to imagine the bitter grief and burning indignation of those who continued faithful. The fiercest zeal of Huguenots in France, of Covenanters in Scotland, against the badges and symbols of the Latin Church, is perhaps but a faint shadow of that which grew to a white heat in the hearts of the worshippers of Jehovah. They spoke out in words of corresponding strength. Evil was coming on Jerusalem which should make the ears of men to tingle (2 Kings xxi, 12). The line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab should be the doom of the Holy City. Like a vessel that had once been full of precious ointment (comp. the Sept. ἀλαβάστρον), but had afterwards become foul, Jerusalem should be emptied and wiped out, and exposed to the winds of Heaven till it was cleansed. Foremost, we may well believe, among those who thus bore their witness was the old prophet, now bent with the weight of fourscore years, who had in his earlier days protested with equal courage against the crimes of the king's grandfather. On him, too, according to the old Jewish tradition, came the first shock of the persecution. Enraged at the rebukes which the aged prophet doubtless administered, the king is said to have caused him to be sawn asunder with a wooden saw; this fate seems to be alluded to in Heb. xi, 37. See ISAIAH. Habakkuk may have shared his martyrdom (Keil on 2 Kings xxi; but comp. HABAKKUK). But the persecution did not stop there. It attacked the whole order of the true prophets, and those who followed them. Every day witnessed an execution (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 3, 1). The slaughter was like that under Alva or Charles IX (2 Kings xxi, 16). The martyrs who were faithful unto death had to endure not torture only, but the mocks and taunts of a

godless generation (Isa. lvii, 1–4). Long afterwards the remembrance of that reign of terror lingered in the minds of men as a guilt for which nothing could atone (2 Kings xxiv, 4). The persecution, like most other persecutions carried on with entire singleness of purpose, was for a time successful (Jer. ii, 30). The prophets appear no more in the long history of Manasseh's reign. The heart and the intellect of the nation were crushed out, and there would seem to have been no chroniclers left to record this portion of its history.

3. Retribution came soon in the natural sequence of events. There are indications that the neighboring nations—Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites—who had been tributary under Hezekiah, revolted at some period in the reign of Manasseh, and asserted their independence (Zeph. ii, 4–19; Jer. xlvii, xlviii, xlix). The Babylonian alliance bore the fruits which had been predicted. Hezekiah had been too hasty in attaching himself to the cause of the rebel prince against Assyria. The rebellion of Merodach-Baladan was crushed, and then the wrath of the Assyrian king fell on those who had supported him. See ESAR-HADDON. According to others, during the constant war between Assyria and Egypt, Manasseh adhered to the policy of his father in making common cause with the latter power. One or the other of these causes, although not stated by the sacred historian, brought into Judæa an Assyrian army, under the general of Esar-haddon, and this time the invasion was more successful than that of Sennacherib. The city apparently was taken. The miserable king attempted flight, but was discovered in a thorn-brake in which he had hidden himself, was laden with chains, and sent away as a captive to Babylon, which was then subject to the Assyrians, where he was cast into prison. His name has been discovered on the Assyrian monuments (*Journ. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1859, p. 75). See NINEVEH. Here, at last, Manasseh had ample opportunity and leisure for cool reflection; and the hard lessons of adversity were not lost upon him. He saw and deplored the evils of his reign—he became as a new man—he humbly besought pardon from God, and implored that he might be enabled to evince the sincerity of his contrition by being restored to a position for undoing all that it had been the business of his life to effect. His prayer was heard. His captivity is supposed to have lasted a year, and he was then restored to his kingdom under certain obligations of tribute and allegiance to the king of Assyria, which, although not expressed in the account of this transaction, are alluded to in the history of his successors (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11–13; comp. Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, p. 362). See MANASSES, PRAYER OF.

Two questions meet us at this point. (*a*) Have we satisfactory grounds for believing that this statement is historically true? (*b*) If we accept it, to what period in the reign of Manasseh is it to be assigned? It has been urged in regard to (*a*) that the silence of the writer of the books of Kings is conclusive against the trustworthiness of the narrative of 2 Chronicles. In the former there is no mention made of captivity or repentance or return. The latter, it has been said, yields to the temptation of pointing a moral, of making history appear more in harmony with his own notions of the divine government than it actually is. His anxiety to deal leniently with the successors of David leads him to invent at once a reformation and the captivity which is represented as its cause (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* i, 2, p. 131; Hitzig, *Begr. d. Kritik*, p. 130). It will be necessary in dealing with this objection to meet the sceptical critic on his own ground. To say that his reasoning contradicts our belief in the inspiration of the historical books of Scripture, and is destructive of all reverence for them, would involve a *petitio principii*, and, however strongly it may influence our feelings, we are bound to find another answer. It is believed that the answer is not far to seek. (1) The silence of a writer who sums up the history of a reign of fifty-five years in nineteen verses as to one alleged event in it is surely a weak ground for refusing to accept that event on the authority of another historian. (2) The omission is in part explained by the character of the narrative of 2 Kings xxi. The writer deliberately turns away from the history of the days of shame, and not less from the personal biography of the king. He looks on the reign only as it contributed to the corruption and final overthrow of the kingdom, and no after repentance was able to undo the mischief that had been done at first. (3) Still keeping on the level of human probabilities, the character of the writer of 2 Chronicles, obviously a Levite, and looking at the facts of the history from the Levitical point of view, would lead him to attach greater importance to a partial reinstatement of the old ritual and to the cessation of persecution, and so to give them in proportion a greater prominence. (4) There is one peculiarity in the history which is, in some measure, of the nature of an undesigned coincidence, and so confirms it. The captains of the host of Assyria take Manasseh to Babylon. Would not a later writer, inventing the story, have made the Assyrian, and not the Babylonian, capital the scene of the captivity; or, if the latter were chosen for the sake of harmony with the prophecy of Isa. xxxix, have made the king of Babylon rather than of Assyria the captor? As it is, the narrative fits in, with the utmost accuracy, to the facts of Oriental history. The first attempt of Babylon to assert its independence of Nineveh failed. It was crushed by Esar-haddon (the first or second of that name; compare ESAR-HADDON, and Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii, 675), and for a time the Assyrian king held his court at Babylon, so as to effect more completely the reduction of the rebellious province. There is (5) the fact of agreement with the intervention of the Assyrian king in 2 Kings xvii, 24, just at the same time. The king is not named there, but Ezra iv, 2, 10, gives Asnapper, and this is probably only another form of Asardanapar, and this = Esar-haddon (compare Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 676; Tob. i, 21 gives Sarchedonus). The importation of tribes from Eastern Asia thus becomes part of the same policy as the attack on Judah. On the whole, then, the objection may well be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious. Like many other difficulties urged by the same school, it has in it something at once captious and puerile. Those who lay undue stress on them act in the spirit of a clever boy asking puzzling questions, or a sharp advocate getting up a case against the evidence on the other side, rather than in that of critics who have learned how to construct a history and to value its materials rightly (comp. Keil, *Comment.* on 2 Kings xxi). Ewald, a critic of a nobler stamp, whose fault is rather that of fantastic reconstruction than needless scepticism (*Gesch. Isr.* iii, 678), admits the groundwork of truth. Would the prophecy of Isaiah, it may be asked, have been recorded and preserved if it had not been fulfilled? Might not Manasseh's release have been, as Ewald suggests, the direct consequence of the death of Esar-haddon? Indeed, all the soberer German critics accept it as truth, and place Manasseh's captivity under Esar-haddon (Bertheau, ad loc.). Bertheau suggests that some support to the account may perhaps be found in 2 Kings xx, 17 sq. For other discussions of the alleged improbabilities of the Biblical narrative, see Dahlers, *De fide Chronic. hist.* p. 139; Gramberg, *Chron.* p. 199, 210; *Religionsid.* ii, 234; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* I, ii, 131; Keil, *Apolog. der Chronik.* p. 425; Hävernick, *Einleit.* II, i, 221; *Stud. u Krit.* 1860, vol. iii.

(*b.*) The circumstance just noticed enables us to return an approximate answer to the other question. The duration of Esar-haddon's Babylonian reign is calculated as being in B.C. 680–667; and Manasseh's captivity must therefore have fallen within those limits. A Jewish tradition (*Seder Olam Rabba*, c. 24) fixes the twenty-second year of his reign as the exact date.

4. The period that followed is dwelt upon by the writer of 2 Chronicles as one of a great change for the better. The discipline of exile made the king feel that

the gods whom he had chosen were powerless to deliver, and he turned in his heart to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. The compassion or death of Esar-haddon led to his release, and he returned after some uncertain interval of time to Jerusalem. It is not improbable that his absence from that city had given a breathing time to the oppressed adherents of the ancient creed, and possibly had brought into prominence, as the provisional ruler and defender of the city, one of the chief members of the party. If the prophecy of Isa. xxii, 15 received, as it probably did, its fulfilment in Shebna's sharing the captivity of his master, there is nothing extravagant in the belief that we may refer to the same period the noble words which speak of Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, as taking the place which Shebna should leave vacant, and rising up to be "a father unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah," having "the key of the house of David on his shoulder."

The return of Manasseh was at any rate followed by a new policy. The old faith of Israel was no longer persecuted. Foreign idolatries were no longer thrust, in all their foulness, into the sanctuary itself. The altar of the Lord was again restored, and peace-offerings and thank-offerings sacrificed to Jehovah (2 Chron. xxxiii, 15, 16). But beyond this the reformation did not go. The ark was not restored to its place. The book of the law of Jehovah remained in its concealment. Satisfied with the feeling that they were no longer worshipping the gods of other nations by name, they went on with a mode of worship essentially idolatrous. "The people did sacrifice still in the high places, but to Jehovah their God only" (ibid. ver. 17).

5. The other facts known of Manasseh's reign connect themselves with the state of the world round him. The Assyrian monarchy was tottering to its fall, and the king of Judah seems to have thought that it was still possible for him to rule as the head of a strong and independent kingdom. If he had to content himself with a smaller territory, he might yet guard its capital against attack by a new wall defending what had been before its weak side (comp. Zeph. i, 10), "to the entering in of the fish-gate," and completing the tower of Ophel, which had been begun with a like purpose by Jotham (2 Chron. xxvii, 3). Nor were the preparations for defence limited to Jerusalem. "He put captains of war into all the fenced cities of Judah." There was, it must be remembered, a special reason for this attitude, over and above that afforded by the condition of Assyria. Egypt had emerged from the chaos of the Dodecarchy and the Ethiopian intruders, and again become strong and aggressive under Psammitichus. Pushing his arms northwards, he attacked the Philistines, and the twenty-nine years' siege of Azotus must have fallen wholly or in part within the reign of Manasseh. So far his progress would not be unacceptable. It would be pleasant to see the old hereditary enemies of Israel, who had lately grown insolent and defiant, meet with their masters. About this time, accordingly, we find the thought of an Egyptian alliance again beginning to gain favor. The prophets, and those who were guided by them, dreaded this more than anything, and entered their protest against it. Not the less, however, from this time forth, did it continue to be the favorite idea which took possession of the minds of the lay-party of the princes of Judah. The very name of Manasseh's son, Amon, barely admitting a possible Hebrew explanation, but identical in form and sound with that of the great sun-god of Egypt (so Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 665), is probably an indication of the gladness with which the alliance of Psammitichus was welcomed. As one of its consequences, it probably involved the supply of troops from Judah to serve in the armies of the Egyptian king. Without adopting Ewald's hypothesis that this is referred to in Deut. xxviii, 68, it is yet likely enough in itself, and Jer. ii, 14–16 seems to allude to some such state of things. In return for this, Manasseh, we may believe, received the help of the chariots and horses for which Egypt was always famous (Isa. xxxi, 1). (Comp. Aristeas, *Epist. ad Philocr.* in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii, 104). If this was the close of Manasseh's reign, we can well understand how to the writer of the books of Kings it would seem hardly better than the beginning, leaving the root-evil uncured, preparing the way for worse evils than itself. We can understand how it was that on his death he was buried as Ahaz had been, not with the burial of a king, in the sepulchres of the house of David, but in the garden of Uzza (2 Kings xxi, 26), and that, long afterwards, in spite of his repentance, the Jews held his name in abhorrence, as one of the three kings (the other two are Jeroboam and Ahab) who had no part in eternal life (*Sanhedr.* xi, 1, quoted by Patrick on 2 Chron. xxxiii, 13).

Indeed, the evil was irreparable. The habits of a sensuous and debased worship had eaten into the life of the people; and though they might be repressed for a time by force, as in the reformation of Josiah, they burst out again, when the pressure was removed, with fresh violence, and rendered even the zeal of the best of the Jewish kings fruitful chiefly in hypocrisy and unreality. The intellectual life of the people suffered in the same degree. The persecution cut off all who, trained in the schools of the prophets, were the thinkers and teachers of the people. The reign of Manasseh witnessed the close of the work of Isaiah and Habakkuk at its beginning, and the youth of Jeremiah and Zephaniah at its conclusion, but no prophetic writings illumine that dreary half-century of debasement. The most fearful symptom of all, when a prophet's voice was again heard during the minority of Josiah, was the atheism which, then as in other ages, followed on the confused adoption of a confluent polytheism (Zeph. i, 12). It is surely a strained, almost a fantastic hypothesis, to assign (as Ewald does) to such a period two such noble works as Deuteronomy and the book of Job. Nor was this dying out of a true faith the only evil. The systematic persecution of the worshippers of Jehovah accustomed the people to the horrors of a religious war; and when they in their turn gained the ascendancy, they used the opportunity with a fiercer sternness than had been known before. Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their reforms had been content with restoring the true worship and destroying the instruments of the false. In that of Josiah, the destruction extends to the priests of the high places, whom he sacrifices on their own altars (2 Kings xxiii, 20).

6. But little is added by later tradition to the O.-T. narrative of Manasseh's reign. The prayer that bears his name among the apocryphal books can hardly, in the absence of any Hebrew original, be considered as identical with that referred to in 2 Chron. xxxiii, and is probably rather the result of an attempt to work out the hint there supplied than the reproduction of an older document. There are reasons, however, for believing that there existed at some time or other a fuller history, more or less legendary, of Manasseh and his conversion, from which the prayer may possibly have been an *excerpt*, preserved for devotional purposes (it appears for the first time in the Apostolical Constitutions) when the rest was rejected as worthless. Scattered here and there, we find the *disjecta membra* of such a work. Among the offences of Manasseh, the most prominent is that he places in the sanctuary an ἄγαλμα τετραπρόσωπον of Zeus (Suidas, s. v. Μανασσῆς; Georg. Syncellus, *Chronograph.* i, 404). The charge on which he condemns Isaiah to death is that of blasphemy, the words "I saw the Lord" (Isa. vi, 1) being treated as a presumptuous boast at variance with Exod. xxxiii, 20 (Nic. de Lyra, from a Jewish treatise: *Jebamoth*, quoted by Amama, in *Crit. Sacri* on 2 Kings xxi). Isaiah is miraculously rescued. A cedar opens to receive him. Then comes the order that the cedar should be sawn through (*ibid.*). That which made this sin the greater was that the king's mother, Hephzibah, was the daughter of Isaiah. When Manasseh was taken captive by Merodach and taken to Babylon (Suidas), he was thrown into prison

and fed daily with a scanty allowance of bran-bread and water mixed with vinegar. Then came his condemnation. He was encased in a brazen image (the description suggests a punishment like that of the bull of Perillus), but he repented and prayed, and the image clave asunder, and he escaped (Suidas and Georg. Syncellus). "And the Lord heard the voice of Manasses and pitied him," the legend continues, "and there came around him a flame of fire, and all the irons about him (*τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν σιδηρᾶ*) were melted, and the Lord delivered him out of his affliction" (*Const. Apost.* ii, 22; compare Jul. Afric. ap. Routh, *Rel. Sac.* ii, 288). Then he returned to Jerusalem and lived righteously and justly.

4. An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Pahath-moab, who repudiated his foreign wife after the exile (Ezra x, 30). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of Hashun who did the same (Ezra x, 33). B.C. 459.

Manasseh BEN-JOSEPH BEN-ISRAEL, one of the most distinguished Jewish theologians of the 17th century, was born at Lisbon, Portugal, in 1604, at a time when the Iberian peninsula was a place of torture for all non-Roman-Catholic believers, but more particularly the Jews. Joseph, his father, a rich merchant, feared the power of the inquisitors, and, like many religiously persecuted, turned towards hospitable Holland for an asylum for himself and his family. The household found a safe home in Amsterdam, and when yet a youth ben-Joseph was placed under the instruction of the celebrated Isaac Uzziel, then rabbi at the Dutch capital. So rapid was his progress and so unbounded the confidence of the Jews of Amsterdam in Manasseh ben-Israel, as he is commonly called, that on the death of Uzziel, when only eighteen years old (1622), he was deemed a worthy successor of the departed rabbi. In 1626, in need of means to meet the expenses of his father's family, largely dependent upon him for support, he established the celebrated "Amsterdam Hebrew printing-office." Two years later he printed his own maiden production, and in 1632 finally came before the public with the first volume of his great and justly celebrated *Conciliator, or Harmony of the Pentateuch* (see below), in which upwards of two hundred and ten Hebrew works, and fifty-four Greek, Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese authors, both sacred and profane, are quoted. His fame was now established in all Europe, and his authority accepted not only by the Jews, but even Christian scholars acknowledged his scholarship, and wrote to him from far and wide, requesting explanations of difficulties which they encountered in the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish history. The celebrated Vossius, Dionysius, Hugo Grotius, Huet, Episcopus, Sobierre, Frankenberg, Thomas Fuller, Nathaniel Homesius, etc., were among his correspondents. He solicited their influence in behalf of his suffering brethren, and was thereby enabled to petition the Long Parliament (1650) to readmit the Jews into England, whence they had been expelled ever since 1290. Shortly after, he dedicated *The Hope of Israel* to the English Parliament, which was gratefully acknowledged in a letter written by lord Middlesex, addressed *To my dear brother M. B. I., the Hebrew philosopher.* Encouraged thereby, Manasseh came over to England in 1655; presented "A Humble Address" in behalf of his coreligionists to Cromwell; published in London, 1656, his *Vindication of Jews*, in answer to those Christians who opposed the readmission of Jews into that country; and though Cromwell, with all his power, could not carry through the measure permitting Jews to settle in England (see JEWS), he granted to Manasseh ben-Israel a pension of £100 per annum, payable quarterly, and commencing Feb. 20, 1656 (comp. Carlyle, ii, 163). Manasseh, however, did not long enjoy this generous gift, for he died in Middleburg in 1657, on his way back to Amsterdam. Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 13, 84-86) rather belittles Manasseh's literary ability. He regards him as "a man of much information, but of little thought," and yet his acquaintance with Manasseh is founded mainly on Kayserling's biography. An encyclopædical knowledge was displayed by Manasseh in his writings; this should certainly not stand against him. His most important works are (1.) פני רבה, in Hebrew, being an index to all the passages of the Hebrew Scriptures in the *Midrash Rabboth* on the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth (Amsterdam, 1628); (2.) *Conciliator, sive de convenientia locorum S. Scripturæ, quæ pugnare inter se videntur*, etc. (in Spanish, Amst. 1632–1651, 4 vols.; vol. i was translated into Latin by Vossius, Amst. 1633, and the whole into English by Lindo, London, 1842); (3.) *De Creatione Problemata* (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1635); (4.) *De Resurrectione Mortuorum, Libri tres* (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1636); (5.) צרור החיים, *De Termino Vitæ* (in Latin, Amsterd. 1639; translated into English by Thomas Pococke, Lond. 1699); (6.) נשמת חיים, four books on the immortality of the soul (written in Hebrew, Amst. 1651; new ed. Leips. 1862. These are valuable contributions to Biblical literature, inasmuch as Manasseh gives in them all the passages from the Hebrew Scriptures which, according to the explanations of the ancient rabbins, teach the immortality of the soul and the resurrection); (7.) אבן יקרה, *Piedra Gloriosa o de la Estatua de Nebuchadnesar* (Amst. 1655), an exposition of Daniel's dream, written in Spanish, which the immortal Rembrandt did not think it below his dignity to adorn with four engravings. He also carried through his own press several beautiful and correctly-printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures; wrote a Hebrew grammar, entitled שפה ברורה, *Grammatica Hebrea, dividida en quatuor libros*, which has not as yet been published; and left us over four hundred well-written sermons in Portuguese. See Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 354–358; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1645–1652; and especially the valuable biographies by Kayserling, *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden* (Leipz. 1861), ii, 85 sq.; and by Carmoly, in the *Revue Orientale* (Bruxelles, 1842), p. 299–348; C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto, iii, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 145 sq.

Manas'ses (*Μανασσῆς*), the Greek form of the name *Manasseh*, and, as such, applied not only to those mentioned in the O. T., but to another in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Joseph by that name (Rev. vii, 6).

2. The king of Judah (Matt. i, 10; and so in "the Prayer" thus entitled).

3. One of the sons of Hashum (1 Esdr. ix, 33; comp. Ezra x, 33).

4. A wealthy inhabitant of Bethulia, and husband of Judith, according to the legend. He was smitten with a sunstroke while superintending the laborers in his fields, leaving Judith a widow with great possessions (Jud. viii, 2, 7; x, 3; xvi, 22–24), and was buried between Dothan and Baal-hamon. See JUDITH.

MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF, one of the shorter apocryphal pieces appended to the O. T. (In the following account we mainly follow the articles on the subject in Kitto and Smith's *Dictionaries*.) Though wanting in the early printed editions of the Sept., it must have been included in the ancient MSS. of the Sept., as is evident from the fact that there exists an Ante-Hieronymian Latin version of it. It is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Greek text was first published in Robert Stephens' edition of the *Biblia Latina* (Paris. 1540), and in the edition of the same printed in 1546. It was also printed in the *Apostolical Constitutions* in 1563; it was then published by Dauderstadt in 1628; inserted in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus, in the *Apostolical Fathers* of Cotelerius in 1672; in the *Libri apocr. V. T.* (Francof. ad M. 1694, Halle, 1749); in the editions of the Apocrypha by Reineccius (1730), Michaelis (1741); and after the text of the Cod. Alexandrinus in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger.

I. *Title and Position.*—This apocryphal production is called *the prayer of Manasses* (προσευχὴ Μανασσῆ), or *hymn of prayer* (προσευχὴ τῆς ᾠδῆς), because it purports to be the supplications which this monarch offered to God when captive in Babylon, mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxiii, 12, 13. Its position varies in the MSS., printed editions of the text, and in the versions. It is more generally appended to the Psalter with the collection of hymns and prayers, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, the Zürich MS. of the Psalms mentioned by Fritzsche, and in the Ethiopic Psalter, published by Ludolf (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); in the three Latin MSS. used by Sabatier it is placed at the end of 2 Chron. (Sabat. *Bibl. Lat.* iii, 1038); in the editions of the Vulgate formed after the Trident. Canon of the Bible it is usually put at the end of the N. T., succeeded by the third and fourth books of Esdras. Luther placed it as the last of the Apocrypha, at the end of the O. T., while Matthew's Bible, which first inserted it among the Apocrypha, and which is followed by the Bishop's Bible and the A. V., puts it before the Maccabees.

II. *Contents, Author, Date, Original Language, etc.*—It opens with an appeal to the God of the faithful patriarchs and their righteous seed, describes his greatness as Creator of all things, before whose power every one trembles, and whose wrath no sinner can endure, and speaks of his proffered pardon to the penitent (ver. 1–8). Thereupon the repentant king confesses his sins, humbles himself on account of them, prays for pardon, and promises to lead a life of gratitude and praise (ver. 9–15).

Many writers have seen nothing in this prayer to militate against its being the penitential dirge of the penitent Manasseh; on the contrary, they think that the simplicity and appropriateness of its style, the earnest and touching manner in which it is expressed, go far to show that if it is not *literally* "his prayer unto his God" rendered into Greek, that prayer formed the basis of the Greek. It is, indeed, certain that the prayer was still extant when the Chronicles were compiled, that the chronicler *saw* it "in the book of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xxxiii, 18), and that later writers, as well as tradition, constantly refer to it (compare *Sanhedrin*, 101, b; 103, a; *Jerusalem Sanhedrin* xvii; *Midrash Rabboth* on Lev., Parsha xxx. p. 150; on Deut., Parsha ii, or ch. iv, 25, p. 216, ed. Sulzbach; *Chaldee Paraphrase* of 2 Chron. xxxiii, 11, etc.; *Const. Apost.* ii, 22). We may more reasonably conclude, however, that it is but the embodiment of these traditions. See MANASSEH, 3.

The Greek text is undoubtedly original, and not a mere translation from the Hebrew, for even within the small space of fifteen verses some peculiarities are found (ἄστεκτος, κλίνειν γόνυ καρδίας, παροργίζειν τὸν θυμόν, τίθεσθαι μετάνοιάν τινι). The writer was well acquainted with the Sept. (τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, τὸ πλῆθος τῆς χρηστότητός σου, πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν), but beyond this there is nothing to determine the date at which he lived. The allusion to the patriarchs (ver. 8, δίκαιοι; ver. 1, τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν τὸ δίκαιον) appears to fix the authorship on a Jew, but the clear teaching on repentance points to a time certainly not long before the Christian era. There is no indication of the place at which the prayer was written. All that we know is that reference is made to it in a fragment of Julius Africanus (circa A.D. 221), that it is given at length in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii, 22), a work attributed to Clemens Romanus, but generally believed to be of the 3d or 4th century, and that the whole complexion of it shows it to be an ante-Christian production, compiled most probably in the first century B.C. The Latin translation which occurs in Vulgate MSS. is not by the hand of Jerome, and has some remarkable phrases (*insustentabilis, importabilis* [ἀνυπόστατος], *omnis virtus cœlorum*), but there is no sufficient internal evidence to show whether it is later or earlier than his time. It does not, however, seem to have been used by any Latin writer of the first four centuries, and was not known to Victor Tunonensis in the sixth (Ambrosius, iv, 989, ed. Migne).

III. *Canonicity.*—This prayer was considered by many of the ancients as genuine, and used as such for ecclesiastical purposes. It is quoted as such by the author of the *Sermons on the Pharisee and Publican;* in the sixth volume of Chrysostom's works; by Anthony the monk (ii, 94); Theodore Studita (*Serm. Catachet.* 93); Theophanes Ceramæus (*Homil.* ii and lvi); by Freculfus, George Syncellus, and George the sinner, in their *Chronicles;* by Suidas (*Lex.* s. v. Μανασσῆς); and by Anastasius Sinaita (in *Psalm* vi); and is still placed by the modern Greeks in their Psalter along with the other hymns (Leo Allatius, *De lib. Ecclesiast. Græcorum*, p. 62). But the fact of its non-occurrence in the Heb. text, and its uniform rejection by the Jewish Church, clearly stamp it as apocryphal. It was never recognised in the Roman Church as canonical, and has, therefore, been omitted in the ancient editions of the Sept. For this reason it is also omitted from the Zürich Version, and Coverdale's Bible, which follows it, as well as from the Geneva Version; but is retained among the Apocrypha in Luther's translation, Matthew's Bible, and in the Bishop's Bible, and thence passed over into the A. V.

IV. *Versions and Exegetical Helps.*—Greek and Latin metrical versions of this prayer have been reprinted by Fabricius, in his edition of *the books of Sirach, Wisdom, Judith*, and *Tobit* (Leipz. 1691). A Hebrew version of it is mentioned by Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, i, 778; a very beautiful Hebrew version, with valuable notes, is printed in the *Hebrew Annual*, entitled *Bikure Ha-Itim* (Vienna, 1824), v, 12 sq.; important literary notices are given by Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* i, 1100 sq.; *Bibliotheca Græca* (ed. Harles), iii, 732 sq.; Müller, *Erklärung des Gebet Manasse* (Salzwedel, 1733); and especially Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokryphen d. A. T.* i, 157 sq. (Leips. 1851). See APOCRYPHA.

Manas'site (מְנַשִּׁי, *Menassi'*, patronymic from MANASSEH, used collectively; Sept. Μανασσή, Auth. Vers. "Manassites," "of Manasseh"), a descendant of Manasseh, or a member of that tribe (Deut. iv, 43; xxix, 8; 2 Kings x, 33; 1 Chron. xxvi, 32).

Manby, PETER, an Irish theologian, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, became chaplain to Dr. Michael Boyle, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, and at length dean of Perry. In the reign of James II he embraced the popish religion, in vindication of which he wrote several books; then removed to France, thence to England, and died at London in 1697. Manby published several controversial tracts in favor of the Roman Catholic religion.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vii, 214, s. v.

Manchet is a name given in the 16th century to the *wafer* used in the mass.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.

Manchuria. See MANTCHURIA.

Mancius, GEORGE WILHELMUS, one of the prominent ministers of the Reformed Church in America, and a sturdy opposer of the movements for securing its independence of the Church in Holland. He was settled in Bergen County, N. J., at Schraalenbergh and Paramus (1730–32), and at Kingston, N. Y. (1732–56 or '59). He possessed much ability and learning, but it was alleged that "consciences slumbered" under his orthodox preaching. His friends, however, claim that his manuscript sermons show him to have been "a faithful, learned, industrious, and zealous preacher of the Gospel, one who did not fear to declare the whole counsel of God; and that it was, on the other hand, his opposition to an illiterate ministry and to heresy, his independence in reproving vice, and his general zeal and fidelity which induced certain of his enemies to misrepresent him." He left 420 members in full communion of his Church. He died Sept. 6, 1762. See Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 150. (W. J. R. T.)

Mandæans. See MENDÆANS.

Mandāta de Providendo. See EXPECTANTIA.

Mandeville, Bernard de, a sceptical writer in the English tongue, was born of French extraction about 1670 at Dort, Holland, and went to England near the opening of the 18th century. He practiced medicine in London, but does not appear to have had much success as a physician, and depended mainly on his literary activity for the means of support. He died in 1733. In the article DEISM (q. v.) the name of Mandeville has not been inserted "because his speculations" (see works below), as Farrar says (*Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 135, note 65), "did not bear directly on religion." Upon morality, however, Mandeville exerted so great an influence that we cannot pass him unnoticed. His attacks on Christian morals already reveal him to have been a champion of Deism. The doctrines laid down in several of his works is nothing more nor less than a further elucidation of the assertion of Bayle (in *Pensées diverses*), that Atheism does not necessarily make man vicious, nor a state unhappy, because dogmas have no influence on the acts of men. Superficial observation of society led Mandeville to the belief that many institutions of public weal derive their strength and support from prevailing immorality. This view he developed in a poem entitled *The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves turned Honest* (1714), to which he afterwards added long explanatory notes, and then published the whole under the new title of *The Fable of the Bees*. However erroneous may be its views of morals and of society, it bears all the marks of an honest and sincere inquiry on an important subject. It exposed Mandeville, however, to much obloquy, and, besides meeting with many answers and attacks, was denounced as injurious to morality. It would appear that some of the hostility against this work, and against Mandeville generally, is to be traced to another publication, recommending the public licensing of stews, the matter and manner of which are certainly exceptionable, though it must at the same time be stated that Mandeville earnestly and with seeming sincerity recommends his plan as a means of diminishing immorality, and that he endeavored, so far as lay in his power, by affixing a high price and in other ways, to prevent the work from having a general circulation. Mandeville subsequently published a second part of *The Fable of the Bees*, and several other works, among which are two entitled *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness*, and *An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*. "*The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices Public Benefits*, may be viewed in two ways, as a satire on men and as a theory of society and national prosperity. So far as it is a satire, it is sufficiently just and pleasant; but viewed in its more ambitious character of a theory of society, it is altogether worthless. It is Mandeville's object to show that national greatness depends on the prevalence of fraud and luxury; and for this purpose he supposes a 'vast hive of bees,' possessing in all respects institutions similar to those of men; he details the various frauds, similar to those among men, practiced by bees one upon another in various professions; he shows how the wealth accumulated by means of these frauds is turned, through luxurious habits, to the good of others, who again practice their frauds upon the wealthy; and, having already assumed that wealth cannot be gotten without fraud and cannot exist without luxury, he assumes further that wealth is the only cause and criterion of national greatness. His hive of bees having thus become wealthy and great, he afterwards supposes a mutual jealousy of frauds to arise, and fraud to be by common consent dismissed; and he again assumes that wealth and luxury immediately disappear, and that the greatness of the society is gone. It is needless to point out inconsistencies and errors, such, for instance, as the absence of all distinction between luxury and vice, when the whole theory rests upon obviously false assumptions; and the long dissertations appended to the fable, however amusing and full of valuable remarks, contain no attempts to establish by proof the fundamental points of the theory. In an 'Inquiry into the Origin of Moral Distinctions,' contained in *The Fable of the Bees*, Mandeville contends that virtue and vice, and the feelings of moral approbation and disapprobation, have been created in men by their several governments, for the purpose of maintaining society and preserving their own power. Incredible as it seems that such a proposition as this should be seriously put forth, it is yet more so that it should come from one whose professed object was, however strange the way in which he set about it, to promote good morals; for there is nothing in Mandeville's writings to warrant the belief that he sought to encourage vice" (*English Cyclop.* s. v.). This book was translated into French, as well as the other writings of Mandeville, and contributed in no small degree to the corruption of French society, and helped forward the sad days of the Revolution. Schlosser (*Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent.*) is quite severe on Mandeville. He says that "Mandeville was a man wholly destitute of morality, and without any insight into the nature of man or the connection between bodily and mental soundness and well-being." See *Life* by Dr. Birch; *Blackwood's Magazine*, ii, 268, 442; xxvii, 712; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref.* vi, 204 sq.; Henke, *Gesch. d. christl. Kirche*, vi, 85 sq. (J. H. W.)

Mandeville, Henry, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Kinderhook, N. Y., March 6, 1804; graduated at Union College in 1826, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1829, and was licensed by the Classis of Albany in 1829. His ministry was chiefly spent in the Reformed Church in the State of New York, viz., at Shawangunk, 1829–31; Geneva, 1831–34; Utica, 1834–41. From 1841 to 1849 he was professor of moral philosophy and belles-lettres in Hamilton College, N. Y. While in this position he published several valuable text-books on elocution and English literature, which evince his thorough scholarship and "aptness to teach." From Hamilton College he was called to the Government Street Presbyterian Church, Mobile, Ala., where he died of yellow fever in 1858. Dr. Mandeville was a man of large frame, imposing presence, and cultivated manners. He was a brilliant pulpit orator, a powerful reasoner, a successful preacher and professor, and a faithful pastor. He gloried in the cross of Christ, and devoted all of his fine powers to his work. His published address on the *Reflex Influence of Foreign Missions*, which was delivered before the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1847, is a masterpiece of reasoning and eloquence, and a worthy memorial of the author's genius, piety, and zeal. — *Personal Recollections;* Corwin's *Manual*, s. v. (W. J. R. T.)

Mandingo is the name of an African people, the nation of the *Wangarawa* — according to Barth, comprising some 6,000,000 or more. Strictly speaking, however, Mandingoes should be termed only the inhabitants of the most south-westerly territories belonging to the great West African race of the Wangarawa (sing. *Wangara*), and inhabiting a district extending in lat. from 8 to 12° N., and between the west coasts and the head waters of the Senegal and Niger. Their original seat is said to be Manding, a small mountain country on the eastern sources of the Senegal, whence, partly by conquest and partly by emigration, they have spread themselves over a most extensive tract of country, and now consist of a variety of tribes. They are black in color, tall and well shaped, with regular features, and are, generally speaking, a fine race, capable of a high degree of civilization and organization, great travellers, fond of trading, and remarkable for their industry and energy. The language of the Mandingo prevails from the Senegal coast up to Sago on the Niger. A grammar of the language was compiled by R. Maxwell Macbrair (Lond. 1837).

Religious Belief, etc. — Of the neighboring nations, the Mandingoes were the first who embraced Islamism.

The greater portion of them are now Moslems, and are zealous propagators of their religion. Those of the Mandingoes adhering to their primitive religion have a very peculiar idea of marriage. With them it is merely a form of regulated slavery, and there is no marriage ceremony observed to evince union (Caillé, *Travels*, i, 350). Most generally the female partner is carried from her home by force (Gray, *Travels in W. Africa*, p. 56). They have also, according to Park (*Travels*, i, 267), a very peculiar idea of the Deity, whom they regard as "so remote, and of so exalted a nature, that it is idle to imagine the feeble supplications of wretched mortals can reverse the decrees and change the purposes of unerring wisdom." Neither do they have any confidence in any belief in the hereafter, of which they assert that "no man knows anything about it."

Mandra (*sheepfold*), a name given to a *monastery* in the Greek Church. See ARCHIMANDRITE.

Mandrake (only in the plur. דּוּדָאִים, *dudaïm'*, from דּוּד, to *be hot*, from their amatory properties; whence the sing. דּוּדָד, a *pot* or boiling vessel, hence a *basket*, Jer. xxiv, 1) occurs in Gen. xxx, 14–16: "Reuben went out in the days of wheat harvest, and found *mandrakes* in the field, and brought them home to his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me of thy son's *mandrakes;*" "And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must come in unto me, for surely I have hired thee with my son's *mandrakes;* and he lay with her that night." The only other passage is Cant. vii, 13: "The *mandrakes* give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant plants." From the above passages it is evident that the *dudaim* were collected in the fields, that they were fit for gathering in the wheat harvest in Mesopotamia, where the first occurrence took place; that they were found in Palestine; that they or the plants which yielded them diffused a peculiar and agreeable odor; and that they were supposed to be possessed of aphrodisiac powers, or of assisting in producing conception. It is possible that there is a connection between this plant and the love-charms (דּוּדִים) which seem to have been worn by Oriental brides (Cant. i, 2, 4; iv, 10; vii, 12; comp. i, 12), like smelling-bottles (Isa. iii, 20, "tablets"); perhaps these contained an odoriferous mandrake philter. From this it is manifest that there is little to guide us in determining what plant is alluded to at such early periods, especially as no similar name has been recognised in any of the cognate languages. Hence interpreters have wasted much time and pains in endeavoring to ascertain what is intended by the Hebrew word *dudaim*. Some translate it by "violet," others "lilies," "jasmins," "truffles or mushrooms;" and some think that the word means "flowers," or "fine flowers." Bochart, Calmet, and Sir Thomas Browne suppose the *citron* intended; Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 20; but see, on the contrary, Oedmann, p. 99) is persuaded that it is *the fruit of the lote-tree;* Hiller that *cherries* are spoken of; and Ludolf (*Hist. Æth.* i, 9, etc.) maintains that it is the fruit which the Syrians call *mauz* (that is, the plantain), resembling in figure and taste the Indian fig; but the generality of interpreters and commentators understand *mandrakes* (not the melon so called, "melo dudaim," but the *mandragora*) by *dudaim*. The ground upon which the mandragora has been preferred is that the most ancient Greek translator interprets the Hebrew name in Gen. xxx, 14 by mandrake apples (*μῆλα μανδραγορῶν*); and in the Song of Solomon by mandrakes, *οἱ μανδραγόραι*. Saadias, Onkelos, and the Syriac Version agree with the Greek translators. The first of these puts *laffach;* the two latter *yabruchin*, which names denote the same plant (Rosenmüller, *Bib. Bot.* p. 130, and note; Castelli, *Lexicon*, p. 1591). The earliest notice of *μανδραγόρας* is by Hippocrates, and the next by Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* vi, 2). Both of these, C. Sprengel (*Hist. Rei. Herb.* i, 38, 82) supposes, intend *Atropa mandragora*. Dioscorides (iv, 76) notices three kinds: (1.) the female, which is supposed to be the *Mandragora autumnalis* of Berloton; (2.) the male, *Mandragora vernalis* of the same botanist (these two are, however, usually accounted varieties of *Atropa mandragora*); (3.) a kind called *morion*. It has been inferred that this may be the same as the mandragora of Theophrastus, which, by some authors, has been supposed to be *Atropa belladonna*. To all of these Dioscorides ascribes narcotic properties, and says of the first that it is also called *Circæa*, because it appears to be a root which promotes venery. Pythagoras named the mandragora *anthropomorphon*, and Theophrastus, among other qualities, mentions its soporific powers, and also its tendency to excite to love. Its fruit was called love-apple, and Venus herself Mandragorites. But it is not easy to decide whether the above all refer to the same plant or plants. (See Lucian, *Tim.* p. 2; Pliny, xxv, 94; Apulæi, *Asin.* x, 233, Bip.; Schol. at Plat. *Rep.* vi, 411, tom. v, Lips.; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 478.) Persian authors on *materia medica* give *madragoras* as a synonyme for *yebrúk*, or *yabrúz*, which is said to be the root of a plant of which the fruit is called *lúfach*. This, there is little doubt, must be the above *Atropa mandragora*, as the Arabs usually refer only to the plants of Dioscorides, and on this occasion they quote him as well as Galen, and ascribe narcotic properties to both the root and the fruit. D'Herbelot (*Bibl. Orient.* i, 72) details some of the superstitious opinions respecting this plant, which originated in the East, but which continued for a long time to be retailed by authors in Europe. (See Schubert, iii, 116; Schulz. *Leit.* v, 197; Burckhardt, i, 441.) By the Arabs it is said to be called *tufah al-sheitan*, or devil's apple, on account of its power to excite voluptuousness. If we look to the works of more modern authors, we find a continuance of the same statements. Thus Mariti, in his *Travels* (ii, 195), says that the Arabs called the mandrake plant *yabrochak*, which is, no doubt, the same name as given above. "At the village of St. John, in the mountains, about six miles south-west from Jerusalem, this plant is found at present, as well as in Tuscany. It grows low, like lettuce, to which its leaves have a strong resemblance, except that they have a dark-green color. The flowers are purple, and the root is for the most part forked. The fruit, when ripe, in the beginning of May, is of the size and color of a small apple, exceedingly ruddy, and of a most agreeable odor; our guide thought us fools for suspecting it to be unwholesome. He ate it freely himself, and it is generally valued by the inhabitants as exhilarating to their spirits and a provocative to venery." Maundrell (*Trav.* p. 83) was informed by the chief priest of the Samaritans that it was still noted for its genial virtues. Hasselquist also seems inclined to consider it the *duduim*, for, when at Nazareth, he says (*Trav.* p. 183), "What I found most remarkable in their villages was the great quantity of mandrakes that grew in a vale below it. The fruit was now (May 16) ripe. From the season in which this mandrake blossoms and ripens its fruit, one might form a conjecture that it is Rachel's *dudaim*. These were brought her in the wheat harvest, which in Galilee is in the month of May, about this time, and the mandrake was now in fruit." Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 380) found mandrakes ripe on the lower ranges of Lebanon and Hermon towards the end of April. On the 15th of May, Schulz also found mandrakes on Mount Tabor, which, as he says, "have a delightful scent, and whose taste is equally agreeable, although not to every body. They are almost globular, and yellow like oranges, and about two and a quarter inches in diameter. This fruit grows on a shrub resembling the mallow; and the fruit lies about the stem, as it were about the root, after such a manner that a single shrub may have six to ten fruits, of which the color is so beautiful that no orange equals its brilliancy." This fruit, which a recent traveller describes as of an "insipid, sickish taste," is by the Arabs of other

regions alleged to possess strengthening virtues, when used in small quantities, but they call it *tuffah el-majanim*, or "apples of the possessed," owing to the temporary insanity which an over-dose produces. "At first," says a traveller, "I felt inclined to doubt the assertion, but during my residence in the country I had the opportunity of witnessing its effect on an English traveller, a Mr. L., who had the temerity to test the property of the mandrake. A few hours after partaking of the root he began to show unequivocal symptoms of insanity; and such was its effect on the nervous system that he had to be relieved by cupping and other remedies before he could be restored to consciousness" (Dupuis, *Holy Places* [1856], i, 272). The name "love-apple"—Gesenius's translation of *dudaim*—was formerly in this country given to a kindred plant, the tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum*), a native of South America, but now largely cultivated everywhere for its agreeable acidulous fruit. "From a certain rude resemblance of old roots of the mandrake to the human form, whence Pythagoras is said to have called the mandrake *ἀνθρωπόμορφον*, and Columella (10, 19) *semihomo*, some strange superstitious notions have arisen concerning it. Josephus (*War*, vii, 6, 3) evidently alludes to one of these superstitions, though he calls the plant *baaras*. In a Vienna MS. of Dioscorides is a curious drawing which represents Euresis, the goddess of discovery, handing to Dioscorides a root of the mandrake; the dog employed for the purpose is depicted in the agonies of death (Daubeny's *Roman Husbandry*, p. 275). The mandrake is found abundantly in the Grecian islands, and in some parts of the south of Europe. The root is spindle-shaped, and



Atropa Mandragora Officinarum.

often divided into two or three forks. The leaves, which are long, sharp-pointed, and hairy, rise immediately from the ground. The flowers are dingy white, stained with veins of purple. The fruit is of a pale orange color, and about the size of a nutmeg; but it would appear that the plant varies considerably in appearance according to the localities where it grows. The mandrake (*Atropa mandragora*) is closely allied to the well-known deadly nightshade (*A. belladonna*), and belongs to the order *Solanaceæ*." See Liebetantz, *De Rachelis Dudaim* (Vitemb. 1702); Simon, *De* דּוּדָאִים, etc. (Halle, 1735); Ant. Bertolini, *Comment. de Mandragoris* (Bol. 1836); Dougtæi *Analect.* i, 35; Velthuysen, *Comment. üb. d. Hohelied*, p. 502; Eichhorn, *Repert.* xi, 158; Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 410; Oken, *Lehrb. d. Natursgesch.* II, ii, 333; W. Bickerton, *Dissertation on the Mandrake of the Ancients* (Lond. 1737); Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 466 sq.

Mandyas (*μανδύας*), a vestment of the Greek priests, not unlike the cope of the Romanists, but with bells at the lower edges, in supposed imitation of the Jewish high-priest.

Ma'neh (מָנֶה, *maneh'*, Ezek. xlv, 12, a *portion* as divided by weight; hence the Greek *μνᾶ*, a *mina*; rendered "pound" in 1 Kings x, 17; Ezra ii, 69; Neh. vii, 21, 22), a weight of *a hundred shekels*, as we gather from 1 Kings x, 17 (compare 2 Chron. ix, 16). Another and somewhat obscure specification is given in Ezek. xlv, 12, "twenty shekels, five and twenty shekels, fifteen shekels, shall be your maneh;" spoken either of a triple maneh of *twenty, twenty-five, and fifty shekels;* or of a single maneh of *sixty shekels*, distributed into three parts of fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five. There are other explanations offered (as by the Chaldee paraphrast, by Jarchi, J. D. Michaelis, and others), but the latter is generally supposed to be the best. See WEIGHTS.

Manĕtho (Μανεθών or Μανεθώς), OF SEBENNYTUS, a distinguished Egyptian historian, a native of Diospolis, according to some, or of Mende or Heliopolis, according to others, is said to have lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to have been a man of great learning and wisdom (Ælian, *De Animal.* x, 16). He belonged to the priestly caste, and was himself a priest, and interpreter or recorder of religious usages, and of the religious and probably also historical writings. His name has been interpreted "beloved of Thoth;" in the *song* of Lagos and Ptolemy Philadelphus, *Mai en tet*, or *Ma Net*, "beloved of Neith;" but both interpretations are doubtful. Scarcely anything is known of the history of Manetho himself, and he is more renowned for his Egyptian history than on any other account. On the occasion of Ptolemy I dreaming of the god Serapis at Sinope, Manetho was consulted by the monarch, and, in conjunction with Timotheus of Athens, the interpreter of the Eleusinian mysteries, declared the statue of Serapis, brought by orders of the king from Sinope, to be that of the god Serapis or Pluto, and the god had a temple and his worship inaugurated at Alexandria. It appears probable, however, that there were more than one individual of this name, and it is therefore doubtful whether all the works which were attributed by ancient writers to Manetho were in reality written by the Manetho who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. (See below.)

Writings.—The only work of Manetho which has come down to us complete is a poem of six books, in hexameter verse, on the influence of the stars (*ἀποτελεσματικά*), which was first published by Gronovius (Leyden, 1698), and has also been edited by Axtius and Rigler (Cologne, 1832). It is probable, however, for many reasons, as Heyne has shown in his *Opuscula Academica* (i, 95), that parts, at least, of this poem could not have been written till a much later date. We also possess considerable fragments of a work of Manetho on the history of the ancient kings of Egypt. (See below.) It was in three books or parts, and comprised the period from the earliest times to the death of the last Persian Darius. Some of these fragments are preserved in the treatise of Josephus against Apion; and still greater portions in the "Chronicles" of George Syncellus, a monk of the 9th century. The "Chronicles" of Syncellus were principally compiled from the "Chronicles" of Julius Africanus and Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, both of whom made great use of Manetho's "History." The work of Africanus is lost, and we only possess a Latin version of that of Eusebius, which was translated out of the Armenian version of the Greek text preserved at Constantinople. Manetho is said to have derived his history of the kings of Egypt, whom he divides into thirty classes, called dynasties, from the sacred records in the temple at Heli-

opolis. In addition to these works, Manetho is also said to have written, 1, Ἱερὰ Βίβλος, on the Egyptian religion; 2, Περὶ ἀρχαϊσμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας, on the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Egyptians; 3, Φυσικῶν ἐπιτομή (Laertius, *Proœm.* s. 10), probably the same work as that called by Suidas φυσιολογικά; 4, Βίβλος τῆς Σώθεως, both the subject and genuineness of which are very doubtful. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v. His name is introduced here on account of the importance of his work on Egyptian history in determining the list of ancient Egyptian kings. See EGYPT. In this regard his authority has been overestimated by one class of writers, and almost wholly set aside by others, according to their own preconceived theories. See PHARAOH.

Authenticity of Manetho's History.—Manetho was a learned priest at the court of the first Ptolemy, according to Plutarch (*de Is. et Os.* c. 28), who cites a religious work of his in Greek, which is quoted also under various names by Ælian, Diogenes Läertius, Porphyry, and other late writers (Fruin, *Manethonis Sebennytæ Reliquiæ*, p. 133 sq.; Parthey, *Plutarch über Isis u. Osiris*, p. 180 sq.). Josephus (*Apion*, i, 14–16, 26, 27) gives two long extracts, with a list of seventeen reigns, from the Αἰγυπτιακά, "a work composed in Greek by Manetho the Sebennyte, from materials which he professes to have rendered from the sacred records:" of which history all else that is extant is a catalogue of Egyptian dynasties, preserved in two widely different recensions by Georgius Syncellus, A.D. 800; the one from the lost *Chronographia* of Julius Africanus, A.D. 220; the other from the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, A.D. 325 (of which we have now the Armenian version); both texts are given by Fruin, and by Bunsen in the appendix to *Egypt's Place*, vol. i. The statement that "Manetho the Sebennyte, of Heliopolis, high-priest and scribe of the sacred adyta, composed this work from the sacred records by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus," rests only on the dedication (ap. Syncell.) prefixed to the *Sothis*, an undoubted forgery of Christian times. All that can be inferred from it is that the forger had grounds, good or bad, for placing Manetho in the time of the second Ptolemy. In fact, the incident with which Plutarch (*ut sup.*) connects his name (the bringing in of Serapis) is related by other writers (*without mention of Manetho*), and is assigned by Tacitus also (*Hist.* iv, 183 sq.) to the time of the first Ptolemy; but by Clem. Alex. (*Protrept.* iv, 48) and Cyrill. Al. (*c. Julian.* p. 13) to Ptolemy Philadelphus, with the date Ol. 124 = B.C. 284–1. If he did live, and was a man of note, under the early Ptolemies, certain it is that "this most distinguished writer, the sage and scholar of Egypt" (as Bunsen calls him, *Aeg. St.* i, 88), was speedily and long forgotten; for more than three centuries after the time at which he is said to have flourished not a trace of him or his writings is anywhere discoverable. Nothing of the kind occurs in the remains of the Alexandrine scholars, the early Greek Jews, Polyhistor's collections, or the chronological writings of Castor. That the *Catalogue of Thirty-eight Theban Kings* (ap. Syncell.) is the work of *Eratosthenes* there is nothing to show; at any rate, it contains no reference to Manetho. If it was from Manetho that Dicæarchas, cir. A.D. 290 (ap. Schol. in *Apollon. Rhod.*), got his two Egyptian names and dates, it was in quite another form of the work; to the scholiast, Manetho is an unknown name. The Egyptian list in the *Excerpta Latino-barbara* of Scaliger, bearing the name of Castor, is a mere abstract from Africanus. Diodorus Sic. and Strabo visited and wrote about Egypt, yet neither of them names or alludes to Manetho; and the former gives (i, 44 sq., from the priests, he says) an account of the kingly succession altogether different from his. If, as Fruin suggests (p. lxiii), it was through measures taken by Domitian to repair the losses sustained by the public libraries (Sueton. *Dom.* 29) that Manetho's works were brought to Rome from the Alexandrine library, where they had long slumbered unregarded, still it is strange that the *Ægyptiaca* should have caught the attention of Josephus alone (among extant writers), and that neither those who, as Plutarch, do mention the other work, nor others who have occasion to speak of the ancient times of Egypt, as Tacitus and the elder Pliny (esp. *H. N.* xxxvi, 8–13), ever name this history, or show any acquaintance with its list of kings. Lepsius (*Chron. der Aeg.* i, 583 sq.) better meets the difficulty by supposing that the original work, never widely known, was so early lost that even in the 1st century all that survived of it was a bare abstract of its names and numbers, and (distinct from this) the two passages relating to the "*Hyksos*" and the "*lepers*," with the accompanying list of seventeen reigns, which some Jewish reader had extracted on account of their Biblical interest, and beyond which Josephus knew nothing of Manetho. Whatever be the explanation, the fact is that it is only through Jewish and Christian writers that we ever hear of Manetho as a historian. Of these, Theophilus Ant. (*ad Autolyc.* iii, 20, cir. A.D. 181) does but copy Josephus. Clemens Alex. nowhere names Manetho. A history of "*the Acts of the Kings of Egypt*, in three books"—not, however, by Manetho, but by "Ptolemy the Mendesian"—is, indeed, quoted by him (*Strom.* i, 26, 101), but at second-hand from Tatian; who again (*ad Gentes*, p. 129), as perhaps Justin Martyr before him (*ad Gr.* 8), quotes Ptolemy, not directly, but from Apion. In short, it is plain, on comparing these passages and Euseb. (*Pr. Ev.* x, 11, 12), that Apion is the sole source of all that is known of this Ptolemy of Mendes; and Apion, as far as we know, makes no mention of Manetho. In what relation the work of Ptolemy may have stood to Manetho's, as there is no evidence to show, it is idle to speculate; and, indeed, the question with which we are concerned would remain very much where it is, even were it proved that "Manetho" is a borrowed name, and the *Ægyptiaca* a product of Roman times. For the important point is, not who wrote the book, and when, but what is its value? It may not be genuine, nor so old as it pretends to be, and yet may contain good materials, honestly rendered from earlier writings or original records, probably as available in the time of Domitian as they were under the Ptolemies; and, in fact, existing monuments do furnish so considerable a number of names unquestionably identical with those in the list, that to reject this altogether, and deny it all historical value, would betoken either egregious ignorance or a reckless scepticism that can shut its eyes to manifest facts.

Chronological Value of Manetho's History.—The attestation which the list obtains from contemporary monuments cannot be held to warrant the assumption that it is to be depended upon where these fail. For the monuments which attest, also correct its statements. Monuments prove some reigns, and even dynasties, contemporaneous, which in the list are successive; but we have no means of ascertaining what was truly consecutive and what parallel, where monuments are wanting. Their dates are always in years of the current reign, not of an æra. From Cambyses upward to Psammetichus, and his immediate predecessor, Taracus = Tirhaka, the chronology is now settled [see CHRONOLOGY, sec. iii]. Thence up to Petubastes (dyn. xxiii) the materials are too scanty to yield any determination. For dyn. xxii, headed by Sesonchis = Shishak, the records are copious: dates on apis-stelæ, of which Mariette reports seven in this dynasty, prove that it lasted much more than the 120 years of Africanus. But even these reigns cannot be formed into a canon, and the epoch of Sesonchis can only be approximately given from the Biblical synchronism, "In 5 Rehoboam Shishak invaded Judæa"—in what year of his reign the monument which records the conquest does not say; although the epoch of Rehoboam is, as to B.C., a fixed point, or nearly so, for all chronologists. The inscription is dated 21 Shishak, but does not indicate the order or time of the several conquests recorded. The attempt has been made to prove from Bib-

lical data that the invasion was in the 20th year. Thus: It was while Solomon was building Millo (2 Kings xi, 27) that Jeroboam fled to "Shishak, king of Egypt" (ver. 40). This work began *not earlier* than 24 Solomon (vi, 37–vii, 1). *If* it began in that or the next year; if Jeroboam was immediately appointed overseer of the forced labor of his tribesmen; if he presently conceived the purpose of insurrection, encouraged by Ahijah; if his purpose became known to Solomon almost as soon as formed; if, in short, his flight into Egypt was not later than 26 Solomon; lastly, if Shishak became king in that year, then 5 Rehoboam (=45 Solomon) will be 20 Shishak. This is a specimen of much that passes for chronology, where the Bible is concerned. Some light is thrown on the dynastic connection of dyn. xxii and xxiii by a stele recently discovered by Mariette in Ethiopia, which proves the fact of numerous contemporary reigns throughout Egypt at that time (Brugsch's *Zeitschrift*, July, 1863; De Rougé, *Inscr. du roi Pianchi Meri Amun*, 1864). But it helps the chronology little or nothing. In dyns. xx, xxi, is another gap, at present not to be bridged over. The seven-named Tanites of xxi (Afr. 130, Eus. 121 years) seem to have been military priest-kings; and that they were partly contemporaneous with xx and xxi may appear from the absence of apis-stelæ, of which xx has nine, xxii seven. Dyn. xx, for which the list gives no names, consisted of some ten or more kings, all bearing the name Rameses, beginning with R. III, and five of them his sons, probably joint-kings. The apis-inscriptions furnish no connected dates, nor can any inference be drawn from their number, since Mariette reports no less than five in the first reign. For dyn. xix (Sethos), xviii (Amosis), the materials, written and monumental, are most copious; yet even here the means of an exact determination are wanting: indeed, if further proof were needed that the Manethonic lists are not to be implicitly trusted, it is furnished by the monumental evidence here of contemporary reigns which in the lists are successive. It is certain, and will at last be owned by all competent inquirers, that in the part of the succession for which the evidence is clearest and most ample, it is impossible to assign the year at which any king, from Amosis to Tirhaka, began to reign. No ingenuity of calculation and conjecture can make amends for the capital defects—the want of an æra, the inadequacy of the materials. The brilliant light shed on this point or that, does but make the surrounding darkness more palpable. Analysis of the lists may enable the inquirer, at most, to divine the intentions of their authors, which is but a small step gained towards the truth of facts.

But it has been supposed that certain fixed points may be got by means of astronomical conjunctures assigned to certain dates of the vague year on the monuments: Thus, (i) A fragmentary inscription of Takelut II, 6th king of dyn. xxii, purports that "on the 25th Mesori of the 15th year of his father" (Sesonk II, according to Lepsius, *Age of XXII Dyn.*, but Osorkon II, according to Brugsch, Dr. Hincks, and v. Gumpach), "the heavens were invisible, the moon struggling . . . ." Hence Mr. Cooper (*Athenæum*, 11 May, 1861) gathers, that on the day named, in the given year of Sesonk II, there was a lunar eclipse, which he considers must be that of 16th March, B.C. 851. Dr. Hincks, who at first also made the eclipse lunar, and its date 4th April, B.C. 945, now contends that it was solar, and the only possible date 1st April, B.C. 927 (*Journal of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1863, p. 333–376; compare *Ib.* Jan. 1864, p. 459 sq.). In making it solar, he follows M. v. Gumpach (*Hist. Antiq. of the People of Egypt*, 1863, p. 29), who finds its date 11th March, B.C. 841. Unfortunately the 25th Mesori of that year was 10th March. This is the only monumental notice supposed to refer to an eclipse: not worth much at the best; the record, even if its meaning were certain, is not contemporary.

(ii) In several inscriptions certain dates are given to the "manifestation of Sothis," assumed to mean the heliacal rising of Sirius, which, for 2000 years before our æra, for the latitude of Heliopolis, fell on the 20th of July. (Biot, indeed, *Récherches des quelques dates absolues*, etc., 1853, contends that the calculation must be made for the place at which the inscription is dated—each day of difference, of course, making a difference of four years in the date B.C.) The dates of these "manifestations" are—(1) "1 Tybi of 11 Takelut II" (Brugsch): the quaternion of years in which 1 Tybi would coincide with 20th July is B.C. 845–42. (2) "15 Thoth in a year, not named, of Rameses VI, at Thebes" (Biot, *ut sup.*; De Rougé, *Mémoire sur quelques phénomènes célestes*, etc., in *Révue Archéol.* ix, 686). The date implied is 20th July, B.C. 1265–62 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1241–38). (3) "1 Thoth in some year of Rameses III at Thebes" (Biot and De Rougé, *ut sup.*, from a festival-calendar). The date implied is, of course, B.C. 1325–22 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1301–1298). (4) "28 Epiphi in some year of Thothmes III" (Biot, etc., from a festival-calendar at Elephantine). This implies B.C. 1477–74 (Biot, 12th July, B.C. 1445–42). The antiquity of this calendar is called in question by De Rougé (*Athèn. Français*, 1855), and by Dr. Brugsch, who says the style indicates the 19th dynasty. Mariette assigns it to Thothmes III (*Journal Asiatique*, tom. xii, Aug., Sept., 1858). Lepsius, who in 1854 doubted (*Monatsbericht* of Berlin R. Acad.), now contends for its antiquity (*Königsbuch der Aeg.* p. 164), having contrived to make it fit his chronology by assuming an error in the numeral of the month. (5) "12 Mesori in 33 Thothmes III" (Mr. S. Poole in *Trans. R. S. Lit.* v, 340). This implies B.C. 1421–18. These dates would make the interval from Rameses III to Takelut II 480 years, greatly in excess even of Manetho's numbers, and more so of Lepsius's arrangement, in which, from the 1st of Rameses III to the 11th of Takelut II are little more than 400 years. Again, the interval of only 152 years, implied in (3) and (4), is unquestionably too little: from the last year of Thothmes III to the first of Rameses III, Lepsius reckons 296, Bunsen 225 years. Lastly, in (4) and (5) the dates imply an interval of 56 years, which is plainly absurd. The fact must be that these inscriptions are not rightly understood. We need to be informed what the Egyptians meant by the "manifestation of Sothis;" what method they followed in assigning it to a particular day; especially when, as in Biot's three instances, the date occurs in a calendar, and is marked as a "festival," we ask, were these calendars calculated only for four years? when a new one was set up, were the astronomical notices duly corrected, or were they merely copied from the preceding calendar?

(iii) "At Semneh in 2 Thothmes III, one of the three feasts of the Commencement of the Seasons is noted on 21 Pharmuthi." Biot (*ut sup.*) supposes the vernal equinox to be meant, and assigns this to 6th April in the quaternion B.C. 1445–42 (as above), in which 6th April *was* 21 Pharmuthi. But the vernal equinox is *not* the commencement of one of the three seasons of the Egyptian year; these start either from the rising of Sirius, 20th July, or, more probably, from the summer solstice: as this, in the 14th century, usually fell on 6th July, the two other tetramenies or seasons would commence cir. 5th Nov. and 6th March. Now 6th March did coincide with 21 Pharmuthi in B.C. 1321–18, at which time it also occupied precisely the place which Mr. Stuart Poole assigns to "the great Rukh" (Leps., "the greater Heat"), just one zodiacal month before the little Rukh, or vernal equinox (*Horæ Ægypt.* p. 15 sq.).

(iv). "On 1 Athyr of 11 Amenophis III the king ordered an immense basin to be dug, and on the 16th s. m. celebrated a great panegyry of the waters" (Dr. Hincks, *On the Age of Dynasty XVIII*, *Trans. R. Irish Acad.* vol. xxi, pt. i; comp. Mr. S. Poole, *Trans. R. S. Lit.* v. 340). If the waters were let in when the Nile had reached its highest point—which, as it is from 90 to 100 days after the summer solstice, in the 14th century would be at 4–14 Oct.—the month-date indicates

one of the years B.C. 1369–26. But if (which is certainly more likely) the time chosen was some weeks earlier, the year indicated would be after B.C. 1300. So this and the preceding indication may agree, and so far there is some evidence for the supposition that the sothiac epochal year B.C. 1322 lies in the reign of Thothmes III. (See Dr. Hincks, *ut sup.*, and in the *Dublin Univ. Magazine*, 1846, p. 187.)

(v) An astronomical representation on the ceiling of the Rameseum (the work of Rameses II) has been supposed to yield the year B.C. 1322 as its date (bishop Tomlinson, *Trans. R. S. Lit.* 1859; Sir G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, etc., 2d ser. p. 377); while Mr. Cullimore, from the same, gets B.C. 1138. The truth is, these astronomical configurations, in the present state of our knowledge, are an unsolved riddle. Lepsius's inferences (*Chron. der Aeg.*) from the same representations in the reigns of Rameses IV and VI are little more than guesses, too vague and precarious to satisfy any man who knows what evidence means.

It appears, then, that the supposed astronomical notes of time hitherto discovered lend but little aid, and bring nothing like certainty into the inquiry. We cannot accept the lists as they stand. How are they to be rectified? Until we have the means of rectifying them, every attempt to put forth a definite scheme of Egyptian chronology is simply futile. The appeal to authority avails nothing here. Lepsius, Bunsen, Brugsch, and many more, all claim to have settled the matter. Their very discrepancies—on the scale of which half a century is a mere trifle—sufficiently prove that to them, as to us, the evidence is defective. The profoundest scholarship, the keenest insight, cannot get more out of it than is in it; "that which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered." Yet, from the easy confidence with which people assign dates —their own, or taken on trust—to the Pharaohs after Amosis, and even of much earlier times, it might be thought that from Manetho and the monuments together a connected chronology has been elicited as certain as that of the Roman emperors. In particular, there appears to be a growing belief—even finding its way into popular Bible histories and commentaries—that *the Pharaoh of the Exodus* can be identified in Manetho, and so the time of that event determined.

Early Christian writers usually assumed, with Josephus, that the *Hyksos* or "shepherd-kings," whose story he gives from Manetho (*Apion*, i, 14–16), were the Israelites, and their expulsion by Amosis or Tethmosis—one or both, for the accounts are confused—the Egyptian version of the story of the exode. This view has still its advocates (quite recently Mr. Nash, *The Pharaoh of the Exodus*, 1863), but not among those who have been long conversant with the subject. Indeed, there is a monument of Thothmes III which, if it has been truly interpreted, is conclusive for a much earlier date of the exode than this reign, or perhaps any of the dynasty. A long inscription of his twenty-third year gives a list of the confederates defeated by him at Megiddo, in which De Rougé reads the names *Jacob* and *Joseph*, and Mr. Stuart Poole thinks he finds the names of some of the tribes, *Reuben, Simeon, Issachar, Gad* (Report of R. S. Lit. in *Athenæum*, March 21, 1863).

But the story of the Jews put forth by "Manetho" himself (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 26, 27), with the confession, however, that he obtained it not from ancient records, but from popular tradition (*ἀδεσπότως μυθολογούμενα*), represents them as a race of lepers, who, oppressed by the reigning king, called to their aid the Hyksos from Palestine (where these, on their expulsion some centuries earlier by Tethmosis, had settled and built Jerusalem), and with these allies overran all Egypt for thirteen years, at the end of which Amenophis, who had taken refuge in Ethiopia, returning thence with his son Sethos, drove out the invaders. These, headed by Osarsiph (=Moses), a priest of Heliopolis, retired into Palestine, and there became the nation of the Jews. Josephus protests against this story as a mere figment, prompted by Egyptian malignity, and labors to prove it inconsistent with Manetho's own list: unsuccessfully enough, for, in fact, Amenophis (Ammenephthes, Afr.) does appear there just where the story places him, i. e. next to Sethos and Rameses II, with a reign of nineteen years and six months. The monuments give the name Menephtha, and his son and successor Seti=Sethos II, just as in the story. The *names* are not fictitious, whatever may be the value of the story as regards the Israelites. This Menephtha, then, son and successor of Rameses the Great, is the Pharaoh of the Exode, according to Lepsius and Bunsen, and of late accepted as such by many writers, learned and unlearned. Those to whom the name of Manetho is not voucher enough, will demand independent evidence. In fact, it is alleged that the monuments of the time of Menephtha attest a period of depression: no great works of that king are known to exist; of his reign of twenty years the highest date hitherto found is the fourth; and two rival kings, Amenmessu (the Ammenemses of the lists) and Si-phtha, are reigning at the same time with him, i. e. holding precarious sovereignty in Thebes during the time of alien occupation and the flight of Menephtha (Bunsen, *Aeg. Stelle*, iv, 208 sq.). That these two kings reigned in the time of Menephtha, and not with or after Sethos II, is assumed without proof; that the reign of Rameses II was followed by a period of decadence proves nothing as to its cause; and the entire silence of the monuments as to an event so memorable as the final expulsion of the hated "Shepherds" (*Shas-u*), who so often figure in the monumental recitals of earlier kings (e. g. of Sethos I, who calls them *shas-u p'kanana-kar*, "shepherds of the land of Canaan"), tells as strongly against the story as any merely negative evidence can do it. More important is the argument derived from the mention (Exod. i, 11) of the "treasure-cities Pithom and Raamses," built for the persecuting Pharaoh by the forced labor of the Hebrews; the Pharaoh (says Rosellini, *Mon. Storici*, i, 294 sq.) was Rameses [II, son of Sethos I], who gave one of the cities his own name. (Comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* ii, 66, note.) Lepsius, art. Aegypten, in Herzog's *Encyklop.*, calls this "the weightiest confirmation," and in *Chronol. der Aeg.* i, 337–357, enlarges upon this argument. Raamses, he says, was at the eastern, as Pithom (*Πάτουμος*) was certainly at the western end of the great canal known to be the work of Rameses II, and the site of the city bearing his name is further identified with him by the granite group disinterred at Abu Keisheib, in which the deified king sits enthroned between the gods Ra and Tum. Certainly a king Rameses appears first in the 19th dynasty, but the place may have taken its name, if from a man at all, from some earlier person.

That the exode cannot be placed *before* the 19th dynasty, Bunsen (*ut sup.* p. 234) holds to be conclusively shown by the fact that on the monuments which record the conquests of Rameses the Great in Palestine, no mention occurs of the Israelites among the *Kheti* (Hittites) and other conquered nations; while, on the other hand, there is no hint in the book of Judges of an Egyptian invasion and servitude. On similar negative grounds he urges that the settlement in Palestine must have been subsequent to the conquests made in that country by Rameses III, first king of the 20th dynasty. To this it may be replied, (1.) that we have no clear information as to the route of the invaders; if it was either along the coast or to the east of Jordan, the tribes, perhaps, were not directly affected by it. (2.) The expeditions so pompously described on the monuments (as in the Statistical Table of Karnak, Thothmes III, and similar recitals of the conquests of Rameses II and III; see Mr. Birch, in *Trans. of R. S. Lit.* ii, 317 sq.; and vii, 50 sq.) certainly did not result in the permanent subjugation of the countries invaded. This is sufficiently shown by the fact that the conquests repeat themselves under different kings, and even in the same reign. Year

by year the king with his army sets out on a gigantic *razzia*, to return with spoil of cattle, slaves, and produce of the countries overrun. (3.) If the lands of the tribes were thus overrun, it may have been during one of the periods of servitude, in which case they suffered only as the vassals of their Canaanitish, Moabitish, or other oppressors. That this may possibly have been the case is sufficient to deprive of all its force the argument derived from the silence of the monuments, and of the book of Judges.

There remains to be noticed one piece of documentary evidence which has quite recently been brought to light. Dr. Brugsch (*Zeitschrift*, Sept. 1863) reports that "one set of the Leyden hieratic papyri, now publishing by Dr. Leemans, consists of letters and official reports. In several of these, examined by M. Chabas, repeated mention is made of certain foreigners, called *Apuruju*, i. e. Hebrews, compelled by Rameses II to drag stones for the building of the city Raamses." In his *Mélanges Egyptol.* 1862, 4th dissertation, M. Chabas calls them *Aperiu*. It is certainly striking, as Mr. Birch remarks (in *Révue Archéol.* April, 1862, p. 291), that "in the three documents which speak of these foreigners, they appear engaged on works of the same kind as those to which the Hebrews were subjected by the Egyptians; it is also important that the papyri were found at Memphis. But the more inviting the proposed identification, the more cautious one needs to be." As the sounds R and L are not discriminated in Egyptian writing, it may be that the name is *Apeliu;* and as B and P have distinct characters, one does not see why the *b* of עִבְרִים should be rendered by *p*. (The case of *Epep*=אֲבִיב is different; see below.) It seems, also, that the same name occurs as late as the time of Rameses IV, where it can hardly mean the Hebrews. Besides, the monument of Thothmes III above mentioned leads to quite a different conclusion. Where the evidence is so conflicting, the inquirer who seeks only truth, not the confirmation of a foregone conclusion, has no choice but to reserve his judgment.

The *time* of this Menephtha, so unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the Pharaoh of the Exode, is placed beyond all controversy—so Bunsen and Lepsius maintain—by an invaluable piece of evidence furnished by Theon, the Alexandrine mathematician of the 4th century. In a passage of his unpublished commentary on the Almagest, first given to the world by Larcher (*Herodot.* ii, 553), and since by Biot (*Sur la période Sothiaque*, p. 18, 129 sq.), it is stated that the Sothiac Cycle of Astronomy which, as it ended in A.D. 139, commenced in B.C. 1322 (20th July), was known in his time as "the æra of Menophres" (ἔτη ἀπὸ Μενόφρεως). There is no king of this name: read Μενόφθεως—so we have Menephtha of the 19th dynasty, the king of the leper-story, the Exodus Pharaoh. Lepsius, making the reign begin in B.C. 1328, places the exode at B.C. 1314=15 Menephtha, in accordance with the alleged thirteen years' retirement into Ethiopia and the return in the fourteenth or fifteenth year. Certainly the precise name *Menophres* does not appear in the lists; but in later times that name may have been used for the purpose of distinguishing some particular king from others of the same name; and there is reason to think this was actually the case. (1.) The king Tethmosis or Thothmes III repeatedly appears on monuments with the addition to his royal legend *Mai-Ré*, "Beloved of Ré," with the article *Mai-ph-Ré*, and with the preposition *Mai-n'-ph-Ré*, which last is precisely Theon's Μενόφρης. (2.) The acknowledged confusion of names in that part of the 18th dynasty where this king occurs—*Misaphris, Misphres, Memphres* (Armen.), then *Misphra*gmuthosis (the ΑΛΙΣΦΡ. of Josephus is evidently an error of copying for ΜΙΣΦΡ.: in the list *ibid.* the 5th and 6th names are Μήφρης, Μεφραμούθωσις)—is perhaps best explained by supposing that the king was entered in the lists by his distinctive as well as his family name. (3.) In Pliny's notice of the obelisks (*H. N.* xxxvi, 64), that known to be of Thothmes III is said to belong to *Mesphres*, which, says Bunsen (iv, 130), "would be the popular distinctive name given to this Thothmes." Just so! And in the statement of Theon the king is presented by "his popular distinctive name," *Menophres*. (4.) "There was (says Dr. Hincks, *Trans. R. Irish. Acad.* vol. xxi, pt. 1) a tradition, if it does not deserve another name, current among the Egyptians in the time of Antoninus, to the effect that the Sothiac Cycle, then ending (A.D. 139), commenced in the reign of Thothmes III. The existence of such a tradition is evidenced by a number of scarabæi, evidently of Roman workmanship, referring to the Sothiac Cycle, and in which the royal legend of this monarch appears." These are sufficient grounds for believing that the Menophres of Theon is no other than Thothmes III, and that his reign was *supposed* (rightly or wrongly) to include the year B.C. 1322. It may be, also, that when Herodotus was told that *Moeris* lived about 900 years before the time of his visit to Egypt—a date not very wide of B.C. 1322—Thothmes was named to him by his popular distinctive appellation, *Mai-Ré*, only confused with *Mares*=Amenemha III, the Pharaoh of the Labyrinth and its Lake. (Other explanations of the name Menophres may be seen in Böckh, *Manetho*, p. 691 sq.; Biot, *Récherches*, interprets it as the name of Memphis, *Men-nofru*, importing that the normal date, 20th July, for the heliacal rising of Sirius and epoch of the cycle, is true only for the latitude of Memphis.) What has been said is sufficient to show that there is no necessity for altering a letter of the name; consequently that the time of Menephtha is not defined by the authority of Theon. De Rougé emphatically rejects Lepsius's notion of Menophres (*Révue Archéol.* ix, 664; *Journal Asiatique*, Aug. 1858, p. 268). He thinks the year 1322 lies in the reign of Rameses III.

In support of his date, B.C. 1314, for the exode, Lepsius (*Chronol.* p. 359 sq.) has an argument deduced from the modern Jewish chronology (Hillel's *Mundane Era*), in which he says that it is the precise year assigned to that event. Hillel, he is confident, was led to it by Manetho's Egyptian tradition, which gave him the name of the Pharaoh, and this being obtained would easily give him the time. Bunsen, though finally settling on the year B.C. 1320, had previously declared with Lepsius for B.C. 1314, "decided by the circumstance that *a tradition not compatible with the usual chronological systems of the Jews, but which cannot be accidental*, places the exode at that year. This fact seems, from Lepsius's account of the *Seder Olam Rabba*, to admit of no doubt" (iv, 336). It admits of more than doubt—of absolute refutation. Hillel's whole procedure, from first to last, was simply Biblical. Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks gave him B.C. 422 for 11 Zedekiah; thence up to 6 Hezekiah he found the sum=133 years; for the kings of Israel the actual numbers were 243, of which he made 240 years; then 37 years of Solomon; 480 years of 1 Kings vi, 1, added to these, made the total 890 years, whence the date for the exode was B.C. 422+890=1312; for that this, not 1314, was Hillel's year of the exode is demonstrable (Review of *Lepsius on Bible Chronology*, by H. Browne, in Arnold's *Theolog. Critic*, i, 52–59, 1851). Yet, though the process by which Hillel got his date is so transparent, it is spoken of as "an important tradition" by those who take ready-made conclusions at second-hand, without inquiry into their grounds. So Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, i, 196, note; Dr. Williams, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 58.

It is alleged that an indication confirmatory of the low date assigned by these writers is furnished by the *month-date* of the Exodus passover, 14 Abib, a name which occurs only in connection with that history (Exod. xii, 2; xiii, 4; xxiii, 15; xxxiv, 18; Deut. xvi, 1). This argument proceeds on the presumption that Abib is the Hebraized form of the Egyptian *Epep*, Coptic *Epiphi*, of which the Arabic rendering is also *Abib*. The Egyp-

tian month takes its name from the goddess *Apap:* the change of *p* to *b* is *intended* to make the word pure Hebrew, denoting the time of year, חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב = the month when the barley is in the ear (*abîb*) (Exod. ix, 31). "At the time assigned, the vague month Epep would pretty nearly coincide with the Hebrew Abib" (Lepsius, *Chron.* p. 141). Hardly so, for in the year named 1 Epiphi would fall on 14th May, and it is scarcely conceivable that the passover month (whose full moon is that next to the vernal equinox, which in that century fell cir. 5th April) should begin so late as the middle of May. Not till a hundred years later would the vague month Epiphi and the Hebrew passover month coincide. The argument proves too much, unless we are prepared to lower the exode to cir. B.C. 1200. (To some it may imply that the narrative of the exode was written about that time—Mr. Sharpe, *History of Egypt*, i, 63—but one can hardly suppose that the Hebrews retained the vague Egyptian months as well as their names so long after their settlement in Palestine.) If in any year from B.C. 1300 upwards, the full moon next the vernal equinox fell in the month Epiphi, it would follow that the Coptic month-names (which, it is well understood, never occur on the monuments) belonged then to a different form of the year.

For the first seventeen dynasties, numbering in Afr. more than 4000 years, a bare statement of their contents and of the monumental evidence would greatly exceed the limits of this article. Perhaps the time is not far distant when the attempt to educe a connected chronology from Manetho (whether for or against the Mosaic numbers) will be abandoned by all sensible men. Full and unprejudiced inquiry can have but one result: *for times anterior to* B.C. 700 *Egypt has no fixed chronology.* De Rougé has in two words set the whole matter in its true light: "Les textes de Manéthon sont profondement *alterés*, et la série des dates monumentales est très *incomplète*." The incompleteness of the record is palpable: the alteration of the texts is the result of their having passed through numerous hands, and been refashioned according to various intentions, by which the whole inquiry has been complicated to a degree that baffles all attempts to determine what was their original form. These intentions were mainly *cyclical.* A very brief statement of facts, not resting on critical conjecture and questionable combinations, as in the elaborate treatise of Böckh, but lying on the surface, will place the character and relations of the several texts in a clear light. Menes stands, 1. In Africanus (according to Syncellus's running summation of the numbers in book i) just *three complete sothiac cycles,* 3 × 1460 Julian years, before B.C. 1322; 2. In Eusebius, according to the epigraphal sum of book i, *three cycles* before the epoch of Sethosis, dyn. xix; 3. In Eusebius, according to the actual sum of book i, *three cycles* before the year B.C. 978–77, meant as the goal of the Diospolitan monarchy or epoch of Shishak; 4. In Syncellus's period of 3555 years (accepted by Lepsius and Bunsen as the true Manethonic measure from Menes to Nectanebus), *two cycles* before the same goal; 5. In the Old Chronicle, according to its *sothiac* form, *one cycle* before the same goal; 6. In the Sothis, *one cycle* before B.C. 1322; but here it is contrived that *Osiropis*, or the commencement of Diospolitan monarchy, stands *one cycle* before *Susakeim* = Shishak. The inquirer may easily verify these facts for himself. In the series of papers, "Cycles of Egyptian Chronology," published in Arnold's *Theol. Critic*, 1851–52, he will find them fully stated, with many other like facts, which prove that these chronographies, one and all, are intensely cyclical. But if Manetho, as we have him, is cyclical, then, Lepsius himself confesses (*K. B.* p. 6, 7), "*the historical character of his work falls to the ground;* for the very fact of Menes heading a sothiac circle could only be the result of after-contrivance;" and Bunsen (*Aeg. St.* iv, 13) sees that in place of "the genuine historical work of Manetho, the venerable priest and conscientious inquirer," we get "*a made-up thing, systematically carved to shape, and therefore really fabulous.*" Whether or not the original "Manetho," whatever its authorship and date, was contrived upon a cyclical plan, we have but the lists as they come to us finally from the hands of Annianus and Pandorus through Syncellus. It may be observed, however, that the cardinal dates given by *Dicæarchus*, which we have from an independent source, imply that the cyclical treatment of Egyptian chronology is at least as old as the alleged time of Manetho ("*Cycles*," etc., *u. s.*, sec. 4, 16, 34, 36).

For literature additional to the above, see under EGYPT; also Fruin, *Dissertatio Historica de Manethone* (Leyd. 1847, 8vo); Böckh, *Manetho* (Berlin, 1845, 8vo); A. H. von Sagaus, *Manethos, die Origines unserer Gesch.* (Gotha, 1865, 8vo); *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1866, p. 180.

Manger is the rendering found in Luke ii, 7, 12, 16, of the term φάτνη, used to designate the place in which the infant Redeemer was cradled; which seems to denote a *crib* or "stall" for feeding cattle, as it is rendered in Luke xiii, 15 (see Horrei *Miscell. Crit.* Leon. 1738, bk. ii, ch. xvi). It is employed in the Sept. in a similar sense for the Heb. אֲבוּס, Job xxxix, 9; Isa. i, 3; also by Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 4; comp. Lucan, *Tim.* p. 14; Xenophon, *Eg.* iv, 1. Gersdorff (*Beiträge zur Sprachcharakterestik des N. T.* p. 220) is in favor of translating the word *crib* everywhere, and quotes Ælian (apud Suid. s. v.), Philo (*De somniis*, p. 872, b. ed. Colon. 1613), and Sybile. Eryth. (ap. Lactantius, vii, 24, 12) to that effect. Schleusner (*Lex.* s. v.) says it is any enclosure, but especially the vestibule to the house, where the cattle were enclosed, not with walls, but wooden hurdles; but in common Greek the word undoubtedly often refers to a trough hollowed out to receive the food for horses, etc. (see Homer, *Il.* v, 271; x, 568; xxiv, 280). The Peshito Version evidently so understands it. On the other hand, it is doubtful if such a contrivance as a proper manger was known in the East, especially in the khans or "inns" of the description alluded to in the text. See CARAVANSERAI. "Stables and mangers, in the sense in which we understand them, are of comparatively late introduction into the East (see the quotations from Chardin and others in Harmer's *Observations*, ii, 205), and, although they have furnished material to modern painters and poets, did not enter into the circumstances attending the birth of Christ, and are hardly less inaccurate than the 'cradle' and the 'stable' which are named in some descriptions of that event." We are therefore doubtless here to regard the term as designating the ledge or projection in the end of the room used as a stable, on which the hay or other food of the animals of travellers was placed. (See Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 14.) Several of the Christian fathers maintain that the stable itself was in a cave, and the identical manger in which the infant Jesus is traditionally stated to have lain is still shown by the superstitious monks, being no other than a marble sarcophagus; but the whole story is at variance with the narrative in the Gospels. (See Meldon, *De præsepi Christi*, Jen. 1662.) See BETHLEHEM. Tavernier, speaking of Aleppo, states that "in the caravanserais, on each side of the hall, for persons of the best quality, there are lodgings for every man by himself. These lodgings are raised all along the court, two or three steps high, just behind which are the stables, where many times it is as good lying as in the chambers. Right against the head of every horse there is a niche with a window into the lodging-chamber, out of which every man may see that his horse is looked after. These niches are usually so large that three men may lie in them, and here the servants dress their victuals." In modern Oriental farm-houses, however, something corresponding to a Western "manger" may be found. "It is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides with his cattle fitted up with these mangers, and the remainder elevated about two feet higher for the accommodation of the family. The

mangers are built of small stones and mortar, in the shape of a box, or, rather, of a kneading-trough, and when cleaned up and whitewashed, as they often are in summer, they do very well to lay little babes in" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 98). See STABLE.

Mangey, THOMAS, D.D., an English theologian, was born at Leeds in 1684; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; held successively the livings of St. Mildred, Bread Street, London; St. Nicholas, Guilford, and Ealing, in Middlesex; was chaplain to Dr. Robinson, bishop of London; in 1721 was presented to the fifth stall in the cathedral of Durham, and was advanced to the first stall in 1722; became D.D. in 1725, and died in 1755. Dr. Mangey published a number of *Sermons* and controversial tracts, and a most valuable edition of the works of Philo Judæus: *Philonis Judæi Opera omnia quæ reperiri potuerunt* (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.).—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vii, 222.

Manhartists or **Haagleitnerians** the name of a party in the Romish Church, especially in the archbishopric of Salzburg, from 1814 to 1826, whose founder and chief was a young priest named Caspar Haagleitner, of Hopfgarten; and its most distinguished and active member was Sebastian Manzl, of Westendorf (known also by the name of Manhart, from one of his estates). In 1809 Napoleon I had appointed the prince-bishop of Chiem-see and the coadjutor of Salzburg as ecclesiastical authorities in the diocese. The clergy submitted with the exception of Haagleitner, who refused to recognise them, and showed symptoms of heresy. He left Hopfgarten and went to Tyrol, where he created some religious and political troubles, and gained a number of followers. At the peace of Schönbrunn the Tyrol fell again into the hands of the French, and Haagleitner was taken a prisoner to Kusstein and Salzburg. He finally succeeded in making good his escape; and when, in 1814, Austria recovered the Bavarian Tyrol, he was appointed vicar at Wörgel. Here he continued his intrigue, and succeeded so well that the people came to consider him as the only true priest in the country, the others having failed to do their duty by submitting to the dictates of Napoleon. Manhart assisted Haagleitner greatly in propagating his doctrines in Westendorf, Hopfgarten, and Kirchbichel, and their effect was felt even long after Haagleitner had been removed from Wörgel. Manhart held meetings in his own house, preaching himself, or allowing his wife to preach, as well as another woman from Hopfgarten. The administrator of the diocese of Salzburg, and afterwards the archbishop Augustin Gruber, sought in vain to reconcile them with the Church; they asked to be instructed by the pope himself in case they were in the wrong, and for this purpose went to Rome in 1825. The difficulty ended soon after.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, viii, 781.

Ma'ni (Μανί, Vulg. *Banni*), given (1 Esdr. ix, 30) by error for BANI (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 29).

Mani, Manès, or **Manichæus** (entitled *Zendik*, Sadducee), the founder of the heretical sect of the Manichæans, is said to have flourished in the second half of the 3d century. Little is known with regard to his early history, and the accounts transmitted through two distinct sources—the Western or Greek, and the Eastern—are legendary and contradictory on almost every important point. According to the most probable supposition, he was a native of Persia, and was born about 214. His real name appears to have been *Curbicus*, and he was the slave of a rich woman of Ctesiphon, who bought him when he was but seven years of age, had him carefully educated, and at her decease left him all her wealth. Among the books she left him he is said to have found the writings of Scythianus, which had been given to her by one of the latter's disciples named Terebinthus, or *Budda*. The East was at this time in great ferment. The progress of Christianity had awakened the opposition of all the heathen religions from the Indus to the Euphrates. Parsism was the most powerful among them. Mani, with the aid of the treasure left him in the writings of Scythianus, believed it possible to accomplish the amalgamation of Parsism and Christianity, and for this purpose he emigrated to Persia, changed his name so as to obliterate all traces of his origin and former state, and, to carry out his plans more successfully, he proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Christ. It is said that the attempt was looked upon with favor by king Sapor and by Hormisdas, but this appears doubtful. Followers soon gathered, and three of the new sect—Thomas, Buddas or Addas, and Hermas—propagated the doctrines, the first in Egypt and the second in India. Hermas only remained with Mani to assist him. While they were away the son of Sapor fell ill, and Mani, who had been highly spoken of as a physician, was called to attend him; but, not succeeding, he was thrown into prison. Mani bribed his keepers, and succeeded in escaping, but was pursued and captured, and publicly executed.

There are other accounts, however, which make Mani the scion of a noble magian family, and a man of extraordinary mental powers and artistic and scientific abilities—an eminent painter, mathematician, etc. According to them Mani embraced Christianity in early manhood, and became presbyter at a church in Ehvaz or Ahvaj, in the Persian province of Hazitis. He purposed to purge Christianity of its alleged Jewish corruptions, to demonstrate its unity with Parsism, and thereby to present the perfect universal religion. He gave himself out to be the Paraclete, and styled himself in ecclesiastical documents "Mani, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the election of God the Father. These are the words of salvation from the eternal and living Source." Persecuted by king Sapor I, he sought refuge in foreign countries, went to India, China, and Turkistan, and there lived in a cave for twelve months, during which he claimed to have been in heaven. He reappeared with a wonderful book of drawings and pictures, called Erdshenk or Ertenki-Mani. No doubt during his residence in these countries he had become acquainted with Buddhism, and had decided to incorporate some of its best points in his syncretistic religion (comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 288 sq.). After the death of Sapor (A.D. 272) he returned to Persia, where Hormas, the new king, who was well inclined towards him, received him with great honors, and, in order to protect him more effectually against the persecutions of the magi, gave him the stronghold of Deshereh, in Susiana, as a residence. After the death of this king, however, Bahram, his successor, entrapped Mani into a public disputation with the magi, for which purpose he had to leave his castle; and he was seized and flayed alive, A.D. 277. His skin was stuffed and hung up for a terror at the gates of the city Jondishapur.

Among the works of Mani may be reckoned four books, sometimes ascribed to Terebinthus and sometimes to Scythianus, entitled the *Mysteries*, the *Chapters* or *Heads*, the *Gospel*, and the *Treasure*. In the *Mysteries* Mani endeavored to demonstrate the doctrine of two principles from the mixture of good and evil which is found in the world. He grounded his reasons on the argument that if there were one sole cause, simple, perfect, and good in the highest degree, the whole, corresponding with the nature and will of that cause, would show simplicity, perfection, and goodness, and everything would be immortal, holy, and happy like himself. The *Chapters* contained a summary of the chief articles of the Manichæan scheme. Of the *Gospels* nothing certain can be asserted. Beausobre, apparently without sufficient grounds, considers it as a collection of the meditations and pretended revelations of Mani. The *Treasure*, or *Treasure of Life*, may, perhaps, have derived its name from the words of Christ, wherein he compares his doctrine to a treasure hid in a field. Mani also wrote other works and letters, and among them the *Epistle of the Foundation*, of which we

have fragments still extant in St. Augustine, who undertook to refute it. His works appear to have been originally written, some in Syriac, some in Persic. For his doctrine, etc., see MANICHÆISM. (J. H. W.)

Manichæism. As we have seen in the life of MANI (q. v.), the origin of Manichæism, as well as the history of its founder and propagator, is matter of obscure and confused tradition. Although it utterly disclaimed being denominated Christian, it was reckoned among the heretical doctrines of the Church. It was intended, as we have already indicated in the sketch of Mani, to blend the chief doctrines of Parsism, or rather Magism, as reformed by Zoroaster, with a certain number of Buddhistic views, under the outward garb of Biblical, more especially New-Testament history, which, explained allegorically and symbolically, was made to represent an entirely new religious system, and one wholly at variance with Christianity and its fundamental teachings (comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 389 sq.; and see the references there for Lassen and others).

Doctrines. — Like Magism, Manichæism holds that there are two eternal principles from which all things proceed, the two everlasting kingdoms, bordering on each other—the kingdom of light under the dominion of God, and the kingdom of darkness under the dæmon or *hyle* (ὕλη). The Light, the Good, or God, and the Darkness, the Bad, Matter, or Archon, each inhabited a region akin to their natures, and excluding each other to such a degree that the region of Darkness and its leader never knew of the existence of that of the Light. Twelve æons—corresponding to the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve stages of the world—had sprung (emanated) from the Primeval Light; while "Darkness," filled with the eternal fire, which burned but shone not, was peopled by "dæmons," who were constantly fighting among themselves. In one of these contests, pressing towards the outer edge, as it were, of their region, they became aware of the neighboring region, and forthwith united, attacked it, and succeeded in taking captive the Ray of Light that was sent against them at the head of the hosts of Light, and which was the embodiment of the Ideal or Primeval Man (Christ). A stronger æon (the Holy Ghost) then hastened to the rescue, and redeemed the greater and better part of the captive Light (Jesus Impatibilis). The smaller and fainter portion, however (Jesus Passibilis), remained in the hands of the powers of Darkness, and out of this they formed, after the ideal of *The Man of Light*, mortal man. But even the small fraction of light left in him (broken in two souls) would have prevailed against them had they not found means to further divide and subdivide it by the propagation of this man (Eve—Sin). Not yet satisfied, they still more dimmed it by burying it under dark "forms of belief and faith, such as Paganism and Judaism." Once more, however, the Original Light came to save the light buried in man—to deliver the captive souls of men from their corporeal prison. On this account there were created two sublime beings, Christ and the Holy Ghost. Christ was sent into the world clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance, to teach mortals how to deliver the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to overcome the power of malignant matter. But again the dæmons succeeded in defeating the schemes of the power of light. Obscuring men's minds, even those of the apostles, so that they could not fully understand Christ's object, his career of salvation was cut short by the dæmons seducing man to crucify him. His sufferings and death were, naturally, only fictitious, since he could not in reality die; he only allowed himself to become an example of endurance and passive pain for his own, the souls of light. But to carry out the intended salvation of men Christ, shortly before his crucifixion, gave the promise recorded by John (xvi, 7–15), that he would send to his disciples the Comforter, "who would lead them into all truth." This promise, the Manichæans maintain, was fulfilled in the person of Mani, who was sent by the God of light to declare to all men the doctrine of salvation, without concealing any of its truths under the veil of metaphor, or under any other covering.

Mani, like Christ, surrounded himself with twelve apostles, and sent them into the world to teach and to preach his doctrine of salvation. To carry out his work more successfully, and to make converts also of the Christians, he rejected the authority of the Old Testament, which, he said, was the work of the God of darkness, whom the Jews had worshipped in the place of light, and also a good part of the New Testament, upon the ground that many of the books had been grossly interpolated, and were not the productions of the persons whose names they bear. As strictly canonical, he admitted only his own writings, and such parts of the New Testament as answered his purpose. "Whatever," says Baur (*Manich. Religionssystem*, p. 375), "in the writings of the New Testament seemed to concur with the dualism set forth by Mani was accounted among the most genuine ingredients in the doctrines of Christianity, and Mani and his adherents were very glad to cite for the confirmation of their own doctrines and principles passages like Matt. vii, 18; xiii, 24; John i, 5; viii, 44; xiv, 30; 2 Cor. iv, 4 (comp. Epiph. *Hær.* lxvi, 67–69); and especially those in which the apostle Paul speaks of the opposition between flesh and spirit. As they found, however, so much in the New Testament which not only did not confirm the Manichæan doctrines, but stood in open opposition to them, they were obliged, in accordance with the hypothesis that the original doctrines of Christianity did not differ from those of Manichæism, to regard all passages of this kind as a distortion and falsification of Christianity. Accordingly, they laid down the rule that the written records of Christianity ought not to be received unconditionally, but must be subjected to a previous scrutiny, with a view to ascertain how far they exhibited the genuine substance of Christianity; and this was limited to those portions which bore the character of Manichæism, so that, following this criterion, whatever did not harmonize with their own doctrines was rejected without hesitation, because original Christianity could not contradict itself."

Mani also taught that those souls which obeyed the laws delivered by Christ, as explained by himself, the Comforter, and struggled against the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, would, on their death, be delivered from their sinful bodies, and, after being purified by the sun and moon—"the two light-ships for conducting the imprisoned light into the eternal kingdom of light"—would ascend to the regions of light; but that those souls which neglected to struggle against their corrupt natures would pass after death into the bodies of animals or other beings, until they had expiated their guilt. Belief in the evil of matter led to a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection. "These ideas," says Donaldson (*Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 143), "they [the Manichæans] worked out in a manner peculiar to themselves, and with results decidedly unfavorable to the integrity and authenticity of the New Testament. They could accept neither the doctrine nor the facts of revelation, unless they could regard them as a reflex of their own dualism. Without wishing to reject Christianity, they made their own system the standard of measurement, and lopped off or stretched the religion of the Cross, wherever it did not fit the religion of light and darkness. The identification of Christ with Mithras led, of course, to a profession of Docetism, namely, to the assertion that our Lord's sufferings on the cross were not real, but apparent only. Christ had no real human body, no double nature, but only a fantastic semblance of corporeity, in which his essence, as the Son of Everlasting Light, was presented to the eyes of men. . . . Accordingly, Christ had no human birth, and his apparent sufferings were really inflicted on him by his enemy, the Prince of Darkness; and in thus resolving the life of Jesus into a series of illusory appearances, the Manichæans take from Chris-

tianity all its historical foundation, and leave us nothing but the realistic applications of a few Christian metaphors." "Christianity," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. History*, i, 249) "is here resolved into a fantastic, dualistico-pantheistic philosophy of nature; moral regeneration is identified with a process of physical refinement; and the whole mystery of redemption is found in light, which was always worshipped in the East as the symbol of deity. Unquestionably there pervades the Manichæan system a kind of groaning of the creature for redemption, and a deep sympathy with nature, that hieroglyphic of spirit; but all is distorted and confused. The suffering Jesus on the cross, Jesus patibilis, is here a mere illusion, a symbol of the world-soul still enchained in matter, and is seen in every plant which works upwards from the dark bosom of the earth towards the light; towards bloom and fruit, yearning after freedom. Hence the class of the 'perfect' would not kill nor wound a beast, pluck a flower, nor break a blade of grass. The system, instead of being, as it pretends, a liberation of light from darkness, is really a turning of light into darkness."

Organization.—"Manichæism," says Dr. Schaff (i, 250), "differed from the Gnostic schools in having a fixed, and that a strictly hierarchal organization. At the head of the sect stood twelve apostles or magistri, among whom Mani and his successors, like Peter and the pope, held the chief place. Under them were seventy-two bishops, answering to the seventy-two (strictly, seventy) of the disciples of Jesus; and under these came presbyters, deacons, and itinerant evangelists. In the congregations there were two distinct classes, designed to correspond to the catechumens and the faithful in the Catholic Church—the 'hearers' (Auditores) and the 'perfect' (Electi), the esoteric, the priestly caste, which represents the last stage in the process of the liberation of the spirit and its separation from the world, the transition from the kingdom of matter into the kingdom of light, or, in the Buddhistic terms, from the world of Sansara into Nirvana." The Elect are required to adhere to the *Signaculum Oris*, *Manus*, and *Sinus*, that is, they have to take the oath of abstinence from evil and profane speech (including "religious terms such as Christians use respecting the Godhead and religion"), further, from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and all intoxicating drinks (comp. Manu, *Instit.* vs. 51, 52, 53: "He who makes the flesh of an animal his food . . . not a mortal exists more sinful . . . he who . . . desires to enlarge his own flesh with the flesh of another creature," etc.); further, from the possession of riches, or, indeed, any property whatsoever; from hurting any being, animal or vegetable; from heeding their own family, or showing any pity to him who is not of the Manichæan creed; and finally, from breaking their chastity by marriage or otherwise. The Auditors were comparatively free to partake of the good things of this world, but they had to provide for the subsistence of the Elect, and their highest aim, also, was the attainment of the state of their superior brethren.

Cultus.—In Manichæan worship, the visible representatives of the light (sun and moon) were revered, but only as representatives of the Ideal, of the good or supreme God. Neither altar nor sacrifice was to be found in their places of religious assemblies, nor did they erect sumptuous temples. Fasts, prayers, occasional readings in the supposed writings of Mani, chiefly a certain *Fundamental Epistle*, were all their outer worship. Sunday, as the day on which the visible universe was to be consumed, the day consecrated to the sun, was kept as a great festival; Church festivals they rejected, and, instead, made the most solemn day in their year the anniversary of the death of Mani. Baptism they repudiated, considering it useless; the Lord's Supper was celebrated, but only by the Elect. Of the mode of celebration, however, we know next to nothing; even Augustine, who, for about nine years, belonged to the sect, and who is our chief authority on this subject, confesses his ignorance of it. Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* i, 250) says that they partook of it without wine (because Christ had no blood), "and regarded it perhaps according to their pantheistic symbolism, as the commemoration of the light-soul crucified in all nature."

Character.—As to the general morality of the Manichæans, we are equally left to conjecture; but their doctrine certainly appears to have had a tendency, chiefly in the case of the uneducated, to lead to a sensual fanaticism hurtful to a pure mode of life. Bower, in the second volume of his *History of the Popes*, has attempted to prove that the Manichæans were addicted to immoral practices, but this opinion has been ably controverted by Beausobre and Lardner. "The morality of the Manichæans," says Dr. Schaff, "was severely ascetic, based on the fundamental error of the intrinsic evil of matter and the body; the extreme opposite of the Pelagian view of the essential moral purity of human nature. The great moral aim is to become entirely unworldly, in the Buddhistic sense; to renounce and destroy corporeity; to set the good soul free from the fetters of matter. This is accomplished by the most rigid and gloomy abstinence, which, however, is required only of the elect, not of the catechumens."

Extent.—Mani, as we have noted already in our sketch of his life, was put to death about 275; but the sect soon spread into proconsular Asia, and even into Africa, Sicily, and Italy, although they were vehemently opposed by the Catholic Church, and persecuted by the heathen emperors, who enacted bloody laws against them, as a sect derived from hostile Persia. The precise time when the doctrines of Mani made their way into the Roman empire it is impossible definitely to determine. The principal document on the subject, entitled *Acta disputationis Archelai, episcopi Mesopotamiæ, et Manetis hæresiarchæ*, is deemed apocryphal. Diocletian, as early as A.D. 296, issued rigorous laws against the Manichæans, which were reiterated by Valentinian, Theodosius I, and successive monarchs. Notwithstanding this, they gained numerous adherents; and very many mediæval sects, as the Priscillians, Paulicians, Bogomiles, Catharists, Josephinians, etc., were suspected to be secretly Manichæans, and were therefore called "New Manichæans." "Indeed, the leading features of Manichæism, the dualistic separation of soul and body, the ascription of nature to the devil, the pantheistic confusion of the moral and the physical, the hypocritical symbolism, concealing heathen views under Christian phrases, the haughty air of mystery, and the aristocratic distinction of esoteric and exoteric, still live in various forms even in modern systems of philosophy and sects of religion. The Mormons of our day strongly bring to mind, in many respects, even in their organization, the ancient Manichæans" (Dr. Schaff). It is a remarkable circumstance in their history, that though they could not stand openly against the power and severity of their persecutors, they continued for ages, up to the very time of the Reformation, to make proselytes in secret. Their doctrines lurked even among the clergy and the monks. The profound and noble Augustine fell under their influence, and was a member of the sect from his twentieth to his twenty-ninth year (374–383). They were still to be found in Leo's time, 440. The Arian Hunneric, in 477, began his reign with attempts to persecute them, and was mortified to find most of those whom he detected had professed to be lay or clerical members of his own sect. Gregory the Great, about 600, had to take means for extirpating them from Africa; and even after his pontificate traces of them appeared now and then in Italy, as well as other countries, threatening danger to the Church. About the year 1000 they spread from Italy into other countries, especially into southern France, Spain, and even Germany.

Literature.—Archelaus (bishop of Cascar about 278), *Acta disputationis cum Manete* (first composed in Syriac, but extant only in a Latin translation, and in many re-

spects untrustworthy), in Routh's *Reliquiæ sacræ*, v, 3–206. The Oriental accounts, of later date, indeed (the 9th and 10th centuries), but drawn from ancient sources, are collected in Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* (Par. 1679), s. v. Mani. See Titus Bostrensis (about 360), Κατὰ Μανιχαίων; Epiphanius, *Hær.* p. 66 (drawn from Archelaus); Zachagni, *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ et Latinæ* (Rome, 1698); St. Augustine, *De Moribus Manichæorum; De Genesi contra Manichæos; De duabus animabus contra Manichæos; De Vera religione Epistola fundamentis contra Faustum;* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, v, 284; Beausobre, *Histoire crit. de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (Amst. 1734 and 1739, 2 vols.); F. Chr. Baur, *Das Manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen untersucht* (Tüb. 1831); Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre u. seine Schriften* (Lpz. 1862); Trechsel, *Ueber den Kanon, die Kritik, u. die Exegese der Manichäer* (Berne, 1832); Colditz, *Entstehung d. manich. Religionssystems* (Lpz. 1837); Reichlin-Meldegg, *Theologie d. Magiers Mani u. ihr Ursprung* (Frankf. 1825); V. de Wagnern, *Manich. indulgentias cum brevi totius Manich. adumbratione, e fontibus descripsit* (Lpz. 1827); P. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni contra Manich. libri quatuor Syriace* (Berl. 1859); *Stud. und Krit.* vi, 3, 875 sq. (review of Baur); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv, 400 sq.; xi, 245 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 707 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, § 73; Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 127 sq.; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chrétiens* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 240 sq., 337, 352, 353; Pressensé, *L'histoire du Dogme* (Par. 1869), chap. ii. (J. H. W.)

Manipa, the name of a monstrous idol worshipped in the kingdoms of Tangut and Barantola, in Tartary. It has nine heads, which rise pyramidally, there being three in the first and second row, then two, and one at the top of all. A bold, resolute young fellow, dressed in armor, and prompted by enthusiastic courage, on certain days of the year, runs about the city Tanchuth, and kills every one he meets in honor of the goddess. By such outrageous sacrifices as these the devotees imagine they extremely oblige Manipa.—Kircher, *China illustr.;* Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* s. v.

Maniple, an article of dress introduced when the use of the stole as a handkerchief fell into disuse. It now represents the cord with which our Lord was bound to the pillar at his scourging.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.; Siegel, *Archæol.* s. v. Manipulus.

Manitou is the name of any object used as a fetish or amulet among some tribes of the American Indians—those of the North and North-west. "The Illinois," wrote the Jesuit Marest, "adore a sort of genius which they call Manitou; to them it is the master of life, the spirit that rules all things. A bird, a buffalo, a bear, a feather, a skin—that is their manitou." "If the Indian word manitou," says Palfrey, "appeared to denote something above or beside the common aspects and agencies of nature, it might be natural, but it would be rash and misleading to confound its import with the Christian, Mohammedan, Jewish, Egyptian, or Greek conception of the Deity, or with any compound or selection from some or all of those ideas." See Indians.

Manley, Ira, a Congregational minister and home missionary, was born about the year 1780; was a graduate of Middlebury College, studied law, was admitted to the bar, and left a fine practice to enter the ministry. He was a home missionary for sixty years, and a pioneer in all good enterprises. The last twenty-two years of his life were mostly spent in Wisconsin. He died at Keene, Essex County, N. Y., Feb. 5, 1871.—*New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871, p. 569.

Man'lius, the name of one of the ambassadors who is said to have written a letter to the Jews confirming whatever concession Lysias had granted them. Four letters were written to the Jews, of which the last is from "Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius (Gr. Τίτος Μάνλιος, v. r. Μάνιος; Vulg. *Titus Manilius*), ambassadors (πρεσβῦται) of the Romans" (2 Macc. xi, 34). There is not much doubt that the letter is a fabrication, as history is entirely ignorant of these names. Polybius (*Reliq.* xxxi, 9, 6), indeed, mentions C. Sulpitius and *Manius* Sergius, who were sent to Antiochus IV Epiphanes about B.C. 163, and also (*Reliq.* xxxi, 12, 9) Cn. Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and L. Aurelius, who were sent into Syria in B.C. 162 in consequence of the contention for the guardianship of the young king Antiochus V Eupator, but entirely ignores Q. Memmius or T. Manlius. We may therefore conclude that legates of these names were never in Syria. The true name of T. Manlius may be *T. Manius*, and as there is not sufficient time for an embassy to have been sent to Syria between the two recorded by Polybius, the writer may have been thinking of the former. The letter is dated in the 148th year of the Seleucidan æra (=B.C. 165), and in this year there was a consul of the name of *T. Manlius* Torquatus, who appears to have been sent on an embassy to Egypt about B.C. 164, to mediate between the two Ptolemies, Philometor and Euergetes (Livy, xliii, 11; Polybius, *Reliq.* xxxii, 1, 2). The employment of this Seleucidan æra as a date, the absence of the name of the city, and especially the fact that the first intercourse of the Jews and Romans did not take place till two years later, when Judas heard of the fame of the Romans (1 Macc. viii, 1 sq.), all prove that the document is far from authentic.

The three other letters do not merit serious attention (2 Macc. xi, 16–33). See Wernsdorff, *De fid. Libr. Maccab.* sec. lxvi; Grimm, *Exeg. Handbuch*, ad loc.; and on the other side, Patritius, *De Cons. Macc.* p. 142, 280.

Manly, Basil, D.D., a Baptist divine and educator of note, was born in Chatham County, N. C., Jan. 28, 1798. At the age of sixteen he became a member of a Baptist Church, and not long after began speaking in public, though he was not regularly licensed till 1818. He preached his first sermon in Beaufort, S. C., and must have made a favorable impression, for he at once received an offer of aid from a society for the education of ministers, and commenced his studies. In December, 1819, he entered the junior class in South Carolina College, and graduated with the highest honor in 1821. He immediately entered into an engagement to preach in the Edgefield District, and was ordained in March, 1822. A Church was formed at Edgefield Court-house about a year later, of which he was pastor for three years, gaining a wide reputation as a preacher in upper South Carolina. He was called in 1826 to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Charleston, and continued there eleven years, during which time he not only sustained and extended his reputation as a preacher, but was active in the cause of liberal and theological education, effecting the establishment of what is now known as Furman University, at Greenville, S. C. At that period theological instruction was included in the plans of this and similar institutions. Dr. Manly lived to see the Baptists of the South concentrate their energies upon the establishment and support of a single theological seminary. He took a lively interest in this matter, partly, no doubt, from a sense of the disadvantages under which he had himself labored; for, though a good scholar, he was a self-educated theologian. He was chosen in 1837 to the presidency of the University of Alabama, and administered the office for about eighteen years with eminent ability and success. In 1855 he returned to Charleston, and to the pastoral office over one of the four churches that now existed in place of the one to which he had formerly ministered. He was subsequently engaged as a missionary and evangelist in Alabama, and as a pastor at Montgomery. He died at Greenville, S. C., Dec. 21, 1868. As a preacher, Dr. Manly was eminently popular. His discourses, though instructive and convincing, were also charged with the elements of emotional power, and, with all his success as an educator, this was the work in which he most delighted. Dr. Manly wrote a "treatise on Moral Science," which was for years a text-book in Southern colleges. It indicated

a high order of talent. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1868, p. 450; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v. (L. E. S.)

Mann, Cyrus, an American Congregational minister and author, was born at Oxford, N. H., April 3, 1785; was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1806); was principal of Gilmanton Academy two years; teacher of the Troy high-school one year; tutor at Dartmouth College from 1809 to 1814; pastor of the Church at Westminster, Mass., from 1815 to 1841; then of Robinson Church, Plymouth, three years; next a teacher at Lowell several years; finally, from 1852 to 1856 acting pastor of the North Falmouth Church. He died at Stoughton, Mass., Feb. 9, 1859. Mr. Mann published *An Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity:—History of the Temperance Reformation:—Memoir of Mrs. Myra W. Allen;* and some *Sermons.*—Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* p. 595.

Mann, Horace, LL.D., one of the most prominent educators in our country, a philanthropist whose name deserves to be honored by every American—"a soul whose life was a galvanic thrill along the muscles of our age"—was born, of very humble parentage, at Franklin, Mass., May 4, 1796. Though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training in his early boyhood, he yet managed to acquire a pretty good knowledge of the so-called "common branches." At the age of twenty he resolved to secure for himself the advantages of a collegiate training. His instructors hitherto, he tells us himself, he had found to be "very good people, but very poor teachers." He had lost his father when only thirteen years old, and since that time "all the family," he tells us, "labored together for the common support, and toil was considered honorable, although it was sometimes of necessity excessive." Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, Horace was bent upon a course of study in college. Within the short space of six months he had acquired a sufficient preparation to enter the sophomore year at Brown University, and at this institution he graduated, with the highest honors, in 1819. The subject of his graduating speech was "The Progressive Character of the Human Race." This was always a favorite theme with him, and his first oration may be said to have foreshadowed his subsequent career as a philanthropist and statesman. After serving his alma mater for two years as instructor, he entered upon the study of jurisprudence at the law-school in Lichfield, and in 1823 was admitted to practice at Dedham. In 1827 he was elected to the legislature of Massachusetts, and during his connection with that body was distinguished for the zeal with which he devoted himself to the interests of education and temperance. His first speech was in favor of religious liberty. He was active in founding the State Lunatic Asylum. In 1831 he removed to Boston, and was elected in 1836 to the state senate, of which he became president.

At the organization of the Massachusetts Board of Education, June 29, 1837, Horace Mann was elected its secretary, and, as such, he served for eleven years. He now gave up all other business, withdrew from politics, and devoted his whole time to the cause of education, introducing normal schools and paid committees. During these eleven years he worked fifteen hours a day, held teachers' conventions, gave lectures, and conducted a large correspondence. In 1843 he made a visit to educational establishments in Europe. His Report was reprinted both in England and America. In 1848 he was elected to Congress, as the successor of ex-president John Quincy Adams, whose example he followed in energetic opposition to the extension of slavery. Mr. Mann's years in Congress were those stormy cloud-gathering years whose records are labelled "Fillmore," "Fugitive-Slave Law," "New Mexico and California." Staunch and steady he stood, a man of iron, in those days of compromise and political corruption. Hating slavery through every fibre of his soul, he had his weapon drawn whenever and wherever its crest arose. His great abilities as a statesman are evinced in his letters written at this time, foreshadowing the troubles of 1861–65. His first speech in Congress was in advocacy of the right and duty of the national government to exclude slavery from the territories. In a letter dated Dec., 1848, he says on this subject, "I think the country is to experience serious times. Interference with slavery will excite civil commotion at the South. Still, it is best to interfere. Now is the time to see whether the United States is a rope of sand or a band of steel." In another letter, dated January, 1850, he says, "Dark clouds overhang the future, and that is not all; they are full of lightning." Again, "I really think that if we insist upon passing the Wilmot Proviso for the territories, that the South—a part of them—will rebel. But *I* would pass it, rebellion or no rebellion. *I consider no evil so great as the extension of slavery.*" After having spent two terms in Congress, we find Mr. Mann in 1853 embarking into a new and somewhat formidable enterprise—the establishment of a college at the West to be open to both sexes, and to be founded and conducted on the educational principles which he had espoused in Massachusetts, and which we shall presently pass in review. The experiment made here for the co-education of the sexes proved a success, and in our own day the admission of young ladies to our best and highest schools is likely to be commendatory of Mr. Mann's enterprise in 1853. The labors and anxieties of this position at Antioch College, however, proved at length too much for his health, never strong, and now undermined by a life of the most intense and unremitting activity. The fiery soul consumed the body at last, Aug. 2, 1859.

Mann on the Relation of Religion to Education.—Mr. Mann had been reared under the influence of the Calvinistic faith. While yet a youth he had cherished an aversion to this orthodox belief, because, as he tells us, it had taught him to look upon God as "Infinite Malignity personified." When, at the mature age of forty, just as he entered on his work as an educator, he fell in with Combe's *Constitution of Man*, he at once became a warm admirer of the theological, psychological, or anthropological school of which Mr. George Combe was the distinguished teacher. Education has certainly no less to do with the conscience and heart than with the understanding, as "most of our relations to our fellowmen, for which education is to prepare us, grow out of our relations to God;" it therefore should derive its knowledge from the holy Scriptures, and make these, indeed, the corner-stone. Mann, however, held that it should depend for its guidance on the lights of natural religion. He came forward now to assert that "*natural religion* stands as pre-eminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay," and proposed to substitute, for the Christian influence which pervaded our whole educational institution, a system of "philosophical and moral doctrines," the prevalence of which would, in his view, "produce a new earth at least, if not a new heaven." Believing what is called the "evangelical faith," at that time ruling New England, to be in its influence derogatory to the character of God, and dwarfing and enslaving to the mind of man, he conceived it to be his task to vindicate the former and to emancipate the latter. Especially he conceived it his mission to overcome the "foul spirit of orthodoxy," so far as it entered the domain of the public schools, and this he believed to be "the greatest discovery ever made by man." "Other social organizations," he says, "are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this is to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete—the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged—men would walk more safely by day—every pillow would be more inviting by night—property, life, and character held by a stronger tenure;

all rational hopes respecting the future brightened. It is obvious that these glowing anticipations were born of something more, if not better, than reading, writing, and arithmetic." Education was, in Mann's view, a word of much higher import than that popularly given to it. "Its function is to call out from within all that was divinely placed there, in the proportion requisite to make a noble being." It was one of his maxims, however, that "every human being should determine his religious belief for himself." "It seems to me," he says, "that a generation so trained would have an infinitely better chance of getting at the truth than the present generation has had." Herein lay the greatest defect of the system he sought to establish in our schools. Stamping with the name of bigotry all religious views that did not coincide with his own, regarding orthodoxy as the great thraldom by which man was enslaved, he would introduce a system of Christian ethics and doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penalties, time and eternity, constituting the basis of his theories and schemes of popular education, which meant nothing else than the substitution of natural religion for revealed. How far Mr. Mann succeeded in this attempt we may judge by the prevalence of the doctrines of the so-called "liberal theology" in the Eastern States, particularly in Massachusetts. In the West he must certainly have been disappointed. Though more than a thousand students sat at his feet in Antioch, he was only in a very moderate degree successful in spreading "a religionism from whose features the young would not turn away." But if Mr. Mann failed in meeting that success which a person of his indomitable will, uncommon energy, and rare acquirements must have looked for and desired, we would not in the least detract from the value of his labors in behalf of education among the masses, and the greatness of his services to common-school education in America.

Besides his annual reports, a volume of lectures on education, and voluminous controversial writings, his principal work is *Slavery: Letters and Speeches* (Boston, 1851). Since his decease all his writings have been collected and published by his wife, under the title *The Works of Horace Mann* (Cambridge, 1867 sq., 2 vols. 8vo). See *Life of Horace Mann*, by his wife (Boston, 1865, 12mo); Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.; Princeton Review*, 1866 (January); reprinted in the *Brit. and For. Evan. Review*, 1866 (August). (J. H. W.)

Mann, William, D.D., an American educator of note, was born in Burlington County, N. Y., about the year 1784. When quite young he was placed in a printing-office, where he remained until his fourteenth year. Though unable to attend school a single day, he acquired a thorough education by private study. He was converted in his 23d year, joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and shortly after became a local preacher. The principal part of his life after this time was devoted to teaching. He was for some years principal of Mt. Holly Academy, in his native state. Subsequently he removed to Philadelphia, where he maintained a high reputation for his success in teaching the classics. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Dickinson College. He died in Philadelphia July 4, 1867.—*New Am. Cyclop.* 1867, p. 567.

Man'na (מָן, *man*, according to Gesenius, a *portion*, from the Arabic; but a different derivation is alluded to in the passage where it first occurs [see Thym, *De origine vocis Manna*, etc., Vitemb. 1641]), the name given to the miraculous food upon which the Israelites were fed for forty years during their wanderings in the desert. The same name has in later ages been applied to some natural productions, chiefly found in warm, dry countries, but which have little or no resemblance to the original manna. This is first mentioned in Exod. xvi. It is there described as being first produced after the eighth encampment in the desert of Sin, as white like hoar frost (or of the color of *bdellium*, Numb. xi, 7), round, and of the bigness of coriander seed (*gad*). It fell with the dew every morning, and when the dew was exhaled by the heat of the sun, the manna appeared alone, lying upon the ground or the rocks round the encampment of the Israelites. "When the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, *What is it?* for they knew not what it was" (Exod. xvi, 15). In the authorized and some other versions this passage is inaccurately translated—which, indeed, is apparent from the two parts of the sentence contradicting each other ("It is *manna;* for they wist not what it was"). The word occurs only in Exod. xvi, 15, 31, 33, 35; Numb. xi, 6, 7, 9; Deut. viii, 3, 16; Josh. v, 12; Neh. ix, 20; Psa. lxxviii, 24. In the Sept. the substance is almost always called *manna* (μάννα, and so the N. Test. always: John vi, 31, 49, 58; Heb. ix, 4; Rev. ii, 17; also the Apocrypha, Wisd. xvi, 20, 21) instead of *man* (μάν, Exod. xvi, 31, 33, 35). Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 1, 6), in giving an account of this substance, thus accords with the textual etymology: "The Hebrews call this food *manna* (μάννα), for the particle *man* (μάν) in our language is the asking of a question, '*What is this?*' (Heb. מָן־הוּא, *man-hu*)." Moses answered this question by telling them, "This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat." We are further informed that the manna fell every day, except on the Sabbath. Every sixth day, that is on Friday, there fell a double quantity of it. Every man was directed to gather an omer (about three English quarts) for each member of his family; and the whole seems afterwards to have been measured out at the rate of an omer to each person: "He who gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered little had no lack." That which remained ungathered dissolved in the heat of the sun, and was lost. The quantity collected was intended for the food of the current day only, for if any were kept till next morning it corrupted and bred worms. Yet it was directed that a double quantity should be gathered on the sixth day for consumption on the Sabbath. It was found that the manna kept for the Sabbath remained sweet and wholesome, notwithstanding that it corrupted at other times if kept for more than one day. In the same manner as they would have treated grain, they reduced it to meal, kneaded it into dough, and baked it into cakes, and the taste of it was like that of wafers made with honey or of fresh oil. In Numb. xi, 6–9, where the description of the manna is repeated, an omer of it is directed to be preserved as a memorial to future generations, "that they may see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness;" and in Josh. v, 12 we learn that after the Israelites had encamped at Gilgal, and "did eat of the old corn of the land, the manna ceased on the morrow after, neither had the children of Israel manna any more."

This miracle is referred to in Deut. viii, 3; Neh. ix, 20; Psa. lxxviii, 24; John vi, 31, 49, 58; Heb. ix, 4. Though the manna of Scripture was so evidently miraculous, both in the mode and in the quantities in which it was produced, and though its properties were so different from anything with which we are acquainted, yet, because its taste is in Exodus said to be like that of wafers made with honey, many writers have thought that they recognised the manna of Scripture in a sweetish exudation which is found on several plants in Arabia and Persia. The name *man*, or *manna*, is applied to this substance by the Arab writers, and was probably so applied even before their time. But the term is now almost entirely appropriated to the sweetish exudation of the ash-trees of Sicily and Italy (*Ornus Europæa* and *Fraxinus rotundifolia*). These, however, have no relation to the supposed manna of Scripture. Of this one kind is known to the Arabs by the name of *guzunjbin*, being the produce of a plant called *guz*, which is ascertained to be a species of tamarisk. The same species seems also to be called *tûrfa*, and is common along different parts of the coast of Arabia. It is also found in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai. Burckhardt,

while in the valley wady el-Sheik, to the north of Mount Serbal, says: "In many parts it was thickly overgrown with the tamarisk or *tûrfa;* it is the only valley in the Peninsula where this tree grows at present in any quantity, though some small bushes are here and there met with in other parts. It is from the *turfa* that the manna is obtained; and it is very strange that the fact should have remained unknown in Europe till M. Seetzen mentioned it in a brief notice of his 'Tour to Sinai,' published in the *Mines de l'Orient.* The substance is called by the Arabs *mann.* In the month of June it drops from the thorns of the tamarisk upon the fallen twigs, leaves, and thorns which always cover the ground beneath the tree in the natural state. The Arabs use it as they do honey, to pour over their unleavened bread, or to dip their bread into; its taste is agreeable, somewhat aromatic, and as sweet as honey. If eaten in any quantity it is said to be highly purgative." He further adds that the tamarisk is one of the most common trees in Nubia and throughout the whole of Arabia; on the Euphrates, on the Astaboras, in all the valleys of the Hejaz and Beja it grows in great quantities, yet nowhere but in the region of Mount Sinai did he hear of its producing manna. Ehrenberg has examined and described this species of tamarisk, which he calls *T. mannifera,* but which is considered to be only a variety of *T. gallica.* The manna he con-



Tamarix Gallica.

siders to be produced by the puncture of an insect which he calls *Coccus manniparus.* Others have been of the same opinion. When Lieut. Wellsted visited this place in the month of September, he found the extremities of the twigs and branches retaining the peculiar sweetness and flavor which characterize the manna. The Bedouins collect it early in the morning, and, after straining it through a cloth, place it either in skins or gourds; a considerable quantity is consumed by themselves; a portion is sent to Cairo, and some is also disposed of to the monks at Mount Sinai. The latter retail it to the Russian pilgrims. "The Bedouins assured me that the whole quantity collected throughout the Peninsula, in the most fruitful season, did not exceed 150 wogas (about 700 pounds); and that it was usually disposed of at the rate of 60 dollars the woga" (*Travels in Arabia,* i, 511).

Another kind of manna, which has been supposed to be that of Scripture, is yielded by a thorny plant very common from the north of India to Syria, which by the Arabs is called *Al-haj,* whence botanists have constructed the name Alhagi. The two species have been called *Alhagi Maurorum* and *A. desertorum.* Both spe-

Alhagi Maurorum.

cies are also by the Arabs called *ûshter-khar,* or "camel's-thorn;" and in Mesopotamia *aqûl,* according to some authorities, while by others this is thought to be the name of another plant. The *Alhagi Maurorum* is remarkable for the exudation of a sweetish juice, which concretes into small granular masses, and which is usually distinguished by the name of Persian manna. The late professor Don was so confident that this was the same substance as the manna of Scripture that he proposed calling the plant itself *Manna Hebraica.* The climate of Persia and Bokhara seems also well suited to the secretion of this manna, which in the latter country is employed as a substitute for sugar, and is imported into India for medicinal use through Caubul and Khorassan. In Arabian and Persian works on Materia Medica it is called *Turungbin.* These two, from the localities in which they are produced, have alone been thought to be the manna of Scripture. But, besides these, there are several other kinds of manna. Burckhardt, during his journey through El-Ghor, in the valley of the Jordan, heard of the Beiruk honey. This is described as a substance obtained from the leaves and branches of a tree called *Gharb* or *Garrab,* of the size of an olive-tree, and with leaves like those of the poplar. When fresh this grayish-colored exudation is sweet in taste, but in a few days it becomes sour. The Arabs eat it like honey. One kind, called *Shir-khisht,* is said to be produced in the country of the Uzbecs. A Caubul merchant in-

formed Dr. Royle that it was produced by a tree called *Gundeleh*, which grows in Candahar, and is about twelve feet high, with jointed stems. A fifth kind is produced on *Calotropis procera*, or the plant called *Ashur*. The sweet exudation is by Arab authors ranked with sugars, and called *Shukur-al-ashur*. It is described under this name by Avicenna, and in the Latin translation it is called *Zuccarum-al-husar*. A sixth kind, called *Bedkhisht*, is described in Persian works on Materia Medica as being produced on a species of willow in Persian Khorassan. Another kind would appear to be produced on a species of oak, for Niebuhr says, "At Merdin, in Mesopotamia, it appears like a kind of pollen on the leaves of the tree called *Ballot* and *Afs* (or, according to the Aleppo pronunciation, *As*), which I take to be of the oak family. All are agreed that between Merdin and Diarbekir manna is obtained, and principally from those trees which yield gall-nuts." Besides these there is a sweetish exudation found on the larch, which is called *Manna brigantiaca*, as there is also one kind found on the cedar of Lebanon. Indeed a sweetish secretion is found on the leaves of many other plants, produced sometimes by the plant itself, at others by the punctures of insects. It has been supposed also that these sweetish exudations, being evaporated during the heat of the day in still weather, may afterwards become deposited, with the dew, on the ground and on the leaves of plants, and thus explain some of the phenomena which have been observed by travellers and others. According to Col. Chesney, "The most remarkable production in ancient Assyria is the celebrated vegetable known here by the name of manna, which in Turkish is most expressively called *Kudret-hal-vassiz*, or 'the divine sweetmeat.' It is found on the leaves of the dwarf oak, and also, though less plentifully and scarcely so good, on those of the tamarisk and several other plants. It is occasionally deposited on the sand, and also on rocks and stones. The latter is of a pure white color, and appears to be more esteemed than the tree manna. It is collected chiefly at two periods of the year, first in the early part of spring, and again towards the end of autumn; in either case the quality depends upon the rain that may have fallen, or at least on the abundance of the dews, for in the seasons which happen to be quite dry it is understood that little or none is obtained. In order to collect the manna the people go out before sunrise, and having placed cloths under the oak, larch, tamarisk, and several other kinds of shrubs, the manna is shaken down in such quantities from the branches as to give a supply for the market after providing for the wants of the different members of the family. The Kurds not only eat manna in its natural state, as they do bread or dates, but their women make it into a kind of paste; being in this state like honey, it is added to other ingredients used in preparing sweetmeats, which, in some shape or other, are found in every house throughout the East. The manna, when partially cleaned, is carried to the market at Mosul in goat-skins, and there sold in lumps at the rate of $4\frac{3}{4}$ pounds for about $2\frac{1}{2}$d. But for family consumption, or to send to a distance out of the country, it is first thoroughly cleansed from the fragments of leaves and other foreign matter by boiling. In the natural state it is described as being of a delicate white color. It is also still, as in the time of the Israelites, like coriander seed, and of a moderate but agreeable sweetness" (*Euphrates Expedition*, i, 123).

"The manna of European commerce comes mostly from Calabria and Sicily. It is gathered during the months of June and July from some species of ash (*Ornus Europæa* and *Ornus rotundifolia*), from which it drops in consequence of a puncture by an insect resembling the locust, but distinguished from it by having a sting under its body. The substance is fluid at night, and resembles the dew, but in the morning it begins to harden."

"The natural products of the Arabian deserts and other Oriental regions, which bear the name of manna, have not the qualities or uses ascribed to the manna of Scripture. They are all condiments or medicines rather than food, stimulating or purgative rather than nutritious; they are produced only three or four months in the year, from May to August, and not all the year round; they come only in small quantities, never affording anything like 15,000,000 pounds a week, which must have been requisite for the subsistence of the whole Israelitish camp, since each man had an omer (or three English quarts) a day, and that for forty years; they can be kept for a long time, and do not become useless in a day or two; they are just as liable to deteriorate on the Sabbath as on any other day; nor does a double quantity fall on the day preceding the Sabbath; nor would natural products cease at once and forever, as the manna is represented as ceasing in the book of Joshua. The manna of Scripture we therefore regard as wholly miraculous, and not in any respect a product of nature."

Manna is the emblem or symbol of immortality (Rev. ii, 17): "I will give him to eat of the hidden manna;" i. e. the true bread of God, which came down from heaven, referring to the words of Christ in John vi, 51, a much greater instance of God's favor than feeding the Israelites with manna in the wilderness. It is called *hidden*, or laid up, in allusion to that which was laid up in a golden vessel in the holy of holies of the tabernacle (comp. Exod. xvi, 33, 34, and Heb. ix, 4).

See Liebentanz, *De Manna* (Vitemb. 1667); Zeibich, *De miraculo Mannæ Israeliticæ* (Geræ, 1770); Hoheisel, *De vasculo Mannæ* (Jen. 1715); Schramm, *De urna Mannæ* (Herb. 1723); Fabri *Historia Mannæ*, in Fabri et Reiskii *Opusc. med. Arab.* (Hal. 1776), p. 121; Hardwick, in *Asiatic Researches*, xiv, 182; Frederic, in *Transact. of the Lit. Society of Bombay* (Lond. 1819), i, 251; Ehrenberg, *Symbol. Phys.* (Berl. 1829); Martius, *Pharmakogn.* p. 327; Oedmann, *Samml.* vi, 1; Buxtorf, *Exercit.* (Basil. 1659), p. 335 (and in Ugolini, *Thesaur.* vol. viii); Rosenmüller, *Alterthumsk.* iv, 316 sq.; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 362; comp. Robinson's *Researches*, i, 470, 550; and other Oriental travellers.

Mannheimer, Isaak Noa, one of the most celebrated of modern Jewish pulpit orators and theologians, was born at Copenhagen, Denmark, Oct. 17, 1793. His father was the reader of the synagogue of the Danish capital, and, anxious to afford his Isaak all the advantages of modern culture, placed the child in a school at the tender age of three years and a half. When only nine years old, Isaak was introduced to the study of the Talmud, and at the age of responsibility (thirteen) was noted for his great erudition in Jewish tradition. In his secular studies, also, he made rapid progress, and promised much for the future. In 1808 he entered the gymnasium, and by 1814 he was ready to pass his examination for admission to the university. Here he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, philology, and the Oriental languages. Scarcely had his course been completed when the government offered him employment as catechist of the Jewish society of his native place; he accepted the proffered position, and served his people to their great satisfaction. About this time the reformatory movements among the Jews of Northern Europe were taking place, and Mannheimer became one of the leaders in the progressive step. He was especially encouraged by a personal acquaintance with the German-Jewish reformer Jacobson, whom he met in Berlin, whither he was called in 1821, as pastor of the Temple. But, by the interference of the government, the reform movement was greatly barred there, and, after a vain struggle with the orthodox, he accepted a call from Vienna in 1824, and removed to the Austrian capital in June, 1825. Austria, which was always slow to grant religious liberty to non-Roman-Catholics, had not up to this time recognised the Jews as a religious sect, and, without authority to act as pastor, Mannheimer was called to perform substantially similar duties

in the official capacity of "principal of the Religious School" ("Direktor der Wiener Kaiserlich Königl. öffentlichen israelitischen Religionsschule"). Though personally decidedly in favor of the reform movement inaugurated by Jacobson and others, he felt it his duty, in this new relation, to assume a conservative position, and by his moderation and wisdom succeeded in building up one of the best Jewish congregations in Germany. His great oratorical talent did much to swell the number of his auditors, but his success as a leader of the Jews of the Austrian capital is due solely to his determination "to produce no rupture in the Jewish camp." He served his people faithfully to the end of his terrestrial course, March 17, 1865. His influence on the Jews of Germany, however, still remains, and will be felt for years to come. During the stormy days of 1848 he represented his people in the nation's councils, as a deputy from Lemberg (Gallicia). His humane principles are manifest in his exertions for the abolishment of capital punishment. "Isaak Noa Mannheimer," says Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 433), "might be called the embodied nobility of the Jews. He was a perfect man. . . . The inner and outer man, disposition and wit, inspiration and wisdom, ideal life and practical safety, poetical talent and sober sense, childlike gooduess and hitting sarcasm, gushing oratory and earnest activity, love for Judaism and a special liking for reform, were in his being most harmoniously blended." As a pulpit orator he had no peer among his Hebrew brethren. Unfortunately, however, but few of his sermons were ever printed. For a list of them see Kayserling, *Bibliothek jüd. Kanzelredner*, Jahrgang i (Berl. 1870), p. 291. His other works consist of a translation of the Jewish Prayer-book for Sabbath and holy-days (*Sidur* and *Machzor*), a few polemical tracts, and a translation of part of the Bible for Salomon's German version. For the study of homiletics his sermons are valued by both Christian and Jewish divines. See, besides Grätz and Kayserling, Ehrentheil, *Jüd. Charakterbilder* (Rest. 1867), i, 57–66; Wolf, *Isak Noa Mañheimer* (Vienna, 1863); the same, *Gesch. d. israelit. Cultusgemeinde in Wien* (1861); Geiger, *Zeitschrift*, iii, 167 sq. (J. H. W.)

Manning, James, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Elizabethtown, N. J., Oct. 22, 1738, and was educated at Princeton College (class of 1762). Soon after the completion of his collegiate course he was ordained pastor of a Baptist Church in Morristown, N. J., but he remained only a year, and then became pastor of the Baptist Church in Warren, R. I. During his ministry there he instituted a Latin school, which seems to have been the germ of the great Baptist College, now the Brown University, he having been chiefly instrumental in the procuring of the charter in 1764. He was appointed its first president and professor of languages in 1765, when the college went into operation at Warren, whence it was removed to Providence in 1770, and was given the name it now bears. President Manning remained connected with the college until his death, July 29, 1791. During his residence at Providence, however, he was also pastor of a church for twenty years, absenting himself only for some six months in 1786, when he was chosen member of Congress for Rhode Island. "Dr. Manning was equally known in the religious, political, and literary world. Nature had given him distinguished abilities. The resources of his genius seemed adequate to all duties and occasions. He was of a kind and benevolent disposition, social and communicative in habit, and enchanting in manners. His life was a scene of labor for the benefit of others. His piety, and his fervent zeal in preaching the Gospel, evinced his love to God and man. With a most graceful form, a dignified and majestic appearance, his address was manly, familiar, and engaging, his voice harmonious, and his eloquence irresistible. In the government of the college he was mild, yet energetic. He lived beloved and died lamented, beyond the lot of ordinary men. The good order, learning, and respectability of the Baptist churches in the Eastern States, under God, are much owing to his personal influence, and assiduous attention to their welfare" (Benedict, ii, 346). See Guild (R. H.), *Life, Times, and Correspondence of Dr. James Manning* (1864, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 89.

Manning, Owen, an English clergyman, was born at Orlingburg, Northamptonshire, in 1721; was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1741; became prebend of Lincoln in 1760; in 1763, vicar of Godalming, Surrey; in 1769, rector of Pepperharrow, and died in 1807. Mr. Manning published *Two Occasional Sermons:—Sermons on Important Subjects* (1812, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Discourse on Justification, Rom. iii.* 28; published by Rev. J. H. Todd, with a discourse of Abp. Sharp's (1829, 8vo); and several works of a secular character.—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog.* s. v.

Mannus, according to Tacitus, the name given by the Germans to the son of the earth-born god Tuisco. From his three sons they derived their three great tribes, the Ingavones, the Iskavones, and the Herminones. Mannus belongs, not to the Teutonic people alone, but to the great mythus of the origin of the human race, common to the whole Aryan family, and, like the Hindu *Manu* or *Manus*, stands forth as the progenitor of the inhabitants of earth endowed with reason. The name is derived from the Aryan root *man*, to think. Compare Wackernagel, in Haupt's *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, vol. vi.

Mano'äh (Heb. *Mano'äch*, מָנוֹחַ, *rest*, as in Gen. viii, 9, and often; Sept. Μανωέ; Josephus Μανώχης, *Ant.* v, 8, 2 [where the Biblical narrative is greatly embellished]; Vulg. *Manue*), the father of Samson, of the tribe of Dan, and a native of Zorah (Judg. xiii, 2–22; xvi, 31). B.C. 1185. "The narrative of the Bible (xiii, 1–23), of the circumstances which preceded the birth of Samson, supplies us with very few and faint traits of Manoah's character or habits. He seems to have had some occupation which separated him during part of the day from his wife, though that was not field-work, because it was in the field that his wife was found by the angel during his absence. He was hospitable, as his forefather Abraham had been before him; he was a worshipper of Jehovah, and reverent even to a degree of fear. We hear of Manoah once again in connection with the marriage of Samson and the Philistine of Timnath. His father and his mother remonstrated with him thereon, but to no purpose (xiv, 2, 3). They then accompanied him to Timnath, both on the preliminary visit (ver. 5, 6) and to the marriage itself (ver. 9, 10). Manoah appears not to have survived his son: not he, but Samson's brothers, went down to Gaza for the body of the hero, and bringing it up to the family tomb between Zorah and Eshtaol, reunited the father to the son (xvi, 31) whose birth had been the subject of so many prayers and so much anxiety. Milton, however, does not take this view. 'In *Samson Agonistes* Manoah bears a prominent part throughout, and lives to bury his son.' See Samson.

Manse, the Scottish name synonymous with our word *parsonage*. In Scotland the manse, with unendowed churches, is the property of the Church, erected and maintained by it. In the Established Church it is built and maintained by law, and belongs to the heritors. Dunlop says, "While manses and houses which had belonged to the popish clergy were still standing, these, of course, fell to be first designed for a manse, and an order of designation, similar to that prescribed by the act of 1593 as to glebes, seems to have been followed. See Glebe. A minister accordingly was not allowed to have a manse designed to him within the precincts of an abbey or bishop's palace if there was a parson's or vicar's manse in the parish; nor was he entitled to any house which, though erected on Church lands, had not of old belonged to any kirkman, or incumbent serving at the church. Where there is no manse in a parish

the minister is entitled to have designed to him by the presbytery of the bounds half an acre of land for the manse, offices, and garden, and to have the heritors ordained to erect a manse and offices thereon. The statutes regarding manses require that they shall be situated near the parish church; and in general the manse and glebe are contiguous. The presbytery are, of course, in the designation of a new manse, entitled, in the first instance, to fix its situation; and even in the case of an old manse to be rebuilt they may fix on a new situation, always, of course, within the ground or glebe allotted to the minister. The act of 1663 provides 'that where competent manses are not already built,' the heritors shall 'build competent manses to their ministers, the expenses thereof not exceeding one thousand pounds, and not being beneath five hundred merks;' and it has been questioned whether, in respect of the phrase 'competent manses,' heritors can be compelled to expend a greater sum than one thousand pounds Scots on the erection of a manse." Hill says, "The law of Scotland provides the minister of every country parish with a dwelling-house, called a manse, a garden, a glebe of not less than four acres of arable land, designed out of lands in the parish near the manse, and with grass, over and above the glebe, for one horse and two cows; and with the out-houses necessary for the management of his small farm. As the act of James VI, parl. 3, c. 48, declares that the manse and glebe shall be marked and designed by the archbishop, bishop, superintendent, or commissioner of each diocese or province, upon whose testimonial being presented by the minister, the lords of Council and Session are instructed to direct letters, charging the former occupiers to remove, and entering the minister to possession; as the act of Charles II, parl. 1, sess. 3, c. 21, ordains that the heritors of the parish, at the sight of the bishop of the diocese, or such ministers as he shall appoint, with two or three of the most knowing and discreet men of the parish, build competent manses to the ministers; and as, by the settlement of presbyterian government in Scotland, the presbytery has come in place of the bishop, all applications concerning manses and glebes are made, in the first instance, to the presbytery of the bounds. After taking the regular steps suitable to the nature of the business, which, as a civil court specially constituted for that purpose, they are called to discuss, the presbytery pronounce a decreet; and their sentence, unless brought by a bill of suspension before the Court of Session, is binding upon all concerned." Prior to the Reformation, canon xiii ordained that every parish should have a dwelling for the minister, built at the expense of the parsons and their vicars, the support of it afterwards falling as a burden on the vicars. By the General Assembly of 1563 ministers having manses were required to live in them.

Mansel, Henry Longueville, one of the leading English divines of our day, noted particularly for his ability as a philosopher of the Hamiltonian school, was born in 1820 in the parish of Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, of which his father was then rector. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and later at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1843. He was shortly after ordained, and served the Church in various positions until 1855, when he was appointed reader in moral and metaphysical philosophy at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1859 became the Waynflete professor. In 1867 he was made regius professor of ecclesiastical history, and at the same time also canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In October, 1868, he was appointed dean of St. Paul's, London, and died in the English metropolis in 1871. His works are: Aldrich's *Logic*, with Notes (1849):—*Prolegomena Logica* (1851):—article "Metaphysics," in the 8th ed. of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1857), afterwards published separately:—*Bampton Lectures — The Limits of Religious Thought* (1858):— *The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (1866), in reply to Mill's *Review of Hamilton's Philosophy*. He was also one of the editors of Sir William Hamilton's Lectures. Mansel wrote in a clear and elegant style. His *Bampton Lectures* occasioned much controversy, both theological and philosophical. In the first one mentioned, on *The Limits of Religious Thought*, which passed through a number of editions, both in England and in this country, he takes as the basis of his arguments Sir W. Hamilton's position that "the unconditioned is incognizable and inconceivable." This treatise of Mansel is regarded as "one of the most important applications of the Hamiltonian philosophy to questions of religion." Farrar (in his *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 470) thus speaks of *The Limits of Religious Thought*: "It is a work which is valuable for its method, even if the reader differs (as the author of these lectures does in some respects) from the philosophical principles maintained, or occasionally even from the results attained. It is an attempt to reconstruct the argument of Butler from the subjective side. As Butler showed that the difficulties which are in revealed religion are equally applicable to natural, so Mr. Mansel wishes to show that the difficulties which the mind feels in reference to religion are parallel with those which are felt by it in reference to philosophy. Since the time of Kant a subjective tone has passed over philosophy. The phenomena are now studied in the mind, not in nature; in our mode of viewing, not in the object viewed. Hence Butler's argument needed reconstructing on its psychological side. Mr. Mansel has attempted to effect this; and the book must always in this respect have a value, even to the minds of those who are diametrically opposed to its principles and results. Even if the details were wrong, the method would be correct, of studying psychology before ontology; of finding the philosophy of religion, not, as Leibnitz attempted, objectively in a theodicée, but subjectively, by the analysis of the religious faculties; learning the length of the sounding-line before attempting to fathom the ocean." See *The Nation* (N. Y.), Jan. 10, 1867, p. 27 sq.; Grote, *Review of Niel's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy* (Lond. 1868, 18mo), p. 43 sq.; McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind* (see Index); Porter, *Human Intellect* (Index). See Hamilton, Sir W. (J. H. W.)

Mansi, J. Dominicus, a noted Italian prelate, was born in Lucca Feb. 16, 1692; entered the Church at an early age, and was for a long time professor of theology at Naples. He was created archbishop in 1765, and died Sept. 27, 1769. He was distinguished for his historical and philological acquirements, as also for his zeal as a compiler. Among his principal works are *Supplementum collectionis concilior. et decretorum Nicol. Coleti* (Lucæ, 1748–52, 6 vols.):—his own very complete collection, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, etc. (Florent. et Venet. 1759–88, 31 vols.), which was continued after his death. He published also a valuable edition of St. Baluzii *Miscellanea* (Lucca, 1761, 2 vols.), and the splendid Lucca edition of Baronius's *Annal. Eccles.*, with the continuation by Raynaldus (1738–56); a new edition of Natalis Alexandri *Historia eccles. Vet. Novique Test.* (Lucæ, 1748–52), and of J. A. Fabricii *Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. æt.* (Patavii, 1754). He also published the 2d edition of the important *Memorie della Gran Contessa Matilda da Fr. M. Fiorentini* (Lucca, 1756), to which he made many important additions. He wrote also *De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensium.* See Ant. Zatti, *Commentar. de vita et scriptis J. D. Mansi* (Ven. 1772); Anton. Lombardi, *Storia della letteratura Italiana nel secolo xviii* (Modena, 1827); Sarteschi, *De Scriptoribus Congreg. Matris Dei*, p. 352; Saxii *Onom. lit.* vii, 4 sq.; Baur, *Neues hist.-biog.-lit. Handb.* iii, 488; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 259; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 1. See Mamachi.

Mansionarii (παραμονάριοι), a class of functionaries who were not only keepers of churches, but especially bailiffs or stewards of the glebes or lands belonging to the Church or the bishop. See Doorkeepers.

Mansionaticum. See Taxes.

Manslayer (מַרְצֵחַ, *meratstse'ăch*, a *murderer*, *ἀνδροφόνος*, 1 Tim. i, 9, as sometimes rendered), one who by an accidental homicide was entitled to the benefit of asylum (Numb. xxxv, 6, 12; elsewhere usually "slayer"). See Blood-revenge. "One of the most peculiar provisions in the statute respecting the manslayer was the limitation of the period of his compulsory residence in one of the cities of refuge: 'He shall abide in it until the death of the high-priest, which was anointed with the holy oil.' After that he was allowed to 'return into the land of his possession' (ver. 28). Different reasons have been assigned by commentators for making the one event dependent on the other, which it is unnecessary to particularize. As the enactment was intended for the whole body of the people, and is recorded in Scripture without any explanation, the most simple view that can be taken of it is likely to be the nearest to the truth. One thing, however, all knew respecting the anointed high-priest, viz. that he was the head and representative of the whole community in matters pertaining to life and death; and as some limitation would evidently require to be set to the restraint laid on the manslayer, the thought would naturally commend itself to the people to make responsibility for an accidental death cease and determine with the death of him who stood nearest to God in matters of that description. In the general relations of the community a change had entered in that respect, which touched all interests, and it was fit that it should specially touch those who had been casually bereft of the freedom of life." "The principle on which the 'man-slayer' was to be allowed to escape, viz. that the person slain was regarded as 'delivered into his hand' by the Almighty, was obviously open to much wilful perversion (1 Sam. xxiv, 4, 18; xxvi, 8; compare Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* iii, 21; ii, 320), though the cases mentioned appear to be a sufficient sample of the intention of the lawgiver. *a.* Death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (Numb. xxxv, 22). *b.* Death by a stone or missile thrown at random (ib. 22, 23). *c.* By the blade of an axe flying from its handle (Deut. xix, 5). *d.* Whether the case of a person killed by falling from a roof unprovided with a parapet involved the guilt of manslaughter on the owner is not clear; but the law seems intended to prevent the imputation of malice in any such case, by preventing, as far as possible, the occurrence of the fact itself (Deut. xxii, 8) (Michaelis, *On the Laws of Moses*, arts. 223, 280, ed. Smith). In all these and the like cases the manslayer was allowed to retire to a city of refuge. See City of Refuge. Besides these, the following may be mentioned as cases of homicide: *a.* An animal, not known to be vicious, causing death to a human being, was to be put to death, and regarded as unclean. But if it was known to be vicious, the owner also was liable to fine, and even death (Exod. xxi, 28, 31). *b.* A thief overtaken at night in the act might lawfully be put to death, but if the sun had risen the act of killing him was to be regarded as murder (Exod. xxii, 2, 3). Other cases are added by the Mishna, which, however, are included in the definitions given above (*Sanh.* ix, 1, 2, 3; *Maccoth*, ii, 2; compare Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. Homicida)." See Murder.

Mansus Ecclesiæ. *Mansus* is in reality equivalent to *locus, ubi quis* manet, the residence including the portion of land belonging to it (*huoba*), and both expressions are sometimes used the one for the other (see Du Fresne, s. v.; Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 536; Eichhorn, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. i, § 84; Guérard, *Polyptique de l'abbé Irminon* [Paris, 1844, 4to]). Birnbaum, in *Die rechtliche Natur der Zehnten* (Bonn, 1831), p. 174, is of opinion that the word *mansus* is derived from *manumissio* or *mancipium*, from the slaves in early times becoming free in obtaining an estate, a *mansus hereditarius*. But, putting aside the philological difficulties, we find that the *mansi* were properties with which serfs (*glebæ adscripti*) or even freemen were invested on some conditions, hence the distinction between *mansi serviles* and *ingenuiles* (Grimm, p. 537; Eichhorn, vol. i, § 83). In the 9th century the whole of France was divided into mansi, as the taxes were based on this division, as well as the obligation to military service (see *Capitulare*, i, a. 803, c. 1, a. 807, 811; Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ*, iii, 119, 172; Walter, *Corpus juris Germanici*, ii, 228; Hincmari Remensis *Annales*, ad a. 866, 877). The Church itself was not free from these taxes, but paid according to the number of mansi it held (see *Capitul. Aquisgran.* a. 812, cap. 11; Pertz, iii, 175: "Ut de rebus unde censum ad partem regis exire solebat, si ad aliquam ecclesiam traditæ sunt, aut tradantur propriis heredibus, aut qui eas retinuerit, vel illum censum persolvat"), with the exception of those which they held from the liberality of the king, and which were given with such immunities; as also the mansi forming the *dos* of a church, and given to it at its foundation. See Immunity. In this case the immunity covered the whole mansus (*mansus integer*), and it became the duty of the incumbents to see to it that their privilege was not infringed (see *Capitulare Wormatiense*, a. 829, cap. generalia, no. 4; Pertz, iii, 350). This principle was also adhered to afterwards, so that both Gratian (see c. 24, 25, can. xxiii, qu. viii) and Raymondus à Pennaforte (c. i, x, *de censibus*, iii, 39) considered it well to recall these enactments. The size of the mansus did not always remain the same; yet it was at all times calculated so as to afford a *dos competens* to the church, the income from which would be sufficient to defray the expenses of worship and to supply the greater part of the requisites of the clergy (see Ziegler, *De dote ecclesiastica ejusque juribus et privilegiis* [Wittemb. 1686, 4to], chap. vii, § 34 sq.). If we study the history of the establishment of Christianity in the different countries, we find that many adopted these principles of the French law. Thus in Prussia, at the foundation of churches, they were each endowed with eight hides of land. In 1232 we see the parishes of Kulm and Thorn receiving besides forty hides. When in 1249 peace was made with the heathen Prussians, a stipulation required that each new church should receive a *dos* of eight hides (see Voigt, *Gesch. Preussens*, ii, 239, 630). The later documents on the subject (see Voigt, *Codex diplomaticus Prussicus*) show that this custom was observed in after times. This practice of church endowments was continued notwithstanding the changes introduced by the Reformation. See Jacobson, *Gesch. der Quellen d. evangelischen Kirchenrechts von Preussen*, i, 2, Urkunden, p. 8, 25, etc.; Moser, *Allgem. Kirchenbl.* 1856, p. 141 sq.; Berlin *Evang. Kirchenzeit.* 1857, No. 9; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 1. (J. N. P.)

Mant, Richard (1), D.D., an English prelate and commentator, was born at Southampton, Feb. 12, 1776; was educated at Winchester College, and Trinity College, Oxford; became fellow of Oriel College in 1798; vicar of Great Coggeshall, Essex, in 1810; of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, London, in 1815; and of East Horsley, Surrey, in 1818; bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, in 1820; was translated to Down and Connor in 1823; and in 1842 succeeded bishop Saurin in the diocese of Dromore. He died Nov. 2, 1848. He published, in conjunction with D'Oyly, *An Edition of the Bible, with Notes* (1817): —*Eight Sermons*:—*An Appeal to the Gospel, or an Inquiry into the Justice of the Charge that the Gospel is not preached by the National Clergy* (1812, 8vo; 6th ed. 1816, 8vo; reviewed in the *Lond. Quart. Rev.* viii, 356–374, and xv, 475):—*The Book of Common Prayer, selected, with Notes* (1829, 4to; abridged, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1840, 4to):—*The Book of Psalms in an English Metrical Version, with Notes, critical and illustrative* (1824, 8vo):—*Biographical Notices of the Apostles, Evangelists, and other Saints* (1828, 8vo):—*Primitive Christianity* (Lond. 1843, 8vo):—*Hist. Ch. of Ireland* (1840, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Horæ liturgicæ* (1845, sm. 8vo):—*Sermons*, and other productions on various subjects. See Allibone,

Dict. Brit. and Amer. Biog. s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.

Mant, Richard (2), D.D., an English divine, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century; was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and became rector of All Saints, Southampton. He died in 1817. He published a sermon entitled *Public Worship* (1796, 8vo):—*Order for the Visitation of the Sick, from the Book of Common Prayer* (1805, 12mo):—*Eight Sermons on the Occurrences of the Passion Week* (1807, 12mo):—*Guide to the Understanding of the Church Catechism* (1807).—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Mantchuria, a Chinese territory in Eastern Asia, extending between lat. 42° and 53° N., is now the possession partly of the Chinese and partly of the Russians. It is bounded, according to its present limits, by the Amur on the north; by the Usuri and the Sungacha on the east, separating it from the Russian maritime territory of Orochi; by the Shan-Alin range on the south, separating it from Korea; and by a portion of the Khingan Mountains, the river Sira-Muren, and the district of the upper Sungari, which separate it on the west from the desert of Gobi. Previously to the recent incursions of the Russians on the north, the area of this territory was about 682,000 square miles. Since the treaty of Nov. 14, 1860, the Russians possess all the territory east of the Usuri and north and east of the Amur, and the Chinese possession is reduced to about 378,000 square miles. The population is variously estimated at from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000. Mantchuria is divided into three provinces: Shing-King (formerly Leaotong), which alone contains upwards of 2,100,000 inhabitants, and the chief town of which, Mukden, is the seat of government for the three provinces; Girin, or Kirin; and Tsi-tsi-har. The country is mountainous, densely wooded in the south, but consisting chiefly of prairies and grass-land in the north. It is well watered and fruitful in the valleys. Chinese form the great bulk of the population. The Mantchus themselves are for the most part soldiers; they are the present rulers of China, who gradually subjugated the country. They are not a nomadic race like the Mongols, but are given to agriculture or hunting, according to the part of their country they inhabit. They are of a lighter complexion and slightly heavier build than the Chinese, have the same conformation of the eye-lids, but rather more beard, and their countenances present greater intellectual capacity. Literary pursuits are more esteemed by them than by Mongolians. They are of the same religious faith as the Chinese, but they are less under the priesthood. The Mantchus, in short, may be regarded as the most improvable race in Central Asia, if not on the continent. See Williams, *Middle Kingdom*, i, 153 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v. See also China; Tartary.

Mantelet, a long cape, with slits for the arms, worn by prelates. Regular bishops wore it without the rochet; and cardinals, vested in rochet and mozzetta, lay it aside when visiting another of their order. The *mantellone* is a purple cloak, with long, hanging sleeves.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.

Mantle, in the A. V., is the term used to render *four* Hebrew words, viz.,

1. אַדֶּרֶת, *adde'reth*, from אַדִּיר, "ample," and therefore probably meaning a large over-garment like the Roman *pallium*. The Sept. renders it by μηλωτή (a sheep's skin), 1 Kings xix, 13, etc.; δερρίς, Zech. xiii, 4; and δορά, Gen. xxv, 25. From the passages in which it is mentioned we can conjecture its nature. It is used most frequently (1 Kings xix; 2 Kings ii, 8, 13, etc.) of Elijah's "mantle," which was in all probability a mere sheepskin, such as is frequently worn by dervishes and poor people in the East, and which seems, after Elijah's time, to have been in vogue among the prophets (Zech. xiii, 4). Accordingly, by it only is denoted the cape or wrapper which, with the exception of a strip of skin or leather round his loins, formed, as we have every reason to believe, the sole garment of the prophet. The Baptist's dress was of a similar rough description, and we see from Heb. xi, 37 (ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν) that such garments were regarded as a mark of poverty and persecution. The word *addereth* twice occurs with the epithet שֵׂעָר, "hairy" (Gen. xxv, 25; Zech. xiii, 4). On the other hand, it is sometimes undoubtedly applied to royal and splendid robes, and is even used to mean "magnificence" in Ezek. xvii, 8 ("vine of magnificence") and Zech. xi, 3. It is the expression for the "goodly Babylonish garment" stolen by Achan, and the "robe" worn by the king of Nineveh (Josh. vii, 21; Jonah iii, 6). The connection between two meanings apparently so opposite is doubtless to be found in the etymology of the word (from אָדַר, *ample*), or in the notion of a dress richly lined or trimmed with costly *furs*. See Robe.

2. מְעִיל, *meïl'*, which in the A. V. is variously rendered "mantle," "robe," "cloke;" and in the Sept. ἐπενδύτης, διπλοΐς, ὑποδύτης, ποδήρης, χιτών. Josephus calls it μεείρ. It is a general term derived from מָעַל, *to cover*, and is most frequently applied to "the *robe* of the ephod" (Exod. xxviii, 4, etc.; Lev. viii, 7), which is described as a splendid under-tunic of blue, wrought on the hem with pomegranates of blue, purple, and scarlet, with golden bells between them. It came below the knees, being longer than the ephod, and shorter than the *kittoneth*. It was a garment of unseamed cotton, open at the top so as to be drawn over the head, and having holes for the insertion of the arms (Joseph. *Ant.* iii, 7, 4; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* sec. 122; Braunius, *De Vest. Sac.* p. 436; Schröder, *De Vest. Mul.* p. 237, etc.). It was worn, however, not only by priests, like Samuel (1 Sam. ii, 19; xv, 27; xxviii, 14), but by kings and princes (*Saul*, 1 Sam. xxiv, 4; *David*, 1 Chron. xv, 27), and rich men (*Ezra*, ix, 3–5; *Job* and his friends, i, 20; ii, 12), and even by king's daughters (2 Sam. xiii, 18), although in the latter case it seems to have had sleeves (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 811). Properly speaking, the *meil* was worn under the *simlah*, or outer garment, but that it was often itself used as an outer garment seems probable from some of the passages above quoted. It is interesting to know that the garment which Samuel's mother made and brought to the infant prophet at her annual visit to the holy tent at Shiloh was a miniature of the official priestly tunic or robe; the same that the great prophet wore in mature years (1 Sam. xv, 27), and by which he was on one occasion actually identified. When the witch of Endor, in answer to Saul's inquiry, told him that "an old man was come up, covered with a *meil*," this of itself was enough to inform the king in whose presence he stood—"Saul perceived that it was Samuel" (xxviii, 14).

3. שְׂמִיכָה, *semikah'* (Judg. iv, 14), the garment (marg. "rug," or "blanket") used by Jael to fling over the weary Sisera as a coverlid (Sept. ἐπιβόλαιον, but δερρίς appears to have been the reading of Origen and Augustine). The word is derived from סָמַךְ, *imponere*, and is evidently a general term. Hesychius defines ἐπιβόλαιον by πῶμα ἢ ῥάκος, and Suidas by τὸ τῷ προτέρῳ ἐπιβαλλόμενον. The word used in the Targum is גּוּנְכָּה, which is only the Greek καυνάκη, and the Latin *gaunacum;* and this word is explained by Varro to be "majus sagum et amphimallon" (*De Ling. Lat.* iv, 35), i. e. a larger cloak woolly on *both* sides. Hesychius differs from Varro in this, for he says καυνάκαι στρώματα ἢ ἐπιβόλαια ἑτερομαλλῆ, i. e. woolly on *one* side; the Scholiast, on Aristophanes, adds that it was a Persian, and Pollux that it was a Babylonian robe (Rosenmüller, *Schol.* ad loc.). There is, therefore, no reason to understand it of a curtain of the tent, as Faber does. Since the Orientals constantly used upper garments for bedding, the rendering "mantle," though inaccurate, is not misleading (compare Ruth iii, 9; Ezek. xvi, 8, etc.). In the above passage the Hebrew word has the definite ar-

ticle prefixed, and it may therefore be inferred that it was some part of the regular furniture of the tent. The clue to a more exact signification is given by the Arabic version of the Polyglot, which renders it by *al-katifah*, a word which is explained by Dozy (*Dictionnaire des Vêtements Arabes*, p. 232), on the authority of Ibn Batuta and other Oriental authors, to mean certain articles of a thick fabric, in shape like a plaid or shawl, which are commonly used for beds by the Arabs: "When they sleep they spread them on the ground. For the under part of the bed they are doubled several times, and one longer than the rest is used for a coverlid." On such a bed, on the floor of Heber's tent, no doubt the weary Sisera threw himself, and such a coverlid must the *semikah* have been which Jael laid over him.

4. מְעַטָּפוֹת, *maataphoth'*, occurs only in Isa. iii, 22. It was some article of female dress, and is derived from עָטַף, *to weave*. Schröder, the chief authority on this subject, says it means a large exterior tunic with sleeves,

In-door Dress of a modern Egyptian Lady, showing the back Veil and the Mantle.

worn next to the pallium (*De Vest. Mul.* xv, 247–277). In this same verse, and in Ruth iii, 15, occurs the word מִטְפָּחוֹת, *mitpachoth'*, A.V. "wimples," which appears to have been a sort of square covering like a plaid (Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 1021; Rosenmüller, *Schol.*; Isa. iii, 22). We cannot find the shadow of an authority for Jahn's very explicit statement, that both these words mean the same article, מַעֲטָפָה being the fashion for the winter, and מִטְפָּחָה for the summer; though his assertion that "it covered the whole body from head to foot" may be very true (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* sec. 127).

For other terms, such as שִׂמְלָה, *simlah'* (Gen. ix, 23, etc.), χλαμύς (Matt. xxvii, 28), στολή (Mark xii, 38), etc., see DRESS. The φελόνης (A.V. cloke) to which St. Paul makes such an interesting allusion in 2 Tim. iv, 13, seems to have been the Latin *pænula* (comp. פַּלְיוֹן), a sort of travelling-cloak for wet weather. A great deal has been written about it, and at least one monograph (Stosch, *Dissert. de Pallio Pauli*, Lugd. 1709). Even in Chrysostom's time some took it to be τὸ γλωσσόκομον ἔνθα τὰ βιβλια ἔκειτο (a sort of travelling-bag), and Jerome, Theophylact, Grotius, etc., shared in this opinion (Schleusner, *Lex. N. T.* s. v. φαιλόνης). See CLOAK.

Manton, THOMAS, D.D., one of the most eminent of the Puritan divines of the 17th century, was born in 1620 at Lawrence-Lydiard, Somerset, England. His father and both his grandfathers were ministers. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and received orders from bishop Hall before he had attained the age of twenty, being regarded by the good prelate as an extraordinary young man. The greatness of his character displayed itself even at this early age. Believing that admission to deacon's orders constituted authority to preach, he steadfastly refused priest's orders after having received deacon's. After staying a short time at Colyton, in Devonshire, he removed to London, and was presented in 1643 with the living of Stoke-Newington, near London. Here he prepared and afterwards published his *Expositions of James and Jude*. (The former was published in 1651; edited by Sherman, 1840, royal 8vo; edited by M'Donough, 1842, 8vo; the latter was published in 1658, 4to; new ed. 1838, 8vo.) During the Revolution he was frequently called to preach before Parliament, where he had the courage to speak against the death of the king, though he gave great offence. In 1653 he was chosen preacher of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, where he had a numerous congregation of persons of great note and rank, and was eminently successful in his ministry. Joining in the Rebellion, he became one of the chaplains to the protector, and one of the committee for examining ministers under the commonwealth. He was forward, however, to promote the Restoration in 1660, was chosen one of the king's chaplains, and was also honored by Oxford at this time with the degree of D.D. by special request of king Charles II. In 1661 he was offered the deanery of Rochester, but this position he refused. Like Baxter, he clung to the last to the hope that a scheme of comprehension might be carried for the Presbyterians; and he had yielded so far as to receive episcopal institution from Sheldon to permit the reading of the Common Prayer in his church, but when he clearly saw that there was peace only within the Establishment, and by an utter abandonment of all Puritan principles, he let the deanery go, content to remain in the position he was then filling. The passing of the Act of Uniformity forced him into the ranks of the Nonconformists. Efforts were made by Calamy, Manton, and Bates, the leaders of those Presbyterians who still hoped for redress, to secure their rights from the king by personal interview, and they even received encouragement from Charles II of a favorable change, who "promised to restore them to their employments and places again, as pitying that such men should lie vacant" (Stoughton, i, 302). But the king proved false, and the Puritans lost their places. Among the Nonconformist ministers who would not quit the pulpit until forced was Thomas Manton. Deprived of a church, he opened his rooms in Covent Garden, and there gathered a congregation. Here the Oxford oath was tendered to him, and on refusal he was committed a prisoner to the Gate-house, and was kept confined for six months. He died Oct. 18, 1677. Perhaps few men of that age had more virtue and fewer failings; but his only trust was in *the Lamb of God*. As a preacher he was most highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Usher calls him "one of the best preachers in England." As a practical expositor of Scripture he was perhaps never surpassed. He left numerous writings, chiefly sermons and expositions. A collective edition of his works was published in 5 vols. 8vo, in 1681–84–89–93–1701, with *Life* by Dr. William Harris; but this collection is incomplete. A list of all his productions is given by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1953–56. The publication of a complete collection of his works, prepared under the supervision of the Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D., and others, with full indexes and an original memoir by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, was begun in 1869, and is to be completed, in 20 vols. demy 8vo, in 1874. See the excellent article in Allibone's *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biogr.* vol. vii,

s. v.; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, iii, 429. (J. H. W.)

Mantua, an Italian province, formerly an independent duchy, had a high reputation in the time of the Romans. After sharing the fate of the rest of Northern Italy, it was seized by the Gonzagas about the commencement of the 14th century. The last duke of the house of Gonzaga died childless at Padua in 1708, when Mantua fell into the hands of Austria. In 1859 the province was given up to Italy, but the town of Mantua was not restored to Italy until 1866, since which time Mantua has formed a province of the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY. The city of Mantua is noted in ecclesiastical history for a council that was held there in 1067 to judge pope Alexander II for a charge of simony brought against him. Alexander II took an oath to deny the accusation, and, proving the validity of his election, was recognised as the proper incumbent of the papal chair; while Honorius II (q. v.), the anti-pope, was unanimously condemned as simoniacal. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 390.

Mantuan, BAPTIST, a famous Italian monastic and poet, was born at Mantua in 1448; joined the Carmelites, became general of the order, quitted it in 1515, and devoted himself for the remainder of his life to belles-lettres. He died in 1516. His works were published at Paris in 1513 (3 vols. fol.), with the Commentaries of S. Murrhon, S. Brant, and J. Badius; and at Antwerp in 1576 (4 vols. 8vo), under the title, *J. Baptistæ Mantuani, Carmelitæ, theologi, philosophi, poëtæ, et oratoris clarissimi, opera omnia, pluribus libris aucta et restituta.* —*Gen. Biog. Dict.* ix, 51, s. v.

Mantz, FELIX, a Baptist martyr of the early part of the 16th century, and a leader of the Reformation in Germany, was a native of Zürich. In 1519 he studied Hebrew with Zwingle, under Carlstadt, and was intimate with that reformer, and also with Myconius, Capito, and other leaders of the Swiss Reformation. About 1522 he objected openly to the doctrine of infant baptism, to the tithes, usury, and other peculiarities of the Romish Church, and thus failing to harmonize with the opinions of Zwingle, he was led to a separation from the party of that reformer, and became connected with the Baptists. In 1523 he preached publicly on the subject of baptism. In the three disputes held at Zürich in 1525, Mantz appears to have taken part, and after that of March was thrown into prison, from which, however, he escaped. He afterwards preached in different parts of Switzerland; in 1526 was imprisoned in the tower of Wellenberg, on the charge of baptizing contrary to the prohibitory edict of the magistrates of Zürich, and, refusing to recant, was condemned, and drowned in January, 1527. See Brown, *Baptist Martyrs*, p. 49 (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soc. Phila.).

Manu (from the Sanscrit *man*, to *think;* literally, *the thinking being*) is the name of the reputed author of the most renowned law-book of the ancient Hindus, and likewise of an ancient *Kalpa sutra* (q. v.). It is matter, however, of considerable doubt whether both works belong to the same individual, and whether the name Manu, especially in the case of the author of the law-book, was intended to designate a historical personage. In several passages of the Vedas (q. v.), as well as of the Mahâbhârata (q. v.), Manu is spoken of as the progenitor of the human race, and in the first chapter of the law-book ascribed to him he declares himself to have been produced by Virâj, an offspring of the Supreme Being, and to have created all the universe. Hindu mythology, moreover, recognises a succession of Manus, each of whom created, in his own period, the world anew after it had perished at the end of a mundane age. The word Manu—kindred with our "*man*"—belongs therefore, properly speaking, to ancient Hindu mythology, and it was connected with the renowned law-book in order to impart to the latter the sanctity on which its authority rests. This work is not merely a law-book in the European sense of the word; it is likewise a system of cosmogony, or, as Sir William Jones has it, "comprises the Indian system of duties, religious and civil." It propounds metaphysical doctrines, teaches the art of government, and, among other things, treats of the state of the soul after death. The chief topics of its twelve books are the following; 1. Creation; 2. Education and the duties of a pupil, or the first order; 3. Marriage and the duties of a householder, or the second order; 4. Means of subsistence, and private morals; 5. Diet, purification, and the duties of women; 6. The duties of an anchorite and an ascetic, or the duties of the third and fourth orders; 7. Government, and the duties of a king and the military caste; 8. Judicature and law, private and criminal; 9. Continuation of the former, and the duties of the commercial and servile castes; 10. Mixed castes, and the duties of the castes in time of distress; 11. Penance and expiation; 12. Transmigration and final beatitude. It is the opinion of Maine (*Ancient Law*) and other eminent scholars that the code of Manu was never fully accepted or enforced in India, and remained always an ideal of the perfect Brahmanic state. It is supposed, by Wilson, Lassen, Max Müller, and Saint Martin, to have been written about B.C. 900 or 1000. The text of this work has been published in several editions both in India and Europe. An excellent English translation of it we owe to Sir W. Jones (Calcutta, 1796; 2d ed., by Haughton, Lond. 1825), and a very good French translation to A. Loiseleur Deslongchamps (Paris, 1833). See Johäntzen, *Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu* (Berl. 1863); Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop* (Index to vol. ii); Elphinstone, *Hist. of India* (3d ed.), p. 226 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 194 sq.; James Freeman Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, p. 100 sq. See HINDUISM.

Manuductor is the name of an ecclesiastical officer whose duty it was to give the signal to the choristers to sing, to mark the measure, beat the time, and regulate the music. The word means *to lead by means of the hand;* and the officer was so called because he was required to stand in the middle of the aisle, and to guide the choir by the motions of his hand. The Greek Church has an officer who performs similar services, who is called *Mesochoros*, because he is seated in the midst of the choir.

Manuel CHARITOPŪLUS (ὁ Χαριτόπουλος), or SARANTĒNUS (ὁ Σαραντηνός), or *the Philosopher*, a Greek ecclesiastic who flourished in the 12th and 13th centuries, acquired a high reputation by his philosophical attainments. He was appointed patriarch of Constantinople on the death of Maximus II, A.D. 1215, and held the patriarchate for five years and seven months. He died about A.D. 1221. Three synodal decrees of a Manuel, patriarch of Constantinople, are given in the *Jus Græco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (lib. iii, p. 238, etc.), who assigns them to Charitopulus, and is followed by Cave and Oudin, who have confounded Charitopulus with another Manuel (of Constantinople). Le Quien objects to this judgment of Leunclavius, as not founded on evidence, and, with better reason, adjudges them to Manuel Bryennius. Ephraem of Constantinople celebrates Charitopulus as "an exact observer of the laws and canons" (Georg. Acropolit. *Annal.* [c. 19, p. 17, ed. Paris; p. 35, ed. Bonn]; Ephraem. *De Patriarchis* [Charitop. vs. 10, 251, ed. Bonn]; Anonymous [supposed by some to be Niceph. Callist.], *De Patriarchis Charitopolitanis Carmen Iambicum*, and *Patriarchæ Charitopoleos*, apud Labbe, *De Histor. Byzant. Scriptorib.* Προτρεπτικόν; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i, col. 278; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1240, ii, 297 [ed. Oxford, 1740–42); Oudin, *Comment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* iii, col. 177).—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Manuel (I) COMNENUS (Μανουὴλ ὁ Κομνηνός), emperor of Constantinople from 1143 to 1180, was the fourth son of John II, and was born about A.D. 1120. Two of his elder brothers, Alexis and Andronicus, both died before their father, and a special declaration of the

emperor appointed Manuel as his successor, to the prejudice of his third son, Isaac Sebastocrator. As soon as Manuel ascended the throne, he surrounded himself with the bravest warriors of the West, and soon became foremost even among them for his courage. His reign was a succession of wars, sometimes in Asia, sometimes in Europe. Conrad III and Louis VII having informed him that they were preparing a new crusade, Manuel, although apparently disposed to help them, gave secret information to the Turks of the approaching danger.

The relation which Manuel Comnenus sustained to the Church of Rome is of special interest to us. His Latin subjects he treated with kindness, embellished their churches, and readily did all they asked of him. This generous disposition on the part of Manuel Comnenus towards the Latins encouraged pope Hadrian IV (1154–1159) to make proposals for a union of the Eastern with the Western Church, but the plan failed of success because of the objections of the Greek patriarch to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope of Rome. See Greek Church. After Hadrian's death Manuel entered into correspondence with Alexander III, declared himself in favor of the Crusades, and offered assistance. The German emperor, Frederick I, had taken sides with the rival pope Victor, and Manuel embraced this opportunity to urge upon Alexander the claims of the Greek emperor to the Roman crown, promising in return to aid the pope in establishing the papal power in all Italy, and in the union of the Eastern and Western Church. So long as the pope was in danger from the invading Allemanni, he acted as if he felt inclined to acknowledge the true representative of Constantine and Augustus. But after the establishment of peace and friendship with Frederick, Alexander "spoke a more peremptory language, confirmed the acts of his predecessors, excommunicated the adherents of Manuel, and pronounced the final separation of the churches, or at least the empires of Constantinople and Rome" (Gibbon, v, 491). Manuel died Sept. 24, 1180. He is said to have been deeply versed in theology, but "was certainly rather a great talker than a great thinker on religion." See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Lebeau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1834), xvi, 63 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Manuel of Constantinople. There were two Manuels patriarchs of Constantinople, Manuel I (Charitopulus), and Manuel II, the subject of the present article. Cave, Oudin, and others seem to have confounded the two, for they state that Manuel Charitopulus succeeded Germanus II in A.D. 1240. Charitopulus was the predecessor of Germanus, not his successor; Manuel II was his successor, though not immediately, for the brief patriarchate of Methodius II and a vacancy in the see, of considerable but uncertain length, intervened. Manuel's death is distinctly fixed as having occurred two months before that of the emperor Joannes Ducas Vatatzes, A.D. 1255, Oct. 30. The duration of his patriarchate is fixed by Nicephorus Callisti, according to Le Quien, at eleven years; but the table in the *Protrepticon* of Labbe assigns to him fourteen years, so that A.D. 1240 or 1244 may be assumed as the year of his accession, according as one or the other of these authorities is preferred. Manuel held, before his patriarchate, a high place among the ecclesiastics of the Byzantine court, then fixed at Nice, and was reputed a man of piety and holiness, "though married," and of a mild and gentle disposition, but by no means learned. The three *Sententiæ Synodales* of the patriarch Manuel given in the *Jus Græco-Romanum* undoubtedly belong to this patriarch, not to Charitopulus, for the second of them, *De Translatione Episcoporum*, is expressly dated July, Indict. 8, A.M. 6578, æra of Constant. = A.D. 1250. Some works in MS., especially a letter to pope Innocent by "Manuel Patriarcha CPol.," probably belong to Manuel of Constantinople (Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i, col. 279; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1240, ii, 297 [ed. Oxford, 1740–42]; Oudin, *Comment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Ecc*les. iii, col. 177; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 668).—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Manuel Holobōlus, a Byzantine ecclesiastic of the 13th century, about 1261 or 1262 was cruelly mutilated by the cutting off of his nose and lips, by order of the ambitious Michael Palæologus, because he had expressed grief at the deposition, persecution, and banishment of Joannes Lascaris, emperor of Nicæa, by Palæologus, his successor in the empire. Holobolus was then confined to the monastery of the Precursor, where, having excellent abilities and opportunities, he pursued his studies with success. About A.D. 1267 Germanus III, bishop of Constantinople, procured for him the appointment of teacher of a school of young ecclesiastics, and prevailed upon the emperor to remit his punishment and allow him to quit the monastery. Germanus also conferred on him the ecclesiastical office of rhetor, reader and expounder of the Scriptures. When the emperor Palæologus attempted a reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, he sought the counsel of Holobolus, but he declared against the plan of reconciliation. This brought upon him the emperor's indignation, and he was obliged to take refuge in the church sanctuary to escape violence from the emperor's courtiers; was banished thence to the monastery of Hyacinthus, at Nice, A.D. 1273; was afterwards taken back to Constantinople, and beaten and paraded ignominiously through the streets. In A.D. 1283, after the accession of Andronicus II, Palæologus, son of Michael, who pursued with respect to the union of the churches an opposite policy to that of his father, Holobolus appeared in the Synod of Constantinople, in which Joannes Veccus was deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople, and he took part in the subsequent disputations with that chief of the Latinizing party. Little else is known of Holobolus. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Manuel Palæolŏgus. See Ferrara; Florence, Synod of.

Manuel, Niclaus, or Nicolas, sometimes called Deutsch, one of the most prominent characters in the ecclesiastical history of Switzerland, in the age just preceding the Reformation, was born at Bern in 1484. His real name is conjectured by his biographer, Dr. Grüneisen, to have been *Alleman*, but, as he was illegitimate, it was, for family reasons, changed anagrammatically into that of Manuel. It is further conjectured that he was brought up by his maternal grandfather, Thüring Frickart. He was an artist by profession, but he excelled also as a poet and author. He studied the art of painting at Colmar, under the successors of the celebrated Martin Schön, until the fame of Titian attracted him to Venice, where, about 1511, he became one of his pupils: he is the *Emanuello Tedesco* of Ridolfi and other Italian writers. He is said to have assisted Holbein, in 1515, in his "Dance of Death;" but this is very improbable, as he was himself employed at that time in painting the same subject in the cloister of the Dominican convent at Bern. It was executed in fresco or distemper. The picture consisted of forty-six subjects, forty-one of which were the actual *Todtentanz;* it has long since been destroyed, but the compositions are preserved in prints and copies: the wall on which it was painted was pulled down in 1660. Manuel was an active reformer, and many of these designs are reflections upon the abuses of the Roman Church. He also ornamented his own house with a large fresco, representing Solomon worshipping idols. But of these and several other of his works nothing now remains, except some small water-color copies preserved in the library at Basle. However, either because his pencil did not bring him sufficient for the maintenance of his family, or from his political ardor, he was induced to engage in military and public affairs. He served, as quartermaster or commissary, among the Swiss allies who assisted Francis I in his expedition against Milan, 1522, and was present both at

the storming of Novara and the battle of Bicocca. In the following year he was chosen landvogt of Erlach, and from the year 1526 distinguished himself by his zeal in the cause of the Reformation. From this period he was entirely devoted to that cause, and to his various public employments. He died in 1530, when only forty-six years of age. As a writer he began to distinguish himself in 1509, by various popular poems and songs in the Swiss dialect, full of humor and sharp satire. He is said by some to be the author of a song, which originated in the early part of the 16th century, deriding the belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But though this be doubtful, it is certain that Manuel wielded his pen in support of the Reformation by attacking the gross abuses of the clergy and the licentiousness of monastics. His *Fastnachtsspiele*, or "Dramatic Moralities and Mysteries," which he began to compose about 1522, are marked by the same qualities as his polemical pieces. See Dr. Grüneisen, *Nicolas Manuel, Leben und Werke eines Malers, Dichters, Kriegers, Staatsmannes, und Reformators* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1837); Nagler, *Neues Allgemeines Künstler-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 4 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Manure. Although the Scriptures do not furnish us with many details respecting the state of agriculture in Judæa, yet we may collect from various passages many interesting hints that will enable us to form some idea of the high state of its cultivation. See AGRICULTURE. It is not probable that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of manures from Egypt, but they doubtless adopted and preserved the customs which existed among the previous inhabitants of the country. In the parable of the fig-tree which had for three years been barren, and which the proprietor therefore doomed to be cut down, the gardener is represented as praying for delay, until he should "dig about it and dung it" (Luke xiii, 7). To explain this, Lightfoot quotes the following from the Talmud: "They lay dung to moisten and enrich the soil; dig about the roots of trees; pluck up the suckers; take off the leaves; sprinkle ashes, and smoke under the trees to kill vermin." In addition to the various modes of irrigation, the soil was likewise enriched by means of ashes; to which were added the straw (תֶּבֶן, *tében*), stubble (קַשׁ, *kash*), husks, or chaff (מוֹץ, *môts*), together with the brambles and grass that overspread the land during the sabbatical year; all being reduced by fire and used as manure (Prov. xxiv, 31; Isa. vii, 23; xxxii, 13). The burning over the surface of the land had also another good effect, that of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 57). Dunghills are mentioned in 1 Sam. ii, 8; Ezra vi, 11; Dan. ii, 5; iii, 29, and one of the gates at Jerusalem was called the Dung-gate, from dung being carried out there (Neh. ii, 13). That the soil was manured with dung, we learn from 2 Kings ix, 37; Psa. lxxxiii, 10; Jer. viii, 2; ix, 22; xvi, 4; xxv, 33; Luke xiv, 35. The Israelites had comparatively few horses and few swine, two sources of excellent strong manure. Their animals consisted chiefly of oxen, camels, asses, sheep, and goats. The dung of the cow and camel was used to a considerable extent for fuel, and the dung of the sacrifices was directed to be burned—circumstances calculated to diminish the supply. That salt was used for manure we learn from Matt. v, 13 and Luke xiv, 34, 35, and it would appear that salt was sometimes sown by itself on the land, at others mixed in the dunghill. From the Talmud we learn that a dunghill in a public place exposed the owner to the payment of whatever damage it might occasion, and any person might remove it as a nuisance. Dung might not, during the seventh year, be transported to the neighborhood of the fields intended to be manured. Under certain restrictions it was, however, permitted to fold cattle, for the sake of their manure, upon the lands that required it in the sabbatic year, and it is from this only we learn that the practice existed among the Jews, who would seem more generally to have folded their sheep within walled enclosures (John x, 1–5), the occasional clearance of which must have afforded a principal supply of manure. It would seem that gardens, except a few old rose-gardens, were not allowed within the walls of Jerusalem, on account of the manure they would have required, and "because of the stench," as the Mishnah states, this produced, as well as because of that arising from the weeds thrown out from gardens. From another passage of the Talmud we are informed that the surplus blood of the sacrifices offered in the Temple, that is to say, the blood which was poured out at the foot of the altar, after the altar had been duly sprinkled, was conducted by a subterraneous channel to the outside of the city, and was sold to the gardeners as manure for their gardens; by which we are to understand that the gardeners were allowed to use it on paying the price of a trespass-offering, without which it could not be appropriated to any common use after having been dedicated at the altar. See DUNG.

Manus Mortua. See AMORTISATION.

Manuscripts, BIBLICAL. These are either Hebrew or Greek; we shall treat of them separately, referring for details to subordinate articles, where they are discussed more copiously.

I. *Jewish Manuscripts.*—1. These are divided into (*a.*) *Synagogue rolls* or *sacred copies*, and (*b.*) *Private* or *common copies.*

(*a.*) The synagogue rolls contain the Pentateuch, the appointed sections of the prophets, or the book of Esther, which last is used only at the Feast of Purim. The three are never put together, but are written on separate rolls. They are in the Chaldee or square Hebrew character, without vowels and accents, accompanied with the *puncta extraordinaria*, and having the unusual forms of certain consonants. The parchment is prepared in a particular manner by the hands of Jews only, and made from the hides of *clean* animals, which, when duly wrought, are joined together by thongs made out of the same material. They are then divided into columns, the breadth of which must not exceed half their length. These columns, whose number is prescribed, must be of equal length and breadth among themselves, and contain a certain number of lines, each line having no more than three words. The Talmud contains strict rules concerning the material, the color, the ink, letters, divisions, writing instrument, etc., which are closely followed, especially in the Pentateuch. These rules are extracted from the Talmud, and translated in Adler's *Judæorum Codicis Sacri rite scribendi leges*, etc. (Hamburg, 1779, 8vo). The minuteness of such regulations renders it a most irksome task for the *sopher* or scribe to write out a synagogue roll. The revision of the *Torah*, as the synagogue roll is often called, must be undertaken within thirty days after its transcription, else it is unfit for use. *Three* mistakes on one side or skin are allowable; but should there be *four*, or should there happen to be an error in the *open* and *close* sections of the law, in the position of the songs in Exod. v and Deut. xxii, which are the only portions of the Pentateuch written in poetical lines, then the whole copy is worthless. The great beauty of penmanship exhibited in these synagogue copies has always been admired. They are taken from authentic exemplars, without the slightest deviation or correction. Seldom do they fall into the hands of Christians; since, as soon as they cease to be employed in the synagogue, they are either buried or carefully laid aside, lest they should be profaned by coming into the possession of Gentiles.

(*b.*) Private MSS. are written partly in the *square* or *Chaldee* character, partly in the *Rabbinical*. They are held in far less esteem than the synagogue rolls, and are wont to be denominated *profane* (*pesulim*). Their form is entirely arbitrary. They are in folio, quarto, octavo, and duodecimo. Of those written in the *square character*, the greater number are on parchment, some on

paper. The ink of the letters is always black, but the vowel points are usually written with ink of a different color from that of the consonants. Initial words and letters are frequently decorated with gold and silver colors. The prose parts are arranged in columns; the poetic in parallel numbers. Some copies are without columns. The columns are not always occupied with the Hebrew text alone; for a version is frequently added, which is either written in the text after the manner of verses, or in a column by itself, or in the margin in a smaller character. The number of lines is not prescribed by the Talmud. The upper and lower margin are filled with the Great Masorah, and sometimes with a rabbinical commentary; as also with prayers, psalms, and the like. The external margin is for corrections, scholia, variations, notices of the *haphtaroth* (sections from the prophets), *parshioth* (sections from the law), the commentaries of the rabbins, etc. The inner margin, or that between the columns, is occupied with the Little Masorah. The single books of the O. T. are separated from one another by spaces, except the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which are written continuously. The sections of the law and prophets are generally marked. In the MSS. of different countries the books are differently arranged. These copies generally pass through various hands before they are finished. The consonants proceed from the *sopher* or scribe. When the same person writes both consonants and vowels, as is frequently the case—he never makes them at the same time—the former are finished before he begins to append the latter. The *Keris* in the margin uniformly proceed from the vowel-writer. It is probable that these copies were in no instance made by Christians.

The square character employed in the MSS. of which we have spoken has varieties. The Jews themselves distinguish in the synagogue rolls—1. the *Tam* letter, with sharp corners and perpendicular coronulæ, used among the German and Polish Jews; 2. the *Velshe* letter, more modern than the *Tam*, and rounder, with coronulæ, particularly found in the sacred copies of the Spanish and Oriental Jews. See Old Testament.

2. The age of Hebrew MSS. is not easily determined. It is true that they often contain subscriptions giving an account of the time when they were written, and the name of the scribe, or also of the possessor. But these accounts are often ambiguous, occasionally incorrect. Where they are altogether wanting it is still more difficult to discover the age. In the latter case the character of the writing, the color of the ink, the quality and complexion of the parchment, the absence of the Masorah, of the vowel-points, of the unusual letters, etc., have been chiefly rested upon. Still, however, such particulars are uncertain marks of age.

The oldest Hebrew MS. known to Kennicott or De Rossi was 634 of De Rossi, a mere fragment, containing small portions of Leviticus and Numbers. According to its former possessor, it belongs to the 8th century. So much uncertainty attaches to the internal marks adopted by these two Hebraists that the ages to which they assign several Hebrew MSS. are gratuitous. Since Pinner examined a number of MSS. belonging to the Bible Society of Odessa, older ones are now known. (For the dates of his MSS., see below.) In the imperial public library at St. Petersburg there is a collection of Hebrew MSS. made by Mr. Firkowicz, containing several very ancient ones. The oldest date is in a roll found in a Karaite synagogue in the Crimea, viz. A.D. 489; but that date is very suspicious. Several fragments of rolls give, as the dates of purchase or dedication, A.D. 639, 764, 781, 789, 798, 805, 815, 843, 848.

3. A few of the oldest Hebrew MSS. may be briefly described here. We begin with the

Helali or *Hillel Codex* (סֵפֶר הֲלָאלִי), one of the most ancient and most celebrated codices of the Hebrew Scriptures, which derived its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla (הַלָּאלָה), a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel. Others, however, maintain that it was called *Hilali* because the name of the man who wrote it was *Hillel*. But whatever uncertainty there may be about the derivation of its name, there can hardly be any doubt that it was written A.D. 600, for Sakkuto tells us most distinctly that when he saw the remainder of it (cir. A.D. 1500) the Codex was 900 years old. His words are, "In the year 4956, on the 28th of Ab (1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms that came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books which were written long ago, about the year 600, by R. Moses ben-Hillel (on which account the Codex was called Hilali), in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all the copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of it—viz. the earlier and later prophets—written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimchi, in his Grammar on Numb. xv, 4, says that the Pentateuch of this Codex was extant in Toleti" (*Juchassin*, ed. Filipowski, Lond, 1857, p. 220). The Codex had the Tiberian vowels and accents, Masorah and Nikud glosses, and it served up to A.D. 1500 as a model from which copies were made. The Codex which Haja had in Babylon about A.D. 1000 was conveyed to Leon, in Spain, where the greater part of it became a prey to the fury of the martial hosts who sacked the Jewish dwellings in 1197. The celebrated grammarian, Jacob ben-Eleazar, fixed the renderings of the Biblical text according to this Codex, and the older philologians frequently quote it. Comp. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Lpz. 1859), vi, 132, 229; Fürst, *Geschichte des Karäerthums* (Leipzic, 1869), i, 22, 138; Kimchi, *Radicum Liber ed. Biesenthal et Lebrecht* (Berolini, 1847), p. 26. See Jacob ben-Eleazar.

No. 1, Pinner. This is a Pentateuch roll on leather, containing the five Mosaic books complete. It has no



Odessa MS., No. 1 of Pinner (Mal. iv, 6).

vowels, accents, or Masorah. The roll consists of forty-five pieces. As to the form of the letters, it differs considerably from the present style. This is particularly

observable in the case of א ב ג ד ל מ. The variations in the text from the Masoretic recension are few and inconsiderable. The MS., according to the subscription, was corrected in the year 580, consequently the roll must have been written upwards of 1280 years. It was brought from Derbend, in Daghestan, and is now at St. Petersburg. If the subscription be genuine, it is the oldest MS. known, except that one in the Firkowicz collection dated 489. (See Rule, *Karaites*, p. 100 sq.)

No. 634, De Rossi, quarto. This is but the fragment of a MS., containing Lev. xxi, 19–Numb. i, 50. It is on parchment, without the vowel-points, Masorah, or Keris. It has also no interval between the parshioth or sections. But there are sometimes points between the words. It belongs, in De Rossi's opinion, to the 8th century, and is corroded by age. The character of the letters is intermediate, approaching the German. It is now at Parma.

No. 5, Pinner. This is a roll of the Pentateuch, but incomplete. The writing begins with Numb. xiii, 19. The form of the letters is very different from the present style. It is carelessly written, words and letters being frequently omitted. The subscription states that it was written A.D. 843.

No. 11, Pinner. This is a fragment of a synagogue roll, beginning with Deut. xxxi, 1. The date is 881.

No. 503, De Rossi, in quarto. This is a MS. of the Pentateuch, made up of different pieces. It begins with Gen. xlii, 15, and ends with Deut. xv, 12. There is a chasm in it from Lev. xxi, 19 to Numb. i, 50, because De Rossi separated this portion, thinking it to be older than the rest, and characterized it as an independent fragment by the No. 634. The vowel-points are attached, but not throughout, evidently by the same hand as that which wrote the consonants. There are no traces of the Masorah or Keris. Sometimes its readings have a remarkable agreement with those of the Samaritan text and ancient versions. De Rossi places the various pieces of which it is made up in the 9th and 10th centuries.

No. 3, Pinner, small folio. This MS. contains the greater and lesser prophets, on 225 leaves. Every page is written in two columns, between which, as well as below, and in the outer margin, stands the Masorah. Every column contains twenty-one lines. After each verse are two points, to which, without any interval, a new verse succeeds. The vowels and accents, as well as the greater and lesser Masorah, are wholly different from the Masoretic. The former are placed above the consonants. The first page has a twofold pointing, viz. above and below, but this does not occur again except occasionally in verses or words. From Zech. xiv, 6 to Mal. i, 13 there is no punctuation, and the first three verses of Malachi alone have been pointed much later in the manner now usual. The whole Codex is very correctly written. The form of the consonants differs considerably from the present text. The various readings of this MS., according to Pinner's collation, are numerous and important. The date is 916. Two others in the same collection, Nos. 15 and 17, have the same vowel and accent system, i. e. the Babylonian or Eastern, which originated in the 6th century, and from which, in the 7th, that of the Western, or the school of Tiberias, was developed. Pinsker has written ably on the subject (*Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punktationssystem*, etc., Wien, 1683), reviewed by Fürst in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xviii, 314 sq.

No. 13, Pinner, folio. This is an incomplete MS., consisting of 115 leaves, on good parchment, containing 2 Samuel from vi, 10 to the end, and the books of Kings. Each page has three columns, between which, as also at the sides of the text, stands the Masorah. The vowels and accents are different from those now in use. The text has many and important readings; and the Masorah deserves to be examined. Two points stand after each verse; and 2d succeeds 1st Kings without a vacant space between. An inscription states that the MS. was purchased in 938. It is obviously an important codex.

Codex 590, Kennicott, folio. This MS. contains the Prophets and Hagiographa on parchment. The text has the vowel-points, but apparently from a later hand. The margin does not exhibit the Masorah, but variations are noted here and there. Some books have the final Masorah. The separate books have no titles, and they are arranged in the oldest order, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coming before Isaiah, and Ruth before the Psalms. According to the subscription, it was written A.D. 1019, or 1018 by another reckoning. The MS. is in the imperial library of Vienna.

—, Pinner, small folio. A MS. containing the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa, on good parchment. Every page has three columns, except in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, where there are but two. The text is furnished with vowels and accents, two points standing after each verse. The letters and accents are like those in No. 3 of Pinner. The Great and Little Masorah are in the margins. Being a Karaite MS., it has not been written with great accuracy. Words and verses are sometimes repeated. It is highly ornamented with gold and silver colors. The Codex states that it was written in Egypt in the year 1010.

The most important and oldest Hebrew MSS. collated by Kennicott, Bruns, De Rossi, Pinner, and others, are described in Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, i, 346 sq.; and his *Text of the Old Testament considered*, etc., p. 98 sq. See also the *third* section of Tychsen's *Tentamen de variis Codicum Hebraicorum Vet. Test. MSS. generibus*, etc. (Rostock, 1772, 8vo), in which the learned writer examines the marks of antiquity assumed by Simon, Jablonski, Wolf, Houbigant, Kennicott, and Lilienthal, and shows that the *Masorah alone* is a certain index for determining the age and goodness of Hebrew MSS. See also the same writer's *Beurtheilung der Jahrzahlen in den Hebräisch-Biblischen Handschriften* (Rostock, 1786, 8vo), in which the mode of determining the age of MSS. adopted by Kennicott, Bruns, and De Rossi is rejected; and Schnurrer's *Dissertatio Inauguralis de Codicum Hebræorum Vet. Test. ætate difficulter determinanda* (Tübingen, 1772, 4to), reprinted in his *Dissertationes Philologico-Criticæ* (Gotha and Amsterdam, 1790, 8vo).

Private MSS. written in the *Rabbinical character* are much more recent than the preceding, none of them being older than 500 years. They are on cotton or linen paper, in a *cursive* character, without vowel-points or the Masorah, and with many abbreviations.

The MSS. found among the Chinese Jews are partly synagogue rolls, partly private copies, whose text does not differ from the Masoretic. The Pentateuch of the Malabar Jews, brought from India to England by the late Dr. Buchanan, and described by Mr. Yeates, resembles, on the whole, the usual synagogue rolls of the Jews, except that it is written on red skins. Its text is the Masoretic, with a few unimportant deviations.

Eight exemplars are celebrated among the Jews for their correctness and value. They are now lost, but extracts from them are still preserved. From Jewish writings, and from the margin of some MSS., where a reference is made to them, we learn that they were highly prized for their singular accuracy. They formed the basis of subsequent copies. They are, 1. The Codex of Hillel (see above); 2. The Babylonian Codex; 3. The Codex of Israel; 4. An Egyptian Codex; 5. Codex Sinai; 6. The Pentateuch of Jericho; 7. Codex Sanbuki; 8. The book Taggin.

For a more copious account of Hebrew MSS. we refer to Eichhorn's *Einleitung* (Introduction), vol. ii; Kennicott's *Dissertatio generalis*; Walton's *Prolegomena to the Polyglott*, separately edited by Dathe and Wrangham; Tychsen's *Tentamen*; De Rossi's *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.* etc.; and his *Scholia critica in V. T. libros*, etc.; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung*; Davidson's *Treatise on Biblical Criticism*; and his *Introd. to the Old Test.*, in Horne. See OLD TESTAMENT.

II. *Manuscripts of the Greek Testament.*—1. Those that have descended to our time are either on vellum or paper. The oldest material was the Egyptian papyrus, but even so early as the 4th century the N. T. was written on the skins of animals. This writing material continued in use till the 11th century, when paper began to be employed. Till the 10th century, MSS. were usually written in *capital* or *uncial* letters; then the cursive character came into use. The most ancient copies have no division of words, being written in a continued series of lines. Accents, spirits, and iota, postscribed or subscribed, are also wanting.

2. The whole of the N. T. is contained in very few MSS. Transcribers generally divided it into three parts; the first, containing the four Gospels; the second, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles; the third, the Apocalypse of St. John. The greatest number of MSS. are those which have the four Gospels, because they were most frequently read in the churches. Those containing the Acts and Epistles are also numerous. Such as have the book of Revelation alone are extremely few, because it was seldom read in public.

Greek codices are not often complete in all their parts. They have many chasms. Again, some contain merely detached portions of the N. T., or sections appointed to be read on certain days in the churches. Such codices are called *ἀναγνώσεις* or *ἀναγνώσματα* in Greek; in Latin, *lectionaria*. Those containing lessons from the *Gospels* are called *evangelistaria;* such as were taken from the *Acts*, *πραξαπόστολοι* ; those from the epistles, *epistolaria* or *ἀπόστολοι*.

Several MSS. are accompanied with a Latin translation *interlined*, or in a *parallel column*. Such have been called *bilingues* or *Græco-Latini*.

3. We shall now advert to the *uncial* MS. of the Greek Testament, and to those usually quoted in the examination of the controverted passage 1 John v, 7. The former are marked with the letters of the alphabet, A, B, C, etc.; the latter by the Arabic numerals, 1, 2, 3, etc. (in some late critics by small letters, a, b, c, etc.).

The number of uncial MSS. remaining, though great when compared with the ancient MSS. extant of other writings, is inconsiderable. (See the table in 4, below.) Tischendorf (*N. T.* Præf. cxxx) reckons 40 in the Gospels, of which 5 are entire, B K M S U; 3 nearly entire, E L Δ; 10 contain very considerable portions, A C D F G H V X Γ Λ; of the remainder, 14 contain very small fragments, 8 fragments more (I P Q R Z) or less considerable (N T Y). To these must be added ℵ (*Cod. Sinait.*), which is entire; Σ (Π), a new MS. of Tischendorf (*Not. Cod. Sin.* p. 51–52), which is nearly entire; and Ξ (*Cod. Zacynth.*), which contains considerable fragments of Luke. Tischendorf has likewise obtained 9 additional fragments (*l. c.*). In the Acts there are 12, of which 4 contain the text entire (ℵ A B), or nearly so (E_2); 5 have large fragments (C D H_2 G_2= L_2 and P_2), 3 small fragments. In the Catholic Epistles 7, of which 5, ℵ A B K_2 G_2=L_2 are entire; 2 (C P_2) nearly entire. In the Pauline Epistles there are 18: 1 (ℵ) entire; 3 nearly entire, D_2 L_2 P_2; 7 have very considerable portions, A B C E_3 F_2 G_3 K_2 (but E_3 is of little account); the remaining 7 some fragments. In the Apocalypse 5: 3 entire (ℵ A B_2), 2 nearly entire (C P_2).

According to date these MSS. are classed as follows:

Fourth century: ℵ B.

Fifth century: A C, and some fragments.

Sixth century: D P R Z E_2 D_2 H_3, and 9 smaller fragments.

Seventh century: Some fragments.

Eighth century: E L (Λ) Ξ B_2, and some fragments.

Ninth century: F K M V X Γ Λ Π H_2 G_2=L_2 F_2 G_2 K_2 M_2 P_2, and fragments.

Tenth century: G H S U (E_2).

A complete description of these MSS. is given in the great critical editions of the N. T.: here those only can be briefly noticed which are of primary importance.

(*a.*) *Uncials.*

ℵ, *Codex Sinaiticus* (*Cod. Frid. Aug.* of the Sept.) at St. Petersburg, obtained by Tischendorf from the convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in 1859. The fragments of the Sept. published as *Cod. Frid. Aug.* (1846) were obtained at the same place by Tischendorf in 1844. The N. T. is entire, and the Epistle of Barnabas and parts of the Shepherd of Hermas are added. The whole MS. was published in 1862 by Tischendorf, at the expense of the emperor of Russia. It is probably the oldest of the MSS. of the N. T., and of the 4th century (Tischendorf, *Not. Cod. Sin.* 1860). See Sinaitic Manuscript.

A, *Codex Alexandrinus* (British Museum), a MS. of the entire Greek Bible, with the Epistles of Clement added. It was given by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I in 1628, and is now in the British Museum. It contains the whole of the N. T. with some chasms: Matt. i.–xxv, 6, *ἐξέρχεσθε* ; John vi, 50, *ἵνα*–viii, 52, *λέγει*; 2 Cor. iv, 13, *ἐπίστευσα*–xii, 6, *ἐξ ἐμοῦ*. It was probably written in the first half of the 5th century. The N. T. has been published by Woide (1786, fol.), and with some corrections by Cowper (1860, 8vo). Compare Wetstein, *Proleg.* p. 13–30 (ed. Lotze). See Alexandrian Manuscript.

B, *Codex Vaticanus* (No. 1209), a MS. of the Greek Bible, which seems to have been in the Vatican Library almost from its commencement (cir. A.D. 1450). It contains the N. T. entire to Heb. ix, 14, *καθα* ; the rest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Apocalypse were added in the 15th century. Various collations of the New Test. were made by Bartolocci (1669), by Mico for Bentley (cir. 1720), whose collation was in part revised by Rulotta (1726), and by Birch (1788). An edition of the whole MS., on which Mai had been engaged for many years, was published three years after his death in 1858 (5 vols. 4to, ed. Vercellone; N. T. reprinted, London and Leipsic). Mai had himself kept back the edition (printed 1828–1838), being fully conscious of its imperfections, and had prepared another edition of the N. T., which was published also by Vercellone and others in 1859 (8vo). This was revised by Tischendorf (Lpz. 1867). The whole of Codex B is to be published by authority of the pope, and the N.-T. part has already appeared (Rome, 1868), nearly complete. The MS. is assigned to the 4th century (Tischendorf, *N. T.* p. cxxxvi–cxlix). See Vatican Manuscript.

The Apocalypse in these last editions is taken from *Codex Vaticanus*, 2066 (formerly *Codex Basilianus*, 105), in the Vatican Library. It belongs to the 8th century (see Tischendorf's *N. T.* p. cxlii sq. [7th ed.]).

C, *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus* (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 9), a palimpsest MS. which contains fragments of the Sept. and of every part of the N. T. In the 12th century the original writing was effaced, and some Greek writings of Ephraem Syrus were written over it. The MS. was brought to Florence from the East at the beginning of the 16th century, and came thence to Paris with Catherine de Medici. Wetstein was engaged to collate it for Bentley (1716), but it was first fully examined by Tischendorf, who published the N. T. in 1843; the O.-T. fragments in 1845. The only entire books which have perished are 2 Thess. and 2 John, but lacunæ of greater or less extent occur constantly. It is of about the same date as the *Codex Alex.* See Ephraem Manuscript.

D (of the Gospels), *Codex Bezæ* (University Library, Cambridge), a Græco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and Acts, with a small fragment of 3 John, presented to the University of Cambridge by Beza in 1581. Some readings from it were obtained in Italy for Stephens's edition, but afterwards Beza found it at the sack of Lyons in 1562, in the Monastery of St. Irenæus. The text is very remarkable, and, especially in the Acts, abounds in sin-

gular interpolations. The MS. has many lacunæ. It was edited in a splendid form by Kipling (1793, 2 vols. fol.), but so imperfectly that it has been published anew under the care of the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (Cambr. 1864, 4to). The MS. is referred to the 6th century. Comp. Credner, *Beiträge*, i, 452–518; Bornemann, *Acta Apostolorum*, 1848; Schulz, *De Codice D, Cantab.* 1827. See CAMBRIDGE MANUSCRIPT.

D_2 (of the Epistles), *Codex Claromontanus*, or *Regius* (in the Imperial Library at Paris, 107), marked by the same letter of the alphabet as the preceding, but containing a different part of the N. T., viz., all Paul's Epistles with the exception of a few verses. It is a Greek-Latin MS., written stichometrically, with accents and breathings, but without division into words. According to Montfaucon, it belongs to the 7th century, but Tischendorf assigns it to the 6th. The text was edited by the latter scholar in 1852, and is very valuable. Various correctors may be traced, but it is not always easy to distinguish them. The first readings are of course the principal ones (see the prolegomena to Tischendorf's edition). See CLERMONT MANUSCRIPT.

E (of the Gospels), *Codex Basiliensis* (K, iv, 35 in the public library at Basle). It contains the Gospels, with a very few chasms in Luke's. In some parts smaller writing has taken the place of the older. It belongs to the middle of the 8th century, and was collated by Tischendorf in 1843. See his description in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1844. See BASILEAN MANUSCRIPT.

E_2 (of the Acts), *Codex Laudianus*, a Greek-Latin MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The text is written stichometrically. It contains the Acts, and has a hiatus from xxvi, 29 to xxviii, 26. Its age is the end of the 6th century, as Tischendorf supposes; or the 7th, as Wetstein prefers. The readings are very valuable. Hearne published an edition at Oxford (1715, 8vo), and Tischendorf proposes to publish it more correctly in a future volume of his *Monumenta Sacra;* but Scrivener has undertaken a new edition. See LAUDIAN MANUSCRIPT.

E_3 (of the Epistles), *Codex Sangermanensis* (in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg), a very incorrect transcript of the Codex Claromontanus, and therefore possessing no authority or importance. It appears to belong to the 10th century.

F (of the Gospels), *Codex Boreeli*, now in the library of Utrecht, containing the Gospels, but with many chasms. It was collated and described by Heringa, whose work was published by Vinke (1843). The MS. belongs to the end of the 9th century. See BOREEL'S MANUSCRIPT.

F^a, *Codex Coislinianus*, containing a few fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, found among the scholia of Codex Coislin. 1, which has the Octateuch, with the book of Kings. They were edited by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita* (1846), p. 400 sq. The fragments belong to the 7th century. See COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 1.

F^b, in the British Museum, 17,136, a *rescript* fragment from the Nitrian desert, containing a few places of John's Gospel, which were deciphered and published by Tischendorf in his *Monum. ined.* vol. ii. The text agrees with the most ancient and best authorities. Tischendorf assigns the fragment to the 4th century; it rather belongs to the 5th.

F_2 (of the Epistles), *Codex Augiensis*, a Greek-Latin MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It wants the Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek, and Romans i, 1–iii, 18. Dots are inserted between many of the Greek and Latin words. The text is ancient and valuable. It belongs to the 9th century. In 1842 and 1849 it was collated by Tischendorf, and edited by Scrivener (1859). See AUGIAN MANUSCRIPT.

G (of the Gospels), *Codex Harleianus* (5684 in the British Museum), a MS. of the four Gospels, but imperfect in many places. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles and Tischendorf.

G_2 (of the Epistles), *Cod. Boernerianus*, a Greek-Latin MS. of Paul's Epistles, now in the Royal Library of Dresden. It has the same chasms as F, Augiensis, with which it agrees remarkably, so that both texts seem to have proceeded from the same copy. They belong to one country and age—probably to Switzerland and the 9th century. Matthæi published it in 1791, 8vo. See BOERNER MANUSCRIPT.

H (of the Gospels), *Codex Seidelii*, II, a MS. of the four Gospels in the public library of Hamburg. It is imperfect in many places, belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles in 1850.

H_2 (of the Acts), *Codex Mutinensis* (196 in the Ducal Library of Modena), a MS. of the Acts, with considerable gaps. Its age is the 9th century. From Acts xxvii, 4 till the end was supplied in uncial letters in the 11th century. The Pauline and Catholic Epistles were added in cursive letters in the 15th or 16th century. Tischendorf collated it in 1843.

H_3 (of the Epistles), *Codex Coislinianus* (202 in the Imperial Library at Paris). This MS. contains fragments of Paul's Epistles. It consists only of twelve leaves, two which it formerly had being now at Petersburg. Another leaf was recently brought by Tischendorf from Mount Athos, containing Col. iii, 4–11. The fifteen leaves should be put together. It has been collated by Tischendorf, who intends to publish it all. It belongs to the 6th century. See COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 2.

I, a MS. in the library of St. Petersburg, found by Tischendorf on his travels in the East. It is a *rescript*, containing the remains of seven very ancient MSS. exhibiting parts of the Gospels, Acts, and two Pauline Epistles. Tischendorf thinks that the first, second, and third belong to the 5th century. All are edited by him in the first volume of *Monumenta Sacra*, p. 1, etc.

I^b. See N^b.

K (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius*, or *Cyprius* (now 63 in the Imperial Library of Paris). It contains the four Gospels complete, belongs to the middle of the 9th century, and was accurately collated by Tischendorf in 1842. See PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.

K_2 (of the Epistles), *Codex Mosquensis* (xcviii in the Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), containing the Catholic and Pauline Epistles. It belongs to the 9th century, and was collated by Matthæi.

L (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius* (62 in the Imperial Library at Paris), containing the Gospels entire with the exception of five places. The text of this codex contains very old and good readings, agreeing remarkably with B. It belongs to the 8th century, and was published by Tischendorf in his *Monum. Sacra*, 1846, p. 57. See PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.

L_2 (of the Acts and Epistles), *Codex Bibliothecæ Angelicæ* (A 2, 15 in the library of the Augustine monks at Rome), a MS. containing the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and those of Paul. It begins with Acts viii, 10, and ends with Hebrews xiii, 10. Its age is the 9th century. It was first collated with care by Fleck; afterwards by Tischendorf and Tregelles.

M (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius* (48 in the Imperial Library of Paris), containing the Gospels entire. This MS. has been transcribed by Tischendorf, but is not yet published. He assigns it to the latter part of the 9th century. See PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.

M_2 (of the Epistles), two fragments; one at Hamburg, the other at London. The former contains some parts of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the latter, portions of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Both were published by Tischendorf in his *Anecdota Sacra*, p. 174 sq. The text is both ancient and valuable.

N (of the Gospels), *Codex purpureus*, the fragment of a MS., of which four leaves are in the British Museum, six in the Vatican, and two at Vienna. Tischendorf has recently found 33 leaves more, containing about a third of the entire Gospel of Mark, between vi, 53 and xv, 3. The letters were silver on purple vellum. They are larger and rounder than in A B C. The text is in

two columns. The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are placed in the margin. All contain portions of the Gospels. The contents of the twelve leaves were published by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta inedita*, who assigns the fragment to the end of the 6th century. See PURPLE MANUSCRIPT.

N_2 (of the Epistles), a fragment consisting of two leaves, with Gal. v and vi, and Heb. v and vi. Assigned by Tischendorf to the 9th century.

N^b [Tisch. I^b] (Brit. Mus. *Add.* 17, 136), a palimpsest of the 4th or 5th century, deciphered by Tregelles, and published by Tischendorf (*Mon. Ined.* vol. ii).

N^c, a few fragments, now at Moscow, of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Tischendorf thinks they may be of the 6th century, but Matthæi did not state enough to determine their age.

O, a small fragment, consisting of two leaves, containing 2 Cor. i, 20–ii, 12, belonging to the 9th century.

O^t, *Codex Mosquensis* (cxx, at Moscow), a fragment consisting of eight leaves, containing a few parts of John's Gospel; probably of the 9th century. Matthæi published the text.

O^a, the two hymns, Luke i, 46–55 and i, 68–79, in a Latin MS. containing the grammar of Pompeius. They are written in uncial Greek letters, and belong to the 9th century. Tischendorf published them in his *Anecdota sacra et profana*, p. 206 sq.

O^b, the same two hymns, together with a third, Luke ii, 29–32, in a Psalter in the Bodleian Library, No. 120, belonging to the 9th century. See Tischendorf, *Anecdota*, p. 206.

O^c, the hymn of Mary, Luke i, 46–55, contained in the Verona Psalter, and belonging to the 6th century. The Greek is in Latin letters. It was published by Blanchini in the *Psalterium duplex* appended to his *Vindiciæ canonicarum Scripturarum* (Romæ, 1740).

O^d, the three hymns of Luke i and ii, as contained in the Psalter of Turin, written in gold and silver letters, belonging to the 7th century. Tischendorf is about to publish the entire Psalter.

O^e, the same three hymns in a St.-Gall Codex, 17, written partly in Greek and partly in Latin. Tischendorf assigns the MS. to the 9th century.

P (of the Gospels), *Codex Guelpherbytanus*, A (in the library of Wolfenbüttel), a palimpsest MS. containing fragments of the Gospels. In 1762 Knittel published all he could read. In 1854 Tischendorf succeeded in deciphering almost all the portions of the Gospels that exist, which he has published in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita* (1860). See below, Q.

P_2 (of the Acts and Epistles), a MS. of the Acts, Catholic and Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, belonging to the library of bishop Uspenski in St. Petersburg. This is a valuable palimpsest, consisting of upwards of 300 leaves. Though belonging to the 9th century, the text, except in 1 Peter and Acts, agrees with that of the oldest codices. The Epistles were published in 1865, and the Acts and Rev. in 1869, by Tischendorf, in his *Monum. Sacra*.

Q, *Codex Guelpherbytanus*, B, another palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke and John's Gospels, discovered by Knittel, and published with the last fragments. Tischendorf is about to re-edit it in a more complete and accurate state. According to him, P belongs to the 6th, and Q to the 5th century. See WOLFENBÜTTEL MANUSCRIPTS.

Q′, a papyrus fragment, containing parts of 1 Cor. i, vi, vii, belonging to the 5th or 6th century.

R, a rescript MS. belonging to the British Museum, brought from the Nitrian desert, with many other codices, chiefly Syriac ones. The Syriac text of Severus of Antioch was written over it. The forty-eight leaves contain parts of Luke's Gospel. The writing is in two columns; and the Ammonian sections have not the canons of Eusebius. Tischendorf published *almost* the whole text (for some of it is illegible) in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, vol. ii. Dr. Wright found three leaves overlooked by Tischendorf, of which he gave an account in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for January, 1864. It is assigned to the 6th century, but may belong to the 7th.

S, *Codex Vaticanus*, 354. This MS. contains the four Gospels entire. It is in the Vatican Library, where Birch carefully collated it twice for his Greek Testament. A subscription to it states that it was written A.D. 949. See Tischendorf, in the *Annales Vindobon.* (1847), where a fac-simile better than those of Blanchini and Birch is given.

T, *Codex Borgianus* (1 in the library of the Propaganda at Rome), a MS. of thirteen leaves, containing fragments of John's Gospel. The Greek text has a *Thebaic translation* by its side. Giorgi published the text in 1789 at Rome. Tischendorf, who inspected the MS. and made a fac-simile of it, assigns it to the 5th century. See BORGIAN MANUSCRIPT.

T^b, six leaves, containing John i, ii, iii, iv, belonging to the 6th century.

T^c, two leaves, containing Matt. xiv, xv, belonging to the 6th century. The writing and text resemble those of the Borgian fragments.

T^d, fragments of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, from Borgian MSS. of the 7th century.

T^s, *Fragmentum Woideanum*, a few leaves, Greek and Sahidic, whose text was edited by Woide (contained in the Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus, 1799). The one contains Luke xii, 15–xiii, 32; the other, John viii, 33–42. Tischendorf has discovered that these fragments are parts of T, published by Giorgi. Hence they belong to the same time.

U, *Codex Venetus Marcianus*, formerly *Nanianus* (in St. Mark's Library at Venice), a MS. of the Gospels complete, with a text elegantly written. It was first collated accurately by Tischendorf in 1843, and again by Tregelles in 1846. According to Tischendorf it belongs to the end of the 9th or to the 10th century.

V, *Codex Mosquensis* (in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), a MS. of the four Gospels, with several chasms. From John vii, 39 has been supplied by a more recent hand of the 13th century, in cursive letters. It belongs to the 9th century, and was twice collated by Matthæi.

W^a, two leaves at the end of *Codex Regius*, now in the Imperial Library of Paris. They contain Luke ix, 34–47; x, 12–22, and are the fragment of a continuous MS. of the Gospels belonging to the 8th century. Tischendorf has edited the whole in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*.

W^b, *Codex Neapolitanus rescriptus*, consisting of fourteen leaves which contain fragments of the first three Gospels as old as the 8th century. Tischendorf edited some verses of it in the *Annales Vindobonenses* (1847); and it is described by Scotti. Tischendorf supposes that the leaves belong to the same MS. as W^a.

W^c, three leaves at *St. Gall*, containing fragments of Mark and Luke. They are a sort of palimpsest, the writing having been effaced, though nothing new was written over. Tischendorf, who copied, and intends to edit these fragments, assigns them to the 9th century.

W^d, fragments of Mark's Gospel, vii, viii, ix, found in Trinity College, Cambridge, belonging to the 9th century.

X, *Codex Monacensis*, in the library of the University of Munich, containing fragments of the four Gospels. Commentaries of several fathers, especially Chrysostom, accompany the text, except Mark's. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century. Between John ii, 22 and vii, 1, is supplied by a later hand of the 12th century. The MS. was collated by Tischendorf and Tregelles. See MUNICH MANUSCRIPT.

Y, *Codex Barberinus*, No. 225, six leaves containing fragments of John's Gospel, belonging to the 8th century, copied by Tischendorf in 1843, and published in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, 1846. They are now in the Barberinian Library at Rome.

Z, *Codex Dublinensis*, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, a palimpsest, containing fragments of Matthew's Gospel, and belonging to the 6th century. The text of this MS. presents ancient and valuable readings. It was published in fac-simile by Barrett, 1801, 4to, and Tregelles has since (1853) deciphered the remainder (*Printed Text*, p. 166 sq.). See DUBLIN MANUSCRIPT.

Γ, a MS., now in the Bodleian Library, consisting of 157 leaves large 4to. It contains Luke's Gospel entire, and parts of the other three. The form of the letters resembles the *Codex Cyprius* or K. Tischendorf, who got it in the East, assigns it to the 9th century. He collated and described it in *Anecdota sacra et profana*.

The second half of this MS. has recently been found, containing the greatest part of Matthew and John. The date is 844.

Δ. *Codex Sangallensis*, a Greek-Latin MS. in the library of St. Gall, containing the four Gospels entire, with the exception of John xix, 17–35. It is very similar in character to G (*Cod. Boernerianus*), both belonging to the same age and country, i. e. they were written in the monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, in the 9th century. Rettig published it at Zürich, in fac-simile, in 1836. This MS., with the codices Augiensis and Boernerianus, are portions of one and the same document. See GALL, ST., MANUSCRIPT.

Θ. *Codex Tischendorfianus I*, in the library of Leipzic University, consisting of four leaves, of which the third is almost decayed, containing a few fragments of Matthew's Gospel. Tischendorf assigns them to the end of the 7th century. He published the contents in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, p. 1, etc.

Θ^b, a fragment, containing six leaves, with Matt. xxii and xxiii, and Mark iv, belonging to the 7th century.

Θ^c, two leaves, containing Matt. xxi, 19–24, and John xviii, 29–35, belonging to the 6th century.

Θ^d, a small fragment of the 8th century, containing Luke xi.

Θ^e, a fragment of Matt. xxvi, of the 6th century.

Θ^f, four leaves, containing Matt. xxvi, xxvii, Mark i and ii. Of the 6th century.

Θ^g, a fragment of John vi, belonging to the 6th century.

Θ^h, a Greek-Arabic MS., containing three leaves, with Matt. xiv and xxv, belonging to the 9th century.

Λ, a MS. in the Bodleian Library, containing the Gospels of Luke and John entire. It consists of 157 leaves, and belongs to the 9th century. Tischendorf and Tregelles have collated it.

Π, a valuable MS. of the Gospels, almost complete, brought by Tischendorf from Smyrna to St. Petersburg. It belongs to the 9th century. (See Tischendorf's *Notitia editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici*, etc., p. 51.)

Ξ, *Codex Zacynthius*, a palimpsest containing fragments of Luke's Gospel, belonging to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. It is of the 8th century, and is accompanied by a *catena* of the 13th. Tregelles transcribed and published the fragments (1861). See ZACYNTHIAN MANUSCRIPT.

Such are the *uncial* MSS. hitherto collated. Their number is not great, but every year is adding to it. There are known upwards of a hundred uncials, including evangelistaria and apostoli. (See the table below.)

4. The number of the *cursive* MSS. (*minuscules*) in existence cannot be accurately calculated. Tischendorf catalogues about 500 of the Gospels, 200 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, 250 of the Pauline Epistles, and a little less than 100 of the Apocalypse (exclusive of lectionaries); but this enumeration can only be accepted as a rough approximation. Many of the MSS. quoted are only known by old references; still more have been "inspected" most cursorily; few only have been thoroughly collated. In this last work the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (*Collation of about 20 MSS. of the Holy Gospels*, Camb. 1853; *Cod. Aug.* etc., Camb. 1859) has labored with the greatest success, and removed many common errors as to the character of the later text. His summary is as follows:

	Uncial.	Cursive.	Duplicates already deducted.
Gospels	34	601	32
Act. Cath. Epp.	10	229	12
Paul	14	283	14
Apoc.	4	102	..
Evangelistaria	58	183	6
Apostoli	7	65	..
Total	127	1463	64

Among the MSS. which are well known and of great value the following are the most important:

A. Primary Cursives of the *Gospels:*

1 (Act. 1; Paul. 1; *Basileensis*, K. iii, 3). 10th cent. Very valuable in the Gospels. Collated by Roth and Tregelles.

33 (Act. 13; Paul. 17; Paris, Bibl. Imp. 14). 11th cent. Coll. by Tregelles.

59 (Coll. Gonv. et Cai. Cambr.). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener, 1860, but as yet unpublished.

69 (Act. 31; Paul. 37; Apoc. 14; *Cod. Leicestrensis*). 14th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable. Coll. by Tregelles, 1852, and by Scrivener, 1855, who published his collation in *Cod. Aug.* etc., 1859.

118 (Bodleian. Miscell. 13; Marsh 24). 13th cent. Coll. by Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* i, ccii sq.

124 (Cæsar. Vindob. Nessel. 188). 12th cent. Coll. by Treschow, Alter, Birch.

127 (Cod. Vaticanus, 349). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch.

131 (Act. 70; Paul. 77; Apoc. 66; Cod. Vaticanus, 360). 11th cent. Formerly belonged to Aldus Manutius, and was probably used by him in his edition. Coll. by Birch.

157 (Cod. Urbino-Vat. 2). 12th cent. Coll. by Birch.

218 (Act. 65; Paul. 57; Apoc. 33; Cæsar-Vindob. 23). 13th cent. Coll. by Alter.

238, 259 (Moscow, S. Synod. 42, 45). 11th cent. Coll. by Matthæi.

262, 300 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 53, 186). 10th and 11th cent. Coll. (?) by Scholz.

346 (Milan, *Ambros.* 23). 12th cent. Coll. (?) by Scholz.

2pe (St. Petersburg. *Petropol.* vi, 470). 9th cent. Coll. by Muralt. (Transition cursive.)

^{c}scr, ^{g}scr (Lambeth, 1177, 528, Wetstein, 71). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

^{p}scr (Brit. Mus. Burney, 20). 13th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

^{w}scr (Cambr. Coll. SS. Trin. B. x, 16). 14th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

To these must be added the Evangelistarium (B. M. Burney, 22), marked ^{y}scr, coll. by Scrivener. (Cut, fig. 4.)

The following are valuable, but need careful collation:

13 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 50). Coll. 1797. 12th cent. (Comp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* i, cliv–clxvi.)

22 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 72). 11th cent.

28 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 379). Coll. by Scholz.

72 (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5647). 11th cent.

106 (Cod. Winchelsea). 10th cent. Coll. by Jackson (used by Wetstein), 1748.

113, 114 (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 1810, 5540).

126 (Cod. Guelpherbytanus, xvi, 16). 11th cent.

130 (Cod. Vaticanus, 359). 13th cent.

209 (Act. 95; Paul. 138; Apoc. 46; Venice, Bibl. S. Marci, 10). 15th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable.

225 (Vienna, *Bibl. Imp.* Kollar. 9, Forlos. 31). 12th cent.

372, 382 (Rome, Vatican. 1161, 2070). 15th and 13th cent.

405, 408, 409 (Venice, S. Marci, i, 10, 14, 15). 11th and 12th cent.

B. Primary Cursives of the *Acts and Catholic Epistles:*

13=Gosp. 33, Paul. 17.

31=Gosp. 69 (*Codex Leicestrensis*).

65=Gosp. 218.

73 (Paul. 80. Vatican. 367). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch.

95, 96 (Venet. 10, 11). 14th and 11th cent. Coll. by Rinck.

180 (Argentor. Bibl. Sem. M.). Coll. by Arendt.

^{l}oti=^{p}scr 61 (Tregelles, Brit. Mus. *Add.* 20,003). 11th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. See cut, fig. 2.

^{a}scr (Lambeth, 1182). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

^{c}scr (Lambeth, 1184). Coll. by Sanderson ap. Scrivener.

The following are valuable, but require more careful collation:

5 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 106).

25, 27 (Paul. 31; Apoc. 7; Paul. 33. Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5537, 5620). Comp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* ii, 184, 185.

29 (Paul. 35; Genev. 20). 11th and 12th cent.

36 (*Coll. Nov.* Oxon.).

40 (Paul. 46; Apoc. 12. Alex. Vatican. 179). 11th cent. Coll. by Zacagni.

66 (Paul. 67).

68 (Paul. 73, Upsal). 12th and 11th cent.

69 (Paul. 74; Apoc. 30; Guelph. xvi, 7). 14th and 13th cent.

81 (Berberini, 377). 11th cent.

137 (Milan, *Ambros.* 97). 11th cent. Coll. by Scholz.

142 (Mutinensis, 243). 12th cent.

(1.)

(2.)



(3.)



(4.)



Specimens of Greek MSS. from the 10th to the 14th century, now in the British Museum: Fig. 1 is from the Harleian Evangelistary, No. 5598, and contains John i, 1, 2 (Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 218, No. "150"). Fig. 2 is from Add. 20,003, and contains Acts xiii, 18–20 (Scrivener, p. 198, No. "*lo^{u}"). Fig. 3, from Harleian Evangelistary, No. 5540, contains John i, 1–3 (Scrivener, p. 157, No. "115"). Fig. 4, from Burney Lectionary, 22, contains John i, 1–3 (Scrivener, p. 220, No. "*y^{scr}").

C. Primary Cursives in the *Pauline Epistles:*
17=Gosp. 33.
37=Gosp. 69 (*Codex Leicestrensis*).
57=Gosp. 218.
108, 109=Act. 95, 96.
115, 116 (Act. 100, 101, Mosqu. Matt. d. f.).
137 (Gosp. 263; Act. 117, Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 61).

The following are valuable, but require more careful collation:
5=Act. 5.
23 (Paris, Coislin. 28). 11th cent. Descr. by Montfaucon.
31 (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5537)=l^{scr}, Apoc. 13th cent.
39 (Act. 33. Oxford, Coll. Lincoln. 2).
46=Act. 40.
47 (Oxford, Bodleian. Roe, 16). 11th cent.
55 (Act. 46. Monacensis).
67 (Act. 66. Vindob. Lambec. 34). The corrections are especially valuable.
70 (Act. 67. Vindob. Lambec. 37).
71 (Vindob. Forlos. 19). 12th cent.
73 (Act. 68).
80 (Act. 73. Vatican. 367).
177–8–9 (Mutin.).

D. Primary Cursives of the *Apocalypse:*
7=l^{scr} (Act. 25. Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5537). 11th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.
14=Gosp. 69 (*Cod. Leicestrensis*).
31=c^{scr} (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5678). 15th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.
38 (Vatican. 579). 13th cent. Coll. by B. H. Alford.
47 (Cod. Dresdensis). 11th cent. Coll. by Matthæi.
51 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.*). Coll. by Reiche.
g^{scr} (Parham, 17). 11th and 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.
m^{scr} (Middlehill)=87. 11th and 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

The following are valuable, but require more careful collation:
2 (Act. 10; Paul. 12; Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 237).
6 (Act. 23; Paul. 28. Bodleian. Barocc. 3). 12th and 13th cent.
11 (Act. 39; Paul. 45).
12=Act. 40.
17, 19 (Ev. 35; Act. 14; Paul. 18; Act. 17; Paul. 21. Paris. Coislin. 199, 205).
28 (Bodleian. Barocc. 48).
36 (Vindob. Forlos. 29). 14th cent.
41 (Alex. Vatican. 68). 14th cent.
46=Gosp. 209.
82 (Act. 179; Paul. 128; Monac. 211).

5. MSS. are sometimes divided by the critics of Germany into, 1. Such as were written before the practice of *stichometry*, a mode of dividing the text in lines or clauses. See STICHOMETRY. 2. The *stichometrical*. 3. Those written after *stichometry* had ceased. So Hug and De Wette, in their Introductions to the N. T. According to this classification, ℵ, A, B, and C belong to the first class; D, D_2, etc., to the second; and by far the greatest number to the third. We have alluded to them under the two great heads of *uncial* and *cursive*.

In examining MSS. and comparing their characteristic readings, it is not easy in every instance to arrive at the true original form of a passage. Many circumstances are to be taken into account, and many cautions to be observed. They are more useful in detecting interpolated passages than in restor-

ing the correct reading. The reading of an older MS. is preferable *cæteris paribus*. In determining the age of a MS. internal marks are chiefly followed, such as the form of the letters, the divisions, abbreviations, the nature of the lines, the presence or absence of the accents, etc. These particulars, however, are not safe criteria. Age alone is not sufficient to insure the value of the text of a MS. The copyist may have been guilty of negligence or inattention. In proportion to his accuracy or carelessness the authority of the codex will be greater or less. Again, a document certainly copied from one which is very ancient will have greater authority than an earlier taken from another of no great antiquity. Thus a MS. of the *eighth* century may have been directly copied from one of the *fifth*, and consequently the former will be entitled to greater estimation than one belonging to the 7th century transcribed from one of the 6th. In determining the value of a codex, it is usual to refer to the country where it was written. Griesbach and others prefer the *African;* Scholz, the *Constantinopolitan*. Those written in Egypt are the best. With respect to Hebrew MSS., it is admitted by all that the Spanish are the best. The Italian, again, are superior to the German. The reading contained in the greater number of MSS. is preferable to that of a less number. *Mere majority*, however, is not a safe criterion. A majority arising from *independent sources*, or, in other words, of those belonging to *different recensions*, can alone be relied on as decisive. But here critics are not agreed as to the number of *recensions* belonging to Greek MSS. Some have proposed four, some three, others two. Besides, the same MS. may belong to a different recension in different parts of itself. In others, the characteristic readings of two or three recensions are mingled together, rendering it difficult to determine which recension or family preponderates. Hebrew MSS. belong to one and the same recension. It is true that some have distinguished them into *Masoretic* and *Ante-masoretic*, but the existence of the latter is a mere fiction. One great family alone, viz. the *Masoretic*, can be distinctly traced. Since the time of Lachmann's first edition, greater importance has been attached by N.-T. critics to the age of MSS. It has been the object of his followers in the same department to adhere for the most part to the oldest copies. This is right within certain limits. The true text of the N. T., as far as we can now obtain it, lies in the MSS. of the 4th till the 8th centuries, accompanied and modified by the testimony of ancient versions and fathers during that period. But within this period we can easily distinguish MSS. of a second order in goodness, viz. E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, from those of the first class, א, A, B, C, Z (see Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, vol. ii). See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Ma'och (Heb. *Maok'*, מָעוֹךְ, *compressed;* Sept. Ἀμμάχ, Vulg. *Maoch*), the father of the Achish king of Gath to whom David repaired for safety (1 Sam. xxvii, 2). B.C. ante 1054. By many he has been confounded with the MAACAH of 1 Kings ii, 39. See ACHISH.

Ma'on (Heb. *Maön'*, מָעוֹן, *habitation*, as often; Sept. Μαών), the name of a man and of a place. See also MAONITE.

1. The son of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah and family of Caleb, and the "father" (i. e. founder) of Bethzur (1 Chron, ii, 45). B.C. prob. post 1618.

2. A town in the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 55), which gave name to a wilderness (part of the desert of Judæa), where David hid himself from Saul, and around which the churlish Nabal had great possessions (1 Sam. xxiii, 24, 25; xxv, 2). Josephus calls it *Emma* (Ἔμμᾶ, *Ant.* vi, 13, 6). Eusebius and Jerome place it to the east of Daroma (*Onomast.* s. v. Μαών, Maon). Irby and Mangles were in the neighborhood in 1818, but did not detect this and other ancient names. Robinson finds it in the present *Main*, which is about seven miles south by east from Hebron. Here there is a conical hill about 200 feet high, on the top of which are some ruins of no great extent, consisting of foundations of hewn stone, a square enclosure, the remains probably of a tower or castle, and several cisterns. The view from the summit is extensive. The traveller found here a band of peasants keeping their flocks, and dwelling in caves amid the ruins (*Bibl. Researches*, ii, 190–196). With this identification De Saulcy (*Narrative*, i, 441) and Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 106) agree. See MEHUNIM.

Ma'onite (Heb. same word as MAON, used collectively; Sept. and Vulg. interpret Χαναάν [v. r. Μαδιάμ], *Chanaan*, Auth. Vers. "Maonites"), an Arabian tribe mentioned in connection with the Amalekites, Sidonians, Philistines, and others as having oppressed the Hebrews (Judg. x, 12). They are the same as the MEUNITES (מְעוֹנִים, *Meünim'*, the plural of MAON; Sept. Μιναῖοι, confounding them with the Ammonites; Vulg. *Ammonitæ*, and *tabernacula;* Auth. Vers. "Mehunims," and "the habitations"), elsewhere mentioned in a similar connection (2 Chron. xxvi, 27; 1 Chron. iv, 41). See also MEHUNIM. At the present day there exists a town called *Ma'an*, with a castle, in Arabia Petræa, to the south of the Dead Sea (see Seetzen, in Zach's *Monatl. Corresp.* xviii, 382; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 437). Prof. Robinson says, "Ma'an, the well-known town on the route of the Syrian Haj, nearly east of wady Musa, is with good reason assumed as the probable seat of the Maonites mentioned in the Scriptures. Abulfeda (*Syr.* p. 14) describes Ma'an as inhabited by Ommiades and their vassals" (*Researches*, ii, 572). That the *Minæi* of Arabia (Diod. Sic. iii, 42; Ptol. vi, 7, 23; Strabo, xvi, 768) are a different people has long since been shown by Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 23). Traces of the name *Maon* are found in several localities besides that of the above passages. It is given to a town in the south of Judah, now identified with the ruins of Tell Main (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 61). In pronouncing a prophetic curse upon Moab, Jeremiah mentions Beth-meon (xlviii, 23), which may perhaps be the same as the Beth-baal-meon of Josh. xiii, 17, and the Baal-meon of Numb. xxxii, 38, and would thus be identical with the ruin Main, three miles south of Heshbon. See BETH-BAAL-MEON. Hence "it is probable that all these names indicate the presence of an ancient and powerful nomad tribe, which was allied to the Phœnicians (or Sidonians), whose earliest settlements were in the vale of Sodom, and with the Amalekites who dwelt in the wilderness south of Palestine. These Maonites migrated eastward, leaving their name at Maon in the south of Judah, where they may have had their headquarters for a time, and again at Beth-meon, on the plateau of Moab; and also at the large modern village above described."

Maoris. See NEW ZEALAND.

Maphrian is in the Syrian Church the highest episcopal dignitary after the patriarch of Antioch. The jurisdiction of the maphrian extends over Chaldæa, Assyria, and Mesopotamia. His residence was formerly at Tabriz, beyond the Tigris, but since this see has coalesced with that of Mosul it is at the latter place. Neale (*Introd. Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 152) says that "the maphrians are now only nominally distinguished from the other metropolitans."

Mapletoft, JOHN, D.D., an English minister, was born at Margaret-Inge, Huntingdonshire, in 1631; received his education at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; in 1653 became fellow of Trinity; in 1658 became tutor to Joscelin, earl of Northumberland; in 1660 entered upon the study of medicine, and finally practiced it with great success, filling at one time the chair of physic in Gresham College, London. Having turned his attention to the study of divinity, he took, in 1682, both deacon's and priest's orders; was soon after presented to the rectory of Braybrooke, in Northamptonshire, by lord Griffin; in 1684 was chosen lecturer of Ipswich; in 1685 vicar of St. Lawrence, Jewry.

and lecturer of St. Christopher's, in London; received his D.D. in 1689, and in 1707 was chosen president of Sion College. He died at Westminster in 1721. Dr. Mapletoft published *Principles and Duties of the Christian Religion* (2d ed., corrected and enlarged, Lond. 1713, 8vo), and other minor pieces upon moral and theological subjects.

Mappa, the name of the linen cloth with which the communion table, and subsequently the altar, was covered. It came to be considered essential that this cloth should be of linen, according to some, in commemoration of the linen cloth in which the body of the Lord was wrapped. This, however, it seems would apply better to the corporale (q. v.). Optatus of Milene, in *De schismate Donatistarum*, speaks of this custom as general. In the Roman Catholic Church there are a number of regulations concerning the *mappa*, which is always to be blessed by the bishop, or by some one commissioned by him for the purpose.—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 848; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 7.

Ma'ra (Heb. *Mara'*, מָרָא, for מָרָה, *bitter*, as explained in the context; Sept. πικρία, Vulg. *Mara, id est amara*), a symbolical name proposed for herself by Naomi on account of her misfortunes (Ruth i, 20). See RUTH.

Mara, a famous dîva of Hindu mythology mentioned in the history of *Gautama* (q. v.).

Marabuts, a name given to the descendants of the *Moravides* (q. v.; see also MOHAMMEDANS), or *Almoravides*, a certain Arabic tribe which, in 1075, founded a dynasty in the north-western parts of Africa, and held Morocco and Spain for a considerable period. The Almohades having put an end to their temporal dominion, their descendants exercise to this day a kind of spiritual superiority over the Moslem negroes in Barbary, the coast of Guinea, etc. At present the Marabuts form a kind of priestly order, officiating at mosques and chapels, explaining the Koran, providing the faithful with amulets, prophesying, and working miracles. They are looked up to with great awe and reverence by the common people, who also allow them a certain vague license over their goods and chattels, their wives not excluded. The Great Marabut ranks next to the king, and the dignity of a Marabut is generally hereditary. One of the most eminent Marabuts of our day is the celebrated Mohammedan warrior Abd-el-Kader, who was born in 1807, and in 1832 opened the contest against the French to expel the latter from African territory, which resulted so unsuccessfully to the Mohammedan cause.

Marafoschi, PROSPERO, an Italian prelate, was born Sept. 29, 1653, at Macerata; entered the priesthood while yet a youth; became canon of St. Peter's at Rome, and later bishop in partibus of Cyrene. He enjoyed the favor and confidence of several of the incumbents of the papal chair. Clement XI, in 1721, gave him the archiepiscopal see of Cæsarea and Cappadocia; Benedict XIII created him cardinal in 1724, and in 1726 made him vicar-general of Rome. He died Feb. 24, 1732.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 347.

Ma'rah (Hebrew *Marah'*, מָרָה, *bitterness*, from the taste of the water; Sept. Μερρᾶ, Πικρία, Vulg. *Mara*), a brackish fountain, forming the sixth station of the Israelites, three days distant from their passage across the Red Sea (Exod. xv, 33; Numb. xxiii, 8). Finding here a well so bitter that, thirsty as they were, they could not drink its water, they murmured against Moses, who at the divine direction cast in "a certain tree," by which means it was made palatable. "It has been suggested (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 474) that Moses made use of the berries of the plant *Ghŭrkŭd* (Robinson says [i, 26] the *Peganum retusum* of Forskål, *Flora Æg. Arab.* p. lxvi; more correctly, the *Nitraria tridentata* of Desfontaines, *Flora Atlant.* i, 372), and which still, it is implied, would be found to operate similarly. Robinson, however (i, 67), could not find that this or any tree was now known by the Arabs to possess such properties; nor would those berries, he says, have been found so early in the season as the time when the Israelites reached the region. It may be added that, had any such resource ever existed, its eminent usefulness to the supply of human wants would hardly have let it perish from the traditions of the desert. Further, the expression 'the Lord showed' seems surely to imply the miraculous character of the transaction." With regard to the cure of the water, it has been well argued (Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, p. 209) that no explanation of the phenomena on natural grounds has proved consistent or satisfactory; neither is there any tree in that region or elsewhere now known which possesses such virtue in itself, or which is used for a similar purpose by the Arabs. We are therefore compelled to conclude, as, indeed, the narrative spontaneously suggests, that the shrub selected was indifferent, being one nearest at hand, and that the restorative property ceased with the special occasion which had called for its exercise, leaving the well to resume its acrid taste as at present found.

The name Marah, in the form of *Amarah*, is now borne by the barren bed of a winter torrent, a little beyond which is still found a well called *Howarah*, the bitter waters of which answer to this description. Camels will drink it, but the thirsty Arabs never partake of it themselves—and it is said to be the only water on the shore of the Red Sea which they cannot drink. The water of this well, when first taken into the mouth, seems insipid rather than bitter, but when held in the mouth a few seconds it becomes exceedingly nauseous. The well rises within an elevated mound surrounded by sand-hills, and two small date-trees grow near it. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water about two feet deep. (See Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 472; Robinson, *Researches*, i, 96 sq.; Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 30; and other travellers.) "Winer says (*Handwb.* s. v.) that a still bitterer well lies east of Marah, the claims of which Tischendorf, it appears, has supported. Lepsius prefers *wady Ghŭrundel*. Prof. Stanley thinks that the claim may be left between this and Howarah, but adds in a note a mention of a spring south of Howarah 'so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink it,' of which 'Dr. Graul (ii, 254) was told.' The *Ayoun Mousa*, 'wells of Moses,' which local tradition assigns to Marah, are manifestly too close to the head of the gulf, and probable spot of crossing it, to suit the distance of 'three days' journey.' The soil of this region is described as being alternately gravelly, stony, and sandy; under the range of the Gebel Wardan chalk and flints are plentiful, and on the direct line of route between Ayoun Mousa and Howarah no water is found (Robinson, i, 67)." See EXODE.

Mar'alah (Heb. *Maralah'*, מַרְעָלָה, a *trembling*; Sept. Μαραλά), a place on the southern boundary of Zebulon, but apparently within the bounds of Issachar, west of Sarid and east of Dabbasheth (Josh. xix, 11). These indications point to some locality not far from the present *Mujeidil*, although the name would seem to agree better with that of the neighboring site, *Melul*. The latter place agrees with the identification of Porter, who remarks that Malul is a little village about four miles south-west of Nazareth, on the top of a hill, containing the ruins of a temple, and other vestiges of antiquity. In the surrounding rocks and cliffs are some excavated tombs (*Handbook*, p. 385). See NAHALAL.

Maran-a'tha (Μαρὰν ἀθά, from the Aramæan מָרָן אֲתָה, *maran' athah'*, *our Lord comes*, i. e. to judgment, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1248, and so found in the Peshito version), a phrase added to the sentence of excommunication by way of appeal to the divine Head of the Church for ratification (1 Cor. xvi, 22). See ANATHEMA. "In the A. V. it is combined with the preceding 'anathema,' but this is unnecessary; at all events it can only be regarded as adding emphasis to the previous

adjuration. It rather appears to be added 'as a weighty watchword' to impress upon the disciples the important truth that the Lord was at hand, and that they should be ready to meet him (Alford, *Gr. Test.* ad loc.). If, on the other hand, the phrase be taken to mean, as it may, 'our Lord *has* come,' then the connection is, 'the curse will remain, for the Lord has come who will take vengeance on those who reject him.' Thus the name 'Maronite' is explained by a tradition that the Jews, in expectation of a Messiah, were constantly saying *Maran*, i. e. Lord; to which the Christians answered *Maran atha*, the Lord is come, why do you still expect him? (Stanley, *Corinthians*, ad loc.)."

Maraños is one of the names used to designate the new Christians of Spain, i. e. those Jews (q. v.) who, during the religious persecutions under Romish rule, publicly avowed conversion to Christianity and yet privately confessed the religion of their fathers, as e. g. the family of Maimonides (q. v.). The name owes its origin to the fact that not only Jews, but also *Moors* (q. v.) made a feigned profession of conversion to the Christian faith. See INQUISITION; SPAIN.

Maran(us), PRUDENTIUS, a noted French theologian, was born, according to Winer (*Theol. Literatur*, p. 654), at Sezanne, whilst Le Cerf (*Biblioth. historique de la Cong. de St. Maur*, p. 293) and Zedler (*Universallexikon*) consider him to have been born at Troyes, in Champagne, October 14, 1683. In 1703 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur, taking the vows at the Abbey of St. Faron, at Meaux. He subsequently resided at the Convent of St. Germain des Prés, Paris. He died April 2, 1762. He published the works of Cyril of Jerusalem in Greek and Latin (Paris, 1720; Venice, 1763). Though the best edition of Cyril's works, it was attacked by the author of the *Mémoires de Trévoux*. Maranus defended himself in his *Dissertation sur les semi-Ariens* (Paris, 1722). He also completed the edition of the works of Cyprian commenced by St. Baluze (Paris, 1726; Venice, 1728), and published the works of Justin Martyr in Greek and Latin, with a valuable introduction (Paris, 1742; Venice, 1747). He published also a work of his own on the divinity of Christ, under the title *Divinitas Domini nostri Jesu Christi manifesta in scripturis et traditione* (Paris, 1746). This work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the proofs contained in the Old and the New Testaments; the second, of the unanimity, on this point, of the Roman Catholic Church and of the different sects; the third, of the continuous controversies with the Jews, heathen, and heretics; and the fourth, of the unanimous testimony of the fathers. It contains, besides, arguments to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Maranus took also an active part in the controversies arising from the bull "Unigenitus Dei filius," siding with the party called *appellants;* and, although he had written nothing on the subject, he had in consequence to endure great annoyances from the *acceptants*, who were the strongest.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 9. See JANSENISTS. (J. N. P.)

Maratta or **Maratti**, CARLO, a celebrated Italian painter, was born at Camurano, near Ancona, May, 1625; became a pupil of Andrea Sacchi and a devout student of Raphael's works, and chose Rome as his permanent residence. He was employed by Clement IX and by four other successive popes, and received the title of painter ordinary to Louis XIV, for whom he painted a picture of Daphne. His Madonnas are admired for modest dignity and amiable expression. Maratta also excelled in the art of etching. He was the last great painter of the Roman school. He died in 1713.

Maraviglia (Latin *Mirabilio*), GIUSEPPE MARIA, an Italian philosopher, a native of Milan, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He at first belonged to the body of regular clergy, was commissioned in 1651 to teach ethics in Padua, and exchanged the duties of provincial prior for those of bishop at Novara in 1667. He died there in 1684. Among his works we find *Leges honestæ Vitæ* (Ven. 1657, 12mo), a moral treatise dedicated to Christine, queen of Sweden:—*Leges Doctrinæ a sanctis Patribus* (Venice, 1660, 24mo):—*Proteus ethico-politicus seu de multiformi hominis statu* (Venice, 1660, folio):—*Pseudomantia veterum et recentiorum explosa, seu de fide divinationibus adhibenda* (Ven. 1662, fol.):—*De erroribus virorum doctorum* (Ven. 1662, 12mo; Rome, 1667, 4to):—*Legatus ad principes Christianos* (Ven. 1665, 12mo):—*Ammœstramenti dell' anima Christiana* (Novara, 1675, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxiii, 362.

Marbach, JOHANN, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Lindau Aug. 24, 1521, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he commenced in 1539 the study of theology. He became successively deacon at Jena in 1540, preacher at Ivry in 1544, and at Strasburg in 1545. He was afterwards sent by the latter city to the Council of Trent, together with Sleidan. In 1552 he was appointed chief pastor and professor of theology. Here he labored to introduce the Lutheran doctrines in the place of the Reformed, whereby he became involved in numberless controversies. In 1556 he was employed by the elector Otto Henry to organize the Reformation in the Palatinate, and in 1557 was present at the Diet of Worms. He ceased preaching in 1558, and died deacon of Thomas College, March 17, 1581. He wrote *Christlicher und wahrhafter Unterricht von d. Worten d. Einsetzung d. heil. Abendmals*, etc. (Strasb. 1565, 8vo), and other similar works, all upholding the ultra-Lutheran views. See Treuss, *Situation intérieure de l'Église Luthérienne de Strasbourg sous la direction de Marbach* (Strasb. 1857); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 852; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* ix, 10.

Marban, PEDRO DE, a Spanish Jesuit and missionary, flourished near the close of the 17th century. In 1675 he went to Bolivia, and later to Mexico, and labored industriously to spread the Gospel of Christ among the savages of America, and finally became superior of all the missions of the Jesuits in this quarter. He wrote *Arte de la Lengua Moxa, con su vocabulario y catechismo* (Lima, 1701, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxxiii, 361.

Marbeck or **Merbecke**, JOHN, the composer of the solemn and now venerable notes set to the "Prèces" and Responses in use in the cathedrals of England, to our day with only slight modifications, was organist of Windsor during the reigns of Henry VIII and his successor. A zeal for religious reformation led him to join a society in furtherance of that object, among the members of which were a priest, a singing-man of St. George's Chapel, and a tradesman of the town. Their papers were seized, and in the handwriting of Marbeck were found notes on the Bible, together with a concordance, in English. He and his three colleagues were found guilty of heresy, and condemned to the stake. The others were executed according to their sentence; but Marbeck, on account of his great musical talents, and being rather favored by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was pardoned, and lived to witness the triumph of his principles, and to publish his work, which appeared under the title of *The Boke of Common Praier, noted.* The colophon is "Imprinted by Richard Grafton, printer to the kinges majestie, 1550, cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum" (a verbatim reprint was given by John Pickering, London, 1848, sm. 4to). In the same year appeared also his *Concordance of the Whole Bible* (1550, folio), the first complete work of the kind in English; and, in 1574, *The Lives of Holy Saints, Prophets, Patriarchs, and others;* and, subsequently, his other books connected with religious history and controversy. See Allibone, *Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Marble is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two forms of the same Heb. word, and is thought by some to be signified by others differently rendered. שֵׁשׁ (*shesh*,

Esth. i, 6, Sept. *πάρινος*; Cant. v, 15, Sept. *μαρμάρινος*), or שֵׁישׁ (*sha'yish*, 1 Chron. xxix, 2, Sept. *πάριος*), so called from its whiteness, undoubtedly refer to a pure kind of marble, *μάρμαρος* (Rev. xviii, 12). Primary limestone, or marble, is a simple rock, consisting of carbonate of lime. In its pure state, it is granular, crystalline, and of a color varying from pure white to gray and yellowish. It is sometimes found in irregular masses, or beds, or large nodules, with little or no appearance of stratification; more generally, however, it is regularly stratified, and these strata alternate with other rocks, and are of all varieties of thickness. The texture varies from a highly crystalline, of a larger or finer grain, to a compact and even earthy. Other substances are sometimes combined with the simple rock, which modify its appearance and texture, such as mica, quartz, hornblende. It is never found in veins, except in the form of regular crystals, and, in this respect, it exactly resembles quartz. There is considerable difficulty in drawing the line of distinction between the primary and secondary limestones, where the latter do not happen to contain organic remains. In the primary limestone, strictly speaking, no organic remains have yet been discovered. With one or two exceptions, and as a general rule, it may be said, they, like the primary schists, are almost destitute of organic bodies. Like the strata which it accompanies, beds of limestone are often bent and contorted, evidently from disturbance below. The colors vary from a pure white, which constitutes the statuary marble, to various shades of gray, brown, black, and green. These tints are derived from a carbonaceous matter or oxide of iron, or an admixture of other minerals.

Several other terms occur in Esth. i, 6, as the names of stones in the pavement of the magnificent hall in which Ahasuerus feasted the princes of his empire. That rendered "white" marble, is דַּר, *dar*, which some take to signify Parian marble, others white marble; but nothing certain is known about it. In Arabic, the word *dar* signifies a large pearl. Now pearls were certainly employed by the ancients in decorating the walls of apartments in royal palaces, but that pearls were also used in the pavements of even regal dining-rooms is improbable in itself, and unsupported by any known example. The Septuagint refers the Hebrew word to a stone resembling pearls (*πίννινος λίθος*), by which, as J. D. Michaelis conjectures, it intends to denote the *Alabastrites* of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, 7, 8), which is a kind of alabaster with the gloss of mother-of-pearl. See ALABASTER. The בַּהַט (*bahat'*; Sept. *σμαραγδίτης*, "red" marble) of the same passage was, Gesenius thinks, the *verde-antique*, or half-porphyry of Egypt. The סֹחֶרֶת (*soche'reth*; Sept. *Πάριος λίθος*, "black" marble) is likewise there mentioned with the other kinds of marble for forming a pavement. Gesenius says, perhaps tortoise-shell. Others, from the rendering of the Syriac, think it refers to black marble. It was probably some spotted variety of marble. See MINERALOGY. The pavement in the palace of Ahasuerus was no doubt of mosaic work, the floors of the apartments being laid with painted tiles or slabs of marble, in the same way as Dr. Russell describes the houses of the wealthy in modern times. In these a portion of the pavement of the courts is of mosaic, and it is usually that part which lies between the fountain and the arched alcove on the south side that is thus beautified. See HOUSE.

"The marble pillars and tesseræ of various colors of the palace at Susa came doubtless from Persia itself, where marble of various colors is found, especially in the province of Hamadan, Susiana (Marco Polo, *Travels*, p. 78, ed. Bohn; Chardin, *Voy.* iii, 280, 308, 358, and viii, 253; P. della Valle, *Viaggi*, ii, 250). The so-called marble of Solomon's architectural works, which Josephus calls *λίθος λευκός*, may thus have been limestone—(*a*) from near Jerusalem; (*b*) from Lebanon (Jura limestone), identical with the material of the Sun Temple at Baalbek; or (*c*) white marble from Arabia or elsewhere (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 3, 2; Diod. Sic. ii, 52; Pliny, *H. N.* xxxvi, 12; Jamieson, *Mineralogy*, p. 41; Räumer, *Pal.* p. 28; Volney, *Trav.* ii, 241; Kitto, *Phys. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 73, 88; Robinson, ii, 493; iii, 508; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 307, 424; Wellsted, *Trav.* i, 426; ii, 143). That this stone was not marble seems probable from the remark of Josephus, that whereas Solomon constructed his buildings of 'white stone,' he caused the roads which led to Jerusalem to be made of 'black stone,' probably the black basalt of the Haurân; and also from his account of the porticoes of Herod's temple, which he says were *μονόλιθοι λευκοτήτης μαρμάρου* (Josephus, *Ant.* l. c., and *War*, v, 5, 1, 6; Kitto, *ut sup.* p. 74, 75, 80, 89). But whether the 'costly stone' employed in Solomon's buildings was marble or not, it seems clear, from the expressions both of Scripture and Josephus, that some, at least, of the 'great stones,' whose weight can scarcely have been less than forty tons, must have come from Lebanon (1 Kings v, 14–18; vii, 10; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 9). There can be no doubt that Herod, both in the Temple and elsewhere, employed Parian or other marble. Remains of marble columns still exist in abundance at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 4, 6, and 11, 3, 5; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 330; Sandys, p. 190; Robinson, i, 301, 305)." See STONE.

Marburg Bible is the name given to an edition of the holy Scriptures, published at Marburg (1712, 4to), under the care of Prof. Dr. Horch (with the aid of others, particularly of inspector Scheffer, in Berleburg). It contains the text of Luther's, corrected by comparison with the original texts, and gives, in the introductions and in the headings, commentaries on the most important allegories and prophecies (by Cocceius). The most complete of these are the notes on Solomon's Song and the Apocalypse. It was highly prized by the theologians and Mystics of that time, and was the predecessor of the Mystic Berleburg Bible (1726–74, 8 vols. fol.), hence it is sometimes called the *little* Mystic Bible. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 13. See BERLEBURG BIBLE.

Marburg Conference, a gathering of all the reformed theological leaders, held at the city of Marburg, Oct. 3, 1529, and designed to bring about, if possible, an agreement between Luther and Zwingle and their adherents. The landgrave Philip of Hesse, one of the noblest princes of the Reformation days, believing that the dissensions in the Protestant camp should be allayed, directed all his energies towards the conciliation of the two reformed factions, caused by a difference of opinion as to the proper observance of the eucharistic ceremony. With such a purpose in view, he invited the principal theologians of both parties to meet for the purpose of comparing their opinions in a friendly manner. Melancthon had already, in 1529, at the Diet of Spires, declared his readiness to attend such a conference (*Corp. Ref.* i, 1050 and 1078), and even had gone so far as to declare that he attached no special importance to the differences concerning the Eucharist (*Corp. Ref.* i, 1046). Philip of Hesse now applied to Zwingle (Zwingli *Opp.* viii, 287), who also expressed his willingness to come (Zwingli *Opp.* viii, 662). Luther, however, at first strongly opposed the plan, fearing that it might result in more harm than good; but the landgrave persisting, Luther finally consented, and on Sept. 30, 1529, Luther, Melancthon, Cruciger, Jonas, Mykonius, and Menius, accompanied by the Saxon counsellor Eberhard, went to Marburg, where Philip had called the conference. The Swiss theologians had arrived the day before; among them, Zwingle, professor Rudolph Collin, Œcolampadius, Sturm, Bucer, and Hedio. Osiander, Brenz, and Agricola arrived only on October 2. A number of other theologians and eminent persons from all parts of Germany were also present. After a private conference between Luther and Œcolampadius, and Zwingle and Melancthon, the public debates commenced. "In the first place, several points were discussed touching the

divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., regarding which the Wittenbergers suspected the orthodoxy of Zwingle. These were all secondary matters with Zwingle, in reference to which he dropped his unchurchly views, and declared his agreement with the views of the œcumenical councils. But in regard to the article of the Lord's Supper he was the more persistent. Appealing to John vi, 33, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' he argued the absurdity of Luther's view" (Kurtz). Luther had insisted upon the literal interpretation of the expression, *Hoc est corpus meum.* Both parties disputed without arriving at any better appreciation of each other's views. "Agreement was out of the question. Zwingle, nevertheless, declared himself ready to maintain fraternal fellowship, but Luther and his party rejected the offer. Luther said, 'Ihr habt einen andern geist denn wir.'" Still the conference, while failing in its main object, was not entirely fruitless. "Luther found that his opponents did not hold as offensive views as he supposed, and the Swiss also that Luther's doctrine was not so gross and Capernaitic as they thought." Both parties engaged to refrain in future from publishing injurious pamphlets against each other as they had formerly done, and agreed "to earnestly pray God to lead them all to a right understanding of the truth." At the request of the landgrave, Luther drew up a series of fifteen articles (Articles of Marburg), containing the common fundamental principles of the Reformation, which were subscribed to by the Zwinglians. "In the first fourteen they declared unanimous consent to the œcumencical faith of the Church against the errors of papists and Anabaptists. In the fifteenth the Swiss conceded that the body and blood of Christ were present in the *sacrament*, but they could not agree to his *corporeal presence in the bread and wine*" (Kurtz). The Articles of Marburg were subsequently used as a basis for the Confession of Augsburg (q. v.). See L. J. K. Schmitt, *Das Religionsgespräch z. Marburg* (Marb. 1840); A. Ebrard, *D. Gesch. d. Dogma's v. h. Abendmahle*, ii, 268; Hassenkamp, *Hessiche Kirchengesch.* ii, 1, p. 35 sq.; H. Heppe, *D. fünfzehn Marburger Artikel* (Cassel, 1847 and 1854); Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation* (Philadel. 1871, 8vo), p. 355 sq., 427; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 309, 314; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Harper's edit.), iv, 133; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. since the Reformation*, p. 72 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 13 sq. (J. H. W.)

Marbury, Edward, an English minister of the 17th century, became rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, London, in 1613; subsequently rector of St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf, and retired from public labors during the Rebellion. He died about 1655. Marbury published *A Commentary on Obadiah* (Lond. 1649, 4to):—*A Commentary on Habakkuk* (1650, 4to).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Marca, Pierre de, a French Roman Catholic theologian and historian, was born at Pau, in Bearn, Jan. 24, 1594. He was of good family, was brought up by the Jesuits of Auch, and afterwards studied law at Toulouse. In 1613 he became member of the Council of Pau, and when, in 1621, this body was erected into a parliament by Louis XIII, he was appointed its president, as a reward for his services to Romanism. After the death of his wife, which occurred in 1632, he entered the Church. In 1639 he was made counsellor of state. Cardinal de Richelieu having commissioned him to reply to Hersent's *Optatus Gallus*, Marca composed *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii* (Paris, 1641 sq.), which is his ablest work, and was rewarded by the bishopric of Conserans, to which he was appointed in 1643. The pope, however, would not approve the Gallican writer as incumbent of the episcopal office, and the appointment was not sanctioned at Rome until Marca had recalled the work in 1647. In 1652 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Toulouse; later was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Paris, and there died in the year of his transfer, 1662. He wrote also *Dissertatio de Primatu Lugdunensi et cæteris primatibus* (1644, 8vo):—*Relation de ce qui s'est fait depuis* 1653 *dans les assemblées des évêques au sujet des cinq propositions* (Paris, 1657, 4to). This was unfavorable to the Jansenists, and was refuted by Nicole in his *Belga percontator*, and some other writers. Collections of some other writings of Marca on divers subjects were published by Baluze (1669 and 1681, 2 vols. 8vo) and abbé Faget (1668, 4to), who, however, brought out the best edition of Marca's *De Concordia* (Paris, 1663, and often). See *Gallia Christiana*, vols. i and vii; De Faget, *Vie de Pierre de Marca;* Bompart, *Éloge de Marca* (Paris, 1672, 8vo); De Longuerue, *Dissertations diverses; Mercure de France*, 1644 to 1662; Fisquet, *France Pontificale.* See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 374; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 17 sq.

Marcella, St., is the name of two saints in the Romish Church. (1) One of these was a Roman widow, the intimate friend of Paula and of Eustochius, and a pupil of the noted Church father Jerome, who said of her that we could judge of her merits by her noble disciples. Marcella was a Christian, and deeply learned in the Scriptures. She was greatly opposed to the errors of Origen, who mingled the dogmas of Oriental philosophy with the truths of Christianity. On difficult passages of Scripture she consulted Jerome; but she herself was consulted from all parts as a great theologian, and her answers were always dictated by prudence and humility. She died A.D. 409, soon after Rome was taken by the Goths, from the effects of the assault and abuse of the troops of Alaric. She is commemorated January 31. (2) The second, a martyr of the Church in Alexandria, flourished in the days of the emperor Severus. She is commemorated June 28.

Marcellians, a sect of heretics who flourished towards the close of the 4th century; so called from Marcellus of Ancyra, whom the Arians unjustly accused of reviving the errors of Sabellius. Epiphanius informs us that great diversity of opinion prevailed in his day on the justness of charging Marcellus of Ancyra with the heretical tendencies of the so-called Marcellians. The latter denied the three hypostases, holding the Son and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the divine nature, to exist independently only until the performance of their respective offices, and then to return again into the substance of the Father. See Marcellus of Ancyra.

Marcellīna, a noted female pupil of Carpocrates (q. v.), commenced teaching at Rome the Gnostic system of her instructor, in 160, under Anicetus, and met with so great success (see Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i, 25, 6; Epiphanius, *Hær.* 27, 6) that her followers and pupils were denominated *Marcellinists.* This is the sect mentioned by Celsus (Orig. *c. Celsum*, vol. v), and are not to be mistaken for the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra, the *Marcellians.* Origen asserts that he could find no trace of the Marcellinists. Another Marcellina was the sister of Ambrosius, and a strict ascetic.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 20; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 855.

Marcellīnus, a native of Rome, son of Projectus, is said to have been made bishop of Rome May 3, 296. As he lived in a period of violent persecution, we have but little certain information concerning him; the acts of a synod said to have been held at Sinuessa in 303 (published by Mansi, *Coll.* i, 1250 sq.; and Hardouin, *Coll. Conc.* i, 217 sq.) relate as follows: Diocletian had succeeded in compelling the hitherto steadfast bishop to come with him into the temple of Vesta and Isis, and to offer up incense to them; this was afterwards proclaimed by three priests and two deacons who had witnessed the deed, and a synod was assembled to investigate the affair at Sinuessa, at which no less than three hundred bishops were present—"a number quite impossible for that country, especially in a time of persecution" (Dr. H. B. Smith, in Döllinger's *Fables*, p. 82, foot note). Marcellinus denied everything for the first two days, but on the third came in, his head covered with ashes, and made

a full confession, adding that he had been tempted with gold. The synod declared that Marcellinus had condemned himself, for the *prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam*. This resulted, however, in Diocletian causing a large number of the bishops who had taken part in the synod, and even Marcellinus himself, to be put to death, August 23, 303. Although the Roman Breviary itself credits this account of the weakness and punishment of Marcellinus (in Nocturn. ii, April 26), this account of the synod is now considered spurious both by Romanists and by Protestants. Indeed, Augustine (*De unico baptismo contra Petilianum*, c. 16) and Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 2) declared the statement of Marcellinus having betrayed Christianity and offered sacrifices to idols false. Dr. Döllinger, in his *Fables respecting Popes in the Middle Ages* (edit. by Dr. H. B. Smith, N. Y. 1872, 12mo), p. 84, says "the acts of the pretended synod are evidently fabricated in order to manufacture a historical support for the principle *that a pope can be judged by no man*. This incessantly-repeated sentence is the red thread which runs through the whole; the rest is mere appendage. By this means it is to be inculcated on the laity that they must not venture to come forward as accusers of the clergy, and on the inferior clergy that they must not do the like against their superiors." As the date and occasion of the fabrication, Dr. Döllinger assigns "those troubled sixteen years (498–514) in which the pontificate of Symmachus ran its course. At that time the two parties of Laurentius and Symmachus stood opposed to one another in Rome as foes. People, senate, and clergy were divided; they fought and murdered in the streets, and Laurentius maintained himself for several years in possession of part of the churches. Symmachus was accused by his opponents of grave offences. . . . The hostile party were numerous and influential . . . and therefore the adherents of Symmachus caught at this means of showing that the inviolability of the pope had been long since recognised as a fact and announced as a rule. . . . This was the time at which Eunodius wrote his apology for Symmachus, and this, accordingly, was also the time at which the Synod of Sinuessa, as well as the *Constitution* of Sylvester, was fabricated." Marcellinus is commemorated in the Romish Church April 24. See Pagi, *Crit. in annales Baronii ad ann.* 302, n. 18; Papebroch, *Acta Sancta in Propyl. Maji*, t. viii; Xaver de Marco, *Difesa di alcuni pontefici di errore*, c. 12; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, i, 80 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 118; iii, § 10, note 2, where the main authorities against the fable are cited. (J. H. W.)

Marcellus, St. (*martyr*). Aside from Marcellus I, pope of Rome (q. v.), and Marcellus of Apamea (q. v.), the martyrologues mention a number of other martyrs of that name, the more important of which are:

I. Marcellus who perished during the persecution of Antoninus Philosophus. Having refused to participate in a repast with the prefect Priscus, and remonstrated with the latter and his guests on account of their idolatry, he was half buried in the ground, in the open air, and died thus after three days. The year 140 is given as the date of his death; he is commemorated on September 4. See Surius, T. V. Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloriamart.* c. 53; Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum*, p. 73.

II. Marcellus, the chief of the Trajan Legion, who, for refusing to participate in heathen sacrifices at Tingis, in Mauritania, was beheaded by order of the governor, Aurelianus Agricola, in 270. See Surius, vol. v; Ruinart, p. 302 sq. He is commemorated on Oct. 20.

III. Marcellus who suffered at Argenton, in France, under Aurelian. He was a native of Rome, son of a heathen father and a Christian mother, who brought him up a Christian. When of age, he fled to Argenton on account of the persecution of Aurelian. Here he wrought some wonderful cures, which attracted the attention of the prefect Heraclius. Arrested, he fearlessly confessed his faith, and, after scourging, was roasted on a spit; but as this neither converted nor killed him, he was beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloria mart.* c. 52.

IV. Marcellus, bishop of Die, in France, was born at Avignon of Christian parents, and religiously brought up. He was ordained by his brother, who was bishop of Die before him. At the time of his election another was also appointed, but he was taken to the church by his adherents and there reconciled with his adversaries. On this occasion, it is said, a dove was seen to descend upon his head. He was thrown into prison by the Arians for opposing their views, and died there in the beginning of the 6th century. He is commemorated on April 9. See Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloria confess.* c. 70. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 22; Pierer, *Univ.-Lexikon*, x, 855. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, noted for the part he took in the Synod of Ancyra (314 or 315), held at the end of the persecution of Maximin (see Ancyra), made himself conspicuous at the Council of Nicæa (325) by his homoousian views, and was upheld by Athanasius and the whole Western Church. We next find him at the Council of Tyre (335), where he opposed the condemnation of Athanasius, and of Maximus III, patriarch of Jerusalem. In the Council of Jerusalem, of the same year, he declared against the admission of Arius to communion. At the Council of Constantinople, in 336, the Arians having the majority, Marcellus was deposed with the assent of the emperor, who had been prejudiced against him. After the death of Constantine, May 22, 337, he was restored to his bishopric; but once more expelled, he sought refuge in the West, where he was absolved by the councils of Rome and of Sardica (347). He returned to Ancyra, but Basil, who had been appointed bishop in his place, refused to surrender his seat. Marcellus, who was already well advanced in years, retired to a mónastery, where he subsequently died. St. Jerome states that he wrote several works, principally against the Arians; but we now possess under his name only a *letter* addressed to Julius I, containing an exposition of his doctrine, given by St. Epiphanius; two *confessions of faith*, given by his disciples; and some passages, quoted by Eusebius, of his work against Asterius. There has been great diversity of opinion concerning his orthodoxy. His confessions are perfectly correct; but in the passages of the work against Asterius, his doctrine, otherwise very difficult to make out, seems to border on Sabellianism. Photinus of Sirmium, who was condemned as a heretic, was his disciple, and had been his deacon, and a sect who refused to admit the three hypostases took the name of *Marcellians* (q. v.). Yet all ecclesiastical writers agree in calling him a saint; and it is possible that his enemies, the Arians and others, unjustly made Marcellus the father of heretic views. See Athanasius, *Apoll.* 2; Basilius, *Epist.* lii; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* vol. ii; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* vol. i; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vol. ii and iii; Hermani, *Vie de St. Athanase;* Du Pin, *Bibl. Ecclesiastique*, ii, 79; Rettberg, *Marcelliana* (Götting. 1794); Klose, *Gesch. u. Lehre des Marcellus und Photin* (Hamb. 1837); Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Willenborg, *Ueber die Orthodoxie des Marcellus* (Münich, 1859); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 651 sq.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, i, 255, 263, 368; Lardner, *Works* (see Index); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 22 sq.

Marcellus, bishop of Apamea (1), in Syria, near the close of the 4th century, distinguished himself particularly by his zeal for the destruction of the heathen temples. He considered them as maintaining heathen tendencies among the people. Having attempted to destroy the main temple of the city with the help of soldiers and gladiators, he was taken by the people and put to death. His sons sought to avenge his death, but were restrained by the provincial synod, held in 391.

(2.) Another Marcellus of Apamea is mentioned, who is said to have lived in the 5th century. He was a native of Syria, of a wealthy family, and after the death of his parents went to Antioch, where he devoted him-

self to study. Dividing his fortune among the poor, he went to Ephesus, and there attempted to support himself by copying books. He subsequently joined abbot Alexander at Constantinople, and was afterwards chosen as his successor. To avoid this honor, Marcellus fled to a neighboring convent until another abbot had been selected, and then returned and was made deacon. The new abbot, named John, however, became jealous of his deacon, and obliged him to perform menial service. Marcellus cheerfully submitted; but after the death of John he was again appointed abbot. Under his direction the convent acquired such reputation that it had to be greatly enlarged, and other convents applied to be governed by pupils of Marcellus. He died in 485. See Fleury, *Hist. ad a.* 448; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 25; Lardner, *Works* (see Index).

Marcellus I, Pope, son of Benedict, a Roman priest, succeeded Marcellinus (q. v.) as bishop of Rome (according to Pagi, June 30, 308), but held that position only during eighteen months. He endeavored to restore ecclesiastical discipline, which had become much relaxed during the persecutions. For this purpose he organized in Rome twenty dioceses, the incumbents of which were to administer to converts from heathenism the sacraments of baptism and penance. They were also bound to attend to the burial of the martyrs. By command of Maxentius, who had ordered him to resign his office of bishop and to sacrifice to idols, he was imprisoned, and condemned to serve as a slave in the imperial stables. After nine months he was freed by his clergy, and concealed in the house of a Roman matron named Lucinia, who, it is said, converted that house afterwards into a church. Maxentius was so angry when he heard of it that he commanded the church to be turned into a stable, and condemned Marcellus to the lowest employment about the stables. Marcellus is said to have died a martyr. He is commemorated on the 16th of January.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 21; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 855. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus II, Pope, succeeded Julius III, April 9, 1555, but died twenty-two days afterwards. He was a native of the Papal States, and was originally named *Marcello Cervini*. He was first secretary of Paul III, and afterwards cardinal of Santa Croce. By appointment from pope Julius III, he took part in the Council of Trent as cardinal legate, and evinced in that capacity great talents, as well as moderation. His election gave rise to many hopes, which were speedily crushed by his death, the result, no doubt, of poison. He is also noted for the minor but curious circumstance of his refusing to comply with the ancient custom by which the pope, on his election, lays aside his baptismal name and assumes a new one. Marcello Cervini retained on his elevation the name which he had previously borne. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 21; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 855; Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 459, Riddle, *Papacy* (see Index); Artaux de Montor, *Hist. des Souverains Pontifes Romains*, s. v.

Marcellus, Aaron A., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam, N. Y., May 11, 1799; was prepared for college by the Rev. Drs. Van Zandt and Spencer, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1826, afterwards followed teaching, and for some years had charge of the Female Seminary in Syracuse, and subsequently of Schenectady, N. Y. He removed to New York, and was for a short time superintendent of the Orphan Asylum; but, feeling that his duty pointed in the direction of the ministry, he entered the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at New Brunswick, N. J., and graduated in 1830. He was licensed by the New York Classis, and in July, 1830, became pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at Lysander, N. Y.; subsequently of the Church of Schaghticoke; missionary near the Dry Dock, New York; principal of the Lancaster County Academy, Pa.; pastor at Freehold, N. J., in 1839; of the Church in Greenville, N. Y., in 1856; and in 1859 removed to Bergen, N. J., where he labored as a teacher until he died, May 24, 1860. Mr. Marcellus was courteous and refined in manners, an earnest preacher, and an excellent instructor of youth. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 252.

Marchéshvan (מַרְחֶשְׁוָן, *Marcheshvan'*, of the later Hebrew; Josephus, *Ant.* Μαρσουάνης, i, 3, 3; the Macedonian Δῖος) is the name of that month which was the eighth of the sacred and the second of the civil year of the Jews, and began with the new moon of our November. There was a fast on the 6th in memory of Zedekiah's being blinded, after he had witnessed the slaughter of his sons (2 Kings xxv, 7). This month is always spoken of in the Old Testament by its numerical designation; except once, when it is called *Bul* (בּוּל, 1 Kings vi, 38; Sept. Βαάλ). According to Kimchi, Bul is a shortened form of the Hebrew רְבוּל, "rain," from רָבַל. The signification of *rain-month* is exactly suitable to November in the climate of Palestine. Others derive it from בָּלַל. Benfey, availing himself of the fact that the Palmyrene inscriptions express the name of the god Baal, according to their dialect, by בול (as עגלבול, Ἀγλιβόλος), has ventured to suggest that, as the months are often called after the deities, Bul may have received its name from that form of Baal (*Monatsnamen*, p. 182). The rendering of the Sept. might have been appealed to as some sanction of this view. He supposes that Marcheshvân is a compound name, of which the syllable *mar* is taken from the Zend *Ameretât*, or its later Persian form *Mordâd*, and that *cheshvân* is the Persian *chezân*, "autumn," both of which are names belonging to the same month (*l. c.* p. 136 sq.). See Bul.

Marchetti, François, an eminent French writer and archæologist, was born at Marseilles about the opening of the 17th century; was educated at a college of the "Fathers of the Oratory," entered their order in 1630, and became one of the ablest members. He died at his native place in 1688. Of his works the following are of particular interest to us: *Paraphrase sur les Epîtres de Saint Pierre* (1639), and *Traité sur la Messe avec l'explication de ses cérémonies.*

Marchetti, Giovanni, an Italian ecclesiastic of note, was born at Empoli, in Tuscany, in 1753, of humble parentage. After struggling for years to secure the advantages of a thorough education, he entered the priesthood in 1777. Later he took up the pen in defence of the rights of the Roman see. His works, which made him known as a brilliant writer and a learned student, attracted the attention of pope Pius VI, who accorded him a pension and invested him with different offices. In 1798, after Rome had been proclaimed a republic, he was banished. In 1799 he was conducted to Florence, where he endured imprisonment for one month. On his return to Rome (1800) he opened an academy of theology. When the excommunication of the emperor Napoleon by Pius VII became known (1809), Marchetti and cardinal Mattei, accused of aiding the pope in this violent part, were imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo. Some time after Marchetti obtained permission to go to his native town. He returned to Rome in 1814; in 1822 was appointed vicar of Rimini; in 1826 became secretary of the Assembly of Bishops, and died Nov. 15, 1829. Among his works, which have been translated into many languages, we find *Saggio critico sopra la Storia Ecclesiastica di Fleury* (Rome, 1780, 12mo):—*Critica della Storia Ecclesiastica e de' discorsi di Fleury* (Bologne, 1782, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Esceritazioni Ciprianiche circa il battesimo deyli eretici* (Rome, 1787, 8vo):—*Del concilio di Sardica* (Rome, 1785, 8vo):—*Il Christianesimo dimonstrabile sopra i suoi libri* (Rome, 1795, 8vo):—*Strattenimenti di famiglia sulla storia della religione con le sue prove* (Rome, 1800, 2 vols. 8vo):—*La Providenza* (Rome, 1797, 12mo):—*Metamorfosi ver-*

dute da Basilide l'eremita sul terminare del secolo xviii (Florence, 1799, 8vo):—*Il si ed il no, parallelo delle dottrine e regole ecclesiastiche* (Rome, 1801, 8vo):—*Lezioni sacre dall' ingresso del popolo di Dio in Cananea fino alla schiavitù di Babilonia* (Rome, 1803–8, 12 vols. 8vo): —*Della Chiesa quanto alto stato politico della città* (Rome, 1817–18, 3 vols. 8vo):—*La vita razionale dell' uomo* (Rome, 1828, 8vo). He also contributed many articles to the *Giornale Ecclesiastico* (Rome) from 1788 to 1798. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 491.

Marcion (Μαρκίων), founder of the sect of Marcionites, flourished near the middle of the 2d century. He was a native of Sinope. According to Tertullian, he was a pilot. Some critics have expressed their doubts that so learned a man should have followed such a trade, but nothing proves Marcion having been a very learned man. He seems to have at first connected himself with the Stoics, and, although his father was a bishop (probably of Sinope), he long inquired into the merits of Christianity before becoming a convert to it. He either retained some of his former views, or else indulged in new speculative views which caused him to be excommunicated by his own father. Epiphanius, who states that Marcion was driven out of the Church for having seduced a young girl (not credited any longer by modern scholars, as Beausobre and Neander), affirms that he afterwards endeavored to regain admission into it by affecting to be deeply penitent, but his father refused to admit him again. Marcion now went to Rome, where he arrived, according to Tillemont, in 142, or, according to Lipsius (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1847, p. 77), in 143 or 144, but, more probably, in 138, as St. Justin mentions his residence in Rome in his *Apology*, written in 139. According to St. Epiphanius, Marcion's first step upon reaching Rome was to ask readmission into the Church, but he was refused. The same writer further states that Marcion aimed to succeed pope Hyginus, who had just died, and that his regret at having failed was the cause of his accepting Gnosticism. These Oriental doctrines were then preached at Rome by a Syrian named Cerdon. Marcion joined him, and proclaimed his intention of creating an abiding schism in the Christian Church. Quite different is the statement of Epiphanius. Marcion, says he, was at first received into the Church at Rome, and professed at first orthodox views, but being of a speculative turn of mind, his prying, theorising intellect constantly led him into opinions and practices too hostile to the opinions and practices of the Church to escape opposition, and he was therefore constantly involved in controversies, in which he often espoused heretical views. After repeated warnings, he was finally cut off from communion with the Church, "in perpetuum discidium relegatus." He continued to teach, still hoping to become reconciled with the Church. Finally he was offered reconciliation on the condition of returning with all his followers, but died while endeavoring to do so. His disciples were then but few, and did not hold all the doctrines afterwards maintained by the Marcionites, who flourished as a sect, in spite of untold persecution, until the 6th century, particularly in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. The most distinguished among his disciples and followers were Apelles, Lucanus, Basilus, Blastus, and Potitus.

The fundamental point of Marcion's heresy was a supposed irreconciliable opposition between the Creator and the God of the Christians, or, in other words, between the two religious systems, the Law and the Gospel. His theological system is but imperfectly known. St. Epiphanius accuses him of recognising three first principles, one supreme, ineffable, and invisible, whom he calls good; secondly, the Creator, thirdly, the devil, or perhaps matter, source of evil. According to Theodoret, he admitted three, the good God, the Creator, matter, and evil which governs matter, i. e. the devil. It is proved that Marcion believed in the eternity of matter, but it is uncertain whether he considered the Creator as a first principle, or as, in some degree, an emanation of the good God. At any rate, he considered them as essentially antagonistic. This conclusion he arrived at because he could not find in the O. T. the love and charity manifested in the Gospel of Christ. He therefore made the Creator, the God of the O. T., the author of evil, "malorum factorem," by which he meant suffering, not moral evil. The old dispensation was, according to his views, the reign of the Creator, who chose the Jews for his own special people, and promised them a Messiah. Christ is not this Messiah, but is the Son of the invisible, good God, and appeared upon earth in human form (being, perhaps, but a phantom), to free the soul and overthrow the dominion of the Creator. Marcion also supposed that when Christ descended into hell, he did not deliver those who in the O. T. are designated as saints, such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, etc., but rather those who had disobeyed and rejected the Creator, like Cain, Esau, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The other doctrines of Marcion were the natural consequences of these principles. He disapproved of marriage, and did not admit married persons to baptism, considering it wrong to propagate a race subject to the cruel dominion of the Creator. His disciples, convinced that this world is a prey to evil, hailed death, even a martyr's, as freeing them from it. They denied the resurrection of the body, and, notwithstanding Epiphanius's assertion, it appears doubtful whether they believed in the transmigration of the soul. They were in the habit of being baptized several times, as if the sins of every day diminished the effect of that sacrament; but this custom, which is not mentioned by Tertullian, was probably introduced after the death of Marcion. Women were allowed to baptize persons of their sex, and the new converts were admitted to witness the mysteries. To make the Scripture agree with his views, Marcion rejected a large portion of the N. T. He looked upon the O. T. as a revelation of the Creator to the Jews, his chosen people, which not only differed from, but was entirely opposed to Christianity. He admitted but one Gospel, and that a truncated version of Luke's, the first four chapters of which he rejected, making it to commence by the words: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, God came to Capernaum, a town in Galilee, and spoke on the Sabbath. He carefully omitted all the passages in which Christ acknowledged the Creator as his Father. Among the Epistles, he admitted those to the Romans, 1st and 2d to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st and 2d to the Thessalonians, Philemon, and some part of a supposed Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans; but all these Epistles were expurgated and interpolated to suit his views. Marcion also composed a work entitled *Antithesis;* it is a collection of passages from the O. and the N. T. which he looked upon as contradictory. In reality, the system of Marcion bore a close resemblance to that of Mani (q. v.); it was an attempt to explain the origin of evil. Marcion, as afterwards Mani, thought to solve the problem by supposing two first principles; but there is this essential difference between them, that while Marcion based his system on the Scriptures, interpreted with daring subtility, Mani derived his from Parseeism, without direct reference to Christian dogmas or traditions. See Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem*, libri v; *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum;* Justin, *Apologia;* Irenæus, *Adversus Hæres.;* Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, iii, 3; St. Epiphanius, *Panarium;* Ittigius, *De Hæresiarchis*, sect. ii, c. 7; Cave, *Historia Litteraria*, i, 54; Tillemont, *Mémoires Eccles.* ii, 266; Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, lib. iv, c. v, viii; Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, vol. ii, c. x; Esnig, *Darstellung des marcionitischen Systems*, from the Armenian by Neumann, in the *Zeitschrift für hist. theol.* 1834; Hahn, *Antithesis Marcionis* (1823); id. *De canone Marcionis antinomi* (1824); Becker, *Examen critique de l'évangile de Marcion* (1837); Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcion's u. d. Evangel. des Lukas* (1846); Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Untersuchungen ü. d. Evangel. Justin's d. clement. Hom. u. Mar-*

cion's (1852); Heim, *Marcion, sa doctrine et son évangile* (1862); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 245; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity;* Donaldson, *Literature;* Werner, *Gesch. d. apologet. u. polem. Literatur;* Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 58 sq., 85, 190, 198; *Zeitschrf. f. Wissensch. theol.* 1860, ii, 285; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, ii, 296; *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1860 (May), p. 360; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 458 sq.; id. *Christian Dogmas* (see Index); Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii (see Index); Bayle, *Dict. Hist. and Crit.;* *Dict. des Sciences philosophiques;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 505; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v. See TRINITY.

Marcionites. See MARCION.

Marcites or **Marcītæ**, a sect of heretics in the 2d century, who also called themselves the *Perfecti*, and made profession of doing everything with a great deal of liberty, and without fear. This doctrine they borrowed from Simon Magus, who, however, was not their chief; for they were called Marcites, from one Marcus, who conferred the priesthood and the administration of the sacraments on women.

Marck, JOHANN VAN, a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born Dec. 31, 1655, at Sneek, in Friesland, and educated at the University of Leyden. His early reputation was such that before the completion of his twenty-first year he was appointed to the professorship of theology at Franeker. In 1682 he removed to Groningen as professor primarius of theology and university preacher. In 1690 he accepted a theological chair at Leyden, and in 1720 succeeded the younger Spanheim as professor of ecclesiastical history. He died Jan. 30, 1731. He wrote several works on dogmatic theology, which are highly esteemed in the Reformed Church, and made various valuable contributions to the interpretation of the Scriptures. His principal works are, *De Sybyllinis carminibus* (Frankf. 1682, 8vo):—*In Apocalypsin Commentaria seu analysis exegetica* (Lugd. Bat. 1689, ed. auct. 1699, 4to):—*In Canticum Salomonis Commentarius seu analysis exegetica cum analysi Psa. xlv* (Lugd. 1703, 4to):—*In præcipuas quasdam partes Pentateuchi Commentarius, seu ultimorum Jacobi, reliquorum Bilhami et novissimorum Mosis analysis exegetica* (Lugd. 1713, 4to):—*Commentarii seu analysis exegetica in Prophetas minores* (Amsterd. 1696–1701, 5 vols. 4to). This is a very complete and carefully-executed work. Walch characterizes it as one of the best of the commentaries on the minor prophets:—*Sylloge dissertationum philologico-exegeticarum ad selectos quosdam textus N. T.* (Rotterd. 1721, 4to):—*Compendium theologiæ Christianæ didactico-elencticum* (Amsterd. 1722, 4to):—*Fasciculus dissertationum philologico-exegeticarum ad selectos textus V. et N. Testamenti* (Lugd. 1724–27, 2 vols.), etc. A selection from his works was published at Groningen in 1748, in 2 vols. 4to. See Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* vol. iii, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Marckius. See MARCK.

Marconville or **Marcouville**, JEAN DE, a French writer of note, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century at Paris, is the author of several works of interest to the theological student. Among them the following deserve special mention: *L'origine des temples des Juifs, Chrétiens, et Gentiles* (Paris, 1563, 8vo):—*La diversités des opinions de l'homme* (1563, 8vo):—*Chrétien avertissement aux refroidis et écartés de la vraie et ancienne Église Catholique* (1571, 8vo), a work in which Marconville, though displaying great attachment to the Roman Catholic Church, condemns her conduct towards the Protestants. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 509.

Marcomanni, a Germanic tribe of the Suevic branch, dwelt from the Helvetian border to the Main, and from the Rhine to the Danube. They are first mentioned by Julius Cæsar in his Gallic wars (i, 51), who reckons them among the forces of Ariovistus, king of the Suevi. The conquests of the Romans brought them into dangerous proximity to the Marcomanni, and induced the latter to seek a new home in modern Bohemia. They were led by Marobodhus, a man of noble rank among them, trained in the Roman armies, and he became their king after the conquest of Bohemia. The Marcomanni quickly acquired influence, and were greatly strengthened by alliances with all the neighboring tribes, so that their power became threatening to the empire. Tiberius concluded a treaty of peace with them, which secured the empire against an attack, but turned against them the hatred of the remaining Germanic tribes. Led by Arminius, these enemies defeated the Marcomanni in A.D. 17, after which date their history presents an almost uninterrupted succession of conflicts. They defeated the emperor Domitian (Dio Cassius, lxvii, 7), and in A.D. 164 advanced to Aquileia, in Italy. The fruits of a decisive victory over them, won by the generals of M. Aurelius, were lost by a treaty which the emperor Commodus concluded with them (A.D. 180), and they continued to make frequent irruptions into the neighboring provinces of the empire, penetrating in A.D. 270 even to Milan, besieging Ancona, and threatening Rome itself. Their name gradually disappears from history during the 5th century, when the migration of more distant barbarians brought a succession of new peoples into their land.

It is not definitely known how or when they became acquainted with Christianity. Their frequent incursions into the empire doubtless brought them into contact with its disciples, some of whom must have been among their prisoners of war. A statement in the life of St. Ambrose, by Paulinus—which, however, is not confirmed by any contemporaneous author—relates that in the time of that bishop an Italian Christian had visited the Marcomanni, and had awakened the interest of their queen in Christianity to an extent that led her to apply to Ambrose for instruction. He sent, in compliance with her request, a work in the form of a catechism, by which both she and the king were led to embrace Christianity towards the close of the 4th century. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vii, 347; Hefele, *Gesch. d. Einführung des Christenthums im süd-westl. Deutschland*, vol. vii; Tacitus, *Annals;* Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* l, 54, and Greek and Roman historians of this period. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 112; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v. (G. M.)

Marcosians or **Colobarsians**, an ancient sect in the Church, making a branch of the Valentinians. Irenæus speaks at large of the leader of this sect, Marcus, who, it seems, was reputed a great magician. The Marcosians had a great number of apocryphal books, which they held as canonical, and of the same authority with ours. Out of these they picked several idle fables touching the infancy of Jesus Christ, which they circulated as authentic histories. Many of these fables are still in use and credit among the Greek monks. See VALENTINIANS.

Mar'cus (Col. iv, 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v, 13). See MARK.

Marcus, Pope, one of the early bishops of Rome, succeeded Sylvester Jan. 18, 336; but little is known either of his life or administration. Anastasius states that by him the bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the bishop of Rome. He died October 7 of the same year in which he had been chosen, and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name. "His body," says Bower, "has since been worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence at Florence, though no mention has been made by any writer of its having been translated thither." Novaes relates that Marcus bore the title of cardinal before his election, and that with him originated this dignitary of the Church of Rome. He is also by some writers believed to have been the first pontiff to order the reading of the Nicene confession of faith, after the Gospels, in the celebration of mass. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 114;

Shepherd, *Hist. of the Church of Rome to Damasus* (A.D. 384), p. 77.

Marcus OF ALEXANDRIA, a patriarch of Alexandria, flourished early in the 13th century, and was particularly well versed in ecclesiastical law. He proposed certain questions for solution on various points of ecclesiastical law or practice. Sixty-four of these questions, with the answers of Theodorus Balsamon, are given in the *Jus Orientale* of Bonefidius, p. 237, etc. (Paris, 1573, 8vo), and in the *Jus Græco-Romanum* of Leunclavius, i, 362–394 (Frankfort, 1596, fol.). Some MSS. contain two questions and solutions more than the printed copies. Fabricius suggests that Mark of Alexandria is the Marcus cited in a MS., *Catena in Matthæi Evangelium*, of Macarius Chrysocephalus, extant in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.—Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1203, ii, 279 (ed. Oxford, 1740–42); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Marcus OF ARETHUSA, a bishop in the Eastern Church, was one of three prelates sent to Rome, A.D. 342, by the emperor Constantius II, to satisfy the Western emperor Constans of the justice and propriety of the deposition of Athanasius of Alexandria and Paulus of Constantinople. Marcus and his fellow-prelates are charged with having deceived Constans by presenting to him as their confession of faith, not the Arian or Eusebian confession, lately agreed on at the Synod of Antioch, but another confession of orthodox complexion, yet not fully orthodox, which is given by Socrates. Marcus appears to have acted with the Eusebian or Semi-Arian party, and took part on their side, probably in the Council of Philippopolis, held by the prelates of the East after their secession from Sardica (A.D. 347), and certainly in that of Sirmium (A.D. 359), where a heterodox confession of faith was drawn up by him. The confession which is given as Marcus's by Socrates is believed by modern critics not to be his. They ascribe to him the confession agreed upon by the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, and also given by Socrates. During the short reign of Julian, Marcus, then on old man, was cruelly tortured in various ways by the heathen populace of Arethusa, who were irritated by the success of his efforts to convert their fellow-townsmen to Christianity. He appears to have barely survived their cruelty. His sufferings for the Christian religion seem to have obliterated the discredit of his Arianism, for Gregory Nazianzen has eulogized him in the highest terms, and the Greek Church honors him as a martyr. See Athanasius, *De Synodis*, c. 24, s. v.; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 18, 30, 37, with the notes of Valesius; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 10; iv, 17; v, 10; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 7; Gregorius Naz. *Oratio iv;* Bolland, *Acta Sanctor. Mart.* iii, 774, etc.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. vi and vii; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Neander, *Hist. of Chr. Ch.* ii, 51, 61.

Marcus AURELIUS. See AURELIUS.

Marcus DIADŎCHUS, who flourished probably in the 4th century, was the author of a short treatise entitled *τόν μακαρίου Μάρκου του Διαδόχου κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος, Beati Marci Diadochi Sermo contra Arianos*, published with a Latin version by Jos. Rudolph. Wetstenius, subjoined to his edition of Origen, *De Oratione* (Basle, 1694, 4to; reprinted with a new Latin version in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, v, 242). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ix, 266 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 356, i, 217; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg. ad vol. v, c. 14; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Marcus EREMĬTA (ὁ Ἐρημίτης, *the Ascetic*, called also Μόναχος, Ἀββᾶς, and Ἀσκητής or *Excercitator*), a disciple of Chrysostom, and contemporary of Nilus and Isidore of Pelusium, was a celebrated Egyptian hermit of the Scythian deserts, who lived at the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century. From early manhood he was noted for his piety, meekness, and ascetic virtues, and for his exact acquaintance with the holy Scriptures, the whole of which he had committed to memory; and in his old age he enjoyed the repute of an especial sanctity and wonder-working power. Palladius, who visited him in person about A.D. 395, Sozomen, and the Greek menologies relate many of his miracles; but some of them are elsewhere attributed to Macarius (q. v.). Indeed, the writings of Palladius and the monkish traditions seem frequently to confound the names of Marcus and Macarius; and, as both names were common among monks, it is difficult to decide whether the scattered notices of a prominent saint of this name that have reached us refer to one person or to several. There are traces of a younger Marcus, living early in the 5th century, and of others living in the 9th and 10th centuries. Bellarmine attributes the nine or ten tracts of Marcus Eremita which still exist, and are classed among the most interesting relics of the mystico-ascetic literature of the Greek Church, to a monk of the 9th century; but trustworthy authorities assign to them a much earlier date. Photius († 891) mentions nine tracts of Marcus (*Bibl. cod.* 200, p. 519, edit. Bekker), which are identical with ours. Maximus Confessor, in the 7th century, furnishes a work by Marcus (ed. of Combefis, i, 702 sq.); and Dorotheus cites expressions from him in the 6th century (comp. Tillemont, x, 801; Ceillier, xvii, 504). Besides, the contents of these tracts are so related to what is found in Chrysostom, Macarius, and to some extent in Jovinian (comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 390), that we are compelled to recognise in their author a contemporary of Chrysostom. The only remaining question is, whether the author of the tracts be identical with the Marcus of Palladius and Sozomen, or a younger contemporary. The preponderance of authority points decidedly to the former (see *Prolegomena* in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* viii, 3 sq.; and works on Church history and history of literature, especially Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl.* iii, 8, 2 sq.; Oudin, *Comm. de scr. eccl.* i, 902 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Eccl.* xvii, 300 sq.; Cave, *Script. eccl. hist. bibl.* i, 372 sq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vols. viii and x). The Roman Catholic Church historians generally ignore him. Marcus Eremita is said to have died about A.D. 410, aged more than a hundred years. The Greek Church surnamed him the wonder-worker, and commemorated him on the 25th of March; a day in October was formerly observed in his honor by a portion of the Latin Church.

The nine tracts of Marcus are, in brief, as follows: 1. *Περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ, De lege spirituali s. de paradiso*, "Profitable for those who have chosen an ascetic life." It comprises an introduction, which is followed by two hundred separate propositions designed to comment on the scriptural expression *νόμος πνευματικός*. The leading thoughts are: All good centres in God; without his aid men can neither believe nor do good. Hence humility is necessary to obedience, and its expression is to be found in restraining our passions rather than in an ascetic hatred of God's creatures. 2. *Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, De his qui putant se ex operibus justificari*, seems originally to have formed part of the first, and comprises two hundred and eleven capita or propositions, treating mainly of justification by faith. Saving faith must be accompanied by works of righteousness, but heaven cannot be earned. The kingdom of God is of grace, which God has provided for his faithful servants. Such as do good for a reward, serve not God, but their own will. 3. *Περὶ μετανοίας τῆς πάντοτε πᾶσι προσηκούσης, De pœnitentia cunctis necessaria.* Repentance consists of three parts: purification of our thoughts, persistent prayer, and patient endurance of tribulation. None can be saved except they continually repent, and none are damned except they despise repentance. 4. *Of baptism;* a series of questions and answers relating to the worth and effects of baptism. It is represented as the channel through which Christ imparts gracious aid, rather than as an agency that works perfection in its subject. 5. *Salutary precepts, addressed to the monk Nicholas, and showing how to lead*

a Christian life, and especially how to restrain anger and fleshly lusts. Ascetic exercises are rejected as a means, and looking to Jesus is recommended as pre-eminently the way to virtue and true Christianity. Annexed is a reply from Nicholas, returning thanks for this counsel. 6. *Brief reflections of a pious and mystical character*, generally bearing on some passage or expression of the Scriptures, treated in the freest style of allegorical interpretation. A state of mystical ecstasy, in which the soul is lost to all created things, and in an ecstasy of love is wholly absorbed in God, is characterized as the most exalted spiritual condition, and ascetic duties are accorded only a secondary value. Another tract, upon the subject of fasting, is wanting in the older editions, and was first published in 1748 by Remondini. It possibly formed a part of 6, which closes abruptly. 7. *General questions of Christian morality;* a disputation with a jurist as to the possibility of reconciling capital punishment with Christian principles, and a discussion of the nature and use of prayer, of the various ways to honor God, of the desire to please men, etc. 8. *A mystical dialogue between the soul and spirit concerning sin and grace*, chiefly remarkable because of its decided rejection of the doctrine of original sin, and of its clear and pointed statement of the doctrines of the Greek fathers respecting sin and human freedom. We are to seek the source of our sinfulness neither in Satan, Adam, nor other men. No power can compel us to good or evil, but rather the condition of every person is that which he has chosen from the time of his baptism. The same passions which seduced Adam and Eve still exist in human nature, and produce a like result in every soul that, in the exercise of its freedom, submits to their control. The conflict with sin is therefore a struggle against our own will, in which Christ aids us when we keep his commandments to the extent of our power. 9. *Christ's relation to Melchisedek.* This tract is directed against a class who regarded Melchisedek as a divine being; probably the Origenistic sect founded in Egypt by Hieracas, who were said to regard Melchisedek as the holy Spirit or an incarnation of the Spirit. While combating such views, the tract reveals a tendency to Monophysitism, in ascribing to the human nature of Jesus all the attributes of the Godhead. These tracts of Marcus Eremita reveal to us the memorials of a partly ascetic, partly ecstatic mysticism, which was especially cultivated among the Egyptian monks, and which aimed to spiritualize the practices of Monachism. In its excess of pious feeling over dogmatic conceptions, it contained the seeds of many diverse systems of dogmatics and ethics. Monophysitism had essentially its root in the mysticism of the Egyptian monks; and in these writings are found, in curious juxtaposition, Pelagianism and Augustinism, the strongest assertion of human freedom and of the sole efficiency of grace in the work of salvation, the evangelical view of justification by faith and the Roman Catholic doctrine of works. Hence Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics supposed that modern heretics had forged these writings, while Protestant writers have remarked their Pelagian cast. The tracts of Marcus were in the 17th century placed in the Index, as "caute legenda." They are chiefly important as a connecting link between the mysticism of Macarius and that of the Areopagite and Maximus Confessor.

Eight of the above mystical treatises are λόγοι ὀκτά, "equal to the number of the universal passions." A Latin version of all together was prepared by Joannes Picus (Paris, 1563, 8vo; later editions in *Bibl. Patr.*); a Greek version by Guillaume Morel, with the *Antirrhetica* of Hesychius of Jerusalem (Par. 1563, 8vo). Both versions were reprinted in the first volume of the *Auctarium* of Ducæus (Paris, 1624, folio), in the eleventh volume of *Bibl. Patrum* (Paris, 1654, folio), and in the eighth volume of the *Bibl. Patrum* of Galland. Marcus Eremita was probably the author also of the tract Περὶ νηστείας, *De Jejunio;* Latin version by Zinus (Venice, 1574, 8vo). Two of Marcus's tracts—the first and second, viz. Περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ, *De Lege Spirituali*, and Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, *De jus qui putant se Operibus justificari*, were published together by Vincentius Opsopœus, with a Latin version (Haguenau, 1531, 8vo). The first was reprinted in the *Micropresbyticon* (Basle, 1550), and in the *Orthodoxographa* (Basle, 1555). The tract *De Jejunio*, and another, *De Melchizedek*, were first published by B. M. Remondinus (Rome, 1748). See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, ix, 267; Cave, *Histor. Litt.* ad ann. 401, i, 372; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, col. 902 sq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x, 801; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg. ad viii, c. 1; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; and especially Wagenmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* xx, 85–91. (G. M.)

Marcus Eugenĭcus. See Eugenicus.

Marcus of Gaza, the biographer of St. Porphyry of Gaza, lived in the 4th and 5th centuries; was probably a native of Proconsular Asia, whence he travelled to Palestine, there became acquainted with Porphyry, and then lived at Jerusalem some time before A.D. 393. Porphyry sent him to Thessalonica to dispose of his property in those parts, and after his return Marcus appears to have been the almost inseparable companion of Porphyry, by whom he was ordained deacon, and sent (A.D. 398) to Constantinople to obtain of the emperor Arcadius an edict for destroying the heathen temples at Gaza. He obtained an edict to close, but not to destroy them. This, however, was not effectual for putting down heathenism; and Porphyry went in person to Constantinople, taking Marcus with him, and they obtained an imperial edict for the destruction both of the idols and the temples of the heathen. Marcus afterwards returned with Porphyry to Gaza, where he probably remained till his death, of which we have no account. He wrote the life of Porphyry, the original Greek text of which is said to be extant in MS. at Vienna; it has never been published. A Latin version, *Vita St. Porphyrii Episcopi Gazensis*, was published by Lipomanus in his *Vitæ Sanctorum;* by Surius, in his *De Probatis Sanctorum Vitis;* and by the Bollandists, in the *Acta Sanctorum Februar.* iii, 643 sq., with a *Commentarius Prævius* and notes by Henschenius. It is given also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, ix, 259 sq. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, x, 316; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 421, i, 403; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, col. 999; Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, Proleg. ad ix, c. 7; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Marcus the Heresiarch, sometimes called *the Gnostic*, a teacher of Gnosticism in the 2d century, thought by Jerome to be a native of Egypt; by Lardner, of Proconsular Asia; and by Neander, of Palestine. That Jerome's conjecture is correct, seems probable from the statement of Irenæus that Marcus was a disciple of Valentinus. The followers of Marcus were called Marcosians. His peculiar tenets were founded on the Gnostic doctrine of æons; professing to derive his knowledge of these æons, and of the production of the universe, by a revelation from the four primal emanations in the system of æons, who descended to him from the region of the ineffable and invisible in the form of a female. He set forth his system in a *poem*, in which he introduced the divine æon discoursing in liturgical forms, and with gorgeous symbols of worship. He prominently developed in his system the idea of a λόγος τοῦ ὄντος, of a word manifesting the hidden divine essence in the creation—creation being a continuous *utterance* or *becoming expressed* of the ineffable. See Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* i, 8–18; Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxxiv, s. ut alii, xiv; Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 50 sq.; id. *Adv. Valent.* c. 4; id. *De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 5; Theodoret, *Hæreticarum Fabularum Compend.* c. 9; Eusebius, *H. E.* iv, 11; Philastrius, *De Hæresib. post Christum*, c. 14; Prædestinatus, *De Hæresib.* i, 14; Augustin. *De Hæres*, c. 15; Jerome, *Comm. ad Isa.* lxiv, 4, 5; *Ep. ad Theod.* 29; Ittigius, *De Hæresiarchis*, lect. ii, c. 6, § 4; Tillemont, *Mémoirs*, ii, 291; Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, book ii, c. 7;

Neander, *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* i, 440; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 147; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v. See MARCOSIANS; VALENTINIANS.

Marcus THE HERETIC (sometimes confounded with MARCUS THE HERESIARCH), a native of Memphis, in Egypt, flourished in the 4th century. He is said by Isidore of Seville, and Sulpicius Severus in *Hist. Sacra*, to have been a skilful magician—a Manichæan, perhaps personally a disciple of Manes, and the originator of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. See PRISCILLIANISTS. He travelled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrines to Elpidius, a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape; from them the doctrines were communicated to Priscillian (see PRISCILLIAN), who, by embodying them in systematic form and giving them spread, became the founder of the sect.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 710.

Marcus HIEROMONĂCHUS, said by Oudin to have been a monk of the convent of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, flourished in the opening of the 11th century. He wrote Σύνταγμα εἰς τὰ ἀπορούμενα τοῦ τυπικοῦ, *De Dubiis quæ ex Typico oriuntur*, contained in the *Typicum*, or ritual directory of the Greek Church (Τυπικὸν σὺν θεῷ ἁγίῳ παρεῖχον πᾶσαν την διάταξιν τῆς ἐκκλεσιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ χρόνου ὅλου, *Typicum, favente Deo, continens integrum Officii Ecclesiastici Ordinem per totum Annum*). See a description of the work in Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. ii; *Dissert.* ii, 38. This commentary is adapted to the arrangement of the *Typicum*, ascribed to St. Saba, but which Oudin supposes to have been drawn by Marcus himself, and produced by him as the work of St. Saba, in order to obtain for it an authority which, had it appeared in his own name, it would not have secured. *A Life of Gregory of Agrigentum* is supposed to be by the same author as the *Typicum*. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. ii; *Dissert.* i, 13; Oudin, *De Scriptorib. Eccles.* ii, col. 584, etc.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* x, 232, 678; Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Marcus, bishop OF OTRANTO, probably of the 8th century. Allatius says he was œconomus or steward of the great Church of Constantinople before he became bishop, which seems to be all that is known of him. He wrote Τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ ἡ ἀκροστιχίς, *Hymnus Acrostichus in Magnum Sabbatum, s. In Magno Sabbato Capita Versuum*, published by Aldus Manutius, with a Latin version, in his editions of Prudentius and other early Christian poets (Venice, 1501, 4to). A Latin version of the hymn is given in several editions of *Bibliotheca Patrum*.—Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 177, 677; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 750, i, 630; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Mardochæ'us (Μαρδοχαῖος), the Sept. or Greek equivalent of MORDECAI (q. v.), in the Apocrypha; namely, (*a.*) the uncle of Esther, in the apocryphal additions (Esth. x, 1; xi, 2, 12; xii, 1–6; xvi, 13; 2 Macc. xv, 36). The 14th of the month Adar, on which the feast of Purim was celebrated, is called in the last passage "Mardochæus's day" (ἡ Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα). (*b.*) A Jew who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esdr. v, 8; comp. Ezra ii, 2).

Mardochaï, a name borne by many rabbins and Jewish savans. The most renowned of them are the following:

1. MARDOCHAÏ ASHKENASI, a fanatical adherent of Sabbathai Zewi, flourished very near the middle of the 17th century. A man of prepossessing appearance, and remarkably talented as a pulpit orator, he travelled through Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia, everywhere preaching the Sabbathical doctrines, and declaring himself a prophet, insisted upon the duty of his people to welcome Sabbathai Zewi as the veritable Messiah. The persecutions which were so frequent at that time in Germany, France, and Spain had softened the hearts of the poor Jews, and they were anxiously looking for relief from some quarter. Finding that his declarations were favorably received, Mardochaï finally announced that he himself was the risen Zewi, who had been dead three years, and actually found many adherents, especially in Italy and in Poland. He is said to have lost his reason, and to have died, a poor and forsaken wretch, somewhere in Poland, about 1682. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 334 sq.; and lxii, in Appendix.

2. MARDOCHAÏ BEN-ELEASAR COMINO (or *Comiano*) flourished in the second half of the 15th century (1460–1490), first at Constantinople, later at Adrianople. A thorough master of mathematics and astronomy, he fell in with the writings of Aben-Ezra (q. v.), and became one of his most ardent admirers and devoted followers. He commented on the sacred writings, and by his generous ways secured the love and admiration of both Karaites and Rabbinites. He also studied the Aristotelian philosophy, introduced by the works of Moses Maimonides, and thus as a philosopher secured no mean reputation. He wrote כתר תורה, a *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (1460); a Commentary on Aben-Ezra's יסוד מוזא; a Commentary on Ezra's ספר השם; a Commentary on Ezra's ספר האחד; a Commentary on Maimonides's *Logik*, and other logical writings, etc.

3. MARDOCHAÏ BEN-HILLEL, a German rabbi, who, while a resident of Nuremberg, was accused of insulting the Christian faith and defending the cabalistic writers, and was visited with the death penalty for his hasty conduct in 1310. He wrote *Mardochaï Magnus*, a commentary on Alphesius's *Compendium Talmudicum* (Riva, 1559, 4to; Cracow, 1598, folio, and often):—*De Ritibus mactationis* (Venice, 8vo). See Auerbach, *Berit Abraham*, p. 15; Würfel, *Hist. Nachricht von der Judengemeinde in Nürnberg.*

4. MARDOCHAÏ BEN-NISSAN, a Polish rabbi, flourished at Crosni-osthro, in Galicia, in the second half of the 17th century. He wrote דוד מרדכי, or "the friend of Mardochaï" (Hamb. 1714 and 1721, 4to, with a Latin transl. by Wolf, in *Notitia Karaiorum*), a work which contains a complete exposé of the doctrines of the Karaites. Mardochaï was himself a Karaite, and wrote this work by special request of the learned Trigland, who afterwards translated this valuable contribution to the history of the Karaite Jews. Mardochaï ben-Nissan wrote also לבוש מלכות (published by Neubauer), another work on Karaism. See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.*; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 301, and note 5 in the Appendix.

5. MARDOCHAÏ, ISAAC NATHAN, an Italian rabbi, flourished at Rome near the middle of the 11th century. He was the author of *Concordantiæ Hebraicæ* (Basle, 1581, fol.; Cracow, 1584, 4to, with a German transl.; Rome, 1622, fol., with additions by Mario de Calasio; London, 1747–49, 4 vols. fol.); a Latin translation was published at Basle in 1556.

6. MARDOCHAÏ, JAPHE SCHLESINGER, a noted rabbi and learned cabalist, flourished at Prague, in Bohemia, near the opening of the 17th century. He was a pupil of the celebrated Isserles (q. v.), when the latter lived at Cracow. He was a native of Prague, and was born, according to Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 485), about 1530, and lived in the capital of Bohemia until the persecutions against the Jews made his stay impossible; he went first to Venice, and later returned to Poland, where he was successively rabbi at Grodno, Lukin, Krzemnitz (1575–1592), and, in a good old age, found a refuge in his native place. He died at Prague about 1612, as rabbi of his people. He wrote לבוש יקרות, a cabalistic treatise, divided into six books, which is believed to have been completed about 1560. It has been frequently published at Cracow (1594–1599, 4 vols. fol.), Prague (1609, 1623, 1688, 1701), and Venice (1622, fol.).

7. MARDOCHAÏ IBN-ALCHARBIJA. See SAAD ADDANLA. (J. H. W.)

Maréchal, Ambroise, D.D., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Ingre, near Orleans, France, in 1769, and was educated at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He

came to Baltimore in 1792; returning to France, he was from 1803 to 1811 professor in the seminaries of St. Fleur, Aix, and Lyons; afterwards became coadjutor to the archbishop of Baltimore, whom he succeeded on his decease, Dec. 14, 1817. He visited Rome in 1821–2, to procure aid for his Church in Baltimore. He died Jan. 29, 1828.

Maréchal, Bernard, a noted French writer, was born at Rethel in 1705, and, after completing his studies under the guidance of the congregation of the Benedictines of St. Maur, took the vows in 1721; in 1755 he became prior of Beaulieu, in Aragon. After this we know of him only as a writer. He died at Metz July 19, 1770. He wrote *Concordance des Saints Pères de l'Église, Grecs, et Latins, où l'on se propose de montrer leurs sentiments sur le dogme, la morale, et la discipline*, etc. (Paris, 1739, 2 vols. fol.; in Latin, Strasb. 1769, 2 vols. fol.); the work comprehends the fathers of the Church of the first three centuries. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 522; Francois, *Biblioth. de l'ordre de Saint-Bénoit*, ii, 367.

Maréchal, Pierre Sylvain, a noted French atheist, was born at Paris, Aug. 15, 1750, and was destined by his father to the mercantile profession. Preferring a literary life, his father educated him for the profession of law. Pierre, however, was determined to get a livelihood from his friends, and eschewed all personal care. When inclined to work, he would write something for the daily press, and, endowed with great facility of the pen and a vivid imagination, he soon gained great notoriety for his excellences as a writer. Had he remained within his legitimate channels, his name would have had no interest for us; but Pierre, believing that popularity must be gained at the expense even of manhood and morality, courted the tendency of his age, and became a scoffer of religion and decency. In imitation of Lucretius, he published the fragments of a *moral* (!) poem, which denies the existence of a God. Not sufficing to provoke public attention to him, he next attacked the Bible, parodied the prophetical writers, and applied himself to all manner of work to further the interests of atheism. Sad, indeed, was the life of such a being as Pierre Sylvain Maréchal, and as his life so was his death. When the hour of his departure had arrived, Jan. 18, 1803 (at Montrouge, near Paris), he was heard to exclaim, "Mes amis, la nuit est venue pour moi." His works are noticed in detail in Hoefer's *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 522 sq. See also Lalande, *Notice sur S. Maréchal* (1803). (J. H. W.)

Mar'eshah (Hebrew *Mareshah'*, מָרֵשָׁה, fully מָרֵאשָׁה, Josh. xv, 44; 1 Chron. ii, 42; iv, 21; Sept. Μαρισά and Μαρησά, but in 1 Chron. ii, 42, Μαρισάς), the name of one or two men, and also of a place, possibly settled by one of them.

1. A person named as the "father" of Hebron among the descendants of Judah, but it is only left to be inferred that he was the brother of Caleb's son Mesha, with whom the Sept. confounds him (1 Chron. ii, 42). B.C. prob. ante 1612.

2. In 1 Chron. iv, 21, a person of the name of Mareshah is apparently mentioned as the son of Laadah, of the family of Shelah, perhaps as being the founder of the city of the same name (B.C. cir. 1612); possibly identical with the foregoing.

3. A town in the tribe of Judah, "in the valley," enumerated with Keilah and Achzib (Josh. xv, 44), rebuilt (comp. 2 Chron. iv, 21) and fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron, xi, 8). The Ethiopians under Zerah were defeated by Asa in the valley of Zephathah, near Mareshah (2 Chron. xiv, 9–13). It was the native place of Eliezer ben-Dodavah, a prophet who predicted the destruction of the ships which king Jehoshaphat had built in conjunction with Ahaziah of Israel (2 Chron. xx, 37). It is included by the prophet Micah among the towns of the low country which he attempts to rouse to a sense of the dangers their misconduct is bringing upon them (Mic. i, 15). Like the rest, the apostrophe to Mareshah is a play on the name: "I will bring your heir (*yoresh*) to you, O city of inheritance" (*Mareshah*). The following verse (16) shows that the inhabitants had adopted the heathen and forbidden custom of cutting off the back hair as a sign of mourning. In the time of the Maccabæans it was occupied by the Idumæans (2 Macc. xii, 35), but it was laid desolate by Judas on his march from Hebron to Ashdod (1 Macc. v, 65–68; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8, 6). Only a few years later it is again reckoned to Idumæa; and Hyrcanus I took it and compelled its inhabitants to practice circumcision (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 1). Josephus mentions it among the towns possessed by Alexander Jannæus, which had been in the hands of the Syrians (*Ant.* xiii, 15, 4); but by Pompey it was restored to the former inhabitants, and attached to the province of Syria (*ib.* xiv, 1, 4). *Maresa* was among the towns rebuilt by Gabinius (*ib.* xiv, 5, 3), but was again destroyed by the Parthians in their irruption against Herod (*ib.* xiv, 13, 9). A place so often mentioned in history must have been of considerable importance; but it does not appear that it was ever again rebuilt (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 888). The site, however, is set down by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Morasthi) as within two miles of Eleutheropolis, but the direction is not stated. Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Researches*, ii, 422) found, at a mile and a half *south* of the site of Eleutheropolis, a remarkable *tel*, or artificial hill, with foundations of some buildings. As there are no other ruins in the vicinity, and as the site is admirably suited for a fortress, this, he supposes, may have been Mareshah. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 104) these ruins are still known by the Arabs by the name *Marasa*, probably the *Marash* described by Tobler (*Dritte Wand.* p. 129, 142) as lying on a gently swelling hill leading down from the mountains to the great western plain, from which it is but half an hour distant (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 333).

Maresius or **Marets, Jean de**, a most remarkable character in French history, flourished in the 17th century. In his youth he was an infidel. He has himself left us a picture of his morals in early life, which is by no means an advantageous one; for he owns that, in order to triumph over the virtue of such women as objected to him the interest of their salvation, he made no scruple to lead them into atheistical principles. "I ought," says he, "to weep tears of blood, considering the bad use I have made of my address among the ladies; for I have used nothing but specious falsehoods, malicious subtleties, and infamous treacheries, endeavoring to ruin the souls of those I pretended to love. I studied artful speeches to shake, blind, and seduce them; and strove to persuade them that vice was virtue, or, at least, a thing natural and indifferent." But after his conversion Marets ran into as great extremes in the opposite direction. In short, he became at last a visionary and a religious fanatic, dealing in nothing but inward lights and revelations. Among other things, he promised the king of France, upon the strength of some prophecies, whose meaning, he tells us, was imparted to him from above, that he should overthrow Mohammedanism and become the promoter of Christian unity, under the leadership of the pope of Rome. But Maresius deserves our attention especially for the relation he sustained to the Jansenists. Appointed inquisitor, he became one of the severest persecutors of Jansenism, and was bent upon the extirpation of this heresy from French ground. In *Délices de l'esprit*, one of his productions, he seriously boasts that "God, in his infinite goodness, had sent him the key of the treasures contained in the Apocalypse, which was known but to few before him;" and that, "by the command of God, he was to levy an army of 144,000 men, part of which he had already enlisted, to make war upon the impious and the Jansenists" (p. 76). He died in 1676. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* vol. ix, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Maresius (*Des Marets*), **Samuel**, a noted French

Reformed theologian, was born at Oisemond, Picardy, in 1599; was educated at Geneva and at Paris; studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, entered the ministry in 1620, and was settled at Laon by the Synod of Charenton. His experience in this place was rather of a peculiar nature. He was stabbed one night, and this attack on his life is charged to the Jesuits, because he had violently opposed them, and had, in a pamphlet defending the Protestant faith, severely criticised their conduct. In 1624 he accepted a call to Sedan, both as pastor and theological instructor in the school of theology situated in this place, lately so celebrated in history. Before he entered upon this new position he went to Leyden, and there secured the degree of D.D. in July, 1625. Having made a small tour into England, he returned to Sedan. In 1632 he was called as pastor to Maestricht; in 1636 he removed to Herzogenbusch as minister and professor at the *Schola illustris;* in 1640 he had an invitation to a professorship at Franeker, and to another at Groningen in 1642. This last he accepted, and from that time to his death did such great services to that university that it was reckoned one of the most flourishing in the Netherlands. The magistrates of Bearn, well informed of his abilities and learning, offered him, in 1671, the professor of divinity's chair at Lausanne; and in 1673 the University of Leyden invited him to a like professorship there. He accepted this last, but died before he had taken possession of it (May 18, 1673). Maresius's literary activity was very great, and his ability as a writer equal to that of any man of his day. He was an able polemic, and wrote much against the Roman Catholics, the Socinians, the Millenarians, and the Arminians, and even against many of his own confession. Indeed, Maresius was quite a literary pugilist. His contest with Voetius, the Utrecht professor, is famous. See VOETIUS. His ablest work is his *Systema theologiæ* (Gron. 1673), in the appendix of which is found a list of all the productions from his pen. Their number is prodigious, and the variety of their subjects shows an unbounded genius. He designed to collect all his works into a body, as well those which had been already published as those which were in MS. He revised and augmented them for that purpose, and had materials for four volumes in folio, but his death prevented the execution of that project. The first volume was to have contained all those works which he had published before settling at Groningen. The second his *Opera theologica didactica.* The third his *Opera theologica polemica.* The title of the fourth was to have been *Impietas triumphata.* Its contents were to have been the "Hydra Socinianismi expugnata," one of the ablest works against the Socinians, the "Biga fanaticorum eversa," and the "Fabula præadamitarum refutata," three works which had been printed at different times. Marets's system of divinity was found to be so methodical that it was made use of at other academies; indeed, his reputation procured him so much authority in foreign countries as well as his own that a person in Germany who had published some severe censures against Marets received orders to suppress his book. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* vol. ix, s. v.; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s. v. Marets; *Effigies et Vitæ professorum Groning.;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* vol. ix, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Marets. See MARESIUS.

Marezoll, JOHANN GOTTLOB, a German theologian, was born at Plauen, grand-duchy of Saxe-Weim.-Eis., Dec. 25, 1761; studied theology at the University of Leipsic from 1779 to 1783; became then tutor for three years in a private family; in 1789 became preacher of the University of Göttingen, with the dignity of professor extraordinary of divinity, and lectured with success on moral philosophy and homiletics; in 1794 was honored by the University of Helmstadt with the doctorate of divinity, and in the same year also accepted a call to Copenhagen as pastor primarius of the German St. Peter's Church, where he was allowed much time for study; but the northern climate injuring his health, he obtained in 1802, by Herder's influence, a position at Jena as superintendent and pastor of the town church, and at the same time commenced lectures on homiletics at the university of that place. He died Jan. 15, 1828. Marezoll was a child of the rationalistic times in which he flourished; but still, with a strong desire to preach and spread abroad the teachings of the Gospel, and gifted with a spirited language and animating mode of delivery, he became a blessing to many thousands of hearers, and an example and a subject of imitation to thousands of students. His productions were repeatedly reprinted, and translated into several languages, and effected much good. He is justly styled one of Germany's greatest preachers of the 19th century. He wrote *Das Christenthum ohne Gesch. u. Einkleidung* (1787):—*Bestimmung des Kanzelredners* (1793), besides his sermons, published in 1790–1, 1806, 1811, 1829, etc.:—*Predigten zur Erinnerung an die fortdauernde Wirksamkeit der Reformation* (Jena, 1822):—*Homilien* (1828):—*Nachgelassene Predigten* (1852, and since). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* vol. xx, s. v.; Döring, *Kanzelredner d.* 18ten *u.* 19ten *Jahrh.* s. v.

Margaret, ST., the name of several Roman Catholic saints. I. The latest of these was canonized through the influence of the Dominicans, who manifested a special interest in her, both before and after her death; she is patronized, however, simply in the neighborhood of her native village, San Severin, in the duchy of Ancona. From the former name of that place, she was called *Septempeda;* the practice of such virtues as are common among saints, and which she cultivated during her widowhood, gave her the surname *Vidua;* and since, in her humility, she would never wear shoes, she received the appellation *Discalceata.* The only inheritance left to her daughter comprised a pair of shoes and the soles of her feet, which became loosened in death and assumed the form of shoes, and which were the principal relics exhibited in her memory by the Dominicans. She died in 1395.

II. The merely beatified saints [see BEATIFICATION] of this name belong, without exception, to the monastic orders; and in their legends the fancy and the jealousy of the monks are equally apparent. The more celebrated are:

1. A beautiful Italian from the neighborhood of Perugia, who had up to her twenty-fifth year led a grossly licentious life, but afterwards, having been awakened by a startling incident, distinguished herself by turning to a life of the severest penance in the convent of the Franciscans at Cortona (hence called *Margaret de Cortona*). Her confessor, however, resisted her desire to revisit the scenes of her former shame, accompanied only by an old woman. She is usually represented with the instruments of torture, because in spirit she experienced the entire passion of the Saviour, who refused to designate her his handmaiden, but honored her as his friend. Her conversations with Christ and the Virgin Mary served to endorse the more lenient treatment of the Spiritualists (*Act. SS.,* l. c., p. 648). When she died, in 1297, the Franciscans claimed that they saw her soul ascend from purgatory to heaven. In 1623 Urban VIII permitted them to pay her religious honors.

2. As an offset to Margaret de Cortona, the Dominicans raised up one of their tertiaries, a blind girl of Urbino, in whose heart were found, after death, three wondrous stones, bearing the image of the Virgin Mary with the child in the manger (*Act. SS.,* April 13; beatified Oct. 19, 1609).

Other Margarets, including a royal princess of Hungary, who died a Dominican, Jan. 28, 1271, are obscure. They are found in the *Act. SS.* under Jan. 23; Feb. 11; March 5, 7, 13, and 22; April 12 and 30; May 15, 18, and 23; and June 4, 10, and 13.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 54; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 835.

Margaret OF FRANCE, duchess of Berry and Savoy,

daughter of Francis I. was born in 1523, and received a superior education. She was a patroness of the sciences and learned men; and after the death of her father gained a high reputation by her beauty, piety, learning, and amiable qualities. She married Philibert, duke of Savoy, in 1559, and died in 1574, aged fifty-one. The most illustrious of the literati contended who should praise her best, and her subjects called her the *Mother of her People*.

Margaret (or *Marguerite* OF ORLEANS, duchess of Alençon and afterwards queen of Navarre, occupies an important place in the history of French Protestantism. She was born at Angoulême April 11, 1492, and was brought up at the court of Louis XII. Her brother, afterwards Francis I, after he had ascended the throne, employed her in numerous important affairs, and she went to Madrid to attend to him when he was a prisoner there. In 1509 she was married to duke Charles of Alençon, but he dying in 1525, she in 1527 again married, this time Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, and from this marriage was born Jeanne d'Albret, mother of Henry IV. Henry d'Albret died in 1544, and Margaret continued to govern the kingdom with great wisdom. She died Dec. 21, 1549. She was very handsome and highly talented, and her court was the refuge of all persecuted for the sake of their religious belief; yet very different opinions have been advanced concerning her personal views. Some consider her a fervent Protestant, whilst others look upon her as a very orthodox Roman Catholic, and still others as a free-thinker. The fact seems to be that she observed Roman Catholic practices, although firmly believing in the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ only; she protected the Protestants, without herself leaving the Roman Church; she loved poetry and even pleasure, although strictly moral and truly pious. All these apparent contradictions find a natural explanation in her inclination towards mysticism, verging even on quietism, and resulting in indifference towards the mere externals of religion—a tendency common also to a number of the most distinguished theologians of that time, and one that helps us to understand many otherwise obscure points in the early history of the Reformation in France. Her private character was the object of many attacks, yet none of these accusations have been substantiated; they were all made by her enemies. Margaret of Orleans wrote *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (1533), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, as it made no mention either of the saints or of purgatory:—*L'Heptaméron des nouvelles*, a collection of tales after the manner of Boccaccio, but intended as moral lessons; they have since been used as illustrating the supposed immorality of her life. The work was first published under the title *Histoires des amants fortunés* (Paris, 1558; afterwards by Gruget, Paris, 1559, 2 vols.; Amsterd. 1698; Berne, 1780, 3 vols.; Leroux de Lericy, Paris, 1853, 3 vols.; Lacroix, Paris, 1857; in English dress it is published in Bohn's collection, *extra volumes*):—fragments published after her death by Jean de la Haye, under the title *Marguerites de la marguerite des Princesses* (Lyon, 1547; Par. 1554). Her *Correspondance* was published by Génin (Par. 1842); also *Nouvelles lettres de la Reine de Navarre* (Par. 1842). The *Hist. de M. de Valois*, etc., published at Amsterdam (1696, 2 vols.), is a mere novel. In the library of Rouen there is to be found a MS. of the 17th century, entitled *Intrigues secrètes de la reyne Marguerite pour établir les erreurs et les nouveautés de Calvin et de Luther dans son royaume de Béarn et de Navarre*. See Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Polenz, *Gesch. des französischen Calvinismus*, i, 199 sq.; Haag, *La France Protestante*, vii, 228 sq.; Victor Durand, *Marguerite de Valois et la Cour de Francis I* (1848, 2 vols. 8vo); Miss Freer, *Life of Marguerite, Queen of Navarre* (1855); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 55 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 867; *Foreign Quar. Rev.* (October, 1842).

Margaret OF SCOTLAND, daughter of king Edward III, fled to Scotland with her brother, Edgar Edelinga, when William the Conqueror invaded England, and in 1070 there married king Malcolm, who afterwards died fighting against William II of England, she following him only four days later to the grave (Nov. 16, 1093). She was canonized by Innocent IV in 1251, and in 1673 Clement X made her the patron saint of Scotland. According to the statement of her confessor Theodoric, Margaret of Scotland was very active, generous, and even lavish in helping the poor. She had regularly 300 persons dependent on her charity, and did much towards softening the native rudeness of the Scottish nobility. She founded a number of churches, working herself in adorning them, and gained her place in the Martyrologium Romanum by her efforts to unite the Church of Scotland with that of Rome, and to civilize the country. She had worked no miracles, but her children were accounted such; among them was David I, "splendor generis," who Romanized Scotland. In after times her cathedral was destroyed by the Puritans, and her relics were scattered; such portions as were subsequently collected were transferred by Philip II to the Escurial. The "toast of Margaret" is named after her; pope Eugenius IV in 1430 attached to it an indulgence of forty days, but with the express condition that this toast should be the last. Margaret is commemorated June 16 by the Church of Rome.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 54. (J. N. P.)

Margarit (or *Marguerit*), JUAN DE, a Spanish cardinal, was born at Girona about 1415. He belonged to an ancient and illustrious house of Catalonia; one of his ancestors, Béranger, distinguished himself at the siege of Tyre. Margarit became doctor of theology at Girona; in 1453 he was elevated to the episcopal see of Elna. The king of Aragon, Alfred V, employed him in several important diplomatic missions to Naples, and he was so successful that he was made ambassador to pope Pius II. In 1461 Margarit became chancellor at Girona, and in this office mediated peace between Sixtus IV and the king of Naples, Ferdinand I. For his services to the holy see he was honored with the cardinal's hat towards the close of 1443. He died at Rome in 1444. See Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 543.

Margarīta (*μαργαρῖτις*, *margaritum*), *the pearl*, was the name given in the Greek Church to the vessel in which the consecrated host was kept. Margaritæ, on the other hand, designated the pieces of the host which the priests preserved in a special vessel for the use of the sick. These pieces were dipped in consecrated wine, and given to the sick with a spoon. See Du Fresne, *Gloss. Latin.* ii, 510.

Magarītès. See PEARL.

Margil, JESUS DE (*Father Antonio*), an early Franciscan missionary to Texas, was born at Valencia Aug. 18, 1657, and died in Mexico Aug. 6, 1726. He was the author of *El Peregrino Septentrional Atlante* (Valencia, 1742). He is styled "Notario Apostolico," "Commissario del Santo Oficio," "Fundador y ex Guardian de tres Coligios," and "Prefecto de las Missiones de *Propagande Fide* en todas las Indias Occidentales." See *Hist. Mag.* June, 1864, s. v.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Marguerite OF VALOIS. See MARGARET OF ORLEANS.

Margunius, MAXIMUS, an Eastern theologian, was born in Crete in 1522; studied divinity at Padua and Venice; became a monastic; in 1589 bishop of Cythera (Cerigo); and died at Crete in 1602. He published *Μηνολόγιον* and *Βίοι ἁγίων*, as well as a collection of sacred poems in Old Greek (Leyden, 1592). and *Ὕμνοι Ἀνακρεόντιοι*.—*Regensburger Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. ix, s. v.

Marheineke, PHILIP KONRAD, an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Hildesheim May 1, 1780. He studied theology at Göttingen, where he was made a professor in 1805. He afterwards became

successively professor in the University of Heidelberg in 1807, and professor in the university, and, in 1810, minister of the Trinity Church of Berlin, as colleague of the renowned Schleiermacher. He died in the capital of Prussia, May 31, 1846. Marheineke's studies were especially directed towards Christian symbolics and dogmatics, which he treated from the speculative stand-point of Daub and Hegel. He was, indeed, the head of that fraction of the Hegelian school which asserted the coincidence of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity. He was equally distant from the strict orthodox views held by the Lutheran, as from Rationalism, or from the old supernaturalism. He wrote *Gesch. d. christlichen Moral seit d. Anfange d. Reformation* (Nuremb. 1805):—*Universalhistorie d. Christenthums* (Erlangen, 1806):—*Christliche Symbolik* (Heidelb. 1810-13, 3 vols.):—*Grundriss d. Homiletik* (Hamb. 1811; 2d edit. 1827):—*Institutiones symbolicæ* (1812; 3d edit. 1830):—*Aphorismen z. Erneuerung d. Kirchlichen Lebens* (1814):—*Predigten* (1814-18):—*Geschichte d. deutschen Reformation* (Berl. 1816, 2 vols.; 2d edit. 1831-34, 4 vols.):—*Grundlehren d. christlichen Dogmatik* (Berl. 1819; other edit. 1827):—*Ottomar. Gespräche ü. Freiheit d. Willens u. göttliche Gnade* (Berl. 1821):—*Lehrbuch d. christl. Glaubens u. Lebens* (Berl. 1823; 2d edit. 1836):—*Betrachtungen ü. d. Leben u. d. Lehre d. Welterlösers* (Berl. 1823):—*Ueber d. wahre Stelle d. liturgischen Rechtes* (1825):—*Katechismus d. christlichen Lehre* (1825; 2d edit. 1840):—*Entwurf d. praktischen Theologie* (Berl. 1837):—*Predigten z. Vertheidigung d. evangelischen Kirche gegen d. päpstliche* (1839):—*Einleitung in d. öffentl. Vorlesungen ü. d. Bedeutung d. Hegelschen Philosophie in d. christl. Theologie* (Berl. 1842):—*Das gottesdienstliche Leben d. Christen* (Magdeb. 1842):—*Zur Kritik der Schellingschen Offenbarungsphilosophie* (Berl. 1843):—*Der Erzbishop Clemens August als Friedenstifter zwischen Staat u. Kirche* (Berl. 1843):—*Die Reform der Kirche durch den Staat* (1844):—*Kurze Erzählung d. Reformation* (1846). After his death his lectures were published under title *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmatik* (1847); *über die theologische Moral* (1847); *über die christliche Symbolik* (1848); and *über die Dogmengeschichte* (1849). See Saintes, *Hist. of German Rationalism*, p. 284; Kahnis, *Mod. German Protestantism*, p. 244 sq.; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philos.* ii, 199, 203; Bretschneider, *Dogmatik*, i, 115 sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 265; and the excellent articles in Wagner, *Staats-Lexikon*, s. v.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 871; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 62.

Maria Angelica DE S. MAGDALENA is the name by which *Jaqueline*, one of the daughters of Anthony Arnauld (q. v.), was known after she became the prioress of the noted convent of Port Royal. "She at first led a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French nunneries; but in 1609 the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon a very different course of life; and afterwards becoming intimate first with Francis de Sales, and then, in 1623, with the abbot of St. Cyran, she conformed both herself and her convent to their views and prescriptions. . . . . The consecrated virgins inhabiting it followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost everywhere abrogated rule of the Cistercians; nay, they imposed on themselves more rigors and burdens than even that rule prescribed." Dr. Murdoch's Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i, § 46. See PORT ROYAL. The relation which this retreat sustained to the Jansenists has been detailed in the article JANSENIUS, CORNELIUS (2).

Maria Theresa, empress of Austria and Germany, the daughter of Charles VI, was born at Vienna May 13, 1717, and succeeded to the throne, by the "Pragmatic Sanction," Oct. 21, 1740. With her secular history we have nothing to do here, but as to her influence on the interests of Romanism and Protestantism, we must add here a few particulars to the article on *Austria*. Although herself a zealous Roman Catholic, she maintained the rights of her crown against the court of Rome, and endeavored to correct some of the worst abuses in the Church. She prohibited the presence of priests at the making of wills, abolished the right of asylum in churches and convents, suppressed the Inquisition in Milan, and in 1773 the Order of Jesuits. She also forbade that any person, male or female, should take monastic vows before the age of twenty-five years. She did nothing, however, to ameliorate the treatment of the Protestants in her dominions. She professed personal sympathy with their oppressed condition, but pretended to be unable to do anything for them on account of her coronation oaths and the laws of the country. This was especially the case in Hungary. Maria Theresa died Nov. 29, 1780, leaving as her successor to the throne Joseph II, who is noted for his generous efforts in behalf of his Protestant subjects. See Duller, *M. Theresia u. Joseph II* (Wiesbaden, 1844); Ramshorn, *M. Theresia u. ihre Zeit* (Lpz. 1859 sq.); Wolf, *Oestereich unter Maria Theresa* (1855); Coxe, *House of Austria*, iii, 189 sq., 241 sq.; Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, ii, 164 sq. Comp. AUSTRIA; BOHEMIA; HUNGARY.

Mariales, XANTIS, an Italian theologian, was born at Venice at the close of the 16th century. He belonged to a patrician family of the Pinards. He was appointed lecturer at Padua, and afterwards inspector of the schools. These offices he filled till 1624, when he retired in order to give his whole time to politics. His zeal for Rome and his hatred towards France caused his expulsion from his native country twice. He retired to Boulogne, afterwards obtained his recall from banishment, and died in April, 1660. We give him place here mainly on account of his many theological productions. The most important are *Controversiæ ad universam summam Theologiæ St. Thomæ Aquinatis* (Venice, 1624, fol.):—*Biblioth. Interpretum ad univ. summ. theol. St. Thomæ* (Ven. 1660, 4to):—*Stravaganze nuovamente segnite nel Christianissimo regno di Francia* (Col. 1646 4to):—*Enormità inaudita nuovamente uscite in luce nel Christianismo regno di Francia, contra il decoro della sede apostolica Romana in due libri intitolati; l'uno: Dell' arrogante potesta de Papi in difesa della chiesa Gallicana; l'altro Del Divitto della Regalia* (Frkf. 1649, 4to). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 615.

Mariamnè (Μαριάμνη, a Greek form of the Heb. *Miriam*), the name of several females of the Herodian family, whose history is detailed by Josephus, especially the two following (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.):

1. The daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, high-priest of the Jews, was the most beautiful princess of her age. She married Herod the Great, by whom she had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Salampso and Cypros; also a son called Herod, who died young, during his studies at Rome. Herod was excessively fond of Mariamne, who but slightly returned his passion, and at length cherished a deadly hatred towards him. Herod had her put to death, but afterwards his affection for her became stronger than ever. Josephus mentions a tower that Herod built in Jerusalem, which he named Mariamne. See HEROD.

2. A daughter of the high-priest Simon, and likewise wife of Herod the Great; by him she had a son called Philip, who married first the infamous Herodias, afterwards paramour of Herod Antipas, and the instigator of the death of John the Baptist. See HERODIAN FAMILY.

Mariana, JUAN, a distinguished Spanish Jesuit, was born at Talavera, in the diocese of Toledo, in 1537. In 1554 he joined the Jesuits, and soon acquired great reputation for his historical, theological, and philological learning. In 1561 he taught theology at Rome (where the celebrated Bellarmine was one of his pupils), and in 1565 in Sicily; in 1569 he went to Paris, where he remained five years, and lectured on Thomas Aquinas. In 1574 he returned to Spain on account of his health,

and died there in 1624. Among Mariana's works we notice *De rege et regis institutione* (Toledo, 1598), written at the request of Garcia de Loayso, and dedicated to Philip III. In this work he expresses his views on royalty with the greatest freedom, even going so far as to maintain that, under certain circumstances, it may be legitimate to put a king to death. The sixth chapter of the first book is entirely taken up with the question whether it is allowable to assassinate a tyrant, and he concludes affirmatively. Mariana begins by an account of the murder of Henry III, and quotes the divers opinions expressed by others on this event, but it is easy to perceive that he approves of the deed. From this individual fact he passes to the general theory, which he bases on the principle that regal power is intrusted to a king by his people under certain conditions, and that the nation therefore retains the supreme right of making kings accountable for their conduct, and revoking them if need be. From this principle, that sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, he deduces the following consequences: 1, according to theologians and philosophers, every citizen has a right to kill a prince who has usurped sovereign authority without the consent of the nation ("perimi a quoconque, vita et principatu spoliari posse"); 2, if a prince regularly elected, or who has regularly come on the throne by succession, seeks to overthrow religion or the laws, and refuses to listen to the remonstrances of the nation, he is to be got rid of by the surest possible means; 3, the surest way is to assemble the states-general, who will depose him, and, should he resist, proclaim him an enemy of the country, and treat him accordingly; 4, the states-general have the right to condemn to death a prince declared the enemy of the country, and every citizen has then a right to kill him; 5, if it is impossible to assemble the states-general, and yet it is the wish of the nation that the tyrant perish, then a citizen is not guilty who accomplishes this general wish ("qui votis publicis favens eum perimere tentavit haudquaquam inique eum fecisse existimabo"). Mariana, however, puts one restriction to the exercise of this terrible right: he declares that the judgment of one or several citizens is not sufficient; that the general wish of the nation must have been clearly expressed, and that the advice of serious and well-informed men should also be taken. After thus justifying the assassination of kings under certain circumstances, Mariana examines the means by which it may be accomplished. All means, he thinks, are allowable, but such as will be least likely to commit the nation or the individual are to be preferred. He shows some partiality for poison, yet maintains that it should not be administered in the food, but rather placed in things of daily use, such as the clothes, etc. The appearance of this work created quite a sensation in France. The Sorbonne and Parliament informed against his book; the Jesuits' congregation of the province of France condemned Mariana, and the condemnation was approved by general Aquaviva (Mariana had formerly opposed him in Spain) until the book should be revised. See Jesuits. After the murder of Henry IV the Parliament condemned the book to be publicly burned, July 8, 1610, and his treasonable doctrines, as they were called, continued during the whole of that age of loyalty and part of the following to furnish a common subject of animadversion, and a chief ground of accusation against the Jesuits. It is, however, but just to add here that like doctrines were taught also by Protestant contemporaries of Mariana, and that by no means should the Society of Jesus be held accountable for the propagation of such views (Compare Hallam, *Literary History*, iii, 130–140). The Jesuits have, indeed, occasionally supported the claims of the people against their rulers, but always with a view to the interests of their own body only. Mariana, on the contrary, discussed this subject on better and higher grounds. Mankind occupied his thoughts, and had a much stronger hold on his affections than the interests and plans of his order.

When Leon de Castro questioned the orthodoxy of Arias Montanus for introducing rabbinical readings and commentaries into the *Plantina Regia* or *Philippina Polyglot*, a new edition of the *Complutensis* which Montanus had undertaken at the command of Philip II, Mariana silenced the noisy polemic by his historical, ecclesiastical, and Biblical lore, as well as by the fair and candid tone of his discussion; but by this step he lost all chance of preferment, which, however, he was glad to exchange for learned leisure and the gratification of his love of historical research. Mariana published next, in 1599, his imperfect work, *De Ponderibus et Mensuris*, a subject which his countrymen Lebrija, or Nebrija, Diego Covarrubias, Pedro Ambrosio Morales, and Arias Montanus had treated before, and which Eisenschmidt, Freret, Paucton, etc., have pursued much further since. Observing that the sudden rise and ascendancy of Spain excited a general interest and curiosity abroad, while its origin and causes were either unknown or misunderstood, and that the Spanish historians, though numerous, were at that time little read, and some of them hardly known, he came forward with a *History of Spain* (in twenty books, under the title *Historiæ de rebus Hispaniæ*, Toleti, 1592, lib. xx, fol., but subsequently extended to thirty books, in the complete edition of 1605, publ. at Mayence). This is a compact and lucid exhibition of an unbroken chronological narrative, from the origin of the Spanish nation to the death of Ferdinand the Catholic (a period of twenty-five centuries at least), and embraces the history of all the Spanish kingdoms, which had hitherto been treated separately. A subject so extensive, expressed in classical Latin, met with universal favor and acceptance. A Spanish translation soon became necessary, and fortunately Mariana accomplished the task himself, and carried the work through four successive Spanish editions in his lifetime. Mariana has been charged with credulity; but traditions held sacred in times past, although rejected in the present age—prodigies which formed part of history, and which Mariana could not dismiss with the disdainful smile of modern criticism, are spots which will never obscure the brilliancy of his digressions on some of the most important events of the world—events which appear as great causes when so admirably interwoven with those peculiarly belonging to the history of Spain. The manly feelings of the historian, his noble indignation against crimes, his bold exposure of the misdeeds of princes and their abettors, deserve still higher commendation. Yet he, as well as Ferreras and Masdeu more recently, has spared a gross instance of queen Urraca's licentious conduct; but, on the other hand, the defence of queen Blanca's honor is highly creditable to Mariana. It is true also that Mariana did not always examine all the original authorities, as Ranke observes in the *Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber;* but to institute an inquiry into every minor detail, to comprehend a wide field of inquiry, and yet to open new and to disdain all trodden paths, would have required the perusal of whole libraries, and a single life would not have been sufficient to complete the undertaking. And if others had been invited to join in the labor of the investigation, a motley compilation might have been the only result of so much research, which it is almost impossible ever to combine into one harmonious whole. Mariana's portraits of lords and favorites were found too original and faithful by the living, as in the case of the detestable Fernandez Velasco, of Castile, and his worthy secretary Pedro Mantaono. The secretary, after having been a panegyrist of the new historian, tried to serve his master by his attack on Mariana, entitled *Advertencias á la Historia de Mariana.* He was discovered, however, and roughly treated by Tamayo Vargas in *La Defensa de Mariana.* Probably to this criticism may be traced many improvements in Mariana's second Spanish edition of his history, which appeared at Madrid in 1608. It is on this edition, and the various readings selected from the editions of 1617 and 1623, that the edition of Valencia is based,

which contains ample notes and illustrations (1783–96, 9 vols. 8vo). This edition also closes, like the original, with the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic (1515–16). There have subsequently been published at Madrid—1. The continuation of Mariana by Miñana, translated from the Latin by Romero (1804, fol.); 2. A complete Mariana, continued down to the death of Charles III, 1788, by Sabau y Blanco (1817–22, 20 vols. 4to); 3. Another by the same, brought down to the year 1808 (9 vols. 8vo, with portraits).

The profound erudition of Mariana is also displayed in another publication, his *Tractatus Septem* (Cologne, 1609). The second of these treatises, *De Editione Vulgata*, is an epitome of his report on the fierce controversy between Arias Montanus and Leon de Castro. The fourth, *De Mutatione Monetæ*, provoked the indignation of the duke of Lerma and his partners in the system of general peculation and frauds which Mariana exposed. He foretold the calamities which threatened the Spanish nation; and his words, which had been disregarded, were remembered when the opportunity was gone. As a reward for proclaiming such unwelcome truths, at the age of seventy-three he suffered a whole year of judicial trickery, humiliations, and confinement in the convent of St. Francis at Madrid. In searching his papers another exposure was found, entitled *Del Gobierno de la Compañia*, or on the defects of his order, in which he also pointed out the means of correcting them. Copies of this MS. had multiplied so alarmingly that, the year after the author's death, the general of the Jesuits, Vitaleschi, issued a circular, dated Rome, July 29, 1624, enjoining the collection of such papers in order to be burned. Still that measure did not prevent its being printed at Bordeaux in 1625, and reprinted elsewhere in several languages. This curious circular was found in the archives of the Jesuits of Valencia at the time of their sudden expulsion from the Spanish dominions in 1767. After his persecution he made an epitome of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, translated some homilies, revised his *History of Spain*, and published a supplement, or, rather, a summary, of concise annals of Spain from 1515 to 1612. At the age of eighty-three he published his *Scholia* on the Old and New Testament, availing himself of the best Hebrew commentaries, and some valuable and very early MSS., which dated from the age of the ancient Gothic dominion in Spain. This work, though written at this advanced stage of life, "displays a degree of vigor and of learning which might well provoke the admiration of modern Biblical students." It secured for him a place among the best commentators in the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* of the hypercritical father Simon, who is usually unfavorable to Spaniards. Bayle, in his *Dictionary*, supposes Mariana to be also author of a work *Respublica Christiana*, but neither Alegambe nor Nicolas Antonio, both of them Spaniards, mentions it. Stevens, the English translator of Mariana's history, misstates some particulars of the author's life, and very unaptly compares him with Raleigh. Mariana left MSS. of at least twice the extent of all his publications. He died Feb. 6, 1623, in the eighty-seventh year of his age and the forty-ninth of his retirement to Toledo. See Mondejar. *Advertencias á Mariana; Juicio y Noticia de los Historiadores de España;* Andrade, *Vida de Mariana;* Acosta, *Vida de Mariana;* Andr. Schot., *Hispan. Illustrat.;* Baronius, *Annal. Ecclesiast.;* Bernard. Gerald., *Pro Senatu Veneto*, quoted in Colomesius, *Hispania Orientalis;* René Rapin, *Réflexions sur l'Histoire;* Nicolas Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispanonova;* Saavedra, *Respublica Literaria;* Tamayo de Vargas, *Vida del P. Juan Mariana;* Alegambe, *Biblioth. script. societatis Jesu;* Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.; Prosper Marchand, *Dictionnaire;* Freher, *Theatrum Virorum clarorum*, i, 347; Woltmann, *Gesch. u. Politik*, 1801, i, 265; Sismondi, *Littérature du Midi de l'Europe*, iv, 100; Bouterweck, *Hist. de la Littérature Espagnole*, 1812, vol. ii; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, iii, 143; Ranke, *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber* (1824); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 105 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 884; *Engl. Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 618 sq. (J. N. P.)

Marianists, an order of knighthood. See KNIGHTHOOD, p. 132 (iv); TEUTONIC KNIGHTS.

Marianus Scotus, a noted ecclesiastic, was born in Ireland or Scotland A.D. 1028; became a monk; travelled on the Continent in 1058, especially in Germany, and frequented the German monasteries of Cologne, Fulda, and Mentz, and died A.D. 1086. Marianus Scotus was the first to correct the inaccurate chronologies of the chronicles in his *Chronicon* (3 vols. to 1084; continued by Dödechin up to 1200). It is published among the *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* by Struve and others. The most valuable is the 3d volume, treating of the Carlovingian and following emperors. See Hansen, *De antiquiss. codice chronici Mariani Scoti* (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1782).

Mariastein, a noted place of pilgrimage in the Swiss canton of Solothurn, is annually visited by some 60,000 persons. The pilgrimages to this place began in the Middle Ages, and continue unabated to our day. During the first and second French Revolutions the place was ransacked by the French soldiers, but the monastics of the adjoining convent repaired and rebuilt it each time. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 767.

Mariazell, a famous place of pilgrimage in Austria, situated on the north border of the crown-land of Styria, twenty-four miles north of Bruck. It consists of a number of inns or lodging-houses, and contains 1200 inhabitants. It is visited by 300,000 pilgrims annually, who come hither to pay homage to an image of the Virgin believed to possess the power of working miracles, which was brought to Mariazell about 1157 by the Benedictine St. Lambrecht. A pilgrim chapel was first erected there about 1200 by margrave Henry I of Moravia. King Louis I of Hungary built a pilgrim church in 1343. The large pilgrim church now standing was built near the end of the 17th century; the miracle-working image is within a chapel, closed by a heavy gate of solid silver. During the great annual procession from Vienna, the greater part of the pilgrims of both sexes spend the night in the woods in drinking, singing, and general riot and debauchery. See Hillbach, *Der Pilger u. Tourist nach Maria-Zell* (Vienna, 1857, 8vo).

Marie à la Coque, a visionary, whose real name was *Margaret*, was born July 22, 1647, at Lauthecour, in the diocese of Autun, France. She boasted of religious transports, and heavenly visions and revelations, besides which she is reputed to have worked manifold wonders. She evinced a deep aversion to all evil in her infancy, and from her fourth year maintained an intimate communion with God. On the death of her father, which took place in the eighth year of her age, she entered a convent. Attributing the cure of a disease that had afflicted her during four years to the Virgin Mary, she gratefully adopted the name "Marie," and always used it by preference. She entered the Order of Salesians on the 27th of August, 1671, as a novice, and on the 6th of November, 1672, took the veil. From this time she claimed to be constantly favored with visions and revelations, and is said to have performed many miracles; such were her transports that she carved in large letters the name of Jesus on her breast. She had knowledge of the time when she should die, and prepared for that event in deep retirement, closing her life Oct. 17, 1690. She left a small work of a mystical character, entitled *La dévotion au cœur de Jésus*, and others of a similar nature. Her life was published by Jean Joseph Languet under the title *La vie de la vénérable mère Marguérite Marie;* but her memory has been kept alive chiefly through the four songs, *Ver-Vert*, in *Œuvres de M. Gresset* (Amsterd. 1748), i, 9–45. On the 4th of February, 1836, the advocate of the pontifical consistory addressed the pope, for the first time, on the process of her beatification;

but Talleyrand, as bishop of her native diocese, had already sought to effect her canonization during the last decennials of the 18th century.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 92 sq.

Marie DE L'INCARNATION, a French female missionary, whose original name was *Guyard*, was born at Tours in 1599. She early joined the Ursuline nuns; visited Canada in 1639, where she made many converts among the Indians; and founded a convent of her order. She died in 1672. See Charlevoix, *Vie de la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation; Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

Marietû, a celebrated Hindu sage or demi-god, was, according to one account, the son of Brahma—according to another, the son of Bhrigu. He was the father of Kasyapa. By some he is considered as the god of "light," which appears to be the etymological signification of his name. See Moor, *Hindu Pantheon; Institutes of Manu*, chap. i; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythology*, s. v.

Marillac, CHARLES DE, a noted prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Auvergne, in France, about 1510. He was advocate in the Parliament of Paris when, perceiving himself suspected of Lutheranism, he followed John de la Forest, ambassador of France to Constantinople, and thus avoided persecution from the inquisitors. He afterwards became abbot of St. Père and archbishop of Vienne; also counsellor in the privy council when the assembly of notables convened at Fontainebleau in 1560, and in it advocated the calling of a national council and a meeting of the states-general, but without much effect. He endeavored to take measures to prevent the mischiefs threatening the country at that time, but, despairing of success, he became melancholic, was preyed upon by disease, and died at his abbey of St. Père, in December, 1560.

Mar'imoth (2 Esdr. i, 2), the Latin form of MERE-MOTH (q. v.).

Marin, MICHEL ANGE, a French ecclesiastical writer, was born of a noble family at Marseilles in 1697. In 1714 he was admitted to the order of the Minimes; was employed in their schools, and four times filled a provincial office. He possessed not only a liking for theology and natural history, but also a natural taste for belles-lettres. His style is a little diffuse, and sometimes weak and incorrect, without being entirely void of elegance. He died April 3, 1767, at Avignon. His works are mainly in the department of practical religion. We note *Lei desastres de Barbacan chin errant dins Avignoun* (Avignon, 1722, 1759, 16mo; Aix, 1744): —*Conduite Spirituelle de la sœur Violet* (Avignon, 1740, 12mo):—*Adelaide de Witsbury ou la Pieuse pensionnaire* (Avignon, 1744, 12mo):—*La Parfaite Religieuse* (Avign. 1752, 12mo):—*Virginie, ou la virge Chretienne, histoire Sicilienne* (Avignon, 1752, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Vies des Pères des déserts d'Orient, avec leur doctrine spirituelle et leur discipline monastique* (Avignon, 1761–64, 3 vols. 4to, or 9 12mo; Lyons, 1824, 9 vols. 8vo):—*Le Baron de Van Hesden, ou la republique des incrédules* (Toulouse, 1762, 5 vols. 12mo):—*Agnès de Saint-Amour, ou la fervente novice* (Avignon, 1762, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1829):—*Théodule ou l'enfant de la bénédiction* (Avignon, 1762, 12mo):—*Farfulla, ou la commédienne convertie* (Avignon, 1762, 12mo):—*Agélique* (Avignon, 1766, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1830):—*La Marquise de los Valientes, ou la Dame Chrétienne* (Avignon, 1765, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Lettres ascétiques et morales* (Avignon, 1769, 2 vols. 12mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Marina DE ESCOBAR. See ESCOBAR.

Mariner (מַלָּח, *mallach'*, a *seaman*, comp. Gr. ἁλιεύς, Eng. "an old *salt*;" Ezek. xxvii, 9, 27, 29; Jonah i, 5; שַׁטִּים, *shatim'*, Ezek. xxvii, 8, "*rowers*," as in ver. 26), a sailor. See SHIP.

Marini, GIOVANNI FILIPPO, an Italian Jesuit and missionary, was born near Genoa in 1608; resided fourteen years at Tonking, Japan, and died in that country in 1677. He published *Della Missione de padri della comp. di Giesu nella provincia di Giuppone e particolarmente di quella di Tunchino* (Rome, 1663, 4to); and *A New and Curious Account of the Kingdoms of Tonquin and Laos* (1666), considered quite valuable.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Marino, or SAN MARINO, one of the most ancient and most limited republican states of Europe, consists of a craggy mountain 2200 feet in height, situated amid the lesser ranges of the Apennines, and encircled by provinces formerly belonging to the pontifical states. It possesses a total area of twenty-one miles, and comprises a town of the same name, and several villages in the adjacent territory. The climate is healthy, but, owing to its exposure, high winds and frequent rains prevail. The inhabitants, who are reckoned at 8000, are noted for their hospitality, sobriety, industry, and general morality. They are sensitively jealous of their rights, and cling with tenacity to their territorial and legislative independence. The religion of the country is Roman Catholic. The early history of the republic is very obscure. During the mediæval wars of Italy, Marino had its pigmy feuds and factions, which seem to have been none the less envenomed from the pettiness of the arena in which they were enacted. In 1740 the democratical form of government was securely guaranteed against further assault. The rights of this miniature state were scrupulously respected by Napoleon during his Italian campaign. The government, designated the Sovereign Grand Council (*Generale Consiglio Principe*), is composed of sixty members, of whom one third are nobles. From this number are selected the smaller "Council of Twelve" (two thirds from the town and the rest from the country), who, with the assistance of a jurisconsult, decide in questions of the second and third instance. The representatives of the state are termed captains-regent (*capitani reggenti*). They are chosen, the one from the party of the nobles, the other from the bourgeoisie. They each hold office only for six months. The army, or rather the militia of the republic, numbers 1189 men.

Marīnus, a martyr of the second half of the 3d century, is mentioned by Eusebius in his *Hist. Eccl.* vii, 15. According to this authority, Marinus was of a high family, served in the army, and was about to be appointed centurion by Gallienus (266–268) when he was denounced as a Christian by one of his fellow-soldiers. Brought before judge Achæus, he acknowledged his Christian faith, and was given three hours to recant. During this respite he was taken to church by bishop Theoteknos, who, presenting him a sword with one hand and the Gospel with the other, bade him choose between them. Marinus joyfully chose the latter, returned to the judge, to whom he declared his choice, and was at once executed. A Roman senator, Asterius, who was a witness of the execution, carried away the body upon his own shoulders, laid him out in fine clothes, and buried him (see *Acta Sanct.* ap. Bolland, t. 1, 3d of March). See also MARTIN II and III.

Another St. Marinus is commemorated on the 4th of September. He was a native of Dalmatia, and worked on the bridge of Rimini, when his piety attracted the notice of bishop Gaudentius of Brescia, who persuaded him to enter the Church, and made him deacon. Marinus retired on the mountain of Titano, where he erected a hermitage, and died towards the close of the 4th century. According to the legend, the miracles wrought at his tomb attracted a number of pilgrims to the place, who settled there, and this gave rise to his saintship.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 108; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 893; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 769.

Mariolatry (Gr. Μαρία, *Mary*, and λατρεία, *adoration*) is the technical term given by the Protestant world to the worship which Romanists render to the Virgin Mary. Romanists themselves term this worship *Hyperdulia* (q. v.), to distinguish it from the worship

paid to God, which they term *Latria* (q. v.), and adoration paid to saints, *Dulia* (q. v.). In our articles Hyperdulia, Immaculate Conception, and Invocation of Saints, we have already pointed out the great difficulty of bringing distinctions so refined within the comprehension of the common mind, so as to prevent the multitude from worshipping the creature instead of the Creator. "As mother of the Saviour of the world," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* ii, 410), "the Virgin Mary unquestionably holds forever a peculiar position among all women and in the history of redemption;" and, from this point of view, he remarks that it is "perfectly natural, nay, essential to sound religious feeling, to associate with Mary the fairest traits of maidenly and maternal character, and to revere her as the highest model of female purity, love, and piety. . . . But, on the other hand, it is equally unquestionable that she is nowhere in the N. T. excepted from the universal sinfulness and the universal need of redemption, nor represented as immaculately holy, or as in any way an object of divine veneration." Roman Catholics, however, have insisted upon the *adoration*, as they term worship in this instance, of the mother of Jesus, holding that Mary has been assumed in the Trinity, so as to make it a Quaternity; that "Mary is the complement of the Trinity" (Pusey, *Eirenicon*, ii, 167), and that *the intercession of Mary is needed for the salvation of the followers of Jesus Christ.* We quote the words of Liguori himself: "We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of Justice, and that by his merits he obtains us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of Grace; and that receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same, whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession" (*Glories of Mary*, p. 124). There is certainly not a word in the Bible, nor in the creeds of the Apostolic Church, nor even in the writings of the Church fathers of the first five centuries, to warrant any Christian in assigning such a position to Mary, the mother of Jesus, as the Catholic Church, both Latin and Greek, has dared to bestow upon her. One of the accepted interpreters of the Church of Rome, Liguori, in commenting on the exalted position which the Virgin Mary should hold in the estimation of Latin communicants, says that she is Queen of Mercy (p. 13); that she is the Mother of all mankind (p. 23); that she offered her Son to the Father on Mount Calvary (p. 23); that she is especially the Mother of repentant sinners (p. 42); that she is our Life (p. 52); that God was reconciled with sinners by the humility and purity of Mary (p. 56); that she obtains us perseverance (p. 59); that she renders death sweet to her clients (p. 68); that she is our Protectress at the hour of death (p. 71); that she is the Hope of all (p. 79); that she is our only Refuge, Help, and Asylum (p. 81); that she is the Propitiatory of the whole world (p. 81); that she is the one City of Refuge (p. 89); that it is her office to withhold God's arm from chastising sinners until he is pacified (p. 93); that she is the Comfortress of the world, the Refuge of the unfortunate (p. 100); that we shall be heard more quickly if we call on the name of Mary than if we call on the name of Jesus (p. 106); that she is our Patroness (p. 106); that she is Queen of heaven and hell, of all saints, and all evil spirits, because she conquered the latter by her virtues, and the devil by her fair humility and holy life (p. 110); that she protects us from the divine justice and from the devil (p. 115); that at the name of Mary every knee bows and hell trembles (p. 116); that she is the Ladder of paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man (p. 121); that her intercession is necessary for salvation (p. 122); that she is the Mediatrix of grace (p. 124); that in her is all hope of life and virtue, all grace of the Way and Truth (p. 125); that in her we find eternal salvation (p. 125); that no one can enter heaven except by her (p. 127); that all graces of the spiritual life are transmitted by Mary (p. 127); that all gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed by her, to whomsoever, when, and as she pleases (p. 128); that from her the world receives every good (p. 128); that she is the Helper of the Redemption (p. 133); that she and her Son redeemed the world (p. 133); that she is the Co-operator in our justification (p. 133); that the way of salvation is open to none otherwise than through Mary (p. 135); that God says, "Go to Mary," when we seek for grace from him (p. 136); that the salvation of all depends on the favor and protection of Mary (p. 136); that the other saints intercede with her (p. 138); that she is a tender Advocate; that all power is given unto her in heaven and earth (p. 145); that God obeys the command of Mary (p. 146); that Mary is omnipotent (p. 146); that the whole Church is under the dominion of Mary (p. 146); that what she wills is necessarily done (p. 147); that her prayers have something of a command in them (p. 151); that Jesus Christ is under an obligation to her to grant all she asks (p. 152); that she is the singular Refuge of the lost (p. 156); that she is the Advocate of the whole human race (p. 161); that her chief office in the world is to reconcile fallen souls with God (p. 167); that she is the great Peace-maker who obtains reconciliation, salvation, pardon, and mercy (p. 165); that in her is established the seat of God's government (p. 179); that she delivers her clients from hell (p. 183); that her clients will necessarily be saved (p. 184); that she has sent back many from hell to earth who have died of mortal sins (p. 188); that she consoles, relieves, and succors her clients in purgatory (p. 195); that she delivers her clients from purgatory by applying her merits (p. 195); that she carries away from purgatory all who wear the Carmelite scapulary on the Saturday after they die, provided they have been chaste and have said her office (p. 196); that she does not suffer those who die clothed in the scapulary to go to hell (p. 185); that Mary leads her servants to heaven (p. 198); that she has the key of the gate of paradise (p. 199); that she is the Way of our salvation (p. 200); that it is for the love of Mary and on account of her merits that God is more merciful under the New than under the Old Dispensation (p. 214); that her powerful intercession sustains the world (p. 214); that she is the Throne of grace to which St. Paul bids us fly (p. 215); that Christ has promised that all who invoke the holy name of Mary with confidence shall have perfect sorrow for their sins, atonement for their crimes, strength to attain perfection, and shall reach the glory of paradise (p. 226), etc.

We will also cite for the benefit of our readers some passages from the writings of Liguori bearing more directly on the field of *doctrinal* theology. Mary is not only titled by him "Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King: to her belongs dominion and power over all creatures" (p. 12); "She is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice" (p. 13). "If Jesus is the Father of souls, Mary is also their Mother. On two occasions, *according to the holy fathers*, Mary became our spiritual Mother. The first, according to blessed Albert the Great, was when she *merited* to conceive in her virginal womb the Son of God. This was revealed by our Lord to S. Gertrude, who was one day reading the above text, and was perplexed, and could not understand how Mary, being only the Mother of Jesus, could be said to have brought forth her first-born. God explained it to her, saying that Jesus was Mary's first-born according to the flesh, but that all mankind were her second-born according to the Spirit. . . . . The second occasion on which Mary became our spiritual Mother, and brought us forth to the life of grace, was when *she offered* to the eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Mount Calvary with such bitter sorrow and suffering" (p. 23). "Thus it is that in every engagement with the infernal powers we shall always certainly conquer by having recourse to the Mother of God, who is also our Mother, saying and repeating again and again, 'We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God; we fly to thy patronage, O holy

Mother of God!' Oh, how many victories have not the faithful gained over hell by having recourse to Mary with this short but most powerful prayer! Thus it was that that great servant of God, sister Mary, the crucified, of the Order of S. Benedict, always overcame the devils" (p. 26). "'Since the very tigers,' says our most loving Mother Mary, 'cannot forget their young, how can I forget to love you, my children?'" (p. 30). "Our Blessed Lady herself revealed to sister Mary, the crucified, that the fire of love with which she was inflamed towards God was such that, if the heavens and earth were placed in it, they would be instantly consumed; so that the ardors of the Seraphim, in comparison with it, were but as fresh breezes" (p. 31). "Let us love her like a S. Francis Solano, who, maddened as it were (but with holy madness) with love for Mary, would sing before her picture, and accompany himself on a musical instrument, saying that, like worldly lovers, he serenaded his most sweet Queen" (p. 38). "Let us love her as so many of her servants have loved her, and who never could do enough to show their love. Father Jerome of Texo, of the Society of Jesus, rejoiced in the name of slave of Mary; and, as a mark of servitude, went often to visit her in some church dedicated in her honor. On reaching the church, he poured out abundant tears of tenderness and love for Mary; then prostrating, he licked and rubbed the pavement with his tongue and face, kissing it a thousand times, because it was the house of his beloved Lady" (p. 38). "Mary is the Mother of repentant sinners" (p. 42). "When Mary sees a sinner at her feet imploring her mercy, she does not consider the crimes with which he is loaded, but the intention with which he comes; and if this is good, even should he have committed all possible sins, the most loving Mother embraces him, and does not disdain to heal the wounds of his soul" (p. 45). "'My God,' she says, 'I had two sons—Jesus and man; man took the life of my Jesus on the cross, and now thy justice would condemn the guilty one. O Lord! my Jesus is already dead; have pity on me; and if I have lost the one, do not make me lose the other also!' And most certainly God will not condemn those sinners who have recourse to Mary, and for whom she prays, since he himself commended them to her as her children" (p. 47). These passages are taken almost at random from Liguori's *Glories of Mary*, chapter i, which is a paraphrase of the words *Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy!* Yet these claims are moderate compared with those set up in the fifth chapter, entitled, *Of the Necessity of the Intercession of Mary for our Salvation.* "S. Lawrence Justinian asks, 'How can she be otherwise than full of grace who has been made the *Ladder to paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man?*'" (p. 121). "That which we intend to prove here is that the intercession of Mary is now *necessary* to salvation; we say necessary—not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that he dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of S. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of theologians and learned men. The author of *The Reign of Mary* positively asserts that such is the case. It is maintained by Vega, Mendoza, Pacciuchelli, Segnori, Poiré, Crasset, and by innumerable other learned authors" (p. 122).

Now what have we in holy Scripture to warrant such a position as is here taken by Liguori? Comparison, as distinct from contrast, requires the existence of some similitude, but take any passage in which Mary is mentioned, from the salutation down to the period after the ascension, and there is nothing in any way similar. It only remains, therefore, to contrast instead of comparing. But our readers are so well acquainted with holy Writ that we remit the task to them, only begging them to remember four things: 1. That Mary is represented as she is, and not otherwise in the Gospels; 2. That she is not mentioned at all in the Acts after the first chapter, or in the Epistles, although St. Paul has entered so minutely into the economy of the Christian scheme of salvation; 3. That all that prophet and apostle has said of our Lord is by Romanists transferred to Mary; 4. That all those passages which speak of one Mediator between God and man not only ignore, but exclude the modern doctrine, pronounced by Dr. Schaff "one of the principal points of separation between Græco-Roman Catholicism and evangelical Protestantism" (*Ch. Hist.* ii, 411).

Lest the charge should be brought to our door that we have attributed to the Church of Rome the doctrines held by only a part of her communicants, or even only one of her priests, we continue our quotations from some of her most eminent writers, affording ample proof of the manner in which the Roman Catholic is taught to look upon the Virgin: "O thou, our Governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being his Mother, command your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things" (from the *Crown of the Blessed Virgin*, Psalter of Bonaventura). "We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the Spouse of the eternal Father. All the angels and archangels, all thrones and powers, do faithfully serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a never-ceasing voice, Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God. . . . The whole court of heaven doth honor thee as queen. The holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, the Mother of divine Majesty. . . . Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father. . . . In thee, sweet Mary, is our hope; defend us forever more. Praise becometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee forever and ever" (from a *Parody on the Te Deum*, by the same writer). "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith concerning Mary; which faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. . . . He (Jesus Christ) sent the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, and upon his Mother, and at last took her up into heaven, where she sitteth on the right hand of her Son, and never ceaseth to make intercession with him for us. This is the faith concerning the Virgin Mary, which, except every one do believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved" (from a *Parody on the Athanasian Creed*, by the same writer). "During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly that they had no time to make the least preparation. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the clergy and people to go in procession to the church of our Lady, called St. Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced: in every street as they passed the plague ceased, and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the Tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, 'Regina Cœli,' 'Triumph, O Queen,' Hallelujah. The holy pope added, 'Ora pro nobis Deum,' 'Pray for us,' etc. The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time" (from Alphonsus Liguori's *The Glories of Mary*). Gabriel Biel, *Super Canonem Missæ*, says "that our heavenly Father gave the half of his kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, Queen of heaven; which is signified in the case of Esther, to whom Ahasuerus promised the half of his kingdom. So that our heavenly Father, who possessed justice and mercy, retained the former, and conceded to the Virgin Mary the exercise of the latter." Antoninus, archbishop of Flor-

ence, goes further yet than Gabriel Biel. We hesitate to record the profane blasphemies which are found in the writings of various popes, prelates, and divines on this subject. Stories of the Middle Ages, many ludicrous, many trivial, one or two sublime, are all penetrated with this single thought, that from Mary, and Mary alone, could heart worship, and repentance, and prayer, in the very second of death, in the very act of sin, without the Eucharist, without the priest, at sea, in the desert, in the very home of vice, obtain instant and full remission; but, with Elliott (*Delineation of Romanism*, p. 754), "we refuse even to name the vulgar preaching and rude discourses of friars and priests who induct the multitude into this worship, as being too indelicate for the ears of even an intelligent Romanist." The following we take from a *Prayer of St. Bernard:* "Remember, O most Holy Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O Mother of Jesus, the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer." "*Prayer.*—O God of goodness, who hast filled the holy and immaculate heart of Mary with the same sentiments of mercy and tenderness for us with which the heart of Jesus Christ, thy Son and her Son, was always overflowing; grant that all who honor this virginal heart may preserve until death a perfect conformity of sentiments and inclinations with the sacred heart of Jesus Christ, who, with thee and the Holy Ghost, lives and reigns one God, forever and ever. Amen." "*Aspiration.*—O Mary! Thou art light in our doubts, consolation in our sorrows, and protection in our dangers! After thy Son, thou art the certain hope of faithful souls! Hail, hope of the desponding and refuge of the destitute, to whom thy Son has given such power that whatever thou willest is immediately done!" From the Breviary: "O Holy Mary, succor the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex; let all be sensible of thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration." . . . "Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joy, through our Lord Jesus Christ." The *Litany of the Sacred Heart of Mary* deserves to be added:

"Lord have mercy on us!
Son of God, have mercy on us!
Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!
Jesus Christ, hear us!
Jesus Christ, graciously hear us!
God, the Father of heaven, have mercy on us!
God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us!
God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!
Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us!
Heart of Mary, conceived without the stain of sin! } Pray for us!
Heart of Mary, full of grace!
Heart of Mary, sanctuary of the Trinity!
Heart of Mary, tabernacle of the incarnate Word!
Heart of Mary, after God's own heart!
Heart of Mary, illustrious throne of glory!
Heart of Mary, perfect holocaust of divine love!
Heart of Mary, abyss of humility!
Heart of Mary, attached to the cross!
Heart of Mary, seat of mercy!
Heart of Mary, consolation of the afflicted!
Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners!
Heart of Mary, advocate of the Church, and mother of all faithful!
Heart of Mary, after Jesus, the most assured hope of the agonizing!
Heart of Mary, queen of angels and of the saints!
Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, spare us!
Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, hear us, O Lord!
Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord!
O most sacred and amiable heart of Mary, Mother of God, pray for us! That our hearts may be inflamed with divine love."

The following is an extract from the encyclical letter addressed by Gregory XVI to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, bearing date Aug. 15, 1832, affording ample evidence that the same doctrine was approved by the highest authorities of the Romish Church even prior to the promulgation of the dogma of *immaculate conception* (q. v.): "Having at length taken possession of our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of our predecessors, we turn to you without delay, venerable brethren; and, in testimony of our feelings towards you, we select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most Blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven; that she, who has been through every great calamity our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock. . . . But, that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." (Comp. here Kitto, *Journal Sacred Lit.* ix, 25; xv, 211; *English Review*, x, 350 sq.; *Christ. Remembrancer*, 1855 [Oct.], p. 417 sq.; especially p. 443 and 449.) In view of such a document emanating from the head of the Church, what account can we make of the declaration of the Romish vicars apostolic in Great Britain that "Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven; but in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints as to the authors or givers of divine grace, but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him;" except to consider it as a document well calculated for a Protestant latitude, but liable to be looked upon in Rome as semi-heretical? "What ideas also are we to entertain of the candor or veracity of those Romanists who cease not, after Bossuet and others, to affirm that 'they only pray to saints to intercede for them?' Here is the head of their Church performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her presumed assumption, invoking her, as his patroness and protectress, in a time of great calamity, entreating her to aid him by her heavenly influence to that which would be salutary for the Church. Is this *only* to pray to her to undertake for us? The leader in this act of devotion is the supreme earthly oracle; the visible, living, speaking guide of the Church. If this be not idolatry, then idolatry exists only in name" (Elliott, p. 754). Nor do we find in the present pontiff less devotion to the Virgin, if we may base our knowledge on the official documents issued in his name. In the decree of Dec. 8, 1854, Pius IX urges all Catholics, *colere, invocare, exorare beatissimam Dei genitricem*, translated as follows by the *Tablet* (Jan. 27): "Let all the children of the Catholic Church most dear to us hear these words; and, with a most ardent zeal of piety and love, *proceed to worship, invoke, and pray to* the most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, conceived without original sin" —the head of the Roman Catholic Church urging on his subjects a *greater* zeal and ardor in the worship of Mary than that which St. Alfonso had displayed. In the same decree he states that "the true object of this devotion" is Mary's "conception." How that act can be an object of devotion, it is difficult intelligently to imagine. But such is *Mariolatry*. Not only do we now find the adoration of the Mother of God permitted, but actually *commanded*. "The devout Roman Catholic," says Cramp (p. 400) justly, "pays Mary the most extravagant honor and veneration. The language adopted in addressing the 'Queen of heaven' cannot be acquitted of the charge of blasphemy, since prayers are offered directly to her as if to a divine being, and bless-

ings are supplicated as from one who is able to bestow them. In all devotions she has a share. The *Ave Maria* accompanies the *Pater Noster*. 'Evening, morning, and at noon,' said the Psalmist, 'will I pray unto thee, and cry aloud;' the pious Roman Catholic transfers these services to the Virgin. In tender childhood he is taught to cherish for her the profoundest reverence and the highest affection; throughout life she is the object of his daily regard, and five solemn festivals, annually observed to her honor, call forth his ardent love and zeal, and in the hour of death he is taught to place reliance on her mercy. To the ignorant devotee she is more than Christ, than God; he believes that she can command her Son, that to her intercession nothing can be denied, and that to her power all things are possible." But if the Latin Church be adjudged guilty of Mariolatry, it must not be forgotten that the same sentence of condemnation should fall still more heavily on the Greek Church; for "it cannot be denied," says Pusey (*Eirenicon*, ii, 425), "that the orthodox Greek Church does even surpass the Church of Rome in exaltation of the Blessed Virgin in their devotions."

Mariolatry likewise appears in the favorite prayer to Mary, the angelic greeting, or the *Ave Maria*, which in the Catholic devotions runs parallel with the *Pater Noster*, and of which we had occasion to speak above. It takes its name from the initial words of the salutation of Gabriel to the Holy Virgin at the annunciation of the birth of Christ. It consists of three parts: (1) The salutation of the angel (Luke i, 28): *Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum!* (2) The words of Elizabeth (Luke i, 42): *Benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui, Jesus.* (3) The later unscriptural addition, which contains the prayer proper, and is offensive to the Protestant and all sound Christian feeling: *Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis. Amen.* (For the English, etc., see AVE MARIA.) "Formerly this third part, which gave the formula the character of a prayer, was traced back to the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus in 431, which sanctioned the expression *mater Dei*, or *Dei genitrix* (Θεοτόκος); but Roman archæologists (e. g. Mast, in Wetzer und Welte [Rom. Cathol.], *Kirchen-Lexikon*, i, 563) now concede that it is a much later addition, made in the beginning of the 16th century (1508), and that the closing words, *nunc et in hora mortis*, were added even after that time by the Franciscans. But even the first two parts did not come into general use as a standing formula of prayer until the 13th century. From that date the *Ave Maria* stands in the Roman Church upon a level with the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, and with them forms the basis of the rosary" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 424, 425).

The chief festivals of the Virgin, common to the Western and Eastern churches, celebrating the most important facts and fictions of her life, and in some degree running parallel with the festivals of the birth, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, are the *Conception* (q. v.), the *Nativity* (q. v.), the *Purification* (q. v.), the *Annunciation* (q. v.), the *Visitation* (q. v.), and the *Assumption* (q. v.). All these festivals are observed also in the English Church, but from a quite different standpoint, of course. The Roman Church has, besides these, several special festivals, with appropriate offices—all, however, of minor solemnity. See MARY, THE VIRGIN.

Origin of Mariolatry.—We have detailed somewhat at length the views held by the Græco-Roman theologians on the adoration they consider due to the Virgin Mary to afford a fair insight into Mariolatry as now practiced. It remains, however, to examine how the *veneration* of Mary degenerated into the *worship* of Mary, a worship which itself "was originally only a reflection of the worship of Christ . . . designed to contribute to the glorifying of Christ" (Schaff, ii, 410). All unbiassed historians agree in regarding the worship of Mary as an echo of ancient heathenism. Polytheism was so deeply rooted among the non-Israelites of the days of Christ that it reproduced itself even among the followers of Jesus, though it is true it appeared clothed in a Christian dress. "The popular religious want," says Dr. Schaff, "had accustomed itself even to female deities, and very naturally betook itself first of all to Mary, the highly favored and blessed mother of the divine-human Redeemer, as the worthiest object of adoration." But, though it is apparent that remnants of ancient heathenism thus laid hold even on the newly-found doctrines, it is quite certain also that during the first ages the invocation of the Virgin and of saints must have held a subordinate place in Christian worship, for there is not a word about it in the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries. "We may scan each page that they have left us, and we shall find nothing of the kind. There is nothing of the sort in the supposed works of Hermas and Barnabas, nor in the real works of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; that is, the doctrine is not to be found in the 1st century. There is nothing of the sort in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian; that is, in the 2d century. There is nothing of the sort in Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyprian, Methodius, Lactantius; that is, in the 3d century. There is nothing of the sort in Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose; that is, in the 4th century. There is nothing of the sort in Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Basil of Seleucia, Orosius, Sedulius, Isidore, Theodoret, Prosper, Vincentius Lirinensis, Cyril of Alexandria, popes Leo, Hilarus, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus; that is, in the 5th century." Nor is there the least trace of Mariolatry among the remains of the Catacombs. Says a writer in the *Lond. Qu. Rev.* July, 1864, p. 85: "As regards the sacred person of the Virgin, she takes that place only in the art of the Catacombs which the purity of earlier Christianity would lead us to predicate. She is seen there solely in a scriptural and historical sense—in the subject of the Adoration of the Wise Men who found 'the young child and his mother.' And this even takes its place among the later productions of classic-Christian art; while the subject of the Nativity, which occurs on two sarcophagi, evidently belongs to the last decline of that period. With these two exceptions, no trace of a representation of the Virgin can be found in the mural or sculptural art of the Catacombs." We cannot do better than sum up this portion of our subject in the words of the Rev. E. Tyler, to whose conscientious labors every student of Christian antiquities is so much indebted: "We have examined to the utmost of our ability and means the remains of Christian antiquity. Especially have we searched into the writings of those whose works (A.D. 492) received the approbation of the pope and his council at Rome; we have also diligently sought for evidence in the records of the early councils; and we find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers—not for a few years, or in a portion of Christendom, but to the end of the first five hundred years and more, and in every country in the Eastern and the Western empire, in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia—testifying as with one voice that the writers and their contemporaries knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God; no practice, in public or private, of prayer to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no ascription of divine honor and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer, and Christ the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust" (p. 290). There is not a shadow of doubt that the origin of the worship of Mary is to be traced to the apocryphal legends of her birth and of her death, which, in the course of time, decorated the life of Mary with fantastic fables and wonders of every kind, and

thus furnished a pseudo-historical foundation for an unscriptural Mariology and Mariolatry (compare Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 34 sq.). It is in these productions of the Gnostics (q. v.) that we find the germ of what afterwards expanded into its present portentous proportions. Some of the legends of her birth are as early as the 2d or 3d century. But to the honor of the Christians of that day be it remembered that they unanimously and firmly rejected these legends as fabulous and heretical. Witness the conduct of the Church towards the *Collyridians* (q. v.), and the excesses in the opposite direction it gave rise to by the formation of a sect known as the *Antidicomarianites* (q. v.). "The whole thing," says Epiphanius, when commenting upon the unwarranted practices of the Collyridians, "is foolish and strange, and is a device and deceit of the devil. Let Mary be in honor. Let the Lord be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary" (*Hæret.* lxxxix, in *Opp.* p. 1066, Paris, 1662).

Indeed, down to the time of the Nestorian controversy of A.D. 430, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, it would appear, was wholly external to the Church, and was regarded as heretical. It was this controversy that first produced a great change of sentiment in men's minds. Nestorius had maintained, or at least it was the tendency of Nestorianism to maintain, not only that our Lord had two natures, the divine and the human (which was right), but also that he was two persons, in such sort that the child born of Mary was not divine, but merely an ordinary human being, until the divinity subsequently united itself to him. This was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431; and the title Θεοτόκος, loosely translated "Mother of God," was sanctioned. The object of the council and of the Anti-Nestorians was in no sense to add honor to the Mother, but to maintain the true doctrine with respect to the Son. Nevertheless the result was to magnify the Mother, and, after a time, at the expense of the Son. For now the title Θεοτόκος became a shibboleth, and in art the representation of the Madonna and Child became the expression of orthodox belief. Very soon the purpose for which the title and the picture were first sanctioned became forgotten, and the veneration of Mary began to spread within the Church, as it had previously existed external to it. The legends, too, were no longer treated as apocryphal. Neither were the Gnostics any longer the objects of dread. Nestorians, and afterwards Iconoclasts, in turn became the objects of hatred. The old fables were winked at, and thus they universally became the mythology of Christianity among the southern nations of Europe, while many of the dogmas which they are grounded upon have, as a natural consequence, crept into the faith. "Thenceforth the Θεοτόκος was a test of orthodox Christology, and the rejection of it amounted to the beginning or the end of all heresy. The overthrow of Nestorianism was at the same time the victory of Mary-worship. With the honor of the Son, the honor also of the Mother was secured. The opponents of Nestorius, especially Proclus, his successor in Constantinople († 447), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), could scarcely find predicates enough to express the transcendent glory of the Mother of God. She was the crown of virginity, the indestructible temple of God, the dwelling-place of the Holy Trinity, the paradise of the second Adam, the bridge from God to man, the loom of the incarnation, the sceptre of orthodoxy; through her the Trinity is glorified and adored, the devil and dæmons put to flight, the nations converted, and the fallen creature raised to heaven. The people were all on the side of the Ephesian decision, and gave vent to their joy in boundless enthusiasm, amid bonfires, processions, and illuminations" (Schaff, ii, 426). "Yet it is not exactly the fact that the giving of this title (Theotokos) was the cause of the *cultus*, for some of the fathers before that time had employed the word to express the doctrine of the incarnation, as the two Gregorys did; it was the Nestorian heretics who really drove the Catholic mind to paying her the tribute of devotion; and even then it seems as if the *cultus* of that time was far more in honor of the Son than of the Mother, more a mode of testifying the belief in the verity of the true doctrine of the incarnation, denied by the heretics, than of giving her an undue worship. When she was addressed as the 'Mother of God,' when she was represented as the Mother with her infant Son, she appeared, it is true, as the prominent figure; but it was to express clearly the Catholic doctrine of the incarnation—the two natures in the one person of Christ. We can see how easily the mind of the worshipper would penetrate further, and, from looking at her merely as the Theotokos, would see in the Mother of God one possessed of a mother's influence and power" (*Christian Remembrancer*, 1868, July, p. 136, 137).

From this time the worship of Mary grew apace; it agreed well with many natural aspirations of the heart. To paint the mother of the Saviour an ideal woman, with all the grace and tenderness of womanhood, and yet with none of its weaknesses, and then to fall down and worship that which the imagination had set up, was what might easily happen, and did happen. Evidence was not asked for. Perfection was becoming the mother of the Lord, therefore she was perfect. Adoration "was befitting" on the part of Christians, therefore they gave it. Any tales attributed to antiquity were received as genuine, any revelations supposed to be made to favored saints were accepted as true; and the Madonna reigned as queen in heaven, in earth, in purgatory, and over hell. The mother of the Saviour soon became the Mother of Salvation, as John of Damascus calls her (*Homil. in Amun.*), "the common salvation of all in extremity" (ἡ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς κοινὴ σωτηρία). "The alone Mother of God, who art to be worshipped (ἡ προσκυνητή) forever." Nestorianism lived on, and lives still, when other earlier heresies on the nature of Christ—like Arianism—have died; nay, it was once a great ecclesiastical power. Catholics showed their orthodoxy by honoring the Mother of God, their abhorrence of heresy by rendering her worship. Thus arose the story of her assumption, and the festival (Aug. 15) in honor of that supposed event. She then became the *Mater Coronata*, endued with power both in heaven and earth. Language was addressed to her such as belonged only to God; e. g. Peter Damian, in a sermon (*In Nativ. B. V. M.*), speaks thus: "Et data est tibi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra: nil tibi impossibile, cui possibile est desperatos in spem beatitudinis relevare. Quomodo enim illa potestas tuæ potentiæ poterit obviare, quæ de carne tua carnis suscepit originem? Accedis enim ante illud aureum humanæ reconciliationis altare, non solum regnans sed imperans, domina non ancilla." Under such teaching as this we need not wonder at the extent to which her *cultus* went. "From that time," says Dr. Schaff, "numerous churches and altars were dedicated to the holy Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin; among them also the church at Ephesus in which the anti-Nestorian Council of 431 had sat. Justinian I, in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman empire, and on the dedication of the costly altar of the church of St. Sophia he expected all blessings for church and empire from her powerful prayers. His general, Narses, like the knights in the Middle Age, was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection. Pope Boniface IV, in 608, turned the Pantheon in Rome into a temple of Mary *ad martyres;* the pagan Olympus into a Christian heaven of gods. Subsequently even her images (made after an original pretending to have come from Luke) were divinely worshipped, and, in the prolific legends of the superstitious Middle Age, performed countless miracles, before some of which the miracles of the Gospel history grow dim. She became almost coordinate with Christ, a joint redeemer, invested with most of his own attributes and acts of grace. The popular belief ascribed to her, as to Christ, a sinless concep-

tion, a sinless birth, resurrection and ascension to heaven, and a participation of all power in heaven and earth. She became the centre of devotion, cultus, and art, and the popular symbol of power, of glory, and of the final victory of Catholicism over all heresies" (ii, 424, 425). In the 6th century the practice became general within the Church, both in the East and in the West, and the writers, commencing with the post-Nicene period, which had brought in this innovation with many others, down to the 16th century, are now found to relate the untold privileges of the Virgin, and with an enthusiasm constantly growing until checked by the opposition of the Reformers, we are told of the efficacy of Mary as a mediator with her Son. This devotional enthusiasm was carried to its greatest height by St. Bernard (q. v.), and still more so by Bonaventura (cited above), who, Dr. Wiseman says, was one of the saints and luminaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and every Roman Catholic prays that he may be enlightened by his teaching and benefited by his prayers. It is Bonaventura who gave the following version of the 51st Psalm: "Have pity upon me, O great Queen, who art called the Mother of Mercy; and, according to the tenderness of that mercy, purify me from my iniquities." And so it runs throughout. The 149th Psalm is—"Sing a new song in honor of our Queen. Let the just publish her praises in their assemblies. Let the heavens rejoice in her glory; let the isles of the sea and all the earth rejoice therein. Let water and fire, cold and heat, brightness and light, praise her. Let the mouth of the just glorify her; let her praises resound in the triumphant company of the saints. City of God, place thy joy in blessing her, and let songs of praise continually be sung to her by thy illustrious and glorious inhabitants."

Promotion of Mariolatry by religious Art.—Ever since the condemnation of Nestorius the popular doctrine had found its ablest support in art. The representation of that beautiful group, since popularly known as the Madonna and Child, became the expression of the orthodox faith. "Every one who wished to prove his hatred of the arch-heretic exhibited the image of the maternal Virgin holding in her arms the infant Godhead, either in his house as a picture, or embroidered on his garments, or on his furniture, or his personal ornaments—in short, wherever it could be introduced" (Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, p. xxi). With the extension and popularity of the worship of the Virgin, the multiplication of her image, in every form and material, naturally enough spread throughout Christendom, until suddenly checked by the iconoclastic movements of the 8th century [see ICONOCLASM], and, descending the Middle Ages, we find Christian art generally at its lowest ebb in the 10th and 11th centuries. The pilgrimages to the Holy Land and the Crusades mark the renaissance, but it was not until the 13th century that Mariolatry received more aid from religious art. Then the popular enthusiasm was kindled anew by the exertions of Bonaventura, and by the formation of many chivalric brotherhoods that vowed her especial service (as the *Serviti*, who were called in France *les esclaves de Marie*), and by the action of the great religious communities, at this time comprehending all the enthusiasm, learning, and influence of the Church. These had placed themselves solemnly and especially under the protection of the Virgin. "The Cistercians wore white in honor of her purity; the Servi wore black in respect to her sorrows; the Franciscans had enrolled themselves as champions of the immaculate conception; and the Dominicans introduced the Rosary. All these richly-endowed communities vied with each other in multiplying churches, chapels, and pictures in honor of their patroness, and expressive of her several attributes. The devout painter, kneeling before his easel, addressed himself to the task of portraying these heavenly lineaments, which had visited him perhaps in dreams. Many of the professed monks and friars became themselves accomplished artists" (Mrs. Jameson). Poetry also came to the altar of sacrilege, and made her offering in the person of the immortal Dante, who, "through the communion of mind, not less than through his writings, infused into religious art that mingled theology, poetry, and mysticism which ruled in the Giottesque school during the following century, and went hand in hand with the development of the power and practice of imitation. . . . His ideas respecting the Virgin Mary were precisely those to which the writings of St. Bernard, St. Bonaventura, and St. Thomas Aquinas had already lent all the persuasive power of eloquence, and the Church all the weight of her authority" (Mrs. Jameson). He hastened to render these doctrines into poetry, and in the *Paradiso* Mary figures as the Mystic Rose (Rosa mystica) and Queen of heaven, with the attendant angels, circle within circle, floating round her in adoration, and singing the Regina Cœli, and saints and patriarchs stretching forth their hands towards her. "Thus," says Mrs. Jameson (p. xxx), "the impulses given . . . continued in progressive development . . . the spiritual sometimes in advance of the material influences; the moral idea emanating, as it were, *from* the soul, and the influences of external nature flowing *into* it; the comprehensive power of fancy using more and more the apprehensive power of imitation, and both working together till their 'blended might' achieved its full fruition in the works of Raphael" (q. v.). The Hussite war, and the iconoclastic spirit of the Bohemians, rather strengthened the Churchmen than otherwise, and contributed to the growth of the impulse to worship Mary. But strange fancies were now as freely interpolated in the productions of the artist, which, though themselves but "the reflex influence of that interpolation of new doctrines which had been going on in the Church for so many centuries" (Hill, *Engl. Monasticism*, p. 320), nevertheless received the disapproval of pious Catholics of that age, who "cried out 'temerarium, scandalosum, et periculosum,' when they saw the most solemn spectacle in the world's history made the sport of wanton imaginations . . . the sorrow of the cross made to rest more heavily upon the mother of Christ than upon him" (Hill). The Council of Trent felt itself forced to denounce the impropriety of certain pictures, and it was generally acknowledged that paganized and degenerate influences had overruled spiritual art, that the latter was indeed no more, that "it was dead; it could never be revived without a return to those modes of thought and belief which had at first inspired it" (Mrs. Jameson).

Just at this time "theological art," as Mrs. Jameson calls it, came to the rescue of Mariolatry. It is true the Reformation at the opening of the 16th century had dealt a severe blow at all the various institutions of Romanism savoring of idolatry and superstition, but this was only an additional reason why the Church of St. Peter should seek to fortify herself the more strongly in the fortress so severely assailed by the enemy. Mariolatry had served her purpose ably, and just now, if ever, needed re-enforcing. Deprived of the aid of "religious art," the poets and artists no longer wrought up to a wild pitch of enthusiasm to inspire the spirit of worship of the Virgin, the infallible guide of the Church himself came to the rescue, and supplied by "theological art" what was needed. In 1571 the battle of Lepanto was fought. In it the combined fleets of Christendom, led by Don Juan of Austria, were arrayed against the Turks, and achieved a memorable victory over the devout adherents of the prophet of Mecca. Pope Pius V quickly availed himself of this opportunity to attribute the victory "to the special interposition of the Blessed Virgin." From a very early period in Mariolatry we find festivals instituted in honor of the "Blessed Virgin," but now a new festival, that of the Rosary, was added to those already observed, a new invocation added to her litany, under the title of *Auxiliam Christianorum*, and, more than all, many sanctuaries were declared to be especially sacred to her worship, and thus a prominence was given to her devotion which found its full expression only in our

own day, on Dec. 8, 1854, when this dogma, conceived in the silence of the cell by the brain of infatuated monks, was canonized by a helpless pontiff, and the doctrine established "that not only did the Virgin Mary immaculately conceive her son Jesus Christ (as Protestants hold), but was as immaculately conceived herself" (Hill, p. 314; comp. Krauth, *Conservative Reformation*, p. 381 sq.). Well, indeed, may it be said that "the controversy with Rome threatens more and more to resolve itself into the question whether the creed of Christendom is to be based upon the life of Jesus or the life of Mary, upon the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels" (Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom* [Boyle Lect. 1866], p. 342). Need we wonder, then, that Bishop Bull waxes warm when this abomination presents itself for his comments, and is made to speak in the following severe strain: "We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and represented her as a vainglorious and aspiring creature; like Lucifer (I tremble at the comparison), thirsting after divine worship and honor, and seeking out superstitious men and women, whom she may oblige to her more special service, and make them her perpetual votaries. For what greater affront than this could they have offered to her humility and sanctity? How fulsome, yea, how perfectly loathsome to us are the tales of those that have had the assurance to tell us of the amorous addresses of the Blessed Virgin to certain persons, her devout worshippers, choosing them for her husbands, bestowing her kisses liberally on them, giving them her breasts to suck, and presenting them with bracelets and rings of her hair as love-tokens! The fables of the Jewish Talmudists, yea, of Mohammed, may seem grave, serious, and sober histories, compared to these and other such impudent fictions. Insomuch that wise men have thought that the authors of these romances in religion were no better than the tools and instruments of Satan, used by him to expose the Christian religion, and render it ridiculous, and thus introduce atheism. And, indeed, we are sure that the wits of Italy, where these abominable deceits have been and are chiefly countenanced, were the first broachers and patrons of infidelity and atheism in Europe, since the time that Christianity obtained in it." "We honor the Virgin Mary," says Mr. Endell Tyler (*Worship*, p. 391), one of the latest and most critical students of early Church history and Christian antiquities, "we love her memory, we would, by God's grace, follow her example in faith and humility, meekness and obedience; we bless God for the wonderful work of salvation, in effecting which she was a chosen vessel; we call her a blessed saint and a holy Virgin; we cannot doubt of her eternal happiness through the merits of him who was 'God of the substance of his Father before the world, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world.' But we cannot address religious phrases to her; we cannot trust in her merits, or intercession, or advocacy, for our acceptance with God; we cannot invoke her for any blessing, temporal or spiritual; we cannot pray to God through her intercession, or for it. This in us would be sin. We pray to God alone; we offer religious praise, our spiritual sacrifices, to God alone; we trust in God alone; we need no other mediator, we apply to no other mediator, intercessor, or advocate, in the unseen world, but Jesus Christ alone, the Son of God and the Son of man. In this faith we implore God alone, for the sake only of his Son, to keep us steadfast unto death; and, in the full assurance of the belief that this faith is founded on the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone, we will endeavor, by the blessing of the Eternal Shepherd and Bishop of souls, to preserve the same faith, as our Church now professes it, whole and undefiled, and to deliver it down, without spot or stain of superstition, to our children's children, as their best inheritance forever."

Literature.—Bonaventura, *Opera*, vol. i, part ii, p. 466–473 (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Canisius (R. C.), *De Maria Virgine libri quinque* (Ingolst. 1577); Lambertini (R. C.), *Comment. duæ de J. Christi, matrisque ejus festis* (Petav. 1751); Perrone (R. C.), *De Immaculata B.V. Mariæ conceptu* (Rom. 1848) (in defence of the new papal dogma of the sinless conception of Mary); *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God;* transl. from the Italian of blessed Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic priest (John Coyne, Dublin, 1833); Horne, *Mariolatry, or Facts and Evidences*, etc. (Lond. 1841); Townsend, *Travels in Spain; Abstract of the Douay Catechism*, p. 76; *The Garden of the Soul;* Jowett, *Christian Researches in the Mediterranean; Roman Catholic Missal for the Use of the Laity;* Gilly, *Tour in Piedmont;* Graham, *Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome; Laity's Directory*, 1833; *Greg. P. XVI Epist. Ency.* 18 Kalend. Sept. 1832; S. Antonini *Summæ Theol.* pars iv, tit. xv, p. 911–1270; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.;* Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. iv, p. 754 sq.; Hook, *Church Dict.;* Cramp, *Text-Book of Popery*, p. 400 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 409 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, especially the *Introduction;* Tyler, *Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Lond. 1844); Mozley, *Moral and Devotional Theol. Ch. of Rome* (Lond. 1857); Lord Lindsay, *Christian Art* (London, 1847), vol. i; Miss Twining, *Symbols of Early Christian Art;* F. W. Genthe, *Die Jungfrau Maria, ihre Evangelien u. ihre Wunder* (Halle, 1852); *Bible and Missal*, p. 1, 35; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1852, p. 200; 1854; Oct. 1855, art. vi; July, 1868, art. vii; *Contemp. Rev.* Nov. 1868, p. 454; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1866, p. 729. Comp. also the elaborate article *Maria, Mutter des Herrn*, by Steitz, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 74 sq.; and the article *Maria, die heil. Jungfrau*, by Reithmayr (R. C.), in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* vi, 835 sq.; also the *Eirenicon* controversy between Pusey and Newman (1866). (J. H. W.)

Marion, Elie, a prophet of the Cevennes, was born in 1678 at Barre. Being destined for the bar by his family, he studied for that profession till October, 1701, when he became possessed with the religious fanaticism of the Camisards, and returned to his native country in order to take part in the movement already began there. He shortly after announced himself a prophet. He joined a troop of Camisards and became their leader, but soon capitulated to marshal Villars (Nov. 1704), and was expelled from the kingdom. After a brief stay in Geneva and Lausanne, he yielded to the solicitations of Flottard, and returned to France with more Camisards. Not succeeding in the enterprise which he meditated, he obtained a new capitulation, and returned to Geneva in August, 1705. The following year he went to England. A great number of refugees hastened part way to meet him. The sensation which they produced was profound, and their feigned inspiration was the cause of a lively controversy. See French Prophets. Marion having publicly denounced both episcopacy and royalty, the government obliged him to leave England. He then went to Germany, where he found a few adherents. His works are *Avertissements prophétiques d'Elie Marion, ou discours prononcés par sa bouche, sous l'inspiration du Saint-Esprit et fidelement reçus dans le temps qu'il parlait* (Lond. 1707, 8vo):—*Cri d'Alarme, ou avertissement aux nations qui sortent de Babylone* (London, 1712, 8vo):—*Quand vous aurez saccagé, vous serez saccagés* (Lond. 1714, 8vo):—*Plan de la justice de Dieu sur la terre dans ces derniers jours* (Lond. 1714, 8vo). Letters signed by Allut, Marion, Fatio and Pourtales, translated into Latin, were published by Fatio (1714, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* vol. xxxiii, 791.

Maris, a name of frequent occurrence among the Orientals, and especially in Syria and Persia. 1. The later Nestorians circulated a legend concerning a person of this name, whom they claimed to have been one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, a disciple of Thaddæus, colaborer with Thomas, and founder and first bishop of the Church at Seleucia-Ctesiphon. This legend is

connected with that of Abgarus (q. v.), and deserves no credit. The Chaldæan Christians class him with their principal saints as the Apostle of Mesopotamia, and ascribe to him the composition of their liturgy in part. 2. A second Maris, better known in the West, is noted solely because to him is addressed the letter of Ibas, president of the theological school at Edessa, which is preserved in Mansi (t. ix, col. 298-300), among the acts of the fifth œcumenical council held at Constantinople in 553, and which the Nestorians afterwards regarded as a kind of confession of faith. 3. Another Maris was surnamed *Bar-Tobi*. He became patriarch of the Persian Nestorians in 987, and is remarkable as the first patriarch who derived his authority from the caliphs. 4. A fourth of this name, distinguished by the name of *Solomon's son*, lived in the 12th century, and wrote a history in Arabic of the Nestorian patriarchs, of which Assemani (*Bibliotheca Orient.* iii, 554 sq., 581 sq.) furnishes an epitome. 5. Finally, Theodoret (q. v.) narrates an anecdote of still another Maris, which is noteworthy chiefly because of the light which it throws on the views of that bishop, and of the use which Romanists have made of it. Maris was a hermit, who had long desired to see "the most sacred, mysterious sacrifice" offered, and Theodoret joyfully complied with his wish. The sacred vessels were taken to his retreat, the hands of the deacons served as an altar, "and thus," says the bishop, "I offered the mysterious, divine, and saving sacrifice" in his presence. Romish writers find in these words of the distinguished father and historian of the 5th century an argument in favor of the Mass. See Theodoret, *Religiosa historia*, c. 2; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 769. See also NESTORIUS.

Mar'isa (Μαρισά), the Græcized form (2 Macc. xii, 35) of MARESHAH (q. v.).

Marius AVENTĪCUS, a Swiss prelate, was born of a noble French family of Autun, near the middle of the 6th century. From childhood he was destined for the Church, and his literary remains furnish evidence that he received a careful training. He was made bishop of Aventicum, now Avenches, in the canton Waadt, in 573, or, as some state, in 580. The times were tumultuous, the population depleted, the country impoverished. In these circumstances he distinguished himself by a praiseworthy frugality, and a devotion to agricultural pursuits that furnished the means for a lavish liberality. He was bounteous to the poor, and generous to the Church. In honor of Mary Θεοτόκος, he rebuilt the town of Payerne (Paterniacum) on his own lands, and dedicated its church to her; he also donated to this church many of his adjoining lands, on condition, however, that the chapter of Lausanne should derive its tithes from Payerne and two neighboring towns. In the specific work of the episcopal office he was tireless—a model ecclesiastic for the times. Serving his God with reverence and in humility, he was an impartial judge, a protector of the oppressed, and a devoted shepherd to his flock. Towards the close of his life he translated his see to Lausanne, which from that time gave its name to the diocese. The only additional fact connected with his life that has come to our knowledge is that he was present at the Synod of Macon in 585, which was convened by Guntram, a son of Chlotar, to attempt the purification of the Church in his dominions by executing justice on unworthy members of the clergy. Marius is supposed to have died in 593, and was commemorated at first on the 31st of December, but now on the 4th of February. His *Annals*, a continuation of the work of Prosper Aquit., are the only writings of his that have reached our time which may justly be ascribed to him. They were published at Paris, in the collections of Du Chesne and Dom Bouquet; at Venice, in the *Bibliotheca veter. patrum;* and, the best manual, by Rickly, in the *Mémoires et documens publiés par la société d'histoire de la Suisse Romande*, tom. xiii. See Zurlauben, *Mémoire sur Marius*, in the *Mém. de l'Acad. roy. des inscript.* (Paris, 1770); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 108 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 891.

Marius MERCĀTOR, a layman in the Church of the 4th century, flourished at Constantinople after 421. Dr. Murdock, the editor of Mosheim, says that Marius Mercator "was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of Augustine, and an active defender of his doctrines from A.D. 418 to the year 451." Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iii), however, speaks of Marius Mercator first as a layman (p. 716), and later (p. 784) mentions him as a learned Latin monk in Constantinople (A.D. 428-451). Marius Mercator was, so supposes his biographer Baluze (Præfat. *in Mercat.* p. 7), an African by birth, who went to Rome about 417, when Julius and the other Pelagian chiefs were disputing in the Eternal City, and then and there produced a work against the Pelagian heresy, which is probably the *Hypognosticon*, printed in the Appendix of vol. x of the works of St. Augustine (comp. Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac.* viii, 498 sq.). Ceillier gives us 421 (p. 501) as the date of Marius Mercator's arrival at Constantinople, and as the date of his decease 449 (p. 507); and says, "On ne voit pas qu'il ait été employé dans le ministére ecclésiastique, et il ne prend d'autre qualité dans ses écrits que celle de serviteur de Jésus-Christ." Marius Mercator's works as collected are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly Nestorius, Theodosius of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus, Theodoret, etc., accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. Himself one of the most bitter opponents of Pelagianism (q. v.), his writings are all designed to confute either the Pelagian or Nestorian errors. They were edited, with notes, by Joh. Garnier (Paris, 1673, folio), and still better by Stephen Baluze (*Opera*, Stephanus Baluzius ad fidem veterum codicum MSS. emendavit, et notis illustravit, Paris, 1684, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Mark (Μάρκος, from the frequent Latin surname *Marcus*, as the word is Anglicized only in Col. iv, 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v, 13), the evangelist, is probably the same as "John whose surname was Mark" (Acts xii, 12, 25). Grotius indeed maintains the contrary, on the ground that the earliest historical writers nowhere call the evangelist by the name of John, and that they always describe him as the companion of Peter and not of Paul. But John was the Jewish name, and Mark, a name of frequent use among the Romans, was adopted afterwards, and gradually superseded the other. The places in the N. T. enable us to trace the process. The John Mark of Acts xii, 12, 25, and the John of Acts xiii, 5, 13, becomes Mark only in Acts xv, 39; Col. iv, 10; 2 Tim. iv, 11; Philem. 24. The change of John to Mark is analogous to that of Saul to Paul; and we cannot doubt that the disuse of the Jewish name in favor of the other is intentional, and has reference to the putting away of his former life, and entrance upon a new ministry. No inconsistency arises from the accounts of his ministering to two apostles. The desertion of Paul (Acts xiii, 13) may have been prompted partly by a wish to rejoin Peter and the apostles engaged in preaching in Palestine (Benson; see Kuinöl's note), and partly from a disinclination to a perilous and doubtful journey. There is nothing strange in the character of a warm impulsive young man, drawn almost equally towards the two great teachers of the faith, Paul and Peter. Had mere cowardice been the cause of his withdrawal, Barnabas would not so soon after have chosen him for another journey, nor would he have accepted the choice.

John Mark was the son of a certain Mary, who dwelt at Jerusalem, and was therefore probably born in that city (Acts xii, 12). He was of Jewish parentage (Col. iv, 10). He was the cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas (Col. iv, 10). It was to Mary's house, as to a familiar haunt, that Peter came after his deliverance from prison (Acts xii. 12), and there found "many gathered together praying;" and probably John Mark was converted by Peter

from meeting him in his mother's house, for he speaks of "Marcus my son" (1 Pet. v, 13). This term has been taken as implying the natural relation by Bengel, Neander, Credner, Hottinger, Tholuck, Stanley (*Serm. on the Apost. Age*, p. 95), but this is contrary to the view of the earlier writers (Origen, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi, 25; Eusebius, *H. E.* ii, 15; Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* c. 8). The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples is without any warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal (A.D. 29), related by Mark alone, is one that befell himself (Olshausen, Lange), must not be so promptly dismissed. "There followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked" (Mark xiv, 51, 52). The detail of facts is remarkably minute; the name only is wanting. The most probable view is that Mark suppressed his own name, while telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it, in some house in the valley of Kedron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved already. He is so deeply interested in his fate that he follows him even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, "fear overcoming shame" (Bengel), he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We can only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the narrative receives its most probable explanation. John (i, 40; xix, 26) introduces himself in this unobtrusive way, and perhaps Luke the same (xxiv, 18). Mary the mother of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying-point for Christians in those dangerous days (Acts xii, 12). A.D. 44. Her son, already an inquirer, would soon become more. Anxious to work for Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their "minister" (ὑπηρέτης) on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have seen above, turned back (Acts xii, 25; xiii, 13). On the second journey Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable "sharp contention" between them (Acts xv, 36-40). Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation, it did not separate him forever from Paul, for we find him by the side of that apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome (Col. iv, 10; Philem. 24). A.D. 56. In the former place a possible journey of Mark to Asia is spoken of. Somewhat later he is with Peter at Babylon (1 Pet. v, 13). Some consider Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a mystical sense—surely without reason, since the date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that he made the journey to Asia Minor (Col. iv, 10), and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon. On his return to Asia he seems to have been with Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (2 Tim. iv, 11). A.D. 64.

When we desert Scripture we find the facts doubtful, and even inconsistent. If Papias be trusted (quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 39), Mark never was a disciple of our Lord, which he probably infers from 1 Pet. v, 13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples who turned back from our Lord at the hard saying in John vi (*Cont. Hær.* li, 6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition). The same had been said of Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make the evangelist the interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) of the apostle Peter (Papias in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 39; Irenæus, *Hær.* iii, 1; iii, 10, 6; Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv, 5; Jerome, *ad Hedib.* vol. ix, etc.). Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the apostle (Eichhorn, Bertholdt, etc.); while others adopt the more probable view that Mark wrote a Gospel which conformed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the Church at large (Valesius, Alford, Lange, Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). The passage from Eusebius favors the latter view; it is a quotation from Papias. "This also [John] the elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them; for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but he was afterwards, *as I* [Papias] *said, a follower of Peter*." The words in italics refer to the word interpreter above, and the passage describes a disciple writing down what his master preached, and not an interpreter orally translating his words. See MARK, GOSPEL OF. The report that Mark was the companion of Peter *at Rome* is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for "a tradition which he had received of the elders from the first" (*παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*, Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 14; Clem. Alex. *Hyp.* p. 6). But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Pet. v, 13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome (Eusebius, *H. E.* ii, 15; Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8). Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter (Epiphanius, *Hær.* li, 6, p. 457, Dindorf; Eusebius, *H. E.* ii, 16), Mark there founded the Church of Alexandria (Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8), and preached in various places (Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii, 43), then returned to Alexandria, of which Church he was bishop, and suffered a martyr's death (Nicephorus, *ibid.* and Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8) in the eighth year of Nero. According to the legend, his remains were obtained from Alexandria by the Venetians through a pious stratagem, and conveyed to their city, A.D. 827. Venice was thenceforward solemnly placed under his protection, and the lion, which mediæval theology had selected from the apocalyptic beasts as his emblem, became the standard of the republic. The place of the deposition of his body having been lost, a miracle was subsequently wrought for its discovery, A.D. 1094, which figures in many famous works of art. Where his remains now lie is, according to the Roman Catholic Eustacius, "acknowledged to be an undivulged secret; or, perhaps, in less cautious language, to be utterly unknown.

MARK, GOSPEL OF, the second of the evangelical narratives in the N. T. Although the shortest of the four Gospels, its treatment is beset with difficulties in some respects peculiar to itself. See NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *Authorship.*—The voice of the Church with one consent assigns our second Gospel to Mark, the "son" (1 Pet. v, 17) and "interpreter" (Papias, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 39) of Peter. The existence of this ascription is the best evidence of its truth. Had not Mark been its author, no sufficient reason can be given for its having borne the name of one so undistinguished in the history of the Church. His identity with the "John Mark" of the Acts and Epistles has usually been taken for granted, nor (see last article) is there any sufficient ground for calling it in question. It must, however, be acknowledged that there is no early testimony for the fact—as there is none *against* it—which appears first in the preface to the *Commentary* on the evangelist usually attributed to Victor of Antioch, cir. A.D. 407 (Cramer, *Catena*, i, 263), and in a note of Ammonius (*ibid.* ii, iv), where it is mentioned with some expression of doubt *τάχα οὗτός ἐστιν Μάρκος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής . . . πιθανὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος* (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 212). An argument in favor of their identity has been drawn with much acuteness by Tregelles (*Journ. of Philol.* 1855, p. 224; Horne's *Introd. to N. T.* p. 433) from the singular epithet "stump-fingered," *κολοβοδάκτυλος*, applied to the evangelist in the *Philosophumena*, vii, 30, as illustrated by the words of the Latin preface found in some MSS. "at least nearly coeval with Jerome," "amputasse sibi post fidem polli-

cem dicitur ut sacerdotio reprobus haberetur;" as if, by his desertion of the apostles (Acts xiii, 13), he had become figuratively a "pollice truncus"—a poltroon.

II. *Source of this Gospel.*—The tradition of the early Church asserts that Mark wrote his Gospel under the special influence and direction of the apostle Peter. The words of John the presbyter, as quoted by Papias (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 39), are explicit on this point: "This, then, was the statement of the elder: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής), wrote accurately all that he remembered (ἐμνημόνευσε); but he did not record the words and deeds of Christ in order (οὐ μέν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of our Lord, but afterwards, as I said, became a follower of Peter, who used to adapt his instruction to meet the requirements of his hearers, but not as making a connected arrangement of our Lord's discourses (ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων); so Mark committed no error in writing down particulars as he remembered them (ἕνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν), for he made one thing his object—to omit nothing of what he heard, and to make no erroneous statement in them." The value of this statement, from its almost apostolic date, is great, though too much stress has been laid upon some of its expressions by Schleiermacher and others, to discredit the genuineness of the existing Gospel of Mark. In addition to Peter's teaching having been the basis of the Gospel, we learn from it three facts of the greatest importance for the right comprehension of the origin of the Gospels: "The historic character of the oral Gospel, the special purpose with which it was framed, and the fragmentariness of its contents" (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 186). The testimony of later writers is equally definite, though probably to a certain extent derived from that of Papias. Justin quotes from the present Gospel under the title τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου. Irenæus (*H. E.* iii, 1) asserts that Mark "delivered in writing the things preached by Peter;" and Origen (*ibid.* vi, 25) that he "composed it as Peter directed him" (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα). Clement of Alexandria enters more into detail, and, according to Eusebius's report of his words (*H. E.* vi, 14; ii, 15), contradicts himself. He ascribes the origin of the Gospel to the importunity of Peter's hearers in Rome, who were anxious to retain a lasting record of his preaching from the pen of his ἑρμηνευτής, which, when completed, the apostle viewed with approbation, sanctioning it with his authority, and commanding that it should be read in the churches; while elsewhere we have the inconsistent statement that when Peter knew what had been done "he neither forbade nor encouraged it." Tertullian's testimony is to the same effect: "Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri affirmatur" (*Adv. Marc.* vi, 5); as is that of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 5) and Jerome (*De Vir. ill.* c. 8; *ad Hedib.* c. 2), who in the last passage writes, "Cujus (Marci) evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est." Epiphanius says that, immediately after Matthew, the task of writing a Gospel was laid on Mark, "the follower of Peter at Rome" (*Hær.* li).

Such, so early and so uniform, is the tradition which connects, in the closest manner, Mark's Gospel with the apostle Peter. To estimate its value we must inquire how far it is consistent with facts; and here it must be candidly acknowledged that the Gospel itself supplies very little to an unbiassed reader to confirm the tradition. The narrative keeps more completely to the common cycle of the Synoptic record, and even to its language, than is consistent with the individual recollections of one of the chief actors in the history; while the differences of detail, though most real and important, are of too minute and refined a character to allow us to entertain the belief that Peter was in any way *directly* engaged in its composition. Any record derived immediately from Peter could hardly fail to have given us far more original matter than the slender additions made by Mark to the common stock of the Synoptical Gospels. It is certainly true that there are a few unimportant passages where Peter is specially mentioned by Mark, and is omitted by one or both of the others (i, 36; v, 37; xi, 20; xiii, 3; xvi, 7); but, on the other hand, there are still more numerous and more prominent instances which would almost show that Mark was less intimately acquainted with Peter's life than they. He omits his name when given by Matthew (xv, 15; comp. Mark vii, 17); passes over his walking on the sea (Matt. xiv, 28–31; comp. Mark vi, 50–51), and the miracle of the tribute-money (Matt. xvii, 24–27; comp. Mark ix, 33), as well as the blessing pronounced on him by our Lord, and his designation as the rock on which the Church should be built (Matt. xvi, 17–19; comp. Mark viii, 29, 30). Although Peter was one of the two disciples sent to make ready the Passover (Luke xxii, 8), his name is not given by Mark (xiv, 13). We do not find in Mark the remarkable words, "I have prayed for thee," etc. (Luke xxii, 31, 32). The notice of his repentance also, ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε (xiv, 72), is tame when contrasted with the ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς of Matthew and Luke. Advocates are never at a loss for plausible reasons to support their preconceived views, and it has been the habit from very early times (Eusebius, Chrysostom) to attribute these omissions to the modesty of Peter, who was unwilling to record that which might specially tend to his own honor—an explanation unsatisfactory in itself, and which cannot be applied with any consistency. Indeed, we can hardly have a more striking proof of the readiness with which men see what they wish to see, and make the most stubborn facts bend to their own foregone conclusions, than that a Gospel, in which no unbiassed reader would have discovered any special connection with Peter, should have yielded so many fancied proofs of Petrine origin.

But while we are unable to admit any considerable *direct* influence of Peter in the composition of the Gospel, it is by no means improbable that his oral communications may have *indirectly* influenced it, and that it is to him the minuteness of its details and the graphic coloring which specially distinguish it are due. While there is hardly any part of its narrative that is not common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there is often a marked character, which puts aside at once the supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid; touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the Redeemer's doings. The most remarkable case of this is the account of the dæmoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, where the following words are peculiar to Mark: "And no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always night and day he was in the mountains crying and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran," etc. Here we are indebted for the picture of the fierce and hopeless wanderer to the evangelist whose work is the briefest, and whose style is the least perfect. He sometimes adds to the account of the others a notice of our Lord's look (iii, 34; viii, 33; x, 21; x, 23); he dwells on human feelings and the tokens of them; on our Lord's pity for the leper, and his strict charge not to publish the miracle (i, 41, 44); he "loved" the rich young man for his answers (x, 21); he "looked round" with anger when another occasion called it out (iii, 5); he groaned in spirit (vii, 34; viii, 12). All these are peculiar to Mark, and they would be explained most readily by the theory that one of the disciples most near to Jesus had supplied them. To this must be added that while Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts thrown in which prove that we are listening to an

independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him (i, 16–20), and his connection with Capernaum (i, 29); he tells us that Levi was "the son of Alphæus" (ii, 14), that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon (iii, 16), and Boanerges a surname added by him to the names of two others (iii, 17); he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the twelve (iii, 32; iv, 10, 36; viii, 34; xiv, 51, 52); we owe to him the name of Jairus (v, 22), the word "carpenter" applied to our Lord (vi, 3), the nation of the "Syro-Phœnician" woman (vii, 26); he substitutes Dalmanutha for the "Magdala" of Matthew (viii, 10); he names Bartimæus (x, 46); he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel through the Temple (xi, 16); and that Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus (xv, 21). Thus in this Gospel the richness in subtle and picturesque touches, by which the writer sets, as it were, the scene he is describing before us in all its outward features, with the very look and demeanor of the actors, betoken the report of an eye-witness; and with the testimony of the early Church before us, which can hardly be set aside, we are warranted in the conclusion that this eye-witness was Peter. Not that the narrative, as we have it, was his; but that when Mark, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, after separation from his master, undertook the task of setting forth that cycle of Gospel teaching to which—from grounds never yet, nor perhaps ever to be satisfactorily explained—the Synoptists chiefly confine themselves, he was enabled to introduce into it many pictorial details which he had derived from his master, and which had been impressed on his memory by frequent repetition.

III. *Relation to Matthew and Luke.*—The question of priority of composition among the Synoptic Gospels has long been the subject of vehement controversy, and to judge by the diversity of the views entertained, and the confidence each appears to feel of the correctness of his own, it would seem to be as far as ever from being settled. (For monographs under this head, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 3; Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Marcus.)

The position of Mark in relation to the other two has, in particular, given rise to the widest differences of opinion. The independence of his record was maintained up to the time of Augustine, but since his day three theories have been entertained. (*a.*) That father conceived the view, which, however, he does not employ with much consistency, that Mark was merely "tanquam pedissequus et breviator" of Matthew (*De Consens. Ev.* i, 4); and from his day it has been held by many that Mark deliberately set himself to make an abridgment of one or both the other Synoptists. Griesbach expressed this opinion most decidedly in his *Commentatio quo Marci Evangelium totum a Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena, 1789–90; also in Velthuysen, *Comment.* i, 360 sq.); and it has been stated in a more or less modified form by Paulus, Schleiermacher, Thiele, De Wette, Delitzsch, Fritzsche, and Bleek, the last two named adding John's Gospel to the materials before him. Nor can it be denied that at first sight this view is not devoid of plausibility, especially as regards Matthew. We find the same events recorded, and apparently in the same way, and very often in the same words. Mark's is the shorter work, and that principally, as it would seem, by the omission of the discourses and parables, which are a leading feature in the others. There are in Mark only about three events which Matthew does not narrate (Mark i, 23; viii, 22; xii, 41), and thus the matter of the two may be regarded as almost the same. But the form in Mark is, as we have seen, much briefer, and the omissions are many and important. The explanation is that Mark had the work of Matthew before him, and only condensed it. But many would make Mark a compiler from both the others (Griesbach, De Wette, etc.), arguing from passages where there is a curious resemblance to both (see De Wette, *Handbuch*, § 94 *a*). Yet, though this opinion of the dependence, more or less complete, of Mark upon the other Gospels, was for a long time regarded almost as an established fact, no very searching investigation is needed to show its baselessness. Instead of Mark's narrative being an abridgment of that of Matthew or of Luke, it is often much fuller. Particulars are introduced which an abridger aiming at condensation would have been certain to prune away if he had found them in his authority; while the freshness and graphic power of the history, the life-like touches which almost put us on the stage with the actors, and his superior accuracy as regards persons, words, times, and places, prove the originality and independence of his work. (*b.*) Of late, therefore, opinion has been tending as violently in the opposite direction, and the prevailing view among modern critics is that in Mark we have the primitive Gospel, "*Urevangelium*," from which both those of Matthew and Luke were derived. This is held by Weisse, Wilke, Ewald, Lachmann, Hitzig, Reuss, Ritschel, Thiersch, Meyer, etc., and has lately been maintained with considerable ingenuity in Mr. Kenrick's *Biblical Essays*. (*c.*) Hilgenfeld again adopts an intermediate view, and considers Mark to have held a middle position both as regards form and internal character; himself deriving his Gospel from Matthew, and in his turn supplying materials for that of Luke; while doctrinally he is considered to hold the mean between the Judaic Gospel of the first, and the universal Gospel of the third evangelist.

Many formidable difficulties beset each of these theories, and their credit severally is impaired by the fact that the very same data which are urged by one writer as proofs of the priority of Mark, are used by another as irrefragable evidence of its later date. We even find critics, like Baur, bold enough to attribute the vivid details, which are justly viewed as evidences of the independence and originality of his record, to the fancy of the evangelist; thus importing the art of the modern novelist into times and works to the spirit of which it is entirely alien.

So much, however, we may safely grant, while maintaining the substantial independence of each of the Synoptical Gospels—that Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant from, and furnishes the most direct representation of the common basis on which they all rest. "In essence, if not in composition," says Mr. Wescott, *Introd.* p. 190 (the two not being necessarily identical, the earlier tradition being perhaps possibly the latest committed to writing), "it is the oldest." The intermediate theory has also so much of truth in it, that Mark does actually occupy the central position in regard to diction; frequently, as it were, combining the language of the other two (i, 32; comp. Matt. viii, 16; Luke iv, 40: i, 42; comp. Matt. viii, 3; Luke v, 13: ii, 13–18; comp. Matt. ix, 9–14; Luke v, 27–33: iv, 30–32; comp. Matt. xiii, 31–33; Luke xiii, 18–21), as indeed would naturally be the case if we consider that his Gospel most closely represents the original from which all were developed. In conclusion we may say, that a careful comparison of the three Gospels can hardly fail to convince the unprejudiced reader that, while Mark adds hardly anything to the general narrative, we have in his Gospel, in the words of Meyer (*Comment.*), "a fresher stream from the apostolic fountain," without which we should have wanted many important elements for a true conception of our blessed Lord's nature and work.

If now we proceed to a detailed comparison of the matter contained in the Gospels, we shall find that, while the history of the conception, and birth, and childhood of our Lord and his forerunner have no parallel in Mark, afterwards the main course of the narrative (Luke ix, 51–xviii, 14, being of course excepted) is on the whole coincident; and that the difference is mainly due to the absence of the parables and discourses, which were foreign to his purpose of setting forth the *active* ministry of Christ. Of our Lord's parables he only gives us four:

"the sower," "the mustard seed," and "the wicked husbandmen"—common also to Matthew and Luke; and one, "the seed growing secretly," iv, 26–29 (unless, indeed, it be an abbreviated and independent form of the "tares"), peculiar to himself. Of the discourses, he entirely omits the sermon on the mount, the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees, and almost entirely the instructions to the twelve; while of the other shorter discourses he only gives that on fasting (ii, 19–22), the Sabbath (ii, 25–28), the casting out devils by Beelzebub (iii, 23–29), on eating with unwashen hands, and corban (vii, 6–23), and divorce (x, 5–9). That on "the last things" (chap. xiii) is the only one reported at any length. On the other hand, his object being to develop our Lord's Messianic character in deeds rather than words, he records the greater part of the miracles given by the Synoptists. Of the twenty-seven narrated by them, eighteen are found in Mark, twelve being common to all three; three—the Syro-Phœnician's daughter, the feeding of the four thousand, and the cursing of the fig-tree—common to him and Matthew; one—the dæmoniac in the synagogue—to him and Luke; and two—the deaf stammerer (vii, 31–37), and the blind man at Bethsaida (viii, 22–26) (supplying remarkable points of correspondence, in the withdrawal of the object of the cure from the crowd, the use of external signs, and the gradual process of restoration)—peculiar to himself. Of the nine omitted by him, only three are found in Matthew, of which the centurion's servant is given also by Luke. The others are found in Luke alone. If we suppose that Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, it is difficult to assign any tolerably satisfactory reason for his omission of these miracles, especially that of the centurion's servant, so kindred to the object of his work. On the contrary hypothesis, that they copied from him, how can we account for their omitting the two remarkable miracles mentioned above?

The arrangement of the narrative, especially of our Lord's earlier Galilæan ministry, agrees with Luke in opposition to that of Matthew, which appears rather to have been according to similarity of subject than order of time.

According to Norton (*Genuineness of Gospels*), there are not more than twenty-four verses in Mark to which parallels, more or less exact, do not exist in the other Synoptists. The same painstaking investigator informs us that, while the *general* coincidences between Mark and one of the other two amount to thirteen fourteenths of the whole Gospel, the *verbal* coincidences are one sixth, and of these four fifths in Mark occur in the recital of the words of our Lord and others; and only one fifth in the narrative portion, which, roughly speaking, forms one half of his Gospel.

Additions peculiar to Mark are, "the Sabbath made for man" (ii, 27); our Lord's friends seeking to lay hold on him (iii, 21); many particulars in the miracles of the Gadarene dæmoniac (v, 1–20); Jairus's daughter, and the woman with issue of blood (v, 22–43); the stilling of the tempest (iv, 35–41), and the lunatic child (ix, 14–29); the salting with fire (ix, 49); that "the common people heard him gladly" (xii, 37); the command to watch (xiii, 33–37); the young man with the linen cloth about his body (xiv, 51); the want of agreement between the testimony of the false witnesses (xiv, 59); Pilate's investigation of the reality of Christ's death (xv, 44), and the difficulty felt by the women as to the rolling away the stone (xvi, 3, 4). Mark has also preserved several words and phrases, and entire sayings of our Lord, which merit close attention (i, 15; iv, 13; vi, 31, 34; vii, 8; viii, 38; ix, 12, 39; x, 21, 24, 30; xi, 17; xiii, 32; xiv, 18–37; xvi, 7 [15–18]).

The hypothesis which best meets all these facts is, that while the matter common to all three evangelists, or to two of them, is derived from the oral teaching of the apostles, which they had purposely reduced to a common form, our evangelist writes as an independent witness to the truth, and not as a compiler; and the tradition that the Gospel was written under the sanction of Peter, and its matter in some degree derived from him, is made probable by the evident traces of an eye-witness in many of the narratives. The omission and abridgment of our Lord's discourses, and the sparing use of O.-T. quotations, might be accounted for by the special destination of the Gospel, if we had surer data for ascertaining it; since it was for Gentiles, with whom illustrations from the O. T. would have less weight, and the purpose of the writer was to present a clear and vivid picture of the acts of our Lord's human life, rather than a full record of his divine doctrine. We may thankfully own that, with little that is in substance peculiar to himself, the evangelist does occupy for us a distinct position, and supply a definite want, in virtue of these traits.

IV. *Characteristics.*—Though this Gospel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to suppose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the fresh and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between his deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the history of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that he dwelt as a Man among men. Our Lord is presented to us, not as in Matthew, as the Messiah, the Son of David and Abraham, the theocratic King of the chosen people; nor, as in Luke, as the universal Saviour of our fallen humanity; but as the incarnate and wonder-working Son of God, for whose emblem the early Church justly selected "the lion of the tribe of Judah." His record is emphatically "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark i, 1), living and working among men, and developing his mission more in acts than by words. The limits of his narrative and its general character can hardly be better stated than in the words of his apostolic teacher, Acts x, 36–42. Commencing with the Baptist preaching in the wilderness, and announcing the "Mightier One" who was at hand, he tells us how, at his baptism, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power," and declared him to be his "beloved Son:" gathering up the temptation into the pregnant fact, "He was with the wild beasts;" thus setting the Son of God before us as the Lord of nature, in whom the original grant to man of dominion over the lower creation was fulfilled (Maurice, *Unity of the N. T.* p. 226; Bengel, ad loc.; Wilberforce, *Doctrine of Incarnation*, p. 89, 90). As we advance, we find him detailing every exercise of our Lord's power over man and nature distinctly and minutely—not merely chronicling the incidents, as is Matthew's way, but surrounding them with all the circumstances that made them impressive to the bystanders, and making us feel how deep that impression was; how great the awe and wonder with which his mighty works and preaching were regarded, not only by the crowd (i, 22, 27; ii, 12; vi, 2), but by the disciples themselves (iv, 41; vi, 51; x, 24, 26, 32); how the crowds thronged and pressed upon him (iii, 10; v, 21, 31; vi, 33; viii, 1), so that there was scarce room to stand or sit (ii, 2; iii, 32; iv, 1), or leisure even to eat (iii, 20; vi, 31); how his fame spread the more he sought to conceal it (i, 45; iii, 7; v, 20; vii, 36, 37); and how, in consequence, the people crowded about him, bringing their sick (i, 32–34; iii, 10); and "whithersoever he entered into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole" (vi, 56); how the unclean spirits, seeing him, at once fell down before him and acknowledged his power, crying, "Thou art the Son of God" (i, 23–26; iii, 11); how, again, in Peter's words, "He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him."

But while the element of divine power is that which specially arrests our attention in reading his Gospel, there is none in which the human personality is more conspicuous. The single word *ὁ τέκτων* (vi, 3) throws a flood of light on our Lord's early life as man in his native village. The limitation of his knowledge is expressly stated (xiii, 32, *οὐδὲ ὁ Υἱός*); and we continually meet with mention of human emotions—anger (iii, 5; viii, 12, 33; x, 14), wonder (vi, 6), pity (vi, 34), love (x, 21), grief (vii, 34; viii, 12); and human infirmities —sleep (iv, 38), desire for repose (vi, 31), hunger (xi, 12).

In Mark we have no attempt to draw up a continuous narrative. His Gospel is a rapid succession of vivid pictures loosely strung together (usually by *καί*, *καὶ πάλιν*, or *εὐθέως*), without much attempt to bind them into a whole, or give the events in their natural sequence. This pictorial power is that which specially characterizes this evangelist; so that, as has been well said, "if any one desires to know an evangelical fact, not only in its main features and grand results, but also in its most minute and, so to speak, more graphic delineation, he must betake himself to Mark" (Da Costa, *Four Witnesses*, p. 88). This power is especially apparent in all that concerns our Lord himself. Nowhere else are we permitted so clearly to behold his very gesture and look; see his very position; to read his feelings and to hear his very words. It is Mark who reveals to us the comprehensive gaze of Christ (*περιβλεψάμενος*, iii, 5, 34; v, 32; x, 23; xi, 11); his loving embrace of the children brought to him (*ἐναγκαλισάμενος*, ix, 36; x, 16); his preceding his disciples, while they follow in awe and amazement (x, 32). We see him taking his seat to address his disciples (*καθίσας*, ix, 34), and turning round in holy anger to rebuke Peter (*ἐπιστραφείς*, viii, 33); we hear the sighs which burst from his bosom vii, 34; viii, 12), and listen to his very accents ("Talitha cumi," v, 41; "Ephphatha," vii, 34; "Abba," xiv, 36). At one time we have an event portrayed with a freshness and pictorial power which places the whole scene before us with its minute accessories—the paralytic (ii, 1–12), the storm (iv, 36–41), the dæmoniac (v, 1–20), Herod's feast (vi, 21–29), the feeding of the 5000 (vi, 30–45), the lunatic child (ix, 14–29), the young ruler (x, 17, 22), Bartimæus (x, 46–52), etc. At another, details are brought out by the addition of a single word (*κύψας*, i, 7; *σχιζομένους*, i, 10; *σπλαγχνισθείς*, i, 41; *τοῖς ἔξω*, iv, 11; *προσωρμίσθησαν*, vi, 53; *ἔσωθεν, ἔξωθεν*, vii, 21, 23; *κράξας, σπαράξας*, ix, 26; *στυγνάσας*, x, 22; *συντρίψασα*, xiv, 3; *ἐμβλέψασα*, xiv, 67), or by the substitution of a more precise and graphic word for one less distinctive (*ἐκβάλλει*, i, 12; *ἐξίστασθαι*, ii, 12; *γεμίζεσθαι*, iv, 37; *ἐξηράνθη*, v, 29; *ἀποταξάμενος*, vi, 46; *ἀθετεῖτε*, vii, 9; *ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*, xiv, 33). It is to Mark also that we are indebted for the record of minute particulars of persons, places, times, and number, which stamp on his narrative an impress of authenticity.

(1.) *Persons.*—i, 20; ii, 14; iii, 5, 17, 32, 34; iv, 11; v, 32, 37, 40; vi, 40, 48; vii, 1, 25, 26; viii, 10, 27; ix, 15, 36; x, 16, 23, 35, 46; xi, 21, 27; xiii, 1, 3; xiv, 20, 37, 65; xv, 7, 21, 40, 47; xvi, 7.

(2.) *Places.*—i, 28; iv, 1, 38; v, 11, 20, 21; vi, 55; vii, 17, 31; viii, 10, 27; ix, 30; xi, 4; xii, 41; xiv, 66; xv, 16, 39; xvi, 5.

(3.) *Time.*—i, 32, 35; ii, 1, 26; iv, 35; v, 2, 18, 21; vi, 2; xi, 11, 19, 20; xiv, 1, 12, 17, 30, 68, 72; xv, 1, 25, 33, 34, 42; xvi, 1, 2.

(4.) *Number.*—v, 13, 42; vi, 7; viii, 24; xiv, 30, 72.

Other smaller variations are continually occurring. Here a single word, there a short parenthesis, sometimes an apparently trivial accession—which impart a striking air of life to the record; e. g. Zebedee left with the hired servants (i, 20); our Lord praying (i, 35); the paralytic borne of four (ii, 3); the command that a ship should wait on him (iii, 9); "thy sisters" (iii, 32): our Lord taken "even as he was in the ship" (iv, 36); "other little ships with them" (ibid.); Jairus's daughter "walked" (v, 42); "divers came from far" (viii, 3); only "one loaf" in the ship (viii, 14); "so as no fuller on earth can white" (ix, 2); the danger of *trusting* in riches (x, 24); "with persecutions" (x, 30); "no vessel suffered to be carried through the Temple" (xi, 16); "a house of prayer for *all* nations" (xi, 17); "she hath done what she could" (xiv, 8); Barabbas, one of a party of insurrectionists *all* guilty of bloodshed (xv, 7).

We cannot conclude our remarks on this head better than in the words of Mr. Westcott (*Introd.* p. 348)—that "if all other arguments against the mythic origin of the evangelic narratives were wanting, this vivid and simple record, stamped with the most distinct impress of independence and originality, would be sufficient to refute a theory subversive of all faith in history."

V. *Style and Diction.*—The style of Mark may be characterized as vigorous and abrupt. His terms of connection and transition are terse and lively; he is fond of employing the direct for the indirect (iv, 39; v, 8, 9, 12; vi, 23, 31, 37; ix, 25, 33; xii, 6), the present for the past (i, 25, 40, 44; ii, 3, 4, 5; iii, 4, 5, 13, 20, 31, 34; iv, 37, etc.), and the substantive instead of the pronoun; he employs the cognate accusative (iii, 28; vii, 13; xiii, 19; iv, 41; v, 42), accumulates negatives (*οὐκέτι οὐδείς*, vii, 12; ix, 8; xii, 34; xv, 5; *οὐκέτι οὐ μή*, xiv, 25; *μηκέτι μηδείς*, xi, 14), and for sake of emphasis repeats what he has said in other words, or appends the opposite (i, 22, 45; ii, 27; iii, 26, 27, 29; iv. 17, 33, 34), and piles up synonymes (iv, 6, 8, 39; v, 12, 23; viii, 15; xiii, 33; xiv, 68), combining this forcible style with a conciseness and economy of expression consistent with the elaboration of every detail.

Mark's diction is nearer to that of Matthew than to that of Luke. It is more Hebraistic than the latter, though rather in general coloring than in special phrases. According to Davidson (*Introd.* i, 154), there are forty-five words peculiar to him and Matthew, and only eighteen common to him and Luke. Aramaic words, especially those used by our Lord, are introduced, but explained for Gentile readers (iii, 17, 22; v, 41; vii, 11, 34; ix, 43; x, 46; xiv, 36; xv, 22, 34). Latinisms are more frequent than in the other Gospels: *κεντυρίων*, xv, 39, 44, 45; *σπεκουλάτωρ*, vi, 27; *τὸ ἱκάνον ποιῆσαι*, xv, 15; *ξέστης*, vii, 4, 8, are peculiar to him. Others—*δηνάριον, κῆνσος, λεγίων, πραιτώριον, φραγελλόω, κοδράντης*—he has in common with the rest of the evangelists. He is fond of diminutives—*θυγάτριον, κοράσιον, κυνάρια, ὠτάριον*—but they are not peculiar to him. He employs unusual words and phrases (e. g. *ἀλαλάζειν, ἐπισυντρέχειν, κωμόπολις, μεγιστᾶνες, νάρδος πιστική, νουνεχῶς, παιδιόθεν, πλοιάριον, προμεριμνᾶν, τρυμαλία, ὑπολήνιον, στοιβάς, σμυρνιζόμενος οἶνος; συνθλίβειν, ἐνειλεῖν*). Of other noticeable words and expressions we may remark, *ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα*, eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; *ἤρξατο λέγειν, κράζειν*, twenty-five times; *διεστείλατο, -στέλλετο*, five times, Matthew once; compounds of *πορεύεσθαι*: e. g. *εἰσπορ.*, eight times, Matthew once, Luke four; *ἐκπορ.*, eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; *παραπορ.*, four times, Matthew once; *προσπορ.* The verb *ἐπερωτάω* occurs twenty-five times, to eight times in Matthew and eighteen in Luke; *εὐαγγέλιον*, eight times, Matthew four, but the verb not once; *εὐθέως*, forty times, Matthew fifteen, Luke eight. Other favorite words are, *κηρύσσειν*, fourteen, Matthew nine, Luke nine; *μακρόθεν*, five, Matthew two, Luke four; *οὐκέτι* and *μηκέτι*, ten, Matthew three, Luke four; *περιβλέπω*, six times, Luke once; *πιστεύω*, fourteen, Matthew eleven, Luke nine; *πρωΐ*, six times, Matthew twice, John once; *φέρω*, thirteen, Matthew four, Luke four times. Of words only found in Mark, as compared with Matthew and Luke, we may mention—*ἀμάρτημα, ἀναθεματίζω, ἐξάπινα, εὔκαιρος* and *-ρως, εὐσχήμων, ἡδέως, θαμβεῖσθαι, θυρωρός, κτίσις, κυλίομαι, μογιλάλος, μορφή, παραβάλλειν, παραδέχεσθαι, παρόμοιος, προστρέχω, συμπόσια, συστασιαστής, στίλβειν, σκώ-*

ληξ. Words not found at all, or found less frequently in Mark, are—ἀγαθός, only twice, in the same context (x, 17, 18), Matthew sixteen, Luke fifteen times; νόμος, παῖς, στόμα, ὥσπερ, ἀνοίγω, ἄξιος, κελεύω, μεριμνάω, μακάριος, ὀφείλω, καλέω, only three times, to Matthew twenty-six, Luke forty-two; πέμπω, only once; Χριστός, seven, Matthew sixteen, Luke thirteen. Publicans are only mentioned twice, Samaria and its inhabitants not once.

VI. *Persons for whom the Gospel was written.*—A dispassionate review of the Gospel confirms the traditional statement that it was intended primarily for Gentiles, and among these the use of Latinisms, and the concise abrupt character "suitable for the vigorous intelligence of a Roman audience" (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 348), seem to point out those for whom it was specially meant. In consistency with this view, words which would not be understood by Gentile readers are interpreted: Boanerges (iii, 17); Talitha cumi (v, 40); Corban (vii, 11); Bartimæus (x, 46); Abba (xiv, 36); Eloi lama sabachthani (xv, 34); two mites "make a farthing" (xii, 42); Gehenna is "unquenchable fire" (ix, 43). Jewish usages, and other matters with which none but Jews could be expected to be familiar, are explained, e. g. the washing before meals (vii, 3, 4); in the days of unleavened bread the Passover was killed (xiv, 12); at the Passover the season of figs had not come (xi, 13); the preparation is "the day before the Sabbath" (xv, 42); the Mount of Olives is "over against the Temple" (xiii, 3); Jordan is a "river" (Mark i, 5; Matt. iii, 6); the Pharisees, etc., "used to fast" (Mark ii, 18; Matt. ix, 14); the Sadducees' worst tenet is mentioned (Mark xii, 18); and explanations are given which Jews would not need (Mark xv, 6, 16). All reference to the law of Moses is omitted, and even the word νόμος does not occur; the Sabbath was appointed for the good of man (ii, 27); and in the quotation from Isaiah (lvi, 7) he adds "of all nations." The genealogy of our Lord is likewise omitted. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are similarly passed over, such as the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign (Matt. xii, 38–45); the parable of the king's son (Matt. xxii, 1–14); and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii). Matter that might offend is omitted, as Matt. x, 5, 6; vi, 7, 8. Passages, not always peculiar to Mark, abound in his Gospel, in which the antagonism between the pharisaic legal spirit and the Gospel come out strongly (i, 22; ii, 19, 22; x, 5; viii, 15), which hold out hopes to the heathen of admission to the kingdom of heaven even without the Jews (xii, 9), and which put ritual forms below the worship of the heart (ii, 18; iii, 1–5; vii, 5–23). Whilst he omits the invective against the Pharisees, he indicates by a touch of his own how Jesus condemned them "with anger" (iii, 5). Mark alone makes the Scribe admit that love is better than sacrifices (xii, 33). In conclusion, the absence of all quotations from the O. T. made on his own authority, with the exception of those in the opening verses from Mal. iii, 1; Isa. xl, 3 (xv, 28 being rejected as interpolated), points the same way. The only citations he introduces are those made by our Lord, or by those addressing him.

VII. *Citations from Scripture.*—The following are the only direct citations:

Mal. iii, 1.....i, 2.	(*b*) Isa. lvi, 7; Jer. vii, 11.....xi, 17.
Isa. xl, 3.....i, 3.	Psa. cxviii, 22, 23..xii, 10, 11.
Isa. vi, 9, 11.....iv, 12.	Deut. xxv, 5.....xii, 19.
Isa. xxix, 13.....vii, 6.	Exod. iii, 6.....xii, 26.
Exod. xx, 12; xxi, 17.....vii, 10.	Deut. vi, 4.....xii, 29, 30.
(*a*) Isa. lxvi, 24....ix, 44, 46, 48.	Lev. xix, 18.....xii, 31.
Gen. i, 27.....x, 6.	Psa. cx, 1.....xii, 36.
Gen. ii, 24.....x, 7, 8.	Dan. ix, 27; xii, 11..xiii, 14.
Exod. xx, 12–15...x, 19.	Zech. xiii, 7.....xiv, 27.
Psa. cxviii, 25, 26..xi, 9.	Isa. liii, 12 (?).....xv, 28.
	Psa. xxii, 1.....xv, 34.

Of these, (*a*) is the only one peculiar to Mark. In (*b*) we have the addition of a few words to the Synoptical quotation. We have also references to the O. T. in the following passages:

Lev. xiv, 2.....i, 44.	Isa. xiii, 10.....xiii, 24.
1 Sam. xxi, 6.....ii, 25.	Dan. vii, 13.....xiv, 62.
Deut. xxiv, 1.....x, 4.	

VIII. *Time and Place of Composition.*—On these points the Gospel itself affords no information, except that we may certainly affirm, against Baur, Hilgenfeld, Weisse, etc., that it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem, since otherwise so remarkable a fulfilment of our Lord's predictions could not but have been noticed. Ecclesiastical tradition is, as usual, vacillatory and untrustworthy. Clement, as quoted by Eusebius (*ut sup.*), places the composition of the Gospel in the lifetime of Peter; while Irenæus, with much greater probability, asserts that it was not written till after the decease (ἔξοδον, not "departure from Rome," Mill, Grabe, Ebrard) of Peter and Paul. Later authorities are, as ever, much more definite. Theophylact and Euthym. Zigab., with the Chron. Pasch., Georg. Syncell., and Hesychius, place it ten years after the Ascension, i. e. A.D. 40; Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 43, when Peter, Paul, and Philo were together in Rome. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 10), where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this Epistle was written about A.D. 57. If, after coming to Asia Minor on Paul's sending, he went on and joined Peter at Babylon, he may have then acquired, or rather completed that knowledge of Peter's preaching, which tradition teaches us to look for in the Gospel, and of which there is so much internal evidence; and soon after this the Gospel may have been composed. We may probably date it between Peter's martyrdom, cir. A.D. 63, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

As to the place, the uniform testimony of early writers (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc.) is that the Gospel was written and published in Rome. In this view most modern writers of weight agree. Chrysostom asserts that it was published in Alexandria, but his statement is not confirmed—as, if true, it must certainly have been—by any Alexandrine writer. Some (Eichhorn, R. Simon) maintain a combination of the Roman and Alexandrine view under the theory of a double publication, first in one city and then in the other. Storr is alone in his view that it was first made public at Antioch.

IX. *Language.*—There can be no reason for questioning that the Gospel was composed in Greek. To suppose that it was written in Latin—as is stated in the subscription to the Peshito, and some early Greek MSS., ἐγράφη Ρωμαΐστι ἐν Ρώμῃ—because it was intended for the use of Roman Christians, implies complete ignorance of the Roman Church of that age, which in language, organization, and ritual was entirely Greek, maintaining its character in common with most of the churches of the West as "a Greek religious colony" (Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i, 27). The attempt made by Baronius, Bellarmine, etc., to strengthen the authority of the Vulgate by this means was therefore, as one of their own Church, R. Simon, has shown, entirely futile; and the pretended Latin autograph, said to be preserved in the library of St. Mark's at Venice, turned out to be part of an ancient Latin codex of the four Gospels, now known as Codex Forojuliensis.

X. *Contents.*—The Gospel of Mark may be divided into three parts:

(1.) The occurrences previous to the commencement of the public ministry of our Lord, including the preaching and baptism of John, our Lord's baptism and temptation (i, 1–13).

(2.) Our Lord's ministry in Galilee, including that in Eastern Galilee (i, 14–vii, 23); that in Northern Galilee (vii, 24–ix, 37); that in Peræa, and the journeyings towards Jerusalem (ix, 38–x, 52).

(3.) His triumphant entry, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension (xi, 1–xvi, 8 [20]).

XI. *Genuineness and Integrity.*—The genuineness of Mark's Gospel was never doubted before Schleiermacher, who, struck by an apparent discrepancy between the orderly narrative we now possess and the description of Papias (*ut sup.*), broached the view followed by Credner, Ewald, and others, that the Gospel in its present form is not the work of Mark the companion of Peter. This led to the notion, which has met with much acceptance among German critics (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, etc.), of an original, præcanonical Mark, "the Gospel of Peter," probably written in Aramaic, which, with other oral and documentary sources, formed the basis on which some unknown later writers formed the existing Gospel. But even if, on other grounds, this view were probable, all historical testimony is against it; and we should have to account for the entire disappearance of an original document of so much importance without leaving a trace of its existence, and the silent substitution of a later work for it, and its acceptance by the whole Church. If ordinary historical testimony is to have any weight, we can have no doubt that the Gospel we now have, and which has always borne his name, was that originally composed by Mark. We can have no reason to think that either John the presbyter or Papias were infallible; and if the ordinary interpretation of *οὐ τάξει* was correct, and the description of the Gospel given by Papias was really at variance with its present form, it would be at least equally probable that their judgment was erroneous and their view mistaken. There can, however, be little doubt that the meaning of *οὐ τάξει* has been strained and distorted, and that the words do really describe not Mark's alone, but all three Synoptic Gospels as we have them; not, that is, "Lives of Christ" chronologically arranged, but "a summary of representative facts" given according to a moral and not a historic sequence, following a higher order than that of mere time.

As regards the *integrity* of the Gospel, Ewald, Reuss, and others have called in question the genuineness of the opening verses (i, 1–13). But the external evidence for them is as great as that for the authenticity of any part of the Gospels. Internal evidence is too subtle a thing, and varies too much with the subjectivity of the writer, for us to rely on it exclusively.

The case is different with the closing portion (xvi, 9–20), where the evidence, both external and internal, is somewhat strong against its having formed a part of Mark's original Gospel, which is thought to have broken off abruptly with the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* (for various theories to account for this, the death of Peter, that of Mark, sudden persecution, flight, the loss of the last leaf, etc., see Hug, Meyer, Schott). No less than twenty-one words and expressions occur in it, some of them repeatedly, which are never elsewhere used by Mark. This alone, when we remember the peculiarities of diction in the pastoral epistles, as compared with Paul's other writings, would not be sufficient to prove that it was not written by the same author; though when taken in connection with the external evidence, it would seem to show that it was not composed at the same time. On this ground, therefore, we must conclude that if not the work of another hand, it was written at a later period than the rest of the Gospel. The external evidence, though somewhat inconsistent, points, though less decidedly, the same way. While it is found in all codices of weight, including A, C, D, and all versions, and is repeatedly quoted, without question, by early writers from the time of Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 10, 6), and appears in the very ancient Syriac recension published by Cureton, it is absent from the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. (in the former of which, after the subscription, the greater part of the column and the whole of the next are left vacant, a phenomenon nowhere else found in the N.-T. portion of that codex), while in several MSS. that contain it, it is noted that it is wanting in others, and those the most accurate copies. Jerome (*ad Hedib.* iv, 172) speaks of it as being found in but few copies of the Gospels, and deficient in almost all the Greek MSS. Eusebius (*ad Marin.* quæst. I) states that it is wanting "in nearly all the more accurate copies," while the canons that bear his name and the Ammonian sections do not go beyond v, 8. Of later critics, Olshausen and De Wette pronounce for its genuineness. The note of the latter may be consulted, as well as those of Alford and Meyer, who take the other side, for a full statement of the evidence for and against. See also Burgon, *The last twelve Verses of Mark vindicated* (Lond. 1871).

XII. *Canonicity.*—The citation of v, 19 as Scripture by Irenæus appears sufficient to establish this point. With regard to other passages of Mark's Gospel, as it presents so few facts peculiar to himself, we cannot be surprised that there are but few references to it in the early fathers. The Muratorian canon, however (cir. A.D. 170), commences with words which evidently refer to it. It is mentioned by Papias. Justin Martyr refers to it for the name Boanerges (*Tryph.* 106), as the "Memoirs of Peter." Irenæus, as we have seen above, quotes from it, and in the 19th Clementine Homily (ed. Dusseldorf, 1853) a peculiar phrase of Mark (iv, 34) is repeated verbally. The fact also recorded by Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 11, 7), that the Docetic heretics preferred the Gospel of Mark to the others, affords an early proof of its acceptance in the Church.

XIII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the entire Gospel of Mark; to a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk: Victor of Antioch, *In Marcum* (Gr. ed. Matthäi; also in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* iv, 370); Jerome, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*], xi, 758); also *Commentarius* (*ibid.* xi, 783); Possinus, *Catena Gr. Patrum* (Rom. 1673, fol.); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v, 92; *Works*, x, 1); Aquinas, *Catena* (in *Opp.* iv; also in vol. ii of Engl. transl.); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ix); Gerson, *Lectiones* (in *Opp.* iv, 203); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 141); Brentius, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* v); Myconius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1538, 8vo); Hegendorphinus, *Adnotationes* (Hag. 1526, 1536, 8vo); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1539, 1540, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentaria* (Tigur. 1545, fol.); Hofmeister, *Commentarius* [includ. Matt. and Luke] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Par. 1563; Colon. 1572, 8vo); Danæus, *Quæstiones* (Genev. 1594, 8vo); Gualther, *Homiliæ* (Heidelb. 1608, fol.); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1612, 8vo); Del Pas, *Commentaria* (Rom. 1623, fol.); Novarinus, *Expensio* (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Petter, *Commentary* (London, 1662, 2 vols. fol.); Hartsocker, *Aantekeningen* (Amsterd. 1671, 4to); De Veiel, *Explicatio* [includ. Matt.] (Lond. 1688, 8vo); Dorche, *Commentarius* (Kilon. 1690, 4to); Heupel, *Notæ* (Argent. 1716, 8vo); Klemm, *Exercitia* (Tübing. 1728, 4to); *Elsner, *Commentarius* (Traj. 1773, 4to); Cunningham, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1825, 12mo); Hinds, *Manual* (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Bland, *Annotations* (Lond. 1830, 8vo); *Fritzsche, *Commentarii* (Lips. 1830, 8vo); Ford, *Illustrations* (Lond. 1849, 1864, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, *D. Marcus-evangelium* (Halle, 1850, 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Alexander, *Explanation* (N. Y. 1858, 12mo); Klostermann, *D. Markus-evangelium* (Götting. 1867, 8vo); Goodwin, *Notes* (Lond. 1869, 8vo). See Gospels.

Mark on the Person (in this sense תָּו, *tav*, Ezek. ix, 4, 6; *χάραγμα*, Rev. xiii sq.), a *brand* or other character fixed upon the forehead (q. v.), hand, etc., usually of slaves, for the purpose of identifying them. See Slave.

In the case of Cain (Gen. iv, 15), a special token (אוֹת, *sign*, as elsewhere rendered) was assigned him in assurance of safety. See Cain.

Märk (*Mark*), Georg Joachim, a German theologian, was born at Schwerin March 1, 1726; was educated at the University of Kiel; in 1745 entered the ministry; and in 1747 was appointed a member of the philosophical faculty of his alma mater. In 1752 he accepted a call as librarian to the prince Louis of Mecklenburg-Schwerin; in 1758, as professor ordinary of divinity to

the University of Kiel; in 1766 he was honored with the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 5, 1774. Gifted with a quick perception and a good memory, Märk acquired great learning, particularly in theology and philosophy. By his indefatigable diligence as an author he kept the press almost constantly busy. Of his works the following have special interest for us: *Meditationes de Sapientia sanctissima rite colenda* (Kiel, 1762, 4to):—*Primælinæ juris divini evangelici* (ibid. 1763, 4to):—*Diss. de divina vocatione hominum miserorum ad fidem et salutem* (ibid. 1767, 4to):—*Causa Dei et sub ipso imperantium contra theologiam Jesuitarum* (ibid. 1767, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s. v.

Market (מַעֲרָב, *maarab'*), a mercantile term, found only in Ezek. xxvii (rendered "merchandise," except in ver. 13, 17, 19, 25), in several senses: (*a*) properly *barter*, and so trade, traffic (ver. 9, 27); (*b*) place of barter, *mart* (ver. 12, 13, 17, 19); (*c*) *gain*, wealth, acquired by traffic (ver. 27, 34; plur. ver. 33, perh. *precious wares*), like סַחַר, "merchandise," and עֲנָבוֹן, "fair," "ware." In the N. Test. the word *agora* (ἀγορά), thus rendered ("market-place" in Matt. xx, 3; Mark xii, 38; Luke vii, 32; Acts xvi, 19), denotes generally any place of public resort in towns and cities where the people came together; and hence more specially it signifies (*a*) a *public place*, a broad street, etc. (Matt. xi, 16; xx, 3; xxiii, 7; Mark vi, 56; xii, 38; Luke vii, 32; xi, 43; xx, 46); (*b*) a *forum* or market-place, where goods were exposed for sale, and assemblies or public trials held (Acts xvi, 19; xvii, 17). In Mark vii, 4 it is doubtful whether ἀγορά denotes the market itself, or is put for that which is brought from the market; but the known customs of the Jews suggest a preference of the former signification. From this is derived the term *agoræus* (ἀγοραῖος), properly signifying the things belonging to, or persons frequenting the *agora;* improperly rendered "in law" in Acts xix, 38, where it is applied to the days on which public trials were held in the forum; and in ch. xvii, 5 (where it is rendered "baser sort") it denotes idlers, or persons lounging about in the markets and other places of public resort. There is a peculiar force in this application of the word, when we recollect that the market-places or bazaars of the East were, and are at this day, the constant resort of unoccupied people, the idle, and the newsmongers.

In very early periods markets were held at or near the gates of cities, sometimes within and sometimes without the walls. Here commodities were exposed for sale, either in the open air or in tents (2 Kings vii, 18). It is still not unusual in the East for the wholesale market for country produce and cattle to be held (for a short time in the early part of the morning) at the gates of towns; but manufactured goods and various sorts of fruits are retailed in the bazaars within the towns. In the time of our Saviour, as we learn from Josephus, the markets were inclosed in the same manner as the modern Eastern bazaars, which are shut at night, and contain traders' shops disposed in rows or streets; and in large towns the dealers in particular commodities are confined to certain streets. That this was also the case in the time of the prophet Jeremiah, we may infer from his expression, "the bakers' street" (xxxvii, 21). That a close connection existed between those of the same craft, we learn incidentally from Neh. iii, 32. In rebuilding Jerusalem after the exile, "the goldsmiths and the merchants" acted together in repairing the walls. Josephus calls the valley between Mounts Zion and Moriah the Tyropœon (τυροποιῶν), i. e. the valley "of the cheesemakers." In like manner there is mentioned the valley of Charashim, or "the craftsmen" (1 Chron. iv, 14; Neh. xi, 35). Josephus also mentions a street of the meat-dealers. The streets of Eastern cities are generally distinguished from each other, not by the separate names which they bear, but by the sort of traffic or business carried on in them. Thus at Cairo and other large Oriental cities we hear of the market of the butchers, of the fruit-dealers, the copper-ware sellers, the jewellers, and so on; each consisting of a row of shops on each side of the street devoted to that particular kind of trade (Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 61). See BARGAIN; BAZAAR; COMMERCE; MERCHANT.

Märklin, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Reichenbach, in Würtemberg, Feb. 6, 1732; was educated at the University of Tübingen; in 1755 became archdeacon at Waiblingen; in 1760 lectured at his alma mater; in 1767, archdeacon; in 1786 was raised to the dignity of professor of divinity, the department of exegesis of the Old Test. and Oriental literature falling to him. In 1797 he was made general superintendent of the churches of Würtemberg, and died May 13, 1804. He was a distinguished interpreter of the O.-T. Scriptures. Of his productions we only mention *Diss. inaug. de Sermone Dei ad Joh.* 28, 29 *ejusque Scopo* (Tubingæ, 1754, 4to):—*Diss. de religione, imprimis Christiana, magno in officiis*, etc. (ibid. 1786, 4to).—Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s. v.

Marks, RICHARD T., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Louisville, Ga., Sept. 24, 1809. He was educated a printer. In 1827 he removed to Columbus, Ga., and united with Mr. Larmar in establishing the *Columbus Inquirer*, the first paper started in the western part of Georgia. Soon after, feeling called to the ministry, he commenced the study of theology under Thomas Goulding, D.D.; was licensed in 1837, and ordained in 1839. He labored as a minister mostly in missionary fields, or where the destitution was so great that unrequited labor had to be given. He preached in the following places, all in Georgia: Muscogee, Greenville, West Point, Hamilton, Columbus, Emmaus, Americus, Mount Tabor, Ephesus, and White Sulphur Springs. He died Dec. 6, 1867. Mr. Marks was a ready writer, an excellent preacher, and an editor of great power and influence. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 342.

Mark's, St., Day, the 25th of April, observed at least since the 6th century, in commemoration of St. Mark, the evangelist. It is celebrated in most parishes of the Romish Church by a solemn, supplicatory procession, mentioned as early as pope Gregory the Great. Walafrid Strabo states (*De reb. eccl.* c. 8) that it was instituted by that pope at the commencement of his pontificate, with a view to supplicate God for deliverance from a pestilence which was devastating Rome; and it is certain that Gregory held a procession in A.D. 590, in order to avert the pestilence. But the two ceremonies are clearly not identical. The latter was held in August, and continued during three days; and while, in the procession of St. Mark, the faithful issued from seven separate churches, in this they all proceeded from a single sanctuary. In churches of which St. Mark is the patron, a mass is celebrated in connection with the procession, in which the color used is blue, indicative of the penitential feeling which predominates in the ceremony. An occasional removal of the festival to another day does not set aside the procession, which is always held on the 25th of April, unless Easter Sunday falls on that date.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 832.

Mark's, St., Liturgy. See LITURGY.

Marlatt, ARCHIBALD G., a noted educator and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Warren County, N. J., in 1829, and educated at Dickinson College (class of 1850); was junior preacher on Carlisle Circuit in 1851; was the following year appointed to Lock Haven Circuit, where a bronchial affection developed itself, which compelled him to locate in 1854. In this same year he was appointed professor of a high literary institution in Washington City, where he remained until 1856, when he accepted the presidency of the newly-founded Irving Female College, and to this institution he devoted his energy and talents until Jan. 2, 1865, when he "fell asleep in Jesus." "The personal character of our brother may be included in the comprehensive title 'a Christian gentleman,' the

highest style and type of manhood. As a gentleman, a scholar, and a minister of truth, his was a noble candor. . . . In everything that bore upon truth or purity he was a decided man. Of his mental power and literary culture it may be safely said that he possessed a clear intellectual perception; rapid insight, coupled with careful analysis and broad power of generalizing; a vivid sensibility of nature, a keen discrimination of character, a large acquaintance with ancient and modern belles-lettres; and from the college under his presidency have been sent forth those that shall shine brightly in the literary world."—*Conf. Minutes*, 1865, p. 12.

Marlay, Michael, D.D., a noted Methodist minister, was born, of Roman Catholic parentage, in Berkeley County, Va., June 21, 1797. In the year 1818 he migrated to the State of Ohio, and settled near Dayton. In 1821 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon after appointed a class-leader. The Church, recognising his gifts and graces, speedily licensed him as an exhorter, and afterwards as a local preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received on trial as a travelling preacher by the Ohio Conference. He quickly rose to a commanding position in the ministry, and was widely known as a sound theologian, an able preacher, and a skilful administrator of discipline. So great was his reputation as an executive officer, that more than half of his ministry of thirty-five years was spent in the office of presiding elder. He was twice an active and influential member of the General Conference, by which body he was appointed, in 1852, one of the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to manage the suit in the then pending trial for the property of the Western Book Concern. In 1860 he received the degree of D.D. from the Indiana State University. He died of cholera, while in attendance upon the session of the Cincinnati Conference, at Ripley, Ohio, Sept. 2, 1866. The late bishop Thomson thus spoke of Dr. Marlay shortly after his decease (*Christian Advocate*, N. Y., vol. xli, No. 43): "His strong frame of medium size, fine proportion, and high health, admirably fitted him for itinerant labors; his benignant countenance, amiable spirit, and gentle manners rendered him a welcome guest wherever he went. His fine head indicated great intellectual power; his habits of study seemed to render certain his constant improvement, while his clear call to the ministry insured his unwavering devotion to its duties. . . . In Biblical science, as well as in theoretical, practical, and experimental divinity, he was a master. . . . He was a great man in private as well as in public life; and one of the strongest proofs of his high moral worth is the fact that, of a large family which he leaves behind him, every one is an ornament to society. . . . He expired in the arms of his brethren, and they buried him, feeling that they could lay in the tomb no man to whom the Methodist Church in Ohio has been more indebted." See also *Ladies' Repository*, 1866, Jan.; *Conf. Minutes*, 1866, p. 262. (J. F. M.)

Marlorat(us), Augustine, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Bar-le-Duc in 1506. At an early age he was put in an Augustine convent, and took the vows in 1524. He soon acquired great reputation as a preacher. Having been appointed prior of a convent of his order at Bourges, he commenced to entertain Protestant views, as is evinced in the sermons he delivered after 1533 at Bourges, Poitiers, and Angers. He was designated to preach during the Lenten season at Rouen, when he openly separated from the Church. Pursued as a heretic, he sought refuge at Geneva, where he lived for a time by correcting proofs for the printers. He then went to Lausanne, to perfect his knowledge of theology. In 1549 he was appointed pastor at Crissier, and afterwards at Vevay. The consistory of Geneva sent him in 1559 to Paris, and in the beginning of the year following he was called to take charge of the Reformed Church at Rouen. His talents and his personal qualities now had a fair opportunity for display, and soon gained him great influence in that city, and brought many converts to the Church. In 1561 he went to the Colloquy of Poissy, where, next to Theodore de Beza, he stood at the head of the Protestants, and on the 15th of May he presided over the provincial synod assembled at Dieppe. The opposition of the government towards all expression of religious opinion adverse to Roman Catholicism, and more particularly the bloody deeds of Vassy on March 1, 1562, had greatly exasperated the Protestants [see Huguenots]; and the latter, feeling that there was only one alternative for them, either to fight for their conscience sake or abjure their honest convictions, took to arms all over France. The opening scene had been made at Paris. At Rouen the Protestants were in the majority (if we may follow Beza; according to Floquet [Rom. Cath.], however, they only constituted one fifth of the population), and, anxious to secure the city for the armies of Condé, made themselves masters of the place by stealth in the night of April 15 to 16. An independent government was established, and unbounded religious toleration exercised towards non-Protestants. The masses, however, in the hour of excitement behaved madly. A spirit of iconoclasm took hold upon them, and within twenty-four hours they destroyed some of the most valuable works of art in fifty churches. For this and other outrages the Protestant leaders, of whom Marloratus was one, were not responsible either directly or indirectly. Yet, when the Roman Catholics succeeded in retaking the city, he was one of the first accused, and, though he had done no more than simply battle for the grant of religious freedom, he was arrested Oct. 26, 1562, brought before the bar of the Parliament, which had re-entered Rouen with the Roman Catholic forces, and condemned, as a traitor and heretic, to be drawn on a hurdle through the streets of the town, and then hung in front of his own church. After the execution, which took place Nov. 1, 1563, his head was severed from the trunk, and exposed on the bridge of the town. The Huguenots revenged this outrage by the execution of two leading Romanists in their hands. The widow and five children of Marloratus fled to England, where they were for a long time maintained by the French Protestants.

As a writer Marloratus figures very prominently also. His exegetical works are numerous and valued, because of the accuracy and scholarship which they evince in the author. "They may be best described as painstaking and not injudicious selections of the interpretations of other writings" (Kitto). His earliest production is *Remonstrances à la reyne mère par ceux qui sont persecutés pour la parole de Dieu* (1561, 12mo; 2d ed. 1561, 8vo); but one of his most important productions is his *Novi Testamenti catholica expositio*, etc. (Geneva, 1561, fol.; 2d ed. 1605, fol.). This is a valuable work, containing Erasmus's Latin version of the N. T., with the expositions of the fathers of the Church, and of Bucer, Calvin, Erasmus, Musculus, Melancthon, Sarcerius, Brentius, Bullinger, Zwinglius, Vitus Theodorus, etc. His object seems to have been to prove to Romanists the identity of the Protestant and the Apostolic Church, and the essential oneness of the two Protestant parties. He himself leaned towards Calvinism. Parts of it were translated into English, and published under the following titles: *A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition of the holy Gospell after S. Mathewe. Translated out of Latine into Englishe by Thomas Tymme, Mynister* (Lond. 1570, fol.); *A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition upon the Apocalyps of S. John the Apostle. Translated* (black letter, Lond. 1574, 4to). Translations have also been published of his *Exposition of St. Mark* (1583, 4to); *St. John* (1574, 4to); *St. Jude* (1584, 4to), etc. He also wrote *Genesis, cum catholica Expositione*, etc. (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted); *In CL Psalmos et aliorum S. S. Prophetarum Expositio ecclesiastica, etc., Item Cantica sacra ex divinis Bibliorum locis cum simili expositione* (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted; and in English un-

der the title *Prayers in the Psalms*, Lond. 1571, 16mo); etc. See Haag, *La France Protestante;* Chevrier, *Mem. pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres de la Lorraine; Notice sur Aug. Marlorat*, in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Hist. du Protestantisme Français*, 6me année, p. 109; *Augustin Marlorat, sa vie et sa mort* (Caen, 1862, 8vo); Floquet's Beza, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, i passim, and especially ii, 610 sq.; Schott, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 92–96; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 858; Darling, *Cyclopœdia Bibliographica*, ii, 1965; Middleton, *Ev. Biog.* ii, 82. (J. H. W.)

Marmontel, JEAN FRANÇOIS, a celebrated French critic, and a leader in the French school of infidelity which flourished under the guidance of Diderot, Holbach, and Voltaire, was born at Bort, in Limousin, in 1723, of humble parentage. He was educated at the Jesuits' college at Mauriac, but, not inclining towards asceticism, went to Paris finally (1746), and there became intimate with the great freethinkers of the 18th century. Marmontel wielded an able pen, and largely devoted himself to authorship, producing both original works and translations of valuable English writers. By intercession of Madame Pompadour, he secured a secretaryship at Versailles in 1753. Later he became editor of the *Mercure*, for which he wrote, in part, his celebrated *Contes Moraux*, afterwards published in book form (Paris, 1761, 2 vols.). These *Moral Tales* were received with extraordinary favor, and were translated into most of the languages of Europe. Though written with great elegance and animation, their morality is rather questionable, and, appearing at a time when literature was unusually weighed down by freethinkers and atheists, the French clergy declaimed against the *Contes Moraux*. The opposition of the clergy became more decided against Marmontel in 1767, when he published his *Bélisaire*, a political romance. A chapter of it treats on toleration. This part of the work was specially objected to by the doctors of the Sorbonne "as heretical and blasphemous," and quickly the cry resounded through the pulpits of the capital, and thence into those of the inland towns, until the excitement became general. *Bélisaire* was condemned by the archbishop of Paris. Voltaire could hardly say enough in its praise, and the empress Catharine II honored it by a special order for its immediate translation into Russian. Marmontel himself came off victor in this contest with the Sorbonne and the clergy, and gained the honorable appointment of historiographer of France. To the *Encyclopédie* (s. v.) he contributed "Eléments de Littérature" (1787, 6 vols. 8vo); he had charge, moreover, of its departments of poetry and general literature. During the Revolution he retired to the country, and died at the village of Abloville, near Evreux, December 31, 1799. An edition of his *Œuvres Complètes* was published by himself in 17 vols.; another in 18 vols. (Paris, 1818); a third in 7 vols. (Paris, 1819–20). See Saint-Surin, *Notice sur Marmontel* (1824); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, vol. iv; Morellet, *Éloge de Marmontel* (1805); Villenave, *Notice sur les Ouvrages de Marmontel* (1820); *Edinb. Rev.* 1806 (Jan.); Schlosser, *Gesch. d.* 18*ten u.* 19*ten Jahrhunderts*, ii, 2, § 1; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Mar'moth (Μαρμωθ), a less correct form (1 Esdr. viii, 62) of the Heb. name MEREMOTH (1 Ezra viii, 33).

Marne, JEAN-BAPTISTE DE, a Flemish ecclesiastic and historian, was born at Douai in 1699. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1619; was appointed minister to Namur, after having taught belles-lettres and theology in many cities, and filling different missions. Afterwards he was called to Liege, and became confessor to John-Theodore of Bavaria, and synodal examiner of the diocese. Ten years later he retired to Liege. He died Oct. 9, 1756. Marne wrote *Martyr du secret de la confession, ou la Vie de Saint Jean Nepourneine* (Paris, 1741, 12mo; Avignon, 1820, 18mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 907.

Marnix, PHILIPPE VAN, DE STE. ALDEGONDE, occupies a distinguished place in the history of the Netherlands during the Reformation period. He was born at Brussels in 1538, of parents thoroughly identified with the interests of their country, and was carefully educated at home, and later at Geneva under Calvin and Beza. After returning to his home in 1560, he spent six years in retirement, but became known, notwithstanding his seclusion, as a careful observer of events, and respected as a patriot and a man of honor. His devotion to the cause of the Reformation, whose influence he steadily endeavored to extend, could not remain concealed; nor could his learning, his keen understanding, and his power as a writer escape recognition. He was soon in intimate relations with the leaders of the nation, and the rapid progress of events forced him into prominence. He is universally held to be the author of the so-called compromise (about 1565–66) by which the nobles and others pledged themselves to resist, by all lawful means, the introduction of the Inquisition. The league soon attained such proportions that it dared to present (April 5, 1566) a petition to the regent for the suppression of the institution. Soon after, when Protestant field-preaching was introduced, he placed himself at the head of the movement, and insisted that the Protestants should be permitted to worship in Antwerp itself. On the 19th of August an iconoclastic mob destroyed the many works of art that adorned the churches, etc., of Antwerp, and the regent, in alarm, permitted Protestant worship in specified places; and under this sanction the first synod of the Walloon churches assembled in Antwerp Oct. 26, 1566. Marnix presided, and by his influence contributed to the adoption of the reformed confession, by which event the Calvinists acquired a pre-eminence that still continues. The government now adopted more energetic measures to restrain the Protestants, by placing garrisons in important towns, and even besieging such as refused to admit them. This was the case at Valenciennes; and Marnix, while seeking to aid the beleaguered city, was defeated, his brother killed, himself banished, and his property confiscated. During his exile he was influential in converting William of Orange and Nassau to the Protestant faith, and formed a connection with him that was only dissolved by death. In the mean time, however, Marnix had entered the service of the Palatine Frederick III, and fixed his residence at Heidelberg, where he was largely engaged in theological investigations; but, with the consent of the elector, he was often employed in the affairs of his own country, under the direction of the prince of Orange, being present at the defeat of Louis of Nassau at Jemmingen in July, 1568, etc. He attended the synod of the exiled clergy at Wesel in November, 1568, and his influence is seen in the constitution of the Church then adopted. A second important synod was held at Emden, Oct. 4 to 14, 1571, at which Marnix was also present, and which selected him to write a history of recent events in the Netherlands; but the needs of his country prevented the execution of this task. In July, 1572, he was sent by the prince of Orange to confer with the delegates of Holland, who were assembled at Dort, and succeeded in inducing them to pledge their readiness to make every sacrifice to throw off the Spanish yoke. Thenceforward his activity was incessant. He was taken prisoner by the Spaniards in November, 1573, but his life was spared, as the prince of Orange had threatened to retaliate, and Requesens, successor to the duke of Alba, employed him in an attempt to negotiate a peace, which was defeated by the sagacity of Orange. A similar office, undertaken after his exchange on the order of the prince of Orange, likewise failed, as did his mission to induce queen Elizabeth of England to accept the sovereignty of the Netherlands. He assisted in the negotiations that resulted in the "Pacification of Ghent" in November, 1576, and in the formation of the second union between the provinces at Brussels in December, 1577. In May, 1578, he repre-

sented the Netherlands at the Diet of Worms, and prevailed on the German states to remain neutral in the contest with Spain. In the mean time religious intolerance had led to gross outrages among his countrymen, and the bitter feeling between the parties threatened ruin to the union that had been secured with so much effort. An attempt to reconcile these differences, in which he was engaged on his return, failed, and several of the Roman Catholic provinces withdrew, and placed themselves and their religion under Spanish protection. An alliance with France was now thought of, and Marnix exerted his influence successfully to induce the states-general to offer the crown to Francis, duke of Anjou-Alençon. This prince reached Antwerp on Feb. 19, 1572; but an attempt to seize Antwerp and other important towns led to his expulsion from the land before he had reigned a year, and both Orange and Marnix were suspected of connivance with the French. In consequence, Marnix retired from public life; but the progress of the Spaniards, under the duke of Parma, induced William of Orange to recall him, and he was appointed to the office of first burgomaster of Antwerp, in order that he might direct its defence. He entered on its duties Nov. 15, 1583, and a few days later the siege began. It was continued until Aug. 17, 1585, when the city honorably capitulated. With this event his political career was ended, and he retired to his estates, devoting himself mainly to theological studies. In 1596, having been appointed by the states-general to translate the Bible into Dutch, he removed to Leyden, in order to avail himself of its library, and of the assistance of his friends Scaliger, Lipsius, Junius, and others. He only lived, however, to complete the book of Genesis. He died Dec. 15, 1598. "He was," says Motley, "a man of most rare and versatile genius—scholar, theologian, diplomatist, swordsman, orator, pamphleteer; he had genius for all things, and was eminent in all." The theological works of Van Marnix were chiefly of a polemical character. The principal one, *The Bee-hive*, is a satire after the manner of Von Hutten, and written in the style of Rabelais. It was probably intended to promote a reconciliation between the Romish and the Protestant provinces of his country. Another able contribution is his *Tableau des différences de la religion* (1669, and often). A complete edition of his works, in 8 vols., was published at Brussels, 1857–60, under the title *Œuvres de Phil. de Marnix de Ste. Aldegonde;* vol. iv contains a brief memoir, and a notice bibliographique. His life has been frequently written; among others, Th. Juste has treated it in connection with his studies of the Netherlands (1858). Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, and *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, vol. i, chap. iii, are valuable aids to the study of this career. See also Prins, *Leven van P. v. Marnix* (1782); Dresselhuïs, *F. v. Marnix* (1832); Broes, *F. v. Marnix* (1838–40, 2 vols. 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 96 sq.; Edgar Quinet, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1854.

Maron, Joannes, a noted Eastern patriarch, supposed to be the founder of the *Maronites*, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, in Syria, about the middle of the 7th century; studied at Constantinople, and became monk and priest in the convent of St. Maron. Elevated to the bishopric of Botoys in 676, according to some, by the papal legate, he brought, if we may follow Romish authority, all the Christians of Lebanon within the communion of the Church of Rome; was then made patriarch of Antioch, and confirmed by pope Honorius; and died in 707. See, however, Maronites.

Maronites, a community or sect of Christians, numbering some 150,000, in Syria, particularly in the northern part of Mount Lebanon, and said to be of very ancient origin.

I. *History.*—Considerable controversy has arisen as to the real origin of this most peculiar Christian people; the most probable account represents them as descendants of a remnant of the *Monothelites* (q. v.), who, fleeing from the repressive measures of the emperor Anastasius II, in the early part of the 8th century, settled on the slopes of the Lebanon, and gradually yielded their distinctive Monothelite views. According to Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* i, 457; iii, 127), many Monothelites, after the Council of Constantinople, found a refuge among the Mardaites, signifying in Syriac *rebels*, a people who took possession of Lebanon A.D. 676, and made it the asylum of vagabonds, slaves, and all sorts of rabble; and about the conclusion of the 7th century these Monothelites of Lebanon were called Maronites, after Maro, their first bishop. None, he says, of the ancient writers give any certain account of the first person who converted these mountaineers to Monothelitism; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they have adopted; and that this ecclesiastic received the name of Maro from his having lived, in the character of a monk, in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Orontes, before his settlement among the Mardaites of Mount Libanus. Gieseler (*Eccles. Hist.* ii, 419), however, takes exception to this identification of the *Maronites* with the *Mardaites*, and, by authority derived from the writings of Anquetil Duperron (*Récherches sur les migrations des Mardes*, in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* i, 1), holds that "the Mardaites or Mards, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 676 (Theophanes, p. 295), and were withdrawn as early as 685 by Justinian II (Theophanes, p. 302). Madden (*Turkish Empire*, ii, 154), upon the authority of the learned Benedictine St. Maur (*Histoire Monastique de l'Orient*, p. 348), holds that the Maronites were founded by St. Maro, a patriarch of Syrian Christians in the 5th century, and that they existed under that name in the 7th century, when the Saracens ravaged the country, and were afterwards persecuted as *Mardaites* (comp. here Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, iii, 58). There is certainly much in favor of this argument, not the least of which is the fact that, "at the commencement of the 7th century, the entire range of mountains from Antioch to Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrian Christians, who formed a political power under chiefs or emirs, exercising a hereditary government" (Churchill). But, however great may be the darkness surrounding their earliest history, one thing is certain, from the testimony of William of Tyre and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records, namely, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the 12th century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were readmitted into the communion of the Roman Church. Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre in the 12th century, thus speaks of the Maronites in his *Historia Hierosolymitana*, drawn up at the request of pope Honorius III: "Men armed with bows and arrows, and skilful in battle, inhabit the mountains in considerable numbers, in the province of Phœnicia, not far from the town of Biblos. They are called Maronites, from the name of a certain man, their master, Maron, a heretic, who affirmed that there was in Jesus but one will or operation. The Christians of the Lebanon, dupes of this diabolical error of Maron, remained separate from the Church nearly five hundred years. At last, their hearts being turned, they made profession of the Catholic faith in presence of the venerable father Amaury, patriarch of Antioch, and adopted the traditions of the Roman Church." The most learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their Church against this accusation; they have labored to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the Catholic faith, and in their attachment to the Roman pontiff, without ever adopting the doctrine of the Monophysites or Monothelites (compare Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, iii, 51). But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these assertions, and the testimonies they allege appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.

There can be no doubt that the Maronites were

brought back to the communion of Rome by the influence of the Crusaders. Even in our day the Maronites, "warranted, indeed, both by historical and traditional records, allude in terms of pride and satisfaction to the service done by their ancestors to the armies of the Crusaders, and estimate in round numbers 50,000 of their population as having fallen under the standards of the Cross" (Churchill). During the early part of the 12th century the communications between the Maronite patriarch and the papal see were of frequent recurrence, and thus the way was easily paved for reunion. But though the Maronites joined the communion of Rome in this very age, it required three centuries more before the sturdy mountaineers could be brought to acknowledge Rome's supremacy in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, and we are afforded a picture of a Christian Church existing for three centuries, "popish in all its forms and doctrines, saving the cardinal point of submission to the pope." They had entered the Romish communion on the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in the 12th century, but they did not enter into a formal act of union with Rome until the Council of Florence in 1445, and only formally subscribed to the decrees of the Council of Trent in 1736. Mosheim observes that the subjection of the Maronites to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff was agreed to with this express condition, that neither the popes nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish anything that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions of this people; so that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that savors of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontiff. It is also certain that there are Maronites in Syria who still hold the Church of Rome in the greatest aversion and abhorrence (Schaff, *Church Hist.* iii, 783); nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontiff, opposed his authority during the 17th century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, flew into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa against the violence of the inquisitors. Their union with Rome gave the Maronites the protection of European powers, especially that of the devoted Frank; but when the Franks were expelled from Syria, in 1300, by Malek Ashraf, the Maronites were compelled to defend their independence against the Mameluke sovereigns, and the greater part of them became mixed up with the Druses, still keeping up, however, their connection with Rome. In the 17th century they placed themselves under the direct protection of France, Louis XIV and Louis XV granting them "Letters of Protection;" and for some time the French consul at Beirût exercised almost regal sway over them, the Maronites regarding themselves as "the French of the East." In the early part of the 18th century the Druses called the Mohammedan family of the Shehabs to govern Lebanon, and in 1713 the Turks made the first attempt to bring the inhabitants under the direct rule of a pacha. They resisted successfully, defeating the Turks in the battle of Aindara; but in 1756 several emirs became Maronites, and, incited by the Maronite clergy, showed great favor to their new brethren, thereby displeasing the Druses, and provoking a feeling of ill-will between the Druses and the Maronites, which has not yet subsided. The pachas of Acre, since Jezzar, carefully promoted this misunderstanding, for they felt that the tribes of Lebanon, fully united under an enterprising chief, would become dangerous to the Porte. Yet there was no feeling of religious animosity between the two nations at this early date, and, whenever political troubles broke out, Druse and Maronite sided indiscriminately with both parties. Emir Beshir Shehab (1789–1840), although in secret a Maronite, was always surrounded by the most important among the Druses, and, whenever he needed help, asked it of them rather than of the Maronites. Thus the Druses and the Christians were living peaceably side by side until 1831, when Syria passed under the rule of Mohammed Ali, and he commissioned his son, Ibrahim Pacha, to govern the province. Carrying out his father's enlightened views, Ibrahim Pacha applied himself to the improvement of the condition of his Christian subjects, and, in spite of the opposition of the Mohammedans, they were raised to civil and military offices. The Syrians, however, accustomed to the indolent Turkish rule, revolted against this energetic and active Egyptian management, and it was some time before the insurrection was quelled, the Druses being the last to submit. They had asked the Maronites to join them, and the latter, who had held back when there was some chance of success, now rose under the most frivolous pretences. In the mean time, in 1840, the allied fleet of England, Austria, and Turkey were employed to secure the restoration of Syria to Turkey. Turkish agents were busy among the Maronites, fanning the flame of rebellion; most of these wretches were Englishmen. Finally, France not upholding Egypt, Syria was returned to Turkish rule. The position of the Christians now became worse than ever, and their merchants were obliged to invoke the protection of the European consuls against the spoliation of the Turks. Lord Stratford of Redcliffe interfered in their behalf at Constantinople, and quiet was for a while restored. The Turkish government wished to appoint a Turkish governor over Lebanon, but the English finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of emir Beshir Kassim Shehab, a Christian. The Druses, however, took exception to this arrangement, and when subsequently the Maronite patriarch attempted to confiscate all civil authority for the benefit of the Maronites, they became exasperated. Colonel Rose, the English consul-general, wrote on that occasion, "The Maronite clergy show a determination to uphold their supremacy in the mountains at the risk of a civil war." And a civil war was the result of this obstinacy. The patriarch (for his functions among the Maronites, see below, under III. *Religious Status.*—1. *Clergy*) at the same time, by his mismanagement, excited the jealousies of the Turks, and displeased the English, whom the Druses hailed as their friends.

On Sept. 14, 1841, a first affray took place between the Druses and the Christians at Deir el-Kamar; it was repressed by the efforts of colonel Rose. The Druses rose again, however, on Oct. 13, 14, and 15, and the entire destruction of the town was only prevented by the arrival from Beirût of colonel Rose and Ayûb Pacha on the 16th. But the war had commenced, and the Druses, assisted by the Turks, who wilfully and purposely promoted the hateful strife, soon got the better of the Christians, and, had it not been for the interference of the English consul, Turkish fanaticism would have extinguished every Christian life on and near Mount Lebanon. Quiet was restored, however, only for a season. See DRUSES. On Aug. 30, 1859, an affray took place at Bate-mirri, three hours from Beirût, originating in a quarrel between a Druse and a Christian boy, in which the Druses were defeated; but the next day, Sunday, they renewed the fight in greater numbers, and were victorious. The Druses now commenced burning the Maronite villages; the Turks fearing the power of European governments, Kurchid Pacha put an end to the disturbance, yet without punishing the offenders. The Maronites, perceiving or believing that a secret understanding existed between the Druses and the Turks, promptly commenced arming. In April, 1860, Kurchid Pacha received despatches from Constantinople; soon afterwards Seid Bey Jumblatt assembled a Druse divan at Muchtara, and great agitation commenced to pervade the Druse districts; Christians were murdered either singly or in small parties, and a great number of them, leaving their villages, fled to the stronger places of

Zachlé and Deir el-Kamar. On May 4 some Druses broke into the convent of Amîk, near Deir el-Kamar, and murdered the superior in his bed. The Maronites still sought to obtain peace, but found that they would be compelled to meet force with force. Three thousand men from Zachlé attacked the Druse village of Aindara, but were beaten by a much smaller force, their arrangements, and especially their discipline, being much inferior to that of the Druses. Kurchid Pacha had a Turkish camp in the immediate vicinity of Beirût, and commanding the plain, but he did not interfere now as he had done on the former occasion. On the contrary, after encouraging the Maronites by promising them his protection against the Druses, he gave the signal of their massacre on May 30. One hundred Turkish soldiers and the irregular Turkish cavalry joined the Druses in cutting down the Maronites. The Druses would have pushed on to Beirût had they not been prevented by the Turks. The European consuls now attempted to interfere; they were met with fine protestations by the Turkish authorities, and nothing was done to repress the outrages. At the end of May the Druses blockaded Deir el-Kamar, and on June 1 it was attacked by 4000 of them. The city surrendered the next day. The pacha, after entering the city, upbraided the Maronites as traitors, rebels, etc., because they had thought it wise to defend themselves against the Druses. At the same time 2000 Druses, commanded by Seleb Bey Jumblatt, took Jezîn, and murdered the inhabitants. Roman Catholic convents shared the same fate as those of the Maronites, being sacked, plundered, and burned: in that of Meshmûsy alone thirty monks had their throats cut; the plunder was enormous. Ali Said Bey's district was given up to fire and the sword. Sidon was only saved by the timely arrival of captain Maunsell, with his English ship the Firefly, on June 3. In the Anti-Lebanon, Said Bey's sister followed her brother's example and instructions, causing the Christians of Hasbeya and Rasheya to be inveigled into the serail of the former place, under promise of their being taken safely to Damascus; they were there murdered in cold blood by the Druses, without distinction of age or sex, on June 10. The Turkish soldiers crowded into the serail to enjoy the sight, and some of them even took part in the butchery. On June 14 Zachlé was invested and taken and on the 19th Deir el-Kamar met with the same fate. The entire male population was ruthlessly massacred, and the city given a prey to the flames. The surviving widows and children fled to the coasts. On June 22 a disturbance broke out at Beirût, in which even the Europeans were assailed, but it was repressed with the aid of general Kmety (Ismail Pacha). The purely Maronite districts of Lebanon now became greatly alarmed, the more as Turkish soldiers were quartered there under the pretence of protecting them. The European consuls advised together, and drew up a remonstrance to the Druse chiefs, which a Mr. Graham was sent to deliver to them. Said Bey Jumblatt, however, when appealed to, declared only his respect for England and his willingness to see this struggle end, but added that he had no power over it, and that the Druses would not obey him. Most of the Druse sheiks contrived to avoid Mr. Graham, and those he did meet gave him but evasive answers. Finally, on July 10, the Mohammedans of Damascus rose against the Christians, of whom there were some 25,000 in the city. The Christian quarter was soon a heap of smouldering ruins, beneath which numberless corpses were buried. Women, married and unmarried, were wandering through the streets, and were seen to cry for assistance, with heads uncovered and feet naked, appealing to the murderers for mercy. Many were sold as slaves for a few piastres, or taken away to the desert. The streets were crowded with fanatics, who shouted continually, "Death to the Christians! Let us slaughter the Christians! Let not one remain!" Every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burned. The silver plate, jewelry, and gold coin taken from these sanctuaries "were not allowed to be plundered by the rabble, but were removed by soldiers." These are the words of the British consul, Mr. Brant. The consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States were all burned. Those of England and Prussia escaped, as they were not situated in the Christian quarter, and they became an asylum for as many as were able to reach them. Others were saved in great numbers in the house of Abd-el-Kader, and in the citadel; but the governor, Ahmed Pacha, was an unmoved witness of the devastation, or an accomplice in the lawless deeds of the plundering rabble (*Lond. Rev.* 1860, Oct., p. 160). As has already been stated in the article DRUSES (q. v.), the French and English governments were obliged to come to the rescue of the Syrian Christians, and the Porte was forced to inflict punishment upon those whom the Turkish officers had made pliant tools for the destruction of the Maronites. On Aug. 3 a conference of the great powers—Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey as well—met, but the meeting was closed without accomplishing any real good. All that was secured was the promise that the Sublime Porte had endeavored and would continue to do its duty; but what this duty consisted in, it has been hard to determine to this day. Only a few weeks previously the Christian emirs had been compelled by the Turkish pacha to testify that the conduct of the Turks was irreproachable, when the emirs felt constrained afterwards to acknowledge their extorted perjury. In October, finally, the international conference of the plenipotentiaries of European powers convened at Beirût, and crowned their labors successfully, June 9, 1861, by a special treaty concerning the administration of the Lebanon. See DRUSES, vol. ii, p. 900, col. 2.

II. *Social Position.*—The nation may be considered as divided into two classes, the common people and the *sheiks*, by whom must be understood the most eminent of the inhabitants, who, from the antiquity of their families and the opulence of their fortunes, are superior to the ordinary class. They all live dispersed in the mountains, in villages, hamlets, and even detached houses, which is never the case in the plains. The whole nation consists of cultivators. Every man improves the little domain he possesses, or farms, with his own hands. Even the *sheiks* live in the same manner, and are only distinguished from the rest by a bad pelisse, a horse, and a few slight advantages in food and lodging; they all live frugally, without many enjoyments, but also with few wants, as they are little acquainted with the inventions of luxury. In general, the nation is poor, but no one wants necessaries; and if beggars are sometimes seen, they come rather from the sea-coast than the country itself. Property is as sacred among them as in Europe; nor do we hear of robberies and extortions so frequently committed by the Turks. Travellers may journey there, either by night or by day, with a security unknown in any other part of the empire, and the stranger is received with hospitality, as among the Arabs: it must be owned, however, that the Maronites are less generous, and rather inclined to the vice of parsimony. Conformably to the doctrines of Christianity, they have only one wife, whom they frequently espouse without having seen, and always without having been much in her company. Contrary to the precepts of that same religion, however, they have admitted, or retained, the Arab custom of retaliation, and the nearest relation of a murdered person is bound to avenge him. From a habit founded on distrust, and the political state of the country, every one, whether sheik or peasant, walks continually armed with a musket and poniards. This is, perhaps, an inconvenience; but this advantage results from it, that they have no novices in the use of arms among them when it is necessary to employ them against the Turks. As the country maintains no regular troops, every man is obliged to join the army in time of war; and if this militia were

well conducted, it would be superior to many European armies. From accounts taken in late years, the number of men fit to bear arms amounts to 35,000.

Maronite Sheik and his Wife.

III. *Religious Status.*— Although the Maronites are united with Rome, and though they are perhaps the most ultramontane people in the world, they nevertheless retain their distinctive national rites and usages.

1. *Clergy.*—The most peculiar of all their institutions is undoubtedly the clerical. As we have seen above, it is supposed that the founder of the Maronites constituted himself a patriarch, and this position remains the highest dignity among them. It is true they admit the supremacy of Rome, but for the home government of the Church the patriarch is the highest authority, and in his election, as well as in the selection of all the clergy, the Maronite exercises his own private judgment, independent of the papal power at Rome. Here it may not be improper to state that the patriarch is at present expected to furnish every tenth year a report of the state of his patriarchate. Associated with the patriarch in the ecclesiastical government of the Maronites are twelve bishops, but of the latter four are titular, or *in partibus*. The patriarch himself is chosen by the bishops in secret conclave, and by ballot. "The debates usually last for many days, and even weeks; at last, when the choice is made, the bishops present kneel down and kiss the new patriarch's hands; the patriarch immediately writes letters to all the chief nobles of the mountain informing them of his nomination. The latter lose no time in assembling to pay him their respects and make their obeisance. A pelisse of honor shortly afterwards arrives for the patriarch from the governor of Lebanon. Fires, and rejoicing, and illumination extend throughout the whole range of the Maronite districts; a petition is now drawn up to be sent to the pope, praying him to confirm the choice which has just been made, and signed by the principal chiefs. It is open, however, to the clergy, or any party, to protest against the nomination. . . . The pope, however, never fails at once to confirm a selection which has the support of the feudal aristocracy and principal clergy of Lebanon" (Churchill, iii, 78). In true puerile affectation and presumptuous inference, the patriarch of the Maronites, who is styled the Patriarch of Antioch, usually takes the name of *Peter*, intended to denote an official descent from the apostle Peter. "His power," says Churchill, "is despotic, and from his decision there is no appeal, either in temporal or spiritual affairs; even the pope's legate, who resides constantly in Lebanon, and is supposed to superintend all the ecclesiastical proceedings of the Maronite Church, has no influence over the patriarch beyond what may be obtained by personal superiority of character. . . . The income of the patriarch may amount to about £5000 a year, derived principally from lands set apart exclusively for the office. He obtains likewise a sixth of the revenue of the bishops." "The patriarch of the Maronites," says Madden (*Turkish Empire*, ii, 160), "formerly exercised very extensive power not only of a religious, but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in all great emergencies and dangers at the hands of their old and constant enemies the Druses, are wont to look for counsel and guidance to their patriarch rather than to the emir, their nominal civil protector. The patriarch, in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesruan, and in the summer at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerated Maron had fixed his abode." The eight regular bishoprics of the Maronite Church are Aleppo, Tripoli, Jebail, Baalbek, Damascus, Cyprus, Beirût, Tyre, and Sidon. The incumbents of this, the second office, are, like the patriarch, possessed of stated revenues, that enable them to live in comparative affluence. Their election takes place as follows: "When a bishop dies, the patriarch writes to the principal people of the village under the jurisdiction of the deceased prelate, requesting them to assemble together and nominate a priest to the vacant see; should there be a unanimity of voices, the patriarch confirms their selection; if, on the contrary, they cannot agree, he desires them to send him the names of three priests, and from this list he selects one for the bishopric." The inferior clergy of the Maronites, who have no fixed sources of income, subsist on the produce of their masses, the bounty of their congregations, and, above all, *on the labor of their hands*, i. e. they exercise trades, or cultivate small plots of ground, and are thus industriously employed *for the maintenance of their families:* it is one of the peculiar characteristics of the Eastern clergy that they are not strangers to the married state. The Maronite priests marry as in the first ages of the Church, but their wives must be maidens, and not widows; nor can they marry a second time.

The poverty to which the Maronite clergy is doomed is, however, recompensed to them by the great respect the people award them. "Their vanity is incessantly flattered; whoever approaches them, whether rich or poor, great or small, is anxious to kiss their hands, which they fail not to present. . . . It is perhaps to the potent influence of the clergy that we must attribute the mild and simple manners generally prevailing among the Maronites, for violent crimes are extremely rare among them. Retribution immediately follows every offence, however slight, and the clergy are rigorous in preventing every appearance of disorder or scandal among the members of their flocks. Before a young man can marry he must obtain the consent of his pastor and of his bishop. If they disapprove of the marriage they prohibit it, and the Maronite has no remedy. If an unmarried girl become a mother, her seducer is compelled to marry her, whatever be the inequality of their conditions; if he refuses he is reduced to obedience by measures of severity, fasting, imprisonment, and even bastinadoing. This influence of the clergy extends to every detail of civil and domestic life. The Maronite who should appeal from the decision of the clergy to the civil authority of the emirs would not be listened to by them, and the act would be regarded by the appellant's bishop as a transgression to be visited with condign punishment" (Kelly). The number of Maronite priests is said to be 1200, and the number of their churches 400.

2. *Monastics.*—Of the more than 200 convents scattered through Lebanon, nearly one half belong to the Maronites, and contain from 20,000 to 25,000 inmates,

who all wear a distinctive costume, and follow the rule of St. Anthony. They are divided into three different congregations: those of St. Isaiah, those of the Alipines, and those of the Libanese or Baladites; besides which there are also a number of nunneries. Their dress, like that of all Greek monastics, consists of a black frock-coat, reaching to the knees, confined round the waist by a leathern girdle, and surmounted by a hood, which can be drawn over the head. This attire is called a "cacooly." The temporal affairs of the convents are directed by a superior monk, called Reis el-Aam, a sort of accountant-general, who regulates all the disbursements of his fraternity. "Lest the monks should form any particular local attachments, they are removed from convent to convent every six months, in a kind of rotation. They are, in general, exceedingly ignorant, but skilful in such trades as are necessary for their own wants and necessities." "The monks, by the rules of their order, are not allowed to smoke or eat meat. The latter, however, is permitted in case of sickness, by the order of the physician and the consent of the superior. In making long journeys the bishop may give the same permission, provided they shall not indulge in it on the days in which its use is forbidden by the canons of the Church. Much stress is laid on the nunneries being built at a distance from the convents; and no nun or woman is allowed to enter a convent, nor a monk to enter a nunnery, except on occasions of great necessity, and with strict limitation. The monks are employed in their prayers, and in various occupations of industry; the lay-brothers tilling the lands of the convents, making shoes, weaving, begging, etc.; and the priests applying themselves to study, copying books, and other matters befitting the dignity of their office. The nuns are taught to read and sew. Both the monks and nuns vow the three conditions of a monastic life—namely, chastity, poverty, and obedience; and, taken as a whole, both are extremely ignorant and bigoted."

IV. *Peculiar Religious Usages.*—Like the Bohemians and the Greek Christians, the Maronites administer the sacraments in both kinds, dipping the bread in wine before its distribution. "The host is a small round loaf, unleavened, of the thickness of a finger, and about the size of a crown-piece. On the top is the impression of a seal, which is eaten by the priest, who cuts the remainder into small pieces, and putting it into the wine in the cup, administers to each person with a spoon, which serves the whole congregation" (Kelly, *Syria and the Holy Land*, as compiled from Burckhardt, etc., p. 92). They also keep up public nightly prayers, which are attended by women as well as by men; have a peculiar commemoration of the dead in the three weeks preceding Lent, and their whole office during Lent is of immense length and peculiar to themselves. Indeed their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the Latin Church. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being simply used in the services of the Church and the offices of the priests.

V. *Educational Status.*—The Maronite clergy had formerly lands at Rome, the revenues of which were appropriated to keeping up a seminary for the education of young Christians from the Lebanon; and from this high school came forth some illustrious Romanists, e. g. Gabriel Sionita, Abr. Echellensis, the Assemani, etc. The resources of this appropriation were confiscated by the French during the first revolutionary war. Since then the court of Rome has granted them a *hospitium* at Rome, to which they may send several of their youth to receive a gratuitous education. It would seem that this institution might introduce among them the ideas and arts of Europe; but the pupils of this school, limited to an education purely monastic, bring home nothing but the Italian language, which is of no use, and a stock of theological learning from which as little advantage can be derived; they accordingly soon assimilate with the rest. Nor has a greater change been operated by the three or four missionaries maintained by the French Capuchins at Gazir, Tripoli, and Beirût. Their labors consist in preaching in their church, in instructing children in the Catechism, Thomas à Kempis, and the Psalms, and in teaching them to read and write. Formerly the Jesuits had two missionaries at their house at Antura, but the Lazarites have now succeeded them in their mission. The most valuable advantage that has resulted from these labors is that the art of writing has become more common among the Maronites, and rendered them, in that country, what the Copts are in Egypt, that is, they are in possession of all the posts of writers, intendants, and *kaiyas* among the Turks, and especially of those among their neighbors, the Druses. "But, though the ability to read and write be thus general among the Maronites, it must not be inferred that they are a literary people. Far from it; the book-learning of all classes, both clergy and laity, can hardly be rated too low. There are native printing-presses at work in some of the monasteries, but the sheets they issue are all of an ecclesiastical kind—chiefly portions of the Scripture or mass-books in Syriac, which few even of the clergy understand, though they repeat them by rote" (Kelly, p. 97).

The American Protestant churches, so ably represented by the Rev. W. M. Thomson and others, have done already a noble work for Syria. The Maronite, of course, has not been forgotten, and his educational disadvantages it has been sought to ameliorate by bringing the influence of American schools to his very door. Tristram (*Land of Israel* [Lond. 1865], p. 22), who cites the opinion of the noted pacha Daûd Oghli, writes the following as from the mouth of the illustrious Mussulman ruler of Mount Lebanon: "He spoke with much warmth and interest of the American mission-schools; and it was gratifying to hear his independent testimony to the importance and solid nature of the work they are carrying on, especially among the Maronites, with whom he considered they have met with greater success than with any any other sect."

See Churchill, *Mount Lebanon* (Lond. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo), iii, chap. v–viii; id. *Druse and Maronite* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Kelly, *Syria and the Holy Land* (compiled from Burckhardt and others), chap. viii; Guys, *Beyrut et le Liban* (Par. 1860); Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, ch. vi; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvii, 744; Robinson, *Palestine*, ii, 572; Comte de Paris, *Dumas et le Liban*, p. 75–78; Neale, *Hist. Holy East. Ch.* (Introd.), i, 153 sq.; Cowper, *Sects in Syria* (Lond. 1860); Schnurrer, *De eccl. Spurmit.* (Tüb. 1810 and 1811); Silbernagl, *Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämmtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Landshut, 1865); Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, ii, ch. ix; *New-Englander*, 1861, p. 32; *Westminster Review*, 1862 (July).

Marot, Clement, a French poet, known in the theological world for his translation of the Psalms into French verse, was born at Chalons in 1495. At an early age he commenced writing poetry, and at the recommendation of Francis I became a member of the household of Margaret, duchess of Alençon. He afterwards accompanied Francis I to Italy, and was wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia. On his return to France he wrote poetry for Diana of Poitiers, the king's mistress, who showed him favor; but, having presumed too much upon his familiarity with her, she discarded him, and he was soon after put in prison, through her agency as some have believed, in 1525. Margaret procured his release; and it appears likely that Marot's intercourse with that princess caused him to incline towards the Reformation, although he is not known to have openly embraced it. When, in 1533, Gérard Roussel preached in Paris, after the dismissal of the fanatic Sorbonnist Beda, satirical verses against the Protestants were posted on the walls; Marot answered in the same tone; and when the persecution broke out, in

the spring of 1534, prohibited books being found in his dwelling, Marot was compelled to flee to Bearn, whence he afterwards proceeded to Ferrara, the residence of the duchess Renata of Este. In 1536 Francis I recalled him to his court. It is said that he had recanted, but this is not proved. In 1538 he commenced, with the aid of the learned Vatablus, the translation of the Psalms, which was very warmly received; it became the fashion at court to sing them, and Charles V himself gave Marot a reward of two hundred doubloons. The Sorbonne, however, condemned the book, while the pope caused it to be reprinted at Rome in 1542. Marot, in the mean time, was, on account of the condemnation of the Sorbonne, obliged, in 1543, to flee to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin, and invited to continue his translation of the Psalms, which was first used in public worship at Granson, Switzerland, Dec. 1, 1540. Geneva, however, did not long please Marot, accustomed to the gayety of the French court; and, after remaining a while at Chambery, he went to Turin, where he died in 1544. The first known edition of Marot's translation appeared towards the end of the year 1541; it contained thirty psalms, a poetical translation of the Lord's Prayer, etc. A second edition, containing thirty psalms, with the music, and the liturgy of Geneva, was published by Calvin in 1542. The next year another edition appeared, containing twenty more psalms, dedicated "to the ladies of France," and accompanied by the well-known preface of Calvin; this, as well as the subsequent editions, contains the liturgy; the catechism, the reformed confession of faith, and prayers were at sundry times added to others. The remainder of the Psalms was translated by Beza (1550–52), and in 1552 appeared the first complete Psalter, with Beza's eloquent appeal "to the Church of our Lord." The popularity of these Psalms was so great that, after the Colloquy of Poissy, on Oct. 19, 1561, Charles IX gave the Lyons printer, Anton Vincent, the privilege of printing them. In the 17th century the translation was revised by Conrart, first secretary of the French Academy, and the learned Anton Labastide. This revision, approved by the Synod of Charenton in 1679, was admitted in the churches of Geneva, Neufchatel, and Hesse, while the ancient text remained in use in the French villages. In 1701 Beausobre and Lenfant, at Berlin, undertook a revision, which was much opposed, especially by country congregations. See Lenfant. The modern revision was accepted without difficulty. Originally, the Psalms of Marot were sung to popular tunes; but when they came to be used in the Church it was found necessary to adapt a more solemn music to them. William Frank, however, who is considered the original composer of the tunes, wrote only a few. The Lyons edition of 1561 contains some by Louis Bourgeois; those of 1562 and 1565 have some by Claude Goudimel, the teacher of Palestrina, in four voices. See Anguis, *Vie de Marot*, prefixed to his *Œuvres* (1823, 5 vols. 8vo); Jan Suet, *Leven en Bedrijf von C. Marot* (1655); Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau de la Poésie Française au sixième siècle; Christian Review*, vol. ix; Paleario, *Life and Times*, ii, 92 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 115; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxxiii, 924. (J. N. P.)

Ma'roth (Heb. *Maroth'*, מָרוֹת, *bitter* fountains; Sept. *ὀδύναι*, Vulg. *amaritudines*), a place apparently not far from Jerusalem, on the route of the invading Assyrian army from Lachish (Mic. i, 12; see Henderson, *Comment.* ad loc.). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 107) conjectures it was identical with *Maarath* (Josh. xv, 59); but this name is very different in the Hebrew.

Marouf. See Marûf.

Marozia, a Roman lady of noble birth, but of infamous reputation in the scandalous chronicles of her age, daughter of the equally notorious Theodora (q. v.), was born near the close of the 9th century. On the dissolution of all the moral ties of public and private life which the war of factions occasioned in Rome in the 10th century, Marozia, by her beauty and her intrigues, contrived to exercise great influence. She was married three times, and, according to Luitprand, had skill and address enough to procure the deposition and death of the pope, John X, and the elevation of her son, the fruit, it is alleged, of adulterous intercourse with pope Sergius III, to the pontificate, under the name of John XI. This testimony of Luitprand, who wrote some time after the period, is considered doubtful by Muratori and by Dr. Pertz. See, however, our articles John X and John XI. In her latter years Marozia suffered the punishment of her early crimes. She was imprisoned by her own son Alberic, and died in prison at Rome in 938.

Marquesas Isles, frequently applied to the whole Mendaña Archipelago, refers strictly only to the southern group of the Mendaña Archipelago, in Polynesia, the northern group bearing the name of the Washington Islands. They are situated in lat. 7° 30′–10° 30′ S., long. 138°–140° 20′ W., have an area of 500 English square miles, and a population of 6011, and were discovered by Mendaña de Neyra, a Spanish navigator, in 1596 (the Washington Isles were discovered in 1791 by Ingraham, an American). The isles were named after the viceroy of Peru, Marquesas de Mendoza. They are of volcanic origin, and are in general covered with mountains, rising in some cases to about 3500 feet above the sea-level; the soil is rich and fertile, and the climate hot, but healthy. The coasts are difficult of access, on account of the surrounding reefs and the sudden changes of the wind. Cocoa-nut, bread-fruit, and papaw trees are grown, and bananas, plantains, and sugar-cane are cultivated.

The inhabitants are of the same race as those of the Society and Sandwich islands. They are well proportioned and handsome, but degraded in their religion and in many of their customs. They exhibit some confused notion of a divine being, whom they call Etooa; but they give the same name to the spirit of a priest, of a king, or any of his relations, and generally to all Europeans, as superior beings. The principal appearance of a religious feeling is found in their reverence for anything pronounced to be "taboo" or sacred, which a priest only can extend to any general object, but which every person may effect upon his own property by merely declaring that the spirit of his father, or of some king, or of any other person, reposes in the spot or article which he wishes to preserve. They have a universal belief in charms (which they name "kaha") which kill, by imperceptible means and slow degrees, those against whom they are directed, and which the priests chiefly are understood to be able to render effectual. Some reference to a future life appears in their funeral rites. The corpse is washed, and laid upon a platform under a piece of new cloth; and, to obtain a safe passage for the deceased through the lower regions, a great feast is given by the family to the priests and the relations. The body continues to be rubbed for several months with cocoa-nut oil, till it becomes quite hard and incorruptible; and a second feast, exactly twelve months after the first, is then given to thank the gods for having granted to the deceased a safe arrival to the other world. The corpse is then broken in pieces, packed in a box, and deposited in the morai or burying-place, which no woman is permitted to approach upon the pain of death.

On some of the islands there are missionary stations; but, although cannibalism has been abolished, the efforts of the missionaries have not otherwise met with much success. The Gospel was introduced in the Marquesas Isles by the "London Missionary Society" in 1797. The first missionary was William Crook, a man of great zeal and untiring energy. Though greatly discouraged by the ignorance and rudeness of the natives, he pushed the good work, and accomplished much, notwithstanding his failure to secure converts. In 1825, when three teachers came to his aid, it was found that the natives had destroyed many of their idols, and were improving in morals. In 1828 the mission was abandoned; but in 1831 Mr. Darling, then a missionary to Tahiti, visited the isles,

and gave the home society such glowing accounts of the improvements that had been wrought by their earlier efforts, that the mission was re-established in 1833 by Mr. Darling, assisted by Messrs. Rodgerson and Stallworthy, and four natives from Tahiti; but in 1841 the work was again abandoned. The Romanists gained a footing in 1838; and when in 1842 the isles were placed under French protection, the Roman Catholics secured most favorable terms for their missionaries. Their work, however, remains thus far without fruit. See Aikman, *Cyclop. of Christian Missions*, p. 68.

Marquette, JACQUES, a celebrated French Roman Catholic missionary and discoverer, was born in 1637, at Laon, in Picardy; entered the Order of the Jesuits; became a missionary, and travelled and labored several years in Canada and other regions. He was a member of the first exploring party to the Mississippi River, and wrote a narrative of the expedition (Paris, 1681). "He writes," says professor Sparks, "as a scholar, and as a man of careful observation and practical sense. In every point of view, this tract is one of the most interesting among those that illustrate the early history of America." On his return from the Mississippi he resumed his missionary labors among the Miamis on Lake Michigan, and died there, May 18, 1675.—Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, s. v.; Moréri, *Dictionnaire Historique*, s. v.; Bacqueville de la Potheric, *Hist. de l'Amerique Septentrionale* (Paris, 1872, 4 vols. 12mo); Sparks, *Amer. Biog.* vol. x, 1st series, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 942.

Marquez, JUAN, a Spanish theologian, was born at Madrid in 1564; studied at the University of Salamanca; joined the Augustines of Madrid, and attained to the first dignities of his order. He died at Salamanca Feb. 17, 1621. He has written *El gobernador Christiano, de ducido de las vidos de Moysen y Josue, principes del pueblo a Dios* (Salamanca, 1612, 1619, 1634, fol.):—*Los dos Estados de la espiritual Gerusalem sobre los Psalmos cxxv y cxxxvi* (Medina, 1603, and Salamanca, 1610, 4to):—*Origin de los Padros Ermitaños de son Agustin, y su verdadera institucion antes del gran concilio Lateranense* (Salamanca, 1618, fol.):—*Vida del V. P. F. Alonso de Horozco* (Madrid, 1648, 8vo). He left in manuscript some comedies and several theological treatises.—Nicholas Antonio, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Hispaniæ*, iii, 734; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Marquis, James E., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cross Creek, Pa., Nov. 20, 1815; was educated in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1844, and ordained by Sidney Presbytery in 1848. During the first ten years of his ministry he labored successively in the churches of Kenton, Mansfield, Shelby, and Ontario, Ohio. In 1858 he removed to Bloomington, Ill., and commenced to labor as presbyterial missionary for the presbyteries of Peoria and Bloomington. In 1859 he accepted the united charge of the churches of Salem, Brunswick, and Elmwood, which he retained until his death, Feb. 22, 1863. Mr. Marquis was noted for his faithfulness, devotion, and purity of life. He was eminently successful as a pastor; earnest and instructive as a preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 171.

Marquis, Thomas, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Winchester, Va., in 1753. His early life was subjected to many deprivations. He received an ordinary common-school education, prosecuted his classical studies, amid painful vicissitudes, at Buffalo and Canonsburg, and in April, 1793, was licensed to preach; labored one year as a licentiate, and in 1794 was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Cross Creek, Pa. In 1796 he became an active missionary to the Indians, travelling down the Alleghany, and the lower waters of the Muskingum and Scioto rivers. In 1802 he became a member of the executive committee of the Missionary Board west of the Alleghany Mountains. The remaining twenty years of his ministry were filled up with multiplied labors and varied but unusual success. He died Sept. 27, 1829. Mr. Marquis was a laborious and faithful pastor, eminently wise in counsel, and apt in introducing and enforcing religious duty. As a preacher he was composed and earnest, extremely logical in style, and entirely perspicuous in the expression of thought. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 171; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iv, 83–89.

Marracci, an Italian priest, eminent as an Oriental scholar, was born at Lucca in 1612, and for years held the professorship of Arabic in the College della Sapienza in Rome. He died in 1700. His principal work is an excellent edition of the Koran in Arabic, with a Latin version (1698). "This," says Hallam, in his Introduction to the Literature of Europe, "is still esteemed the best."

Marriage. This relation is in a general way represented by several Hebrew words, the most distinctive of which are several forms of חָתַן, *chathan'*, to *give in marriage*; Gr. γάμος, a *wedding*. It is very remarkable, however, as well as significant, that there is no single word in the whole Hebrew Scriptures for *the estate of marriage*, or to express the abstract idea of *wedlock, matrimony*, as the German *Ehe* does. It is only in the post-exilian period, when the laws of marriage had gradually developed themselves, that we meet with the abstract אִרְשׁוּת and זִוּוג = ζεῦγος (*Jebamoth*, vi, 5; *Kiddushin*, i, 2); the former denoting *the legal*, and the latter *the natural* side of matrimony. But even then no such definition of marriage is to be found in the Hebrew writings as we find in the Roman law, "Nuptiæ sunt conjunctio maris et feminæ et consortium omnis vitæ, divini et humani juris communicatio" (*Dig.* lib. xxiii, tit. 2, "De ritu nupt."). In the present article, which treats of marriage as found among the Hebrew race, we cover the entire field of matrimonial relations and ceremonies, both ancient and modern. See WEDLOCK.

I. *Origin, Primitive Relations, and General View of the Married State.*—1. The institution of marriage is founded on the requirements of man's nature, and dates from the time of his original creation. It may be said to have been ordained by God, in as far as man's nature was ordained by him; but its formal appointment was the work of man, and it has ever been in its essence a natural and civil institution, though admitting of the infusion of a religious element into it. This view of marriage is exhibited in the historical account of its origin in the book of Genesis; the peculiar formation of man's nature is assigned to the Creator, who, seeing it "not good for man to be alone," determined to form an "help meet for him" (ii, 18), and accordingly completed the work by the addition of the female to the male (i, 27). The necessity for this step appears from the words used in the declaration of the divine counsel. Man, as an intellectual and spiritual being, would not have been a worthy representative of the Deity on earth, so long as he lived in solitude, or in communion only with beings either high above him in the scale of creation, as angels, or far beneath him, as the beasts of the field. It was absolutely necessary, not only for his comfort and happiness, but still more for the perfection of the divine work, that he should have a "help *meet* for him," or, as the words more properly mean, "the exact counterpart of himself" (עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, Septuag. βοηθὸς κατ' αὐτόν; Vulg. *adjutorium simile sibi*, "a help meet for him")—a being capable of receiving and reflecting his thoughts and affections. No sooner was the formation of woman effected, than Adam recognised in that act the will of the Creator as to man's social condition, and immediately enunciated the important statement, to which his posterity might refer as the charter of marriage in all succeeding ages, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and

they shall be one flesh" (ii, 24). From these words, coupled with the circumstances attendant on the formation of the first woman, we may evolve the following principles: (1) The unity of man and wife, as implied in her being formed out of man, and as expressed in the words "one flesh;" (2) the indissolubleness of the marriage bond, except on the strongest grounds (compare Matt. xix, 9); (3) monogamy, as the original law of marriage, resulting from there having been but one original couple, as is forcibly expressed in the subsequent reference to this passage by our Lord ("they *twain*," Matt. xix, 5) and St. Paul ("*two* shall be one flesh," 1 Cor. vi, 16); (4) the social equality of man and wife, as implied in the terms *ish* and *ishshah*, the one being the exact correlative of the other, as well as in the words "help meet for him;" (5) the subordination of the wife to the husband, consequent upon her subsequent formation (1 Cor. xi, 8, 9; 1 Tim. ii, 13); and (6) the respective duties of man and wife, as implied in the words "help meet for him."

2. The introduction of sin into the world modified to a certain extent the mutual relations of man and wife. As the blame of seduction to sin lay on the latter, the condition of subordination was turned into subjection, and it was said to her of her husband, "he shall rule over thee" (Gen. iii, 16)—a sentence which, regarded as a prediction, has been strikingly fulfilled in the position assigned to women in Oriental countries; but which, regarded as a rule of life, is fully sustained by the voice of nature and by the teaching of Christianity (1 Cor. xiv, 34; Eph. v, 22, 23; 1 Tim. ii, 12). The evil effects of the fall were soon apparent in the corrupt usages of marriage: the unity of the bond was impaired by polygamy, which appears to have originated among the Cainites (Gen. iv, 19); and its purity was deteriorated by the promiscuous intermarriage of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men," i. e. of the Sethites with the Cainites, in the days preceding the flood (Gen. vi, 2).

3. For the history of marriage in the later ages, see below. One question may properly be considered here, i. e. *celibacy*. Shortly before the Christian æra an important change took place in the views entertained on the question of marriage as affecting the spiritual and intellectual parts of man's nature. Throughout the Old-Testament period marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it surmised that there existed in it any drawback to the attainment of the highest degree of holiness. In the interval that elapsed between the Old and New Testament periods, a spirit of asceticism had been evolved, probably in antagonism to the foreign notions with which the Jews were brought into close and painful contact. The Essenes were the first to propound any doubts as to the propriety of marriage; some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under restrictions (Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, § 2, 13). Similar views were adopted by the Therapeutæ, and at a later period by the Gnostics (Burton's *Lectures*, i, 214); thence they passed into the Christian Church, forming one of the distinctive tenets of the Encratites (Burton, ii, 161), and finally developing into the system of Monachism. The philosophical tenets on which the prohibition of marriage was based are generally condemned in Col. ii, 16-23, and specifically in 1 Tim. iv, 3. The general propriety of marriage is enforced on numerous occasions, and abstinence from it is commended only in cases where it was rendered expedient by the calls of duty (Matt. xix, 12; 1 Cor. vii, 8, 26). With regard to remarriage after the death of one of the parties, the Jews, in common with other nations, regarded abstinence from it, particularly in the case of a widow, laudable, and a sign of holiness (Luke ii, 36, 7; Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 13, 4; xviii, 6, 6); but it is clear, from the example of Josephus (*Vit.* 76), that there was no prohibition even in the case of a priest. In the Apostolic Church remarriage was regarded as occasionally undesirable (1 Cor. vii, 40), and as an absolute disqualification for holy functions, whether in a man or woman (1 Tim. iii, 2, 12; v, 9); at the same time it is recommended in the case of young widows (1 Tim. v, 14).

II. *Mode of selecting a Bride, Betrothal, and Marriage-price.*—1. Imitating the example of the Father of the Universe, who provided the man he made with a wife, fathers from the beginning considered it both their duty and prerogative to find or select wives for their sons (Gen. xxiv, 3; xxxviii, 6). In the absence of the father, the selection devolved upon the mother (Gen. xxi, 21). Even in cases where the wishes of the son were consulted, the proposals were made by the father (Gen. xxxiv, 4, 8); and the violation of this parental prerogative on the part of the son was "a grief of mind" to the father (Gen. xxvi, 35). The proposals were generally made by the parents of the young man, except when there was a difference of rank; in such a case the negotiations proceeded from the father of the maiden (Exod. ii, 21), and when accepted by the parents on both sides, sometimes also consulting the opinion of the adult brothers of the maiden (Gen. xxiv, 51; xxxiv, 11), the matter was considered as settled without requiring the consent of the bride. The case of Rebekah (Gen. xxiv, 58) forms no exception to this general practice, inasmuch as the alliance had already been concluded between Eleazar and Laban, and the question put to her afterwards was to consult her opinion, not about it, but about the time of her departure. Before, however, the marriage-contract was finally concluded, a price (מֹהַר) was stipulated for, which the young man had to pay to the father of the maiden (Gen. xxxi, 15; xxxiv, 12), besides giving presents (מַתָּן) to her relations (Gen. xxiv, 53; xxxiv, 12). This marriage-price was regarded as a compensation due to the parents for the loss of service which they sustained by the departure of their daughter, as well as for the trouble and expense which they incurred in her education. Hence, if the proffered young man had not the requisite compensation, he was obliged to make it up in service (Gen. xxix, 20; Exod. ii, 21; iii, 1). Some, indeed, deny that a price had to be paid down to the father for parting with his daughter, and appeal for support to Gen. xxxi, 15, where, according to them, "the daughters of Laban make it a matter of complaint, that their father bargained for the services of Jacob in exchange for their hands, just as if they were *strangers*;" thus showing that the sale of daughters was regarded as an unjust act and a matter of complaint (Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*. p. 733). But, on a closer inspection of the passage in question, it will be seen that Rachel and Leah do not at all complain of any indignity heaped on them by being sold just as if they were strangers, but, on the contrary, mention the sale to corroborate their statement that they are no longer their father's property, have no more any portion in his possession, and are *now* regarded by him as strangers, since, according to the usual custom, they have been duly sold to their husband, and hence agree with the latter that it is time for them to depart. Besides, the marriage-price is distinctly mentioned in other passages of Scripture (Exod. xxii, 15, 16; 1 Sam. xviii, 23, 25; Ruth iv, 10; Hos. iii, 2), and was commonly demanded by the nations of antiquity; as the Babylonians (Herod. i, 196); Assyrians (Ælian, *V. H.* iv, 1; Strabo, xvi, 745); the ancient Greeks (*Odyss.* viii, 318 sq.; Arist. *Polit.* ii, 8; Pausan. iii, 12, 2); the Germans (Tacitus, *Germ.* xviii), and still obtains in the East to the present day. In fact, it could not be otherwise where polygamy was practiced. As the number of maidens was under such circumstances less than that of wooers, it called forth competition, and it was but natural that he who offered the highest marriage-price obtained the damsel. There was therefore no fixed marriage-price; it varied according to circumstances. We meet with no dowry given with the bride by her father during the patriarchal age, except a maid-servant (Gen. xxiv, 61; xxix, 24, 29).

2. The Mosaic enactments introduced no changes into these usages. The father's power over the child in matters of marriage continued paramount, and he could give his children to any one he pleased without asking their consent. Thus Caleb offers his daughter Achsah (Josh. xv, 16, 17) as wife to any one who will conquer Kirjath-sepher (Judg. i, 12). Saul promises his daughter to him who shall kill the Philistine, and barters his daughter Michal for the prepuces of a hundred slain Philistines (1 Sam. xvii, 26, 27; xviii, 25–27); and Ibzan takes thirty wives for his thirty sons (Judg. xii, 9). The imaginary case of women soliciting husbands (Isa. iv, 1) was designed to convey to the mind a picture of the ravages of war, by which the greater part of the males had fallen. A judicial marriage-price (מהר הבתולה) was now introduced, which was fixed at fifty silver shekels (Exod. xii, 16, with Deut. xxii, 29), being the highest rate of a servant (Lev. xxvii, 3), so that one had to pay as much for a wife as for a bondwoman. When the father of the maiden was rich and *did not want the marriage-price* (אין חפץ במהר), he expected some service by way of compensation for giving away his daughter (1 Sam. xviii, 25). As soon as the bargain was concluded, and the marriage-price paid, or the required service rendered, the maiden was regarded as betrothed to her wooer, and as sacredly belonging to him. In fact, she was legally treated as *a married woman* (אשת איש); she could not be separated from her intended husband without a bill of divorce, and the same law was applicable to her as to married people. If she was *persuaded* to criminal conduct between the espousals and the bringing her home to her husband's house, both she and her seducer were publicly stoned to death; and if she was violated, the culprit suffered capital punishment (Deut. xxii, 23–27, with ver. 22; and Lev. xx, 10). With such sacredness was betrothal regarded, that even if a bondmaid who was bought with the intention of ultimately becoming a secondary wife (Exod. xxi, 7–11), was guilty of unchastity prior to her entering into that state, both she and her seducer were scourged, while the latter was also obliged to bring a sin-offering, and the priest had to pray for the forgiveness of his sin (Lev. xix, 20–22). Every betrothed man was by the Mosaic law exempt from military service (Deut. xx, 7).

3. In the post-exilian period, as long as the children were minors—which in the case of a son was up to thirteen, and a daughter to twelve years of age—the parents could betroth them to any one they chose; but when they became of age their consent was required (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Ishuth*, iii, 11, 12). Occasionally the whole business of selecting the wife was left in the hands of a friend, and hence the case might arise which is supposed by the Talmudists (*Yebam.* 2, § 6, 7), that a man might not be aware to which of two sisters he was betrothed. So in Egypt at the present day the choice of a wife is sometimes intrusted to a professional woman styled a *khát'beh;* and it is seldom that the bridegroom sees the features of his bride before the marriage has taken place (Lane, i, 209–211). It not unfrequently happened, however, that the selection of partners for life was made by the young people themselves. For this, the ceremonies connected with the celebration of the festivals in the Temple afforded an excellent opportunity, as may be gathered from the following remark in the Mishna: "R. Simeon ben-Gamaliel says, There were never more joyous festivals in Israel than the 15th of Ab and the Day of Atonement. On these the maidens of Jerusalem used to come out dressed in white garments, which they borrowed, in order not to shame those who had none of their own, and which they had immersed [for fear of being polluted]. Thus arrayed, these maidens of Jerusalem went out and danced in the vineyards, singing, Young man, lift up thine eyes, and see whom thou art about to choose; fix not thine eye upon beauty, but look rather to a pious family; for gracefulness is deceit, and beauty is vanity, but the woman that fears the Lord, she is worthy of praise" (*Megilla*, iv, 8). Having made his choice, the young man or his father informed the maiden's father of it, whereupon the young people were legally betrothed. The betrothal was celebrated by a feast made in the house of the bride (*Jebamoth*, 43 a; *Taanith*, 26 b; *Pesachim*, 49 a; *Kiddushin*, 45 b), and is called קידושין, *made sacred*, for by it the bride was made sacred to her bridegroom, and was not to be touched by any one else. It is also called ארוסין, which may be from ארס = ארש, *to betroth*. For a betrothal to be legal, it has to be effected in one of the following three modes: 1. *By money*, or *money's worth*, which, according to the school of Shammai, must be a *denar* (דינר) = 90 grains of pure gold, or, according to the school of Hillel, a *perutah* (פרוטה) = half a grain of pure silver, and which is to be given to the maiden, or, if she is a minor, to her father, as betrothal price (כסף קידושין); 2. *By letter* or *contract* (שטר ארוסין), which the young man, either in person or through a proxy, has to give to the maiden, or to her father when she is a minor; or, 3. *By cohabitation* (ביאה, *usus*), when the young man and maiden, having pronounced the betrothal formula in the presence of two witnesses, retire into a separate room. This, however, is considered immodest, and the man is scourged (*Kiddushin*, 12 b). The legal formula to be pronounced is, "Behold, thou art betrothed or sanctified to me (הנה את מקודשת לי כדת משה וישראל), according to the law of Moses and Israel" (*Kiddushin*, i, 1; iv, 9; *Tosiftha Kethuboth*, iv; *Kethuboth*, iv, 8; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Ishuth*, iii; *Eben Ha-Ezer*, xxxii). Though betrothment, as we have seen before, was the beginning of marriage itself, and, like it, could only be broken off by a regular *bill of divorcement* (גט), yet twelve months were generally allowed to intervene between it and actual marriage (חופה) in the case of a maiden, to prepare her outfit, and thirty days in the case of a widow (*Kethuboth*, 57 a). The intercourse of the betrothed during this period was regulated by the customs of the different towns (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v, 2). When this more solemn betrothment (קידושין) was afterwards united with the marriage ceremony (חופה), *engagements* (שדוכין) more in our sense of the word took its place. Its nature and obligation will best be understood by perusing the contents of the contract (תנאים) which is made and signed by the parties, and which is as follows: "May he who declares the end from the beginning give stability to the words of this contract, and to the covenant made between these two parties! namely, between A, bachelor, with the consent of his father B, and C, who is proxy for his daughter D, spinster. The said A, bachelor, engages, under happy auspices, to take the afore-mentioned D, spinster, by marriage and betrothal (חופה וקידושין), according to the law of Moses and Israel. These henceforth are not to conceal anything from each other appertaining to money or goods, but to have equal power over their property. Moreover, B, the said father of the bridegroom, is to dress his son in goodly apparel before the marriage, and to give the sum of . . . in cash; whilst C, father of the said bride, is to give his daughter before the marriage a dowry in cash to the amount of . . . as well as jewellery to the amount of . . . to dress her in goodly apparel corresponding to the dowry, to give her an outfit, and the bridegroom *the Talith* (טלית), i. e. the fringed wrapper used at prayer [see FRINGE], and *Kittel* (קיטל), i. e. the white burial garment, in harmony with his position and in proportion to the dowry. The marriage is to be (D. V.) on the . . . in the place . . . at the expense of the said C, the bride's father, and, if agreed to by both parties, may take place within the specified period. Now the two

parties have pledged themselves to all this, and have taken upon themselves by an oath to abide by it, on the penalty of the great anathema, and at the peril of forfeiting half the dowry; but the forfeit is not to absolve from the anathema, nor is the anathema to absolve from the forfeit. The said father of the bride also undertakes to board at his table the newly-married couple for the space of . . . and furnish them with lodgings for the space of . . . The surety on the part of the bridegroom is E, son of F; and on the part of the bride, G, son of H. The two bridal parties, however, guarantee that these sureties shall not suffer thereby. Further, C, the said father of the bride, is to give his daughter an assurance letter, that, in the event of his death, she is to get half the inheritance of a son (שטר חצי זכר); whilst the bridegroom pledges himself to get his brothers, in the event of his dying without issue, to give her *a Chalizah document* [for which see below], without any compensation. But if there should be dispute or delay on the subject, which God forbid, the decision is to be left to the Jewish congregation. We have taken all this in possession from the party and sureties, for the benefit of the other parties, so that everything aforementioned may be observed, with the usual witness which qualified us to take care of it. Done this day . . . Everything must be observed and kept. (Signed) . . .' (Comp. *Nachlas Shiva*, 9 b). This contract, which is written in Rabbinic Hebrew, is used by all orthodox Jews to the present day.

III. *Marriage Ceremonies.*—1. In the pre-Mosaic period, when the proposals were accepted, and the marriage-price (מהר), as well as the sundry other gifts (מתן), were duly distributed, the bridegroom (חתן) could at once remove the bride (כלה) from her father's house to his own house, and this removal of the maiden, under the benedictions of her family, but without any definite religious ceremony whatever, and cohabitation, consummated and expressed *marriage* (לקח אשה). Thus we are told that Isaac, when meeting Eleazar and Rebekah in the field, as soon as he was informed by the former of what had transpired, took Rebekah to the tent of his departed mother, and this without further ceremony constituted the marriage, and she *thereby* became his wife (ויהי לו לאשה, Gen. xxiv, 63–67). Under more ordinary circumstances, however, when the bride had not at once to quit her parental roof under the protection of a friend, as in the case just mentioned, but where the marriage took place in the house of the bride's parents, it was celebrated by a feast, to which all the friends and neighbors were invited, and which lasted seven days (Gen. xxix, 22, 27). On the day of the marriage, the bride was conducted to her future husband veiled, or, more properly, in an outdoor wrapper or shawl (צעיף), which nearly enveloped her whole form, so that it was impossible to recognise the person, thus accounting for the deception practiced on Jacob (Gen. xxiv, 65; xxix, 23) and on Judah (Gen. xxxviii, 14).

2. With regard to age, no restriction is pronounced in the Bible. Early marriage is spoken of with approval in several passages (Prov. ii, 17; v, 18; Isa. lxii, 5), and in reducing this general statement to the more definite one of years, we must take into account the very early age at which persons arrive at puberty in Oriental countries. In modern Egypt marriage takes place in general before the bride has attained the age of sixteen, frequently when she is twelve or thirteen, and occasionally when she is only ten (Lane, i, 208). The Mosaic law prescribes no civil or religious forms for the celebration of marriage. The contract or promise made at the payment of the marriage-price, or when the service which was required in its stead was rendered, constituted the solemn bond which henceforth united the espoused parties, as is evident from the fact pointed out in the preceding sections, that a betrothed maiden was both called *a married woman*, and was legally treated as such. There can, however, be no doubt that the ancient custom of celebrating the consummation of the marriage by a feast, which lasted seven days (Gen. xxix, 22, 27), must have become pretty general by this time. Thus we are told that when Samson went to Timnath to take his wife, he made there a feast, which continued for seven days, according to the usage of young men on such occasions (כי כן יעשו הבחורים), that the parents of the bride invited thirty young men (*υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, Matt. ix, 15) to honor his nuptials, and that to relieve their entertainment, Samson, in harmony with the prevailing custom among the nations of antiquity, proposed enigmas (Judg. xiv, 10–18). We afterwards find that the bridal pair were adorned with nuptial crowns (Cant. iii, 11; Isa. lxi, 10) made of various materials —gold, silver, myrtle, or olive—varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the parties (Mishna, *Sota*, ix, 14; *Gemara*, 49 a and b; Selden, *Ux. Ebr.* ii, 15), and that the bride especially wore gorgeous apparel, and a peculiar girdle (Psa. xlv, 13, 14; Isa. xlix, 18; Jer. ii, 12), whence in fact she derived her name *Kallah* (כלה), which signifies *the ornamented, the adorned.* Thus attired, the bridegroom and bride were led in joyous procession through the streets, accompanied by bands of singers and musicians (Jer. vii, 34; xxv, 10; xxxiii, 11), and saluted by the greetings of the maidens of the place, who manifested the liveliest interest in the nuptial train (Cant. iii, 11), to the house of the bridegroom or that of his father. Here the feast was prepared, to which all the friends and the neighbors were invited, and at which most probably that sacred covenant was concluded which came into vogue during the post-Mosaic period (Prov. ii, 17; Ezek. xvi, 8; Mal. ii, 14). The bride, thickly veiled, was then conducted to the (חדר) bridal chamber (Gen. xxix, 23; Judg. xv, 11; Joel ii, 6), where a nuptial couch (חפה) was prepared (Psa. xix, 5; Joel ii, 16) in such a manner as to afford facility for ascertaining the following morning whether she had preserved her maiden purity; for in the absence of the *signa virginitatis* she was stoned to death before her father's house (Deut. xxii, 13–21).

3. In the period after the exile the proper age for marriage is fixed in the Mishna at eighteen (*Aboth*, v, 31), and though, for the sake of preserving morality, puberty was regarded as the desirable age, yet men generally married when they were *seventeen* (*Jebamoth*, 62; *Kiddushin*, 29). The Talmudists forbade marriage in the case of a man under thirteen years and a day, and in the case of a woman under twelve years and a day (Buxtorf, *Synagog.* cap. 7, p. 143). The day originally fixed for marriage was Wednesday for maidens and Friday for widows (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, i, 1). But the Talmud already partially discarded this arrangement (Gemara, *ibid.* 3 a), and in the Middle Ages it became quite obsolete (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, lxv). The primitive practice of the sages, however, has been resumed among the orthodox Jews in Russia, Poland, etc. The wedding-feast was celebrated in the house of the bridegroom (*Kethuboth*, 8 a, 10 a), and in the evening, for the bridal pair fasted all day, since on it, as on the day of atonement, they confessed their sins, and their transgressions were forgiven. On the day of the wedding, the bride, with her hair flowing, and a myrtle wreath on her head (if she was a maiden, Mishna, *Kethuboth*, ii, 1), was conducted, with music, singing, and dancing, to the house of the bridegroom by her relations and friends, who were adorned with chaplets of myrtle, and carried palm branches in their hands (*Kethuboth*, 16, 17; *Sabbath*, 110 a; *Sota*, 49 b). The streets through which the nuptial procession passed were lined with the daughters of Israel, who greeted the joyous train, and scattered before them cakes and roasted ears of wheat, while fountains freely poured forth wine (*Kethuboth*, 15 b; *Berachoth*, 50 b). Having reached the house, the bridegroom, accompanied by the groomsmen, met the bride, took her by the hand, and led her to the threshold. The *Kethu-*

bah (כתובה)=*donatio propter* or *ante nuptias*, or the marriage-settlement, alluded to in the book of Tobit (vii, 15), was then written, which in the case of a maiden always promises 200, and in the case of a widow 100 *denar* (each denar being equal to 90 grains of pure gold), whether the parties are rich or poor (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, i, 2), though it may be enlarged by a special covenant (תוספות כתובה). The dowry could not be claimed until the termination of the marriage by the death of the husband or by divorce (*ibid.* v, 1), though advances might be made to the wife previously (ix, 8). Subsequently to betrothal a woman lost all power over her property, and it became vested in the husband, unless he had previously to marriage renounced his right to it (viii, 1; ix, 1). The marriage must not be celebrated before this settlement is written (*Baba Kama*, 89). The wording of this instrument has undergone various changes in the course of time (*Kethuboth*, 82 b). The form in which it is given in the Talmud, by Maimonides, etc., is as follows: "Upon the fourth day of the week, on the . . . of the month, in the year . . . of the creation of the world, according to the computation adopted in this place, A, son of B, said to C, spinster, daughter of E, 'Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and Israel, and I will work for thee, honor thee, maintain thee, and provide for thee according to the custom of Jewish husbands, who work for their wives, honor them, maintain them, and provide for them honestly; I also give thee the dowry of thy virginity, 200 silver *Sus*, which belong to thee by the law, as well as thy food, thy apparel, and whatsoever is required for thy maintenance, and I will go in to thee according to the custom of the whole earth.' And C, the spinster, consented, and became his wife. The dowry which she brought him from the house of her father, in silver, gold, and ornaments, as well as in apparel, domestic utensils, and bedding, amounts to . . . pure silver, and A, the bridegroom, has consented to add to it from his own property the same sum; and the bridegroom said thus: 'I undertake for myself and my heirs after me the security for this *Kethubah*, this dowry and this addition, so that the same shall be paid from the best and most choice of my possessions which I have under the whole heaven, which I have acquired or shall acquire in real or personal property.' All this property is to be mortgaged and pledged, yea, even the coat which I have on is to go in order to pay this *Kethubah*, this dowry and this addition, from this day to all eternity.' And the surety of this *Kethubah*, this dowry and this addition, A, the bridegroom, has undertaken in the strictness of all the *Kethubahs* and supplement instruments usual among the daughters of Israel, and which are written according to the order of our sages of blessed memory, not after the manner of a mere visionary promise or empty formula. We have taken possession of it from A, the bridegroom, and given it to C, spinster, daughter of E, according to all that is written and explained above, by means of such a garment as is legal in the taking of possession. All this yea and amen. (Signed) . . ." Comp. Maimonides, *Jad Ha-Chazaka Hilchoth Jebum Ve-Cheliza*, iv, 33. Among the more modern Jews it is the custom in some parts for the bridegroom to place a ring on the bride's finger (Picart, i, 239)—a custom which also prevailed among the Romans (Smith, *Dict. of Ant.* p. 604). Some writers have endeavored to prove that the rings noticed in the O. T. (Exod. xxxv, 22; Isa. iii, 21) were nuptial rings, but there is not the slightest evidence of this. The ring was nevertheless regarded among the Hebrews as a token of fidelity (Gen. xli, 42), and of adoption into a family (Luke xv, 22). According to Selden it was originally given as an equivalent for dowry-money (*Uxor Ebraic.* ii, 14). After the document was handed over to the bride, crowns, varying in expense according to the circumstances of the parties, were placed upon the heads of the bridal pair (*Sota*, 49 a, b), and they, with their relations and friends, sat down to a sumptuous repast; the marriage-feast was enlivened by the guests, who sang various songs and asked each other amusing riddles (*Berachoth*, 31 a; *Nedarim*, 51 a), parched corn was distributed among the guests if the bride was a virgin (*Keth.* ii), and when the meal was concluded with customary prayer of thanksgiving, the bridegroom supplemented it with pronouncing over a cup of wine the seven nuptial benedictions (שבע ברכות) in the presence of at least ten persons (*Kethuboth*, 7 b), which gave the last religious consecration to the marriage-covenant, and which are as follows: i. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created everything for thy glory." ii. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man." iii. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man in thine image, in the image of the likeness of thy own form, and hast prepared for him, in himself, a building for the perpetuity of the species. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the creator of man." iv. "The barren woman shall rejoice exceedingly, and shout for joy when her children are gathered around her in delight. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoicest Zion in her children." v. "Make this loving pair to rejoice exceedingly, as thou hast made thy creature rejoice in the Garden of Eden in the beginning. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoicest the bridegroom and the bride." vi. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast ordained joy and gladness, bride and bridegroom, delight and song, pleasure and intimacy, love and friendship, peace and concord; speedily, O Lord our God, let there be heard in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voice of jubilant bridegrooms under their canopies, and of the young men at the nuptial feast playing music. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who makest the bridegroom rejoice with his bride." vii. "Remove all suffering and anger; then will the dumb be heard in song; lead us in the paths of righteousness, listen to the benedictions of the children of Jeshurun! With the permission of our seniors and rabbins, and my masters, let us bless our God in whose dwelling is joy, and of whose bounties we have partaken!" to which the guests respond, "Blessed be our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live;" and he then answers, "Then let us bless our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live" (*Kethuboth*, 7 b, 8). The married couple were then conducted to an elaborately-ornamented nuptial chamber (חופה, where the bridal couch (*thalamus*) was carefully prepared; and at the production of the *linteum virginitatis* the following morning (Deut. xxii, 13–21), which was anxiously awaited, the following benediction was pronounced by the bridegroom: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast placed a nut in paradise, the rose of the valleys—a stranger must not rule over this sealed fountain; this is why the hind of love has preserved the holy seed in purity, and has not broken the compact. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen Abraham and his seed after him!" (see *Halachoth Gedoloth*, ed. Vienna, 51 [comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xv, 24], where an explanation will be found of the use of אגוז, *nut*, in this connection). Festivities continued for seven days (*Kethuboth*, 7 a).

As important religious questions had to be put to the bridal pair which required a learned man to do (*Gittin*, 6; *Kiddushin*, 6, 13), it was afterwards resolved that the marriage-ceremony should be performed by a rabbi, and it is celebrated in the following manner: A beautifully-embroidered silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, supported by four long poles, is held by four men out of doors on the day of the wedding. Under this *chupah* (חופה), which represents the ancient bridal chamber, the bridegroom is led by his male

friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, *Blessed is he who is now come!* (ברוך הבא); the bride, with her face veiled (*nuptiæ*), is then brought to him by her female friends and led three times round the bridegroom, in accordance, as they say, with the remark of Jeremiah, "The woman shall compass the man" (xxxi, 22), when he takes her round once amid the congratulations of the bystanders, and then places her at his right hand (Psa. xlv, 10), both standing with their faces to the south and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the *Talith*, or fringed wrapper, which the bridegroom has on (comp. Ruth iii, 19; Ezek. xvi, 8), joins their hands together, and pronounces over a cup of wine the benediction of affiance (ברכת ארוסין), which is as follows: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden to us consanguinity, and hast prohibited us the betrothed, but hast permitted us those whom we take by marriage and betrothal. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified thy people Israel by betrothal and marriage" (*Kethuboth*, 7 a). Whereupon the bridegroom and bride taste of the cup of blessing, and the former produces a plain gold ring, and, in the presence of all the party, puts it on the bride's finger, saying, "Behold, thou art consecrated unto me with this ring according to the rites of Moses and Israel!" The rabbi then reads aloud, in the presence of appointed witnesses, the *Kethubah*, or the marriage-settlement, which is written in Syro-Chaldaic, and concludes by pronouncing over another cup of wine the seven benedictions (שבע ברכות), which the bridegroom in ancient times, before the ceremony of marriage became a public act and was delegated to the spiritual head, used to pronounce himself at the end of the meal. The bridegroom and bride taste again of this cup of blessing, and when the glass is emptied it is put on the ground, and the bridegroom breaks it with his foot, as a symbol to remind them in the midst of their joys that just as this glass is destroyed, so Jerusalem is destroyed and trodden down under the foot of the Gentiles. With this the ceremony is concluded, amid the shouts, *May you be happy!* (מזל טוב). See WEDDING.

IV. *Polygamy and Concubinage.*—1. Though the history of the protoplasts—in which we are told that God in the beginning created a single pair, one of each sex—seems to exhibit a standard for monogamy, yet the Scriptures record that from the remotest periods men had simultaneously several wives, occupying either coordinate or subordinate positions. Against the opinion that Lamech, sixth in descent from Adam through Cain, introduced polygamy—based on the circumstance that he is the first who is recorded as having married two wives (Gen. iv, 19)—is to be urged that (1.) Lamech is the first whose marriage or taking of a wife is recorded, and consequently it is impossible to say how many wives his five progenitors had; (2.) The mention of Lamech's two wives is incidental, and is entirely owing to the fact that the sacred historian had to notice the useful inventions made by their respective sons Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain, as well as to give the oldest piece of rhythmical composition which was addressed to the wives, celebrating one of these inventions; and (3.) If polygamy had been for the first time introduced by Lamech, the sacred writer would have as distinctly mentioned it as he mentions the things which were first introduced by Lamech's sons. The manner in which Sarah urges Abraham to take her servant Hagar, and the fact that Sarah herself gives the maiden to her own husband (לאשה) to be his wife, the readiness with which the patriarch accepts the proposal (Gen. xvi, 1–4), unquestionably show that it was a common custom to have one or more secondary wives. In fact, it is distinctly mentioned that Nahor, Abraham's own brother, who had eight sons by Milcah, his principal wife, and consequently did not require another wife for the purpose of securing progeny, had nevertheless a secondary wife (פלגש), by whom he had four sons (Gen. xxii, 21–24). Besides, it is now pretty generally admitted that Gen. xxv, 1 describes Abraham himself to have taken another or secondary wife in the lifetime of Sarah, in addition to Hagar, who was given to him by his principal wife, as is evident from Gen. xxv, 6; 1 Chron. i, 32, and that he could not have taken her for the sake of obtaining an heir. If any more proof be wanted for the prevalence of polygamy in the patriarchal age, we refer to Esau, who, to please his father, married his cousin Mahalath in addition to the several wives whom he had (Gen. xxviii, 8, 9); and to Jacob, who had not the slightest scruple to marry two sisters, and take two half-wives at the same time (Gen. xxix, 23–30; xxx, 4, 9), which would be unaccountable on the supposition that polygamy was something strange. Though sacred history is silent about the number of wives of the twelve patriarchs, yet there can be little doubt that the large number of children and grandchildren which Benjamin had at so early an age (Gen. xlvi, 21; Numb. xxvi, 38–41; 1 Chron. vii, 6–12; viii, 1), must have been the result of polygamy; and that Simeon, at all events, had more than one wife (Exod. vi, 15). The extraordinary rate at which the Jews increased in Egypt implies that they practiced polygamy during their bondage. This is, moreover, corroborated by the incidental notice that Asher, Judah's grandson, had two wives (1 Chron. iv, 5 with ii, 24); that Caleb, Judah's great-grandson, had three principal and two subordinate wives (1 Chron. ii, 9, 18, 42, 46, 48); that Aharaim, probably Benjamin's great-grandson, had three wives (1 Chron. viii, 8–11); and that Moses had two wives (Exod. ii, 21; Numb. xii, 1); as well as by the fact that the Mosaic legislation assumes the existence of polygamy (Lev. xiii, 14; Deut. xxv, 47). Still, the theory of monogamy seems to be exhibited in the case of Noah and his three sons (Gen. vi, 18; vii, 7, 13; viii, 16), of Aaron, and of Eleazar.

In judging of this period we must take into regard the following considerations: (1.) The *principle* of monogamy was retained, even in the practice of polygamy, by the distinction made between the chief or original wife and the secondary wives, or, as the A. V. terms them, "concubines"—a term which is objectionable, inasmuch as it conveys to us the notion of an illicit and unrecognised position, whereas the secondary wife was regarded by the Hebrews as a wife, and her rights were secured by law. The position of the Hebrew concubine may be compared with that of the concubine of the early Christian Church, the sole distinction between her and the wife consisting in this, that the marriage was not in accordance with the *civil* law: in the eye of the Church the marriage was perfectly valid (Bingham, *Ant.* xi, 5, § 11). It is worthy of notice that the term *pillegesh* (פִּלֶגֶשׁ; A. V. "concubine") nowhere occurs in the Mosaic law. The terms used are either "wife" (Deut. xxi, 15) or "maid-servant" (Exod. xxi, 7); the latter applying to a purchased wife. (2.) The motive which led to polygamy was that absorbing desire of progeny which is prevalent throughout Eastern countries, and was especially powerful among the Hebrews. (3.) The power of a parent over his child, and of a master over his slave (the *postestas patria* and *dominica* of the Romans), was paramount even in matters of marriage, and led in many cases to phases of polygamy that are otherwise quite unintelligible, as, for instance, to the cases where it was adopted by the husband *at the request of his wife*, under the idea that children born to a slave were in the eye of the law the children of the mistress (Gen. xvi, 3; xxx, 4, 9); or, again, to cases where it was adopted at the instance of the father (Gen. xxix, 23, 28; Exod. xxi, 9, 10). It must be allowed that polygamy, thus legalized and systematized, justified to a certain extent by

the motive, and entered into, not only without offence to, but actually at the suggestion of those who, according to our notions, would feel most deeply injured by it, is a very different thing from what polygamy would be in our own state of society.

2. In the case of polygamy, as in that of other national customs, the Mosaic law adheres to the established usage. Hence there is not only no express statute to prohibit polygamy, which was previously held lawful, but the Mosaic law presupposes its existence and practice, bases its legislation thereupon, and thus authorizes it, as is evident from the following enactments: 1. It is ordained that a king "shall not multiply wives unto himself" (Deut. xvii, 17), which, as bishop Patrick rightly remarks, "is not a prohibition to take more wives than one, but not to have an excessive number, after the manner of Eastern kings, whom Solomon seems to have imitated;" thus, in fact, legalizing a moderate number. The Mishna (*Sanhedrin*, ii, 4), the Talmud (*Babylon Sanhedrin*, 21 a), Rashi (*on Deut.* xvii, 17), etc., in harmony with ancient tradition, regard eighteen wives, including half wives, as a moderate number, and as not violating the injunction contained in the expression "*multiply*." 2. The law enacts that a man is not to marry his wife's sister to vex her while she lives (Lev. xviii, 18), which, as the same prelate justly urges, manifestly means "that though two wives at a time, or more, were permitted in those days, no man should take two sisters (as Jacob had formerly done) begotten of the same father or born of the same mother;" or, in other words, a man is at liberty to take another wife besides the first, and during her lifetime, provided only they are not sisters. 3. The law of primogeniture (Deut. xxi, 15–17) actually presupposes the case of a man having *two* wives, one beloved and the other not, as it was with Jacob and his two wives, and ordains that if the one less beloved is the mother of his first-born, the husband is not to transfer the right of primogeniture to the son of his favorite wife, but is to acknowledge him as first-born who is actually so. 4. Exod. xxi, 9, 10, permits a father who had given his son a bondwoman for a wife, to give him a second wife of *freer birth*, and prescribes how the first is then to be treated—that she is to have alimony, clothes, and the conjugal duty; and 5. Deut. xxv, 47 expressly enjoins that a man, though having a wife already, is to marry his deceased brother's widow.

Having existed before the Mosaic law, and being acknowledged and made the basis of legislation by it, polygamy continued in full force during the whole of this period. Thus, during the government of the judges, we find Gideon, the celebrated judge of Israel, "had many wives, and three score and ten sons" (Judg. viii, 30); Jair the Gileadite, also a judge of Israel, had thirty grown-up sons (Judg. x, 4) and a proportionate number of daughters. Ibzan, another judge of Israel, had thirty full-grown sons and thirty full-grown daughters (Judg. xii, 9); and Abdon, also a judge of Israel, had forty adult sons and thirty adult daughters—which was utterly impossible without polygamy; the pious Elkanah, father of Samuel the illustrious judge and prophet, had two wives (1 Sam. i, 2). During the monarchy, we find Saul, the first king of Israel, had many wives and half wives (2 Sam. iii, 7; xii, 8); David, the royal singer of Israel, "their best king," as bishop Patrick remarks in his comment on Lev. xviii, 18, "who read God's law day and night, and could not but understand it, took many wives without any reproof; nay, God gave him more than he had before, by delivering his master's wives to him" (2 Sam. xii, 8); Solomon, the wise monarch, had no less than a thousand wives and half wives (1 Kings xi, 3); Rehoboam, his son and successor, had eighteen wives and three score half wives (2 Chron. xi, 21); Abijah, his son and successor to the throne of Judah, married fourteen wives (2 Chron. xiv, 21); and Joash, the tenth king, including David, who reigned from B.C. 378 to 338, had two wives given to him by the godly high-priest Jehoiada, who restored both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses (2 Chron. xxiv, 3). A very remarkable illustration of the prevalence of polygamy in private life is given in 1 Chron. vii, 4, where we are told that not only did the five fathers, all of them chief men of the tribe of Issachar, live in polygamy, but that their descendants, numbering 36,000 men, "had many wives." De Wette, indeed, affirms that "the Hebrew moral teachers speak decidedly for monogamy, as is evident from their always speaking of one wife, and from the high notion which they have of a good wedded wife—'A virtuous woman is the diadem of her husband, but a bad wife is like rottenness in the bones' (Prov. xii, 4); 'Whoso findeth a wife findeth happiness' (xviii, 22); 'A house and wealth are an inheritance from parents, but a discreet wife is from the Lord' (xix, 14). Prov. xxxi, 10–31 describes an industrious and managing wife in such a manner as one only could be it" (*Christl. Sittenlehre*, vol. iii, sec. 472). Similarly Ewald: "Wherever a prophet alludes to matrimonial matters, he always assumes faithful and sacred monogamy contracted for the whole life as the legal one" (*Die Alterthümer Israels*, p. 177 sq.). But we have exactly analogous passages where parental felicity is described: "A wise son is happiness to the father, but a foolish son is the grief of his mother" (Prov. x, 1; xv, 20); "A wise son heareth his father's instruction" (xiii, 1); and upon the same parity of reasoning it might be said that the theory of having only one son is assumed by the sacred moralist, because, when speaking of happiness or misery, which parents derive from their offspring, only one son is alluded to. Besides, the facts which we have enumerated cannot be set aside by arguments.

3. As nothing is said in the post-exilian portions of the Bible to discourage polygamy, this ancient practice also continued among the Jews during this period. During the second Temple, we find that Herod the Great had nine wives (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3); his two sons, Archelaus the Ethnarch, and Antipas the Tetrarch of Galilee, had each two wives (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 13, 2; xviii, 5, 1); and John the Baptist and other Jews, who censured the one for violating the Mosaic law by the marriage of his deceased brother's wife who had children (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 13, 2), and the other for marrying Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip (Matt. xiv, 3, 4; Mark vi, 17, 18; Luke iii, 19), raised no cry against their practicing polygamy; because, as Josephus tells us, "the Jews of those days adhered to their ancient practice to have many wives at the same time" (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 2). In harmony with this ancestral custom, the post-exilian legislation enacted various statutes to regulate polygamy and protect the rights and settlement of each wife (Mishna, *Jebamoth*, iv, 11; *Kethuboth*, x, 1-6; *Kiddushin*, ii, 7). As a striking illustration of the prevalence and legality of polygamy during this period may be mentioned the following circumstance which is recorded in the Talmud: Twelve widows appealed to their brother-in-law to perform the duty of *Levir*, which he refused to do, because he saw no prospect how to maintain such an additional number of wives and possibly a large increase of children. The case was then brought before Jehudah the Holy, who promised that if the man would do the duty enjoined on him by the Mosaic law, he himself would maintain the family and their children, in case there should be any, every sabbatical year, when no produce was to be got from the land which was at rest. The offer was accepted by the *Levir*, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to claim the promised alimony, as it was then the sabbatical year, and they actually obtained it (*Jerusalem Jebamoth*, iv, 12). Rabba ben-Joseph, founder and president of the college at Machuza (A.D. 338–352), taught that a man may take as many wives as he pleases, provided only that he can maintain them all (*Jebamoth*, 65 a). From the

remark in the Mishna, that a *Levir* may marry his deceased brother's *four* widows (*Jebamoth*, iv, 11), the Babylonian Gemara concluded that it recommends a man to have no more than this number (*Babyl. Jebamoth*, 44 a); and from this most probably Mohammed's injunction is derived (Koran, iv, 3). It was Rabanu Gershom ben-Jehudah of France (born cir. 960, died 1028), who, in the 11th century, prohibited polygamy under pains of excommunication, saving in exceptional cases (Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, v, 405–507). His motive for doing so is a matter of dispute; the older Occidental rabbins say that the prohibition originated in a desire to preserve the peace of the family, while the Oriental rabbins will have it that it was dictated by the governments of Christian countries. His interdict, however, made but slow progress, even in Germany and France, for which it was chiefly designed. Thus Simon ben-Abraham of Sens, one of the most celebrated French Tossaphists, tells us (cir. 1200): "The institution of R. Gershom has made no progress either in our neighborhood or in the provinces of France. On the contrary, it happens that pious and learned men and many other people marry a second wife in the lifetime of the first" (*B.-Joseph, Eben Ha-Ezar*, 1). The practice of marrying a second wife in the event of the first having no issue within ten years also obtained in Italy till about the 15th century—the pope giving a special dispensation for it. The Spanish Jews never recognised R. Gershom's interdict; bigamy was practiced in Castile till the 14th century, while the Christian government of Navarre declared polygamy among the Jews legal, and the law of king Theobald allowed them to marry as many wives as they could maintain and govern, but they were not permitted to divorce any one of them without sending all away (Kayserling, *Geschichte der Juden in Spanien*, i, 71). Nor was the said interdict acknowledged by the Jews in the East; and monogamy is there practiced simply because the bride makes a special agreement, and has a clause inserted in the *Kethubah* (כתובה), or *marriage-settlement*, that her husband is not to marry another as long as she lives. An exception, however, is made in case there is no issue. As to the opinion of the Karaites on monogamy and polygamy, the celebrated Jehudah ben-Elia Hadassi (flourished 1149) remarks, in his famous work against rabbinic Judaism, "The Pentateuch prohibits one to marry two wives with a view to vex one of them (לצרור אחת מהן, Lev. xviii, 18); but he may take them provided he loves them and does not grieve either of them, and treats them both affectionately. If he does not diminish their food, raiment, and conjugal rights (Exod. xxi, 11), he is allowed to take two wives or more, just as Elkanah married Hannah and Peninnah, and as David, peace be upon him, and other kings and judges did" (*Eshkol Ha-Copher*, ed. Eupatoria, 1836, p. 129). From this it is evident that polygamy was not prohibited by the Jewish law, nor was it regarded as a sin, and that the monogamy of the Jews in the present day is simply in obedience to the laws of the countries in which they live. There were, however, always some rabbins who discouraged polygamy (*Aboth*, ii, 7; *Jebamoth*, 65 a, al.); and the elevated notion which they had of monogamy is seen in the statutes which they enacted that the high-priest is to be the husband of one wife and to keep to her (*Jebamoth*, 58 a; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Issure Bia*, xviii, 13; Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 12, 2); and which the apostle Paul also urges on Christian bishops (1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 16).

V. *Proscribed Degrees and Laws of Intermarriage.*—1. There were no prescribed degrees within which a man was forbidden to marry in the pre-Mosaic period. On



Table of Degrees of Marriage prohibited by the Mosaic Law, in the ascending and descending scales.

the contrary, the fact that Adam married "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh," and that his sons married their own sisters, rather engendered an aversion to marry out of one's own kindred. Hence we find that Abraham married his half-sister (Gen. xx, 12); Nahor, Abraham's brother, married the daughter of his brother Haran, or his niece (Gen. xi, 29); Jacob married two sisters at the same time, who were the daughters of his mother's brother (Gen. xxviii, 2; xxix, 26); Esau married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (Gen. xxviii, 8, 9); Amram married his aunt Jochebed, his father's sister (Exod. vi, 20); and Judah married his daughter-in-law, Tamar, the widow of his own son (Gen. xxxviii, 26–30). This aversion to intermarriage with strangers and other tribes, which made Abraham pledge his faithful steward by the most sacred oath not to take for his son a wife from the daughters of the Canaanites (Gen. xxiv, 2–4); which occasioned such "a grief of mind" to Isaac, because his son Esau married Hittite women (Gen. xxvi, 34, 35); and which was the cause of great dissatisfaction in the family of Moses when he married a Midianitish woman (Exod. ii, 21); was afterwards greatly increased on the ground of difference of creed. The same feeling of aversion against intermarriage (ἐπιγαμία) with foreigners prevailed among other nations of antiquity, and may also have been the cause why marriages with the nearest of kin were practiced among them. Thus the Athenians were allowed to marry half-sisters by the father's side (Corn. Nepos, *Præf.*; *Cimon*, i; Plutarch, *Cimon*, iv; *Themistocl.* xxxii); the Spartans married half-sisters by the same mother (Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779); and the Assyrians and Egyptians full sisters (Lucian, *Sacrifi.* 5; Diod. i, 27; Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779; Selden, *De jure naturali et gentium*, v, 11). In later times, when the desire to preserve purity of blood, which was the primary cause for not intermarrying with alien tribes, was superseded by religious motives, the patriarchal instances of epigamy recorded without censure during this period became very inconvenient. Hence means were adopted to explain them away. Thus the marriage of Judah with a heathen woman, the daughter of Shuah, a Canaanite (Gen. xxxviii, 2), is made orthodox by the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Midrash (*Bereshith Rabba*, c. lxxxv), the Talmud (*Pesachim*, 50 a), Rashi (ad loc.), etc., by explaining כנענית to mean סוחרא, *merchant*, as in Job xl, 30; Prov. xxxi, 24; and the Jerusalem Targum finds it necessary to add that Judah converted her to Judaism (וגיירה). The marriage of Simeon with a Canaanitess (Gen. xlvi, 10) is explained away in a similar manner (comp. *Bereshith Rabba*, c. lxxx; Rashi *on Gen.* xlvi, 10).

2. The regulations next introduced in this respect are of a twofold nature:

a. The most important change in the Biblical gamology is the Mosaic law about the prohibited degrees among the Israelites themselves. While in the pre-Mosaic period no prohibition whatever existed against marrying one's nearest and dearest relatives, the Mosaic law (Lev. xviii, 7–17; xx, 11, etc.) proscribes no less than fifteen marriages within specified degrees of both consanguinity and affinity. In neither consanguinity nor affinity, however, does the law extend beyond two degrees, viz. the mother, her daughter, aunt, father's wife, father's sister, sister on the father's side, wife of the father's brother, brother's wife (excepting in the case of a Levirate marriage), daughter-in-law, granddaughter, either from a son or daughter, a woman and her daughter, or her granddaughter either from a son or daughter, and two sisters together. The preceding table exhibits these degrees. We must only remark that the squares stand for *males*, the circles for *females*, the triangles within the squares for *deceased*, the numbers refer to the order in which they are enumerated in Lev. xviii, 17, and that the husband and wife, who form the starting-point, are represented by a double square and double circle.

It will be seen from the foregoing table that, while some kindred are proscribed, others are allowed, e. g. a father's sister is forbidden while a brother's daughter is not. This has occasioned great difficulty in tracing the principle which underlies these prohibitions. Philippson is of opinion that it may be deduced from the remarks which accompany the respective vetoes. The stepmother is proscribed because "it is thy father's nakedness" (Lev. xviii, 8); the son's or daughter's daughter because it "is thine own nakedness" (ver. 10); the father's or mother's sister because she is the "father's or mother's flesh" (vers. 12, 13); and the brother's wife because "it is the nakedness of thy brother" (ver. 16). "From this it is evident," this erudite rabbi submits, "that, on the one side, son, daughter, and grandchild are identified with the father, while, on the other side, brothers and sisters are identified with each other, *because they have one and the same source of life*. Accordingly, we obtain the following data. All members proceeding from a common father or mother constitute one issue, because they possess *together* the same source of life; while the ascendants and the descendants in a straight line form *one line*, because they have *one after the other and from each other* the same source of life; and hence the law—1. Two members of the same issue, or two members of the same line, are *not* to intermarry, because they have the same source of life. But inasmuch as the ascending is the primary to each descending issue, and the descending the derived to every ascending, an ascending issue may press forward out of the straight line, or step down into the following, i. e. the primary into the one derived from it; while the succeeding cannot go backwards into the foregoing, i. e. the derived into the primary. Now, as the man is the moving cause in carnal intercourse, hence the law—2. A male member of the succeeding issue must not marry a female member of the preceding issue, while, on the contrary, a male member of the preceding may marry a female of the succeeding issue, provided they are not both of a direct line. Half-blood and step-relations make no difference in this respect, since they are identified, both in the issue and in the line, because husband and wife become identified. It is for this reason, also, that the relationship, which the wife always assumes in marriage with regard to her husband, is such as a blood relation bears to her; hence it is, for instance, that a brother's wife is proscribed, while the wife's sister is allowed. Thus the principle of the Mosaic proscriptions is a profound one, and is fully borne out by nature. Connubial intercourse has for its object to produce a third by the connection of two opposites; but that which proceeds from the same source of life is merely of the same kind. Hence, when two, originally of the same kind, unite, it is contrary to the true design of copulation, and can only proceed from an overpowering and excess of rude and animal passions. It is a desecration of the nature and morality of man, and the highest defilement" (*Israelitische Bibel*, i, 588 sq.; 3d. ed. Leipz. 1863).

Different penalties are attached to the infringement of these prohibitions. The punishment of death is to be inflicted for marrying a father's wife (Lev. xviii, 8; xx, 11), or a daughter-in-law (Lev. xviii, 15; xx, 12); of death by fire for marrying a woman and her daughter at the same time (xviii, 17; xx, 14); of being cut off or excommunicated for marrying a sister on the father's side or on the mother's side (xviii, 9; xx, 17); of not being pardoned for marrying a father's or mother's sister (xviii, 12, 13; xx, 19); of not being pardoned and childlessness for marrying a father's brother's wife (xviii, 14; xx, 20); and of childlessness alone for marrying a brother's wife (xviii, 16; xx, 21), excepting the case of a Levirate marriage (Deut. xxv, 5–10). No penalty is mentioned for marrying one's mother (xviii, 7), granddaughter (xviii, 10), or two sisters together (xviii, 18). From this enumeration it will be seen that it only specifies *three instances* in which capital punishment is to be inflicted.

The grounds on which these prohibitions were enacted are reducible to the following three heads: (1) moral propriety; (2) the practices of heathen nations; and (3) social convenience. The first of these grounds comes prominently forward in the expressions by which the various offences are characterized, as well as in the general prohibition against approaching "the flesh of his flesh." The use of such expressions undoubtedly contains an appeal to the *horror naturalis*, or that repugnance with which man instinctively shrinks from matrimonial union with one with whom he is connected by the closest ties both of blood and of family affection. On this subject we need say no more than that there is a difference in kind between the affection that binds the members of a family together, and that which lies at the bottom of the matrimonial bond, and that the amalgamation of these affections cannot take place without a serious shock to one or the other of the two; hence the desirableness of drawing a distinct line between the provinces of each, by stating definitely where the matrimonial affection may legitimately take root. The second motive to laying down these prohibitions was that the Hebrews might be preserved as a peculiar people, with institutions distinct from those of the Egyptians and Canaanites (Lev. xviii, 3), as well as of other heathen nations with whom they might come in contact. Marriages within the proscribed degrees prevailed in many civilized countries in historical times, and were not unusual among the Hebrews themselves in the pre-Mosaic age. For instance, marriages with half-sisters by the same father were allowed at Athens (Plutarch, *Cim.* 4; *Themistocl.* 32), with half-sisters by the same mother at Sparta (Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779), and with full sisters in Egypt (Diod. i, 27) and Persia, as illustrated in the well-known instances of Ptolemy Philadelphus in the former (Paus. i, 7, 1), and Cambyses in the latter country (Herod. iii, 31). It was even believed that in some nations marriages between a son and his mother were not unusual (Ovid, *Met.* x, 331; Eurip. *Androm.* 174). Among the Hebrews we have instances of marriage with a half-sister in the case of Abraham (Gen. xx, 12), with an aunt in the case of Amram (Exod. vi, 20), and with two sisters at the same time in the case of Jacob (Gen. xxix, 26). Such cases were justifiable previous to the enactments of Moses: subsequently to them we have no case in the O. T. of actual marriage within the degrees, though the language of Tamar towards her half-brother Amnon (2 Sam. xiii, 13) implies the possibility of their union with the consent of their father. The Herods committed some violent breaches of the marriage law. Herod the Great married his half-sister (*Ant.* xvii, 1, 3); Archelaus his brother's widow, who had children (xvii, 13, 1); Herod Antipas his brother's wife (xviii, 5, 1; Matt. xiv, 3). In the Christian Church we have an instance of marriage with a father's wife (1 Cor. v, 1), which St. Paul characterizes as "fornication" (πορνεία), and visits with the severest condemnation. The third ground of the prohibitions, social convenience, comes forward solely in the case of marriage with two sisters simultaneously, the effect of which would be to "vex" or *irritate* the first wife, and produce domestic jars.

Besides the proscribed degrees, the Mosaic law also forbids the following intermarriages: i. No Israelite is to marry the progeny of incestuous and unlawful copulations, or *a mamzer* (ממזר, Deut. xxiii, 2). In the absence of any Biblical definition of this much-disputed expression, we must accept the ancient traditional explanation contained in the Mishna, which is as follows: "When there is betrothal without transgression of the law about forbidden marriages—e. g. if the daughters of priests, Levites, or Israelites are married to priests, Levites, or Israelites—the child goes after the father; where there is betrothal, and this law has been transgressed—e. g. if a widow is married to a high-priest, a divorced woman or one who performed the ceremony of *chalitsah* to an ordinary priest, or a bastardess or a female *nethin* to an Israelite; or, vice versa, if a Jewess is married to a bastard or *nethin*—the child goes after the inferior party; where the woman cannot be betrothed to the man, but might legally be betrothed to another person—e. g., i. if a man married within any one of the degrees proscribed by the law—the child is *a bastard* or *mamzer*" (*Kiddushin*, iii, 12). ii. Any person who is פצוע דכה, *cujus testiculi vulnerati sunt, vel certe unus eorum*, or כרות שפכה, *cujus membrum virile præcissum est*, as the Mishna (*Jebamoth*, viii, 2) explains it, is not allowed to marry (Deut. xxiii, 1). iii. A man is not to remarry a woman whom he had divorced, and who, after marrying another husband, had become a widow, or been divorced again (Deut. xxiv, 2–4). iv. Heiresses are not allowed to intermarry with persons of another tribe (Numb. xxxvi, 5–9). v. A high-priest is forbidden to marry a widow, a divorced woman, a profane woman, or a harlot, and restricted to a pure Jewish maiden (Lev. xxi, 13, 14). vi. Ordinary priests are prohibited from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (Lev. xxi, 7).

b. The proscription of epigamy with non-Israelites is absolute with regard to some nations, and conditional with regard to others. The Mosaic law absolutely forbids intermarriage with the seven Canaanitish nations, on the ground that it would lead the Israelites into idolatry (Exod. xxxiv, 15, 16; Deut. vii, 3, 4); and with the Ammonites and Moabites, on account of national antipathy (Deut. xxiii, 4–8); while the prohibition against marriage with the Egyptians and Edomites only extends to the third generation (Deut. xxiii, 7, 8). The Talmud, which rightly expounds the prohibition to "*enter into the congregation of the Lord*" as necessarily extending to epigamy (comp. 1 Kings xi, 2; *Kiddushin*, iv, 3), takes the third generation to mean *of those who became proselytes*, i. e. the grandchildren of an Ammonite or Moabite who professes Judaism (Mishna, *Jebamoth*, viii, 3; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chazaka*, *Issure Biah*, xii, 19, 20). This view is confirmed by the fact that the Bible only mentions *three* intermarriages with Egyptians, and records at least two out of the three to show the evil effects of it. One occurred after the Exodus and in the wilderness, and we are told that the son of this intermarriage, while quarrelling with a brother Jew, blasphemed the name of God, and suffered capital punishment (Lev. xxiv, 10–14); the second occurred towards the end of the rulership of the judges, and tradition endeavors to show that Ishmael, the murderer of Gedaliah (Jer. xli, 1, 2), was a descendant of Jarha, the Egyptian son-in-law of Sheshan (1 Chron. ii, 34, 35; and Rashi, ad loc.); and the third is the intermarriage of Solomon, which, however, is excepted from the censure in the book of Kings (1 Kings iii, 1 sq.; xi, 1, 2). Of intermarriages with Edomites not a single instance is recorded in the O. T.; the Jewish antipathy against them was transmitted down to a very late period, as we find in the declaration of Jesus, son of Sirach, that his soul hates the inhabitants of Seir (Ecclus. iv, 25, 26), and in the fact that Judas Maccabæus carried on a deadly war with them (1 Macc. v, 3; 2 Macc. xx, 15–23).

An exception is made in the case of female captives of war (Deut. xxi, 10–14), which is evidently designed to obviate as far as possible the outrages committed after the evil passions have been stirred up in the conflict. The law, however, most humanely ordains that the captor, before making her his wife, should first allow her to indulge herself for a full month in mourning for her parents, from whom she is snatched away, and to practice the following customary rites expressive of grief: 1. Cut off the hair of her head, which was the usual sign of mourning both among the Jews and other nations of antiquity (Ezra ix, 3; Job i, 20; Isa. xv, 2; Jer. vii, 29; xvi, 6; Ezek. vii, 18; xxvii, 31; Amos viii, 10; Micah i, 16); 2. Cut off her nails, which were stained to form a part of personal adornment; and, 3. Put off the raiment in which she was taken captive, since the

women who followed their fathers and husbands to the war put on their finest dresses and ornaments previous to an engagement, in the hope of finding favor in the eyes of their captors in case of a defeat (Ovid, *Remed. Amor.* 343; Rosenmüller, *Das alte u. neue Morgenland*, ii, 308).

The first complaint of epigamy with aliens is, strange to say, made against Moses, the lawgiver himself (Numb. xii, 1). In the days of the Judges the law against intermarriage was commonly transgressed (Judges iii, 6), and from the earlier portions of the book of Proverbs, which ring with repeated denunciations of foreign women (Prov. ii, 16, 17; v, 8–11; xv, 17), as well as from the warnings of Isaiah (ii, 6), it is evident that intermarriages with foreign women were generally practiced in private life in after times. Of the twenty kings of Israel who reigned from the division of the kingdom to the Babylonian captivity, Ahab is the only one mentioned who married a foreign wife (1 Kings xvi, 31); while of the nineteen kings of Judah after the division none intermarried with aliens. Marriages between Israelitish women and proselyted foreigners were at all times of rare occurrence, and are noticed in the Bible as if they were of an exceptional nature, such as that of an Egyptian and an Israelitish woman (Lev. xxiv, 10); of Abigail and Jether, the Ishmaelite, contracted probably when Jesse's family was sojourning in Moab (1 Chron. ii, 17); of Sheshan's daughter and an Egyptian, who was staying in his house (1 Chron. ii, 35); and of a Naphthalite woman and a Tyrian, living in adjacent districts (1 Kings vii, 14). In the reverse case, viz. the marriage of Israelites with foreign women, it is, of course, highly probable that the wives became proselytes after their marriage, as instanced in the case of Ruth (i, 16), and probably in that of Solomon's Egyptian wife (Psa. xl, 10); but this was by no means invariably the case. On the contrary, we find that the Canaanitish wives of Solomon (1 Kings xi, 4), and the Phœnician wife of Ahab (1 Kings xvi, 31), retained their idolatrous practices, and introduced them into their adopted countries. Proselytism does not, therefore, appear to have been a *sine quâ non* in the case of a wife, though it was so in the case of a husband: the total silence of the law as to any such condition in regard to a captive, whom an Israelite might wish to marry, must be regarded as evidence of the reverse (Deut. xxi, 10–14), nor have the refinements of rabbinical writers on that passage succeeded in establishing the necessity of proselytism. The opposition of Samson's parents to his marriage with a Philistine woman (Judg. xiv, 3) leads to the same conclusion.

3. In the post-exilian period, besides the fifteen proscribed degrees enumerated in Lev. xviii, 7–17; xx, 11, etc., the *Sopherim*, or scribes (B.C. 322–221), prohibited marriage with other relations (Mishna, *Jebamoth*, ii, 4), and those prohibitions were afterwards extended still further by R. Chija ben-Abba the Babylonian (A.D. 163–193), and friend of Jehudah I the Holy (*Jebamoth*, 22 a). The prohibited degrees of the scribes are denominated שניות, i. e. לערוות, the *second* or *subordinate in rank* with respect to those forbidden in the Bible, and may be seen in the following list given by Maimonides: "i. The mother's mother, and this is infinite, for the mother's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed. ii. The mother of his father's mother, and no further. iii. His father's mother, and this is infinite, for even the father's mother's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed. iv. The mother of his father's father only. v. The wife of his father's father, and this is infinite, for even if she were the wife of our father Jacob, she is forbidden to every one of us. vi. The wife of his mother's father only. vii. The wife of his father's brother by the mother. viii. The wife of his mother's brother, whether by the mother or by the father. ix. His son's daughter-in-law, i. e. his son's son's wife, and this is infinite, for even if she were the son's son's son's son's wife, descending to the end of the world, she is forbidden, so that, as long as the wife of one of us lives, she is secondary or forbidden to our father Jacob x. His daughter's daughter-in-law, i. e. her son's wife only. xi. The daughter of his son's daughter only. xii. The daughter of his son's son only. xiii. The daughter of his daughter's daughter only. xiv. The daughter of his daughter's son only. xv. The daughter of his wife's son only. xvi. The daughter of his wife's daughter only. xvii. The mother of his wife's father's mother only. xviii. The mother of his wife's mother's father only. xix. The mother of his wife's mother's mother only. xx. The mother of his wife's father's father only. Thus, of these secondary prohibitions, there are four which are infinite: *a*, the mother's mother and all upwards; *b*, the father's mother and all upwards; *c*, the grandfather's wife and all upwards; and, *d*, the son's son's wife and all downwards" (*Hilchoth Ishuth*, i, 6). The principle by which the scribes were guided was to extend the prohibition to the whole line wherever the Mosaic law refers to lineal ascendants or descendants, as well as to those who might easily be mistaken by having a common appellation. Thus mother's mother's mother's mother, *ad infinitum*, is forbidden, because the Mosaic law proscribes the mother, so also the wife of the grandfather, because the wife's father is forbidden in the Mosaic law; while the mother of the father is proscribed, because the appellation grandmother is used without distinction for both the mother's and father's mother. From Maimonides's list, however, it will be seen that he, like Alfasi, restricts prohibition ii to the mother of the grandfather, and prohibitions xii–xvi, xx, to the son's grandchildren, great-grandmother, and great-grandchildren, but does not extend it to any further ascendants or descendants. The whole subject is extensively discussed in the Talmud (*Jebamoth*, 21, 22; *Jerusalem Jebamoth*, ii, 4), and by Maimonides (*Iad Ha-Chazaka*, *Hilchoth Ishuth*, i, 6, etc.), to which we must refer. It must, however, be remarked that Philo's list of proscribed degrees is much shorter. After explaining why Moses prohibited marriage with one's own mother or sister, he says, "For this reason he has also forbidden other matrimonial connections, inasmuch as he ordained that a man shall not marry his granddaughter (*μὴ θυγατριδῆν, μὴ νιδῆν*), nor his aunt on the father's or mother's side, nor the wife of an uncle, son, or brother; nor a step-daughter while in the lifetime of her mother or after her death, because a stepfather takes the place of a father, and a step-daughter is to be looked upon as his own daughter. Neither does he allow the same man to marry two sisters, either at the same time or at different times, even in case one of them had been married to another and is divorced; for he did not consider it pious that one sister should succeed to the place of her unfortunate sister, whether the latter is still cohabiting with him, or is divorced and has no husband, or is married to another husband" (*De special. legibus*, 780). Still shorter is the list of Josephus, who says, "The law prohibits it as a heavy sin and an abomination to have carnal intercourse with one's mother, step-mother, father's or mother's sister, one's own sister, or a son's wife" (*Ant.* iii, 12, 1). Marriage with a wife's step-mother is allowed by the Babylonian and forbidden by the Jerusalem Talmud; the Spanish Jews follow the former, while the German-French communities adopt the latter. Intermarriages between cousins, uncle and niece, entire step-brother and step-sister, are quite legitimate. Indeed, for an uncle to marry a niece, which the English law forbids, has been considered by the Jews from time immemorial as something specially meritorious. The Talmud says that the promise given in Isaiah, "Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer" (lviii, 9), refers to that man especially "who loves his neighbors, befriends his relations, *marries his brother's daughter*, and lends money to the poor in the hour of need" (*Jebamoth*, 62 b, 63 a).

As to the *ethical* cause of the proscribed marriages, or the cases specified, including parallels by affinity, the ancient Jews, to whom the oracles of God were commit-

ted, and who had to explain and administer the law in practical life, knew nothing about it. The Palestinian doctors regarded the proscribed degrees as a *positive* law, the cause of which cannot be divined by human reason (*Sifra Kedoshim*, ix, 12; Talmud, *Sabbath*, 130 a; *Joma*, 75 a). The only attempt to rationalize on the subject is on the apparent inconsistency of the Mosaic law in prohibiting marriage with the wife of the father's brother, in case she is divorced or left a widow, and not forbidding the wife of the mother's brother. Upon this the Talmud remarks that a man visits his father's relations more than his mother's (*Jebamoth*, 21 a; and Rashi on this passage); and it is submitted, and we believe with perfect reason, and based on Numb. i, 2, that it is the father's relations who constitute the family, and not the mother's. We thus see that up to the time of the Ptolemies, when the Greek loose barriers of consanguinity threatened to fall among the Jewish families, the ancient Hebrews were bound only by the specific proscriptions in the Mosaic law, and that even after the prohibitions were extended by the scribes, the proscription of a male relative by blood did not imply the wife's relatives of the like degree, because of the strong distinction made by them between consanguinity and affinity by marriage; the former being permanent and sacred, and the latter uncertain and vague, as a man might any moment divorce his wife, or take as many as he pleased, and because the husband's family were regarded as the relations, while the wife's were not esteemed beyond those who are especially mentioned.

The proscribed degrees were sacredly avoided by the Jews during this period, and no dispensation could be obtained by any one, no matter how high his position, as Judaism never invested any spiritual functionary with power to absolve, even in extraordinary cases, from the obligations of the law. Hence the outcry against Herod the Great, who married his half-sister (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3); against Archelaus, who took his deceased brother's widow when she was the mother of children (*ibid.* xvii, 13, 1); and against Herod Antipas, for which John the Baptist had to atone with his life (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1; Matt. xiv, 3). So long as foreign epigamy was of merely occasional occurrence no veto was placed upon it by public authority; but when, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Jews contracted marriages with the heathen inhabitants of Palestine in so wholesale a manner as to endanger their national existence, the practice was severely condemned (Ezra ix, 2; x, 2), and the law of positive prohibition, originally pronounced only against the Canaanites, was extended to the Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines (Neh. xiii, 23–25). Public feeling was thenceforth strongly opposed to foreign marriages, and the union of Manasseh with a Cuthæan led to such animosity as to produce the great national schism, which had its focus in the temple on Mount Gerizim (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 2) A no less signal instance of the same feeling is exhibited in the cases of Joseph (*Ant.* xii, 4, 6) and Anilæus (*Ant.* xviii. 9, 5), and is noticed by Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 5) as one of the characteristics of the Jewish nation in his day. In the N. T. no special directions are given on this head, but the general precepts of separation between believers and unbelievers (2 Cor. vi, 14, 17) would apply with special force to the case of marriage; and the permission to dissolve mixed marriages, contracted previously to the conversion of one party, at the instance of the unconverted one, cannot but be regarded as implying the impropriety of such unions subsequently to conversion (1 Cor. vii, 12).

Besides the proscribed degrees, the rabbinic law also enacted—i. A man must not marry a divorced woman with whom he has committed adultery prior to her divorcement (*Sota*, 27), or even if he is only suspected of it (*Jebamoth*, 24; Maimonides, *Sota*, ii, 12). ii. A man who attested the death of the husband is not allowed to marry the widow, nor is the bearer of a divorce permitted to marry the divorced woman, to avoid suspicion (*Jebamoth*, ii, 9, 10). iii. If a man's wife dies, he must not marry again till three festivals after his wife's death (*Moed Katon*, 23). iv. A man is not to marry a woman who has lost two husbands (*Jebamoth*, 64). v. A father is not to give a young daughter in marriage to an old man, nor is a young man to marry an old woman (*Jebamoth*, 101; Maimonides, *Isure Bia*, xxi, 26). vi. A man is not to marry within thirty days of the death of a near relation (*Moed Katon*, 23). vii. Widows are not to marry within ninety days of the loss of their husbands, nor are divorced women to marry within ninety days of their being divorced, in order that the paternity of the newly-born child might be distinguished (*Jebamoth*, 41 a). viii. If a widow or a divorced woman is nursing an infant, she must not marry within twenty-four months of the birth of the baby (*Jebamoth*, 41; *Kethuboth*, 60; and *Tossafoth*, on these passages).

VI. *Sanctity of Marriage, and Mutual Rights of Husband and Wife.*—1. Though at the creation the wife occupied an equal position with the husband, being a part of him, yet, as she became the cause of his sin, God ordained it as part of her punishment that the wife should be in subjection to the will of her husband, and that he should be her master, and "rule over her" (Gen. iii, 16). This dependence of the wife on her husband is henceforth declared by the very Hebrew appellation (בַּעַל) for husband (Exod. xxi, 3, 22), which literally denotes *lord, master, owner*, and is seen in the conduct of Sarah, who speaks of her husband Abraham as (אֲדֹנִי) *my lord* (Gen. xviii, 12), which is commended by Peter as illustrating the proper position of a wife (1 Pet. iii, 6). From this mastery of the husband over the wife arose the different standard of virtue which obtained in married life. The wife, as subject to her husband, her lord and master, was not allowed to practice polyandry; she was obliged to regard the sanctity of marriage as absolute, and any unchastity on her part was visited with capital punishment; while the husband could take any unmarried woman he liked and violate the laws of chastity, as we should view it, with impunity (Gen. xxxviii, 24). This absolute sanctity of marriage on the part of the wife was also acknowledged by other nations of antiquity, as is gathered from the narratives of the patriarchs. Thus Abraham knew that Pharaoh would not take Sarah from her husband, and we are told that as soon as the Egyptian monarch discovered that she was a married woman, he immediately restored her to her husband (Gen. xii, 15–19); and this is confirmed by Egyptology, which, based on ancient writers and monuments, shows that he who seduced a married woman received a thousand rods, and that the woman had her nose cut off (Uhlemann, *Egypt. Alterthumsk.* 11, sec. 25, 65). The same sanctity was attached to a married woman in Philistia (Gen. xx, 1–18; xxvi, 9–11).

2. Recognising the previously-existing inequality of husband and wife, and basing its laws upon the then prevailing notion that the husband is lord over his wife, that he can take as many wives as he likes, and send them away whenever he dislikes them, the Mosaic gamology, as a matter of course, could neither impose the same obligation of nuptial fidelity nor confer the same rights on both. This is evident from the following facts: 1. The husband had a right to expect from his wife connubial chastity, and in case of infidelity could demand her death as well as that of her seducer (Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 20–22; Ezek. xvi, 40; John viii, 5). 2. If he became jealous and suspicious of her, *even when she had not been unfaithful*, he could bring her before the priest and have administered to her the water of jealousy (Numb. v, 12–31). But if the husband was suspected, or was actually guilty of carnal intercourse with an unmarried woman, no statute was enacted to enable the wife or wives to arraign him for a breach of marriage or infringement of her or their rights. Even when he was discovered with another man's wife, it was the injured husband that had the power to demand the death of the

seducer, but not the wife of the criminal. 3. If the wife vowed anything to the Lord, or imposed upon herself voluntary obligations to the Deity, her husband could nullify it (Numb. xxx, 6–8). 4. He could send her away or divorce her when she displeased him (Deut. xxiv, 1–4). The woman, again, is protected by the following laws: 1. When a Hebrew maiden is sold by her father to a man, with the understanding that she is to be his half-wife (פילגש = אמה, Exod. xxi, 7; Judg. ix, 18 with Judg. viii, 31), the law enacts that, in case her master and intended husband is displeased with her, and he refuses to redeem his promise—i, he is not to keep her till the sabbatic year, and then give her her liberty like ordinary servants; ii, he is not to sell her to any one else as a wife; iii, he may give her to his son as a wife, and in that case must treat her as a daughter-in-law; iv, if he gives his son an additional wife, she is to obtain—*a*, her food, *b*, raiment, and, *c*, conjugal right as heretofore; and, v, if these three last-mentioned points are refused to her, she is forthwith to be set at liberty (Exod. xxi, 7–11). 2. If he maliciously impugns her chastity, he is to be scourged, and loses his right over her to divorce her (Deut. xxii, 13–19). 3. If she has children, they must render equal obedience to her as to the father (Exod. xx, 12; Deut. xxvii, 16). 4. The husband must not vex her by marrying two sisters simultaneously (Lev. xviii, 18). 5. He is not allowed to annoy his less-beloved wife by transferring the primogeniture from her son to the child of his favorite wife (Deut. xxi, 15–17). 6. If her husband dislikes her, he is not arbitrarily to dismiss her, but give her a "bill of divorcement" (Deut. xxiv, 1), which requires the interposition of legal advisers. 7. When a woman is divorced, or her husband dies, she is free, and at liberty to marry any one she likes, as is evident from the enactments in Lev. xxi, 7, 8, 13; Deut. xxiv, 2–4; xxv, 5, which are based upon this fact.

3. The notions about sanctity of marriage were loftier during the post-exilian period than in the preceding epochs, as may be judged from the fact that unfaithfulness to a wife is denounced by the prophet Malachi as violating a sacred covenant, to the transaction of which God himself was a witness (ii, 14). And though it may be questioned whether the prophet's appeal to God as having been witness to the marriage-contract refers to the above-named seven benedictions (שבע ברכות) which the bridegroom had to pronounce at the marriage-feast, and in which he invoked God's presence and blessing to the compact, as Abrabanel will have it, yet there can be no doubt that marriage is here for the first time expressly described as *a covenant* (ברית) *made in the presence of God.* With such a view of the sanctity of marriage, the notion that a wife is a plaything for a leisure hour rapidly disappeared, and the sages who had to expound the law to the people in the time of Christ taught that the declaration "Peace shall be in thy house" (Job v, 24) will be realized by him "who loves his wife as himself, and honors her more than himself, and trains his sons and daughters up in the way of righteousness" (*Jebamoth*, 62 b). Moreover, marriage was regarded as illegal if the man had not given to his wife the instrument (כתובה), in which he promises his wife, "I will work for thee, honor thee, maintain thee, and provide for thee, according to the custom of Jewish husbands." The rabbinic laws both define this promise and insist upon its being fulfilled, as may be seen from the following enactments: i. A wife is to be kept in proportion to the circumstances of her husband, and have her meals with him at the table; if he ill-treats her and she removes from him, he is obliged to send her maintenance (*Jebamoth*, 64 b). ii. If the husband goes on a three months' journey without making provision for his wife, the legal authorities of the place are to maintain her from his property (*Kethuboth*, 48 a, 107). iii. He is obliged to perform the duties of a husband within a stated period (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v, 6). iv. If her husband dies, she is to be maintained from his property, or by the children, in the same manner as she was in his lifetime, till she is betrothed to another man, and her rights must be attended to before the claims of any one else (*Kethuboth*, 43, 51, 52, 68, 103; *Jerusalem Kethuboth*, iv, 14). v. If a woman marries a man of higher rank than herself, she rises with him; but if he is inferior to her, she does not descend to him (ואינה עולה עמו יורדת [*Kethuboth*, 48 a, 61 a]). For other rights which the wife possesses we must refer to the *Kethubah*, or the marriage-instrument given in section 2 of this period. The husband, on the other hand, has a right to expect from his wife chastity which is beyond the reach of suspicion, unreserved obedience, and to do the work of a housewife. Other rights are given in the following section on *divorce.*

VII. *Divorce.*—1. The arbitrary power of the husband over his wife in the patriarchal age is also seen in the fact that he could divorce her at his pleasure. There is but one instance of it recorded, but it is a very significant one. Abraham, though he has a child by Hagar, sends away his half-wife, not requiring any legal or religious intervention (Gen. xxi, 14), but, as in the case of marriage, effecting it by a mere verbal declaration. Wherever marriages are effected by the violent exercise of the *patria potestas*, or without any bond of affection between the parties concerned, ill-assorted matches must be of frequent occurrence; and without the remedy of divorce, in such a state of society, we can understand the truth of the apostles' remark that "it is not good to marry" (Matt. xix, 10). Hence divorce prevails to a great extent in all countries where marriage is the result of arbitrary appointment or of purchase: we may instance the Arabians (Burckhardt's *Notes*, i, 111; Layard, *Nineveh*, i, 357) and the Egyptians (Lane, i, 235 sq.).

2. It must be remarked that the Mosaic law does not *institute* divorce, but, as in other matters, recognises and most humanely regulates the prevailing patriarchal practice (Deut. xxiv, 1–4). The ground on which the law allows a divorce is termed ערות דבר, *any shameful thing.* What the precise meaning of this ambiguous phrase is, and what, according to the Mosaic gamology, gives a husband the right to divorce his wife, has been greatly disputed in the schools of Shammai and Hillel, which were founded before the advent of Christ, and these discussions are given below. It is, however, certain that the phrase does not denote *fornication* or *adultery*, for in that case the woman was not divorced, but *stoned* (Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 20–22; Ezek. xvi, 40; John viii, 5). Moreover, the phrase מצא חן בעיני פלני, with which this statute begins, when used of opposite sexes, as in the case before us, generally denotes *favorable impression which one produces on the other*, by *graceful manners*, or *beautiful appearance* (Gen. xxxix, 4; Ruth ii, 2, 10, 13; Ezek. v, 2 with 8). That it has this sense here seems to be warranted by ver. 3, where it is supposed that the divorced woman marries again, and her second husband also divorces her, and that not on account of immorality, but because *he does not like her.* The humane regulations which the Mosaic gamology introduced in order to render a divorce legal were as follows: 1. If a man dislikes his wife, or finds that he cannot live happily with her, he is not summarily to send her away by word of mouth as heretofore, but is to give her a formal and judicial *bill of divorcement* (ספר כריתת), which required the intervention of a legal adviser, and caused delay, thus affording time for reflection, and preventing many a divorce resolved on under the influence of passion. 2. Allowing the parties, even after the dissolution of the marriage, to renew the connection if they wished it, provided the divorced wife had not in the meantime married another husband, and become a widow, or been again divorced. Not only are bishop Patrick (on Deut. xxiv, 4), Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, ii, 137, English translation), and many other Christian expositors, of this opinion, but it has been so understood

and acted upon by those who were charged with the administration of the law from time immemorial. The only exception which the sages made was when a man divorced his wife because of an evil report which he maliciously circulated about her; then he was not allowed to remarry her (Mishna, *Gittin*, iv, 7). 3. If the divorced woman marries again, and the second husband either dies or divorces her, she is not allowed to remarry her first husband: this was to preclude the possibility of procuring the death of, or a divorce from, the second husband, in case the parties wished to be reunited. 4. If a man seduces a maiden, and on this account is legally obliged to marry her, "he may not put her away all his life" (Deut. xxii, 28, 29). Or, 5. If he groundlessly impugns her chastity, he also loses the power of ever divorcing her (Deut. xxii, 13–19). This, as well as the preceding benign law, was evidently designed to make men care for those women whom they had either virtually or actually deprived of their moral character, and who, if these men were allowed to desert them, might never be able to get husbands. Thus these laws, while checking seduction, inasmuch as the man knew that he would have all his lifetime to be wedded to and care for the injured woman, also prevented those females who had momentarily fallen from being branded for life, and compelled to give themselves up to prostitution. 6. Though the Mosaic law has no express statute that the wife, under certain circumstances, may demand a divorce from her husband, yet it is undoubtedly implied in the enactment contained in Exod. xxi, 10. For if a bondwoman who became the wife of her master could quit him if he did not fulfil the conditions of a husband, it is but natural to conclude that a *free* wife would, under similar circumstances, be able to claim the protection of the same law. A few instances of the violation of the divorce law, between the period of its enactment and the Babylonian captivity, are incidentally recorded without any censure whatever. Thus we are told that Saul took away Michal, his daughter, David's wife, without David's formally divorcing her, and gave her to Phalti (1 Sam. xxv, 44), and that David took back again Michal, who had been united to another husband (2 Sam. iii, 14–16). Still the laws of divorce and of prohibiting reunion after the divorced woman had been married to another husband are alluded to by Jeremiah as well known and commonly observed (iii, i, 8).

3. The rather uncertain grounds on which the Mosaic law permits divorce (Deut. xxiv, 1–4) were minutely defined during the period after the exile. Though the school of Shammai restricts the phrase ערות דבר to *unchastity*, and the Sadducees too insisted that divorce is not to be tolerated except when the woman is guilty of *adultery* (*Eschol Ha-Copher*, *Alphab.* xcix; *Ben-Chonanja*, iv, 276), yet the Jews as a nation, as well as most Christian expositors, agree with the school of Hillel, (Mishna, *Gittin*, ix, 10) that it denotes *faults* or *deformities*, as the context plainly shows. Now, in stating the grounds on which the Jewish expositors of the law, in the time of Christ and after, regarded dissolution of marriage as justifiable, we must distinguish the cases in which the legal authorities themselves took up the matter, from those in which the married parties asked for divorce.

a. Dissolution of marriage occasioned by the lawful authorities took place—i. When the woman is guilty of adultery. ii. When the woman carries on secret intercourse with a man after her husband has warned her against it (*Sota*, 27; *Jebamoth*, 24). iii. Where, though betrothal had taken place, yet a matrimonial law (*matrimonium injustum*) is violated, either referring to the proscribed degrees or to other matters enacted by the rabbins. iv. When the husband is infected with leprosy (*Kethuboth*, 77).

b. It was granted on the demand of the married parties. Thus the husband could effect a dissolution of marriage—i. When his wife, by violating the Mosaic law, caused him, without knowing it, to be guilty of transgression (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, vii, 6). ii. If the wife violates the bounds of modesty—e. g. by going into the street with uncovered hair, flirting with young men, etc. (*ibid.*). iii. If the wife is suspected of adultery. iv. If the woman curses her father-in-law in the presence of her husband (*Kethuboth*, 72). v. If the wife will not follow her husband to another place (*Kethuboth*, 110). vi. If the wife refuses her husband the conjugal rights for twelve months.

The wife can demand a divorce—i. If after marriage the husband contracts a loathsome disease (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, vii, 9, 10). ii. If after marriage he betakes himself to a disgusting business (*ibid.* the Gemara thereon, 75). iii. If he treats her cruelly (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, 154). iv. If her husband changes his religion (*ibid.*). v. If the husband commits an offence which makes him flee from his country (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, 9). vi. If he leads a dissolute and immoral life (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, Gloss on Sects, 11). vii. If he wastes his property and neglects to maintain her (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, vii, 1). viii. If he refuses her connubial rights (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v, 6). There are other grounds on which divorce can be obtained, but for these we must refer to the Mishna, *Gittin*, as they are too numerous to be detailed. The bill of divorcement must be handed over, either by the husband or a messenger, to the wife or one deputed by her, with the words, "This is thy divorce; thou art henceforth divorced from me, and canst marry whomsoever thou likest" (Mishna, *Gittin*, ix). It must, however, be remarked that divorce was greatly discouraged by the Talmudists, and it is declared that "he who divorces his wife is hated of God. The altar sheds tears over him who divorces the wife and companion of his youth" (*Gittin*, 90 a).

During the post-exilian period the abuse of divorce continued unabated (Josephus, *Life*, 76); and under the Asmonæan dynasty the right was assumed by the wife as against her husband, an innovation which is attributed to Salome by Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 7, 10), but which appears to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, if we may judge from passages where the language implies that the act emanated from the wife (Mark x, 12; 1 Cor. vii, 11), as well as from some of the comments of the early writers on 1 Tim. v, 9. Our Lord and his apostles re-established the integrity and sanctity of the marriage-bond by the following measures: (1) by the confirmation of the original charter of marriage as the basis on which all regulations are to be framed (Matt. xix, 4, 5); (2) by the restriction of divorce to the case of fornication, and the prohibition of remarriage in all persons divorced on improper grounds (Matt. v, 32; xix, 9; Rom. vii, 3; 1 Cor. vii, 10, 11); and (3) by the enforcement of moral purity generally (Heb. xiii, 4, etc.), and especially by the formal condemnation of fornication, which appears to have been classed among acts morally indifferent (*ἀδιάφορα*) by a certain party in the Church (Acts xv, 20).

VIII. *Levirate Law.*—1. The only power which a woman had over the man during the pre-Mosaic period, in matrimonial matters, was when her husband died without issue. The widow could then claim his next brother to marry her; if the second also died without progeny, she could ask the third, and so on. The object of this Levirate marriage, as it is called, from the Latin, *levir*, brother-in-law (Hebrew, יבם; Greek, *ἐπιγαμβρέω*), is "to raise up seed to the departed brother," which should preserve his name upon his inheritance, and prevent it from being erased from among his brethren, and from the gate of his town (Gen. xxxviii, 8; Deut. xxv, 6; Ruth iv, 10); since the Hebrews regarded childlessness as a great evil (Gen. xvi, 4; xix, 31), and entire excision as a most dire calamity and awful punishment from God (Deut. ix, 14; Psa. ix, 7; cix, 15). To remove this reproach from the departed, it was regarded as the sacred duty of the eldest surviving brother to marry the widow, and the first-born son resulting from such an alliance was to all intents and purposes

considered as the representative and heir of the deceased. Thus we are told that when Er, Judah's eldest son, who was married to Tamar, died without issue, the second son was called upon to marry his deceased brother's widow, and that when he again died, leaving no children, Tamar, the widow, had still a claim upon the only surviving son, for whom she had to wait, as he was not as yet marriageable (Gen. xxxviii, 6–12, 14, 26). Ultimately Judah himself had to marry his daughter-in-law, for she inveigled him into it as a punishment for neglecting to give her his third son (Gen. xxxviii, 26–30); and Pharez, the issue of this Levirate marriage, not only became the founder of a numerous and illustrious family, but was the direct line from which the royal family of David descended, and the channel through which the Messiah was born (Gen. xxxviii, 29, with Matt. i, 3). This Levirate marriage was not peculiar to the Hebrews. It also obtained among the Moabites (Ruth i, 11–13), Persians (Kleuker, *Zendavesta*, iii, 226), Indians (*Asiatic Researches*, iii, 35), and still exists in Arabia (Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 112; Niebuhr, *Voyage*, p. 61), among the tribes of the Caucasus (Hanthausen, *Transcaucasia*, p. 403), and other nations (comp. Leyser, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 358, s. v. Leviratsehe).

2. This law, which, as we have seen, existed from time immemorial both among the patriarchs and other nations of antiquity, was at length formally enacted as part of the Biblical gamology. In adopting this law, however, as in the case of other primitive practices incorporated in the Mosaic code, the sacred legislator both prescribes for it definite limits, and most humanely deprives it of the irksome and odious features which it possessed in ancient times. This is evident from the enactment itself, which is as follows: "If brothers dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the deceased shall not marry out of the family a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her as his wife, and perform the duty of a brother-in-law. Her first-born shall then succeed in the name of the deceased brother, so that his name be not blotted out of Israel" (Deut. xxv, 5, 6). Accordingly—i. This law is restricted to brothers who *dwell together*, i. e. in contiguous properties, as the rabbinical law explains it according to the meaning of the phrase שבת יחדיו in Gen. xiii, 6; xxxvi, 7, and elsewhere. If the brothers lived far away, or if the deceased had no brothers at all, it was an understood thing that it devolved upon the nearest of kin to marry the widow, or care for her if she was too old, when, of course, it passed over from the domain of Leviration into that of *Goel* or *redeemer* (Ruth ii, 20; iii, 9; iv, 15, 16). ii. To cases where no issue whatever is left, as בן is here used in its general sense of *offspring* and not specifically for *son*. This is not only confirmed by the Sept. (σπέρμα), Matthew (*μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα*, xxii, 5), Mark (xii, 19), Luke (*ἄτεκνος*, xx, 28), Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 23), and the Talmud (*Jebamoth*, 22 b), but is evident from the law of inheritance (Numb. xxvii, 8–11), in which it is declared that if a man dies without leaving a son, his daughter is to inherit the property. For if his widow could claim the surviving brother to marry her in order to raise up a son to the deceased, the daughter who legally came to the inheritance would either have to lose her possessions, or the son born of the Levirate marriage would have to be without patrimony.

In fulfilling the duty of the *Levir* in the patriarchal age the surviving brother had to make great sacrifices. He had not only to renounce the perpetuating of his own name through the first-born son (Gen. xxxviii, 9), and mar his own inheritance (Ruth iv, 6), but, what was most galling, he was obliged to take the widow whether he had an inclination for any such marriage or not, as the *Levir* in the patriarchal age had no alternative. Now the Mosaic law removed this hardship by opening to the man a door of escape: "But if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate of the elders and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the Levirate duty. And the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him. But if he still persist and say, I like not to take her, then shall his brother's wife come in to him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house; and his house shall be called in Israel the house of the barefoot" (Deut. xxv, 7–10). Thus the Mosaic gamology does not impose it as an inexorable law, but simply enjoins it as a duty of love, which the *Levir* might escape by submitting to censure and reproach. Of this he could not complain, for he not only neglected to perform towards his deceased brother the most sacred offices of love, but, by refusing to do so, he openly declared his dislike to the widow, and thus publicly insulted her. The symbolic manner in which she took away in the public court his right to her and his deceased brother's possession, has its origin in the fact that the possession of property was claimed by planting the foot on it. Hence, when the transfer of property was effected by an amicable transaction, the original owner signified the renunciation of his rights by taking off his shoe and giving it to the new possessor (Ruth iv, 7, 8). A similar custom obtained among the Indians (Benary, *De Hebræorum Leviratu*, Berol. 1835, p. 14) and the ancient Germans (Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 156). In the case before us, however, where the privilege of possession was not renounced by a mutual understanding, but involved insult both to the deceased brother and the surviving widow, the outraged sister-in-law snatched the right from him by pulling off his shoe.

3. That this patriarchal law—which, as we have seen, was incorporated in the Mosaic gamology—continued in its full force after the Captivity, is evident from Matthew (xxii, 25–27), Mark (xii, 19–23), and Luke (xx, 28–33). From the question put to our Saviour in these passages, it will be seen that it was incumbent upon each surviving brother in succession to perform the duty of the *Levir*. There were, however, cases where this duty could not be performed, about which the Mosaic law gives no directions whatever—e. g. when the deceased brother's widow was a near relation of the *Levir* and came within the proscribed degrees, of which the Mishna (*Jebamoth*, i, 1) gives fifteen cases; or when the latter was a child when his brother died and left a widow without issue (ii, 3); and if he were on this or any other account exempt from the obligation to marry one of the widows, he was also from the obligation to marry any of them (i, 1); it is also implied that it was only necessary for one brother to marry one of the widows in cases where there were several widows left. The marriage was not to take place within three months of the husband's death (iv, 10). The eldest brother ought to perform the duty of marriage; but, on his declining it, a younger brother might do it (ii, 8; iv, 5). The *chalitsah* was regarded as involving future relationship, so that a man who had received it could not marry the widow's relations within the prohibited degrees (iv, 7). Special rules are laid down for cases where a woman married under a false impression as to her husband's death (x, 1), or where a mistake took place as to whether her son or her husband died first (x, 3), for in the latter case the Levirate law would not apply: and, again, as to the evidence of the husband's death to be produced in certain cases (cap. 15, 16). There can, therefore, be no question that the administrators of the law in the time of the prophets and at the advent of our Saviour had to define and supplement the Levirate law. As the space of this article does not permit us to enumerate these important definitions and enactments, we must refer to the Mishna, Tract *Jebamoth*, which derives its name (יבמות) from the fact that it embodies these laws. These descend into trivial distinctions—e. g. that

the shoe was to be of leather, or a sandal furnished with a heel-strap; a felt shoe, or a sandal without a strap, would not do (*Yebam.* xii, 1, 2). The *chalitsah* was not valid when the person performing it was deaf and dumb (xii, 4), as he could not learn the precise formula which accompanied the act. The custom is retained by the modern Jews, and is minutely described by Picart (*Cérémonies Religieuses*, i, 243). It receives illustration from the expression used by the modern Arabs in speaking of a repudiated wife: "She was my slipper. I have cast her off" (Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 113). It only remains to be remarked that the fear lest the performance of the duty of *Levir* should come into collision with the law of consanguinity, made the ancient rabbins declare that (חליצה קודם ליבום) the ceremony of taking off the shoe is preferable to marrying the widow, and thus virtually set aside Levirate marriages. As this ceremony, which is called *Chalitsah* (חליצה from חלץ, *to draw out, to pull off*), supersedes the ancient law, the rabbins gave very minute orders about the manner in which it is to be performed. The ceremony is performed in the synagogue after morning prayer, in the presence of three rabbis and two witnesses, attended by others of the congregation as auditors and spectators. The Levir and widow are called forward, and after being questioned by the principal rabbi, and avowing his determination not to marry her, the man puts on a shoe of a peculiar form and made for this purpose, and the woman repeats, "My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother." To which the Levir replies, "I like not to take her." Upon this declaration the widow unties the shoe with her right hand, takes it off, throws it on the ground, and spits before him, saying in Hebrew, "So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house: and his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed;" when the persons present exclaim three times, "His shoe is loosed!" This concludes the ceremony, and the rabbi tells the widow that she is now at liberty to marry whom she pleases.

IX. In considering the *social and domestic conditions of married life* among the Hebrews, we must, in the first place, take into account the position assigned to women generally in their social scale. The seclusion of the *harem*, and the habits consequent upon it, were utterly unknown in early times, and the condition of the Oriental woman, as pictured to us in the Bible, contrasts most favorably with that of her modern representative. There is abundant evidence that women, whether married or unmarried, went about with their faces unveiled (Gen. xii, 14; xxiv, 16, 65; xxix, 11; 1 Sam. i, 13). An unmarried woman might meet and converse with men, even strangers, in a public place (Gen. xxiv, 24, 45–7; xxix, 9–12; 1 Sam. ix, 11); she might be found alone in the country without any reflection on her character (Deut. xxii, 25–27); or she might appear in a court of justice (Numb. xxvii, 2). Women not unfrequently held important offices: some were prophetesses, as Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Noadiah, and Anna; of others advice was sought in emergencies (2 Sam. xiv, 2; xx, 16–22). They took their part in matters of public interest (Exod. xv, 20; 1 Sam. xviii, 6, 7); in short, they enjoyed as much freedom in ordinary life as the women of our own country.

If such was her general position, it is certain that the wife must have exercised an important influence in her own home. She appears to have taken her part in family affairs, and even to have enjoyed a considerable amount of independence. For instance, she entertains guests at her own desire (2 Kings iv, 8) in the absence of her husband (Judg. iv, 18), and sometimes even in defiance of his wishes (1 Sam. xxv, 14, etc.); she disposes of her child by a vow without any reference to her husband (1 Sam. i, 24); she consults with him as to the marriage of her children (Gen. xxvii, 46); her suggestions as to any domestic arrangements meet with due attention (2 Kings iv, 9); and occasionally she criticises the conduct of her husband in terms of great severity (1 Sam. xxv, 25; 2 Sam. vi, 20).

The relations of husband and wife appear to have been characterized by affection and tenderness. He is occasionally described as the "friend" of his wife (Jer. iii, 20; Hos. iii, 1), and his love for her is frequently noticed (Gen. xxiv, 67; xxix, 18). On the other hand, the wife was the consolation of the husband in time of trouble (Gen. xxiv, 67), and her grief at his loss presented a picture of the most abject woe (Joel i, 8). No stronger testimony, however, can be afforded as to the ardent affection of husband and wife than that which we derive from the general tenor of the book of Canticles. At the same time we cannot but think that the exceptions to this state of affairs were more numerous than is consistent with our ideas of matrimonial happiness. One of the evils inseparable from polygamy is the discomfort arising from the jealousies and quarrels of the several wives, as instanced in the households of Abraham and Elkanah (Gen. xxi, 11; 1 Sam. i, 6). The purchase of wives, and the small amount of liberty allowed to daughters in the choice of husbands, must inevitably have led to unhappy unions. The allusions to the misery of a contentious and brawling wife in the Proverbs (xix, 13; xxi, 9, 19; xxvii, 15) convey the impression that the infliction was of frequent occurrence in Hebrew households, and in the Mishna (*Ketub.* vii, 6) the fact of a woman being noisy is laid down as an adequate ground for divorce. In the N. T. the mutual relations of husband and wife are a subject of frequent exhortation (Eph. v, 22–33; Col. iii, 18, 19; Tit. ii, 4, 5; 1 Pet. iii, 1–7): it is certainly a noticeable coincidence that these exhortations should be found exclusively in the epistles addressed to Asiatics, nor is it improbable that they were more particularly needed for them than for Europeans.

The duties of the wife in the Hebrew household were multifarious. In addition to the general superintendence of the domestic arrangements, such as cooking, from which even women of rank were not exempted (Gen. xviii, 6; 2 Sam. xiii, 8), and the distribution of food at meal-times (Prov. xxxi, 15), the manufacture of the clothing and the various textures required in an Eastern establishment devolved upon her (Prov. xxxi, 13, 21, 22); and if she were a model of activity and skill, she produced a surplus of fine linen shirts and girdles, which she sold, and so, like a well-freighted merchant-ship, brought in wealth to her husband from afar (Prov, xxxi, 14, 24). The poetical description of a good housewife drawn in the last chapter of the Proverbs is both filled up and in some measure illustrated by the following minute description of a wife's duties towards her husband, as laid down in the Mishna: "She must grind corn, and bake, and wash, and cook, and suckle his child, make his bed, and work in wool. If she brought her husband one bondwoman, she need not grind, bake, or wash; if two, she need not cook nor suckle his child; if three, she need not make his bed nor work in wool; if four, she may sit in her chair of state" (*Ketub.* v, 5). Whatever money she earned by her labor belonged to her husband (vi, 1). The qualification not only of working, but of working *at home* (Tit. ii, 5, where οἰκουργούς is preferable to οἰκουρούς), was insisted on in the wife, and to spin in the street was regarded as a violation of Jewish customs (*Ketub.* vii, 6).

The legal rights of the wife are noticed in Exod. xxi, 10, under the three heads of food, raiment, and duty of marriage or conjugal right. These were defined with great precision by the Jewish doctors, for thus only could one of the most cruel effects of polygamy be averted, viz. the sacrifice of the rights of the many in favor of the one whom the lord of the modern *harem* selects for his special attention. The regulations of the Talmudists, founded on Exod. xxi, 10, may be found in the Mishna (*Ketub.* v, 6–9).

X. The *allegorical and typical* allusions to marriage have exclusive reference to one subject, viz. to exhibit the spiritual relationship between God and his people. The earliest form, in which the image is implied, is in the expressions "to go a whoring," and "whoredom," as descriptive of the rupture of that relationship by acts of idolatry. These expressions have by some writers been taken in their primary and literal sense, as pointing to the licentious practices of idolaters. But this destroys the whole point of the comparison, and is opposed to the plain language of Scripture: for (1) Israel is described as the false wife "playing the harlot" (Isa. i, 21; Jer. iii, 1, 6, 8); (2) Jehovah is the injured husband, who therefore divorces her (Psa. lxxiii, 27; Jer. ii, 20; Hos. iv, 12; ix, 1); and (3) the other party in the adultery is specified, sometimes generally, as idols or false gods (Deut. xxxi, 16; Judg. ii, 17; 1 Chron. v, 25; Ezek. xx, 30; xxiii, 30), and sometimes particularly, as in the case of the worship of goats (A.V. "devils," Lev. xvii, 7), Molech (Lev. xx, 5), wizards (Lev. xx, 6), an ephod (Judg. viii, 27), Baalim (Judg. viii, 33), and even the heart and eyes (Numb. xv, 39)—the last of these objects being such as wholly to exclude the idea of actual adultery. The image is drawn out more at length by Ezekiel (chap. xxiii), who compares the kingdoms of Samaria and Judah to the harlots Aholah and Aholibah; and again by Hosea (chap. i, iii), whose marriage with an adulterous wife, his separation from her, and subsequent reunion with her, were designed to be a visible lesson to the Israelites of their dealings with Jehovah.

The direct comparison with marriage is confined in the O. T. to the prophetic writings, including the Canticles as an allegorical work. See CANTICLES. The actual relation between Jehovah and his people is generally the point of comparison (Isa. liv, 5; lxii, 4; Jer. iii, 14; Hos. ii, 19; Mal. ii, 11); but sometimes the graces consequent thereon are described under the image of bridal attire (Isa. xlix, 18; lxi, 10), and the joy of Jehovah in his Church under that of the joy of a bridegroom (Isa. lxii, 5).

In the N. T. the image of the bridegroom is transferred from Jehovah to Christ (Matt. ix, 15; John iii, 29), and that of the bride to the Church (2 Cor. xi, 2; Rev. xix, 7; xxi, 2, 9; xxii, 17), and the comparison thus established is converted by St. Paul into an illustration of the position and mutual duties of man and wife (Eph. v, 23–32). The suddenness of the Messiah's appearing, particularly at the last day, and the necessity of watchfulness, are inculcated in the parable of the Ten Virgins, the imagery of which is borrowed from the customs of the marriage-ceremony (Matt. xxv, 1–13). The Father prepares the marriage-feast for his Son, the joys that result from the union being thus represented (Matt. xxii, 1–14; xxv, 10; Rev. xix, 9; comp. Matt. viii, 11), while the qualifications requisite for admission into that union are prefigured by the marriage-garment (Matt. xxii, 11). The breach of the union is, as before, described as fornication or whoredom in reference to the mystical Babylon (Rev. xvii, 1, 2, 5).

XI. *Literature.*—The most important ancient literature on all the marriage questions is contained in the third order (סדר) of the *Mishna*, five tractates of which treat respectively—1. On the Levirate law; 2. On the marriage-instrument; 3. On suspicion of having violated the marriage-bond; 4. On divorce; and, 5. On betrothal. To these must be added the Gemaras or Talmuds on these tractates. Maimonides devotes six tractates of the second volume of his *Jad Ha-Chazaka* to Biblical and Talmudic gamology, giving an abridgment of the traditional enactments. Jacob ben-Asher occupies the entire third volume of his *Tur*, called *Eben Ha-Ezar*, with marriage in its various ramifications, and gives a lucid epitome of the ancient code. Of modern writers are to be mentioned Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, i, 450 sq.; ii, 1 sq.; Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, ii, 735 sq.; by the same author, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, ii, 173 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthümer der Volkes Israel*, p. 218 sq.; Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* (Frankfort-on-the-Main), iv, 36 sq., 345 sq.; *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (Breslau, 1862), i, 19 sq., 253 sq.; Stein and Süsskind's *Israelitischer Volkslehrer*, i, 192; iv, 282, 301, 315; v, 323; vi, 74; vii, 264; viii, 73; ix, 171; Frankel, *Grundlinien des Mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts* (Breslau, 1860); Leopold Löw, *Ben Chananja*, vol. iii–vi. Among the writers on special points we may notice Benary, *De Hebr. Leviratu* (Berlin, 1835); Redslob's *Leviratsehe* (Leipz. 1836); and Kurtz's *Ehe des Hosea* (Dorpat, 1859). See WOMAN.

MARRIAGE, CHRISTIAN. The word is derived through the French *mari*, from the Latin *maritus*, "a husband." *Matrimony*, a synonyme, comes from the Latin *mater*, "a mother," as *testimonium* from *testis*, "a witness." *Wedlock*, a beautiful word, is of Anglo-Saxon origin, from *weddian*, "to pledge," "to covenant;" or *wedd*, "a pledge," and *lac*, "a gift." The definition of marriage given by Modestinus, the Roman lawyer and scholar of Ulpian, is as follows: "Nuptiæ sunt conjunctio maris et feminæ et consortium omnis vitæ, divini et humani juris communicatio" (*Digest*, xviii, 2, 1). In the Institutes of Justinian we have "nuptiæ sive matrimonium est viri et mulieris conjunctio individuam vitæ consuetudinem continens," that is, a union of a man and a woman which contains in itself an inseparable life-intercourse. These definitions are not entirely definite, nor free from objection; nor is it easy for the *law* to give a definition of that which transcends the sphere of human rights, and has most important relations to morality and religion.

According to Paley, the public use of the marriage institution consists in its promoting the following beneficial effects: 1. The private comfort of individuals. 2. The production of the greatest number of healthy children, their better education, and the making of due provision for their settlement in life. 3. The peace of human society, in cutting off a principal source of contention, by assigning one or more women to one man, and protecting his exclusive right by sanctions of morality and law. 4. The better government of society, by distributing the community into separate families, and appointing over each the authority of a master of a family, which has more actual influence than all civil authority put together. 5. The additional security which the state receives for the good behavior of its citizens, from the solicitude they feel for the welfare of their children, and from their being confined to permanent habitations. 6. The encouragement of industry. (See also Dwight's *Theology* on this topic, and Anderson, *On the Domestic Constitution.*)

I. The idea of marriage is beautifully expressed in those words of the earliest book of the Bible: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh." Here we have (1) marriage conceived of as a union so close that it separates a man from the union of the family—the closest but this one that can exist; (2) two persons cleave to one another, the word *cleave* in the original denoting to be glued to, to stick to; (3) the result is that they become one flesh, they unite their personalities together. A text like this points to monogamy as alone answering to the true conception of marriage; for how can two be one flesh, and one of them be also united to a third person, so as to be one flesh with that one also. Accordingly the union of one man and one woman in the married state, as opposed to polygamy, must be regarded as the state pointed out by our nature for us. This alone preserves the unity, the undivided love and peace of the household. Polygamy is an institution growing out of the servile subjection of the woman to the man, and out of the indulgence of lewd desire. It is also apparently contrary to the order of things in this, that the sexes, so obviously made for one another, divide between them about equally the numbers of those who are born into the world, there being a slight excess in the number of male children,

which is counterbalanced before manhood is reached by the greater risks incurred by that sex. The conditions which secure the interests of morality are thus pointed out by the laws of our physical nature.

The conception of marriage which appears in the writings of Paul has sometimes been said to be a low one, as having respect to the gratification of bodily desires rather than to the true, spiritual, and heart communion of the wedded pair. This charge is founded on such passages as 1 Cor. vii, 9: "It is better to marry than to burn;" and on those verses in the same chapter where there appears to be a certain preference in the apostle's mind of the single to the married life (ver. 33, 38, etc.). It must be confessed that if such a passage as ver. 9 were the apostle's *only* expression of opinion, it would seem as if he saw nothing in marriage but the prevention of sexual excesses and the satisfaction of sexual longings. It ought, however, to be considered, *first*, that in such words he gives us but one side of a manifold subject. Christian, like all true moralists, must take into account the desires which are implanted in our nature for the purpose of securing certain great ends, among which the introduction of new beings into the world is most prominent. If, as men showed themselves to the apostle, the sexual desires needed a certain control, and a certain satisfaction also, it was good sense to say that a reason for marrying lay in the temperament of the particular person, and that he was bound to consider his power of continence when he inquired what his duty was in this respect. But, *secondly*, the apostle gives us another picture of marriage, from another point of view. The relation (Ephes. v, 22–33) is like that of Christ to his Church. The husband is to love the wife as if she actually formed one body with him, and with that pure, self-sacrificing affection which Christ had when he "loved his Church, and gave himself for it." Here marriage is ennobled and glorified by a comparison with the most spiritual of all relations. But, *thirdly*, neither in the writings of the apostle nor in any other part of the New Testament is there any peculiar sanctity attached to the married life placing it above the single, nor to the single life making it more excellent than the married. The apostle condemns the false teachings of those who forbid men to marry, and command to abstain from meats, "which God has created to be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. iv, 3). His principle would include marriage — for which multitudes give thanks — under this last remark. At the same time the New Testament regards celibacy as equally honorable with marriage (Matt. xiv, 13). Nay more, if a person, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, can lead a life of pure thoughts, undisturbed by any sensual longings, absorbed in spiritual employments and pursuits, he may be said to have a rare nature, or a rare gift to rise above nature; and so he will stand higher in the kingdom of heaven than another, in proportion to the greatness of his self-sacrifice and his consecration. All men are not bound to "forsake houses, or brethren, or sisters," etc., for Christ's name's sake, but those who have the call to do so and obey "shall receive a hundred-fold." So those who lead a single life under the same high motive shall have the greater praise from the Master; and, as they show by their self-denial the strength of Christian virtue, they stand higher in the Christian scale than others. But so do they also who show a readiness to undergo, or actually undergo, any great sacrifice with the same spirit. (Comp. Harless, *Christl. Ethik*, § 44, and especially § 52.)

If the Christian Church had stopped at admiring the continence and rare self-restraint of men who for Christ's sake led unmarried lives, much evil would have been avoided. As it was, the Christian mind passed on from such admiration to an undervaluation of the married life; celibacy was a sign of greater virtue; second marriages were looked on with disfavor; and marriages of clergymen became unlawful. The heretics Marcion and Tatian went even so far as to rail against marriage; as Simon Magus is said, on the other hand, to have taught in his day a plurality of wives, and the Gnostics and Manichæans rejected marriage altogether. But what was really the view of the early Church is best seen in the canons of the Gangran Synod, held about A.D. 370, where it is decreed: "1. If any one reproach marriage, or have in abomination the religious woman that is a communicant and sleeps with her husband, as one that cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema. 4. If any one condemn a married presbyter, as if he ought not to partake of the oblation when he performs the liturgy, let him be anathema. 9. If any one live a virgin, or in chastity, as abominating marriage (while he lives in a retired state), and not for the beauty and sanctity of a virgin life, let him be anathema. 10. If one of those who live a virgin life for the Lord's sake insult those who are married, let him be anathema. 14. If any woman, abominating marriage, desert her husband, and will become a recluse, let her be anathema." (See also Isaac Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*.) At this very same time, however, marriage became a sacrament. One may ask how it came to pass that a kind of life which was looked on as being not the best one, and which had to be renounced in the Western Church if a married man would receive ordination, could come into the category of baptism, the eucharist, and the other acts which, in process of time, took the name of sacraments. Without going into an extended answer to this question, it may be said that the passage of Paul already cited (Ephes. v, 32) calls it a *mystery*, which Jerome's Vulgate renders by *sacramentum*. It was, in fact, peculiarly holy, as symbolizing Christ's union with the Church. But the word *sacramentum* had for a long time no definite sense, and marriage was not so called until the time of Augustine. Nay, that great writer had so vague an idea of its religious meaning that he does not hesitate to call the polygamous marriage of the patriarchs in the Old Testament a "sacramentum pluralium nuptiarum" (*De bono conjugii*, cap. 18), which, he says, "signified a future multitude subject to God in all the nations of the earth, and so the sacrament of a single marriage [i. e. between one pair] in our time signifies the unity of all ours [our Christian Church], which is to be subject to God in the one celestial city." The passage itself, however, in the Ephesians, which we have referred to, does not, in a fair interpretation of it, call marriage a mystery, but gives that name only to Christ's leaving the Father and becoming one with his Church. As for the rest, the Catholic theologians have held widely diverse opinions about the *matter* and *form* of marriage. One opinion has been that the *consent* of the parties expressed in words constitute both the *matter* and the *form;* another that the bodies or persons of the contracting parties are the *matter*, and the words expressing consent the *form*. See MATRIMONY.

Marriage being a peculiarly sacred transaction, and having the religious impress put on it, questions relating to its celebration, the persons capable of contracting it, its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties, and the like, came under the control of the clergy. Accordingly we find in use in the early Church a special ecclesiastical form for the celebration of matrimony. The fathers, Tertullian, e. g., considered marriage contracted without the participation of the Church, as tolerated by the law of Rome, as almost a sin. Later it was sought to make marriage an *exclusively* religious institution, and this it finally became, and so continued until the days of the Reformation. The civil law gradually restricted itself to the regulation of the material interests connected with marriage, leaving the Church to regulate the conditions under which it could be contracted. As gradually the religious impress put on it brought to the door of the clergy the settlement of questions relating not only to its celebration, but also to the propriety of its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties,

and the like, the State was content to lend the Church the secular arm for the enforcement of the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts. The principles of the law concerning marriage thus became a part of canon law in the Romish Church, and received final settlement by the Council of Trent, which not only established marriage as a sacrament in the most solemn manner (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 24, *Mat.* can. 1: "Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicæ sacramentis a Christo institutum, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum neque gratiam conferre: anath. sit;" see also I, can. 7, *Cat. Rom.* 2, 8, 3, 23, 20 sq.; *Conf. orthod.* p. 183), but referred the question of its validity exclusively to the Church. The remains of these and similar laws have almost disappeared in Protestant England in our own times; the act of 1857 (cited as 20 and 21 Vict. cap. 85), with its amendments, destroys all jurisdiction of courts ecclesiastical in matters pertaining to marriage, except so far as marriage licenses are concerned, and constitutes a new court, which is called the court for divorce and matrimonial causes. See Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation* (New York, 1869), p. 174–178.

The Continental Reformers from the first denied the sacramental character of marriage. They acknowledged, indeed, matrimony as holy and instituted of God, yet considered it as partaking more of a civil than of an ecclesiastical character—as an institution which received only a higher consecration by the blessing of the Church. They even required the Protestant civil authorities to legislate on the subject, and thus it passed entirely into the hands of the latter. The new laws were promulgated in the 16th and 17th centuries, yet all still referred to Scripture, the symbolic books, and canon law as their basis; and, being generally drawn up with the assistance of the clergy, the Church still retained the higher authority over all questions pertaining to matrimony. In all Protestant countries at present, as far as we are informed, marriage is essentially controlled by the law of the state, although the solemnization of it may be put into the hands of clerical persons. In Catholic countries there is a tendency to establish two kinds of marriage celebrations—one a *civil*, the other an *ecclesiastical* one; but all the civil consequences of marriage, in relation to property, legitimation of children, bigamy, etc., grow out of the civil marriage, and the other (or ecclesiastical) is left to the option of the parties. The Catholic Church endures this with great unwillingness; and in this feeling the Concordat between Austria and the pope did away with the civil contract, which was restored to its former place in the laws in 1869 (comp. Richter, *Kirchenr.* § 263, 6th ed.). We thus are brought to the question of the relations of the state in right reason to the marriage-contracts of its citizens. Here, before touching the particulars that are within the province of state-law, we wish to make two points in regard to the office of the state: 1. Marriage is a contract, because it is an agreement between two persons to live together in the condition of life called matrimony. But, while in most other cases the contract *creates* or *specifies* the transaction, in the contract of marriage the matter of the contract is *presupposed*, and the contract has nothing to do except to introduce two persons into a definite specific state. Out of this grows the peculiar state of *parentage*. This, it seems to us, is one of the greatest points in hand against the institution of "Free-love." The *resultant* of the marital relation is of a character that does not admit of the dissolution of the contract when once it has been entered into. The offspring requires the care of *both* the contractors, as is clearly seen in the case of second marriages with children from the first contract. Thus there can be no contract to enter into a marriage state which is terminable by the consent of the parties, or dependent on the pleasure of either. There may be partnerships of this kind, as contracts of service or of agency, for the performance of specific acts for a specific time, but there are no such contracts of marriage. This institution is unlike the passing business relations of life, and resembles the Church and State unions more closely, although not entirely. The reason for all this is the moral nature of the institution, and its immense importance as the foundation of the family as well as the origin of the state. In this sense the Roman law correctly proclaimed marriage a "viri et mulieris conjunctio individuam vitæ consuetudinem continens" (to which canon law adds, "i. e. talem se in omnibus exhibere viro, qualis ipsa sibi est, et e converso"), or a "consortium omnis vitæ, divini et humani juris communicatio." Quite a different tendency, however, is found in the attempts of some modern philosophers to establish *free-marriage*, as e. g. the St. Simonites (q. v.), who would overthrow all these laws, and make marriage a mere human convention subject to all the whims of the contracting parties, and who have failed hitherto from this very cause, as has also the pretended emancipation of woman which has gone hand in hand with it. The higher nature of marriage over any other human institution at once manifests itself not only in the fact that it has at all times been connected with religion, both as to its contracting and dissolving, but that this view has been in no wise confined to Christendom, but in a great degree has taken a like hold upon heathen communities also.

2. Our other point is that on account of the moral and religious bearings of marriage, State and Church have concurrent power over it; that is, they both may act and lay down principles in regard to matrimonial questions. How are their provinces to be distinguished? In this way, as it seems to us: The State can require nothing which the Word of God forbids in a Christian country, although it may forbid what the Word of God does not forbid. The Church can allow nothing, permitted by the law, which the Word of God forbids. For illustration, we may suppose the State to have very loose divorce laws, or to have no penalty for concubinage during regular marriage; it is evident that the Church must keep its members pure in such respects, until its protest, loud or silent, shall change the current of legislation.

II. These things being premised, we proceed to a brief discussion of some of those points relating to marriage which may be reasonably made the subjects of legislation without violating the feelings of Christians or opposing the authority of the Scriptures.

1. The State may decide who shall be capable of contracting marriage. Thus (*a*) the age at which, or the state of the will or reason with which a matrimonial engagement may be legally made, is as much within the control of the law as the similar conditions necessary for making business contracts or for exercising political rights. If minors are allowed to enter into this condition, the law ought to provide that their free consent is ascertained beforehand. Thus, too, incapacity to give consent, by reason of immaturity, force on the will, insanity, idiocy, and the like, may be obstacles. But (*b*) far more important is the control of state-law over the degrees of relationship and affinity which shall incapacitate parties from entering into this close connection. Here we find that, although the children of the first pair must have united in wedlock, it became the very decided feeling of a large part of the human race that such a union is unlawful for brothers with sisters, or for a parent with a child. H. W. J. Thiersch (*Das Verbot der Ehe* [Nördlingen, 1869], p. 4) remarks that wild heathen tribes in Asia and Africa consider incest a crime. Exceptions to this occurred in Persia and Egypt, where incest was practiced within the reigning families—in the latter country after the example of Isis and Osiris. At Athens a brother might marry a sister who had not the same mother, and adoption was no obstacle to the union of an adopted brother and sister. The Romans were more strict, but allowed this relation to commence between an adopted brother and his adopted sister, after the adoption was dissolved by emancipation. By Ro-

man law a man could not marry his *sister's* daughter, but when the emperor Claudius took Agrippina, his *brother's* daughter, to wife, that relation became permissible (see Gaii *Instit.* i, § 61, 62). By Levitical law the prohibited degrees embraced the direct relatives in the ascending and descending line, whether of full or of half blood, the children who had the same parents or parent, the brothers or sisters of fathers or mothers, brothers' wives, daughters-in-law, a woman and her daughter, or other descendant in the third generation, and the sister of a wife during her lifetime. It would seem that in Lev. xviii, where these rules are given, the analogy derived from relations there mentioned may be applied to others equally close, of which nothing is said (comp. Saalschütz, *Mos. Recht*, cap. 105, § 5). In the Christian Church a stricter system of prohibited degrees was a part of canonical law, and a sign of the new feeling was that the emperor Theodosius I forbade by law the marriage of first cousins, which was formerly by Roman law permitted. The Roman Catholic and the Greek churches went far beyond this. The Latin Church carried the prohibition of marriage to the seventh degree, that is, to the sixth cousins—counting brothers and sisters as of the first degree, and first cousins as of the second—until Innocent III, in 1216, gave a new rule, that the "prohibitio copulæ conjugalis *quartum* consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradum non excedat"—that is, third cousins might marry; but a little while after Gregory IX so modified Innocent's rule that a marriage between a third and a fourth cousin was allowable. Where pressing reasons demanded, these rules might be suspended. More severe and worthless were the rules prohibiting marriage, on the ground of affinity, which reached to the same degrees with the rules affecting blood-relatives, and were altered together with them. Other restrictions touching spiritual affinities, betrothal, etc., were mitigated by the Council of Trent. According to the canons of the Greek Church, a man may not marry—

His second cousin's daughter.
His deceased wife's first cousin.
His deceased wife's first cousin's daughter.
His deceased wife's second cousin.

Two brothers may not marry—

Two sisters.
An aunt and a niece.
Two first cousins.

A man may not marry—

His wife's brother's wife's sister, i. e. his brother-in-law's sister-in-law.
His brother-in-law's wife: nor can his own brother marry her.

Godparentage and *Adoption* constitute impediments to marriage up to the seventh degree. See AFFINITY. What was the feeling lying at the bottom of all these prohibitions? It must have been that which led the Roman lawyer Gaius (*l. c.* § 59) to say that if such persons as parents and children marry one another *nefarias atque incestas nuptias contraxisse dicuntur*. Incest is the greatest unchastity, from which its Latin name comes, and men early felt this. If the children of the first parent did not partake of this sentiment, there is a parallel in the feelings of little children, whose modesty is developed just at the time of life when it is needed for a moral protection. Besides this moral principle, it might be urged that to marry out of one's near relationship binds families together, and diffuses the feeling of brotherhood through neighborhoods and tribes. This is urged by Augustine (*Civit. Dei*, xv, cap. 16). Another consideration is, that the marriage of near relations promotes neither the health nor the multitude of offspring. In a letter imputed to Gregory the Great (A.D. 601), written to his missionary in England, Augustine, he is made to say, while speaking of the marriages of own cousins, "We have learned from experience that from such a marriage offspring cannot grow" (Gratian's *Decr. caus.* xxxv, quæst. 5, c. 2). This is in conformity with a physical law which governs the issue of animals. Nay, plants themselves, it is now known, are benefited by the pollen of one flower being conveyed to another, and it is the office of insects, such as bees and flies, to mediate in this keeping up the "breeds" of the vegetable kingdom. (*c*) Besides enacting laws against the marriage of blood-relations, states have sometimes prohibited men from connecting themselves with women who sustain towards them the closest degrees of affinity. Some Protestant countries make it unlawful to marry a wife's sister. There are no valid arguments against such unions from Scripture, but rather, when it is said (Lev. xviii, 18) that a man shall not have two sisters together as his wives, the fair inference is that Jewish law allowed marriage to one of them after the death of the other and preceding wife. Marriage to a brother's widow or deceased husband's brother is more doubtful. Yet in the canonical law, where such unions are forbidden, the pope can probably give a dispensation from the rule. Such was the case of Henry VIII of England, and a canon of the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv, *De sacr. matrim.* can. iii) ordains that if any one shall say that the Church cannot give a dispensation in the case of some of the prohibitions in Leviticus, ch. xviii, "anathema sit"—evidently referring to that very case which blew up such a flame in England.

On the whole, there are no *certi fines* within which the moral feeling and the law—which in this case is more or less controlled by such feeling—can be confined. We have a parallel to this in the definitions of certain rights, where the law has to make the positive and exact metes and bounds. Thus there is a time in the life of a child when he ought to acquire a jural capacity, and so become legally independent of his father; but whether this shall be reached at the age of eighteen or twenty-one, or shall be reached by degrees or all at once, the reason of a state must determine. So the moral feeling of a state must determine within what limits of consanguinity or of affinity parties may contract marriage; and if the Church has another prevailing sentiment, it must have its own rules prohibiting for its members what the state does not prohibit.

We will just mention, with little or no remark, several other hinderances which either State or Church law have put in the way of wedlock. Such are fraudulent representations of either party, which were leading causes of the contract of marriage; mistakes affecting the identity of the person; and previous crime of one party unknown to the other, especially previous adultery; to which is to be added difference of religious confessions, especially when so great as that between a Jew and a Christian, or a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. Indeed, in the case of *mixed marriages* (see below), there is still much conflict between the legislation of Church and State. Civil law in countries where slavery was allowed made all marriage unions between freemen and slaves unlawful. In some countries marriage between a noble and an ordinary citizen or peasant has been either forbidden or attended with civil disabilities, such as degradation of rank to the offspring. Here it may not be out of place to allude also to the regulations of the Romish Church in the case of persons who may have taken the vow of celibacy. If any such party have not yet entered the convent, pope Boniface VIII decided that marriage may be contracted; after having once entered the convent, the contract becomes illegal. Among Protestants, however, the taking of the vow of celibacy remains a question of conscience only. Another objection to marriage in the Roman Catholic Church is spiritual relationship, *cognatio spiritualis*, which prevents marriage between persons who have held one another at the baptismal font. In the 13th century this was made to include both the infant baptized and the children of the sponsors, as well as the sponsors themselves; but it has since been restricted. The Continental Reformers as early as the Smalcald articles declared against this impediment of the sponsors. In the Greek Church, as we have seen above, *Godparent-*

age and *adoption* constitute impediments up to the seventh degree.

2. In order to preserve the purity and peace of married life, the State has often passed rules making all sexual union of either the husband or the wife with a third party penal, and the Church will of course visit such offences of its members with severe discipline. Some states in their laws have punished the concubinage or illicit intercourse of a husband with an unmarried woman less severely than similar offences of a wife, or, it may be, has let them go unpunished. According to Roman law, adultery was a crime committed only with a married woman; but a wife, displeased with her husband's morals, could without difficulty obtain a divorce. Under English law adultery has not been treated as a public crime, the dealing with it being left to the ecclesiastical law, and "the temporal courts take no cognizance of it otherwise than as a private injury" (Blackstone's *Comment.* bk. iv, chap. 4). In our country it is visited with punishment according to law in almost all the states—New York, which has followed English law, and one or two other states, being exceptions; but it is safe to say that prosecutions for the crime of adultery are very rare indeed. The protection afforded by such laws is very small, except so far as they testify that society regards crimes against marriage as deserving of civil penalties.

3. The State, as the guardian of the family, as the protector of the wife's and the children's rights even against the husband and father, is bound, and has in no civilized country refused, to make laws touching the *patria postestas*—the husband's rights over and obligations towards the wife; his obligations especially to support his wife and children, and the amount of freedom he ought to have in transmitting his property. We do not intend to enter into this large subject, except so far as to say that there lies a feeling of the unity of family life at the foundation of all righteous law on these subjects, whatever may be the specific rules of this or that code. The family being one, the wife ought to be deprived no more than the children of a portion of a deceased husband's effects; so that the *right of testament* in his case, even if he acquired all his property himself, ought not to be absolutely free.

4. The moral feeling of the importance and sanctity of marriage lies also, in a measure, at the foundation of laws and usages regulating its commencement. Such are betrothal, the formal declaration before a registrar or other officer of an intention of marriage, the publication of the banns, the celebration or solemnization before witnesses and with appropriate formalities. Marriage having a religious side, it has been natural that the ministers of religion should have a part in its initial solemnities. But it is a great grievance that they are obliged—as the law of Prussia, we believe, requires of them—to unite in wedlock any persons who may by law be lawfully united, whether the minister's own views touching the lawfulness of marriage after divorce agree with those of the government or not; and it is another grievance when only the ministers of an establishment can solemnize nuptials. Civil marriage, on the other hand, as it exists in some Catholic countries, and marriage before a magistrate or justice of the peace, which is lawful to a great extent through the United States, have this great evil attending on them: that they look on the civil side of marriage exclusively. Surely that institution which is the foundation of the state, the guardian of children against evil influences until they can act their part in the state; in which, and in which alone love presides over the formation of character; from which, through the sympathies of kindred, chords run in all directions, binding and weaving society together, and where the seeds of religion are sown in the impressible heart—such an institution surely, which pagans feel to have a sacred quality, and place under the protection of their gods, ought to have a solemn beginning, so that the parties to be united in "holy matrimony," and the witnesses, may feel that it is a deeply-serious transaction—a relation not to be lightly assumed without forethought and preparation, and solemn consecration to one another, and earnest prayer to that God who has said that "they twain shall be one flesh."

III. When the Church takes a view of divorce different from that taken by the State, it cannot sanction the remarriage of a person whom it regards as bound by Christ's law to a former wife or husband. See DIVORCE.

1. Some of these obstacles to marriage are of such a nature that a marriage actually commenced in disregard of or in ignorance of the law ruling in such cases is a nullity. There is, however, a need of some formal proceeding by which the nullity is made manifest. There are others in which the innocent party may continue the marriage, and condone or consent to live with the offender; nor can such consent be afterwards withdrawn in order to make good a claim which has been once waived. Near relationship or affinity, the existence of a previous wife or husband, are instances of the first kind; impotence, mistake, previous misconduct, even fraudulent statements procuring marriage, are instances of the second. In the first case the marriage is void, in the second it is voidable. We are apt to call separations for either reason divorces, and our statutes in many state-codes group them with divorces properly so called; but there is a wide difference between separations on the ground that there had been no lawful marriage, and divorce proper on the ground of some event occurring after actual marriage. In the first case there was a form without the reality of marriage, and the court—civil or ecclesiastical—pronounced a decree of nullity, which did not affect the children nor the parties up to the time of the sentence. Being decided to have never been united in wedlock, they were free to enter into this union with third parties. See Woolsey, *On Divorce*, etc., p. 123, 124, and especially Richter's *Kirchenr.* § 266–284, 6th ed.; Göschen, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. iii, s. v. Ehe.

2. In regard to the lawfulness of remarriage in general, we must refer to the article on DIVORCE (*Christian Law of*) in this *Cyclopædia*. On the particular point of marrying again after a first wife's or husband's decease, we have room for a few remarks. That this is lawful in itself, and must be left to the conscience and the circumstances of individuals, there can be no question, after what the apostle Paul has said in Rom. vii, 1–3, and in 1 Tim. v, 14, in which latter passage "the younger women" evidently refers to the young widows just before spoken of. The apologist Athenagoras (§ 33, p. 172, edit. Otto) is both unscriptural and weak where he says that a second marriage is "decorous adultery," and applies the words of Christ (Matt. xix, 9) to such remarriages, adding that he who deprives himself of [or separates himself from] a former wife, even if she be dead, is a covert adulterer who transgresses the direction of God, since in the beginning God made one man and one woman. Similar views are entertained by Tertullian in his treatise *De monogamia*, which was written after he became a Montanist (comp. esp. cap. x); while in the treatise *Ad uxorem*, written before he left the Catholic Church, he does not condemn remarriage, although he praises widowhood. Most of the fathers, while, from the times of Hermas and of Clement of Alexandria, they regard remarriage as no sin, look on widowhood and the state of a widower as capable of higher virtue. Augustine thus expresses both opinions in his little work *De bono viduitatis*, written at the request of a widow named Juliana, whose daughter had chosen a virgin's life. "As the good thing of virginity which your daughter has chosen does not condemn your one marriage, so your widowhood does not condemn the second marriage of some one else. . . . Do not so extol your good thing as to accuse that which is not evil belonging to another, as if it were evil, but so much the more rejoice in your good, the more you perceive that not only evils are prevented by it, but that

it surpasses some good things in excellence. The evil things are adultery and fornication. Now from these illicit things she is far removed who by a free vow has bound herself, and thus has brought to pass not by the power of law, but by the purpose of love, that for her not even lawful things should be lâwful." See DIGAMISTS; CELIBACY.

3. But if the apostle Paul could even advise young widows to marry again, must not this be understood as if he thought this the less of two evils, and only necessary to save the persons in question from crime? How otherwise can we explain his directions that a bishop, and so also a deacon, must be the husband of one wife? (1 Tim. iii, 2, 12; Titus i, 6). Some have explained these directions as forbidding polygamy—that is, simultaneous polygamy, to speak technically—which would seem to imply that among the private members of the Church at Ephesus and in Crete such plurality of wives was allowed. But the words in 1 Tim. v, 9, where the qualification occurs that the aged *widow* in question must have been *the wife of one man*, forbid such an interpretation, for otherwise we should have to suppose that *polyandry* was practiced. The phrases are exactly of the same form in all the four cases, since in the last-mentioned verse the participle γεγονῖα is to be joined to "sixty years" (comp. Luke ii, 42). The sense, then, must be that the bishop, or deacon, or widow had not been married but once. Now this was a special precept suited to the state of life of the times, for in marrying more than once they might have obtained divorce—in their heathenish condition—or have married divorced persons contrary to the law of Christ. Of these irregularities, if they had married but once, there would be less probability.

IV. Many one-sided and erroneous opinions must arise when marriage is looked at only in one of its aspects or relations. Thus it may be said to exist *liberorum quærendorum causâ;* but if that is the only side on which we view it, we shall have to say that no marriages ought to be contracted when the woman is past the age of child-bearing. It may be put on the foundation of restraining and moderating those sexual desires which might otherwise imbrute men. But if this were the only reason for marriage, it would be at the best but a necessary evil. It may be said to be instituted for the happiness of the partners in the union; but if this were all, every disappointed man or woman ought to have an opportunity to place his or her affections on a new object. It may be said to be in idea the highest religious union, but a Christian wife has never felt it to be right for this reason to leave a husband merely because he is unconverted. We must, then, look at marriage on every side; on its jural, moral, and religious aspects; on its relations to sexual differences; to the birth and education of children; to its use in cementing the State together through the ties of kindred; to the love that will almost of course subsist between the married couple; to the field which it affords for the highest social and spiritual well-being of husband, wife, and family. It ought to be added also, as a point of no small importance, that the jural relations of marriage are determined by the moral convictions of men, and that thus Christianity, by purifying the moral sense, and by giving forth a nobler idea of marriage, has ennobled and strengthened civil law. Those nations have had the best moral habits where the sentiments regarding matrimony and the family were the most pure. Witness the Romans of the earlier ages, to whom divorce was unknown, and among whom the matron was chaste and frugal. The corruption of Roman morals first appeared, according to Horace, in the defilement of married life and the family:

> "Fecunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
> Primum inquinavere et genus et domos."

And so, if our Christianity is destined to decay, the loss will be soon shown in the family relations. Even now a race of women is springing up who seem to have caught their inspiration from some of the high dames—the Fulvias and Julias—of the expiring Roman republic.

The neglect to look at the religious and moral side of marriage is also doing great evil in this country. In fact, a state of things now exists which our fathers hardly dreamed of, and which makes reflecting men tremble for the future. Rash and ill-sorted marriages have always existed; but where divorce laws, so loose as to be opposed to the very idea of marriage, open an easy door to get out of an uncomfortable relation, the tendency is that parties will marry with divorce before their eyes, and that, instead of forbearance and patience, they will magnify their present evils, and give to one another only half a heart. In the old times there were few who did not look upon large families as a blessing; at present it is established beyond doubt that a multitude of women, in one part of the country, regard children as an evil to be prevented or avoided, and do actually use the means for such flagitious ends. See INFANTICIDE. Some of these women are communicants in Christian churches, as physicians assert who profess to know. This shows that the very notion of marriage in many minds is a degraded and a corrupting one—that this union is entered into as an honest way of gratifying the lowest desires of human beings, and for no higher purpose. Nor are there wanting representatives of these base views, who practice upon them in their communities and defend them before the world. Who will question that the extreme of ancient asceticism, which gave to the word chastity the sense of rigid abstinence, as we give to the word temperance the same perverted meaning, was infinitely nearer to the Christian standard, in fact to any respectable pagan standard of morals, than feelings which can tolerate such practices? That they can exist and even be common is an alarming sign for the future of our country. The conscience of men and women needs to be enlightened on a point of morals which can hardly be referred to from the pulpit. We ought not to hear Catholics twit the Protestantism of the country with winking at methods of preventing the increase of families. We ought to strike at that extravagance of living and showiness of dress which tempt the less wealthy to such things. We ought to hear from every quarter where the subject can be mentioned that "they who do such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (T. D. W.)

See Grove, *Mor. Phil.* ii, 470; Paley, *Mor. Phil.* vol. i, chap. viii, p. 339; Leslie, *Sermons on Marriage* (1702, 8vo); Fordyce, *Moral Philos.* (1769, 8vo); Delany, *Relative Duties* (1750, 8vo); Beattie, *Elem. Moral Science*, vol. ii; Bean, *Christian Minister's Advice to a Newmarried Couple* (Lond. 1793); *Guide to Domestic Happiness; Advantages and Disadvantages of the Married State;* Stennett, *On Domestic Duties;* Jay, *Essay on Marriage;* Doddridge, *Lect.* (8vo edit.) i, 225, 234, 265; Ryan, *Philosophy of Marriage, in its Social, Moral, and Physical Relations* (Lond. 1839, 12mo); Evans, *Christian Doctrine of Marriage* (Balt., Md., 1860, 8vo); Klee, *Die Ehe: eine dogmat.-archæol. Abhandl.; Tradition, ou histoire de l'église sur le sacrement de mariage; tirée des monumens les plus authentiques de chaque siècle tant l'orient que de l'occident* (Paris, 1725, 3 vols. 4to); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 325 sq.; ii, 111 sq., 242 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (see Index); Fry (John), *Marriage between Kindred* (1773, 8vo); *Marriage Rites, Customs, and Ceremonies of the Nations of the Universe* (Lond. 1824, 8vo); Wuttke, *Ethics* (transl. by Prof. Lacroix, N. Y. 1873, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 310 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 95 sq.; *Engl. Rev.* iii, 129; *Biblical Repository*, ii, 70 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, i, 283 sq.; *Fraser's Magazine*, xli, 112 sq.; (*Lond.*) *Quart. Rev.* lxxxv, 84 sq.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* x, 545; *Princet. Rev.* xv, 182, 420; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1866, p. 137; *Christian Remembr.* l, 130; *Evangel. Qu. Rev.* 1870, p. 482 sq.; *North Brit. Review*, xii, 286, 532; 1870, p. 267 sq.; *New Engl.* 1870 (July), p. 540; *Am. Qu. Congreg. Rev.* 1871, p. 627; *South. Rev.* 1871 (Jan.), art. v. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 458; iii, 666, art.

Ehe; and for early literature, Walch, *Bibl.*; and for English writers, especially sermons on this subject, Malcolm, *Theol. Index*, s. v. For modern *half* or *left-hand* matrimony in Christendom, see MORGANATIC MARRIAGE. For marriage as a *sacrament*, see MATRIMONY.

V. *Marriage with Believers.*—The importance of regulating the conjugal alliance on religious principles was, according to the record of the Old Testament, practically recognised at a very early period. Indeed, the corruption of manners which rendered the Flood necessary is directly traced to such mixed marriages (Gen. vi, 1–4). The intermixture, by marriage, of the professed servants and worshippers of God, with those by whom his authority was disowned, was first branded, and afterwards positively forbidden by divine authority; being denounced as an evil, the results of which were most injurious to the interests of religion, and which exposed those who fell into it to the condign and awful displeasure of the Most High (Exod. xxxiv, 16). Now, although there were *some* circumstances attending the marriages in this manner denounced which do not directly apply to the state of society in our own country (especially the circumstance that the people with whom such intercourse was forbidden were idolaters), yet there is much, as must be evident to every pious observer, that illustrates the sin and danger of forming so intimate and permanent a union in life with the ungodly. The general fact is hence clearly deducible that there is an influence in marriage strongly affecting the character, which demands from those who are anxious for moral rectitude and improvement much of caution as to the manner in which their affections are fixed; and that unequal alliances—alliances where the parties are actuated by different spiritual habits and desires, and where good is made to meet and combine with bad, encountering most imminently the danger of seduction and pollution—are guilty, unnatural, and monstrous. The expression of the divine authority, in application to the Jews, is to be regarded as comprehending the principle of his people in all ages, that *here* they ought not to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor to stand in the way of sinners.

What we thus are enabled to conclude from the Old Testament, will be still more distinctly exemplified from the New. The evangelical writings do not, indeed, frequently offer directions expressly on the subject of marriage, the point appearing rather to be assumed than argued, that in Christian marriage the husband and wife ought both, in the emphatic terms of the apostle Peter, to be and walk as being "heirs together of the grace of life." In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul applies himself to a question which seems at that time to have been agitated—whether Christians who, previous to their conversion, had contracted marriages with unbelievers, ought not to be actually divorced from the wives or husbands remaining in unbelief, because of the evil and peril attending the continuance of the alliance. Such an extreme, advocated by some, he considers as uncalled for (1 Cor. vii, 10–17). But, respecting the formation of a new matrimonial connection by a believer (the case taken being that of a believing widow, though the rule, of course, extends to all), this is the direction: "She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord" (1 Cor. vii, 39). Here is a simple proclamation, the force of which is permanent, and in submission to which Christians in every period should act. They are to marry "only in the Lord." They, being themselves "in the Lord"—united to the Lord Jesus by the divine Spirit, and possessing an interest in the redeeming blessings he has purchased—are to marry only on Christian principles, and, of course, only such as are thus also "in the Lord"—believer with believer, and with none else. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, which no sophism can evade or fritter away.

It would be easy to employ the attention further, on the general statements contained in the Word of God, respecting the character of separation from the world which ought to be sustained by his Church, the ends for which it is called, and the objects it is bound to perform; statements which all bear on the principle as to marriage, operating to enforce and to confirm it (see especially 2 Cor. vi, 14–18; vii, 1). But, without amplifying here, and satisfied that this principle receives, from the testimony already quoted, a convincing and solemn establishment, the reader is requested to ponder a truth, which is as indubitable as it ought to be impressive, namely, that marriages formed by Christians in violation of the religious design of the institute, and of the express principles of their religion, are connected with evils many and calamitous, most earnestly to be deprecated, and most cautiously to be avoided. Is it, indeed, to be expected, on the ground of religion, that an act can be committed against the expressed will of the Most High God without exposing the transgressor to the scourge of his chastisement? Is it to be expected, on the ground of reason, that an alliance can be formed between individuals whose moral attributes and desires are essentially incompatible without creating the elements of uneasiness, discord, and disappointment? Excited imagination and passion may delude with the belief of innocence and hope of escape, but religion and reason speak the language of unchangeable veracity, and are ever justified in the fulfilments of experience and of fact.

The operation of the evil results whose origin is thus deduced, is of course susceptible of modifications from several circumstances in domestic and social life; and, for many reasons, the degrees of public exhibition and of personal pressure may vary. 1. Yet it may be remarked uniformly, respecting these results—*they are such as deeply affect the character.* A reference has already been made to the moral influence of marriage, and as the marriages stigmatized under the patriarchal, and forbidden and punished under the Jewish dispensation, were obnoxious on account of the contamination into which they led the professed people of God, so are the marriages of Christians with worldlings in this age, *a worldly spirit being still the essence of idolatry* (James iv, 4; Col. iii, 5; 1 John ii, 15–17; Matt. vi, 24), the objects of censure and deprecation, because of the baneful effect they exert on those who are numbered among the redeemed of the Lord. Such marriages as these present constant and insinuating temptations to seduce Christians to worldly dispositions and pursuits; they enfeeble their spiritual energies; interfere with their communion with God; hinder their growth in the attainments of divine life; check and oppose their performance of duty and their pursuit of usefulness, in the family, the Church, and the world. There has probably never been known a forbidden marriage which, if its original character were continued, did not pollute and injure. Some instances have been most palpable and painful; nor can it be considered other than a truth, unquestionable and notorious, that whoever will so transgress invokes a very blighting of the soul. 2. It may be remarked respecting these results, again, *they are such as deeply affect happiness.* Christian character and Christian happiness are closely connected: if the one be hurt, the other will not remain untouched. And who sees not in the unhallowed alliance a gathering of the elements of sorrow? Are there not ample materials for secret and pungent accusations of conscience, that agitate the heart with the untold pangs of self-condemnation and remorse? Is there not reason for the bitterness of disappointment, and the sadness of foreboding fear, because the *best* intercourse is unknown—the *purest* affection is impossible—the *noblest* union is wanting—and the being on whom the spirit would repose is, to all that is the sweetest and most sublime in human sympathies, human joys, and human prospects, an alien and a stranger? And what must be the horror of that anticipation which sets forth the event of a final separation at the bar of God, when, while the hope of personal salvation may be preserved, the partner of the bosom is seen

as one to be condemned by the Judge, and banished with everlasting destruction from his presence and the glory of his power! Oh the infatuation of the folly which leads to unite, where evils like these are created, rather than where God will sanction, and where time and eternity will both combine to bless! 3. Its effects upon what may be regarded as the supreme end of the marriage relation, *the religious education of children*, is another most distressing consideration. What *must* it be! What *has* it ever been! That much injury, therefore, has arisen to the *public* interests of the Church of Christ from this transgression cannot be doubted. Injury done to individual character is injury done to the community to which the individual is attached. It has always been a fact, that whoever sins in the household of faith, sins not only against himself, but against others; and that *this* transgression is one peculiarly extended in its influence, operating more than, perhaps, any one else which can be named to bring religion from its vantage ground, to clog its progress, and to retard its triumph. See *Cong. Mag.* May, 1831; *Malcolm on the Christian Rule of Marriage;* H. More's *Cœlebs in Search of a Wife.*

VI. *Marriage Ceremonies.*—In the early Christian Church marriages were to be notified to the bishop or society, and in the first centuries were solemnized by the clergy, but with very many exceptions. Much was borrowed from the customs of the Roman law. Banns were required about the 12th century. See BANNS. No prescribed form for the solemnization of marriage seems to have existed in early times. Witnesses were required, and the dowry was settled in writing. The sponsalia or betrothal preceded, and tokens or pledges were given or exchanged. The ceremonies were to all appearances not regarded as essential by the early Christians, but were merely considered appropriate and becoming, and when celebrated were observed as follows: "The use of the ring, in the rites both of espousal and of marriage, is very ancient. It is mentioned both by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, the latter of whom says, 'It was given her, not as an ornament; but as a seal, to signify the woman's duty in preserving the goods of her husband, because the care of the house belongs to her.'" The crowning of the married pair with garlands was a marriage-rite peculiar to many nations professing different forms of religion. Tertullian inveighs against it with all the zeal of a Montanist, but it is spoken of with approbation by the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries, from whom it appears that the friends and attendants of the bridal pair were adorned in the same manner. These chaplets were usually made of myrtle, olive, amaranth, rosemary, and evergreens, intermingled with cypress and vervain. The *crown*, appropriately so called, was made of olive, myrtle, and rosemary, variegated with flowers, and sometimes with gold and silver, pearls, precious stones, etc. These crowns were constructed in the form of a pyramid or tower. Both the bride and the bridegroom were crowned in this manner, together with the groomsman and the bridesmaid. The bride frequently appeared in church thus attired on the day when proclamation of the banns was made. Chaplets were not worn by the parties in case of second marriage, nor by those who had been guilty of impropriety before marriage. In the Greek Church the chaplets were imposed by the officiating minister at the altar. In the Western Church it was customary for the parties to present themselves thus attired. The wearing of a veil by the bride was borrowed from the Romans. It was also conformable to the example of Rebecca (Gen. xxiv). From this marriage-rite arose the custom of taking the veil in the Church of Rome. By this act the nun devotes herself to perpetual virginity as the spouse of Christ, the bridegroom of the Church. It appears to have been customary also to spread a robe over the bridegroom and bride, called *vitta nuptialis, pallium jugale*, etc., and made of a mixture of white and red colors. Torches and lamps were in use on such occasions, as among the Jews and pagan nations. The festivities were celebrated by nuptial processions going out to meet the bridegroom and conducting him home, by nuptial songs and music, and marriage feasts. These festivals were frequently the subject of bitter animadversion by the fathers, especially by Chrysostom, and often called for the interposition of the authority of the Church. At marriage festivals it was customary to distribute alms to the poor. The groomsman had various duties to perform—to accompany the parties to the church at their marriage; to act as sponsor for them in their vows; to assist in the marriage ceremonies; to accompany them to the house of the bridegroom; to preside over and direct the festivities of the occasion.

For a considerable time the observance of a marriage-ceremony fell into desuetude among the Christians, to remedy which certain laws enforcing it were enacted in the 8th century. The ceremony now differs in different places. In Scotland, like all other religious services of that country, it is extremely simple, and is performed in the session-house, the residence of the minister, or the private house of some friend of one of the parties. In Lutheran countries it is generally celebrated in private houses. In England, by the ancient common law, a like custom prevailed as in Scotland until 1757, when, by lord Hardwicke's Act, a ceremony in a church of the state establishment was made necessary, and this continued till 1836, when the Dissenters succeeded in removing this exclusiveness. Persons have now the option of two forms of contracting marriage: it may be with or without a religious ceremony; and, if with a religious ceremony, it may be either in the established church or in a dissenting chapel. If the marriage is to take place in an established church, then there must be either publication of banns of marriage for three preceding successive Sundays, or a license or certificate obtained, which dispenses with such publication; and, in either case, seven or fifteen days' previous residence in the parish by one of the parties is necessary, according as it is a certificate or license respectively which is applied for. The marriage must take place in the church, the marriage-service of the Church of England being read over, and this must be done in canonical hours, i. e. between 8 and 12 A.M., in presence of two witnesses at the altar, before which, in the body of the church, the parties are placed, after having mutually joined hands, and pledged their mutual troth, according to a set form of words, which they say after the minister; the man gives a ring to the woman, then lays it on the book, with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk. The priest then takes the ring and delivers it to the man, whom he instructs to put it on the *fourth* finger of the woman's *left* hand, and, holding it there, to repeat the words, "With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The minister next joins their right hands together, and, after prayers and blessings, during certain parts of which the man and woman kneel before the altar, they are dismissed with the reading of a part of the Prayer-book, which points out the duties of the marriage state. If the marriage is celebrated in a dissenting chapel (and for that purpose such chapel must be duly licensed and registered), there must be present the superintendent-registrar of the district as one of the witnesses, but the dissenting clergyman may use his own or any kind of form of service. If the marriage is not to be with any religious ceremony, then it must take place in the office of the superintendent-registrar, and in presence of witnesses, the essential thing being that both parties should in the presence of witnesses there exchange a declaration that they take each other for man and wife. The canonical hours must be attended to in all cases, and the condition of previous residence by one of the parties in the district; but the condition of residence is often evaded. In all cases the

fact of the marriage must be entered in a register, which register is kept by a public officer, and ultimately filed and kept in Somerset House, London, where a copy of the certificate of registration of every marriage in England can at all times be had for a small sum.

In the United States of America the customs of the Church of Scotland are followed by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, and measurably also by the Baptists. The Protestant Episcopal Church adheres closely to the practices of the Church of England, and from the latter the Methodists also, in a somewhat modified form, have copied in this particular. Minor ecclesiastical bodies of the Christian Church follow the practices of one or the other of the churches mentioned. The laws of the several states differ somewhat as to the matter of marriage ceremonies, but they are adapted to the usages of all acknowledged Christian denominations, and recognise the validity of the act whether performed by a clergyman or magistrate, or by a simple contract before witnesses.

Peculiar usages are found in some of the Eastern churches of to-day. In Russia the bride and bridegroom hold a lighted taper in their hands in front of a small altar placed in the centre of the church. Rings are placed on their fingers, and, their hands being joined, they are led by the priest three times round the altar. Two highly-ornamented gilt crowns are placed on their heads, and held over them by the groomsman during a part of the service. They drink wine out of a cup three times, and, kissing one another, the ceremony is finished. The married couple then make the tour of the church, crossing themselves at and saluting each saintly image on their way. Weddings generally take place towards evening, so that immediately after the ceremony dinner commences at the house of the bride's father. At a marriage-feast lighted candles are placed in every position and corner possible. No other wine but champagne is drunk, and the quantity of this beverage consumed is remarkable. The dinner is followed by a ball, and the feasting is usually kept up for twenty-four hours. The custom of honeymoon does not exist in Russia. The married couple spend the first few days of their wedded life with the bride's father. Shortly after the marriage the bride and bridegroom must call upon every one of their relations, friends, and acquaintances, and after this ceremony is finished they sink back into their ordinary life (*Ivan at Home*). For the Roman Catholic view of marriage, see MATRIMONY.

MARRIAGE, HEATHEN. Under this head, as being most akin to the ancient Hebrew, and perhaps best representing the general type of Oriental matrimony, we begin with—

I. *Mohammedan.*—The following description of this (condensed from Lane's *Modern Egyptians*) applies especially to Cairo, but will serve for a general illustration in most Moslem countries. To abstain from marrying when a man has attained a sufficient age, and when there is no just impediment, is esteemed by the Egyptians improper, and even disreputable. Oriental females arrive at puberty much earlier than the natives of colder climates. Many marry at the age of twelve or thirteen years; few remain unmarried after sixteen years of age. An Egyptian girl at the age of thirteen, or even earlier, may be a mother. It is very common among the Arabs of Egypt and of other countries, but less so in Cairo than in other parts of Egypt, for a man to marry his first cousin. In this case the husband and wife continue to call each other "cousin;" because the tie of blood is indissoluble, but that of matrimony very precarious. Most commonly the mother, or some other near female relation of the youth or man who is desirous of obtaining a wife, describes to him the personal and other qualifications of the young women with whom she is acquainted, and directs his choice; or he employs a woman whose regular business it is to assist men in such cases. The parents may betroth their daughter to whom they please, and marry her to him without her consent if she be not arrived at the age of puberty, but after she has attained that age she may choose a husband for herself, and appoint any man to arrange and effect her marriage. In the former case, however, the relations of a girl sought in marriage usually endeavor to obtain her consent to the proposed union. The bridegroom can scarcely ever obtain even a surreptitious glance at the features of his bride until he finds her in his absolute possession, unless she belong to the lower classes of society; in which case it is easy enough for him to see her face. When a female is about to marry, she should have a deputy to settle the compact and conclude the contract for her with her proposed husband. If she be under the age of puberty this is absolutely necessary; and in this case her father, if living, or (if he be dead) her nearest adult male relation, or a guardian appointed by will or by the magistrate, performs the office of deputy; but if she be of age she appoints her own deputy, or may even make the contract herself, though this is seldom done. After a youth or man has made choice of a female to demand in marriage, on the report of his female relations, and, by proxy, made the preliminary arrangements before described with her and her relations, he repairs, with two or three of his friends, to her deputy. Having obtained consent to the union, if the intended bride be under age, he asks what is the amount of the required dowry. The giving of a dowry is indispensable. It is generally stipulated that two thirds of the dowry shall be paid immediately before the marriage-contract is made, and the remaining third held in reserve, to be paid to the wife in case of divorcing her against her own consent, or in case of the husband's death. This affair being settled, and confirmed by all persons present reciting the opening chapter of the Koran, an early day (perhaps the day next following) is appointed for paying the money, and performing the ceremony of the marriage-contract; but it is very seldom the case that any document is written to confirm the marriage, unless the bridegroom is about to travel to another place, and fears that he may have occasion to prove his marriage where witnesses of the contract cannot be procured. Sometimes the marriage-contract is concluded immediately after the arrangement respecting the dowry, but more generally a day or two after. On the day appointed for this ceremony the bridegroom, again accompanied by two or three of his friends, goes to the house of the bride, usually about noon, taking with him that portion of the dowry which he has promised to pay on this occasion. It is necessary that there be two witnesses (and those must be Moslems) to the marriage-contract, unless in a situation where witnesses cannot be procured. All persons present recite the same chapter of the Koran, and the bridegroom then pays the money. After this the marriage-contract is performed. It is very simple. The bridegroom and the bride's deputy sit upon the ground face to face, with one knee upon the ground, and grasp each other's right hand, raising the thumbs, and pressing them against each other. A schoolmaster is generally employed to instruct them what they are to say. Having placed a handkerchief over their closed hands, he usually prefaces the words of the contract with a few words of exhortation and prayer, with quotations from the Koran and Traditions, on the excellency and advantages of marriage. He then desires the bride's deputy to say, "I betroth [or marry] to thee my daughter [or the female who has appointed me her deputy], such a one [naming the bride], the virgin [or the adult virgin], for a dowry of such an amount." (The words "for a dowry," etc., are sometimes omitted.) The bridegroom says, "I accept from thee her betrothal [or marriage] to myself, and take her under my care, and bind myself to afford her my protection; and ye who are present bear witness of this." The deputy addresses the bridegroom in the same manner a second and a third time, and each time the latter replies as before. They then generally add, "And blessing be on the apostles, and praise be to God, the Lord of all creat-

Mohammedan Bridal Procession.

ures; amen:" after which all present repeat the same chapter. It is not always the same form that is recited on these occasions: any form may be used, and it may be repeated by any person; it is not even necessary, and is often altogether omitted. The contract concluded, the bridegroom sometimes (but seldom unless he be a person of the lower orders) kisses the hands of his friends and others there present; and they are presented with sherbet, and generally remain to dinner. Each of them receives an embroidered handkerchief, provided by the family of the bride. Before the persons assembled on this occasion disperse, they settle upon the night when the bride is to be brought to the house of the bridegroom, and the latter, for the first time, is to visit her.

In general, the bridegroom waits for his bride about eight or ten days after the conclusion of the contract. Meanwhile he sends to her, two or three or more times, some fruit, sweetmeats, etc.; and perhaps makes her a present of a shawl, or some other article of value. The bride's family are at the same time occupied in preparing for her a stock of household furniture and dress. The portion of the dowry which has been paid by the bridegroom, and generally a much larger sum (the additional money, which is often more than the dowry itself, being supplied by the bride's family), is expended in purchasing the articles of furniture, dress, and ornaments for the bride. These articles are the property of the bride, and, if she be divorced, she takes them away with her. She cannot, therefore, with truth be said to be *purchased*. The furniture is sent, commonly borne by a train of camels, to the bridegroom's house. Often among the articles is a chair for the turban or headdress. There are sometimes sent two of these chairs, one for the husband and the other for the wife. The bridegroom should receive his bride on the eve of Friday, or that of Monday; but the former is generally esteemed the more fortunate period. During two or three or more preceding nights the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns (q. v.). An entertainment is also given on each of these nights, particularly on the *last* night before that on which the wedding is concluded, at the bridegroom's house. On these occasions it is customary for the persons invited, and for all intimate friends, to send presents to his house a day or two before the feast which they purpose or expect to attend: they generally send sugar, coffee, rice, wax candles, or a lamb; the former articles are usually placed upon a tray of copper or wood, and covered with a silk or embroidered kerchief. The guests are entertained on these occasions by musicians and male or female singers, by dancing girls, or by some other performance.

On the preceding Wednesday (or on the Saturday if the wedding is to conclude on the eve of Monday), at about the hour of noon, or a little later, the bride goes in state to the bath. In general the first persons among the bride's party are several of her married female relations and friends, walking in pairs, and next a number of young virgins. The former are dressed in the usual manner, covered with the black silk shawl; the latter have white silk shawls. Then follows the bride, walking under a canopy of silk, of some gay color, as pink, rose-color, or yellow, or of two colors composing wide stripes, often rose-color and yellow. It is carried by four men, by means of a pole at each corner, and is open only in front: and at the top of each of the four poles is attached an embroidered handkerchief. The dress of the bride during this procession entirely conceals her person. She is generally covered from head to foot with a red shawl, or with a white or yellow shawl, though rarely. Upon her head is placed a small pasteboard cap or crown. The shawl is placed over this, and conceals from the view of the public the richer articles of her dress, her face, and her jewels, etc., excepting one or two ornaments, generally of diamonds and emeralds, attached to that part of the shawl which covers her forehead. She is accompanied by two or three of her female relations within the canopy; and often, when in hot weather, a woman, walking backwards before her, is constantly employed in fanning her with a large fan of black ostrich feathers, the lower part of the front of which is usually ornamented with a piece of looking-glass. Sometimes one procession, with a single canopy, serves for two brides, who walk side by side. The procession moves very slowly, and generally pursues a circuitous route, for the sake of greater display. On leaving the house it turns to the right. It is closed by a second party of musicians, similar to the first, or by two or three drummers. The whole bath is sometimes hired for the bride and her party exclusively. They pass several hours, seldom less than two, occupied in washing, sporting, and feasting; and frequently female singers are hired to amuse them in the bath: they then return in the same order in which they came. Having returned from the bath to the house of her family, the bride and her companions sup together. If singers have

contributed to the festivity in the bath, they also return with the bride to renew their concert. Their songs are always on the subject of love, and of the joyous event which occasions their presence. It is on this night, and sometimes also during the latter half of the preceding day, that the bridegroom gives his chief entertainment. Low farce-players often perform on this occasion before the house, or, if it be large enough, in the court. The other and more common performances by which the guests are amused have been before mentioned.

On the following day the bride goes in procession to the house of the bridegroom. The ceremony usually occupies three or more hours. Sometimes, before bridal processions of this kind, two swordsmen, clad in nothing but their drawers, engage each other in a mock combat; or two peasants cudgel each other with long staves. The bride and her party, having arrived at the bridegroom's house, sit down to a repast. Her friends shortly after take their departure, leaving with her only her mother and sister, or other near female relations, and one or two other women. The bridegroom sits below. Before sunset he goes to the bath, and there changes his clothes; or he merely does the latter at home, and, after having supped with a party of his friends, waits till a little before the time of the night-prayer, or until the third or fourth hour of the night, when, according to general custom, he should repair to some celebrated mosque, such as that of the Hasaneyn, and there say his prayers. The party usually proceeds to the mosque with a quick pace, and without much order. A second group of musicians, with the same instruments, or with drums only, closes the procession. The prayers are commonly performed merely as a matter of ceremony; and it is frequently the case that the bridegroom does not pray at all. The procession returns from the mosque with more order and display, and very slowly; perhaps because it would be considered unbecoming in the bridegroom to hasten home to take possession of his bride. Soon after his return from the mosque, the bridegroom leaves his friends in a lower apartment, enjoying their pipes, and coffee, and sherbet. The bride's mother and sister, or whatever other female relations were left with her, are above, and the bride herself and her companion in a separate apartment. If the bridegroom be a youth or young man, it is considered proper that he, as well as the bride, should exhibit some degree of bashfulness: one of his friends therefore carries him a part of the way up to the room. On entering the bride's apartment he gives a present to her companion, who then retires. The bride has a shawl thrown over her head, and the bridegroom must give her a present of money, which is called "the price of the uncovering of the face," before he attempts to remove this, which she does not allow him to do without some apparent reluctance, if not violent resistance, in order to show her maiden modesty. The bridegroom now sees the face of his bride for the first time, and generally finds her nearly what he has been led to expect. He remains with her but a few minutes: having satisfied his curiosity respecting her personal charms, he calls to the women (who generally collect at the door, where they wait in anxious suspense) to raise their cries of joy, and the shrill sounds acquaint the persons below and in the neighborhood, and often, responded by other women, spread still further the news that he has acknowledged himself satisfied with his bride: he soon after descends to rejoin his friends, and remains with them an hour or more before he returns to his wife. It very seldom happens that the husband, if disappointed in his bride, immediately disgraces and divorces her; in general he retains her a week or more, even if dissatisfied with her.

Marriages are sometimes conducted without any pomp or ceremony, even in the case of virgins, by mutual consent of the bridegroom and the bride's family, or the bride herself; and widows or divorced women are never honored with a procession on marrying again. The mere sentence, "I give myself up to thee," uttered by a female to a man who proposes to become her husband (even without the presence of witnesses, if none can easily be procured), renders her his legal wife, if arrived at puberty; and marriages with widows and divorced women, among the Moslems of Egypt, and other Arabs, are sometimes concluded in this simple manner. The dowry of such women is generally one quarter, or third, or half the amount of that of a virgin. Among persons not of the lowest order, though in very humble life, the marriage ceremonies are conducted in the same manner as among the middle orders. But when the expenses cannot by any means be paid, the bride is paraded in a very simple manner, covered with a shawl (generally red), and surrounded by a group of her female relations and friends, dressed in their best, or in borrowed clothes, and enlivened by no other sounds of joy than their shrill cry, which they repeat at frequent intervals. The general mode of processions among the inhabitants of the villages is different from those above described. The bride, usually covered with a shawl, is seated on a camel, and so conveyed to the bridegroom's dwelling. Sometimes four or five women or girls sit with her on the same camel, one on either side of her, and two or three others behind, the seat being made very wide, and usually covered with carpets or other drapery. She is followed by a group of women singing. In the evening of the wedding, and often during several previous evenings, in a village, the male and female friends of the two parties meet at the bridegroom's house, and pass several hours of the night in the open air, amusing themselves with songs and a rude kind of dance, accompanied by the sounds of a tambourine, or some kind of drum: both sexes sing, but only the women dance.

II. *Ancient Pagan*, i. e. 1. *Greek.*—The ancient Greek legislators considered the relation of marriage as a matter not merely of private, but also of public or general interest. This was particularly the case at Sparta, where proceedings might be taken against those who married too late or unsuitably, as well as against those who did not marry at all. But, independent of public considerations, there were also private or personal reasons, peculiar to the ancients, which made marriage an obligation. One of these was the duty incumbent upon every individual to provide for a continuance of representatives to succeed himself as ministers of the divinity; and another was the desire felt by almost every one, not merely to perpetuate his own name, but to leave some one who might make the customary offerings at his grave. We are told that with this view childless persons sometimes adopted children. The choice of a wife among the ancients was but rarely grounded upon affection, and scarcely ever could have been the result of previous acquaintance or familiarity. In many cases a father chose for his son a bride whom the latter had never seen, or compelled him to marry for the sake of checking his extravagances.

By the Athenian laws a citizen was not allowed to marry a foreign woman, nor conversely, under very severe penalties; but proximity by blood (*ἀγχιστεία*) or consanguinity (*συγγένεια*) was not, with some few exceptions, a bar to marriage in any part of Greece: direct lineal descent was. At Athens the most important preliminary to marriage was the betrothal (*ἐγγύησις*), which was in fact indispensable to the complete validity of a marriage-contract. It was made by the natural or legal guardian (*ὁ κύριος*) of the bride elect, and attended by the relatives of both parties as witnesses. The wife's dowry was settled at the betrothal. On the day before the *gamos*, or marriage, or sometimes on the day itself, certain sacrifices or offerings (*προτέλεια γάμων* or *προγάμεια*) were made to the gods who presided over marriage. Another ceremony of almost general observance on the wedding-day was the bathing of both the bride and bridegroom in water fetched from some particular fountain, whence, as some think, the custom of placing the figure of a *λουτροφόρος*, or "water carrier," over the tombs of those who died unmarried. Af-

ter these preliminaries, the bride was generally conducted from her father's to the house of the bridegroom at nightfall, in a chariot (ἐφ' ἁμάξης) drawn by a pair of mules or oxen, and furnished with a kind of couch (κλινίς) as a seat. On either side of her sat the bridegroom and one of his most intimate friends or relations, who from his office was called the *paranymph* (παράνυμφος or νυμφευτής); but, as he rode in the carriage (ὄχημα) with the bride and bridegroom, he was sometimes called the πάροχος. The nuptial procession was probably accompanied, according to circumstances, by a number of persons, some of whom carried the nuptial torches. Both bride and bridegroom (the former veiled) were decked out in their best attire, with chaplets on their heads, and the doors of their houses were hung with festoons of ivy and bay. As the bridal procession moved along, the hymenæan song was sung to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes, even in olden times, as beautifully described by Homer, and the married pair received the greetings and congratulations of those who met them. After entering the bridegroom's house, into which the bride was probably conducted by his mother, bearing a lighted torch, it was customary to shower sweetmeats upon them (καταχύσματα), as emblems of plenty and prosperity. After this came the nuptial feast, to which the name *gamos* was particularly applied; it was generally given in the house of the bridegroom or his parents, and, besides being a festive meeting, served other and more important purposes. There was no public rite, whether civil or religious, connected with the celebration of marriage among the ancient Greeks, and therefore no public record of its solemnization. This deficiency then was supplied by the marriage-feast, for the guests were of course competent to prove the fact of a marriage having taken place. To this feast, contrary to the usual practice among the Greeks, women were invited as well as men; but they seem to have sat at a separate table, with the bride, still veiled, among them. At the conclusion of this feast she was conducted by her husband into the bridal chamber; and a law of Solon required that, on entering it, they should eat a quince together, as if to indicate that their conversation ought to be sweet and agreeable. The song called the *Epithalamium* was then sung before the doors of the bridal chamber. The day after the marriage, the first of the bride's residence in her new abode, was called the *epaulia* (ἐπαύλια), on which their friends sent the customary presents to the newly-married couple. On another day, the *apaulia* (ἀπαύλια), perhaps the second after marriage, the bridegroom left his house to lodge apart from his wife at his father's-in-law. Some of the presents made to the bride by her husband and friends were called *anacalypteria* (ἀνακαλυπτήρια), as being given on the occasion of the bride first appearing unveiled; they were probably given on the *epaulia*, or day after the marriage. Another ceremony observed after marriage was the sacrifice which the husband offered up on the occasion of his bride being registered among his own phratores.

The above account refers to Athenian customs. At Sparta the betrothal of the bride by her father or guardian (κύριος) was requisite as a preliminary of marriage, as well as at Athens. Another custom peculiar to the Spartans, and a relic of ancient times, was the seizure of the bride by her intended husband, but of course with the sanction of her parents or guardians. She was not, however, immediately domiciled in her husband's house, but cohabited with him for some time clandestinely, till he brought her, and frequently her mother also, to his home.

The Greeks, generally speaking, entertained little regard for the female character. They considered women, in fact, as decidedly inferior to men, qualified to discharge only the subordinate functions in life, and rather necessary as helpmates than agreeable as companions. To these notions female education for the most part corresponded, and, in fact, it confirmed them; it did not supply the elegant accomplishment and refinement of manners which permanently engage the affections when other attractions have passed away. Aristotle states that the relation of man to woman is that of the governor to the subject; and Plato, that a woman's virtue may be summed up in a few words, for she has only to manage the house well, keeping what there is in it, and obeying her husband. Among the Dorians, however, and especially at Sparta, women enjoyed much more estimation than in the rest of Greece.

2. *Roman.*—A legal Roman marriage was called *justæ nuptiæ, justum matrimonium*, as being conformable to *jus* (*civile*) or to law. A legal marriage was either *cum conventione uxoris in manum viri*, or it was without this conventio. But both forms of marriage agreed in this: there must be connubium between the parties, and consent. The legal consequences as to the power of the father over his children were the same in both.

Connubium is merely a term which comprehends all the conditions of a legal marriage. Generally it may be stated that there was only connubium between Roman citizens; the cases in which it at any time existed between parties not both Roman citizens, were exceptions to the general rule. Originally, or at least at one period of the republic, there was no connubium between the patricians and the plebeians; but this was altered by the Lex Canuleia (B.C. 445), which allowed connubium between persons of those two classes. There were various degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which there was no connubium. An illegal union of a male and female, though affecting to be, was not a marriage: the man had no legal wife, and the children had no legal father; consequently they were not in the power of their reputed father. The marriage *cum conventione* differed from that *sine conventione* in the relationship which it effected between the husband and the wife; the marriage cum conventione was a necessary condition to make a woman a *materfamilias*. By the marriage cum conventione the wife passed into the familia of her husband, and was to him in the relation of a daughter, or, as it was expressed, *in manum convenit*. In the marriage sine conventione the wife's relation to her own familia remained as before, and she was merely *uxor*. "*Uxor*," says Cicero, "is a genus of which there are two species: one is *materfamilias, quæ in manum convenit;* the other is *uxor* only." Accordingly a materfamilias is a wife who is in manu, and in the familia of her husband. A wife not in manu was not a member of her husband's familia, and therefore the term could not apply to her. *Matrona* was properly a wife not in manu, and equivalent to uxor; and she was called matrona before she had any children. But these words are not always used in these their original and proper meanings.

It does not appear that any forms were requisite in the marriage sine conventione; and apparently the evidence of such marriage was cohabitation matrimonii causa. The matrimonii causa might be proved by various kinds of evidence. In the case of a marriage cum conventione, there were three forms: (1) *Usus*, (2) *Farreum*, and (3) *Coemptio*.

(1.) Marriage was effected by *usus* if a woman lived with a man for a whole year as his wife; and this was by analogy to usucaption of movables generally, in which usus for one year gave ownership. The law of the Twelve Tables provided that if a woman did not wish to come into the manus of her husband in this manner, she should absent herself from him annually for three nights (*trinoctium*), and so break the usus of the year.

(2.) *Farreum* was a form of marriage in which certain words were used in the presence of ten witnesses, and were accompanied by a certain religious ceremony, in which panis farreus was employed; and hence this form of marriage was also called *confarreatio*. It appears that certain priestly offices, such as that of Flamen Dialis, could only be held by those who were born of

parents who had been married by this ceremony (*confarreati parentes*).

(3.) *Coemptio* was effected by mancipatio, and consequently the wife was in mancipio. A woman who was cohabiting with a man as uxor, might come into his manus by this ceremony, in which case the coemptio was said to be matrimonii causa, and she who was formerly uxor became *apud maritum filiæ loco*.

Sponsalia were not an unusual preliminary of marriage, but they were not necessary. The sponsalia were an agreement to marry, made in such form as to give each party a right of action in case of non-performance, and the offending party was condemned in such damages as to the judex seemed just. The woman who was promised in marriage was accordingly called *sponsa*, which is equivalent to promissa; the man who was engaged to marry was called *sponsus*. The sponsalia were of course not binding if the parties consented to waive the contract. Sometimes a present was made by the future husband to the future wife by way of earnest (*arrha*, *arrha sponsalitia*), or, as it was called, *propter nuptias donatio*.

The consequences of marriage were: 1. The power of the father over the children of the marriage, which was a completely new relation—an effect indeed of marriage, but one which had no influence over the relation of the husband and wife. 2. The liabilities of either of the parties to the punishments affixed to the violation of the marriage union. 3. The relation of husband and wife with respect to property.

When marriage was dissolved, the parties to it might marry again; but opinion considered it more decent for a woman not to marry again. A woman was required by usage (*mos*) to wait a year before she contracted a second marriage, on the pain of infamia.

It remains to describe the customs and rites which were observed by the Romans at marriages. After the parties had agreed to marry, and the persons in whose potestas they were had consented, a meeting of friends was sometimes held at the house of the maiden for the purpose of settling the marriage-contract, which was written on tablets, and signed by both parties. The woman, after she had promised to become the wife of a man, was called *sponsa*, *pacta*, *dicta*, or *sperata*. It appears that—at least during the imperial period—the man put a ring on the finger of his betrothed as a pledge of his fidelity. This ring was probably, like all rings at this time, worn on the left hand, and on the finger nearest to the smallest. The last point to be fixed was the day on which the marriage was to take place. The Romans believed that certain days were unfortunate for the performance of the marriage rites, either on account of the religious character of those days themselves, or on account of the days by which they were followed, as the woman had to perform certain religious rites on the day after her wedding, which could not take place on a dies ater. Days not suitable for entering upon matrimony were the calends, nones, and ides of every month, all dies atri, the whole months of May and February, and a great number of festivals. On the wedding-day, which in the early times was never fixed upon without consulting the auspices, the bride was dressed in a long white robe with a purple fringe, or adorned with ribbons. This dress was called *tunica recta*, and was bound round the waist with a girdle (*corona*, *cingulum*, or *zona*), which the husband had to untie in the evening. The bride's veil, called *flammeum*, was of a bright yellow color, and her shoes likewise. Her hair was divided on this occasion with the point of a spear. The bride was conducted to the house of her husband in the evening. She was taken with apparent violence from the arms of her mother, or of the person who had to give her away. On her way she was accompanied by three boys dressed in the prætexta, and whose fathers and mothers were still alive (*patrimi et matrimi*). One of them carried before her a torch of white thorn (*spina*), or, according to others, of pine wood; the two others walked by her side, supporting her by the arm. The bride herself carried a distaff and a spindle, with wool. A boy called *camillus* carried in a covered vase (*cumera*, *cumerum*, or *camillum*) the so-called utensils of the bride and playthings for children (*crepundia*). Besides these persons who officiated on the occasion, the procession was attended by a numerous train of friends, both of the bride and the bridegroom. When the procession arrived at the house of the bridegroom, the door of which was adorned with garlands and flowers, the bride was carried across the threshold by *pronubi*, i. e. men who had been married to only one woman, that she might not knock against it with her foot, which would have been an evil omen. Before she entered the house, she wound wool around the door-posts of her new residence, and anointed them with lard (*adeps suillus*) or wolf's fat (*adeps lupinus*). The husband received her with fire and water, which the woman had to touch. This was either a symbolic purification, or a symbolic expression of welcome, as the interdicere aqua et igni was the formula for banishment. The bride saluted her husband with the words, *Ubi tu Caius, ego Caia*. After she had entered the house with distaff and spindle, she was placed upon a sheep-skin, and here the keys of the house were delivered into her hands. A repast (*cœna nuptialis*), given by the husband to the whole train of relatives and friends who accompanied the bride, generally concluded the solemnity of the day. Many ancient writers mention a very popular song, *Talasius* or *Talassio*, which was sung at weddings; but whether it was sung during the repast or during the procession is not quite clear, though we may infer from the story respecting the origin of the song that it was sung while the procession was advancing towards the house of the husband. It may be easily imagined that a solemnity like that of marriage did not take place among the merry and humorous Italians without a variety of jests and railleries; and Ovid mentions obscene songs which were sung before the door of the bridal apartment by girls, after the company had left. These songs were probably the old Fescennina, and are frequently called *Epithalamia*. At the end of the repast, the bride was conducted by matrons who had not had more than one husband (*pronubæ*) to the lectus genialis in the atrium, which was on this occasion magnificently adorned and strewed with flowers. On the following day the husband sometimes gave another entertainment to his friends, which was called *repotia*, and the woman, who on this day undertook the management of the house of her husband, had to perform certain religious rites; on which account, as was observed above, it was necessary to select a day for the marriage which was not followed by a dies ater. These rites probably consisted of sacrifices to the Dii Penates.

The position of a Roman woman after marriage was very different from that of a Greek woman. The Roman presided over the whole household; she educated her children, watched over and preserved the honor of the house, and, as the materfamilias, she shared the honors and respect shown to her husband. Far from being confined, like the Greek women, to a distinct apartment, the Roman matron (at least during the better centuries of the republic) occupied the most important part of the house, the atrium.—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v.

III. *Among the Hindûs.*—There are writers, perhaps we had better call them "fact gatherers" (comp. Müller, *Chips*, ii, 262), who, not contenting themselves with the accomplishment of the task for which they are fitted, frequently go out of their way to cast a slur upon the Christian's belief, and to ridicule him for entertaining the thought that the Bible is the educator of the human race. Yet the deeper the researches into the "primitive" condition of man, and the more intimate our relation with those nations who can claim a civilization outside of the pale of Christian teachings, the more stubborn appears the fact that Christianity alone assigns to woman

a position of equality with man. The N. T. teaches "there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The Hindû's *sacred* writings, however, not only fail to make woman the equal of man, but they even put a stigma upon her from her very birth. A woman, it is affirmed by the *Institutes* of Manu (q. v.), whose inspiration is as unquestioned as his legislative supremacy is universal among the Hindûs, "is never fit for independence, or to be trusted with liberty; for she may be compared to a heifer on the plain, which still longeth for grass." "They exhaust," says Massie (*Continental India*, ii, 153), "the catalogue of vice to affix its epithets to woman's nature—infidelity, violence, deceit, envy, extreme avariciousness, an entire want of good qualities, with impurity, they affirm, are the innate faults of womankind." "Why," says Butler (*Land of the Veda*, p. 470), "if my native friend had six children, three boys and as many girls, and I happened to inquire, 'Lalla, how many children have you?' the probability is he would reply, 'Sir, I have three children;' for he would not think it worth while to count in the daughters." Indeed, the Brahmin is taught that perfection is to be attained only, freed from the contamination of woman, in a purely ascetic state (Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, i, 51). But let us not be misunderstood as conveying the impression that the lay Hindû favors asceticism. Far from it. Among the laity celibacy is a reproach in either sex. As among the Chinese (see below), "girls are not desired, not welcome;" and, when they come, they are either quickly done away with, where the English law does not interfere [see INFANTICIDE], or, if they must live, are ignored, if not despised. Arrived at the age of only seven, the age at which the Shasters pronounce the girl marriageable, the unhappy parents begin to look about for an early opportunity to free themselves from the burden that is upon them by betrothal of the child. As all through the East, so also here the whole matter is held by the parents in their own hands. The poor girl has no choice or voice in her own destiny—all is arranged without consulting her views or affections in any way whatever. "Courtship, in our Christian sense," says Butler, "the maiden in India can never know. She is not allowed to see or converse with him to whose control she will ere long be handed over. She cannot write to him, for she can neither read nor write; all she is able to do is to follow the instructions to 'worship the gods for a good husband.' She is taught to commence as soon as she is four years old. Her prayers are addressed chiefly to Kama-deva (q. v.), the Hindû Cupid. . . . The maiden prays, and father and mother manage the business of selection. Each caste [see INDIAN CASTE] has its professional match-makers, whose aid is indispensable. When the negotiations have reached a certain definiteness, the Pundits are consulted to avoid mistakes of consanguinity, and then the astrologers, who pronounce upon the carefully-preserved horoscopes of the boy and girl, whether they can be united with safety. These preliminaries all found satisfactory, the aid of the Brahmin is sought to ascertain if the family god favors the union. The stars, the gods, and men being a unit, negotiations are opened between the parents and relations as to the amount of gift and dowry, and, when conclusions are reached here to their mutual satisfaction, the astrologer is again called in to ascertain and name a lucky day when the agreement may be registered, and a bond for the dowry executed. This is done with due solemnity, and then the astrologer has again to ascertain and name a lucky day for the ceremony, which is accepted by the parents under their bond to see to the consummation of the engagement. This is the usual method, slightly varied in different localities" (p. 479, 480). No female child is expected to have gone beyond the age of twelve without the consummation of an engagement. Woe be unto that family wherein a girl is past the age of twelve and yet unbetrothed (Butler, p. 497). And yet what is the fate of the poor girl after she has actually found her mate? Marriage to the Hindû female means slavery in its most abject form. "The Hindû," says Massie (ii, 154), "does not marry to secure a companion who will aid him in enduring the ills of life, or in obtaining the means of rational employment, he seeks only a slave who shall nourish (he thinks not of training) children, and abide in abject subjection to his rule."

Betrothal with the Hindûs being as binding as marriage (indeed, the word "marriage" is used to include both betrothal and our conception of the matrimonial alliance), the female child enters into a new state of existence immediately after the ceremony of betrothal. "Henceforth she is no more free to roam the fields and enjoy the lovely face of nature. Reserved for her husband, she can no longer be seen with propriety by any man save her father and brothers. She is from that day 'a *purdah-nashin*' —one who sits behind the curtains within the inclosure which surrounds her mother's home;" and now commences her education, which, lasting for five or six years, may be epitomized in its entire curriculum under these four heads: cooking, domestic service, religion, and their peculiar female literature, to enter at last a state of dependence more strict, contemptuous, and humiliating, ordained for the weaker sex among the Hindûs, than which there cannot easily be conceived another. Look into the house which the bride has entered, and see her as she begins the duties for which she has been trained. She rises to prepare her husband's food, and, when all is ready and laid out upon the mat—for they ignore such aids as chairs and tables, knives or forks, and take their meals with the hand, sitting on the floor—she now announces to her lord that his meal is ready. He enters and sits down, and finds all duly prepared by her care. Why does she still stand? Why not sit down too, and share with her husband the good things which she has made ready. She dares not. He would not allow it—the law of her religion forbids it. She must stand and wait upon him, for do not the Shasters render it her duty? "When in the presence of her husband," they teach her, "a woman must keep her eyes upon her master, and be ready to receive his commands. When he speaks she must be quiet, and listen to nothing else, and attend upon him alone. A woman has no other god on earth but her husband." Therefore she waits upon her husband so patiently. But not only is she prohibited from enjoying the blessings of the family table, even when her lord has fully satisfied himself, but she is obliged to remove what remains to another apartment—"for her religion not only forbids her eating with him, but also prohibits her from eating even what he leaves 'in the same room where he dines'—and not till then can she and her children eat their food" (Butler, p. 492). If the state we have portrayed be sad and low enough, what shall be said of the helpless condition in which the poor woman of India is placed if her husband be cruel, aye, brutal? "Woman," says Butler (p. 492), "is absolutely without redress, in the power of her husband, and no one can interfere when it stops short of actual murder." Such is woman's history in a married life, as guided and controlled by the sacred writings of a people who enjoy a non-Biblical civilization. "If ever woman had an opportunity of showing what she might become under the teachings and influence of a civilization where Christianity or the Bible did not interfere with her state, the women of India have had that opportunity, and now, after forty centuries of such experiment, what is woman there to-day?" (Butler, p. 469). Surely here is a question worthy the attention of those "fact gatherers" who so eagerly thrust aside the benighted influences of a Christian civilization.

Polygamy exists among the Hindûs, as it is allowable. It is a luxury, however, that few poor men can afford, and hence the practice of "successional polygamy:" Hindûs often forsake their wives, and then take others. Where polygamy has invaded the household,

the woman who has had the good fortune to be the first wife takes precedence in rank; she remaining the mistress of the *zenana*—the Hindû *harem*.

Polyandry, strangely enough, has also established itself here. "This singular and amazing relation existed in India twenty-five centuries ago, and lingers to-day in some localities to such an extent as to call for the legislative action of the English government." See POLYANDRY.

The marriage-rites are numerous, tedious, and in many parts far from delicate. All, however, being expressed in Sanscrit, and recited by the officiating Brahmin with the utmost rapidity, no one understands what is said. The principal rites among the Brahmins are walking three times round a fire, and tying the garments of the parties together. The bride has also to make *seven steps*, at the last of which the marriage is complete.

The marriage is usually solemnized in the house of the bride's father. Thither the bridegroom proceeds, attended by his friends, and from thence conducts the bride to his home in a grand procession, usually by night, with torches and great rejoicings. On both occasions considerable expenditure is incurred in feasting the friends and relatives, and in providing ornaments, music, processions, and illuminations. The wealthy spend freely on these objects, and the poorer classes often incur debts which burden them for many years. The costs incurred by the fathers, on both sides, in celebrating a marriage, form a heavy item of Hindû expenditure, and one of the motives to female infanticide is doubtless laid in the desire to avoid this charge (Trevor, *Its Natives and Missions*, p. 214).

The marriage procession is thus described by Butler (p. 485). "Often when travelling at night in my palanquin, I have been roused from my sleep by my bearers catching sight of an approaching marriage procession, with its torches, music, and shouting; falling in with the enthusiasm of each event, they would cry out that 'the bridegroom cometh.' First the bridegroom would make his appearance, mounted on a fine horse splendidly caparisoned—his own or borrowed for the occasion—and wearing a grand coat, decked out in tinsel and gold thread, with the matrimonial crown on his head, and his richly-embroidered slippers, all very fine, his friends shouting and dancing alongside of him, and, of course, as he passes, we make our salaam and wish him joy. Right behind the bridegroom's horse comes the palanquin of the bride, but she is veiled, and the venetians are closely shut, and on the little lady is borne to a home which she never saw before, to surrender herself into the hands of one who has neither wooed nor won her; a bride without a choice, with no voice in her own destiny; married without preference; handed over, by those assumed to do all the thinking for her, to a fate where the feelings of her heart were never consulted in the most important transaction of her existence; beginning her married life under circumstances which preclude the possibility of her being sustained by the affection which is founded upon esteem. When the procession has come within hailing distance of his home, the watching friends go forth to meet the bridegroom, the bride enters her apartments, the door is shut, and the guests are entertained in other parts of the establishment."

IV. *Among the Chinese and Japanese.*—The Chinese are divided into a number of clans, each distinguished by a clan name. Of these clans there are from a hundred to a thousand, according to different authors. The law is that no man shall marry a woman of his own clan name. Thus relationship by the male line, however distant, prevents marriage. This rule is very ancient, its origin being referred by the Chinese to the mythic times of their empire. The legendary emperor Fu-Hi, who reigned before the Hea dynasty, which, according to the Chinese annals, began in B.C. 2207, is said to have divided the people into clans, and established this rule regarding marriage (Tyler, *Researches*, p. 278). We give the Chinese marriage customs at considerable length, as they are highly illustrative of Oriental usages in general.

As in all Eastern countries, the girl to be given in wedlock is not consulted in the choice of her future husband, the parents deciding in her stead. The Chinese are firm believers in the sentiment to which the Western mind has given expression in the proverb that "Matches are made in heaven." To secure an alliance, a person is employed as a go-between or match-maker. The negotiation is generally opened by the family of the male person. Not unfrequently the girl has to be paid for—a relic of the patriarchal custom. Occasionally, when a female child is born to persons in humble circumstances, it is given away to a family having a male child only; is reared by the latter, and, when the girl and boy have reached a marriageable age, they are joined in matrimony. Not unfrequently it occurs among wealthy families having a daughter that the custom of purchase is reversed, and a husband secured for a pecuniary consideration. The wealthy look with special favor upon the literary class, and not unfrequently great sacrifices are made to secure a scholarly husband. "It not unfrequently occurs," says Doolittle (*China*, i, 99), "that a rich family, having only one daughter and no boys, desires to obtain a son-in-law who shall be willing to marry the girl and live in the family as a son. Sometimes a notice is seen posted up, stating the desire of a certain man to find a son-in-law and heir who will come and live with him, perhaps stating the age and qualifications of an acceptable person. In such a case, the parents of those who have a son whose qualifications might warrant such an application, and whom they would be willing to allow to marry on such terms, are expected to make application by a go-between, when the matter would be considered by the rich man. Sometimes the rich man makes application by a go-between to the parents of a young man whose reputation he is pleased with, and who perhaps may be a recent graduate, his name standing near the head of the list of successful competitors of the first or second literary degree."

Betrothal.—This among the Chinese is considered as binding as marriage, if the rites and observances have been carefully looked after. The final act in betrothment is the exchange of cards (for description, see Doolittle, i, 67). The time intervening between betrothal and marriage varies from a month or two to eighteen or twenty years, depending much on the age of the parties. "From one to three months before the marriage a fortunate day is selected for its celebration. Generally a member of the family of the bridegroom, or a trusty friend, takes the eight horary characters which denote the birth-time for each of the affianced parties, and for each of their parents, if living, to a fortune-teller, who selects lucky days and times for the marriage, for the cutting of the wedding garments, for the placing of the bridal bed in position, for the finishing of the curtains of the bridal bed, for the embroidering of the bridal pillows, and for the entering of the sedan, on the part of the bride, on the day of her marriage. These items are written out on a sheet of red paper, which is sent to the family of the girl by the hands of the go-between. If accepted, the periods specified become the fixed times for the performance of the particulars indicated, and both parties proceed to make the necessary arrangements for the approaching wedding. Presenting the wedding-cakes and material for the bridal dress to the family of the bride by the other party is next in order. The relative time usually adopted for the performance of this custom is about one month before the day fixed for the marriage. The number of these '*cakes of ceremony*,' or wedding-cakes, varies from several score to several hundreds. They are round, and about an inch thick, weighing generally about one pound and ten or twelve ounces each, and measure nearly a foot in diameter. They are made out of wheat flour, and contain in

the middle some sugar, lard, and small pieces of fat pork, mixed together in a kind of batter, and then cooked: they are, in fact, a sort of mince-pies. There is also sent a sum of money, of greater or less amount, according to previous agreement; a quantity of red cloth or silk, usually not less than five kinds, for the use of the bride; five kinds of dried fruits, several kinds of small cakes, a cock and a hen, and a gander and a goose. The family of the girl, on receiving these wedding-cakes, proceeds to distribute them among their relatives and intimate friends. The small cakes are also distributed in a similar manner. The money sent is generally spent in outfitting the bride.

"A few days before the day fixed for the wedding, the family of the bridegroom again makes a present of various articles of food and other things to the family of the bride, as a cock and a hen, a leg and foot of a pig and of a goat, eight small cakes of bread, eight torches, three pairs of large red candles, a quantity of vermicelli, and several bunches of fire-crackers. There are also sent a girdle, a head-dress, a silken covering for the head and face, and several articles of ready-made clothing, which are usually borrowed or rented for the occasion. These are to be worn by the bride on her entering the bridal sedan to be carried to the home of her husband on the morning of her marriage. The food, or a part of it, including the cock, is to be eaten by her on that morning. The fire-crackers are for explosion on the road, and the torches are for burning during the time occupied *en route* to her new home. On each of the eight bread-cakes is made a large red character in an ancient form of writing, of an auspicious meaning, as 'longevity,' 'happiness,' 'official emolument,' and 'joy;' or certain four of them have four characters, meaning 'the phœnixes are singing in concert,' or 'the ducks are seeking their mates.' Four of these bread-loaves are accepted; the remaining four and the hen, according to strict custom, are returned to the party which proffers them. The bread-cakes and the vermicelli are omens significant of good, owing to a play on the local sound of the characters which denote them, or in consequence of the shape of the article. The vermicelli is significant of 'longevity,' because of its length; and the four bread-cakes reserved by the family of the bride are kept for a singular use on the morning of the girl's entering her bridal chair. *Placing the bridal bedstead in the position where it is to stand* is an important ceremony. When the day selected arrives, which is generally only a few days before the wedding, the bedstead is arranged in some convenient place in the bride's chamber, and then for a considerable time it must not be moved, for fear of ill luck. This placing of the bedstead in position is attended with various superstitious acts."

Worship of Ancestors by the Bridal Party.—"Usually the day before the wedding, the bride has her hair done up in the style of married women of her class in society, and tries on the clothes she is to wear in the sedan, and for a time after she arrives at her future home on the morrow. This is an occasion of great interest to her family. Her parents invite their female relatives and friends to a feast at their house. The professed object of trying on the clothing is to see how the articles provided will fit, and to ascertain that everything is ready, so that there may be no delay or confusion on the arrival of the hour when she is to take her seat in her sedan. While thus dressed (the thick veil designed to conceal her features on arrival at her husband's residence not now being worn), she proceeds to light incense before the ancestral tablets belonging to her father's family, and to worship them for the last time before her marriage. She also kneels down before her parents, her grandparents (if living), her uncles and aunts (if present), and worships them in much the same manner as she and her husband will on the morrow worship his parents and grandparents, and the ancestral tablets belonging to his family. On the occasion of the girl's trying on these clothes and worshipping the tablet and her parents, it is considered unpropitious that those of her female relatives and friends who are in mourning should be present.

"The bridal chair is selected by the family of the bridegroom, and sent to the residence of the bride generally on the afternoon preceding the wedding-day, attended by a band of music, some men carrying lighted torches, two carrying a pair of large red lanterns, containing candles also lighted, and one having a large red umbrella, and one or two friends or other attendants. The bridal chair is always red, and is generally covered with broadcloth, or some rich, expensive material. It is borne by four men, who wear caps having red tassels. The musicians and all the persons employed in the procession have similar caps. Very early on the morning of her marriage the bride or the 'new woman' arises, bathes, and dresses. While she is bathing the musicians are required to play. Her breakfast consists theoretically of the fowl, the vermicelli, etc., sent by the family of her affianced husband. In fact, however, she eats and drinks very little of anything on the morning or during the day of her wedding. When the precise time approaches for taking her seat in her sedan, usually between five and eight o'clock in the morning, previously fixed by the fortune-teller, her toilet is completed by one of her parents taking a thick veil and placing it over her head, completely covering her features from view. She is now led out of her room by one of her female assistants, and takes her seat in the sedan, which has been brought into the reception-room of the house. The floor from her room to the sedan is covered for the occasion with a kind of red carpeting, so that her feet may not touch the ground. She takes her place in the sedan amid the sound of fire-crackers and music by the band. The bride, her mother, and the various members of the family, are required by custom to indulge during this morning in hearty and protracted crying — oftentimes, no doubt, sincere and unaffected. While seated in the sedan, but before she starts for her future home, her parents, or some members of her family, take a bed-quilt by its four corners, and, while holding it thus before the bridal chair, one of the bride's assistants tosses into the air, one by one, four bread-cakes, in such a manner that they will fall into the bed-quilt. These bread-cakes were received from the family of her husband at the same time as the cock and vermicelli were received. The woman during this ceremony is constantly repeating felicitous sentences, which are assented to by some others of the company. The quilt containing these cakes is gathered up and carried immediately to an adjoining room. The object of this ceremony is explained to be to profit the family of the bride's parents, being an omen of good, which is in some manner indicated to the Chinese apprehension by the quilt and the cakes being retained in the house — the local sound of the common word for 'bread,' and a certain word meaning 'to warrant,' 'to secure,' being identical."

Bridal Procession.— After these performances "the bridal procession starts *en route* for the residence of the other party, amid explosions of fire-crackers and the music of the band. In the front of the procession go two men carrying two large lighted lanterns, having the ancestral or family name of the groom cut in a large form out of red paper pasted upon them. Then come two men carrying similar lanterns, having the family name of the bride in a similar manner pasted on them. These belong to her family, and accompany her only a part of the way. Then comes a large red umbrella, followed by men carrying lighted torches, and by the band of music. Near the bridal chair are several brothers of the bride or friends of her family, and several friends or brothers of the groom. These latter are dispatched from the house of the groom early in the morning, for the purpose of meeting the bridal procession and escorting the bride to her home. This deputation sometimes arrives at the house of the bride

before she sets out on her journey, and, if so, it accompanies the procession all the way. About midway between the homes of the bride and the groom the procession stops in the street, while the important ceremony of *receiving the bride* is formally transacted. The friends of the bride stand near each other, and at a little distance stand the friends of the groom. The former produce a large red card, having the ancestral name of the bride's family written on it; the latter produce a similar card bearing the ancestral name of the groom. These they exchange, and each, seizing his own hands *à la Chinois*, bows towards the members of the other party. The two men in the front of the procession who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the groom now turn about, and, going between the sedan chair and the two men who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the bride, come back to their former position in the procession, having gone around the party which has the lanterns with the bride's ancestral name attached. This latter party, while the other is thus encircling it, turns round in an opposite direction, and starts for the residence of the family of the bride, accompanied by that part of the escort which consisted of her brothers or the friends of her family. The rest of the procession now proceeds on its way to the residence of the bridegroom, the band playing a lively air. At intervals along the street fire-crackers are exploded. It is said that, from the precise time when the two parties carrying lanterns having the ancestral names of the two families attached separate from each other in the street, the name of the bride is changed into the name of her betrothed; the lanterns having his name attached remaining in the procession, while those which have her (former) name are taken back to the residence of her father's family. From this time during the day she generally is in the midst of entire personal strangers, excepting her female assistants, who accompany the procession and keep with her wherever she goes. On arriving at the door of the bridegroom's house fire-crackers are let off in large quantities, and the band plays very vigorously. The torch-bearers, lantern-bearers, and the musicians stop near the door. The sedan is carried into the reception-room. The floor, from the place where the sedan stops to the door of the bride's room, is covered with red carpeting, lest her feet should touch the floor. A woman who has borne both male and female children, or at least male children, and who lives in harmonious subjection to her husband, approaches the door of the sedan and utters various felicitous sentences. If she is in good pecuniary circumstances, and if her parents are living and of a learned family, so much the more fortunate. A boy six or eight years old, holding in his hands a brass mirror, with the reflecting surface turned from him and towards the chair, also comes near, and invites the bride to alight. At the same time the married woman who has uttered propitious words advances as if to open the door of the sedan, when one of the female assistants of the bride, who accompanied the procession, steps forward and opens it. The married woman referred to and the boy are employed by the family of the groom, and receive a small present for their services, which are considered quite important and ominous of good. The mirror held by the lad is expected to ward off all deadly or pernicious influences which may emanate from the sedan. The bride is now aided by her female assistants to alight. While being led towards the door of her room, the sieve which had been placed over the door of the bridal chair on its arrival is sometimes held over her head, and sometimes it is placed directly in front of the door of the sedan, so that, on stepping out, she will step into it.

"The groom, on the approach of the bridal procession, disappears from the crowd of friends and relatives who have assembled at his residence on the happy occasion, and takes his position standing by the side of the bedstead, having his face turned towards the bed. When the bride enters the room, guided by her assistants, he turns around, and remains standing with his face turned from the bed. As soon as she has reached his side, both bridegroom and bride simultaneously seat themselves side by side on the edge of the bedstead. Oftentimes the groom manages to have a portion of the skirt of her dress come under him as he sits down by her, such a thing being considered as a kind of omen that she will be submissive. Sometimes the bride is very careful, by a proper adjustment of her clothing at the moment of sitting down, not only to prevent the accomplishment of such an intention on his part, but also to sit down, if possible, in such a manner that some of his dress will come under her, thus manifesting her determination to preserve a proper independence, if not to bring him actually to yield obedience to her will. After sitting thus in profound silence together for a few moments, the groom arises and leaves the room. He waits in the reception-room for the reappearance of his bride, to perform the ceremony called 'worshipping the temple' (q. v.). Until this time the bride has worn the heavy embroidered outside garment, head-dress, etc., which she had on when she entered her sedan. These are now removed. She has her hair carefully combed in the style of her class in society, and she is arrayed in her own wedding garments. Sometimes her hair is gorgeously decked out with pearls and gems, true or false, according to the ability of the family to purchase, rent, or borrow. When her toilet has been completed, and everything has been made ready, the bride and bridegroom sit down in her room to their wedding dinner. He now, oftentimes for the first time in his life, and always for the first time on his marriage day, beholds the features of his wife. He may eat to his fill of the good things provided on the occasion, but she, according to established custom, may not take a particle. She must sit in silence, dignified and composed.

"The wedding festivities generally last at least two days. The first day the male friends and relatives of the groom are invited to '*shed their light*' on the occasion. On the second day the female friends and relatives of the family of the groom are invited to the wedding feast; this is often called the 'women's day.' Not long after the family and guests have breakfasted on the morning of the second day, the newly-married couple, amid the noise of fire-crackers, come out of their room together for the purpose of worshipping the ancestral tablets belonging to the household, the grandparents, and parents of the groom. This custom is known by the name of '*coming out of the room*.' In the case of those families who devote only one day to the marriage festivities and ceremonies, this custom is observed on the afternoon of the first day. Not long subsequent to the ceremony of 'coming out of the room,' the couple proceed to the kitchen for the purpose of worshipping the god and goddess of the kitchen. This is performed with great decorum, and is regarded as an important and essential part of marriage solemnities. Incense and candles are lighted, and arranged on a table placed before the picture or the writing which represents these divinities, plastered upon the wall of the kitchen. Before this table the bridegroom and his bride kneel down side by side, and bow in worship of the god and goddess of the kitchen. It is believed that they will thus propitiate their good-will, and especially that the bride, in attempting culinary operations, will succeed better in consequence of paying early and respectful attentions to these divinities. On the third day the parents of the bride send an invitation to their son-in-law and his wife to visit them. With this invitation they send sedans for them. The card is usually brought by her brothers, if she has any of the proper age, or by relatives having her own ancestral name. Until this morning, since she left her former home two days previous, the bride has seen none of her own family, and generally none of her own relatives or acquaintances. She and her husband now receive the congratulations and compliments of her brothers or other relatives, and prepare

to visit her parents. The bride enters her sedan first, and proceeds a short distance in front of her husband. They do not start together, nor is it proper that they should arrive at the house of her parents at the same time. The chair provided for the bride on this occasion is a common black sedan in all respects, except that its screen in front has a certain charm painted upon the outside. This charm is the picture of a grim-looking man, sitting on a tiger, with one of his hands raised up, holding a sword, as if in the act of striking, representing a certain ruler of elves, hobgoblins, etc. The object of its use on the occasion of a bride's returning to her parents' house, on the third day after her marriage, is to keep off evil and unpropitious influences from her. On arrival at her paternal home the bride's sedan is carried into the reception-room, and she alights amid the noise of fire-crackers. The sedan which contains the son-in-law stops a few rods from his father-in-law's residence, where he is met by one of his brothers-in-law, or some relative or friend deputed to meet and conduct him into the house. The two parties, standing in the street, respectfully shake their own hands towards each other on meeting, according to the approved fashion. The newly-arrived is now invited to enter the house. He is seated in the reception-room, where he is treated successively to three cups of tea and three pipes of tobacco. Afterwards he is invited to go and see his mother-in-law in her room, where he finds his wife. There he sits awhile, and visits after a stereotyped manner, being careful to use only good or propitious words, avoiding every subject and phrase which, according to the notions of this people, are unlucky. He is soon invited into the reception-room, where he is joined by his wife. Everything being arranged, the husband and wife proceed to worship the ancestral tablets of her family. At the conclusion of this ceremony the bride retires to her mother's apartments, or to some back room, where she and the female relatives present are feasted. Her husband is invited to partake of some refreshments in the reception-room, in doing which he is joined by his bride's brothers, or some others of her family relatives. According to the rules of etiquette, he must eat but very little, however hungry he may be. The usual phrase employed in speaking of it is that he eats part of 'three bowls of vegetables,' after which he declines to receive anything more, under the plea that he has eaten enough. He soon takes his departure in his sedan, leaving his bride to follow by herself by-and-by, accompanied usually only by a servant or female friend. Husbands are never seen with their wives in public."

The marriage customs of the Japanese are so very like those of the Chinese that we have grouped them together. The custom of purchasing the wife is still more general among the Japanese than other Asiatic nations. Polygamy is strictly forbidden. Though the harem is tolerated, only one lawful wife is recognised. "It appears, however," says MacFarlane (*Japan*, p. 268), "to be very easy for a man to put away his wife and take another—at least so far as any law exists to the contrary." The condition of woman is far better than in any other Asiatic country.

V. *Among Savages.*—Perhaps in no other way can the great advantages of Christian civilization be more conclusively shown than by the improvement which it has effected in the relations between the two sexes. The best students of the primitive condition of man have come to the conclusion that where divine revelation does not extend the institution of marriage, if it exists at all, it is by no means the outgrowth of affection and a desire for companionship, but is entered into by the male savages "as a mere animal and convenient connection" as the "means of getting their dinner cooked." There is "no idea of tenderness nor of chivalrous devotion" (Hill, *Tracts of Chittagong*, p. 116; comp. Pallas, *Voyages*, iv, 94). Indeed, according to Lubbock (*Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of Man*), the lowest races have no such institution as the marriage rite, because "true love is almost unknown among them" (p. 50). Kolben (*Hist. Cape of Good Hope*, i, 162) tells us that "the Hottentots are so cold and indifferent to one another that you would think there was no such thing as love between them." There are even some savages, as the North American Indian tribe, the Tinnés, who have no word for "dear" or "beloved;" and it is said of the Algonquins that when the Bible was translated into their language a word had to be coined to give expression to our verb "to love." There are other uncivilized races of men that lack greatly in words to express social relations, as, e. g., the Sandwich Islanders, who, according to Lubbock (p. 61–63), possess no words answering to "son," "daughter," "wife," or "husband," due not to poverty of language, but to the fact that "the idea of marriage does not enter into the Hawaian system of relationship."

Among savages, the peculiar ideas attached to the bond of matrimony make the marriage-ceremony rather an institution peculiar to them. As we have seen above, there are many rude people who do not recognise the symbol of marriage, and, naturally enough, no ceremony is known to them; and then there are many cases in which the marriage bond is recognised, but no ceremony of marriage is observed. "Yet," says Lubbock (p. 58), "we must not assume that marriage is necessarily and always lightly regarded where it is unaccompanied by ceremonial." In Tahiti, says Cook (*Voyage around the World*), "marriage, as appeared to us, is nothing more than an agreement between the man and the woman, with which the priest has no concern. Where it is contracted it appears to be pretty well kept, though sometimes the parties separate by mutual consent" (comp. Klemm, *Cultur der Menschen*, iv, 299).

1. *Ceremonies.*—There cannot be said to exist any marriage ceremonies among the Badagas (Hindostan); the Kurumbas, a tribe of the Neilgherry Hills (*Transact. Ethnol. Soc.* vii, 276); the Indians of California (*Smithsonian Rep.* 1863, p. 368); the Kutchin Indians, further north (*Smith. Rep.* 1866, p. 326); the Arawaks of South America (Brett, *Guiana*, p. 101), and the Brazilian tribes generally (Martins, *Rechtszustand unter den Ureinwohnern Brasiliens*, p. 51); and the same is the case with the Australian tribes (Eyre's *Discoveries*, ii, 319). Speke (*Journ.* p. 361) says "there are no such things as marriages in Uganda;" and of the Mandingoes (West Africa), Caillé (*Trav. to Timbuctoo*, i, 350) says that husband and wife are not united by any ceremony; and Hutton (in Klemm, *Cultur*, iii, 280) makes the same statement as regards the Ashantees. In Congo and Angola (Astley, *Coll. of Voyages*, iii, 221, 227) "they use no peculiar ceremonies in marriage, nor scarce trouble themselves for consent of friends." Neither do we find that the Hottentots know anything about marriage ceremonies, if we may follow La Vaillant (*Voy.* ii, 58); nor do the Bushmen, according to Mr. Wood (*Nat. Hist. Man*, i, 269), have in their language any means of distinguishing an unmarried from a married girl. According to Dalton (*Trans. Ethn. Soc.* vi, 25), the Keriahs of Central India have no word for marriage in their own language, and the only ceremony used appears to be little more than a sort of public recognition of the fact. "The marital rite among our tribes" (i. e. the Redskins of the United States), says Schoolcraft (*Ind. Tribes*, p. 132, 248), "is nothing more than the personal consent of the parties, without requiring any concurrent act of a priesthood, magistracy, or witnesses; the act is assumed by the parties without the necessity of any extraneous sanction." "There is," says Bruce (*Travels*, iv, 487), "no such thing as marriage in Abyssinia, unless that which is contracted by mutual consent, without other form, subsisting only till dissolved by dissent of one or the other, and to be renewed or repeated as often as it is agreeable to both parties, who, when they please, live together again as man and wife, after having been divorced, had children

by others, or whether they have been married or had children with others or not." Among the Bedouin Arabs there is a marriage ceremony in the case of a girl, but the remarriage of a widow is not thought sufficiently important to deserve one.

2. *Communal Marriage.*— Bachofen and M'Lennan, two of the most devoted students of marriage among the savages, will have it that the primitive condition of man was one of pure *Hetairism*, or, as it might perhaps be conveniently Englished, "communal marriage," where every man and woman in a small community were regarded as equally married to one another. Of course none of our readers will be misled by the use of the word "primitive." It is not our province here to enter into a discussion on primeval man [see PRE-ADAMITES]; we use the word with reference to the lowest condition of *unchristianized* man, satisfied, as we stated at the beginning of our subject, that the marriage relation, as it exists among civilized men, is due solely to the influence of divine revelation—man's noblest educator. The most extravagant form of communism we find related of the Techurs of Oude. "They live together almost indiscriminately in large communities, and even when the people are regarded as married the tie is but nominal" (Watson and Kaye, *People of India*, ii, 85). In the Andaman Islands, we are told by Sir Edward Belcher (*Trans. Ethn. Soc.* v, 45), it is the custom for man and woman to remain together until the child is weaned, when they separate as a matter of course, and each seeks a new partner. Among the Southals, one of the aboriginal tribes of India, marriages take place once a year, mostly in January. "For six days all the candidates for matrimony live together in promiscuous concubinage, the introductory rite to the marital relation; for only after this are the separate couples regarded as having established their right to marry" (Watson and Kaye, i, 2). Among the Todas, of the Hawaian race, when a man marries a girl, she becomes the wife of all his brothers as they successively reach manhood; and they also become the husbands of all her sisters, as they become old enough to marry. (Comp. here *Ethn. Journ.* 1867, p. 286, on a practice among the Sioux and other North American Indians.) Among the Greenland Esquimaux it is related that "those are reputed the best and noblest tempered who, without any pain or reluctancy, will lend their friends their wives" (Egede, *Hist. Greenland*, p. 142). This custom of wife-lending is, however, by no means confined to the inhabitants of Greenland, but prevails among North and South American Indians, Polynesians, Eastern and Western negroes, Arabs, Abyssinians, Kaffirs, Mongols, Tutski, etc. (see Lubbock, p. 89), and is practiced especially as an act of hospitality. Plutarch will have it that the custom of lending wives existed also among the Romans. Nor must it be forgotten that it was held one of the essentials of the model Platonic republic that "among the guardians, at least, the sexual arrangements should be under public regulation, and the monopoly of one woman by one man forbidden" (Bain, *Mental and Moral Science;* comp. Kames, *Hist. of Man*, ii, 50). See also PROSTITUTE. A very peculiar custom is found among the Nassaniyeh Arabs. They practice what might be appropriately termed three-quarter marriage; i. e. the woman is legally married for three days out of four, remaining perfectly free for the fourth (Lubbock, p. 54). In Ceylon, according to Davy (*Ceylon*, p. 286), marriages are provisional for the first fortnight, at the expiration of which they are either annulled or confirmed. Among the Reddies of Southern India a still more singular custom prevails. "A young woman of sixteen or twenty years of age may be married to a boy of five or six years. She, however, lives with some other adult male—perhaps a maternal uncle or cousin—but is not allowed to form a connection with the father's relatives; occasionally it may be the boy-husband's father himself—that is, the woman's father-in-law. Should there be children from these liaisons, they are fathered on the boy-husband. When the boy grows up the wife is either old or past child-bearing, when he, in his turn, takes up with some other boy's wife in a manner precisely similar to his own, and procreates children for the boy-husband" (Shortt, *Trans. Ethnol. Soc.*, New Series, vii, 194).

3. *Marriage by Purchase.*— Those who believe, like Tyler, M'Lennan, Bachofen, and Lubbock, that the communal system of the marital relation existed in the primeval state, hold that out of it arose the system of individual marriage. We who depend upon the guidance of a written revelation are rather of the opinion that it is the influence of Christian civilization upon savage life that has led some of them to prefer individual to communal marriage. It is true that the marriage by capture has done much to bring about individual marriage, but it is by no means clear to us that even then the practice was not borrowed from Christianized people directly or indirectly. We certainly do not believe, with Lessing, that nations develop without external influences, that civilization is the possession of every people, and that it is constantly progressive. The condition of the American savage, and the remnants of an early and high civilization, bear witness to the contrary. Yet we believe, with Brinton (*Myths of the New World*, p. 5), that "religious rites are living commentaries on religious beliefs;" and that, while the idea of God does not and cannot proceed from the external world, it nevertheless finds its *historical* origin, also, in the desperate struggle for life, in the satisfaction of the animal wants and passions, in those vulgar aims and motives which possessed the mind of the primitive man to the exclusion of everything else. It is pretty clear that with all pre-Christian nations the modes of getting a wife were the same with those of acquiring any other species of property—capture, gift, sale. The contract of sale may be said to be at the foundation of the marriage relation in every system of ancient law. When daughters belonged to parents as goods, they were parted with only on the principles of fair exchange. Usually the contract was between the heads of families, the intending bride and bridegroom not being consulted. As to the marriage ceremonies, they then were those and no other which were necessary to complete and evidence a sale—delivery, on the price being paid, and "the taking home." It was never thought of that the children should be consulted, and allowed to act on their likings. Just so the savage has been in a measure addicted to the purchase of his wife, with only this difference, however, that the property is secured by the buyer for himself. In Sumatra, e. g., there were formerly three perfectly distinct kinds of marriage: the "Jugur," in which the man purchased the woman; the "Ambel-anak," in which the woman purchased the man (see below, *Polyandry*); and the "Semando," in which they joined on terms of equality (comp. Marsden, *Hist. of Sumatra*, p. 262 sq.). "Among low races," says Lubbock (p. 68), "the wife is indeed literally the property of the husband, as Petruchio says of Catharine:

> 'I will be master of what is mine own.
> She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,
> My household stuff, my field, my barn,
> My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything.'"

Still more peculiar and odd are the ceremonies of courtship and marriage in the mountainous districts of Eastern Hungary. In the fall of the year a fair is held there of marriageable young men and women. From all quarters long trains of chariots wind their way to the plain of Kálinosa. They are laden with household furniture, and followed by the cattle of the family. In the midst of these goods may be seen the young lady whom her family has brought to seek a husband at the fair. She is dressed in her best, with brilliant silk scarf and scarlet petticoat. These caravans take up their position one after the other on one side of the plain, while on the other side a cavalcade of young men approaches and deploys along the whole line. The men—young

Wallachians, for the most part—are dressed in their best goat-skins, and make what show of horsemanship they can. After both parties have taken up their respective quarters opposite each other, the fathers step forward and begin to negotiate marriages for their children. The questions asked on these occasions are, we fear, of a somewhat sordid character. "How many bullocks?" "How much money?" "Your daughter's furniture looks rather old; that chest of drawers does not shut properly. I must find something better than that for my son." Such would doubtless be a correct report of the conversations held in this primitive, if not poetical Arcadia, previous to clinching the matrimonial bargain. The business is, however, carried out with a promptitude equal to its frankness. As soon as the parents are agreed, a priest, who is always ready at hand, is summoned. He chants a hymn and gives his benediction, the bride then kisses her parents, mounts the chariot, and starts for some unknown village with a husband whom she has never seen before, the furniture and cattle which her parents have allowed her as a marriage-portion following in the rear.

5. *Marriage by Capture.*—Marriage by purchase, however, is by no means the most usual way of the savage to secure a help-meet for himself. Perhaps the general mode by which rude nations enter into the marital relation is that of *capture*. In the opinion of Lubbock, the first state of individual marriage was brought about by capture, and, if he chose to treat of this practice as confined to rude nations, we can see no reason to disagree with him that man came to claim for his sole personal benefit the female he secured from the conquered. Indeed, such a practice finds a counterpart not only among the pagan nations, but is related of even in the O.-T. Scriptures (Deut. xx, 10–14). Our readers must not, however, be led to believe that among savage races marriage by capture means the procuring of a wife by hostility. Many savages, indeed, never secure their female companions except by capture, though they be of the same tribe to which they themselves belong. Indeed, while there are many rude nations that do not tolerate anything else but *endogamy*, i. e. intertribal marriage, many others, perhaps the majority, permit only *exogamy*, i. e. marriage without the tribe. (See this head below.) Nor does it at all follow that all exogamous marriages do away with communism. It is simply a step in the right direction, and in many instances has perhaps been instrumental in bringing about individual marriage relations. There is certainly no symbol more widespread, nor more varied in its forms, than that of capture in marriage ceremonies. In many cases feigned theft is necessary to the validity of the marriage. For the Hindû such a marriage form is prescribed in the Sudras (Lassen, *Indische Studien*, p. 325), and in the *Institutes* of Manu marriage by capture is enumerated among "the eight forms of the nuptial ceremony used by the four classes" (chap. iii, 33, Jones *v.* Houghton). "In the description of this marriage, called Racshasa, we have the exact prototype of the Roman and Spartan forms, in a code of laws a thousand years older than our æra" (*Nat. Qu. Rev.* June, 1872, p. 89).

The practice of capture is found in great perfection among the American Indians, existing everywhere throughout the savage races of South America, but more particularly in the regions of the Orinoco and the Amazon. The Fuegians have the practice as well as the fiction of capture. The Horse Indians of Patagonia are commonly at war with each other, or with the Canoe Indians, victory on either side resulting in the capture of women and slaughter of men. The Oens, or Coin men, are more systematic, for every year, at the time of *red leaf*, they are said to make excursions from the mountains in the north to plunder from the Fuegians their women, dogs, and arms (M'Lennan, *Prim. Marriage*, p. 61). The tribes of the Amazon and the Orinoco are in a state of constant warfare, and alternately rich and poor in women. Mr. Bates found the Manaos on the Rio Negro to resemble the Oens in habits. The Caribbees were found by Humboldt to form family groups, often numbering only forty or fifty, which were at constant enmity with each other. Capture prevailed among them to such an extent that the women of any tribe belonged so much to distinct tribes that in no group were the men and women found to speak the same language (*Personal Narrative of Travels*, v, 210). Among the wild Indians of the North the same account is applicable in varying degrees. Hearne tells us that among the Hudson's Bay Indians "it has ever been the custom for the men to wrestle for any woman to whom they are attached, and, of course, the strongest party always carries off the prize; a weak man, unless he be a good hunter and well-beloved, is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice. . . . This custom prevails throughout all their tribes, and causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who are, upon all occasions, from their childhood, trying their strength and skill in wrestling" (*Voyage to the Northern Ocean*, p. 104). Franklin also says that the Copper Indians hold women in the same low estimation as the Chippewayans do, "looking upon them as a kind of property, which the stronger may take from the weaker" (*Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, viii, 43), and Richardson (*Boat Journey*, ii, 24) "more than once saw a stronger man assert his right to take the wife of a weaker countryman. Any one may challenge another to wrestle, and, if he overcomes, may carry off the wife as the prize." Yet the women never dream of protesting against this, which, indeed, seems to them perfectly natural.

The capture of women for wives prevails also among the aborigines of the Deccan, and in Afghanistan (Latham, *Descript. Ethnol.* ii, 215). It formerly prevailed, according to Olaus Magnus, in Muscovy, Lithuania, and Livonia (*Historia de gentibus Septentrionalibus*, bk. xiv, ch. ix, p. 48). There is ample reason to believe that the practice was general among the nations in the north of Europe and Asia. Olaus Magnus, indeed, represents the tribes of the north as having been continually at war with one another, either on account of stolen women, or with the object of stealing women, "propter raptas virgines aut arripiendas" (*ut sup.* p. 328). In numerous cases the plunderers were of the royal houses of Denmark and Sweden. Among the Scandinavians, before they became Christians, wives were almost invariably fought for and wedded at the sword-point. Among the Kalmucks, Kirghis, Nogais, and Circassians, where the price cannot be agreed upon, nothing is more common than to carry off the lady by force. This capture constitutes a marriage, even before the parties come to terms (M'Lennan, p. 73). The Australians, while having a general system of betrothals, yet employ the practice of capturing wives to a great extent. According to Turnbull, when a man sees a woman whom he likes, he tells her to follow him. If she refuses, he forces her to accompany him by blows, ending by knocking her down and carrying her off (*Voyage round the World*, i, 81 sq.). Sir George Grey says that many plots are laid to carry off the women, and in the encounters which result they receive usually very harsh treatment.

Many other less barbarous nations keep up the show of force only. The following are among the most marked examples. Among the Khonds the marriage-ceremony begins with a feast at the dwelling of the bride. This is followed by dancing and song. When the night is far spent in these amusements, the principals are lifted by an uncle of each on his shoulders and carried through the dance. Suddenly they exchange burdens, and the uncle of the youth disappears with the bride. The friends of the bride now seek to arrest his flight, those of the groom to cover it, the mock contest that ensues being often carried to great lengths (M'Pherson, *Report upon Khonds*, p. 55). Among the noble class of the Kalmucks a similar form appears. The price to be paid being fixed, the bridegroom and his no-

ble friends go on horseback to her house to carry her off. Her friends make a sham resistance, but she is always carried off, on a richly-caparisoned horse, with loud shouts and *feux de joie* (Xavier de Hell, *Travels in Steppes of Caspian Sea*, p. 259). Dr. Clarke (*Travels*, etc., i, 433) describes a different ceremony, probably appertaining to a different clan of the Kalmucks. In this the girl is first mounted on horseback, and rides off at full speed pursued by her lover. If he overtakes her, she becomes his wife; but it sometimes happens that the fugitive does not favorably incline towards her pursuer, in which case she will not suffer him to overtake her. The author was assured that no instance was known of a Kalmuck girl being thus caught unless she had a partiality for her pursuer. In many cases this form of capture has become a mere pretence, as in lifting the bride by force on horseback; or, as in North Friesland, where a young fellow, called the bride-lifter, lifts the bride and the two bridesmaids on a wagon in which the married couple are to travel home (*Weinhold*, p. 50). Among the Bedouins the groom must force the bride to enter his tent. A similar custom existed in some provinces in France in the 17th century (*Marriage Ceremonies*, etc. [Gaya, Lond. 1698], p. 30). Among the Circassians the form is like that in ancient Rome. In the midst of noisy feasting and revelry, the groom must rush in, and, with the help of a few daring young men, carry off the lady by force. By this proceeding she becomes his lawful wife (Louis Moser, *The Caucasus and its People*, p. 31). Lord Kames gives a vivid picture of the custom existing in his day, or shortly previous, among the Welsh. On the morning of the wedding-day the groom appeared, with his friends, on horseback, and demanded the bride. Her friends, also mounted, refused. There ensued a mock contest, the bride being carried off mounted behind her nearest kinsman, and pursued with loud shouts. "It is not uncommon to see two or three hundred sturdy Cambro-Britons riding at full speed, crossing and jostling, to the no small amusement of the spectators." When they all were tired, the groom was allowed to overtake the bride and lead her off in triumph (*Sketches of the History of Man* [1807], bk. i, sec. 6, p. 449). In Africa the same custom exists, as observed by Speke and others. Also throughout America. It is observed in its perfection among the people of Terra del Fuego. As soon as a youthful Fuegian has shown his ability to support a wife by exploits in fishing and bird-catching, *he obtains her parents' consent*, builds or steals a canoe, and watches his chance to carry her off. If she is opposed, she hides in the woods till he is tired of looking for her; but this seldom happens (Fitzroy and King, *Voyage of the Beagle*, ii, 182). Sir Henry Piers, in 1682, describes a custom of like nature among the ancient Irish. The ceremony commenced with the drinking of a bottle of good *usquebaugh*, called the agreement bottle. Next the payment of the portion was agreed upon, generally a fixed number of cows. On the day of bringing home, the two parties rode out to meet each other. "Being come near to each other, the custom was of old to cast short darts at the company that attended the bride, but at such distance that seldom any hurt ensued" (*Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis*, i, 122). The Turcoman youth elopes with his lady-love to some neighboring village, where they live five or six weeks. In the mean time his friends obtain the consent of the parents. Afterwards the bride returns to her own home, where she is retained for six months or a year, sometimes two years, and is not allowed to see her husband except by stealth (Fraser, *Journey*, ii, 372). This custom of spending the honey-moon away from home is observed by various other tribes, and has its counterpart in the civilized custom of a wedding journey.

Among the Bedouins of Sinai, the maiden, when coming home in the evening with the cattle, is attacked by the groom and two of his friends. She often defends herself fiercely with stones. The more she struggles, bites, and cries, the more her own companions applaud her. She is taken to her father's tent, where follows the ceremony of throwing over her the abba, or man's cloak, and the name of the groom is formally announced. In the Mezeyne tribe, the girl, after being captured as above, is permitted to escape from her tent and fly to the neighboring mountains. The groom goes in search of her, and is often many days in finding her. Her female companions know her hiding-place, and keep her supplied with provisions. The length of time she remains hidden from the groom depends greatly upon the impression he has made upon her heart. After being found she returns home, but runs away again in the evening. These flights are several times repeated before she finally returns to her tent. It is sometimes a year before she goes to live in her husband's tent (Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 269).

6. *Exogamy and Endogamy.*—Marriage by capture, it is held by Lubbock and others of his class, led to the practice of exogamous marriages. We are, however, of the opinion that the great prevalence of infanticide (q. v.) among savages, especially the destruction of female infants, caused a paucity of women, and made it necessary to secure wives from hostile tribes. On this ground we can easily explain the predominance of exogamy over endogamy. Among the Khonds, intermarriage between members of the same tribe, we are told by M'Pherson (*Account of the Religion of the Khonds*, p. 57), is considered incestuous, and punishable with death. Many savage races have even established something of a caste distinction for this purpose. Thus, e. g., the Kalmucks are divided into four great nations or tribes, subdivided again into many smaller clans. The common people do not marry within three or four degrees of relationship. But no member of the noble class can marry within his own tribe; his wife must be a noble, and of a different stock (Bergmann, *Streifereien*, iii, 155). The Circassians are forbidden to marry within their own fraternities, though these sometimes comprise several thousand members. Formerly such a marriage was considered as incest, and punished by drowning; now a fine of two hundred oxen, and the restitution of the wife to her parents, are exacted (Bell, *Journal of a Residence in Circassia*, i, 347). The Yurak Samoyedes of Siberia consider all the members of the tribe as relations, however large the tribe, and forbid marriage within the tribe limits (Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology*, ii, 455). The system among the North American Indians is very similar. The tribal affiliation of each person is distinguished by his *tolem*, generally some animal sacred to the tribe. Marriage is forbidden between persons of the same tolem. Lafitau considers each nation as divided into clans, whose members are spread indiscriminately through the nation, and says that no clansman could marry a member of his own clan. Every child was considered as belonging to the clan of its mother (i, 558). The Indians of Guiana have similar customs. The Brazilian Indians vary, some being exogamous, others endogamous in their customs. Among the Tinné Indians of the North the same rule holds. A man who marries a woman of his own tribe is laughed to scorn, and considered as marrying his own sister, even if she belong to a separate division of the tribe (*Notes on Tinneh, Smithsonian Report*, 1866). In India the custom prevails to a considerable extent, and is of very ancient origin, the *Institutes* of Manu prescribing that a "twice-born" man shall not marry a woman related to him within the sixth degree, or one bearing his family name (ch. iii, § 5). The Battas of Sumatra enforce this custom of exogamy by a mode of punishment which we should imagine would effectually secure its observance. They punish those who impiously marry within the tribe by cutting them up alive, and eating them, grilled or raw, with salt and red pepper. They claim that marriage between a man and woman who had common ancestors is highly criminal (Taylor, *Nat. Hist. of Society*, i, 122). The principle of

exogamy is strictly enforced among the Australian tribes. These savages are divided into small tribes, named after the districts which they inhabit. The tribe inhabiting a particular district considers itself the owner thereof, and vigorously resents any intrusion. Yet there are many tribes often found inhabiting the same area quite differently disposed. Thus on the sub-Himalayan ranges are certain tribes which forbid intermarriage of clansmen, and others which forbid marriage outside of the tribe limits. In some districts, as in the hills on the north-eastern frontier of India, in the Caucasus, and the hill-ranges of Syria, are found a variety of tribes undoubtedly of the same original stock, yet in this particular utterly differing—some forbidding marriage within the tribe, and some proscribing marriage without it (M'Lennan, p. 147)

7. *Polyandry and Polygyny.*—The paucity of women not only reveals to us the reason why exogamy became so generally established among rude nations, but also easily explains the practice of *polyandry*, which we are told by best authorities exists to a moderate extent among savage races. Lubbock, however, will have it that "polyandry, or the marriage of one woman to several men at once, is more common than is generally supposed, though much less so than polygamy" (p. 55; compare p. 100). It prevails in its most striking form throughout Thibet and in the Himalayan regions. It is also met with in Ceylon, among tribes of the north of Asia, and in parts of Africa and America. In former times it seems to have prevailed still more widely. Tacitus found traces of it among the Germans; and Strabo tells us that in certain cantons of Media a woman was looked upon with contempt who had less than five husbands (lib. ii, p. 794). Cæsar tells us that in his time polyandry prevailed among the Britons (*De Bello Gallico*, lib. v, ch. xiv); and other traces of its former existence remain. It occurs in two distinct forms: the ruder, that in which the husbands are not brothers; the less rude, that in which they are brothers. The latter form only prevails in Thibet. In several other places, as in Ceylon, the two forms coexist. In Thibet the choice of the wife is the privilege of the elder brother. The number of husbands does not appear to be defined or restricted within fixed limits. The same system prevails throughout the Himalayan regions, and generally in Ceylon. Humboldt found this form among the South American savages, and Cæsar among the ancient Britons. In connection with the polyandry of Ceylon are two distinct forms of marriage —the Diga and the Bina. The first occurs when the wife goes to live in the house or village of her husband; the second, when the husband or husbands come to live with her. Among the Kandyans, the right of inheritance of a woman and her children depends on whether she is a diga or a bina wife (Forbes, *Ceylon*, i, 333). Among the Kochs, though their marriage is now monogamous, a like system prevails, seeming to point to former polyandry (compare, on the prevalence of polyandry, M'Lennan, p. 180 sq.; Lubbock, p. 100 sq.).

8. *Family Relations among Savages.*—That the marriage system in such imperfect stages of development as we find it to be among savage races cannot furnish any of the advantages guaranteed by the Biblical marriage system, will appear to all a matter hardly necessary to be dwelt upon. Yet there are some faint ideas of the family relation, as we conceive it, prevailing among rude nations also. That polyandry, polygamy, and communism cannot establish the relationship of father and mother, is clearly apparent. Exogamy, however, will do this measurably, especially where it approaches the monogamous system. In communal marriage no man can identify his father; the child is raised by the mother as a sort of tribal property, and naturally enough assumes her name, and only considers parentage as existing in the female line. This gave rise to the wide-spread system of *kinship through the mother* only, continuing to exist in many cases, though the cause which provoked it has disappeared. There is good reason to believe that this system formerly existed among the Celts, and Max Müller (*Chips from a German Workshop*) has traced it to the ancient Brahmins. It also appears to have been in existence in the Shemitic races, and is traceable in the Grecian systems. Its effect is visible in the habits of many modern tribes, and shows itself evidently in the wide-spread habit, of which we have already given several instances, of naming the child after the clan of its mother, and considering it as belonging especially to her family. Another cause of this lack of knowledge of the paternal relation might be habits similar to those attributed by Lafitau to the North American Indians, who, he says, visited their wives, as it were, by stealth: "Ils n'osent aller dans les cabanes particuliers ou habitent leurs épouses, que durent l'obscurité de la nuit. . . . ce serait un action extraordinaire de s'y présenter le jour" (i, 576). Herodotus says that the Lycians named the children from the mother. On the Etruscan tombs descent is traced in the female line. Many modern instances exist besides those we have already mentioned. We may instance the Nairs, and other peoples of India; the Saporogian Cossacks, certain Chinese communities, the Berberts of Sahara, and various other African tribes. Among the Buntar—the highest rank of Sudras in Tulava—a man's children are not his heirs. During his lifetime he may give them money, but all of which he dies possessed goes to his sisters and to their children. When a rich man died in Guinea, his property descended to his sister's son. Battel says the town of Loango was governed by four chiefs, the sons of the king's sister; for king's sons never became kings. Quatremère relates that, "Chez les Nubiens, dit Abon Selah, lorsqu'un roi vient à mourir et qu'il laisse un fils et un neveu du coté de sa sœur, celui-ci monte sur le trône de préférence à l'héritier naturel" (*Geograph. sur l'Egypte*, etc.). M'Lennan (*Primit. Marriage*, p. 247) thus traces the development of the family relation to our present status; and, though we have said from the outset that we cannot sanction the position taken by him and others of his class, we will not refuse them an introduction to our readers: "The polyandry, in which all the husbands were brothers, would establish the certainty of the children being of their own blood. In time the eldest brother became considered, by a species of fiction, the father of all the children; the mother was deposed from the headship of the family, and kinship became established in the paternal line. The elder brother became a sort of paterfamilias; the right of succession being in the younger brothers in their order, and, after them, in the eldest son. Thus the idea of fatherhood grew up through the Thibetan system of polyandry. In most races, though, as the sexes became more evenly balanced, *through progress towards civilization*, the system of monogamy or of polygamy would arise. Paternity thus becoming certain, the practice of sons succeeding as heirs direct to their father's estates would ensue, and, as this idea of paternal kinship arose, that of maternal relationship would die away." "Our family system, in which the child is equally related to both its parents," says Lubbock (p. 110), "appears at first sight the only natural one, but it is merely so in connection with our marriage system, there being sufficient reason to conclude, as we have seen, that the child is first related to the family group only; then to the mother, and not to the father; afterwards to the father, and not to the mother; and, only as a final result of *civilization*, becomes related to both." Maine (*Ancient Law*) and other writers of his class, however, hold to a theory that considers man's history, in the light of divine revelation, to open with perfect recognition of such kinship. In their view the family, under the father's government, was considered the primary unit, containing the germs of the state and of royalty. The family gathers other families about it, becoming the centre of a group; and these groups, tracing back their descent to a common

origin, aggregate into tribes and nations. Tribes are numerous which make this claim to common descent. But, upon inquiry, the ancestor of the race is always a legendary hero or god—a being invented to explain the origin of the tribe. In some cases the time of the invention is known, as with the Greek tribes which traced their descent to the sons of Helen.

There are several other peculiar customs widely in vogue relating to marriage, some of which are so curious that it will be well to give a brief description of them also. The strangest of these is the general avoidance of intercourse between children and parents-in-law, in which the one is often forbidden to look at or mention the name of the other. The reason or the origin of these customs, or of the many strange forms which these assume, is not clear to us, and we can only give some instances of their general character. Under the peculiar Fijian system known as the *tabu*, the husband and wife are forbidden to eat from the same dish. (Compare the above custom among the Hindûs.) In other places the father is not permitted to speak to the son after the latter is fifteen years old (Williams, *Fiji*, i, 136). Among many races the woman is absolutely forbidden to speak to her son-in-law. This system prevails generally among the American Indians (*Origin of Civilization*, p. 7). Among the Omahaws neither the father nor mother in-law will hold direct communication with their son-in-law (James, *Exp. to Rocky Mountains*, i, 232). Under the social system of the Mongols and Kalmucks a similar restriction appears, the wife being forbidden to speak to her father-in-law, or to sit in his presence. With the Ostiaks of Siberia a similar rule holds ("Un fille mariée évite autant qu'il lui est possible la présence du père de son mari, tant qu'elle n'a pas d'enfant; et le mari, pendant ce temps, n'ose pas paraître devant la mère de sa femme. S'ils se rencontrent par hasard, le mari lui tourne le dos, et la femme se couvre le visage" [Pallas, iv, 71]). In China customs of a like nature exist, and also in some of the Pacific islands. In some cases this peculiar system assumes the strangest and most decided form. In Central Africa the lover carefully avoids seeing either the father or mother of his future bride, taking great precautions to avoid an encounter. If he is of a different camp, this prohibition extends to all the members of the lady's camp, except a few special friends with whom he is permitted to have intercourse. He avoids passing through the camp, and, if obliged to do so, carefully covers his face (Caillé, *Travels to Timbuctoo*, i, 94). This appears to be a relic of the old system of capture, in which the captor would approach with the greatest stealth, and carefully avoid being observed by the inmates of the opposite camp, as in the case of the Australians above described.

Another custom widely prevalent, and of a yet stranger character, is that known in Bearn as *La Couvade*. It consists in putting the husband to bed on the birth of a child, and nursing him with the greatest care, while the mother goes to her usual duties. In some cases the poor fellow is put on such a strict regimen that he really becomes sick. There are, in fact, cases in which his peculiar sufferings are continued for several months, and he is so hardly dealt with that a real sickness would be far more endurable. Cases of this description occur in various parts of America, and in many regions of Europe and Asia, taking often the strangest forms. The idea thus symbolized is that the child is affected by anything happening to its nearest parent, and that any intemperance in eating, drinking, or otherwise, seriously affects the health of the child. Under the idea of male kinship, the father was considered the nearest parent; hence, was obliged to perform this peculiar penance. Max Müller says that the poor husband was first tyrannized over by his female relatives, and afterwards frightened into superstitiously making a martyr of himself, until he became really ill, or took to his bed in self-defence (*Chips from a German Workshop*, ii, 281). Lafitau regards it as arising from a dim recollection of original sin, rejecting the Carib explanation that if the father engaged in rough labor, or was careless in his diet, "cela feroit mal à l'enfant, et que cet enfant participeroit à tous les défauts naturels des animaux dont le père auroit mangé" (i, 259). For additional illustrations, see WEDLOCK. (J. H. W.)

Marron, PAUL HENRI, a Calvinistic divine, was born at Leyden April 12, 1754. After studying at the Academy of Leyden, Marron entered the ecclesiastical office, and in 1776 became pastor of the Walloon Church of Dort. In 1782 he was appointed chaplain of the Dutch embassy at Paris. Six years later, Rabaut-Saint-Etienne secured his election as pastor by the Protestants of Paris, on whom Louis XVI had just conferred civil rights, and who flattered themselves that they would obtain more complete justice. Being disappointed in this hope, they decided, in order to retain their pastor, who had just been called to Sedan, to celebrate public worship in a place rented for that purpose. In June, 1790, Bailly, mayor of Paris, and general La Fayette, obtained permission for the Protestants to rent the Church of Saint-Louis-du-Louvre, which had been suppressed. Marron consecrated it on the 22d of the same month. In November, 1793, he had to present to the parish, as a patriotic gift, the four silver cups used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This proceeding did not save him from persecution. He had been twice arrested on suspicion, when, on the 7th of June, 1794, he was again imprisoned, and did not recover his liberty until after the fall of Robespierre. At this period, not being able to exercise his ministry publicly, he privately fulfilled its duties, and lived on the remuneration received as translator. In March, 1795, he obtained permission to resume his pastoral functions. At the time of the reorganization of divine worship, he shared largely in the benefits of the law of April 7, 1801, and was confirmed in his position of pastor. Marron was a member of the Institute of the Low Countries, and of the Society of Sciences at Harlem; he had some talent for preaching, and possessed, above all, the showy gift of oratory. He died at Paris, July 30, 1832. He composed some Latin verses on the events of his time, which are not without merit, and left some small works, of which the principal are, *Lettre d'un Protestant à l'abbé Cerutti* (Paris, 1789, 8vo) (anonymous):—*Paul-Henri Marron à la citoyenne Hélène-Marie Williams* (Paris, an. iii, 8vo); this letter has been inserted in the second volume of his *Letters* containing a sketch of the politics of France from the 31st of May, 1793, to the 28th of July, 1794 (Lond. 1795, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Constitution du peuple Batave, traduite du Hollandais* (Paris, 1789, 8vo):—*P. H. Marron, ministre du saint-Evangile à Monsieur Lecoz, archevêque de Besançon;* this letter, dated Nov. 11, 1804, is printed at the end of a *Letter to M. Lecoz, archbishop of Besançon, on his project of uniting all the Protestants and Roman Catholics in the French empire*, etc. (Paris, 1807, 8vo). Marron also wrote for the *Journal de Paris*, the *Journal*, and the *Magasin Encyclopédique;* and contributed numerous articles to the ninth edition of the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique*, to the *Biographie Universelle* of Michaud, and to the *Revue Encyclopédique*. He is credited with the notes added to Mirabeau's work, entitled *Au Bataves, sur le stathoudérat* (1788, 8vo). See *Nécrologe de* 1832 (Par. 1833, 8vo); Barbier, *Dict. des ouvrages anonymes et pseudonymes;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Marrow (מֹחַ, *mo'ach*, *fatness*, Job xxi, 24; kindred is the verb מָחָה, *machah'*, Isa. xxv, 6, "fatness *unmarrowed*," i. e. drawn out from the marrow-bones, and therefore the most delicate; μυελός, Heb. iv, 12), the soft, oleaginous substance contained in the hollow of the bones of animals (Job xxi, 23); used figuratively for the delicate and most satisfying provisions of the Gospel (Isa. xxv, 6), and likewise in the New Testament for the most secret thoughts of the heart (Heb, iv,

12). Other terms so rendered are חֵלֶב (*che'leb*, Psa. lxiii, 5, *fat* or fatness, as elsewhere rendered) and שִׁקּוּר (*shikku'y*, Prov. iii, 8, a *moistening*, i. e. refreshing of the bones; or "drink," as in Hos. ii, 5).

Marrow Controversy. The *Marrow of Modern Divinity* was a work published in 1646 by Edward Fisher (q. v.), of the University of Oxford. It was in the form of a dialogue, to explain the freeness of the law—to expose, on the one hand, Antinomian error, and also, on the other, to refute Neonomian heresy, or the idea that Christ has, by his atonement, so lowered the requirements of the law that mere endeavor is accepted in room of perfect obedience. A copy of the book, which had been brought into Scotland by an English Puritan soldier, was accidentally found by Boston, then minister of Simprin, and was republished in 1718, under the editorial care of Mr. Hogg, minister of Carnock. It had been recommended long before by several divines of the Westminster Assembly. The treatise, consisting of quaint and stirring dialogues, throws into bold relief the peculiar doctrines of grace, occasionally puts them into the form of a startling proposition, and is gemmed with quotations from eminent Protestant divines. The publication of the *Marrow* threw the clergy into commotion, and by many of them it was violently censured. But not a few of the evangelical pastors gave it a cordial welcome, and among multitudes of the people it became a favorite book, next in veneration to the Bible and the Shorter Catechism. In 1719 its editor, Mr. Hogg, wrote an explanation of some of its passages, but in the same year principal Haddow, of St. Andrew's, opened the Synod of Fife with a sermon directed against it. The synod requested the publication of the discourse, and this step was the signal for a warfare of four years' duration. The Assembly of that year, acting in the same spirit with the Synod of Fife, instructed its commission to look after books and pamphlets promoting such opinions as are found in the *Marrow*, though they do not name the book, and to summon before them the authors and recommenders of such publications. The commission, so instructed and armed, appointed a committee, of which principal Haddow was the soul; and before this committee, named the "Committee for Purity of Doctrine," four ministers were immediately summoned. The same committee gave in a report at the next Assembly of 1720, in the shape of an overture, classifying the doctrines of the *Marrow*, and solemnly condemning them. It selected several passages which were paradoxically expressed, while it severed others from the context, and held them up as contrary to Scripture and to the *Confession of Faith*. The passages marked for reprobation were arranged under distinct heads—such as the nature of faith, the atonement, holiness, obedience and its motive, and the position of a believer in reference to the law. The committee named them as errors, thus—universal atonement and pardon, assurance of the very essence of faith, holiness not necessary to salvation, and the believer not under the law as a rule of life. Had the *Marrow* inculcated such tenets it would have been objectionable indeed. The report was discussed, and the result was a stern condemnation of the *Marrow;* and "the General Assembly do hereby strictly prohibit and discharge all the ministers of this Church, either by preaching, writing, or printing, to recommend the said book, or in discourse to say anything in favor of it; but, on the contrary, they are hereby enjoined and required to warn and exhort those people in whose hands the said book is or may come not to read or use the same." That book, which had been so highly lauded by many of the southern divines—such as Caryl and Burroughes—by the men who had framed the very creed of the Scottish Church, and who were universally acknowledged to be as able as most men to know truth and detect error, was thus put into a Presbyterian *Index expurgatorius*. Nobody can justify the extreme statements of the *Marrow*, but their bearing and connection plainly free them from an Antinomian tendency. In fact, some of the so-called Antinomian statements condemned by the Assembly are in the very words of inspiration. But the rigid decision of the Assembly only added fuel to the controversy which it was intended to allay, and the forbidden book became more and more an object of intense anxiety and prevalent study. The popular party in the Church at once concerted measures to have that act repealed. Consultations were repeatedly held by a section of the evangelical clergy, and at length it was agreed to hand in a representation to the court, complaining of the obnoxious decision, and of the injury which had been done by it to precious truth. This representation was signed by twelve ministers, and it briefly called the Assembly's attention to the fact that it had condemned propositions which are in accordance at once with the Bible and the symbolical books. The names of the twelve were—Messrs. James Hogg, Carnock; Thomas Boston, Etterick; John Bonar, Torphichen; John Williamson, Inveresk; James Kidd, Queensferry; Gabriel Wilson, Maxton; Ebenezer Erskine, Portmoak; Ralph Erskine and James Wardlaw, Dunfermline; Henry Davidson, Galashiels; James Bathgate, Orwell; and William Hunter, Lilliesleaf. These are the famous "Marrow Men"—also known as the "Twelve Brethren" and the "Representers." They were long held in great veneration by the lovers of evangelical religion. Says Buck (*Theol. Dict.* s. v.), "The 'Representers' were not only accurate and able divines, and several of them learned men, but ministers of the most enlightened and tender consciences, enemies in doctrine and practice to all licentiousness, and shining examples of true holiness in all manner of conversation. They were at the same time zealous adherents to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms." Other discussions followed; the Representers were summoned, in 1722, to the bar of the Assembly and admonished, against which they solemnly protested. As the Assembly was not supported in the position it had assumed by the religious sentiment of the nation, no further steps were taken in the matter, and thus the victory virtually lay with the evangelical recusants. It was, however, substantially this same doctrinal controversy—though it did not go by the same name—which, eleven years later, resulted in the deposition of Ebenezer Erskine and the origination of the secession of 1734. See Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclopœdia*, s. v.; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1868 (April), p. 261; Hetherington, *Eccles. Hist. Ch. of Scotland* (see Index in vol. ii). See also ERSKINE, EBENEZER.

Mars, a contraction of *Mavers* or *Mavors*, in the Oscan or Sabine language *Mamers*, Greek *Avers*, is the name of the Roman and Greek god of war, or, better, of battles.

(1) With the Romans this divinity is surnamed *Gradivus* (=*grandis divus*, the great god), also *Silvanus*, and appears to have been originally an agricultural deity—propitiatory offerings were presented to him as the guardian of fields and flocks; but as the fierce shepherds who founded the city of Rome were even more addicted to martial than to pastoral pursuits, one can easily understand how *Mars Silvanus* should have, in the course of time, become the "God of War." Mars, who was a perfect representation of the stern, relentless, and even cruel valor of the old Romans, was held in the highest honor. He ranked next to Jupiter; like him he bore the venerable epithet of *Father* (Mars-*piter*); he was one of the three tutelary divinities of the city, to each of whom Numa appointed a flamen; nay, he was said to be the father of Romulus himself (by Rhea Silvia, the priestess of Vesta), and was thus believed to be the real progenitor of the Roman people. He had a sanctuary on the Quirinal; and the hill received its name from his surname, *Quirinus*, the most probable meaning of which is *the spear-armed*. It was under this designation that he was invoked as the protector of the *Quirites* (citizens)—in other words, of the state. The

principal animals sacred to him were the wolf and the horse. He had many temples at Rome, the most celebrated of which was that outside the *Porta Capena*, on the Appian Road. The *Campus Martius*, where the Romans practiced athletic and military exercises, was named after him; so was the month of March (*Martius*), the first month of the Roman year. The *Ludi Martiales* (games held in his honor) were celebrated every year in the circus on the 1st of August.

(2) ARES, the Greek god of war, was the son of Zeus and Hera, and the favorite of Aphrodite, who bore him several children. He is represented in Greek poetry as a most sanguinary divinity, delighting in war for its own sake, and in the destruction of men. Before him into battle goes his sister *Eris* (Strife); along with him are his sons and companions, *Deimos* (Horror), and *Phobos* (Fear). He does not always adhere to the same side, like the great *Athena*, but inspires now the one, now the other. He is not always victorious. Diomede wounded him, and in his fall, says Homer, "he roared like nine or ten thousand warriors together." Such a representation would have been deemed blasphemous by the ancient Roman mind, imbued as it was with a solemn, Hebrew-like reverence for its gods. The worship of Ares was never very prevalent in Greece; it is believed to have been imported from Thrace. There and in Scythia were its great seats, and there Ares was believed to have his chief home. He had, however, temples or shrines at Athens, Sparta, Olympia, and other places. On statues and reliefs he is represented as a person of great muscular power, and either naked or clothed with the chlamys. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* vol. ii, s. v.; Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterbuch*, s. v.

Mars.

Mars, ST., a French hermit, was born at Bais, near La Guerche, about 510. He was priest at Vitré, and acquired a great reputation for piety. When old, he constructed a hermitage for himself in some waste land in the neighborhood of the village of Mars, and there ended his days. His tomb became celebrated for the numerous miracles which it was claimed were performed there. The faithful came thither on pilgrimages from all parts of Brittany. In 1427 the inhabitants of Bais, fearing an incursion of the English, carried the body of their saint to Saint-Madelaine de Vitré. The danger passed, the Baisiens demanded the body of their saint, but the canons of Vitré refused to restore it. From law-suits they proceeded to blows, and many times during the processions the Baisiens attempted to recover their precious relic; but the inhabitants of Vitré always proved the stronger, and retained the body of Saint Mars until 1750, when a decree of the Parliament of Rennes reconciled the parties by dividing the body of the saint. Vitré kept the head, the right thigh, and two sides; Bais had the remainder. The festival of Saint Mars occurs on the 14th of January and 21st of June. At these periods the shrine is carried solemnly through the surrounding country. — Dom Lobineau, *Histoire de Bretagne;* Godescard, *Vie des plus célebres Saints*, vol. i; A. Hugo, *La France pittoresque;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Marsay, CHARLES HECTOR DE ST. GEORGES, *Marquis de*, a French mystic, was born in 1688 at Paris, whither his parents, pious members of the Reformed Church, had fled to avoid the persecution raging against the Protestants in the provinces. While yet a youth the whole family removed to Germany, and there Charles took part in the Spanish War of Succession in the Netherlands. He now became a convert to the views of Bourignon (q. v.), and with his friend Cordier retired, in 1711, to Schwarzenau, in the province of Wittgenstein. Cordier, however, leaving him, he married, in 1712, Clara Elizabeth of Callerberg, whose views were similar to his own. During the years 1713–16 he made several journeys to Switzerland, where he became acquainted with the works of Madame Guyon (q. v.). He then returned to Schwarzenau, learned the watch-making trade, became president of the Philadelphian Society, and resided there until 1724. In 1746 he became a Pietist, and died in the neighborhood of Ambleben in 1753, a truly evangelical Christian, a disciple of Christ, clinging faithfully to the truth as it is in Jesus. Marsay had great influence in propagating throughout Germany the mystic views of Bourignon and Guyon. He wrote *Freimüthige u. christliche Discurse* (1734):—*Zeugniss eines Kindes v. d. Richtigkeit d. Wege d. Geistes* (1735, 2 parts): —*Selbstbiographie*, in the 2d vol. of Valenti, *System d. höheren Heilkunde* (Elberf. 1826). — Göbel, *Gesch. der wahren Inspirations-gemeinden* (in Niedner's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1855, iii, § 21, 4); the same, *Gesch. d. christl. Lebens*, etc. (Cobl. 1852), ii, bk. ix; also the excellent article in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 116 sq.

Marsden, SAMUEL, one of the noblest missionary workers the Church of England ever sent out to battle for Christ, the noted Australian chaplain and friend of the Maori, was born of humble parentage in 1764, and was educated at the free grammar-school at Hull, by the celebrated English divine Dr. Joseph Milner. Samuel began life as a tradesman at Leeds. He had been converted under Wesleyan preaching, had joined the Methodists, and belonged to their society for some time, but, having higher aspirations than the mercantile profession, he entered the English Church to secure a collegiate training. He was placed at St. Joseph's College, Cambridge, and there educated by the Elland Society, whose object it was to aid poor young men having the ministry in view. Before Marsden had even taken his degree, he was offered the chaplaincy to New South Wales. At first he was very adverse to accepting it, but, finding that there was no one who could so well fill this difficult post, he consented, and in the spring of 1793 was ordained. Soon after he married Elizabeth Triston, a very worthy lady, who did much to aid him in his missionary labors. In 1794 he arrived at Paramatta, his new home. Early in the 17th century England had adopted penal transportation. The newly-acquired territories in America were then used for this purpose, and, as we know, oftentimes aided in the propagation of white slavery. The Revolution, and the subsequent establishment of independence in the colonies, obliged England to discontinue this practice of disposing of criminals. But the great fear entertained in England that the country would be overrun with crime, led the government of George III to establish a penal colony in Australia. About seven years previous to Marsden's arrival there the first convict ship had been sent out with its living freight, and yet up to this time religious training was unknown. It little mattered to England what became of the convict, so long as he was well out of her way. A powerful military force was required to keep this mass of corrupt humanity in subjection, and, instead of being benefited, they were rather hardened in their sins. For teaching the Gospel the Church furnished only two ministers—for soldiers, convicts, settlers, and all. Marsden was one of these, and, the senior preacher failing in health, he was soon left to struggle on alone. Although severely tried by domestic affliction, he was not found wanting. At that time the custom prevailed there and in England for the parish priest to administer justice as well as give spiritual advice. The son of a Yorkshire farmer could not be expected to be very conversant with law, but good sense and a clear perception of justice came to the rescue. His farming education, however, served him well, for, receiving a

grant of land, and thirteen convicts to till it, as part payment for his services, he made it the model farm in New South Wales, and from the profits was enabled to establish schools and missions. A rebellious spirit manifesting itself among the convicts, Marsden sailed for England, after an absence of fourteen years, to appeal to the home government. His main object was to secure a grant permitting the convicts' friends to go out with them to the penal colony. This was denied him, but his representation that the convicts ought to be instructed in trades was well received.

During his visit to England Mr. Marsden also laid the foundation of the missions to New Zealand, and prepared to become the apostle of the Maori race. Before leaving Australia he had had some intercourse with these tribes, which he found to be of a much higher type of humanity than the Australian native. Indeed, they possessed such a spirit of enterprise and curiosity that they would often visit the island of Australia, and Marsden is said to have entertained thirty at one time. He vainly endeavored to obtain help from the Church Missionary Society. No clergyman could be found to undertake the mission to New Zealand, but two laymen, William Hall and John King, consented to act as pioneers. These two good men accompanied Marsden to Australia in August, 1809. They were soon followed by Thomas Kendall. To transfer these lay missionaries to their intended field of labor, Marsden conceived the plan of fitting out a missionary ship, but, failing to interest outside parties, he finally purchased a small one at his own expense. This was the *Active*, the first of the mission ships that now carry the Gospel to every part of the globe. Marsden accompanied this expedition, and was kindly welcomed by the natives. His method in founding missions to propagate Christianity was unlike that of Eliot; to begin with faith, and then to look for civilization. He rather thought that civilization prepared the way for the acceptance of faith, and, as his teachers were laymen, he employed them only in laying the foundations of a Christian civilization. Marsden frequently repeated his visits, and in many ways aided the enterprise. On his fourth visit he took out with him the Rev. Henry Williams, who afterwards became bishop of a Maori district. It was now nine years since he had first landed here, and, in spite of so many disappointments and so much opposition, he found the condition of the natives greatly improved. A Wesleyan mission had been established at Wingaroa, under Mr. Leigh. During his two months' stay he endeavored to persuade the natives to adopt a fixed form of government, and advised the missionaries to collect a vocabulary, and arrange a grammar that might aid in future translations. In 1838 he made his seventh and last visit. He was now seventy-two years of age. Wherever he went he was greeted as the friend of the Maori. He had always hoped that this intelligent people might be Christianized, and it gladdened his heart to see the improvements they had made. Sunday was generally observed among the natives, and polygamy and cannibalism were fast diminishing, and there was every token that the apostle of New Zealand had conquered a country and people for the Church of God. Marsden was possessed of a will and force of character that enabled him to accomplish whatever he undertook. He died May 12, 1838. See Miss Charlotte M. Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders*, p. 216–240. See NEW ZEALAND; SELWYN.

Mar'sena (Heb. *Marsena'*, מַרְסְנָא, according to Benfey, the Sanscrit *marsha, noble*, with the Zend ending *na, man;* Sept. Μαρσενά, but most copies omit; Vulg. *Marsana*), one of the seven Medo-Persian satraps or viziers of Xerxes (Esth. i, 14). B.C. 483. Josephus understands that they had the office of interpreters of the laws (*Ant.* xi, 6, 1).

Mars' Hill (Ἄρειος πάγος, *collis Martius*, Acts xvii, 22, the *Areopagus*, as in ver. 19; so called, according to Pausan. i, 28, 5, from the fact that Mars was first judged there), a limestone hill in Athens, north-west of the Acropolis (Herod. viii, 52), and considerably lower (Pococke, *East*, iii, tab. 65), where (even down to the time of the Roman emperors, Gell. xii, 7) the most ancient and boasted Athenian supreme tribunal (Tacitus, *Annal.* ii, 55) and court of morals (Æschyl. *Eumen.* 701; Senec. *Trang.* 3; Val. Max. ii, 6, 4), composed of the most honorable and upright citizens (Athen. vi, p. 251), and held in the highest regard not only throughout Greece, but even among foreigners (comp. Wetstein, ii, 565), had its sessions, to discuss cases of civil and criminal offences, originally according to the sole law of its own discretion (comp. Aristot. *Polit.* ii, 10; v, 12; Macrob. *Saturn.* vii, 1, p. 204; Quintil. *Institut.* v, 9; Ælian, *V. H.* v, 15). After having continued for many centuries in full authority, it fell under some restrictions in the times of the New Test.; but the date of its extinction is unknown. (See Pauly, *Real-Encyklop.* i, 700 sq.; Döderlein, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* v, 193 sq.; also Meursii *Areopagus*, Ludg. Bat. 1624; Böckh, *De Areopago*, Berol. 1826.) From some part of that hill, but not before the judges (for there is no trace of a regular judicial procedure in the entire narrative), Paul delivered his famous address (Acts xvii, 19 sq.) to his hearers upon the steps and in the valley (comp. Robinson, *Researches*, i, 10 sq.). See AREOPAGUS.

Marsh (גֶּבֶא, *ge'bè*, a *collection* of waters, Ezek. xlvii, 11; elsewhere a cistern or *reservoir*, rendered "pit," Isa. xxx, 14; Jer. xiv, 3), a swamp or wet piece of land. The passage in Ezekiel speaks of the future blessings of the Jews after their restoration under the figure of drainage of land useless by its dampness: "But the miry places thereof, and the *marishes* thereof, shall not be healed: they shall be given to salt" (xlvii, 11); that is, the part in question shall be reserved for the production of salt by the evaporation of the waters (see Henderson, *Comment.* ad loc.). It is supposed that the "valley of salt" in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea is here referred to, for there the Kedron, the course of which the prophet describes the holy waters as following, empties. This plain or valley has been traversed and described by captains Irby and Mangles in terms appropriate to the prophecy. Lieut. Lynch, in coasting around the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, found not only the Ghor to be an immense marshy flat, but the bottom of the lake itself a muddy shoal, scarcely allowing the boat to be rowed through it. The salt hills around presented a scene of unmitigated desolation (*Expedition*, p. 310).

Marsh, Francis, a noted Irish prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was made bishop of Limerick in 1667; was transferred to Kilmore and Ardagh in 1673; in 1682 became archbishop of Dublin, and died in 1693. But little is accessible to gather a detailed account of his life and work. Lawrence B. Phillips (*Dict. Biog. Ref.*) refers to Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiæ Hibernicæ* (Dubl. 1849, 5 vols. 8vo), and to D'Alton, *Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1838, 8vo).

Marsh, Herbert, an English theologian and prelate, "one of the acutest and most truly learned divines of his day," was born in London in 1757, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; graduated with great distinction; was made fellow, and became M.A. in 1782. He then went to the Continent, and studied at the University of Göttingen, and later at Leipsic. He returned to England in 1800, and in 1807 became professor of divinity at Cambridge. In 1816 he was appointed bishop of Llandaff, and bishop of Peterborough in 1819. He died May 1, 1839. He published several religious and controversial treatises, and furnished an excellent English translation of Michaelis's *Introduction to the New Testament*, with notes. "A dissertation on the genuineness of 1 John v, 7, included in Michaelis's work, drew from Mr. Travis, archdeacon of Chester, 'Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq.,' in defence of the genuineness of the passage, which bishop Marsh

answered, in vindication of Michaelis and himself, in his celebrated 'Letters to Archdeacon Travis'—an able and critical production, but which did not, as some eminent scholars have supposed, settle the question. He has also published several parts of a *Course of Divinity Lectures*, with a historical view of the progress of theological learning, and notices of authors. This work, entitled *Lectures on Divinity, with an Account of the principal Authors who have excelled in Theological Learning* (7 parts, Cambr. 1809–23; Lond. 1838), includes 'Lectures on Sacred Criticism and Interpretation,' which have been published separately, and are, as is well known to Biblical scholars, of the highest value" (Horne, in *Bibl. Bib.* 1839, p. 160 sq.). His other works are *Essay on the Usefulness and Necessity of Theological Learning to those designed for Holy Orders* (1792):—*Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome* (Lond. 1841, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, 1225; *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxix, 69 sq.

Marsh, James, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born July 19, 1794, at Hartford, Vt. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1817; spent some years in Andover Theological Seminary; was ordained Oct. 12, 1824, and during the same month entered upon the duties of a professorship in Hampden Sydney College, Va. In 1826 he was elected president of the University of Vermont, which position he resigned in 1833, but continued as professor of moral and intellectual philosophy until 1840. He died at Colchester, Vt., July 3, 1842. Dr. Marsh assisted in translating the work of Bellermann on the *Geography of the Scriptures* (1822). He published a *Preliminary Essay to Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection"* (1828):—*Selections from the Old English Writers on Practical Theology*:—his *Inaugural Address at Burlington* (1826):—a *Treatise on Eloquence*:—*Translation of Herder's Work on Hebrew Poetry*:—and *Translation of Hegewisch's Chronology*. A memoir of his life, with selections from his writings, was published by professor Torrey (1843, 8vo; 2d ed. 1845). See *North Am. Rev.* xxiv, 470; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. Am. Lit.* ii, 130; Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 692; Drake, *Dict. Am. Biog.* s. v.

Marsh, John (1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 2, 1742 (O. S.), at Haverhill, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1761; entered the ministry in 1765; was appointed tutor at Harvard in 1771; remained there two years, and was ordained January, 1774, pastor of the First Church, Wethersfield, Conn., where he died, Sept. 13, 1821. He published a few occasional *Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 619.

Marsh, John (2), D.D., son of the preceding, an eminent American divine, who enjoyed a national reputation from his connection, almost from its origin, with the great temperance reform of the last half century, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., April 2, 1788; graduated at Yale College, and in 1818 was settled as a Congregational pastor in Haddam, Conn. He at once identified himself with the cause he so ably served for half a generation, and attracted public attention by the address which he delivered before the Windham County Temperance Society in Pomfret, Conn., in 1829. That year a state society had been formed, of which Jeremiah Day, of Yale College, was the president, and Mr. Marsh the secretary and general agent, and, to do efficient service for the society, the latter offered his services to the county associations as far as he could in connection with his pastoral labor. His address in Pomfret, styled "Putnam and his Wolf," ran a parallel between general Putnam's well-known pursuit of the wolf in his den in that town and the temperance crusade against a more terrible monster. The address was afterwards printed, and in a short period 150,000 copies were disposed of. The American Tract Society finally placed it upon its list. See TEMPERANCE REFORM. In 1833 Dr. Marsh was invited to leave his charge and become an agent of the society in Philadelphia; and by the advice of his friends he yielded himself to what was at that time a most laborious and self-denying mission. Three years later he removed to New York as secretary of the American Temperance Union, and editor of its organ and of its publications, and remained until 1865, when the society was reorganized, and a change was made in its officers. Although full of years, he allowed himself no rest from his labors, preaching constantly, lecturing upon his life theme, and offering himself to every good word and work. His last efforts were put forth in behalf of an endowment of the Yale Theological Seminary. He had already raised $10,000, and was full of encouragement in reference to the results of his endeavors. His labors ended only with his life. He died Aug. 4, 1868. "Few men have been more respected or more widely known throughout the country than Dr. Marsh. Enthusiastic in his mission, catholic in spirit, welcoming every new laborer in the great field, and readily seizing upon each new phase of the temperance reformation, his name will remain inseparably connected with the history of the cause in all future time. He was a good man, shedding a benign influence by his devoted life wherever he moved" (*N. Y. Christian Advocate*, August, 1868). Besides editing *The Temperance Journal*, Dr. Marsh was the author of several popular works; among others, of a well-known *Epitome of Ecclesiastical History* (N. Y., A. S. Barnes and Co.); of a valuable handbook entitled *Temperance Recollections — Labors, Defeats, Triumphs*, an autobiography (N. Y. 1866, 12mo), "a rich text-book for every man who would plead the cause of temperance;" etc. See the (*N. Y.*) *Christian Advocate*, August, 1868; the *Eclectic Magazine*, 1866 (June), p. 773. (J. H. W.)

Marsh, Narcissus, D.D., a learned Irish prelate, was born at Hannington, near Highworth, in Wiltshire, in 1638; was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1658 became fellow of Exeter College. The degree of D.D. he received in 1671; some time previous he was made chaplain to the bishop of Exeter, and later to chancellor Hyde, earl of Clarendon. In 1673 he was appointed principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and in 1678 provost of Dublin College. In 1683 he became bishop of Leighlin and Ferns; archbishop of Cashel in 1690, of Dublin in 1694, and of Armagh in 1703. He died Nov. 2, 1713. Dr. Marsh was a pious and noble soul. He founded an almshouse at Drogheda for poor widows of clergymen, and provided for their support. He likewise repaired, at his own expense, many decayed churches within his diocese, and bought in several impropriations, which he restored to the Church. He also gave to the Bodleian Library a great number of MSS. in the Oriental languages, chiefly purchased out of Golius's collection. He was a very learned and accomplished man. Besides sacred and profane literature, he had applied himself to mathematics and natural philosophy; he was deep in the knowledge of languages, especially the Oriental; he was also skilled in music, the practice as well as the theory. He published *Manuductio ad logicam*, written by Philip de Trieu; to which he added the Greek text of Aristotle, and some tables and schemes, and Gassendus's small tract *De demonstratione*, which he illustrated with notes (Oxon. 1678):—*Institutiones logicæ, in usum juventutis academicæ* (Dublin, 1681):—*An Introductory Essay to the Doctrine of Sounds* (published in the "Philosophical Transactions" of the Royal Society of London):—*A Charge to his Clergy of the Diocese of Dublin* (1694, 4to). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. vii, s. v.; *Biog. Brit.* s. v.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. ii (see Index); Ware's *Ireland*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Marsh, William (1), D.D., an English divine, was incumbent of St. Mary's, Leamington; later rector of Beddington, and died in 1866. He published *Catechism on the Collects* (3d ed. 1824, 24mo):—*Plain Thoughts on Prophecy* (3d ed. 1843, 8vo):—*Occasional Sermons*, etc. (1821, etc.). See *Memoirs of the late Rev. Wm. Marsh, D.D.*, by his daughter (post 8vo).

Marsh, William (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Orono, Me., May 4, 1789; was converted when about fifteen years old; began preaching before he was twenty-one years of age, at one time assisting the preacher in charge of a circuit which included the present Dresden charge. In 1811 Marsh joined the New England Conference; was ordained deacon in 1813, and elder in 1815. His appointments were as follows: 1811, Durham, Me.; 1812, East Greenwich, R. I.; 1813, New London; 1814, Bristol; 1815, Tolland, Conn.; 1816, Nantucket, Mass.; 1817, Lynn; in 1818 he appears to have been sent to Bath, but for some reason now unknown he spent most of that year in Orrington. In 1820 he was superannuated, and from 1821 to 1828 he was located and resided in Orrington, where he labored as he was able. In 1829, at the earnest request of the Church at Hampden, he again entered the itinerancy, and was stationed with them. A powerful revival was the result, the people coming miles to the meeting, and, being converted, returning to their homes to scatter the hallowed influence in regions beyond. In 1830-31 he presided on Penobscot District; in 1832 was stationed at Houlton. From 1833-37 he was forced by continued ill health to take a superannuated relation, and retire from active duty. In 1838 he was made effective, and stationed at Lincoln; 1839, at Monroe; 1840, at Frankfort; 1841, superannuated; 1842, was effective, and stationed at Cherryfield; 1843, at Eddington; 1844, again superannuated. In 1845 we find him again effective, and presiding elder of Bangor District; 1846-47, on Portland District; 1848, Bangor District; 1849, superannuated; 1850, effective, and stationed at Oldtown; 1851-53, superannuated; 1854-55, effective, and stationed at Orrington Centre; 1856-57, at South Orrington, after which he never sustained an effective relation. He died Aug. 26, 1865. "Father Marsh possessed great natural abilities. As he had clear perception, good judgment, was apt in illustration, graphic in description, and ready with appropriate language, he could not fail to be an able and effective speaker. It is true that his early educational advantages were not great, nor could we speak of him as a critical scholar; yet, in the best sense of the term, he was learned. . . . He has been justly styled a model in the social relations. His religious experience was deep, his affections centred on God. As a preacher, in his prime, he had few equals. He seemed at times to entirely command the thought and feelings of his hearers, yet was this almost unbounded influence entirely consecrated to Christ, and used to promote his glory and the salvation of men. It is needless to add that under such a ministry many were converted." See *Conference Minutes*, 1866, p. 110.

Marshall, Andrew, a colored Baptist minister, was, according to his own account, born a slave in 1755, but by his diligence and economy succeeded in purchasing his own freedom and that of his whole family. He joined the Baptist Church when nearly fifty years old; was in 1806 ordained pastor of the Second (colored) Baptist Church in Savannah; and after this had, under his ministrations, become large enough to be divided, he became pastor of the part which took the name of "First African Baptist Church." This position he filled until his death, Dec. 8, 1856, occasionally preaching also in Augusta, Macon, Milledgeville, Charleston, and New Orleans. He was also in business on a large scale. He possessed elements in his nature which would have made him a leading character anywhere. The high mental efforts which he at times displayed proved him to be equal to any subject which he would find occasion to meet, if allowed opportunity for preparation. His sight and hearing remained to the last as good as in middle life, and his lower limbs only began seriously to fail him in his one hundredth year. During the long period of his ministry he baptized about thirty-eight hundred persons, and he supposed that about four thousand had professed conversion under his preaching.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 251.

Marshall, George, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beltegh Parish, Derry County, Ireland, in 1830. He attended the schools of his native land, and, after his arrival in America, continued his studies, and graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1852, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1855. He was immediately licensed, and in 1856 ordained and installed pastor of Rock Church, Cecil Co., Md., where he continued to labor until his death, Feb. 27, 1861. Mr. Marshall was a man of devoted piety, excellent natural talents, and solid attainments; his sermons were sound and instructive, his delivery earnest and impressive. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 101.

Marshall, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Pa., Jan. 13, 1813. He received his early education in St. Clairsville, Ohio; graduated at Franklin College, Ohio, in 1839; studied theology in the seminary of the Associate Presbyterian Church in Canonsburg, Pa.; was licensed in 1843, and installed pastor of the Associate Presbyterian churches of Londonderry and West Chester, Ohio. Owing to the discussion going on in anticipation of the union between the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches, his mind was directed to the investigation of their views concerning psalmody and intercommunion, and this led, in 1854, to his joining the presbytery of St. Clairsville. In 1855 he became the stated supply for Woodsfield Church, Ohio, and in 1857 he accepted a call to the churches of Doddsville and Huntsville, Ill. He died Aug. 24, 1858. Mr. Marshall was practical and zealous as a preacher, social and affable as a Christian gentleman. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 75.

Marshall, Joseph D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Stamford, Conn., in Nov., 1804, of Congregational parentage. His early years were spent in mercantile life; he was converted when about twenty years old; felt a call for the ministry, and in 1827 entered the New York Conference, and was for two years stationed at Kingston Circuit. In 1829 he was appointed to New Pfalz Circuit; in 1830 to Flushing; in 1832 was transferred to Troy Conference, and appointed to St. Albans Circuit; next and successively to Peru, Charlotte, Shelburne, and Wesley Chapel, Albany; in 1837 was retransferred to the New York Conference, and appointed to Windham Circuit; in 1838 to Sag Harbor; in 1839 was superannuated, because of failing health; and, though he returned to effective work for a time, he only recovered his health in 1843, when he re-entered active work, and successively preached at Goshen, Conn., Birmingham, Reading, and New Canaan. Thereafter he was a superannuate. He died at Brooklyn, Jan. 9, 1860. "He magnified his office as a pastor in all the churches committed to his care. . . . He was characterized for his equanimity of disposition, and the pure tone of his devotional and experimental piety." See Smith, *Sacred Memories*, p. 232 sq.

Marshall, Nathaniel, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. But little is known of his personal history. In 1712 he preached before the sons of the clergy; in January, 1715, he was lecturer at Aldermanbury and curate at Kentish Town; later he became canon of Windsor. He appears also to have had the lectureship of St. Martin's, Ironmonger-lane, and died Feb. 6, 1730-31. He published *A Translation of the Genuine Works of St. Cyprian* (1717, fol.):—*Sermons* (1717, 1731-1750, 4 vols. 8vo); besides a number of occasional *Sermons*, etc.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1796; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Marshall, Samuel Vance, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayette Co., Ky., Feb. 6, 1798. He was educated at Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. (class of 1821); studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1825, and ordained by West Lexington Presbytery in 1826. During 1827 he labored as a missionary in South Carolina; then went

to North Middleton and Mt. Sterling churches, in Kentucky; and subsequently to Woodford, Ky. In 1735 he was elected professor of languages in Transylvania University, and in 1837 to the same chair in Oakland College, Miss. Here he spent the remainder of his life in teaching, and in voluntary service as an evangelist, especially among colored people. He died Nov. 30, 1860. Mr. Marshall was a man of strong character, and of large attainments, adapted to academic and popular pursuits; a good preacher, kind and social in his disposition. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 102.

Marshall, Stephen, a noted commonwealth Presbyterian divine, lecturer at St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, who flourished in the first half of the 17th century, and died in 1655, was the author of some controversial theological treatises, etc. (1640–81). He also published a number of occasional *Sermons*. "The most memorable of Marshall's works is his sermon preached at the funeral of Pym" (1644, 4to). See *Life of Stephen Marshall* (1680, 4to); Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1759; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Marshall or **Mareschal, Thomas,** an English divine of note, was born at Barkby, in Leicestershire, about 1621; was entered at Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1640, and while there became a constant hearer of archbishop Usher's sermons in All-hallows Church. The influence of that prelate's style is apparent in all the writings of Mr. Marshall. Upon the breaking out of the civil war he took up arms for the king at his own charge, and therefore, in 1645, when he was a candidate for the degree of bachelor of arts, was admitted without paying fees. Upon the approach of the Parliamentary visitation, he left the university, went beyond sea, and became preacher to the company of English merchants at Rotterdam and Dort. In 1661 he was made bachelor of divinity; and, in 1668, became fellow of his college; and, in 1669, doctor of divinity. In 1672 he was appointed rector of Lincoln College, Oxford; later he became chaplain-in-ordinary to the king, and, in 1681, finally dean of Gloucestershire. He died in 1685. He was distinguished for his knowledge of the Oriental tongues and of the Anglo-Saxon. He published *Observationes in Evangeliorum versiones per antiquas duas, Gothicas scilicet, etc., Anglo-Saxonicas*, etc. (Dort, 1665); also a *Life of Archbishop Usher* (Lond. 1686); *The Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer briefly explained by short Notes* (Oxf. 1679). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii (see Index); *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Wood, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. vii, s. v.

Marshall, Walter, an English divine of the second half of the 17th century, was educated at, and later became fellow of New College, Oxford, and Winchester College; vicar of Hursley, Hampshire; was ejected at the Restoration; subsequently became pastor of a dissenting congregation at Gosport, and died in 1690. He published *The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification Opened in sundry Practical Directions*, together with a *Sermon on Justification* (Lond. 1692, 8vo; often reprinted; last ed. 1838, 32mo).—Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. Dissenters*, i, 454.

Marshall, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1789; was educated and studied divinity at Glasgow; was licensed by the Presbytery of Dysart, Scotland; preached a number of years at Calinshow, Fifeshire, and in 1832 came to America, and was installed pastor of the Church at Peekskill, N. Y. In 1843, when the *marriage question* engaged the attention and called forth not a little of the talent and Biblical lore of the Church, he made the argument in that relation before the Synod of New York, which was afterwards published under the title, *An Inquiry concerning the Lawfulness of Marriage between Parties previously related by Affinity; also a short History of Opinions in different Ages and Countries, and of the Action of the Ecclesiastical Bodies on that Subject.* He died in 1864. Mr. Marshall possessed fine analytical powers, comprehensive and penetrating; his sermons were remarkably exact, his manner rather studied. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 99; Sprague, *Ann. Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 7. (J. L. S.)

Marsham, Sir John, an English scholar, celebrated for his acquirements in history, languages, and chronology, was born in London in 1602, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He embraced the cause of the Royalists in the civil war. He died in 1685. He was the author of a work entitled *Chronologicus Canon Ægyptiacus, Ebraicus*, etc. (Lond. 1672, fol.), in which he attempts to reconcile Egyptian chronology with the Hebrew Scriptures, by supposing four collateral dynasties of Egyptian kings reigning at the same time. This theory has been adopted by several eminent scholars. He also wrote the preface to the first volume of Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, and left behind him at his death, unfinished, *Canonis chronici liber quintus: sive, Imperium Persicum:—De provinciis et legionibus Romanis:—De re numeraria;* etc. We are likewise in some measure obliged to him for the *History of Philosophy* by his very learned nephew, Thomas Stanley, Esq., since it was chiefly at his instigation that that excellent work was undertaken. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses;* Shuckford, *Sacred and Profane History; Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Marshman, Joshua, D.D., a noted English Baptist missionary to India, one of the "Serampore Brethren," as the band of missionaries among whom he and Dr. Carey were the most prominent often styled themselves, the person who, above all others, gave to the English Protestant mission in India the strength, consistency, and prudence which it wanted, was born April 20, 1767, at Westbury Leigh, in Wiltshire. While yet a lad, Joshua Marshman attracted attention by his passion for reading, and his quiet, heartfelt religion. His parents were poor, and he had to struggle hard to secure an education. In 1794 he became master of a school at Bristol, at the same time entering himself a student at "Bristol Academy," where he studied thoroughly Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac. His mind became imbued at this time with the missionary spirit which the noted English cobbler, Carey, was spreading in England, and in 1799 Marshman offered to become one of the party sent out to India by the "Baptist Missionary Society," to further the cause which Carey was advocating. Oct. 13, 1799, the company found themselves sixteen miles above Calcutta, at Serampore, on the Hooghly, "a town pleasantly situated, beautiful to look at, and full of a mixed population of Danes, Dutch, English, and natives of all hues." The intention was to proceed to British ground, Serampore being at that time Danish territory; but the Anglo-Indians objected to Christian missionary enterprises in their midst, and the mission was finally established at Serampore, to spread thence, in God's own appointed time, the truths of his Gospel among the benighted of all India. The fate of the missionary enterprise has been spoken of in the article India (q. v.); the activity of each member in the biographical sketches of these faithful servants of Christ [see Carey; Ward, Thomas]; we can here deal only with the part Joshua Marshman himself played in this, one of the most important of missionary enterprises.

Marshman had married the daughter of a Baptist minister before he became teacher at Bristol; his wife now accompanied him to India, and proved a helpmeet indeed from the very outset. Shortly after landing at Serampore, finding the support granted by the home society inadequate to the wants of the colony, Marshman, with the assistance of his wife, opened two boarding-schools for European children, and, succeeding even beyond their most sanguine expectations in securing not only a support for themselves, but a maintenance of the mission, shortly after opened a school for the natives also, which was quickly filled; and the pecuniary

return of this enterprise, together with the additional income which Carey received for his services as an instructor in the government college at Fort William, enabled these good people in a short time to render their mission nearly independent of home support. The Baptists of England, however, failed to appreciate these heroic and self-sacrificing labors of Carey, and Marshman, and Ward, and much fault was found by the committee of the general society. "There were among them many men of good intentions, but without breadth of views, and used to small economies. They listened to false reports, censured without sufficient information, pinched their missions, and dictated the management, so that to deal with them was but a vexation of spirit. . . . Moreover, the American subscribers [American Baptists joined their English brethren until Judson went out from the American society] sent a most vexatious and absurd remonstrance against any part of their contributions for training young men to the ministry being employed in teaching science. 'As if,' said Dr. Marshman, 'youths in America could be educated for ministers without learning science.'"

Had the government of the mission been in the hands of a body acquainted, by personal experience, with the needs of the Serampore Brethren, any misunderstanding springing up could easily have been allayed; but, managed by the class of men we have just spoken of, the disagreement between the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore missionaries (originating in 1817) lasted for some time, and even seriously threatened the success of the enterprise. In 1822 Dr. Marshman had dispatched his son John to England to restore pleasant relations. The disagreement continuing, Dr. Marshman decided to go before the society in person, and in 1826 returned home. But even he failed in his mission; and in 1827, after much argument, the matter ended in the separation of the Serampore mission from the general society. To a man like Dr. Marshman, now hoary with age, this matter became a serious annoyance, and his strength of body and of mind were greatly impaired. Additional trouble came when the ownership of the buildings at the Serampore mission was to be disposed of, the home society naturally enough claiming the property, although it had been secured mainly by the hard labors of Carey and Marshman. In 1823, Dr. Marshman's trials had become very heavy. At that time Mr. Ward was taken away by cholera. "For twenty-three years had the threefold cord between Carey, Marshman, and Ward been unbroken. They had lived together like brothers, alike in aim and purposes, each supplying what the other lacked; and the distress of the parting was terrible, especially to Dr. Marshman, who, at the time of his friend's illness, was suffering from an attack of deafness, temporary indeed, but for some days total, so that he could only watch the final struggle without hearing a single word." His mental strength was even then sorely tried, for "he wrote as if he longed to be with those whose toils and sorrows were at an end." Greater was the shock that the treatment of the home society brought upon him. "Morbid attacks of depression came on, during which he wandered about unable to apply himself so much as even to write a letter." June 9, 1834, Dr. Carey died, and he was left alone to defend his cause. In 1836 a daughter of his, who had married the afterwards so celebrated Christian soldier of the British army, Henry Havelock, barely escaped with her life from her bungalow, which had caught fire, losing one of her three children, a baby, in the flames. The nervous excitement which this affair caused Dr. Marshman prostrated him completely, and he died Dec. 5, 1837. A few days previous to this event arrangements had been concluded in London for the reunion of the Serampore Mission with the parent society, and for retaining Dr. Marshman in the superintendence.

By severe and diligent labor Dr. Marshman had acquired a complete knowledge of the Bengalee, Sanscrit, and Chinese languages. Into the Chinese he translated the four Gospels, the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and the Corinthians, and the book of Genesis. He also wrote *A Dissertation on the Characters and Sounds of the Chinese Language* (1809, 4to):—*The Works of Confucius, containing the original Text, with a Translation* (1811, 4to, reviewed in *London Quarterly Review*, xi, 332):—*Clavis Sinica:—Elements of Chinese Grammar, with a Preliminary Dissertation on the Characters and Colloquial Medium of the Chinese* (Serampore, 1814). In Sanscrit and Bengalee he assisted Dr. Carey in the preparation of a Sanscrit grammar in 1815, and a Bengalee and English dictionary in 1825. In 1827 he published an abridgment of the dictionary. He also engaged in a controversy with Rammohun Roy (q. v.), who distinguished himself greatly among his countrymen in India by his spirited attacks upon idolatry, and by the publication of a work entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace*, in which, while exalting the precepts, he asperses the miracles of Christ. Dr. Marshman answered this work by a series of articles in the *Friend of India* (a periodical issued by the Serampore missionaries), subsequently republished in book form (Lond. 1822), entitled *A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in reply to Rammohun Roy, of Calcutta*. In 1824 appeared a second London edition of Rammohun Roy's work, illustrated with a portrait of the author, and containing a reply to Dr. Marshman. In a sketch of Dr. Marshman's character at the end of the first volume of Dr. Cox's *History of the Baptist Missionary Society* he is spoken of as "possessed of great mental power and diligence, of firmness bordering upon obstinacy, and of much wariness." See *Lond. Gent. Mag.* 1838, pt. ii, p. 216; *English Cyclopædia of Biography* (1857), iv, 120; Kaye, *Christianity in India*, ch. vii; Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders* (Lond. 1872, 12mo), ch. v; Trevor, *India, its Natives and Missions*, p. 316; Marshman (J.), *Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward* (Lond. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo; popular ed., N. Y. 1867, 12mo).

Marsiac, Council of (*Concilium Marsiacense*), was held Dec. 8, 1326, by William de Flavacour, archbishop of Auch, and his suffragans. The proceedings are of little interest. This council established the feast of S. Martha, the sister of S. Mary Magdalene, celebrated on the fourth of the calends of August. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 390.

Marsile, a Dutch philosopher and theologian, was born at Inghen, in the diocese of Utrecht. He was canon and treasurer of the Church of Saint-Andrew, at Cologne, and when Rupert, the duke of Bavaria, founded the academy of Heidelberg in 1386, he called Marsile to a professorship of philosophy. He died there Aug. 20, 1394. Tritenhemius attributes to him a *Dialectic*, and some comments on Aristotle and on Peter Lombard. Fabricius adds that his commentaries on the four books of the *Sentences* were published in Strasburg in 1501, folio. A volume published at La Haye (1497, fol.) contains the first two books of the *Sentences*, with the criticism of D'Inghen.—Fabricius, *Bibl. med. et inf. Latin.*; *Dict. des Sciences philos.*; B. Haureau, *De la Philos. scolast.* ii, 483; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Marsilius, Ficinus. See Ficinus.

Marsilius of Padua, an eminent opponent of the papacy, was born towards the close of the 13th century, and was probably a native of Italy. He first attracted notice at the University of Orleans, in France, and later at that of Paris, where he studied jurisprudence, and also paid some attention to philosophy, medicine, and theology, and in 1312 became rector. It was not, however, until 1324 that he became particularly noted. In that year he composed his principal work, *Defensor pacis s. de re imperatoria et pontificia*. In this work, written in the interest of the emperor Louis IV, the Bavarian, and against the papacy, he describes the papacy of his time as the most dangerous foe to peace and prosperity, supporting his assertion by a reference to events

then current, e. g. the quarrel of Boniface VIII with Philip the Fair of France, the arrogance of Clement V towards the emperor Henry VII, and the treatment accorded by pope John XXII, then reigning, to Louis the Bavarian. In order to prevent such scandals for the future, he declares that the axe must be laid at the root of the evil; and he then proceeds to consider, 1, the nature, origin, and end of the state, with constant reference to peace and quietness as the highest good of social life; 2, the relation between Church and State, opposing to the exaggerated pretensions of the Curia a doctrine of the Church which he grounds on reason, tradition, Scripture, history, and ecclesiastical law. The leading thoughts are these: (1) The official duties and authority of every priest are confined to the ministration of the Word and sacraments. His power is spiritual and moral; the civil power alone may employ force, and the priest, even if he be bishop or pope, is subject to the civil power. (2) All priests, whatever their name, are equal in spiritual rank and authority; there was no distinction in the apostolic Church between bishops and presbyters; and the N. T. shows that there was no primacy of Peter, but that the apostles were all equal. In externals and non-essentials there may be distinctions between priests, and gradations of office, so far as circumstances require, but as a merely human arrangement. (3) There is only one divinely-appointed Head of the Church—Christ himself. (4) The highest authority on earth in ecclesiastical matters does not inhere in a single priest or bishop, not even in the bishop of Rome, but in a general council, composed as well of intelligent laymen, who are versed in the Scriptures, as of priests. Christ has promised to be with his Church unto the end of the world, and a general council is the proper exponent and organ of the Church. The pope has not even authority to convene a council, since the case is possible that he should be guilty of conduct which itself would require the attention of a general council. This authority, therefore, belongs to the sovereign, as supreme lawgiver. (5) The Scriptures, including what must be necessarily inferred from their teaching, alone deserve an unconditional assent. The principles thus submitted by Marsilius found a practical application in 1338, when the heiress of the Tyrol sought a divorce from her husband, John of Bohemia, in order to marry a son of the emperor; a step which was sanctioned by Louis IV (in 1342), regardless of the fact that the parties were within the degrees of consanguinity in which marriage was prohibited by the Church, public opinion everywhere censuring the emperor's action. Both Marsilius and the learned Franciscan, William Occam, came forward in the emperor's defence, in a work bearing the title in each case, *Tractatus de jurisdictione Imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus*. They are complementary to each other, Marsilius treating especially of the dissolution of the former marriage, and Occam of the dispensation on account of consanguinity. Marsilius here also advanced the principle, that the ministers and teachers of the Word are to decide on the sufficiency of any reason for divorce under the divine law, but that the sovereign legislator must decide, on grounds of human law, whether such sufficient reason exists in any given case. Because of his work *Defensor pacis*, Marsilius was placed under the ban in 1327. His death is generally assigned to 1328, but Louis IV speaks of him as living, in a letter addressed to pope Benedict, in 1336, and there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of his work on marriage, which appeared in 1342. He must therefore have lived until after that date. In his life he appears as one of the most determined opposers of the unlimited pretensions of the papacy; and in his views of the headship of the Church as centring in Christ, and of the Scriptures as furnishing the sole rule of faith and practice for the Church, we recognise him as a forerunner of the Reformation. His works were published in Goldast's *Monarchia s. Rom. imp.* (Frankf. 1668). See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxi, 79 sq.; Neander, *Christian Dogm.* ii, 599 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vii, 89 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 109 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 896 sq.; Friedberg, *Zeitsch. f. Kirchenrecht* (Tübing. 1869), viii, 69 sq.

Mart (סָחַר, *sachar'*, Isa. xxiii, 3; also spoken of what is gained from traffic, *profit*, wealth, "merchandise," Prov. iii, 14; Isa. xlv, 14), a trading-place or emporium. The root signifies to travel about as traders, buying and selling; thus pointing out at once the general character of the commerce of the East from the earliest age to the present. See COMMERCE; MARKET; MERCHANT.

Marteilhe, JEAN, a French martyr to the Protestant cause, was born at Bergerac in 1684, and was condemned in 1702 to the galleys at Dunkirk, where he spent seven years. He died in 1777. See *The Huguenot Galley-Slave* (New York, 1867); *Quarterly Review* (July), 1866.

Martel, ANDRÉ, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Montauban in 1618; studied theology at Saumur, and was appointed pastor of Saint-Affrique. In 1647 he was called to Montauban to fill the same office. In 1653 he became professor of theology in the Reformed academy of that town; he was rector there in 1660, when he was transferred to Puylaurens. Although very reserved in all that could wound the pretensions of the Catholic clergy, he was nevertheless involved in a suit instituted against the pastors of Puylaurens, who were accused of having received into the Church those who, once converted to Romanism, had relapsed into Protestantism, contrary to the royal prescriptions of April, 1663, of June, 1665, and of April, 1666. He was conducted with them to the prisons of Toulouse. The attention of the government was particularly directed to him; it was hoped that if they succeeded in extracting from him an abjuration, his example would draw a great number of his fellow-reformers, and would serve as an excuse to those who only asked a pretext for passing over to Romanism. His moderation, moreover, induced them to believe in the possibility of success. Consequently they endeavored to move him sometimes by menaces, sometimes by promises. All was useless, and they finally liberated him. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the ministers of Montauban and of the neighboring churches retired to Holland. Martel preferred Switzerland, and withdrew to the canton of Berne, where he very soon obtained the direction of one of the principal churches. He died at Berne towards the close of the 17th century, about seventy years of age. Of Martel's productions, we have *Réponse à la méthode de M. le cardinal de Richelieu* (Rouen, 1674, 4to). This reply, said Cathala-Couture, indicates in the author a profound knowledge, and, above all, a tone of moderation and propriety far removed from the bitterness and fanaticism which prevail ordinarily in the greater part of controversial works:—*De Natura Fidei et de Gratia efficaci* (Montauban, 1653, 4to):—inaugural thesis—a number of theses which he delivered, during his presidency, to the scholars of the academy of Montauban, from 1656 to 1674:—a collection of sermons that Cathala-Couture attributes to him, without, however, giving their titles in detail. See Cathala-Couture, *Hist. du Querci*, vol. iii; Haag, *La France Protest.*; Bayle, *Nouvelles Lettres* (La Haye, 1739), p. 314, 315; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Martène, EDMUND, a learned French Benedictine, was born at St. Jean de Losne, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1654. After completing his studies, he took the vows in the Benedictine convent of St. Remi, at Rheims, Sept. 8, 1672. He soon distinguished himself by his thorough acquaintance with the ancient ascetic writers, and was sent by the superiors of the Congregation of St. Maur, upon whom his convent depended, to the headquarters of the order, St. Germain des Prés, at Paris. Here he was placed under the guidance, and enjoyed

the friendship of the great lights D'Achery and Mabillon. He soon afterwards published his *Commentarius in regulam S. P. Benedicti* (Paris, 1690, 4to), which met with great success. He was well versed in monastic archæology, and, encouraged by Mabillon, published next *De Antiquis monachorum ritibus libri quinque* (Lugd. 1690, 2 vols. 4to). He was then sent to the convent of Marmoutier, where he remained several years, continuing his studies, and imbibing the strong ascetic views of Claudius Martin, whose biography he wrote upon the death of Martin. His exaggerated praise of this mystic ascetist seemed to his superiors more likely to provoke ridicule than admiration in the age of Louis XIV, and its publication was forbidden. The *Vie du vénérable P. Dom Claude Martin*, etc., was nevertheless published either with or without the author's consent (Tours, 1697, 8vo). He was exiled to Evreux for his insubordination. He was, however, soon transferred to the convent of St. Ouen, at Rouen, and there assisted Dom de Sainte Marthe in his edition of the work of Gregory the Great. Here he republished the life of Martin, and added *Maximes spirituelles du vénérable P. D. Claude Martin* (Rouen, 1698, 12mo). His next work, to which the above *De antiquis monachorum*, etc., was but a preface, is *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus* (Rotomagi, 1700 sq., 3 vols. 4to), and as appendix the *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiæ disciplina in celebrandis officiis* (Ludg. 1706, 4to). In 1700 he published also, as a complement to D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, his *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum . . . collectio nova*, after which he devoted himself especially to antiquarian researches, and writing commentaries on the works of ancient writers. In 1708 the general chapter of his order sent him on a journey through France, to visit all the libraries, and to collect documents for a new *Gallia Christiana*. Dom Ursinus Durand (q. v.) was given him as colleague in 1709, and after six years thus employed the result of their researches was published under the title *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum* (Paris, 1717, 5 vols. fol.), and *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Benedictins*, etc. (Paris, 1717, 4to). In the same year he was allowed by chancellor D'Aguesseau to compile a new collection of the works of French historical writers, more complete than that of Andrew Duchesne, but was prevented from carrying out his plan by political events. He was now sent again, with his former colleague, on a literary journey, from which they returned in 1724. The result of it was the *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum . . . amplissima collectio* (Paris, 1724–33, 9 vols. fol.). In 1734 he fell into disgrace in consequence of his opposition to the bull *Unigenitus*, thereafter devoted himself exclusively to his studies, and in 1738 published a much enlarged edition of his archæological works. He also continued Mabillon's *Annales ordinis S. Benedicti*, tom. vi, ab anno Christi 1117 ad 1157 (Paris, 1739), and prepared a continuation of the *Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, and an edition of the life and works of Thomas of Canterbury. He also asked permission to publish a *Histoire de la Congrégation de S. Maur*, but was refused on account of its too enthusiastic praise of the monastic life. He died June 20, 1739. See Tassin, *Hist. Litt. de la Congr. de S. Maur;* Moréri, *Dict. Histor.; Mercure de France*, August, 1739; *Le Pour et le Contre*, vol. xii, n. 249; *Christian Observer*, vol. xviii; Dowling, *Introd. to Ch. Hist.;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 119; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiii, 1003; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 926. (J. N. P.)

Mar'tha (Μαρθά, of unknown signification, but a Syriac prop. name [מָרְתָּא] according to Plutarch, *Vit. Mar.* 17), a Jewess, the sister of Lazarus and Mary, who resided in the same house with them at Bethany (Luke x, 38, 40, 41; John xi, 1–39; xii, 2). See Lazarus. From the house at Bethany being called "her house," in Luke x, 38, and from the leading part which Martha is always seen to take in domestic matters, it has seemed to some that she was a widow, to whom the house at Bethany belonged, and with whom her brother and sister lodged; but this is uncertain, and the common opinion that the sisters managed the household of their brother is more probable. Jesus was intimate with this family, and their house was often his home when at Jerusalem, being accustomed to retire thither in the evening, after having spent the day in the city. The point which the evangelists bring out most distinctly with respect to Martha lies in the contrariety of disposition between her and her sister Mary. The first notice of Christ's visiting this family occurs in Luke x, 38–42. He was received with great attention by the sisters, and Martha soon hastened to provide suitable entertainment for the Lord and his followers, while Mary remained in his presence, sitting at his feet, and drinking in the sacred words that fell from his lips. The active, bustling solicitude of Martha, anxious that the best things in the house should be made subservient to the Master's use and solace, and the quiet earnestness of Mary, more desirous to profit by the golden opportunity of hearing his instructions than to minister to his personal wants, strongly mark the points of contrast in the characters of the two sisters. (See bishop Hall's observations on this subject in his *Contemplations*, iii, 4, Nos. 17, 23, 24.) She needs the reproof, "One thing is needful;" but her love, though imperfect in its form, is yet recognised as true, and she too, no less than Lazarus and Mary, has the distinction of being one whom Jesus loved (John xi, 3). The part taken by the sisters in the transactions connected with the death and resurrection of Lazarus (John xi, 20–40) is entirely and beautifully in accordance with their previous history (see Tholuck, *Comment.* ad loc.). The facts recorded of her indicate a character devout after the customary Jewish type of devotion, sharing in Messianic hopes and accepting Jesus as the Christ; sharing also in the popular belief in a resurrection, but not rising, as her sister did, to the belief that Christ was making the eternal life to belong, not to the future only, but to the present. Nothing more is recorded of Martha save that some time after, at a supper given to Christ and his disciples at Bethany, she, as usual, busied herself in the external service. Lazarus, so marvellously restored from the grave, sat with her guests at table. "Martha served," and Mary occupied her favorite station at the feet of Jesus, which she bathed with her tears, and anointed with costly ointment (John xii, 1, 2). See Mary. Notwithstanding the seeming drawbacks upon Martha's character, so vividly painted in the Gospels, there can be no doubt of her genuine piety and love for the Saviour. A.D. 29. See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* i, 66; and Schulthess, *Neueste theol. Nachricht.* 1828, ii, 413. According to tradition, she went with her brother and other disciples to Marseilles, gathered round her a society of devout women, and, true to her former character, led them to a life of active ministration. The wilder Provençal legends make her victorious over a dragon that laid waste the country. The town of Tarascon boasted of possessing her remains, and claimed her as its patron saint (*Acta Sanctorum*, and *Brev. Rom.* in Jul. 29; Fabricii *Lux Evangel.* p. 388).

Martha, Order of, is the name sometimes given to the organization of the Hospital Sisters of St. Martha of Pontarlier, etc. The aim of this female order is the care of the sick and the poor, and the gratuitous instruction of poor children. See Hospital Sisters.

Marthe, Anne Briget, a French nun, called *Sister Martha*, born at Besançon in 1749, deserves a place here for her devotion during the French Revolution and the wars that followed to the relief of the sick and wounded, and of prisoners of all nations. She died in 1824. The *Martha Order* (q. v.) is named after her.

Martianay, Jean, a learned Benedictine of St. Maur, was born at St. Sever Cap, in the diocese of Aire, Dec. 30, 1647. In 1667 he entered the convent of La Daurade, at Toulouse. He now applied himself with great zeal to the study of Oriental languages and Biblical literature, both of which he afterwards taught in

colleges of his order. During his residence at Bordeaux he wrote a work against the chronological system of Pezron, which attracted the notice of his superiors. He was called to the head-quarters of his order, the abbey of St. Germain des Près, and intrusted with the preparation of a new edition of the works of St. Jerome. In 1690 he published his *prodromus* of this work, in which he demonstrated the incorrectness of preceding editions. His edition was violently attacked by Simon and Leclerc, but Martianay as vigorously defended it. This controversy lasted a long time, yet did not prevent him from publishing a large number of works, more remarkable for their learning and ingenuity than for largeness of thought or critical acumen. He died June 16, 1717. Among his works we notice the above-mentioned edition of the works of St. Jerome (Paris, 1693–1706, 5 vols. fol.) :—*Défense du texte Hébreu et de la chronologie de la Vulgate* (Par. 1689) :—*Continuation de la Défense du texte*, etc. (Par. 1693). In both these works he endeavors to prove that the Hebrew text is to be preferred to the Septuagint, and that less than 4000 years elapsed from the creation of the world to the advent of Christ :—*Traités de la connaissance et de la vérité de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Paris, 1694–95, 4 vols.) :—*Traité méthodique, ou manière d'expliquer l'Ecriture par le secours des trois syntaxes, la propre, la figurée, et l'harmonique* (1704) :—*Vie de St. Jerome* (1706) :—*Harmonie analytique de plusieurs sens cachés et rapports inconnus de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament* (1708) :—*Essais de Traduction ou Remarques sur les traductions Françaises du Nouveau Testament* (1709) :—*Le Nouveau Testament traduit en Français sur la Vulgate* (1712) :—*Méthode sacrée, pour apprendre à expliquer l'Ecriture sainte par l'Ecriture même* (1716); etc. See *Journal des Savants*, Aug. 9, 1717; *Hist. Litt. de la Congreg. de St. Maur*, p. 382–397; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 120; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 2. (J. N. P.)

Martien, William Stockton, a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church, was born June 20, 1798. He was of Huguenot descent, and received an early Christian education. In 1828 he commenced business, and in 1830, in connection with others, engaged in the establishment of *The Presbyterian*, of which he continued to be the chief proprietor and publisher until 1861. In 1833 he commenced the publication of religious books, and, as a member of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, he issued many works of standard religious character. In 1846 he was elected and ordained ruling elder, in which office he continued to labor in the Sabbath and mission schools belonging to the congregation until his death, April 16, 1861. Mr. Martien was a man of great enterprise and efficiency in the Church—faithful and conscientious in the discharge of every trust, wise in counsels, and eminently gifted in management. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 142.

Martin (*St.*) of Braga, a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the beginning of the 6th century. In his youth he visited the holy places of Palestine. He afterwards went to Galicia, in Spain, where he did much to preserve orthodoxy among the population, which inclined strongly to Arianism. He established several convents there, and was himself abbot of Dumia until about 560. At that time he was made archbishop of Bracara, now Braga, in Portugal. As such he took part in the second Council of Bracara, in 563, against the Priscillianists and Arians, and in 572 presided over the third council at the same place on Church discipline. He died about 583. He was a very voluminous writer. Among his works we notice *Formula honestæ vitæ s. de differentiis quatuor virtutum* (in the *Bibl. Patr. Lugd.* x, 382 sq., and Gallandi *Bibl. Patr.* xii, 273 sq.). This work was very well received. The *Sententiæ Ægyptiorum patrum* were not translated from Greek into Latin by Martin, as some have supposed, but by Paschasius, deacon of the convent of Dumia, at Martin's instigation (Rosweyd, *Vit. Patr.* [Antv. 1615], p. 1002 sq.; see also Grässe, *Handbuch d. allg. Literaturgesch.* ii, 127). Some Latin poems of Martin are to be found in Sismondi, *Opp.* [ed. Ven.], ii, 653, and in Gallandi *Bibl. Patr.*). But more important than all these is his *Collectio Orientalium Canonum, s. Capitula lxxxiv collecta ex Græcis synodis et versa*, etc. (in Aguirre, *Conc. Hisp.* ii, 327 sq., and Mansi, ix, 846 sq.; see Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* iv, 151 sq.). It is a sort of translated compilation of, with commentaries on, the acts of the Greek councils, adapted for the use of the Western Church. It is divided into two parts, the first containing the canons concerning the clergy, the second those applying to the laity. See D. Czvittingeri *Specimen Hungariæ literatæ* (Francf. and Lip. 1711); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii, 392 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 122. (J. N. P.)

Martin of Dunin, a noted Polish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in the village of Wal, near Rawa, Prussian Poland, Nov. 11, 1774. Until his twelfth year he was kept at the Jesuit school of Rawa; was then entered a student at the Gymnasium of Bromberg; but, having determined to devote his life to the Church and her cause, he was sent to Rome, and became a student in the Collegium Germanicum in 1793. Upon the completion of his studies, three years after, he was ordained subdeacon; later, by papal dispensation, successively deacon and priest, when he returned to his native country, which had in the meantime lost its independence, and fallen a prey to the Russians, Austrians, and Prussians. Martin himself was now a Prussian subject, but he took a position in the diocese of Cracowa, and was thus in the employ of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church of Poland under control of the Austrian government. In 1808 the archbishop of Gnesen, count Raczynski, called him to Gnesen, and conferred upon Martin first a canonicate in the metropolitan church, and shortly after made him auditor. Thereafter honors came fast and freely. In 1815 he was made chancellor of the metropolitan chapter; in 1824 master of the Cathedral of Posen, and shortly after was intrusted by the Prussian government with the supervision of the Roman Catholic schools in the diocese. In 1829 he was promoted to the position of capitular vicar and general-administrator, and in 1831 was honored with the archiepiscopal chair of Gnesen and Posen. This position came to him in an hour when great discretion and strong nerve were required of Romish prelates on Prussian territory. The discontent of the Poles in 1830, and the rebellion in which it resulted, caused the government of Frederick William III to look with suspicion upon the priesthood of the papal Church. It was a notorious fact that the latter was leagued with the revolutionists. Poland had ever been a devoted daughter of Rome; Prussia decidedly Protestant, the most daring opponent of papal interests. Could it be expected that the Roman Catholics would hesitate to work for the restoration of Polish independence? Has not even in our day the Prussian government all it can do to control the priesthood in that section of her territory? See Posen. To prevent the further spread of revolutionary tendencies among the priesthood, the Prussian government inaugurated a new policy, the execution of which resulted in a spirited contest between the representative of Rome, our Martin of Dunin, and the secular authority of the province of Posen. The difficulties commenced at the seat of the metropolitan. A school for the education of Romish priests was sustained at this place by the government. Hitherto the instructors had been chosen by the Church for whose service it was intended, but now the government insisted upon its right to choose the incumbents of the professorships. The archbishop protested, but the government proceeded without any regard to his opposition. Fresh fuel was added to the flame in 1837. By the bull *Magnæ nobis admirationis*, issued by pope Benedict XIV (June 27, 1748), mixed marriages were made possible only by special dispensation from the pope, and, when permission was grant-

ed, the children of such unions were demanded for the Church of Rome. Poland had conceded this point to the Roman pontiff, but the Prussian government in 1837 declared that in its territory no such dispensation was needed, nor any understanding in regard to the religious education of any children from such a union. This action on the part of the government the archbishop held to be illegal, and he stoutly asserted his right to dissent from the decision of all secular authority. Had he rested here, and awaited the settlement of this difficulty between the pope of Rome and the king of Prussia, all would have been well. Martin, however, proceeded at once to inaugurate measures which clearly revealed him as a plotter against the government he had sworn to uphold. He secretly entered into communication with the clergy of his dioceses, and threatened with excommunication any and all priests who should obey the mandates of the government without his consent. Promptly the government, after hearing of this procedure, arrested the archbishop, and brought him to trial, and he was condemned to six months' confinement in a fortress, incapacitated for office, and burdened with the expense of his trial. Previous to his arrest the government had addressed the Roman Catholics of the province of Posen, and had assured them of the preservation of their rights and privileges as heretofore, but, notwithstanding all these precautions, the priesthood remained firmly bound to the interests of their religious shepherd, and no sooner had Martin of Dunin been condemned and imprisoned at the fortress of Colberg (Oct. 4, 1839), than the Romanists of the two archiepiscopal sees went into mourning. Fortunately this difficulty occurred near the closing days of the reign of Frederick William III. The wife (now queen widow) of Frederick William IV (who came to the throne in 1840), herself a Roman Catholic, was no doubt instrumental in securing an understanding between the archbishop and her royal spouse. Martin returned to Posen Aug. 5, 1840, and died Dec. 26, 1842. See Pohl, *Martin von Dunin* (Marienburg, 1843, 8vo); Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. See also Prussia. (J. H. W.)

Martin (*St.*) of Tours, a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the year 316. He was educated at Pavia, and, at the desire of his father, who was a military man, entered the army under Constantine I, who was then emperor. When eighteen years old he became a convert to Christianity, was baptized, and a few years afterwards went to Gaul, and there became a pupil and follower of St. Hilarius (q. v.) Pictaviensis. He quitted the army, and zealously devoted himself to the interests of orthodox Christianity. On a visit to Lombardy, wishing to see his parents again, who were Arians, Martin reproved the inhabitants for their views. They took his liberty unkindly; he was imprisoned and flogged by order of the magistrates of Milan. He then retired to a neighboring village with a few adherents, but being again persecuted by Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, he attempted to return to Gaul. That country, however, was also a prey to religious dissensions; Hilarius himself had been banished to Poitiers, and Martin therefore retired to the island of Gallinaria, in the Tyrean Sea. When St. Hilarius was restored to his Church in 360, Martin hastened back to him, and with his assent retired to the wilds in the neighborhood of Poitiers, at the place now called Ligugé. Here he was soon joined by others, and thus arose the convent of Ligugé, probably the oldest monastic establishment of France. About 370, Lidoire, bishop or archbishop of Tours, died, and the clergy of that diocese insisted upon Martin's acceptance of the vacant see. He was finally persuaded to accept the office, but he governed the diocese like a convent, and always lived himself in the simple way to which he was accustomed at Ligugé. He erected a convent which became the celebrated monastery of Marmoutiers, near Tours. Under his active and vigilant care the diocese attained great prosperity, while he himself became renowned for his talents and his virtues, not only in the neighboring parts, but even throughout Gaul. When Maximus, after the murder of Gratian, caused all the bishops of Gaul who had supported his rival to be deposed or imprisoned, Martin was sent by them to the court at Trêves to protest against this violence, and succeeded so well that the emperor released all the prisoners. On another occasion, when the Spanish bishops Idacius and Ithacius besought Maximus to surrender Priscillian and his followers to the civil authorities, to be executed as heretics, Martin protested against such sanguinary orthodoxy, and when, notwithstanding his protests, Priscillian was executed by order of the emperor, Martin refused to hold any intercourse with those who had advocated that measure. This conduct displeased the emperor, and when Martin, some time after, had occasion to ask the pardoning of Narces and Leocadius, accused of rebellion, he granted it only on the condition that Martin would become reconciled with Ithacius. Martin submitted, but left Trêves at once, and it is said expressed himself sorry for having purchased the pardon of Narces and Leocadius at that price. He died at Candes about 396. His life by his contemporary, Sulpicius Severus, is a very curious specimen of the Christian literature of the age, and, in the profusion of miraculous legends with which it abounds, might take its place among the lives of the mediæval or modern Roman Church. The only extant literary relic of Martin is a short *Confession of Faith on the Holy Trinity*, which is published by Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vii, 559. He is the first who, without suffering death for the truth, has been honored in the Latin Church as a confessor of the faith. The festival of his birth is celebrated on the 11th of November. In Scotland this day still marks the winter-term, which is called *Martinmas* (q. v.). In Germany, also, his memory continues to our day among the populace in the celebration of the *Martinalia*. See Gregorius Turon, *Hist. Francor.* lib. x; Gervaise, *Vie de Saint Martin* (1699); Dupuy, *Histoire de Saint Martin* (1852); Jean Maan, *Metropol. Turonensis; Hist. Litt. de la France*, i, 417; *Gallia Christ.* vol. xiv, col. 6; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 203 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 278; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, vol. i, bk. iii; Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, p. 720; Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 14; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 126 sq. (J. H. W.)

Martin of Trêves, a Capuchin monk, was born about 1630, in the archbishopric of Trêves. He took the cowl at an early age, and a little later became a lector of theology; but in consequence of a pestilence, whose ravages broke up his school in 1666, he devoted himself to literature. A catechism issued by him was received with great favor by the public, and this success led to the publication of a great number of works for instruction and edification; but, zealous for the glory of God and the honor of his Church, he did not confine his efforts to this field. He was indefatigable in preaching, in catechizing, and in missionary work, and during the course of his labors traversed nearly the whole of the archbishoprics of Mayence and Trêves. His benevolent spirit found expression in the readiness with which he ministered to the diversified wants of the people, among whom the instruction of the unlearned and of children claimed his especial notice. He is even credited with removing thorns and stones from the highways, and with placing stepping-stones in streams for the convenience of travellers. Withal, he was a thorough ascetic, eating neither flesh nor fish, and travelling without either hat or sandals in the most inclement weather; and he attended mass as often as possible each day for more than twenty years. As a teacher, he was wont to lay especial stress on the adoration of the mass and the worship of the Virgin, which doctrines he was often compelled to defend against opponents. He organized a number of brotherhoods in the provinces of the Rhine, and rebuilt many churches that had been destroyed in the Thirty-years' War. He died, after a

brief illness, Sept. 10, 1712. His works, after being disregarded for a time, are again offered to the public; they mostly consist of contributions to practical religion. The most important are *Christian Doctrine* (Cologne, 1666):—*History of the Church* (1693):—*Exposition of the Mass* (1698):—*Legends of Saints* (1705):—*An Essay on the Divine Perfections* (Mayence, 1707):—*Life of Christ* (Mayence and Augsburg, 1708).—Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 771 sq.

Martin I, Pope, son of Fabricius, a distinguished citizen of the Papal States, was called to the papal chair July 5, 640, as successor to Theodore I. The emperor Constans II made every exertion to induce Martin to approve a decree he had promulgated in 659, forbidding discussions between the orthodox Romanists and the Monothelites. Martin, on the contrary, assembled a council at Rome (the first Lateran), without the emperor's consent, in Oct., 649, in which all heresies, and particularly that of the Monothelites, were condemned, and the decrees of Heraclius and of Constans II denounced. (See for details the article LATERAN COUNCILS [1].) The emperor, enraged at this opposition, caused Martin to be taken prisoner, June 19, 653, and exiled him to the island of Naxos. On Sept. 17, 654, the pope was taken to Constantinople, and kept in prison there for six months. But he bore all his trials with great firmness, refusing to be reconciled to the heretics, and was finally transported to the Thracian Chersonesus. There, in the midst of unfeeling barbarians, he had to suffer the greatest deprivations. Yet he bore it all with Christian patience, and died Sept. 16, 655. His body was afterwards removed to Rome. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome Nov. 12. Eighteen encyclical letters attributed to Martin are published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and in Labbe's *Concilia*. See F. Pagi, *Breviarium*, etc., *complectans illustriora Pontificum Romanorum gesta conciliorum*, etc.; Platina, *Vitæ Potif. Roman.*; Artaud de Montor, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains*, vol. i; Bower, *Hist. Popes*, iii, 44 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. Papacy*, i, 297; Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, vol. i and ii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 18; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, iii, 186, 187, 188, 191; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 122. (J. H. W.)

Martin II (MARINUS I), Pope, was born at Montefiascone, in the Papal States. He was thrice sent to Constantinople (866, 868, 881) as papal legate to oppose the nomination of Photius as patriarch, but when he was elected pope, Dec. 23, 882, did not continue in the policy of his predecessor, John VIII, but reversed the condemnation of Photius, of bishop Formosus of Porto, and others. His reign lasted only fourteen months. He died Feb. 14, 884. See Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 542; F. Pagi, *Breviarium Pontificum Romanorum*, etc.; Muratori, *Ann. Ital.*; Artaud de Montor, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains*, ii, 141; Bower, *Hist. Popes*, v, 101 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. Papacy*, ii, 32; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 18; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 121.

Martin III (called by some MARINUS II), Pope, a Roman by birth, succeeded Stephen VIII in 942. He died only four years after, and was succeeded by Agapetus II. Martin III was a patron of learning, and a noble Christian exemplar.

Martin IV (*Simon de la Brie*), Pope, was probably a native of Touraine, France, and of humble origin. He was educated at Tours, and there entered the Franciscan order. St. Louis, king of France, favored him, and gave him a position at the church of St. Martin. In 1262 he was created cardinal by pope Urban IV, and by pope Gregory X was appointed apostolical legate to the French court. He continued in this office under the popes Hadrian V, John XXI, and Nicholas III; but upon the decease of the last named (Aug. 22, 1280) he was elected successor in the papal chair in 1281, through the influence of Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily and Naples. The "Sicilian Vespers" (q. v.), in 1282, having ejected Charles of Sicily, Martin came to the support of his royal friend with all his influence, and even by the spiritual censures he had at his command sought to maintain French domination in Sicily. He excommunicated Peter of Aragon, whom the Sicilians had elected king; but his excommunication was of no more avail than the arms of the Angevins, for the Sicilians stood firm against both. Martin also excommunicated the Byzantine emperor Michael, and by this measure widened the breach between the Greek and Latin churches. He died in 1285, and was succeeded by Honorius IV. It is to the use of the censures of the Church in the unpopular cause of Charles of Anjou that many Church historians ascribe the decline and ultimate extinction of the authority in temporals which the papacy had hitherto exercised. Not only did he lower the popular esteem of the papal authority, but he made himself a laughing-stock by his rashness and inability to make good his threats. Letters of this pope are found in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* iii, 684. His biography (*Vita*) was written by Bernard, Grindon, and by Muratori. See Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, vii, 435–442; Artaud de Montor, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains*, iii, 55–63; Bower, *Hist. Popes*, vi, 324; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vi, 188 sq.; Leo, *Gesch. v. Italien*, vol. iv. (J. H. W.)

Martin V (*Otto de Colonna*), pope from 1417 to 1431, was the son of Agapetus de Colonna, and a descendant of one of the most ancient and illustrious families of Italy. Martin studied canon law at Perugia, and on his return to his native city, Rome, was created by Urban VI prothonotary and referendary; by Boniface IX nuncio to the States of Italy; under Innocent VII he received the appointment of cardinal deacon of St. George ad Aulicum Aureum; and by John XXIII he was appointed apostolic legate for the patrimony of St. Peter, and vicar-general of the apostolic see in Umbria. When Gregory XII, because of a breach of his oath of office, became so unpopular as to be deserted by his cardinals, Martin alone adhered to him steadfastly until he was deposed by the Council of Pisa. He was likewise a faithful supporter of his immediate predecessor, pope John, and even followed him in his flight from Constance, thus clearly foretokening the uncompromising stand which he afterwards took against all opposition to what he conceived to be the papal prerogative.

The general discontent with the abusive reign of pope John XXIII, which Gerson, the noted chancellor of the University of Paris, had severely attacked, not even hesitating to say that the pontiff was "no longer servant of servants, but John, the lord of lords," as well as other auspicious events, had resulted in the general Council of Constance (q. v.), whose moving spirits seemed determined on reform. Their two great objects were the restoration of the Church's unity, and the reformation of the abuses which had crept in. One of their first steps, largely influenced by the emperor Sigismund, was to depose pope John. There still remained, however, two rival pontiffs, Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, each claiming the title of supreme head of the Church. The latter of these was induced to abdicate, and the former, being without any temporal support, was ignored by the council. The election of a pope was forthwith considered. The choice fell upon cardinal Otto de Colonna by an overwhelming majority of the electors from the five nations represented in the council, and the unanimous vote of the cardinals. Neander (*Ch. Hist.* v, 126) thus narrates the proceedings for the election: "The Germans set the example of sacrificing their own wishes and interests to the good of the Church, declaring themselves ready to give their votes for an Italian; they also prevailed on the English to yield. The French and Spaniards were refractory at first; but finally, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, on St. Martin's day, in November, they were prevailed upon to give place for the Holy Spirit as a spirit of concord; and on the same day cardinal Otto of Colonna was chosen pope, after the election had lasted three days." The election

having taken place on St. Martin's day, the new pope, in honor of that saint, assumed the title of Martin V. The whole assembly was in an ecstacy of joy at the result, especially because it exhibited the unanimity of hitherto conflicting parties. Martin was immediately invested with the papal robes and placed on the altar, where the emperor hastened to do him homage by kissing his feet.

But scarcely was Martin securely seated on the pontifical throne when the whole face of affairs at Constance changed, and it soon became evident that all intentions of reform, for which mainly the council had been called and John XXIII deposed, had been put away from the mind of Martin. Mild, but sagacious and resolute, "seeming to yield everything to the emperor and council, he conceded nothing." As early as April following his election (Nov. 11, 1417), he dissolved the council, which had struggled through three years and a half for reform, without being any nearer the accomplishment of their hopes than when they began, and the spirit of advance which had inspired the uprising of Bohemia and the organization of the Lollards (q. v.) was crushed for a time, to rise only two centuries thence in a force that defied all opposition, and resulted in a schism nearly destroying the mother Church. So far from aiding a reform, Martin V's first act was one of tyranny. "The papal chancery had been the object of the longest, loudest, and most just clamor. The day after the election the pope published a brief confirming all the regulations established by his predecessors, even by John XXIII. . . . The form was not less dictatorial than the substance of the decree. It was an act of the pope, not of the council. It was an absolute resumption of the whole power of reformation, so far at least as the papal court, into his own hands" (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii, 517). The Council of Constance, instead of shaking the papal supremacy, had, by the choice of Otto de Colonna, raised it higher than ever before by producing a pope who, as Romanists will have it, "recovered the waning reverence of Christendom." Martin V was the product of no schism or party, but of the Church universal, and he was justified in seeking such supremacy; nor do we wonder that, in the last consistory of the cardinals at Constance, Martin V put forth a constitution by which, in direct contradiction to the principles so distinctly laid down at Constance, he directed that no one should be allowed to dispute any decision of the pope in matters of faith, and to appeal from him to a general council (Neander, v, 127). See Infallibility. From Constance the pope proceeded to Florence, where he was received with the greatest official respect, and where he remained for three years, during which interval all opposition, in the form of anti-popery, virtually died out. He then proceeded to Rome, where he was also received with demonstrations of great joy, and honored with the title of *the Father of his Country*. He set himself with great energy to the task of restoring the fallen glory of the Eternal City, and so well did he succeed that he received the additional title of *Romulus the Second*. By his address and superior sagacity, Martin V succeeded in bringing a protracted quarrel with Alphonso of Aragon to a termination, which at once secured his own ends and pacified a stubborn adversary. At the Council of Constance the next general council was appointed to meet, five years later, at Pavia. Accordingly such a council was actually opened there in the year 1423, but, on account of the spread of the pestilence called the Black Death, it was dissolved and transferred to Sienna. But at Sienna also only a few sessions were held; and, on the pretence that the small number of prelates assembled did not authorize the continuance of the council, in conformity with the determination of the Council of Constance, the next meeting was appointed to be held seven years later, in the year 1431, at Basle (comp. Fisher [G. P.], *The Reformation* [N. Y. 1873, 8vo], p. 43). See Julian, *Cardinal*. This council was intended to close the difficulty with the Hussites (q. v.), whose leaders Martin V had so summarily disposed of at Constance (q. v.), and to effect the reunion of the Greek Church. At this important crisis he died, in Rome, of an apopletic fit, in February, 1431. As a man, Martin V was of that class who form their determinations deliberately and adhere to them steadily, and, if necessary, doggedly. He was possessed of great administrative ability. He has been accused of avarice, though perhaps unjustly. He certainly favored learning, and the palaces of his cardinals were the schools of advancement for the youth of Italy. He has also been charged, and with greater justice, with nepotism, an instance of which is the appointment of his nephew at the age of fourteen as archdeacon of Canterbury. The main features of his reign are the pacification of Italy, the restoration of peace between France and England, the rebuilding of Rome, and the wars against Bohemia. He was succeeded by pope Eugenius IV. See Bower, *Hist. Popes*, vii, 200 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 126 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, vii, 513 sq.; Muratori, *Script.* iii, p. ii; Leo, *Gesch. v. Italien*, iv, 520 sq.; Trollope, *Hist. Florence*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iv); Reichel, *Roman See in Middle Ages*, p. 492 sq.; *Life of Cardinal Julian*, p. 18, 57 sq., 96 sq., 103, 126 sq., 243 sq., 338; Gillett, *Huss and Hussites*, ii, 335 sq.; Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, vol. ii, ch. vi, p. 83, 134; Butler (C. M.), *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 109–113; Waddington, *Ch. Hist.* p. 105, 110, 137, 142, 196; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1871, iii, 564.

Martin, André, a French ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born in Poitou in 1621; was admitted to the oratory in 1641, and instructed in philosophy. In 1679 he became a professor of theology at Saumur, but was suspended some time after, because accused of Jansenism. He died at Poitiers, Sept. 26, 1695. He was one of the earliest advocates of the Cartesian philosophy, and wrote *Philosophia Moralis Christiana* (Angers, 1653). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 32.

Martin, Asa, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Ind., Oct. 19, 1814. He was educated at Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio; studied theology privately; was licensed by Salem Presbytery, and in 1843 ordained pastor of Mount Vernon Church, Ind. In 1848 he became pastor of Hartford Church, Ind.; in 1852, of Bloomfield, Iowa; in 1854, of West Grove, Iowa; in 1861, of Olivet, in Mahaska Co., Iowa, where he died, Nov. 9, 1865. Mr. Martin was a man of retiring manners, a faithful pastor, an excellent presbyter, and an earnest and sound preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 312.

Martin, Claude, a French theologian, was born at Tours in 1619. He had scarcely attained twelve years of age when he was abandoned by his mother, who entered the convent of the Ursulines. After having studied for some time in the city of Orleans, he entered the Order of the Benedictines. In 1654 he was appointed prior of Blancs-Manteaux. He afterwards filled the same charge at Saint-Corneille de Compiègne, at Saint-Serge d'Angers, at Bonne-Nouvelle de Rouen, and at Marmoutiers. He died Aug. 9, 1696. Martin was distinguished both for great learning and deep piety. His works are *Méditations Chrétiennes pour les Dimanches, les fêtes, et les principales fêtes de l'année* (Paris, 1669, 2 vols. 4to):—*Conduite pour la retraite du mois* (Paris, 1670, 12mo):—*Pratique de la règle de Saint-Benoît* (Paris, 1674, 12mo):—*Vie de la vénérable mère Marie de l'Incarnation, supérieure des Ursulines en Canada* (Paris, 1677, 4to):—*Méditation pour la fête et pour l'octave de sainte Ursule* (Paris, 1678, 16mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Martin, C. F., a Congregational minister, was born in Illinois about 1821. He was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois; taught in an academy at Lisbon, Illinois, four years, and then entered the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, to prepare for the ministry. Upon the completion of his studies, he was

sent by the American Missionary Society to act as missionary among the Copts in Egypt. His health failing him, he was obliged to return after a three years' stay in the East. Later he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Peru, Illinois, and remained there until 1863, when he was appointed associate secretary of the western branch of the American Tract Society. He labored among the soldiers at Chattanooga until he fell in the work, March 7, 1864.

Martin, David, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Revel, Languedoc, in 1639. He studied philosophy at Nismes, and theology at Puy-Laurens. After acting as pastor at several places, he was obliged to leave France in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes: so great was the consideration he enjoyed that Roman Catholics themselves assisted him to flee. He next became pastor at Utrecht, and, although invited to Deventer as professor of theology in 1686, and to Haag in 1695, he remained attached to his congregation. He died at Utrecht in 1721. He wrote three volumes of sermons, some polemical and apologetic works, and some critical essays, all of which give evidence of his learning and talent. The most important of his works are *Le Nouveau Testament, expliqué par des notes courtes et claires* (Utrecht, 1696, 4to): the notes are partly dogmatic, partly literary, and were subsequently used by the editor of the French Roman Catholic translation of the N. T. published at Brussels (1700, 4 vols. 12mo): —*Histoire du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament* (Amst. 1700, 2 vols. fol.). It contained some magnificent copper-plate engravings, and was often reprinted. But Martin's chief claim on posterity lies in his revision of the Geneva version of the Bible, which he undertook at the request of the Walloon communities. It appeared in 1707 (Amst. 2 vols. fol.), and was often reprinted in 8vo. The first edition contained theological and critical notes, with a general introduction, and special ones appended to each book; these, however, were omitted in the subsequent popular editions. It was approved by the Synod of Leuwarden in 1710. Martin's translation, subsequently revised by Osterwald, is still the one most in use in the Protestant churches of France. Among his other works we notice *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Amst. 1708, 8vo):—*L'Excellence de la foi et de ses effets, expliquée en xx sermons* (Amst. 1710, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Traité de la Religion naturelle* (Amst. 1713, 8vo; translated into Dutch in 1720, English in 1720, and German in 1735):—*Le vrai sens du Psaume cx* (Amst. 1715, 8vo). His dissertation on natural religion caused quite a long and spirited controversy with the Arian Emlyn (q. v.). See Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxi; Chaufepié, *Dict. hist.;* Prosper Marchand, *Dict.;* Nayral, *Biog. Castraise*, vol. ii; Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. vii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 34; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 130.

Martin, Enoch R., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Ind., about the year 1811. He received a good common-school education; studied theology privately; was licensed by Cincinnati Presbytery, and ordained by Salem Presbytery in 1836. He preached for several years to the Mt. Vernon and Utica churches, in Clark Co., Ind.; thence removed to Jefferson Co., Ind., and preached to the Mizpeh, Sharon, and Mt. Vernon churches, and afterwards became pastor of Sharon Church, Ill. In 1862 he accepted a call to the Pisgah and Sharon churches, Ind. He died Nov. 26, 1863. Mr. Martin was a very useful minister, and a sincere Christian; he did much for the cause of education and the suppression of intemperance. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 167.

Martin, Gregory, an English Roman Catholic theologian of the 16th century, was a native of Sussex, and was admitted a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, in 1557. He became professor of Hebrew at Douay, and subsequently at Rheims. He died in 1582. He is supposed to have been the author, or one of the authors, of the Rheims translation of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament in the Douay version. He wrote several theologico-controversial pamphlets, among them *A Discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Days, specially the English Sectaries* (printed in Fulke's *Defence of the Translations*, Parker Society, 1843).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.

Martin, Jacques de, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer on philosophical subjects, was born in the diocese of Mirepoix, May 11, 1684; was educated at Toulouse; entered the order of the Congregation of St. Maur in 1709; taught the humanities at Sorize; went to Paris in 1727, and died there Sept. 5, 1751. He was a multifarious writer, and possessed an unusual acquaintance with the most diversified subjects of learning. But he was censured for the immodesty of his illustrations. His most important work is *La Religion des Gaulois* (Paris, 1727, 2 vols. 4to), in which he attempts to prove that the religion of the Gauls was derived from that of the patriarchs; and that, consequently, an illustration of their religious ceremonies must tend to throw light on many dark passages in the Scriptures. He wrote also *Explications de plusieurs textes difficiles de l'Ecriture Sainte:—De l'origine de l'âme, selon le sentiment de Saint Augustin* (1736, 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 37.

Martin, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Union District, S. C., May 14, 1801. He graduated at the North Carolina University, at Chapel Hill, N. C., in 1825; studied divinity under the care of Dr. Cunningham, of Concord Church, Green Co., Ala.; was licensed in 1827, and soon after ordained as a domestic missionary in West Florida and South Alabama. In 1830 he took charge of the churches at Linden and Prairie Bluffs, Ala.; in 1837 moved to Louisville, Miss., where he organized a Church; in 1841 became pastor of a Church at Multona Springs, Miss.; in 1848 removed to Memphis, Tenn., where he taught school till 1850, when he went to Arkansas, and organized several churches. He died Sept. 14, 1863. Mr. Martin possessed an excellent mind; his education was sound and classical, his piety devout and habitual. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 445.

Martin, John (1), an English Baptist minister of the 18th century, was in early life a mechanic; but, brought under the influence of Gospel teaching, he studied, and became the minister of a Baptist congregation at London. He published a number of occasional *Sermons* and theological treatises (1763–1807). Of these, the most important was *The Conquest of Canaan* (Lond. 1797, 12mo). Of his occasional sermons, the one on Acts xiv, 7, deserves special mention, entitled *The Gospel of our Salvation* (Lond. 1796, 8vo). Besides, there were published three volumes of his sermons, one treating of *The Character of Christ* (1793, 8vo); the other two were edited by Thomas Palmer (1817, 2 vols. 8vo). John Martin is described by Ivimy (*Baptists*) as "a man of strong mental powers," and as a truly "evangelical preacher." See his *Autobiography* (1797, 12mo). See also Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Martin, John (2), an English painter of Biblical subjects, was born near Hexham, Northumberland, July 19, 1789; went to London in 1806, and, after some years spent in obscure struggles, made his first appearance as an exhibitor at the Royal Academy in 1812. His picture was entitled *Sadak in Search of the Waters of Oblivion*, and attracted much notice. It was followed within two years by the *Expulsion from Paradise*, *Clytée*, and *Joshua commanding the Sun to stand still.* The last of these works was a great success in point of popularity, but it was also the cause of a quarrel between Martin and the English Academy, in consequence of which he never obtained any distinction from the society. From this period till nearly the close of his life

he incessantly painted pictures in a style which was considered "sublime" by the same sort of people who thought Montgomery's *Satan* and Pollok's *Course of Time* equal to *Paradise Lost*. The principal of these productions are *Belshazzar's Feast* (1821); *Creation* (1824); *The Deluge* (1826); *The Fall of Nineveh* (1828); *Pandemonium* (1841); *Morning and Evening* (1844); *The Last Man* (1850). He died at Douglas, Isle of Man, Feb. 9, 1854. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v. See *Autobiography of John Martin* in the *Athenæum* (1854).

Martin, John Nicholas, a distinguished minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in the duchy of Deux Ponts, or *Zweibrücken*, in Rhenish Bavaria, and came to this country about the middle of the 18th century, in company with a Lutheran colony, as their spiritual teacher. They landed in Philadelphia with the intention of settling permanently on the rich soil of Pennsylvania, but, as the land they desired could not be procured, they passed on to the valley of the Shenandoah, whither many of the German emigrants had already been attracted; but the congregation to which Mr. Martin ministered finally determined to locate in South Carolina, in a district between the Broad and Saluda rivers, a favorite spot with the Germans of that day in the South. The German population in this region increased fast, and Lutheran churches were established on both sides of the rivers. Here Martin remained for many years, all the time officiating in his vernacular German. In 1776 he took charge of the Lutheran Church in Charleston. This was his last field of labor. Many reminiscences of his life and services during this eventful period of our country's history are still preserved. The American Revolution interrupted the peaceful course of his ministry, and exposed him to various annoyances and trials. His naturally ardent temperament, as well as his love of liberty, led him to espouse the cause of the American colonies with great zeal and patriotic devotion. He was closely watched by the enemy; and when it was ascertained that he would not pray for the king, and that his ministrations were not favorable to the royal cause, his pulpit labors were interdicted, he was put under arrest, and a guard placed over him. Subsequently his property was confiscated, and he driven from the city. He remained in the interior of the state until the conclusion of the war. On his return in 1783, although aged and his physical vigor gone, his congregation still clung to him. They urged him to resume his pastoral relations; but he ministered to them only until a regular pastor could be procured for them from Germany. In 1787 he was released from further service, with a vote of thanks for the fidelity with which he had ministered to the spiritual interests of his people. He now retired to his little farm near the city. His physical as well as mental powers gradually failed him, and he closed his honored and useful life July 27, 1795, illustrating in his death the principles which through a long life he had advocated. Mr. Martin was faithfully devoted to his work, and exceedingly useful as a minister of the Gospel. He possessed an integrity that no considerations of personal interest or expediency could seduce from the straight line of duty. He was a man of great courage and decision, firm and persistent in the maintenance of his principles, with an energy of will and a zeal which no discouragements could repress and no failure abate. In the vindication of what he believed was the truth, he was prepared for any emergency. The people appreciated his sagacity, and relied on his clear, practical judgment. He steadfastly devoted himself to their interests. It was the constant burden of his heart and the earnest purpose of his life to honor Christ in the salvation of souls. He was regarded by the community in which he lived as a great blessing. His death was considered a public calamity. (M. L. S.)

Martin, Margaret Maxwell, a lady Methodist noted as a writer, was born at Dumfries, Scotland, in 1807, emigrated to America, and was married in 1836 to the Rev. William Martin, a Methodist divine. She has published *Methodism, or Christianity in Earnest*, and other religious works.

Martin Mar-Prelate, Controversy of. About 1580, the year of the Armada, there appeared in England a number of tracts—"a series of scurrilous libels in which the queen, the bishops, and the rest of the conforming clergy, were assailed with every kind of contumely" (Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* p. 256)—written probably by some radicals of the Puritan camp when the controversy between the Church and the Puritans was waxing hot. Marsden says "there is some reason to believe that the whole was a contrivance of the Jesuits." The charge against the latter is based, however, only upon supposition, and deserves no encouragement. The public printing-presses being at the time shut against the Puritans, all their printing had to be done secretly, and it is therefore difficult to determine the origin of the "Martin Mar-Prelate" tracts. The Puritan divines Udal and Penry, on their trials, were charged with the authorship, or with a wilful knowledge of the authors; but they refused to make any revelations, and the real authorship of these once dreaded and proscribed, but now ludicrous lampoons, remains a mystery. Their titles and contents are given somewhat in detail by Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harpers' edit. i, 190 sq.). They were reprinted as *Puritan Disc. Tracts* (Lond. 1843). See also Maskell, *Hist. of the Martin Mar-Prelate Controversy* (Lond. 1845); Marsden, *Early Puritans*, p. 198 sq.; id. *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects*, i, 131; Hunt, *Religious Thought of England*, i, 72. (J. H. W.)

Martin, Saint-, *Marquis* Louis Claude de, called "the Unknown Philosopher," a noted French mystic, was born at Amboise (Touraine) Jan. 18, 1743; was educated for the bar; preferred a military life, and, through the influence of M. de Choiseul, obtained a commission. The regiment to which he was assigned contained several officers who had been initiated into a sort of mystical freemasonry by the Portuguese mystic Martinez Pasqualis; he soon became enamored with mystical doctrines, and read largely in that line. Mysticism, however, was at that time confined to rather narrow limits in France; the mind of nearly the whole country was absorbed in the rising school of materialism, and to combat the latter became the task of our obscure officer of the regiment of Foix. Saint-Martin soon threw up his commission, and gave himself wholly to writing and meditation, bent to crush, by every means in his power, the cold, heartless form of speculation which was then everywhere the order of the day. First he translated the works of Jacob Bœhme; but finally he originated a religious mysticism, which, according to Morell (*Hist. of Philos. in the 19th Cent.* p. 208), consisted of the principles of the Cambridge Platonist Henry More, "reared up under the guidance of a versatile and enthusiastic spirit, as a barrier against the philosophical sensationalism of Condillac and the religious scepticism of Voltaire." But as all mystical schools have sooner or later found their natural issue in fanaticism, so Saint-Martin also struck against this self-same rock, and, despite the guarded manner in which he handled theological questions, the heresies contained in his writings are neither few nor small. Yet, notwithstanding many feats and vagaries of an ultra eccentric description, Saint-Martin has left us one of the best refutations of sensualist errors on record, and his influence against the materialism of the 18th century has to our very day failed to receive the recognition deserved. With his eyes fixed upon the invisible world, he passed unscathed through all the horrors of the French Revolution; he saw the Reign of Terror, the Directory, the Consulate, and quietly and happily closed a life of great literary activity at Aulnay, near Paris, Oct. 13, 1803.

Among Saint-Martin's achievements, his victory over the sensationalist Garat deserves especial notice.

"The legislators of the first French Revolution, in their attempt to remodel society after the Reign of Terror, had taken as their code of laws, and as their universal panacea, a debasing theory, which they, however, imagined would regenerate the world, and according to which they most naturally therefore wished to train the new generation. Such was the origin of the *École Normale*, subsequently remodelled and organized by Napoleon, and still rendering the greatest services as a seminary of teachers. Saint-Martin had been sent by the district he inhabited to attend the lectures delivered in that school, and, of course, was expected to receive as sound gospel the teaching of the celebrated philosopher Garat, whose prelections on 'ideology' were scarcely anything else but a *réchauffé* of Condillac, dressed up with much taste, but still more assurance. A disciple of Jacob Bœhme, the young mystic, felt that what society required was not the deification of matter, nor the *Encyclopédie* made easy; he boldly rose up to refute the professor, and, by a reference to the third volume of the *Débats des Écoles Normales*, the reader can follow all the circumstances of a discussion which ended in Garat's discomfiture. M. Caro (Saint-Martin's biographer) has supplied a valuable *résumé* of the whole affair—an extremely important epoch in the life of Saint-Martin." M. Caro, in his *Essai sur la vie et la Doctrine de Saint-Martin* (Paris, 1856), has given a complete list of Saint-Martin's works. They are rather numerous. The best are the following: *Des Erreurs et de la Vérité, ou les hommes rappelés au Principe universel de la Science* (1775); *L'Homme de Désir;* and *De l'Esprit des Choses, ou coup d'œil Philosophiques sur la nature des êtres, et sur l'objet de leur existence* (1800, 2 vols. 8vo). These supply a clue to the main features of the author's character, and by a careful study of them we are enabled to ascertain the exact position he occupies in the gallery of modern metaphysicians.

M. Damiron, in reviewing the life and works of Saint-Martin (*Archives Littéraires*, 1804), affords us the following *résumé* of Saint-Martin's views: "The system of Saint-Martin aims at explaining everything by means of *man*. Man is to him the key to every phenomenon, and the image of all truth. Taking, therefore, literally the famous oracle of Delphi, 'Nosce te ipsum,' he maintains that, if we would fall into no mistakes respecting existence, and the harmony of all beings in the universe, we have only to understand *ourselves*, inasmuch as the body of man has a necessary relation to everything visible, and his spirit is the type of everything that is invisible. What we should study, then, are the physical faculties, whose exercise is often influenced by the senses and exterior objects, and the moral faculties or the conscience, which supposes free-will. It is in this study that we must seek for truth, and we shall find in ourselves all the necessary means of arriving at it:" this it is which our author calls natural revelation. For example: "The smallest attention," he says, "suffices to assure us that we can neither communicate nor form any idea without its being preceded by a picture or image of it, engendered by our own understanding; in this way it is that we originate the plan of a building or any other work. Our creative faculty is vast, active, inexhaustible; but, in examining it closely, we see that it is only secondary, temporary, dependent, i. e. that it owes its origin to a creative faculty, which is superior, independent, and universal, of which ours is but a feeble copy. Man, therefore, is a type, which must have a prototype, and that prototype is God." This extract affords a fair insight, we think, into the philosophical mysticism by which Saint-Martin attempted to supplant the shallow materialism and growing infidelity of his age, and to induce his countrymen to take a deeper insight into the constitution of the human mind, and its close connection with the divine. See, besides M. Caro's work above alluded to, Damiron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de philosophie au 18e siècle*, vol. i; Malter, *Saint-Martin, Le Philosophe inconnu* (1862); Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 208, 209; *London Quarterly Review*, 1856 (Jan.); 1857 (April), p. 177; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1863 (April), p. 339. (J. H. W.)

Martin, Sarah, an English philanthropist, was born near Yarmouth in 1791, and died in 1843. She was distinguished for her labors in the cause of prison reform. See *Brief Biographies*, by Samuel Smiles; Rev. Erskine Neale, *Christianity and Infidelity Contrasted; Edinburgh Review* (April), 1847.

Martin, Thomas, an English jurist noted for the part he took in the Marian persecution, was born at Cerne, in Dorsetshire, in the first half of the 16th century, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1555 he was made chancellor of the diocese of Winchester. Martin wrote in Latin, *Life of William of Wykeham*, the founder of New College. He vehemently opposed the marriage of priests, and thus also created considerable excitement. He also took part with Story in the trial of archbishop Cranmer at Oxford. He died in 1584. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.; Strype, *Annals;* Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*

Martin, William Wisner, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rahway, N. J., Dec. 18, 1837. He received a most careful parental training; pursued his preparatory studies in the Academy at Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Yale College, as salutatorian of his class, in 1860; studied divinity at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, where he graduated in 1863; and was immediately licensed and ordained as a home missionary to the Pacific coast. On his arrival there, he began his labors in Sonora, and joined Sierra Nevada Presbytery; thence he supplied the Howard Street Church, San Francisco, for a few months, and subsequently accepted a call from the Church at San José, but, before his installation took place, was taken ill and died, Oct. 16, 1865. Mr. Martin was characterized by an exceedingly frank and genial disposition, clear and discriminating habits of thought, and thorough, decided Christian principles. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 311.

Martin Brethren, or *Knights of the Order of St. Martin of Mayence*, were organized in 1294 by archbishop Gerhard, and renewed by archbishop Berthold in 1497, and flourished until the days of the French Revolution. Their object was the attainment of a godly life, brotherly love among the knights, and protection of the holy faith. Their sign was a golden shield, with a picture of St. Martin.—*Regensburg Allgem. Encyklop.* s. v. Martinsbrüder.

Martina, a Christian martyr in the reign of the tyrant Maximin, was a noble and beautiful virgin of Rome, who for the sake of Christ suffered manifold tortures, which were finished at length by the sword of the executioner, A.D. 235. Multitudes of Christians, in the course of this three years' persecution, were slain without trial, and buried indiscriminately in heaps, fifty or sixty being sometimes cast into a pit together.—Fox, *Martyrs*, p. 25, 26.

Martinalia. See MARTINMAS.

Martindale, Stephen, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland in 1788, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1808. He continued in active service for fifty-three years, filling the most important appointments in the Philadelphia and New York conferences. For twenty years he held the office of presiding elder on the Rhinebeck, Long Island, Prattsville, New York, and Poughkeepsie districts. In all these posts his fidelity, prudence, and capacity were amply shown; and through his long term of ministerial service he maintained an unblemished and even exalted reputation. He was elected to nearly every General Conference between 1820 and 1856. He died at Tarrytown, N. Y., May 23, 1860. See Smith, *Memorials N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf.* p. 127.

Martindale, Theodore Dwight, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Congre-

gational parents, at Greenfield, Mass., Nov. 28, 1820; was educated at the Western Reserve Seminary; taught for a time after his conversion; served in the local ministry for several years; was admitted into the Ohio Conference in the fall of 1852, and appointed to Blendon Circuit. His subsequent appointments were Maysville, Marietta, Logan, Pickerington, and Newark, when, in 1862, his connection with the Conference was dissolved, and thenceforth he sustained the relation of local preacher. In the fall of 1871 the presiding elder of the Zanesville District, at the request of the Circuit, appointed him as a supply with the venerable David Smith on the Hebron Charge, in the bounds of which he resided. He entered upon the work with commendable zeal and with general acceptability, but died on April 7, 1872. He was gifted and fluent in language, and his pulpit efforts generally ranged above mediocrity. See S. C. Riker, in *West. Christ. Advocate*, July 10, 1872.

Martinet, Louis-François, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Epernay, diocese of Rheims, April 19, 1753. At the age of sixteen he entered the regular canons of the Congregation of France, and during his course of studies at the abbey of St. Geneviève, of Paris, he was particularly favored by his superiors, who early made him teacher of philosophy and theology. Ordained priest at the age of twenty-five, he was made prior of Daon, in the diocese of Angers. It was in this capacity that he was elected delegate to the provincial assembly of the clergy of Anjou, and later to the states-general of 1789. Faithful to the principles of the minority of the Constituent Assembly, he was constantly opposed to the legislative measures which, under the semblance of a useful reform, had a destructive and ruinous object. He succeeded in escaping persecution, and emigrated to England. There he did not share in the illusions of his companions in exile of a speedy return to France; and, with a view to exercising his ministry usefully, he applied himself to the study of English. Gifted with indefatigable industry, and severely ascetic in his habits, he was enabled to regulate his time judiciously, and thus attain great success. In 1804 he returned to France, and at the period of the concordat was elected priest of Courbevoie. He passed from there to the parish of Saint-Leu-Saint-Giles, at Paris. It is to Martinet that we owe the preservation of the church of Saint-Leu; and, notwithstanding the opposition of M. Frochot, the prefect of the Seine, he succeeded in interesting powerful protectors, and the church was not abandoned. They even donated to him considerable funds for the reparation and embellishment of the edifice. In 1820 he was made priest of the parish church of Saint-Laurent, and, although advanced in age, his zeal and activity did not diminish in his administration. He died May 30, 1836. Martinet was one of the most worthy priests of the clergy of Paris. A knowledge of a great variety of subjects, an unbiassed, clear, and methodical mind, a pleasing and easy elocution, were increased by that urbanity of manner, that delicacy of tact, and that exquisite politeness which he observed in his habitual relations with persons of distinguished rank.—*Biographie Universelle*, Supplem., vol. lxxiii, s. v.

Martini, Antonio, an Italian prelate, was born at Prato in 1720. Having chosen an ecclesiastical career, and possessing a good knowledge of the ancient languages, he occupied his time in translating the sacred writings into Italian. Pius VI, informed of his merits, appointed him bishop of Bobio (1778); afterwards the grand duke of Tuscany called him to the archiepiscopacy of Florence (1781). Martini was greatly opposed to all new ideas, and decidedly manifested his opinion in haughtily condemning the doctrines of Ricci in the synod.

Martini, Corneille, a learned Belgian Lutheran, was born at Antwerp in 1567, and was educated in Germany, where he took the degree of doctor of arts and theology. In 1591 he taught logic in his native city, and for thirty years filled that chair successfully. He died at Helmstädt, Dec. 17, 1621, at the age of fifty-four. His works are *De Subjecto et fini Logicæ* (Lemgo, 1597, 12mo):—*Metaphysica Commentatio, compendiose, succincte, et perspicue comprehendens universam metaphysices doctrinam* (Strasburg, 1605, 12mo, et al.):—*De Analysi logica* (Helmst. 1619, et al.):—*Commentarius in Apulcii librum περὶ ἑρμηνείας* (Frankfort, 1621, 12mo):—*Commentariorum logicorum adversus Ramistas Libri quinque* (Helmst. 1623, 12mo):—*Ethica*:—*Compendium Theologiæ*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Martini, Giambattista, best known under the title of "Padre Martini," was born at Bologna in 1706. Early in youth he entered the Order of St. Francis, and, prompted by a spirit of inquiry and love of antiquity, soon set out on travels which he extended to Asia. On his return to Europe, he devoted himself to the study of music under the celebrated Ant. Perti. In 1723 he became maestro di capella of the convent of his order, which office he retained till his death in 1784. "He was," says Dr. Burney, who knew him well, "regarded during the last fifty years of his life as the most profound harmonist, and the best acquainted with the art and science of music, in Italy. All the great masters of his time were ambitious of becoming his disciples and proud of his approbation." Martini was also a composer, and produced much music for the Church, which was formerly held in esteem. His sixty canons in the unison, for two, three, and four voices, are still known, and admired for their smoothness and grace. His reputation depends, however, mainly on his *Essay on Counterpoint* (Bologna, 1774, 2 vols. folio), and on his *History of Music* (1781, 3 vols. 4to). See *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Martini, Martino, a Jesuit missionary, was born at Trent in 1614, visited China, and published, after his return, *De Bello Tartarico in Sinis*, which was translated into the principal European languages; also an excellent map of China ("Atlas Sinensis"), and a *History of China previous to the Christian Æra*. He died in 1661.

Martini, Raymond, a Spanish Dominican friar, noted for his great attainments as an Orientalist, was born at Sobirats, Catalonia, near the middle of the 13th century. At a general chapter held at Toledo in 1250, Martini was selected as among the most promising and talented of his order to be educated as a defender of the faith. Spain was at this time the great centre of Jewish and Mohammedan scholarship, and the Dominican general Raymond de Penafort was bent upon a polemical war with the "heretics." To defray the expenses of educating such of the priests and friars as might act as polemics, Raymond had secured a pension from the kings of Castile and Aragon. Both Hebrew and Arabic were assiduously studied by Martini, who, after having sufficiently qualified himself by the mastery of these Shemitic tongues, promptly commenced his attack on the Jews in a work entitled *Pugio fidei*, which he finished in 1278. He is also reputed to have written *Capistrum Judæorum*, and also *A Confutation of the Alcoran*. The time of his decease is not generally known. The great knowledge which Martini displayed in his comments on the books and opinions of the Jews, has made some unjustly imagine that he was of that religion. The "Pugio fidei" is said to have been greatly enlarged after Martini's death. We are told that Bosquet, who died bishop of Montpelier, fell upon the manuscript, while he was with great ardor rummaging all the corners of the library of the College de Foix at Toulouse, about 1629, read it, and, after copying some things out of it, gave it to James Spiegel, a learned German, and his preceptor in the Hebrew tongue. Spiegel advised Maussac to publish it; but the latter, though very able to do it himself, had for an assistant Mr. de Voisin, son of a counsellor in the Parliament at Bourdeaux, who took upon him the greatest part of the task. Thomas Turc, general of the Dominicans, was very earnest in

spurring on the promoters of this edition; and, not satisfied with soliciting them by letters equally importunate and obliging, he gave orders that they should be provided with all the manuscripts of the "Pugio fidei" that could be recovered. In short, the Dominican Order interested themselves so much in it that they bore the charges of the impression, which was made at Paris in 1651.

Martinique, or **Martinico**, called by the natives *Madiana*, one of the Lesser Antilles, lying between latitude 14° 23′ 43″ and 14° 52′ 47″ north, and longitude 60° 50′ and 61° 19′ west, is forty miles long, about twelve miles broad, and has an area of about 380 square miles, and 160,831 inhabitants, of whom upwards of 87,000 are black. The island was discovered by the Spaniards in 1493, colonized by the French in 1635, and now belongs to them. It is of an oval form, with much indented coasts, and is everywhere mountainous; the highest peak, Mount Pelée, being considerably more than 4000 feet above the sea-level. There are six extinct volcanoes on the island, one of them with an enormous crater. The cultivated portion (about one third of the whole of Martinique) lies chiefly along the coast. The climate is moist, but, except during the rainy season, is not unhealthy, and the soil is very productive. Of the land in cultivation, about three fifths are occupied with sugar-cane.

The government of the island consists of a governor, a privy council of seven, and a colonial council of thirty members. Slavery was abolished in 1848. The island is liable to dreadful hurricanes. The capital is Fort Royal, but St. Pierre (q. v.) is the largest town and the seat of commerce. The average annual fall of rain is eighty-four inches. The year is divided into two seasons; one commences about Oct. 15, and lasts some nine months, and the other, or rainy season, lasts the remainder of the year. During the short season the yellow-fever prevails largely. The inhabitants of the Martinique Islands are usually adherents of the Church of Rome.

Martinists, a Russian sect of mystics, which originated near the opening of our æra, as a result of the labors of St. Martin, the French philosopher whose life and labors we have spoken of above. The Martinists allied themselves with freemasonry, and spread from Moscow over all Russia. Aiming to supplant infidelity by mysticism, they read largely the writings of German mystics and pietists; Arndt and Spener were special favorites, and were widely scattered in translations. Catharine II opposed the sect, but it continued to flourish, notwithstanding all persecution, until the despotic reign of Nicholas I, when, with many other sects, the Martinists were crushed. Under Alexander I, the Martinists, favored by the patronage of prince Galitzin, enjoyed their "golden age."

Martinius, Matthias, a German Reformed theologian, was born in 1572, and became eminent as a scholar, preacher, and instructor. He was made court-preacher in 1595, professor at Herborn in the following year, and placed in charge of the grammar-school connected with the academy at that place in 1597. He continued in that relation during ten years; and in 1610, after an interval spent in preaching at Emden, accepted a call from the Council of Bremen to become the rector of the famous gymnasium of their city, and to fill the chair of theology in its faculty. Under his direction this institution rose to great prosperity, and students, even from many foreign lands, thronged its halls. In 1618 he was delegated to the Synod of Dort, where he was noted for the moderation of his views. The course of that body never received his approval, although his name appears among its signers, and in later years he was often heard to exclaim, "O Dort, would to God I had never seen thee!" He died in 1630 of apoplexy, and was buried at Bremen. His chief work, the *Lexicon philologico-etymologicum*, is still used. His other writings, of which sixty-eight have been enumerated, are unimportant. The *Lexicon* was published at Bremen in folio in 1623, in a second edition at Frankfort in 1665, and at Utrecht in 1697.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xx, 113 sq. (G. M.)

Martinmas, or *the Mass of St. Martin*, a feast kept on the 11th of November in honor of St. Martin of Tours. The feast was often a merry one. In England and Scotland the winter's provisions were, in olden days, cured and stored up at that time of the year, and were hence called a *mart*. Luther derived his first name from being born on the eve of this festival; in Germany called also *Martinalia*. See Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.; *Regensburg Real-Encyklop.* ix, 312, col. i (iii).

Martin's Day, St. See Martinmas.

Martinus, Polonus or Bohemus, a Polish chronicler and ecclesiastic of the 13th century, was born at Troppau, in Silesia; entered the Dominican Order; became chaplain and confessor to pope Clement IV, and to several of his successors; and in 1278 was appointed archbishop of Gnesen. He died shortly after at Bologna (1278). He wrote valuable works in the department of ecclesiastical history, including biographies of several popes. His most important production is the *Chronicon de Summis Pontificibus*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 27.

Martyn, Henry, known as "the scholar missionary," one of the most distinguished missionaries of modern times, was born of humble parentage at Truro, in Cornwall, England, Feb. 18, 1781. He was educated in the grammar-school of his native place; sought for a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, but, failing in this, he went to Cambridge, and entered St. John's College in October, 1797. He was at that time outwardly moral, but still unconverted. But, while at college, the death of his father directed his mind to religious subjects, and, by his association with the celebrated evangelical preacher Charles Simeon, he soon became one of the most thoroughly Christian students in the college, where, in 1801, he came out "senior wrangler," the highest academical honor adjudged. He was chosen fellow of his college in March, 1802, and obtained the first prize for the best Latin prose composition in the university. Believing it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, he now devoted himself to the work of the ministry. England was at this time wide-awake in the cause of missions, and Martyn finally determined that he also must go forth to propagate Christianity among the nations who sat in darkness. He sought to be employed by the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East," now the "Church Missionary Society;" but, as he was too young to take holy orders, his appointment was postponed. He was ordained deacon Oct. 22, 1803; was made bachelor of divinity in March, 1805, and was at the same time ordained priest, and, obtaining an appointment as missionary to India, embarked Sept. 10, 1805.

Henry Martyn reached Madras April 21, 1806. He stopped for a while at Calcutta, where he continued the study of Hindostanee, which he had commenced in England, and applied himself also to Sanscrit, as the key to most of the Eastern languages, and to Persian. He then removed to the station of Dinapore, where he was appointed to labor, primarily among the English troops there posted, and the families of the civilians. But to the natives also he constantly addressed himself, and, amid all these labors, yet found time to complete a translation of the English liturgy into Hindostanee (Feb. 24, 1807), a translation of the N. T. in that language, and, this finished, commenced a version of the N. T. in Persian, in which he had the assistance of an Arab translator, Sabat (q. v.).

Near the close of 1809, Mr. Martyn commenced his first public ministrations among the heathen at Cawnpore, whither he had removed in April of this year. His auditory sometimes counted as many as eight hundred. They were young, old, male, female, bloated, wizened,

clothed with abominable rags, nearly naked, some plastered with mud or cow-dung, others with matted, uncombed locks, streaming to the heels, others bald or scabby-headed. The authorities seem to have had a wide-open eye on his proceedings, and anything which appeared to graze roughly against the superstitions of his auditory would at once have wrecked his scheme. Finally, exhausted with these and other labors, his health began to give way, and he was recommended either to try the effects of a sea-voyage, or to return to England for a time. Having embraced the latter proposal, he determined to travel by way of Persia and Arabia, with a view of submitting his Persian and Arabic translations of the N. T. to the revision and critical judgment of learned Persians. He left Cawnpore in the last of September, 1810, and in the early summer of 1811 landed at Bushire, and thence proceeded to Shiraz, where he resided for more than ten months. Here he created great interest by the religious discussions which, as the sole advocate of the Christian faith, he carried on in the crowded conclaves of Mollahs and Sofis. He completed his Persian version of the N. T. Feb. 24, 1812, and a Persian translation of the Psalms six weeks later. From Shiraz he went to Tabriz, resolved on visiting the king in his summer camp, and presenting his work in person. His interview with the vizier, who was surrounded by a number of ignorant and intemperate Mollahs, called forth all the energies of Martyn's faith and patience, and at length it was found that, owing to an informality—the want of an introduction from the British ambassador—he could not be admitted to the royal presence. He now proceeded to Tabriz, where he was laid up for two months, and compelled to abandon all hopes of presenting his N. T. in person to the king, but Sir G. Ousely, the British ambassador, relieved his anxiety by kindly promising to present the volume himself. Ten days after his recovery from the fever which had laid him up, he proceeded on his journey homeward. His plan was to return to England via Constantinople, but, in consequence of too hurried travelling, he was laid up at Tocat with severe illness, and died Oct. 16, 1812. "No more is known of Henry Martyn save that he died at Tocat, without a European near. . . . He died a pilgrim's solitary death, and lies in an unknown grave in a heathen land." The regrets in England which this event created were great. Much was expected from him, and much would probably have been done by him in the cause to which he had devoted himself. As it was, he brought not a few, both Hindûs and Mohammedans, to make profession of the Christian faith, and he caused the Scriptures to be extensively dispersed among a people who had not previously known them. "The ardent zeal of the Celtic character; the religious atmosphere that John Wesley had spread over Cornwall, even among those who did not enroll themselves among his followers; the ability and sensitiveness hereditary in the Martyn family, together with the strong influence of a university tutor—all combined to make such a bright and brief trail of light to the career of Henry Martyn" (Miss C. M. Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders*, p. 71). An interesting account of his life, compiled from various journals left by him, was published by the Rev. John Sargent in 1819. Of his productions there were published *Sermons preached in Calcutta and elsewhere* (4th edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo):—*Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism* (edited by Prof. Samuel Lee, D.D., Camb. 1824, 8vo):—*Journals and Letters* (edited by the Rev. J. B. Wilberforce, later bishop of Oxford, Lond. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo; abridged 1839, post 8vo, and often). See, besides the biography already referred to, that by John Hall (N. Y. 18mo, published by the American Tract Society). See also *Eclectic Review*, 4th series, iii, 321; *Bost. Spirit of the Pilgrims*, iv, 428; Albert Barnes, *Essays and Reviews* (1855), ii, 278; *Edinb. Rev.* 1844 (July), lxxx, 278; *Cyclopædia of Modern Religious Biography*, p. 321; Timpson, *Bible Triumphs*, p. 423; *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge; Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1857 (July), art. ii, p. 329; *Princeton Rev.* 1853, p. 409; 1855, p. 327. (J. H. W.)

Martyr (μάρτυς and μάρτυρ, so rendered only in Acts xxii, 20; Rev. ii, 13; xviii, 6) is properly *a witness*, and is applied in the New Testament (*a*) to judicial witnesses (Matt. xviii, 16; xxvi, 65; Mark xiv, 63; Acts vi, 13; vii, 58; 2 Cor. xiii, 1; 1 Tim. v, 19; Heb. x, 28. The Septuagint also uses it for the Hebrew עֵד, *ed*, in Deut. xvii, 16; Prov. xxiv, 28); (*b*) To one who has testified, or can testify to the truth of what he has seen, heard, or known. This is a frequent sense in the New Testament, as in Luke xxiv, 48; Acts i, 8, 22; Rom. i, 9; 2 Cor. i, 23; 1 Thes. ii, 5, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 2; 1 Pet. v, 1; Rev. i, 5; iii, 14; xi, 3, and elsewhere. (*c*) The meaning of the word which has now become the most usual, is that in which it occurs most rarely in the Scriptures, i. e. one who by his death bears witness to the truth. In this sense we only find it in Acts xxii, 20; Rev, ii, 13; xvii, 6. This now exclusive sense of the word was brought into general use by the early ecclesiastical writers, who applied it to every one who suffered death in the Christian cause (see Suicer, *Thesaurus Eccles.* sub. voc.). See MARTYRS. Stephen was in this sense the first martyr [see STEPHEN], and the spiritual honors of his death tended in no small degree to raise to the most extravagant estimation, in the early Church, the value of the testimony of blood. Eventually a martyr's death was supposed, on the alleged authority of the under-named texts, to cancel all the sins of the past life (Luke xii, 50; Mark x, 39); to supply the place of baptism (Matt. x, 39), and at once to secure admittance to the presence of the Lord in Paradise (Matt. v, 10–12). In imitation of the family custom of annually commemorating at the grave the death of deceased members, the churches celebrated the deaths of their martyrs by prayers at their graves, and by love-feasts. From this high estimation of the martyrs, Christians were sometimes led to deliver themselves up voluntarily to the public authorities—thus justifying the charge of fanaticism brought against them by the heathen. For the most part, however, this practice was discountenanced, the words of Christ himself being brought against it (Matt. x, 23; see Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 109, 110). For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 75, 116. See CONFESSOR.

Martyr, PETER, one of the early Reformers, was born at Florence, Italy, in 1500. His family name was *Vermigli*, but his parents gave him that of Martyr, from one Peter, a martyr, whose church stood near their house. In 1516 he became a canon regular of the Order of St. Augustine, in the convent of Fiesole, near Florence. In 1519 he was sent to the University of Padua, where he soon distinguished himself as a good scholar. He acquired great reputation as a preacher, was made abbot of Spoleto, and afterwards principal of the College of St. Peter ad Aram, at Naples. Here he made the intimate acquaintance of Juan Valdez (q. v.), a Spaniard, who had become a convert to the doctrines of the Reformation, and from whom Vermigli adopted some of those tenets. He concealed them for a time; but his Biblical studies convincing him more and more of the errors of the Church of Rome, and a perusal of the works of Luther, Zwingle, and Bucer making sure his conversion, he publicly avowed his new doctrine shortly after his appointment to Lucca as prior of San Frediano, and was compelled to leave the place secretly. After a short stay at Florence, he went by way of Germany to Switzerland. He found an asylum finally in Strasburg, and there, in 1542, was called to a theological chair, and acted for five years as the colleague of Bucer in the ministerial office. In 1546 he married a converted nun. In 1547 he received from Cranmer, and accepted, an invitation to England. The request was sent in the name of king Edward VI, acting under the advice of Seymour, the protector. In 1549 he was appointed professor of divinity at Oxford. The fame of his learning

secured him a large auditory, many Romanists among the number; "and though they had much envying and heart-burning about him, as may easily be imagined, yet they bore him pretty patiently till he came to handle the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Then they began to break forth into outrages, to disturb him in his lectures, to fix up malicious and scandalous schedules against him, and to challenge him to disputes; which challenges he did not disdain to accept, but disputed first privately in the vice-chancellor's lodge, and afterwards in public, before his majesty's commissioners deputed for that purpose. At length, however, they stirred up the seditious multitude against him so successfully that he was obliged to retire to London till the tumult was suppressed;" and on returning again, in the year following, he was, for his better security, made by the king canon of Christ-church. It is said that some alterations in the Prayer-book were made at Peter Martyr's suggestions. On the accession of Mary he was obliged to leave England, and, returning to Strasburg, there resumed his former professorship. However, as he inclined to Calvin's views on the doctrine of the Eucharist, he accepted a pressing invitation extended to him by the Senate of Zürich, in 1556, to fill the chair of theology in that university. In 1561 he received letters from the queen of France, the king of Navarre, the prince of Condé, as well as from Beza and others of the leading French Protestants, requesting him to attend at the famous Colloquy of Poissy, in France. Here he distinguished himself as well for his skill as for his prudence and moderation. He died at Zürich Nov. 12, 1562. "Peter Martyr is described as a man of an able, healthy, big-boned, and well-limbed body, and of a countenance which expressed an inwardly grave and settled turn of mind. His parts and learning were very uncommon; as was also his skill in disputation, which made him as much admired by the Protestants as hated by the Papists. He was very sincere and indefatigable in promoting a reformation in the Church, yet his zeal was never known to get the better of his judgment. He was always moderate and prudent in his outward behavior, nor even in the conflict of a dispute did he suffer himself to be transported into intemperate warmth or allow unguarded expressions ever to escape him. But his pains and industry were not confined to preaching and disputing against the Papists; he wrote a great many books against them, none of which raised his reputation higher than his *Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* [*Defensio Doctrinæ veteris et apostolicæ de S. Eucharistiæ sacramento; accessit Tractatio, et Disputatio habita Univ. Oxon. de eodem*, 1562, fol.] against bishop Gardiner. He wrote also several tracts of divinity, and commentaries on several books of Scripture, for all of which he was as much applauded by one party as he was condemned by the other." Tirabaschi, a zealous Roman Catholic, acknowledges that Martyr was free from the arrogance and virulence with which the Romanists are wont to charge the Reformers; that he was deeply acquainted with the Scriptures and the fathers, and was one of the most learned writers of the Reformed Church. He was the author of *Expositio Symboli Apostolici; De Cœnâ Domini Quæstiones*, a system of theology, which was first published in England by Massonius, then more fully under the title *Loci communes, ex variis ipsius authoris scriptis* (Zürich, 1580, folio; translated into English, 1583, folio, etc.). His other works are, *In primum librum Mosis qui vulgo Genesis dicitur commentarii.* Addita est initio operis vita ejusdem à Josia Simlero (Tiguri, 1569, folio):—*In Librum Judicum commentarii, cum tractatione perutili rerum et locorum.* Editio tertia, prioribus longe emendatior (Tiguri, 1571, folio):—*In duos libros Samuelis prophetæ commentarii doctissimi, cum rerum et locorum plurimorum tractatione perutili* (Tiguri, 1575, folio):—*In Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos commentarii doctissimi, cum tractatione perutili rerum et locorum, qui ad eam epistolam pertinent.* Cum indicibus (Basle, tertia editio, 1570, folio):—*In i. Epistolam ad Corinthios commentarii doctissimi* (Tiguri, editio secunda, 1567, folio):—*Commentarii in duos libros Regum* (1599):—*Commentarii in Threnos* (1629). See Simler, *Oratio de vita et obitu D. Petri Martyris* (Zürich, 1562, 4to); Schlosser, *Leben des Theodor Beza u. d. P. M. Vermigli* (Heidelb. 1807); *Leben der Väter u. Begründer d. reformirten Kirche*, vol. vii (Elberfeld, 1858); Schmidt, *Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli* (Strasb. 1835, 8vo); McCrie, *Hist. Reformation in Italy;* Wordsworth, *Biog.* vol. iii.; Fisher, *Hist. Ref.* p. 336, etc.; *Biblioth. Sacra* (1859), p. 445; *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1991; Hook, *Ecclesiast. Biog.* vii, 245; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, 67, 192; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* xvii, 82 sq.

Martyrdom is a term employed by Christian ecclesiastical writers to record the suffering of death on account of one's adherence to the faith of the Gospel. See MARTYR. In times of persecution, martyrdom came to be thought so meritorious that it acquired the name of *second baptism*, or *baptism in blood*, because of the power and efficacy it was supposed to have in saving men by the invisible baptism of the Spirit, in the absence of the external element of water. In any case in which a catechumen was apprehended and slain for the name of Christ before he could be admitted among the faithful by baptism, his martyrdom was deemed sufficient to answer all the purposes of the sacrament. In the writings of Prosper there is an epigram to this effect:

> "Fraudati non sunt sacro baptismate Christi,
> Fons quibus ipsa sui sanguinis unda fuit;
> Et quicquid sacri fert mystica forma lavacri,
> Id totum implevit gloria martyrii."

"They are not deprived of the sacred baptism of Christ who, instead of a font, are washed in their own blood; for whatever benefit accrues to any by the mystical rite of the sacred laver, is all fulfilled by the glory of martyrdom." The martyrs were supposed to enjoy very singular privileges; in some ages the doctrine was taught that immediately on death they passed to the enjoyment of the beatific vision, for which other Christians were required to wait till the day of judgment; and that God would grant to their prayers the hastening of his kingdom and the shortening the times of persecution.

Martyriarius is the name, in the Roman Catholic Church, of the *keeper of sacred relics*. The relics of martyrs are most generally kept under the principal altar of the church.

Martyrion. See MARTYRIUM.

Martyrium. The name of a church built over the grave of a martyr, or called by his name to preserve the memory of him, had usually the distinguishing title of *martyrium*, or *memoria martyrum*. Instances of this kind of designation occur with great frequency in the writings of Eusebius, Augustine, etc. Eusebius calls the church which was built by Constantine on Calvary, in memory of Christ's passion and resurrection, *Martyrium Salvatoris*.

Martyrology (*Acta Martyrum*) is (1) with the Protestant a catalogue or list of those who have suffered martyrdom for their religion, including the history of their lives and sufferings; but (2) with those who believe in the adoration and intercession of saints and martyrs, a calendar of martyrs and other saints arranged in the order of months and days, and intended partly to be read in the public services of the Church, partly for the guidance of the devotion of the faithful towards the saints and martyrs. The use of the martyrology is common both to the Latin and Greek Churches. In the latter it is called *Menologion* (q. v.).

Eusebius of Cæsarea was the first who wrote an extensive history of the Christian martyrs; it was translated into Latin by St. Jerome, but has been long irrecoverably lost. St. Jerome's own work on the same subject—the oldest one now extant—is regarded as the great martyrology of the Latin Church [it is published

in the eleventh volume of the collected edition of his works by Vallars]; but it is little used in comparison with later compilations of idle legends and pretended miracles. The latest Greek martyrology or menology extant dates from the 9th century. It was prepared by order of emperor Basilius Macedo (867–886), and was published in 1727 by cardinal Urbini. In the mediæval period, martyrologies were issued in England by Venerable Bede; in France by Florus, Ado, and Usuard; and in Germany by St. Gall, Nolter, and Rabanus Maurus. The so-called "Roman Martyrology" (*Martyrologium Romanum*) is designed for the entire Church, both East and West, and was published by authority of Gregory XIII, with a critical commentary by the celebrated cardinal Baronius, in 1586. A still more critical edition was issued by the learned Jesuit Herebert Rosweid. The Protestant Church possesses many accounts of martyrs; but as a true martyrology in English, from a Protestant stand-point, we may mention Fox's *Book of Martyrs*. See MARTYRS; MARTYRDOM.

Martyrology is (3) also applied to the painted or written catalogues in the Roman churches, containing the foundations, obits, prayers, and masses to be said each day. See ACTA MARTYRUM.

Martyrs, those who lay down their life or suffer death for the sake of their religion. In accordance with the primitive Greek sense of the word, i. e. a *witness* [see MARTYR], it is applied by Christian writers to such as suffer in testimony of the truth of the Gospel or its doctrines. The Christian Church has abounded with martyrs, and history is filled with surprising accounts of their singular constancy and fortitude under the most cruel torments that human nature is capable of suffering. The primitive Christians were accused by their enemies of paying a sort of divine worship to martyrs. Of this we have an instance in the answer of the Church of Smyrna to the suggestion of the Jews, who, at the martyrdom of Polycarp, desired the heathen judge not to suffer the Christians to carry off his body, lest they should leave their crucified Master, and worship him in his stead. To this they answered, "We can neither forsake Christ nor worship any other, for we worship him as the Son of God; but love the martyrs as the disciples and followers of the Lord, for the great affection they have shown to their King and Master." A like answer was given at the martyrdom of Fructuosus in Spain; for when the judge asked Eulogius, his deacon, whether he would not worship Fructuosus, as thinking that, though he refused to worship the heathen idols, he might yet be inclined to worship a Christian martyr, Eulogius replied, "I do not worship Fructuosus, but him whom Fructuosus worships." The courage and constancy of the sufferers naturally enough won the highest admiration from their brethren in the faith; and so it came to be held a special privilege to receive the martyr's benediction, to kiss his chains, to visit him in prison, or to converse with him; and as it was held by the primitive Christians that the martyrs enjoyed very singular privileges with God [see MARTYRDOM], it came to be held also that their great and superabundant merit might, in the eyes of the Church, compensate for the laxity and weakness of less perfect brethren, and thus gradually a practice of intercession arose, which finally degenerated into the granting of indulgences, etc., as now common in the Roman Catholic Church. See INDULGENCES; INVOCATION.

Perhaps the admiration and veneration which Christian martyrdom secures has had a great tendency to excite many to court martyrdom. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that martyrdom in itself is no proof of the goodness of our cause, but only that we ourselves are persuaded that it is so. "It is not the *blood*, but the *cause* that makes the martyr" (Mead). Yet we may consider the number and fortitude of those who have suffered for Christianity as a collateral proof at least of its excellency; for the thing for which they suffered was not a point of speculation, but a plain matter of fact, in which (had it been false) they could not have been mistaken. The martyrdom, therefore, of so many wise and good men, taken with a view of the whole system of Christianity, will certainly afford something considerable in its favor.

In the early days of Christianity it was no unusual occurrence to build a church over the grave of a martyr, calling the church after his name, in order to preserve the memory of his sufferings. See MARTYRIUM. But soon every Church wished to possess a saint's tomb for an altar. Mere cenotaphs did not suffice. Thus, according to Augustine, Ambrose was delayed in the consecration of a new church at Milan till a seasonable dream helped him to the bones of two martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius. And the second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) went even so far as to threaten bishops with deprivation if they should undertake to consecrate churches without relics. The consequence was that a supply was produced by such a demand, and frauds of every kind were perpetrated and overlooked. Each Church also had its own *Fasti*, or calendar of martyrs. See CALENDAR; CHURCH.

The festivals of the martyrs are also of very ancient date. On the first establishment of their religion, it was natural that Christians should look back from a condition of unexpected security on the sufferings of their immediate predecessors with the most vivid sentiments of sympathy and admiration. They had witnessed those sufferings, they had beheld the constancy with which they were endured; the same terror had been suspended over themselves, and their own preservation they attributed, under the especial protection of divine Providence, to the perseverance of those who had perished. The gratitude and veneration thus fervently excited were loudly and passionately expressed; and the honors which were due to the virtues of the departed were profusely bestowed on their names and their memory. Enthusiasm easily passed into superstition, and those who had sealed a Christian's faith by a martyr's death were exalted above the condition of men, and enthroned among superior beings. The day of martyrdom, moreover, as being held to be the day of the martyr's entering into eternal life, was called the "natal" or "birth" day, and as such was celebrated with peculiar honor, and with special religious services. Their bodies, clothes, books, and the other objects which they had possessed, were honored as *Relics* (q. v.), and their tombs were visited for the purpose of asking their intercession. See MARTYRS, FESTIVALS OF THE.

Of the sayings, sufferings, and deaths of the martyrs, though preserved with great care for the purposes above alluded to, and to serve as models to future ages, we have but very little left, the greatest part of them having been destroyed during the Diocletian persecution; for a most diligent search was then made after all their books and papers, and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. Some of those records since compiled have either never reached us at all, or, if they have, their authority is extremely suspected. See MARTYROLOGY.

The appropriate homage to be rendered to the martyrs by the Protestant world, as a reason why our respect of these sainted dead should not degenerate into martyr-worship, by the exhibition of an enthusiasm which with the early Christians was quite natural, but with us would be artificial, has been well commented upon by Gieseler (*Church History*, i, 108, 282), who says: "The respect paid to martyrs still maintains the same character as in the 2d century, differing only in degree, not in kind, from the honor shown to other esteemed dead. As the churches held the yearly festivals of their martyrs at the graves of the latter, so they willingly assembled frequently in the burial-places of their deceased friends, for which they used in many places even caves (*cryptæ catacumbæ*). At the celebration of the Lord's Supper, both the living who brought oblations, as well as the dead, and the martyrs for whom offerings were

presented, especially on the anniversary of their death, were included by name in the prayer of the Church. Inasmuch as the readmission of a sinner into the Church was thought to stand in close connection with the forgiveness of sin, an opinion was associated with the older custom of restoring to Church communion the lapsed who had been again received by the martyrs, that the martyrs could also be serviceable in obtaining the forgiveness of sins. In doing so they set out in part with the idea, which is very natural, that the dead prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the dead, but that the intercession of martyrs abiding in the captivity of the Lord would be of peculiar efficacy on behalf of their brethren; while they also thought that the martyrs, as assessors in the last decisive judgment, were particularly active (1 Cor. vi, 2, 3). Origen attributed very great value to that intercession, expecting from it great help towards sanctification; but he went beyond the ideas hitherto entertained in attributing to martyrdom an importance and efficacy similar to the death of Christ. Hence he feared the cessation of persecution as a misfortune. The more the opinion that value belonged to the intercession of martyrs was established, the oftener it may have happened that persons commended themselves to the martyrs yet living for intercession."

The number of martyrs who suffered death during the first ages of Christianity has been a subject of great controversy. The early ecclesiastical writers, with the natural pride of partisanship, have, it can hardly be doubted, leaned to the side of exaggeration. Some of their statements are palpably excessive; and Gibbon, in his well-known sixteenth chapter, throws great doubt even on the most moderate of the computations of the Church historians. But it is clearly though briefly shown by Guizot, in his notes on this celebrated chapter (see Milman's *Gibbon's Decline and Fall*, i, 598), that Gibbon's criticisms are founded on unfair and partial data, and that even the very authorities upon which he relies demonstrate the fallaciousness of his conclusions. Those who are interested in the subject will find it discussed with much learning and considerable moderation in Ruinart's *Acta Primitiva et Sincera Martyrum*. No little difference of opinion has also existed as to what, in the exploration of the ancient Christian tombs in the Roman Catacombs, are to be considered as signs of martyrdom. The chief signs, in the opinion of older critics, were (1) the letters B. M., (2) the figure of a palm-tree, and (3) a phial with the remains of a red liquor believed to be blood. Each of these has in turn been the subject of dispute, but the last is commonly regarded as the conclusive sign of martyrdom. The first recorded martyr of Christianity, called the "protomartyr," was the deacon Stephen, whose death is recorded in Acts vi and vii.

See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer*, iii, 272 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* p. 102, etc.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquit.* p. 101 sq.; Donaldson, *Lit.* ii, 284 sq.; Neander, *Plant and Train. Christ. Churches* (see Index); Lardner, *Works*, iii, 91, 219 sq.; Jortin, *Remarks*, i, 345; Taylor, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 380; Milman, *Christianity* (see Index); *Lat. Christianity* (see Index); Waddington, *Ch. Hist.* pt. iv, p. 114; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 177 sq., 182 sq.; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 404; *Am. Theol. Rev.* 1860 (Aug.), p. 530; *Zeitschr. histor. theol.* 1850, p. 315; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Martyrs, Canonization of the. The ceremony for canonizing saints in the Roman Catholic Church varied greatly until, in the middle of the last century, pope Benedict XIV definitely prescribed it. It is now as follows: After the candidate's reputation for sanctity has been duly proved, he is styled *venerable*, after which an inquiry is entered into to establish the proof of his virtues, in a high or, as it is termed, *heroic* degree. For that purpose the whole life and all the actions of the candidate are scrutinized. That task devolves on the Sacred Congregation of the Rites, assisted by theologians and canonists, three auditors of the rota, and monks belonging to five different orders. Natural philosophers and physicians are also called on to give their opinions on the temperament of the candidate and on the miracles which are attributed to him. The most important and the most original character in this court of inquiry is that of the promoter of the faith, also called the Advocate of the Devil. His Satanic majesty is a power which must be taken into account, and is allowed to have his cause pleaded even before the ecclesiastical tribunal. This advocate may be supposed to bring forward arguments to prove that the man who is a candidate for canonization is guilty of every sin; that he has violated the ten commandments of God and those of the Church; has eaten on fast days; has entered into a compact with the dæmons of avarice, pride, envy, hatred, and malice; and that the miracles attributed to him were performed by the devil himself. The advocate would probably conclude his argument by saying, "Render therefore unto Satan that which is Satan's, and do not deprive Beelzebub of the fruit of his works." The advocate for the candidate then rises, and endeavors to overturn all the arguments of his learned brother by bringing forward and enlarging upon all the virtues of his client, and concludes by begging the judges to throw open to him the doors of beatitude, and adorn his forehead with the rays of glory. The tribunal then examines all the arguments *pro* and *con*, and at length pronounces in favor of the candidate. Next comes the question of the miracles, and the natural philosophers are requested to bring forward all the objections they may have to make. They in their turn declare that science is vanquished, and the miracles are declared to be *bona fide*. A favorable report is then made to the pope, who delivers the sentence of beatification, and on the day appointed pronounces the canonization from his throne at the Vatican. The honors conferred by canonization are seven in number: 1. The names are inscribed in the ecclesiastical almanacs, in the list of martyrs, and in the litanies. 2. They are publicly invoked in the prayers and service of the Church. 3. Chapters, churches, and altars are dedicated to them. 4. Sacrifice is offered in their honor at the mass. 5. Their fête day is celebrated. 6. Their images are exhibited in the churches, and they may be there represented with a crown of light round the head. 7. Their relics are offered to the veneration of the faithful, and carried with pomp in solemn processions. See CANONIZATION.

Martyrs, Festivals of the. These commemorations of Christian sufferers for the cause of their Master are of very ancient date, and may be carried as high as the time of Polycarp, who suffered death about A.D. 168. In the days of Chrysostom and Theodoret these festivals had become so frequent that, so they tell us, oftentimes one or two were celebrated in one and the same week (see Chrysostom, *Hom.* 40 *in Juventinum*, i, 546; Theodoret, *Serm.* 8 *de Martyribus*, iv, 605; Chrysostom, *Hom.* 65 *de Martyr.* iv, 971). On these occasions, as has been intimated in the article MARTYRS, the assemblies were not held in the churches or in the usual places of worship, but at the graves of the martyrs. The night preceding the festival was passed in holy vigil, praying and singing psalms and hymns. As they were esteemed high festivals, the same service that was performed on the Sabbath was always performed on such occasions. But, besides the usual solemnities of other festivals, the history of the sufferings of the martyrs was also commonly read, and orations were delivered commending their virtues, and the audience invited to profit by these self-denying examples. This practice was encouraged by a canon of the third Council of Carthage ("Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur," *Con. Carth.* 3, can. 47). Mabillon gives several instances to show that they were read also in the French churches. In the Roman Church they were forbidden by pope Gelasius, as many were said to be anonymous, and others by heathen or

heretical authors; but this rule, it seems, did not then prescribe as to other churches. The Lord's Supper was always administered at these festivals, and at the close the rich usually made a feast for the poor, especially to the widows and orphans.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, i, 659; *Cyclop. of Religious Knowledge*, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 777. See FEASTS.

Marûf el-Karkhi, EBEN-MAHFOND, an Arabic mystic, was born at Carkh, between Hamadan and Ispahan, about the year 750. The son of a Christian, he became a Mussulman, under the name of Ali. While attached to the house of the imam Ali Riza, at Bagdad, where he discharged the duties of a door-keeper, he formed a firm friendship with one of the most ancient mystic chiefs, Daûd el-Thayi, and became himself one of the most celebrated mystics of Arabia. He died in 816, at Bagdad. The mystical system of Marûf is neither the ascetic system of the ancient Indian and Christian Cœnobites, which he rejected, nor that of the more recent Persian mystics, who are entirely absorbed in contemplations of divine love. He lays stress on the practical virtues; and if he preaches humility in saying that we should never appear before God except with the exterior of a poor mendicant, he still is not led astray in his reflections upon divine love, which, according to him, is a gift of God's grace, and not learned by the lessons of masters. Marûf, it is true, elsewhere carries out his thoughts, by saying that we must turn to God if we expect God's favor upon us. These ideas have caused him to be regarded as one of the orthodox mystics of Islam. His maxims are found dispersed throughout the ascetic works of Abûlfaray Mansûr ibn al-Yanzi, especially in the *Manakhib-Marûf*, or Panegyrics of Marûf, and in the *Kenzel Modzakkirin*, or Treasure of the Deistical Panegyrists. In the *Monutekhab fil Nowle* is found the most complete selection of Marûf's utterances.—Hadj'l Chalfa, *Lexikon Bibliographicum et Encyclopædicum*; Djami, *Biographie des Soufis*; Hammer, *Gesch. der Arabischen Literatur*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Mărut or **Mârut** (Sanscrit *wind*) denotes in the Hindû mythology the genus or divinities presiding over the winds. In the Vedas the Maruts are often addressed as the attendants and allies of Indra, and are called the sons of Prisni (or Pricni), or the Earth; they are also called *Rhudras*, or the sons of Rhudra. See the Introductions to the several volumes of professor Wilson's translation of the *Rig Veda*; see also Moor, *Hindu Pantheon*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Maruthas, one of the most important men in the Syrian Church of the 4th and 5th centuries, was bishop of Tagrit, in Mesopotamia, called also by the Syrians Maipherkin, Maipherkat, and Medinat Sohde, i. e. city of the martyrs. He took an active part in the management of Church affairs, and is also known as a writer. So great, indeed, was the consideration he enjoyed at the hands of his contemporaries that he was popularly credited with power to work miracles. In 403 he made a journey to Constantinople, as agent in the negotiations between the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius II and the Persian emperor Yezdegerd II, who was persecuting the Christians, and in these negotiations he gained the esteem and confidence of the Persian emperor. He was enabled by his sagacity to defeat the intrigues of the Magians to effect his downfall, and his reputation only rose higher, so that he obtained permission for the Christians to rebuild their churches, and to hold their meetings for divine worship. The next year he went again to Constantinople to plead the cause of Chrysostom, who was exiled. He was subsequently sent again by Theodosius II to Yezdegerd. He is said on this occasion to have taken part in a synod assembled by patriarch Isaac of Seleucia Ctesiphon, but Hefele (*Conciliengesch.* ii, 90) has proved that the documents we possess concerning this council are spurious, and the very existence of such a council is now considered doubtful. Maruthas, however, took part in the Council of Antioch against the Messalians (q. v.), in 383 or 390. He wrote a number of works in Syriac, described by Assemani (*ut infr.*). Among them the following deserve special notice: A liturgic work, found in Syriac in the missal of the Maronites (1594, p. 172), and in Latin in Renaudot (*Liturgiarum Orient. collectio*, ii, 261); an exposition of the Gospels, from which it appears that he inclined towards the doctrine of transubstantiation; a history of the Persian martyrs under king Shapur (Sapores)—this history forms the first part of Assemani's *Acta Martyrum Orientalium, qui in Perside passi sunt, et Occidentalium*, translated under the title *Etliche Acten heiliger Märtyrer d. Morgenlandes* (Innsbruck, 1836). See Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient. Clementino-Vaticana*, i, 174–179; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 131; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, ii, 110, 700. (J. N. P.)

Ma'ry (Μαρία or Μαριάμ, from the Heb. מִרְיָם, *Miriam*), the name of several females mentioned in the New Test.

1. The wife of Joseph, and a lineal descendant of David (Matt. i); "the Mother of Jesus" (Acts i, 14), and "Mary, his Mother" (Matt. ii, 11); in later times generally called the "VIRGIN MARY," but never so designated in Scripture. Little is known of this highly-favored individual, in whom was fulfilled the first prophecy made to man, that the "seed of the *woman* should bruise the serpent's head" (Gen. iii, 15). As her history was of no consequence to Christianity, it is not given at large. Her genealogy is recorded by Luke (ch. iii), in order to prove the truth of the predictions which had foretold the descent of the Messiah from Adam through Abraham and David, with the design evidently of showing that Christ was of that royal house and lineage (comp. Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 589 sq.). Eusebius, the early ecclesiastical historian, although unusually lengthy upon "the name Jesus," and the genealogies in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels, throws no new light upon Mary's birth and parentage. The very simplicity of the evangelical record has no doubt been one cause of the abundance of the legendary matter of which she forms the central figure. Imagination had to be called in to supply a craving which authentic narrative did not satisfy. We shall give the account from both these sources somewhat in detail, with a full discussion of many interesting questions incidentally involved in their consideration. See MARIOLATRY.

I. *Scriptural Statements.*—1. We are wholly ignorant of the circumstances and occupation of Mary's parents. If, as is most probable, the genealogy given by Luke is that of Mary (Greswell, etc.), her father's name was Heli, which is another form of the name given to her legendary father, Jehoiakim or Joachim. But if Jacob and Heli were the two sons of Matthan or Matthat, and if Joseph, being the son of the younger brother, married his cousin, the daughter of the elder brother (Hervey, *Genealogies of our Lord Jesus Christ*), her father was Jacob. See GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD. She was, like Joseph, of the tribe of Judah, and of the lineage of David (Psa. cxxxii, 11; Luke i, 32; Rom. i, 3). What was her relationship to the so-called "sister" named Mary (John xix, 25) is uncertain (see No. 3 below), but she was connected by marriage (συγγενής, Luke i, 36) with Elisabeth, who was of the tribe of Levi and of the lineage of Aaron.

2. In the autumn of the year which is known as B.C. 7, Mary was living at Nazareth, probably at her parents' house, not having yet been taken by Joseph to his home. She was at this time betrothed to Joseph, and was therefore regarded by the Jewish law and custom as his wife, though he had not yet a husband's rights over her. See MARRIAGE. At this time the angel Gabriel came to her with a message from God, and announced to her that she was to be the mother of the long-expected

Messiah. He probably bore the form of an ordinary man, like the angels who manifested themselves to Gideon and to Manoah (Judg. vi, xiii). This would appear both from the expression εἰσελθών, "he came in," and also from the fact of her being troubled, not at his presence, but at the meaning of his words. Yet one cannot but believe that there was a glory in his features which at once convinced Mary of the true nature of her visitor, entering as he did unannounced, apparently into her secret chamber—most probably at the time of her devotions. The scene as well as the salutation is very similar to that recounted in the book of Daniel, "Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me, and said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong!" (Dan. x, 18, 19). The exact meaning of κεχαριτωμένη is "thou that hast had bestowed upon thee a free gift of grace." The A.V. rendering of "highly favored" is therefore very exact, and much nearer to the original than the "*gratia plena*" of the Vulgate, on which a huge and wholly unsubstantial edifice has been built by Romanist devotional writers. The next part of the salutation, "The Lord is with thee," would probably have been better translated, "The Lord be with thee." It is the same salutation as that with which the angel accosted Gideon (Judg. vi, 12). "Blessed art thou among women," is nearly the same expression as that used by Ozias to Judith (Jud. xiii, 18). Gabriel proceeds to instruct Mary that by the operation of the Holy Ghost the everlasting Son of the Father should be born of her; that in him the prophecies relative to David's throne and kingdom should be accomplished; and that his name was to be called Jesus. He further informs her, perhaps as a sign by which she might convince herself that his prediction with regard to herself would come true, that her relative Elisabeth was within three months of being delivered of a child.

The angel left Mary, and she set off to visit Elisabeth either at Hebron or Juttah (whichever way we understand the εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα, Luke i, 39), where the latter lived with her husband Zacharias, about twenty miles to the south of Jerusalem, and therefore at a very considerable distance from Nazareth. Immediately on her entrance into the house she was saluted by Elisabeth as the mother of her Lord, and had evidence of the truth of the angel's saying with regard to her cousin. She embodied her feelings of exultation and thankfulness in the hymn known under the name of the *Magnificat*. Whether this was uttered by immediate inspiration, in reply to Elisabeth's salutation, or composed during her journey from Nazareth, or was written at a later period of her three months' visit at Hebron, does not appear with certainty. The hymn is founded on Hannah's song of thankfulness (1 Sam. ii, 1–10), and exhibits an intimate knowledge of the Psalms, prophetical writings, and books of Moses, from which sources almost every expression in it is drawn. The most remarkable clause, "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," is borrowed from Leah's exclamation on the birth of Asher (Gen. xxx, 13). The same sentiment and expression are also found in Prov. xxxi, 28; Mal. iii, 12; James v, 11. In the latter place the word μακαρίζω is rendered with great exactness "count happy." The notion that there is conveyed in the word any anticipation of her bearing the title of "Blessed" arises solely from ignorance.

Various opinions have been held as to the purpose of divine Wisdom in causing the Saviour to be born of a *betrothed* rather than a *disengaged* virgin. It seems eminently seemly and decorous that the mother of the Messiah should have some one to vouch for her virginity, and to act as her protector and the foster-father of her child, and that he should be one who, as heir of the throne of David, would give to his adopted Son the legal rights to the same dignity, while of all persons he was the most interested in resisting the claims of a pretender. Origen, following Ignatius, thinks it was in order to baffle the cunning of the devil, and keep him in ignorance of the fact of the Lord's advent.

Mary returned to Nazareth shortly before the birth of John the Baptist, and continued living at her own home. In the course of a few months Joseph became aware that she was with child, and determined on giving her a bill of divorcement, instead of yielding her up to the law to suffer the penalty which he supposed that she had incurred. Being, however, warned and satisfied by an angel who appeared to him in a dream, he took her to his own house. It was soon after this, as it would seem, that Augustus's decree was promulgated, and Joseph and Mary travelled to Bethlehem to have their names enrolled in the registers (B.C. 6) by way of preparation for the taxing, which, however, was not completed till several years afterwards (A.D. 6), in the governorship of Quirinus. They reached Bethlehem, and there Mary brought forth the Saviour of the world, and humbly laid him in a manger.

Bethlehem stands on the narrow ridge of a long gray hill running east and west, and its position suggests the difficulty that a crowd of travellers would have in finding shelter within it. As early as the second century, a neighboring cave was fixed upon as the stable where Joseph abode, and where accordingly Christ was born and laid in the manger. The hill-sides are covered with vineyards, and a range of convents occupies the height, and incloses within it the cave of the nativity; but there are grassy slopes adjoining, where the shepherds may have kept watch over their flocks, seen the vision of the angelic hosts, and heard the divine song of "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will towards men." Full of wonder and hope, they sought the lowly sojourn of the Virgin, and there saw with their own eyes what the Lord had made known to them. But while they published abroad and spread the wondrous tale, Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.

3. The circumcision, the adoration of the wise men, and the presentation in the Temple, are rather scenes in the life of Christ than in that of his mother. The presentation in the Temple might not take place till forty days after the birth of the child. During this period the mother, according to the law of Moses, was unclean (Lev. xii). In the present case there could be no necessity for offering the sacrifice and making atonement beyond that of obedience to the Mosaic precept; but already he, and his mother for him, were acting upon the principle of fulfilling all righteousness. The poverty of Mary and Joseph, it may be noted, is shown by their making the offering of the poor. But though tokens of poverty attended her on this occasion, she was met by notes of welcome and hymns of grateful joy by the worthiest and most venerable of Jerusalem. Simeon, we know, was a just and devout man—one who waited for the consolation of Israel, and had revelations from the Holy Ghost; but tradition also says that he was the great rabbi Simeon, the son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel, in whose days, according to the rabbins, the birth of Jesus of Nazareth took place (Rosenmüller, quoted by Wordsworth). Anna, too, who had spent her long life in daily attendance at the worship of the Temple, was evidently the centre of a devout circle, whose minds had been led by the study of Scripture to an expectation of redemption. Mary wondered when Simeon took her child into his arms, and received him as the promised salvation of the Lord, the light of the Gentiles, and the glory of Israel; but it was the wonder of joy at the unexpected confirmation of the promise already given to her by the angel. The song of Simeon and the thanksgiving of Anna, like the wonder of the shepherds and the adoration of the magi, only incidentally refer to Mary. One passage alone in Simeon's address is specially directed to her: "Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also." The exact purport of these words is doubtful. A common patristic explanation refers them to the pang of unbelief which shot through her

bosom on seeing her Son expire on the cross (Tertullian, Origen, Basil, Cyril, etc.). By modern interpreters it is more commonly referred to the pangs of grief which she experienced on witnessing the sufferings of her Son.

In the flight into Egypt, Mary and the babe had the support and protection of Joseph, as well as in their return from thence in the following year, on the death of Herod the Great (B.C. 4). It appears to have been the intention of Joseph to settle at Bethlehem at this time, as his home at Nazareth had been broken up for more than a year; but on finding how Herod's dominions had been disposed of, he changed his mind and returned to his old place of abode, thinking that the child's life would be safer in the tetrarchy of Antipas than in that of Archelaus. It is possible that Joseph might have been himself a native of Bethlehem, and that before this time he had only been a visitor at Nazareth, drawn thither by his betrothal and marriage. In that case, his fear of Archelaus would make him exchange his own native town for that of Mary.

4. Henceforward, until the beginning of our Lord's ministry—i. e. from B.C. 4 to A.D. 25—we may picture Mary to ourselves as living in Nazareth, in a humble sphere of life, the wife of Joseph the carpenter, pondering over the sayings of the angels, of the shepherds, of Simeon, and of those of her Son, as the latter "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man" (Luke ii, 52). Two circumstances alone, so far as we know, broke in on the otherwise even flow of the still waters of her life. One of these was the temporary loss of her Son when he remained behind in Jerusalem (A.D. 8); the other was the death of Joseph. The exact date of this last event we cannot determine, but it was probably not long after the other. See JOSEPH.

5. From the time at which our Lord's ministry commenced, Mary is withdrawn almost wholly from sight. Four times only, as detailed below, is the veil removed which, surely not without reason, is thrown over her. If to these we add two references to her, the first by her Nazarene fellow-citizens (Matt. xiii, 54, 55; Mark vi, 1–3), the second by a woman in the multitude (Luke xi, 27), we have specified every event known to us in her life. It is noticeable that, on every occasion of our Lord's addressing her, or speaking of her, there is a sound of reproof in his words, with the exception of the last words spoken to her from the cross.

(1.) The marriage at Cana in Galilee (John ii) took place in the few months which intervened between the baptism of Christ and the Passover of the year 26. When Jesus was found by his mother and Joseph in the Temple in the year 8, we find him repudiating the name of "father" as applied to Joseph. "*Thy father* and I have sought thee sorrowing." "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be at [not Joseph's and yours, but] *my Father's* house?" (Luke ii, 48, 49). Now, in like manner, at his first miracle, which inaugurates his ministry, he solemnly withdraws himself from the authority of his earthly mother. This is Augustine's explanation of the "What have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come." It was his humanity, not his divinity, which came from Mary. While, therefore, he was acting in his divine character, he could not acknowledge her, nor does he acknowledge her again until he was hanging on the cross, when, in that nature which he took from her, he was about to submit to death (St. Aug. *Comm. in Joan. Evang.* tract viii, vol. iii, p. 1455 [Paris, 1845, edit. Migne]). That the words Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; = מה לי ולך imply reproof, is certain (comp. Matt. viii, 29: Mark i, 24; and Sept., Judg. xi, 12; 1 Kings xvii, 18; 2 Kings iii, 13), and such is the patristic explanation of them (see Iren. *Adv. Hær.* iii, 18; *Apud Bibl. Patr. Max.* tom. ii, part ii, p. 293; St. Chrysost. *Hom. in Joan.* xxi). But the reproof is of a gentle kind (Trench, *On the Miracles*, p. 102 [London, 1856]; Alford, *Comm.* ad loc.; Wordsworth, *Comm.* ad loc.). Mary seems to have understood it, and accordingly to have drawn back, desiring the servants to pay attention to her divine Son (Olshausen, *Comm.* ad loc.). The modern Romanist translation, "What is that to me and to thee?" is not a mistake, because it is a wilful misrepresentation (Douay version; Orsini, *Life of Mary*, etc.; see *The Catholic Layman*, p. 117 [Dublin, 1852]). Lightfoot supposes the marriage to have taken place in the house of Alphæus, Mary's brother-in-law, as his son Simon is called the Canaanite, or man of Cana. But this term rather describes him as a former *Zealot*. See ZELOTES. It is clear that Mary felt herself to be invested with some authority in the house. Jesus was naturally there as her Son, and the disciples as those whom he had called and adopted as his especial friends. As yet, the Lord had done no miracle; and it has been questioned whether Mary, in drawing his attention to the failure of the wine, meant to invoke his miraculous powers, or merely to submit the fact to his judgment, that he might do what was best under the circumstances—either withdrawing from the feast with his disciples, or engaging the attention of the guests by his discourse. The better opinion, however, seems to be that she knew he was about now to enter on his public ministry, and that miracles would be wrought by him in proof of his divine mission; and the early fathers do not scruple to say that a desire to gain *éclat* by the powers of her Son was one motive for her wish that he should supply the deficiency of the wine, and that by his reply he meant to condemn this feeling.

(2.) Capernaum (John ii, 12) and Nazareth (Matt. iv, 13; xiii, 54; Mark vi, 1) appear to have been the residence of Mary for a considerable period. The next time that she is brought before us we find her at Capernaum (Matt. xii, 46; Mark iii, 21, 31; Luke viii, 19). It is the autumn of the year 27—a year and a half after the miracle wrought at the marriage-feast in Cana. The Lord had in the mean time attended two feasts of the Passover, and had twice made a circuit throughout Galilee, teaching and working miracles. His fame had spread, and crowds came pressing round him, so that he had not even time "to eat bread." Mary was still living with her other sons, and with James, Joses Simon, Jude, and their sisters (Matt. xiii, 55); and she and they heard of the toils which he was undergoing, and they understood that he was denying himself every relaxation from his labors. Their human affection conquered their faith. They thought that he was killing himself, and, with an indignation arising from love, they exclaimed that he was beside himself, and set off to bring him home either by entreaty or compulsion. He was surrounded by eager crowds, and they could not reach him. They therefore sent a message, begging him to allow them to speak to him. This message was handed on from one person in the crowd to another, till at length it was reported aloud to him. Again he reproves; again he refuses to admit any authority on the part of his relatives, or any privilege on account of their relationship. "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. xii, 48, 49). Compare Theoph. *in Marc.* iii, 32; St. Chrys. *Hom.* xliv in Matt.; St. Aug. *in Joan.* tract x, who all of them point out that the blessedness of Mary consists, not so much in having borne Christ, as in believing on him and in obeying his words (see also *Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthodox.* cxxxvi; *ap. St. Just. Mart.* in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 138). This, indeed, is the lesson taught directly by our Lord himself in the next passage in which reference is made to Mary. In the midst or at the completion of one of his addresses on the same occasion, a woman of the multitude, whose soul had been stirred by his words, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked!" Immediately the Lord replied, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word

of God, and keep it" (Luke xi, 27). He does not either affirm or deny anything with regard to the direct bearing of the woman's exclamation, but passes that by as a thing indifferent, in order to point out in what alone the true blessedness of his mother and of all consists. This is the full force of the μενοῦνγε with which he commences his reply.

(3.) The next scene in Mary's life brings us to the foot of the cross. She was standing there with her sister Mary and Mary Magdalene, and Salome, and other women, having no doubt followed her Son as she was able throughout the terrible morning of Good Friday. It was about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and he was about to give up his spirit. His divine mission was now, as it were, accomplished. While his ministry was in progress he had withdrawn himself from her that he might do his Father's work. But now the hour had come when his human relationship might again be recognised, "Tunc enim agnovit," says Augustine, "quando illud quod peperit moriebatur" (St. Aug. *In Joan.* ix). Standing near the company of the women was the apostle John, and, with almost his last words, Christ commended his mother to the care of him who had borne the name of "the Disciple whom Jesus loved:" "Woman, behold thy Son." "Commendat homo homini hominem," says Augustine. From that hour John assures us that he took her to his own abode. If by "that hour" the evangelist means immediately after the words were spoken, Mary was not present at the last scene of all. The sword had sufficiently pierced her soul, and she was spared the hearing of the last loud cry, and the sight of the bowed head. Ambrose considers the chief purpose of our Lord's words to have been a desire to make manifest the truth that the redemption was his work alone, while he gave human affection to his mother. "Non egebat adjutore ad omnium redemptionem. Suscepit quidem matris affectum, sed non quæsivit hominis auxilium" (St. Amb. *Expos. Evang. Luc.* x, 132). But it is more probable that she continued at the spot till all was over. See CRUCIFIXION.

(4.) A veil is drawn over her sorrow, and over her joy which succeeded that sorrow. Mediæval imagination has supposed, but Scripture does not state, that her Son appeared to Mary after his resurrection from the dead. (See, for example, Ludolph of Saxony, *Vita Christi* [Lyons, 1642], p. 666; and Rupert, *De Divinis Officiis* [Venice, 1751], vii, 25, tom. iv, p. 92). Ambrose is considered to be the first writer who suggested the idea, and reference is made to his treatise *De Virginitate*, i, 3; but it is quite certain that the text has been corrupted, and that it is of Mary Magdalene that he is there speaking. (Comp. his *Exposition of St. Luke*, x, 156. See note of the Benedictine edition [Paris, 1790], ii, 217.) Another reference is usually given to Anselm. The treatise quoted is not Anselm's, but Eadmer's. (See Eadmer, *De Excellentia Mariæ*, chap. v, appended to Anselm's *Works* [Paris, 1721], p. 138.) Ten appearances are related by the evangelists as having occurred in the forty days intervening between Easter and Ascension Day, but none to Mary. She was doubtless living at Jerusalem with John, cherished with the tenderness which her tender soul would have specially needed, and which undoubtedly she found pre-eminently in John. We have no record of her presence at the Ascension. Arator, a writer of the 6th century, describes her as being at the time not on the spot, but in Jerusalem (Arat. *De Act. Apost.* l. 50, apud Migne, lxviii, 95 [Paris, 1848], quoted by Wordsworth, *Gk. Test. Com. on the Acts*, i, 14). We have no account of her being present at the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. What we do read of her is, that she remained steadfast in prayer in the upper room at Jerusalem with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and those known as the Lord's brothers and the apostles (Acts i, 14). This is the last view that we have of her. Holy Scripture leaves her engaged in prayer (see Wordsworth, as cited above).

6. From this point forwards we know nothing of her. It is probable that the rest of her life was spent in Jerusalem with John (see Epiph. *Hær.* 78). According to one tradition, the beloved disciple would not leave Palestine until she had expired in his arms (see Tholuck, *Light from the Cross*, vol. ii, *Serm.* x, p. 234 [Edinb. 1857]); and it is added that she lived and died in the Cœnaculum, in what is now the Mosque of the Tomb of David, the traditional chamber of the Last Supper (Stanley, *S. and P.* ch. xiv, p. 456). Other traditions make her journey with John to Ephesus, and there die in extreme old age. It was believed by some in the 5th century that she was buried at Ephesus (see *Conc. Ephes.*, *Conc. Labb.* iii, 574 *a*); by others, in the same century, that she was buried at Gethsemane, and this appears to have been the information given to Marcian and Pulcheria by Juvenal of Jerusalem. As soon as we lose the guidance of Scripture, we have nothing from which we can derive any sure knowledge about her. The darkness in which we are left is in itself most instructive.

7. The *character* of the Virgin Mary is not drawn by any of the evangelists, but some of its lineaments are incidentally manifested in the fragmentary record which is given of her. They are to be found for the most part in Luke's Gospel, whence an attempt has been made, by a curious mixture of the imaginative and rationalistic methods of interpretation, to explain the old legend which tells us that Luke painted the Virgin's portrait (Calmet, Kitto, Migne, Mrs. Jameson). We might have expected greater details from John than from the other evangelists, but in his Gospel we learn nothing of her except what may be gathered from the scene at Cana and at the cross. It is clear from Luke's account, though without any such intimation we might rest assured of the fact, that her youth had been spent in the study of the holy Scriptures, and that she had set before her the example of the holy women of the Old Testament as her model. This would appear from the *Magnificat* (Luke i, 46). The same hymn, so far as it emanated from herself, would show no little power of mind as well as warmth of spirit. Her faith and humility exhibit themselves in her immediate surrender of herself to the divine will, though ignorant how that will should be accomplished (Luke i, 38); her energy and earnestness, in her journey from Nazareth to Hebron (Luke i, 39); her happy thankfulness, in her song of joy (Luke i, 48); her silent, musing thoughtfulness, in her pondering over the shepherds' visit (Luke ii, 19), and in her keeping her Son's words in her heart (Luke ii, 51), though she could not fully understand their import. Again, her humility is seen in her drawing back, yet without anger, after receiving reproof at Cana, in Galilee (John ii, 5), and in the remarkable manner in which she shuns putting herself forward throughout the whole of her Son's ministry, or after his removal from earth. Once only does she attempt to interfere with her divine Son's freedom of action (Matt. xii, 46; Mark iii, 31; Luke viii, 19); and even here we can hardly blame, for she seems to have been roused, not by arrogance and by a desire to show her authority and relationship, as Chrysostom supposes (*Hom.* xliv *in Matt.*), but by a woman's and a mother's feelings of affection and fear for him whom she loved. It was part of that exquisite tenderness which appears throughout to have belonged to her. In a word, so far as Mary is portrayed to us in Scripture, she is, as we should have expected, the most tender, the most faithful, humble, patient, and loving of women, but a woman still. See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* i, 58.

II. *Christian Legends.*—These, as might naturally be expected, played an important part in the traditional history of Mary. They began to appear probably in the early part of the 3d century, and were usually published under false names. Of these the apocryphal writings called the *Protevangelium* and the *Gospel of the Birth of Mary* are among the earlier specimens. We give at considerable length their contents on this head.

1. *The early Life of Mary.*—According to these apocryphal accounts, Joachim and Anna were both of the

house of David. The abode of the former was Nazareth, the latter passed her early years at Bethlehem. They lived piously in the sight of God, and faultlessly before man, dividing their substance into three portions, one of which they devoted to the service of the Temple, another to the poor, and the third to their own wants. So twenty years of their lives passed silently away. But at the end of this period Joachim went to Jerusalem with some others of his tribe, to make his usual offering at the Feast of the Dedication. It chanced that Issachar was high-priest (Gospel of Birth of Mary); that Reuben was high-priest (Protevangelion). The high-priest scorned Joachim, and drove him roughly away, asking how he dared to present himself in company with those who had children, while he had none; and he refused to accept his offerings until he should have begotten a child, for the Scripture said, "Cursed is every one who does not beget a man-child in Israel." Joachim was ashamed before his friends and neighbors, and he retired into the wilderness and fixed his tent there, and fasted forty days and forty nights. At the end of this period an angel appeared to him, and told him that his wife should conceive, and should bring forth a daughter, and he should call her name Mary. Anna meantime was much distressed at her husband's absence, and being reproached by her maid Judith with her barrenness, she was overcome with grief of spirit. In her sadness she went into her garden to walk, dressed in her wedding-dress. She there sat down under a laurel-tree, and looked up and spied among the branches a sparrow's nest, and she bemoaned herself as more miserable than the very birds, for they were fruitful and she was barren; and she prayed that she might have a child, even as Sarai was blessed with Isaac. At this moment two angels appeared to her, and promised her that she should have a child who should be spoken of in all the world. Joachim returned joyfully to his home, and when the time was accomplished Anna brought forth a daughter, and they called her name Mary. Now the child Mary increased in strength day by day, and at nine months of age she walked nine steps. When she was three years old her parents brought her to the Temple, to dedicate her to the Lord. There were fifteen stairs up to the Temple, and, while Joseph and Mary were changing their dress, she walked up them without help; and the high-priest placed her upon the third step of the altar, and she danced with her feet, and all the house of Israel loved her. Then Mary remained at the Temple until she was twelve (Prot.), fourteen (G. B. M.), years old, ministered to by the angels, and advancing in perfection as in years. At this time the high-priest commanded all the virgins that were in the Temple to return to their homes and to be married. But Mary refused, for she said that she had vowed virginity to the Lord. Thus the high-priest was brought into a perplexity, and he had recourse to God to inquire what he should do. Then a voice from the ark answered him (G. B. M.), an angel spake unto him (Prot.); and they gathered together all the widowers in Israel (Prot.), all the marriageable men of the house of David (G. B. M.), and desired them to bring each man his rod. Among them came Joseph and brought his rod, but he shunned to present it, because he was an old man and had children. Therefore the other rods were presented and no sign occurred. Then it was found that Joseph had not presented his rod; and behold, as soon as he had presented it, a dove came forth from the rod and flew upon the head of Joseph (Prot.); a dove came from heaven and pitched on the rod (G. B. M.). So Joseph, in spite of his reluctance, was compelled to betroth himself to Mary, and he returned to Bethlehem to make preparations for his marriage (G. B. M.); he betook himself to his occupation of building houses (Prot.); while Mary went back to her parents' house in Galilee. Then it chanced that the priests needed a new veil for the Temple, and seven virgins cast lots to make different parts of it; and the lot to spin the true purple fell to Mary. As she went out with a pitcher to draw water, she heard a voice saying to her, "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women!" and she looked round with trembling to see whence the voice came; and she laid down the pitcher and went into the house, and took the purple and sat down to work at it. But behold the angel Gabriel stood by her and filled the chamber with prodigious light, and said, "Fear not," etc. When Mary had finished the purple, she took it to the high-priest; and, having received his blessing, went to visit her cousin Elisabeth, and returned back again. Then Joseph returned to his home from building houses (Prot.); came into Galilee, to marry the Virgin to whom he was betrothed (G. B. M.), and finding her with child, he resolved to put her away privately; but being warned in a dream, he relinquished his purpose and took her to his house. Then came Annas the scribe to visit Joseph, and he went back and told the priest that Joseph had committed a great crime, for he had privately married the Virgin whom he had received out of the Temple, and had not made it known to the children of Israel. So the priest sent his servants, and they found that she was with child; and he called them to him, and Joseph denied that the child was his, and the priest made Joseph drink the bitter water of trial (Numb. v, 18), and sent him to a mountainous place to see what would follow. But Joseph returned in perfect health, so the priest sent them away to their home. Then after three months Joseph put Mary on an ass to go to Bethlehem to be taxed; and as they were going, Mary besought him to take her down, and Joseph took her down and carried her into a cave, and, leaving her there with his sons, he went to seek a midwife. As he went he looked up, and he saw the clouds astonished and all creatures amazed. The fowls stopped in their flight; the working people sat at their food, but did not eat; the sheep stood still; the shepherds' lifted hands became fixed; the kids were touching the water with their mouths, but did not drink. A midwife came down from the mountains, and Joseph took her with him to the cave, and a bright cloud overshadowed the cave, and the cloud became a great light, and when the bright light faded there appeared an infant at the breast of Mary. Then the midwife went out and told Salome that a Virgin had brought forth, and Salome would not believe; and they came back again into the cave, and Salome received satisfaction, but her hand withered away, nor was it restored until, by the command of an angel, she touched the child, whereupon she was straightway cured. See Giles, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, p. 33–47 and 66–81 (Lond. 1852); Jones, *On the New Testament*, vol. ii, ch. xiii and xv (Oxf. 1827); Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus;* also *Vitæ glorississimæ Matris Annæ per F. Petrum Dorlando*, appended to Ludolph of Saxony's *Vita Christi* (Lyons, 1642); and a most audacious *Historia Christi*, written in Persian by the Jesuit P. Jerome Xavier, and exposed by Louis de Dieu (Lugd. Bat. 1639).

Three spots lay claim to be the scene of the Annunciation. Two of these are, as was to be expected, in Nazareth, and one, as every one knows, is in Italy. The Greeks and Latins each claim to be the guardians of the true spot in Palestine; the third claimant is the holy house of Loretto. The Greeks point out the spring of water mentioned in the Protevangelion as confirmatory of their claim. The Latins have engraved on a marble slab in the grotto of their convent in Nazareth the words *Verbum hic caro factum est*, and point out the pillar which marks the spot where the angel stood; while the head of their Church is irretrievably committed to the wild legend of Loretto. See Stanley, *S. and P.* ch. xiv.

In the Gospel of the Infancy, which seems to date from the 2d century, innumerable miracles are made to attend on Mary and her Son during their sojourn in Egypt, e. g. Mary looked with pity on a woman who was possessed, and immediately Satan came out of her

in the form of a young man, saying, "Woe is me because of thee, Mary, and thy Son!" On another occasion they fell in with two thieves, named Titus and Dumachus; and Titus was gentle and Dumachus was harsh: the Lady Mary therefore promised Titus that God should receive him on his right hand. Accordingly, thirty-three years afterwards, Titus was the penitent thief who was crucified on the right hand, and Dumachus was crucified on the left. These are sufficient as samples. Throughout the book we find Mary associated with her Son, in the strange freaks of power attributed to them, in a way which shows us whence the *cultus* of Mary took its origin. See Jones, *On the New Test.* vol. ii (Oxf. 1827); Giles, *Codex Apocryphus;* Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus.*

2. *Mary's later Life.*—The foregoing legends of Mary's childhood may be traced back as far as the third or even the second century. Those of her death are probably of a later date. The chief legend was for a length of time considered to be a veritable history, written by Melito, bishop of Sardis, in the 2d century. It is to be found in the *Bibliotheca Maxima* (tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 212), entitled *Sancti Melitonis Episcopi Sardensis de Transitu Virginis Mariæ Liber;* and there certainly existed a book with this title at the end of the 5th century, which was condemned by Pope Gelasius as apocryphal (*Op. Gelas.* apud Migne, lix, 152). Another form of the same legend has been published at Elberfeld, in 1854, by Maximilian Enger in Arabic. He supposes that it is an Arabic translation from a Syriac original. It was found in the library at Bonn, and is entitled *Joannis Apostoli de Transitu Beatæ Mariæ Virginis Liber.* It is perhaps the same as that referred to in Assemani (*Biblioth. Orient.* [Rome, 1725], iii, 287), under the name of *Historia Dormitionis et Assumptionis B. Mariæ Virginis Joanni Evangelistæ falso inscripta.* We give the substance of the legend with its main variations.

When the apostles separated in order to evangelize the world, Mary continued to live with John's parents in their house near the Mount of Olives, and every day she went out to pray at the tomb of Christ, and at Golgotha. But the Jews had placed a watch to prevent prayers being offered at these spots, and the watch went into the city and told the chief priests that Mary came daily to pray. Then the priests commanded the watch to stone her. At this time, however, king Abgarus wrote to Tiberius to desire him to take vengeance on the Jews for slaying Christ. They feared, therefore, to add to his wrath by slaying Mary also, and yet they could not allow her to continue her prayers at Golgotha, because an excitement and tumult was thereby made. Accordingly, they went and spoke softly to her, and she consented to go and dwell in Bethlehem; and thither she took with her three holy virgins who should attend upon her. In the twenty-second year after the ascension of the Lord, Mary felt her heart burn with an inexpressible longing to be with her Son; and behold an angel appeared to her, and announced to her that her soul should be taken up from her body on the third day, and he placed a palm-branch from paradise in her hands, and desired that it should be carried before her bier. Mary besought that the apostles might be gathered round her before she died, and the angel replied that they should come. Then the Holy Spirit caught up John as he was preaching at Ephesus, and Peter as he was offering sacrifice at Rome, and Paul as he was disputing with the Jews near Rome, and Thomas in the extremity of India, and Matthew and James: these were all of the apostles who were still living; then the Holy Spirit awakened the dead, Philip and Andrew, and Luke and Simon, and Mark and Bartholomew; and all of them were snatched away in a bright cloud and found themselves at Bethlehem. Angels and powers without number descended from heaven and stood round about the house; Gabriel stood at blessed Mary's head, and Michael at her feet, and they fanned her with their wings; and Peter and John wiped away her tears; and there was a great cry, and they all said "Hail, blessed one! blessed is the fruit of thy womb!" The people of Bethlehem brought their sick to the house, and they were all healed. Then news of these things was carried to Jerusalem, and the king sent and commanded that they should bring Mary and the disciples to Jerusalem. Accordingly, horsemen came to Bethlehem to seize Mary, but they did not find her, for the Holy Spirit had taken her and the disciples in a cloud over the heads of the horsemen to Jerusalem. Then the men of Jerusalem saw angels ascending and descending at the spot where Mary's house was. But the high-priests went to the governor, and craved permission to burn her and the house with fire, and the governor gave them permission, and they brought wood and fire; but as soon as they came near to the house, behold there burst forth a fire upon them which consumed them utterly. Now the governor saw these things afar off, and in the evening he brought his son, who was sick, to Mary, and she healed him.

Then, on the sixth day of the week, the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles to take up Mary, and to carry her from Jerusalem to Gethsemane, and as they went the Jews saw them. Then drew near Juphia, one of the high-priests, and attempted to overthrow the litter on which she was carried, for the other priests had conspired with him, and they hoped to cast her down into the valley, and to throw wood upon her, and to burn her body with fire. But as soon as Juphia had touched the litter the angel smote off his arms with a fiery sword, and the arms remained fastened to the litter. Then he cried to the disciples and Peter for help, and they said, "Ask it of the Lady Mary;" and he cried, "O Lady, O Mother of Salvation, have mercy on me!" Then she said to Peter, "Give him back his arms;" and they were restored whole. But the disciples proceeded onwards, and they laid down the litter in a cave, as they were commanded, and gave themselves to prayer.

Now the angel Gabriel announced that on the first day of the week Mary's soul should be removed from this world. So on the morning of that day there came Eve, and Anne, and Elisabeth, and they kissed Mary, and told her who they were: there came Adam, Seth, Shem, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the rest of the old fathers: there came Enoch, and Elias, and Moses: there came twelve chariots of angels innumerable: and then appeared the Lord Christ in his humanity, and Mary bowed before him and said, "O my Lord and my God, place thy hand upon me;" and he stretched out his hand and blessed her; and she took his hand and kissed it, and placed it to her forehead, and said, "I bow before this right hand, which has made heaven and earth, and all that in them is, and I thank thee and praise thee that thou hast thought me worthy of this hour." Then she said, "O Lord, take me to thyself!" But he said to her, "Now shall thy body be in paradise to the day of the resurrection, and angels shall serve thee; but thy pure spirit shall shine in the kingdom, in the dwelling-place of my Father's fulness." Then the disciples drew near, and besought her to pray for the world which she was about to leave. So Mary prayed. After her prayer was finished her face shone with marvellous brightness, and she stretched out her hands and blessed them all; and her Son put forth his hands and received her pure soul, and bore it into his Father's treasure-house. Then there was a light and a sweet smell, sweeter than anything on earth; and a voice from heaven saying, "Hail, blessed one! blessed and celebrated art thou among women!" (The legend ascribed to Melito makes her soul to be carried to paradise by Gabriel while her Son returns to heaven.)

Now the apostles carried her body to the valley of Jehoshaphat, to a place which the Lord had told them of, and John went before and carried the palm-branch. There they placed her in a new tomb, and sat at the mouth of the sepulchre, as the Lord commanded them; and suddenly there appeared the Lord Christ surrounded by a multitude of angels, and said to the apostles, "What

will ye that I should do with her whom my Father's command selected out of all the tribes of Israel that I should dwell in her?" So Peter and the apostles besought him that he would raise the body of Mary and take it with him in glory to heaven. Then the Saviour said, "Be it according to your word." So he commanded Michael the archangel to bring down the soul of Mary. Then Gabriel rolled away the stone, and the Lord said, "Rise up, my beloved, thy body shall not suffer corruption in the tomb." Immediately Mary arose, and bowed herself at his feet and worshipped; and the Lord kissed her, and gave her to the angels to carry her to paradise.

But Thomas was not present with the rest, for at the moment that he was summoned to come he was baptizing Polodius, who was the son of the sister of the king. And he arrived just after all these things were accomplished, and he demanded to see the sepulchre in which they had laid his Lady: "For ye know," said he, "that I am Thomas, and unless I see I will not believe." Then Peter arose in haste and wrath, and the other disciples with him, and they opened the sepulchre and went in; but they found nothing therein save that in which her body had been wrapped. Then Thomas confessed that he too, as he was borne in the cloud from India, had seen her holy body carried by the angels with great triumph into heaven; and that on his crying to her for her blessing, she had bestowed upon him her precious Girdle, which when the apostles saw they were glad. Then the apostles were carried back each to his own place. For the story of this *Sacratissimo Cintolo*, still preserved at Prato, see Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Madonna*, p. 344 (Lond. 1852).

On this part of the legend, see generally *Joannis Apostoli de Transitu Beatæ Mariæ Virginis Liber* (Elberfeldæ, 1854); *St. Melitonis Episc. Sard. de Transitu V. M. Liber*, apud *Bibl. Max. Patr.* tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 212 (Lugd. 1677); Jacobi a Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Græsse, ch. cxix, p. 504 (Dresd. 1846); John Damasc. *Serm. de Dormit. Deiparæ*, in *Opp.* ii, p. 857 sq. (Venice, 1743); Andrew of Crete, *In Dormit. Deiparæ Serm.* iii, p. 115 (Par. 1644); Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna* (London, 1852); Butler, *Lives of the Saints in Aug.* 15; Dressel, *Edita et inedita Epiphanii Monachi et Presbyteri*, p. 105 (Paris, 1843).

3. *Her Assumption.*—The above story gradually gained credit. At the end of the 5th century we find that there existed a book, *De Transitu Virginis Mariæ*, which was condemned by pope Gelasius as apocryphal. This book is without doubt the oldest form of the legend, of which the books ascribed to Melito and John are variations. Down to the end of the 5th century, then, the story of the Assumption was external to the Church, and distinctly looked upon by the Church as belonging to the heretics and not to her. But then came the change of sentiment on this subject consequent on the Nestorian controversy. The desire to protest against the early fables which had been spread abroad by the heretics had now passed away, and had been succeeded by the desire to magnify her who had brought forth him who was God. Accordingly a writer, whose date Baronius fixes at about this time (*Ann. Eccl.* i, 347, Lucca, 1738), suggested the possibility of the Assumption, but declared his inability to decide the question. The letter in which this possibility or probability is thrown out came to be attributed to Jerome, and may still be found among his works, entitled *Ad Paulam et Eustochium de Assumptione B. Virginis* (v, 82, Paris, 1706). About the same time, probably, or rather later, an assertion (now recognised on all hands to be a forgery) was made in Eusebius's Chronicle, to the effect that "in the year A.D. 48 Mary the Virgin was taken up into heaven, as some wrote that they had had it revealed to them." Another tract was written to prove that the Assumption was not a thing in itself unlikely; and this came to be attributed to St. Augustine, and may be found in the appendix to his works; and a sermon, with a similar purport, was ascribed to St. Athanasius. Thus the names of Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Athanasius, and others, came to be quoted as maintaining the truth of the Assumption. The first writers within the Church in whose extant writings we find the Assumption asserted, are Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, who has merely copied Melito's book, *De Transitu* (*De Glor. Mart.* lib. i, c. 4; Migne, 71, p. 708); Andrew of Crete, who probably lived in the 7th century; and John of Damascus, who lived at the beginning of the 8th century. The last of these authors refers to the Euthymiac history as stating that Marcian and Pulcheria, being in search of the body of Mary, sent to Juvenal of Jerusalem to inquire for it. Juvenal replied, "In the holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures, indeed, nothing is recorded of the departure of the holy Mary, Mother of God. But from an ancient and most true tradition we have received, that at the time of her glorious falling asleep all the holy apostles, who were going through the world for the salvation of the nations, borne aloft in a moment of time, came together to Jerusalem; and when they were near her they had a vision of angels, and divine melody was heard; and then with divine and more than heavenly melody she delivered her holy soul into the hands of God in an unspeakable manner. But that which had borne God, being carried with angelic and apostolic psalmody, with funeral rites, was deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane. In this place the chorus and singing of the angels continued three whole days. But after three days, on the angelic music ceasing, those of the apostles who were present opened the tomb, as one of them, Thomas, had been absent, and on his arrival wished to adore the body which had borne God. But her all-glorious body they could not find; but they found the linen clothes lying, and they were filled with an ineffable odor of sweetness which proceeded from them. Then they closed the coffin. And they were astonished at the mysterious wonder, and they came to no other conclusion than that he who had chosen to take flesh of the Virgin Mary, and to become a man, and to be born of her—God the Word, the Lord of Glory—and had preserved her virginity after birth, was also pleased, after her departure, to honor her immaculate and unpolluted body with incorruption, and to translate her before the common resurrection of all men" (St. Joan. Damas. *Op.* ii, 880, Venice, 1748). It is quite clear that this is the same legend as that which we have before given. Here, then, we see it brought over the borders and planted within the Church, if this "Euthymiac history" is to be accepted as veritable, by Juvenal of Jerusalem in the 5th century, or else by Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, or by Andrew of Crete in the 7th century, or, finally, by John of Damascus in the 8th century (see his three *Homilies on the Sleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, in his *Opp.* ii, 857–886). The same legend is given in a slightly different form as veritable history by Nicephorus Callistus in the 13th century (Niceph. i, 171, Paris, 1630); and the fact of the Assumption is stereotyped in the Breviary services for August 15 (*Brev. Rom. Pars æst.* p. 551, Milan, 1851). Here again, then, we see a legend originated by heretics, and remaining external to the Church till the close of the 5th century, creeping into the Church during the 6th and 7th centuries, and finally ratified by the authority both of Rome and Constantinople. See Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.* (i, 344, Lucca, 1738) and *Martyrologium* (p. 314, Paris, 1607).

4. On the dogma of Mary's sinlessness, see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. On her worship, see MARIOLATRY. On the alleged transportation of her dwelling to Italy, see LORETTO.

III. *Jewish Traditions.*—These are of a very different nature from the light-hearted fairy-tale-like stories which we have recounted above. We should expect that the miraculous birth of our Lord would be an occasion of scoffing to the unbelieving Jews, and we find this to be the case. We have already a hint during our Lord's ministry of the Jewish calumnies as to his birth. "*We* (ἡμεῖς) be not born of fornication" (John

viii, 41), seems to be an insinuation on the Jews' part that *he* was. To the Christian believer the Jewish slander becomes in the present case only a confirmation of his faith. The most definite and outspoken of these slanders is that which is contained in the book called תולדות ישוע, or *Toledoth Jesu*. It was grasped at with avidity by Voltaire, and declared by him to be the most ancient Jewish writing directed against Christianity, and apparently of the first century. It was written, he says, before the Gospels, and is altogether contrary to them (*Lettre sur les Juifs*). It is proved by Ammon (*Biblisch. Theologie*, p. 263, Erlang. 1801) to be a composition of the 13th century, and by Wagenseil (*Tela ignea Satanæ; Confut. Libr. Toldos Jeschu*, p. 12, Altorf, 1681) to be irreconcilable with the earlier Jewish tales. In the Gospel of Nicodemus, otherwise called the Acts of Pilate, we find the Jews represented as charging our Lord with illegitimate birth (c. 2). The date of this Gospel is about the end of the third century. The origin of the charge is referred with great probability by Thilo (*Codex Apocr.* p. 527, Lips. 1832) to the circular letters of the Jews mentioned by Grotius (*ad Matt.* xxvii, 63, *et ad Act. Apost.* xxviii, 22; *Op.* ii, 278 and 666, Basil. 1732), which were sent from Palestine to all the Jewish synagogues after the death of Christ, with the view of attacking "the lawless and atheistic sect which had taken its origin from the deceiver Jesus of Galilee" (Justin, *adv. Tryph.*). The first time that we find it openly proclaimed is in an extract made by Origen from the work of Celsus, which he is refuting. Celsus introduces a Jew declaring that the mother of Jesus was repudiated by her husband for adultery (*ὑπὸ τοῦ γήμαντος, τέκτονος τὴν τέχνην ὄντος, ἐξεῶσθαι, ἐλεγχθεῖσαν ὡς μεμοιχευμένην, Contra Celsum*, c. 28, Origenis *Opera*, xviii, 59, Berlin, 1845; again, *ἡ τοῦ Ιησοῦ μήτηρ κύουσα, ἐξωσθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ μνηστευσαμένου αὐτὴν τέκτονος, ἐλεγχθεῖσα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ καὶ τίκτουσα ἀπό τινος στρατιώτου Πανθήρα τοὔνομα, ibid.* 32). Stories to the same effect may be found in the Talmud—not in the Mishna, which dates from the 2d century, but in the Gemara, which is of the 5th or 6th (see *Tract. Sanhedrin*, cap. vii, fol. 67, col. 1; *Shabbath*, cap. xii, fol. 104, col. 2; and the *Midrash Koheleth*, cap. x, 5). Rabanus Maurus, in the 9th century, refers to the same story: "Jesum filium Ethnici cujusdam Pandera adulteri, more latronum punitum esse." Lightfoot quotes the same story from the Talmudists (*Exercit.* at Matt. xxvii, 56), who, he says, often vilify Mary under the name of *Sotâk;* and he cites a story in which she is called Mary the daughter of Heli, and is represented as hanging in torment among the damned, with the great bar of hell's gate hung at her ear (*ibid.* at Luke iii, 23). We then come to the *Toledoth Jesu*, in which these calumnies were intended to be summed up and harmonized. In the year 4671, the story runs, in the reign of king Jannæus, there was one Joseph Pandera who lived at Bethlehem. In the same village there was a widow who had a daughter named Miriam, who was betrothed to a God-fearing man named Johanan. Now it came to pass that Joseph Pandera meeting with Miriam when it was dark, deceived her into the belief that he was Johanan her husband. So after three months Johanan consulted rabbi Simeon Shetachides what he should do with Miriam, and the rabbi advised him to bring her before the great council. But Johanan was ashamed to do so, and instead he left his home and went and lived at Babylon; and there Miriam brought forth a son, and gave him the name of Jehoshua. The rest of the work, which has no merit in a literary aspect or otherwise, contains an account of how this Jehoshua gained the art of working miracles by stealing the knowledge of the unmentionable name from the Temple; how he was defeated by the superior magical arts of one Juda; and how at last he was crucified, and his body hidden under a watercourse. It is offensive to make use of sacred names in connection with such tales; but in Wagenseil's quaint words we may recollect, "hæc nomina non attinere ad Servatorem Nostrum aut beatissimam illius matrem cæterosque quos significare videntur, sed designari iis a Diabolo supposita Spectra, Larvas, Lemures, Lamias, Stryges, aut si quid turpius istis" (*Liber Toldos Jeschu*, in the *Tela Ignea Satanæ*, p. 2, Altorf, 1681). It is a curious thing that a Pandera or Panther has been introduced into the genealogy of our Lord by Epiphanius (*Hæres.* lxxviii), who makes him grandfather of Joseph, and by John of Damascus (*De Fide orthodoxa*, iv, 15), who makes him the father of Barpanther and grandfather of Mary.

IV. *Mohammedan Traditions.*—These are again cast in a totally different mould from those of the Jews. The Mohammedans had no purpose to serve in spreading calumnious stories as to the birth of Jesus, and accordingly we find none of the Jewish malignity about their traditions. Mohammed and his followers appear to have gathered up the floating Oriental traditions which originated in the legends of Mary's early years, given above, and to have drawn from them and from the Bible indifferently. It has been suggested that the Koran had an object in magnifying Mary, and that this was to insinuate that the Son was of no other nature than the mother. But this does not appear to be the case. Mohammed seems merely to have written down what had come to his ears about her, without definite theological purpose or inquiry.

Mary was, according to the Koran, the daughter of Amram (sur. iii) and the sister of Aaron (sur. xix). Mohammed can hardly be absolved from having here confounded Miriam the sister of Moses with Mary the mother of our Lord. It is possible, indeed, that he may have meant different persons, and such is the opinion of Sale (*Koran*, p. 38, 251) and of D'Herbelot (*Bibl. Orient.* s. v. Miriam); but the opposite view is more likely (see Gaudagnoli, *Apol. pro rel. Christ.* c. viii, p. 277, Rom. 1631). Indeed, some of the Mohammedan commentators have been driven to account for the chronological difficulty by saying that Miriam was miraculously kept alive from the days of Moses in order that she might be the mother of Jesus. Her mother Hannah dedicated her to the Lord while still in the womb, and at her birth "commended her and her future issue to the protection of God against Satan." So Hannah brought the child to the Temple to be educated by the priests, and the priests disputed among themselves who should take charge of her. Zacharias maintained that it was his office, because he had married her aunt. But when the others would not give up their claims, it was determined that the matter should be decided by lot. So they went to the river Jordan, twenty-seven of them, each man with his rod; and they threw their rods into the river, and none of them floated save that of Zacharias, whereupon the care of the child was committed to him (Al Beidawi; Jallalo'ddin). Then Zacharias placed her in an inner chamber by herself; and though he kept seven doors ever locked upon her (other stories make the only entrance to be by a ladder and a door always kept locked), he always found her abundantly supplied with provisions which God sent her from paradise, winter fruits in summer, and summer fruits in winter. Then the angels said unto her, "O Mary, verily God hath chosen thee, and hath purified thee, and hath chosen thee above all the women of the world" (*Koran*, sur. iii). So she retired to a place towards the east, and Gabriel appeared unto her and said, "Verily I am the messenger of thy Lord, and am sent to give thee a holy Son" (sur. xix). Then the angels said, "O Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings that thou shalt bear the Word proceeding from himself: His name shall be Christ Jesus, the Son of Mary, honorable in this world and in the world to come, and one of them who approach near to the presence of God: and he shall speak unto men in his cradle and when he is grown up; and he shall be one of the righteous." But she said, "How shall I have a son, seeing I know not a man?" The angel said, "So God

createth that which he pleaseth: when he decreeth a thing, he only saith unto it, 'Be,' and it is. God shall teach him the Scripture and wisdom, and the Law and the Gospel, and shall appoint him his apostle to the children of Israel" (sur. iii). So God breathed of his Spirit into the womb of Mary; and she preserved her chastity (sur. lxvi); for the Jews have spoken against her a grievous calumny (sur. iv). Thus she conceived a son, and retired with him apart to a distant place; and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm-tree; and God provided a rivulet for her, and she shook the palm-tree, and it let fall ripe dates, and she ate and drank, and was calm. Then she carried the child in her arms to her people; but they said that it was a strange thing she had done. Then she made signs to the child to answer them; and he said, "Verily I am the servant of God: he hath given me the book of the Gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet; and he hath made me blessed, wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer and to give alms so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud or unhappy: and peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life." This was Jesus the Son of Mary, the Word of Truth, concerning whom they had doubt (sur. xix).

Mohammed is reported to have said that many men have arrived at perfection, but only four women; and that these are, Asia the wife of Pharaoh, Mary the daughter of Amram, his first wife Khadîjah, and his daughter Fâtima.

The commentators on the Koran tell us that every person who comes into the world is touched at his birth by the devil, and therefore cries out; but that God placed a veil between Mary and her Son and the Evil Spirit, so that he could not reach them. For this reason they were neither of them guilty of sin, like the rest of the children of Adam. This privilege they had in answer to Hannah's prayer for their protection from Satan (Jallalo'ddin; Al Beidawi; Kitada). The Immaculate Conception therefore, we may note, was a Mohammedan doctrine six centuries before any Christian theologians or schoolmen maintained it.

See Sale, *Koran*, p. 39, 79, 250, 458 (Lond. 1734); Warner, *Compendium Historicum eorum quæ Muhammedani de Christo tradiderunt* (Lugd. Bat. 1643); Gaudagnoli, *Apologia pro Christiana Religione* (Rom. 1631); D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, p. 58 (Paris 1697); Weil, *Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner*, p. 230 (Frkf. 1845).

V. *Emblems.*—There was a time in the history of the Church when all the expressions used in the book of Canticles were applied at once to Mary. Consequently all the Eastern metaphors of king Solomon have been hardened into symbols, and represented in pictures or sculpture, and attached to her in popular litanies. The same method of interpretation was applied to certain parts of the book of the Revelation. Her chief emblems are the sun, moon, and stars (Rev. xii, 1; Cant. vi, 10). The name of Star of the Sea is also given her, from a fanciful interpretation of the meaning of her name. She is the Rose of Sharon (Cant. ii, 1) and the Lily (ii, 2), the Tower of David (iv, 4), the Mountain of Myrrh and the Hill of Frankincense (iv, 6), the Garden enclosed, the Spring shut up, the Fountain sealed (iv, 12), the Tower of Ivory (vii, 4), the Palm-tree (vii, 7), the Closed Gate (Ezek. xliv, 2). There is no end to these metaphorical titles. See Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Madonna*, and the ordinary Litanies of the Blessed Virgin.

VI. *Festivals, etc.*—*The Festival of Mary's Conception* is said to have been instituted on the occasion of the preservation from shipwreck of St. Anselm, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and by the direction of Mary herself, who informed him that the day of her conception was the 8th of December.

The Nativity of the Virgin.—There is a good deal of controversy as to the time of its first celebration and its origin. It is celebrated on the 8th of September, and is not traceable further back than the 9th century. There is a Romish calumny that queen Elizabeth substituted her own birthday in its place.

Her Presentation in the Temple, November 21, mentioned in very early martyrologies, and in a constitution of the emperor Manuel Comnenus.

Her Espousals, January 23.

The Annunciation, March 25.

The Visitation, July 2, established by Urban VI., and approved by the Council of Basle.

The Purification, February 2, established in the East under the emperor Justinian, and a little later in the West.

The Assumption (κοίμησις, in the Greek Church), celebrated originally at different times, but fixed to be on the 15th of August about the time of Charlemagne.

Besides the great festivals in honor of Mary, particular churches and fraternities have had their private ones. Several religious orders have chosen her for their especial patroness, and the whole kingdom of France was, in 1638, placed under her protection by a vow of Louis XIII. Festivals have been established in honor of particular objects connected with her, as the chamber in which she was born, and which was conveyed miraculously from Nazareth to Loretto (q.v.), la Cintola at Prato, la Saint Chemise at Chartres, the rosary which she gave to St. Dominic, and the scapular which she gave to Simon Stock; and indulgences have been granted on the occasion of these festivals, and the devotions they elicited. Books have been written to describe her miraculous pictures and images, and the boundless extent and diversity of the literature to which her worship has given rise may be inferred from a description of two of the 115 works, all on the same subject, of Hippolyte Maracci, a member of the congregation of the Clerks of the Mother of God, born 1604. *Bibliotheca Mariana* is a biographical and bibliographical notice in alphabetical order of all the authors who have written on any of the attributes or perfections of the holy Virgin, with a list of their works. The number of writers amounts to more than 3000, and the number of works in print or MS. to twice as many. This rare and highly-valued work is accompanied by five curious and useful indices. The other is *Conceptio immaculatæ Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ celebrata MCXV anagrammatibus prorsus puris ex hoc salutationis Angelicæ programmate deductis "Ave Maria gratiâ plena Dominus tecum."* This work, of which Maracci was only the editor, certainly exceeds in laborious trifling the production of father J. B. Hepburne, the Scotch Minim, who dedicated to his patron, Paul V, seventy-two encomiums on the Virgin in as many different languages.

For further literature, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 9; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, col. 1841 sq.; Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Maria; Winer, *Realw.* s. v. See Jesus Christ; Virgin.

2. Mary, the Magdalene (Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, A. V. "Mary Magdalene"), one of the most interesting, but at the same time most contradictorily-interpreted characters in the N. T. In the following statements respecting her we largely follow the article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v.

I. *The Name.*—Four different explanations have been given of this. (1) That which at first suggests itself as the most natural, that she came from the town of *Magdala*. The statement that the women with whom she journeyed followed Jesus in Galilee (Mark xv, 41), agrees with this notion. Magdala was originally a tower or fortress, as its name indicates, the situation of which is probably the same with that of the modern village of el-Mejdel, on the western shore of the Lake of Tiberias (Stanley). But Lightfoot starts another supposition, both with regard to the place of residence and to the identity of Mary Magdalene. He shows that there was a place called Magdala very near Jerusalem, so near that a person who set up his candles in order on the eve of the

Sabbath, might afterwards go to Jerusalem, pray there, and return and light up his candles when the Sabbath was now coming in (*Exercit.* John xii, 3). This place is stated in the Talmud to have been destroyed on account of its adulteries. Now, it is argued by Baronius, that Mary Magdalene must have been the same person as Mary the sister of Martha and Lazarus, and on this point Lightfoot entirely agrees with him, and he thinks that, Bethany and Magdala being both near Jerusalem, she may have married a man of Magdala, and acquired the dissolute morals of the place; or that Magdala may have been another name for Bethany. All this, however, is full of improbabilities. (2) Another explanation has been found in the fact that the Talmudic writers, in their calumnies against the Nazarenes, make mention of a *Miriam Megaddela* (מגדלא), and, deriving that word from the Piel of גָּדַל, to *twine*, explain it as meaning "the twiner or plaiter of hair." They connect with this name a story which will be mentioned later; but the derivation has been accepted by Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi, 56; *Harm. Evang.* on Luke viii, 3) as satisfactory, and pointing to the previous worldliness of "Miriam with the braided locks" as identical with "the woman that was a sinner" of Luke vii, 37. It has been urged in favor of this that the ἡ καλουμένη of Luke viii, 3 implies something peculiar, and is not used where the word that follows points only to origin or residence. (3) Either seriously, or with the patristic fondness for *paronomasia*, Jerome sees in her name, and in that of her town, the old *Migdol* ("a watch-tower"), and dwells on the coincidence accordingly. The name denotes the steadfastness of her faith. She is "vere πυργίτης, vere turris candoris et Libani, quæ prospicit in faciem Damasci" (*Epist. ad Principiam*). He is followed in this by later Latin writers, and the pun forms the theme of a panegyric sermon by Odo of Clugni (*Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp, 1727, July 12). (4) Origen, lastly, looking to the more common meaning of גָּדַל (*gâdal'*, to be great), sees in her name a prophecy of her spiritual greatness as having ministered to the Lord, and been the first witness of his resurrection (*Tract. in Matt.* xxxv). See MAGDALENE.

II. *Scripture Incidents.*—1. Mary Magdalene comes before us for the first time in Luke viii, 2 (A.D. 28). It was the custom of Jewish women (Jerome on 1 Cor. ix, 5) to contribute to the support of rabbis whom they reverenced, and, in conformity with that custom, there were among the disciples of Jesus women who "ministered unto him of their substance." All appear to have occupied a position of comparative wealth. With all the chief motive was that of gratitude for their deliverance from "evil spirits and infirmities." Of Mary it is said specially that "seven dæmons (δαιμόνια) went out of her," and the number indicates, as in Matt. xii, 45, and the "legion" of the Gadarene dæmoniac (Mark v. 9), a *possession* of more than ordinary malignity. We must think of her, accordingly, as having had, in their most aggravated forms, some of the phenomena of mental and spiritual disease which we meet with in other dæmoniacs—the wretchedness of despair, the divided consciousness, the preternatural frenzy, the long-continued fits of silence. The appearance of the same description in Mark xvi, 9 (whatever opinion we may form as to the authorship of the closing section of that Gospel), indicates that this was the fact most intimately connected with her name in the minds of the early disciples. From that state of misery she had been set free by the presence of the Healer, and, in the absence, as we may infer, of other ties and duties, she found her safety and her blessedness in following him. The silence of the Gospels as to the presence of these women at other periods of the Lord's ministry, makes it probable that they attended on him chiefly in his more solemn progresses through the towns and villages of Galilee, while at other times he journeyed to and fro without any other attendants than the Twelve, and sometimes without even them.

2. In the last journey to Jerusalem, to which so many had been looking with eager expectation, they again accompanied him (Matt. xxvii, 55; Mark xv, 41; Luke xxiii, 55; xxiv, 10), A.D. 29. It will explain much that follows if we remember that this life of ministration must have brought Mary Magdalene into companionship of the closest nature with Salome, the mother of James and John (Mark iv, 40), and even also with Mary, the mother of the Lord (John xix, 25). The women who thus devoted themselves are not prominent in the history: we have no record of their mode of life or abode, or hopes or fears, during the few momentous days that preceded the crucifixion. From that hour they came forth for a brief two days' space into marvellous distinctness. They "stood afar off, beholding these things" (Luke xxiii, 49), during the closing hours of the agony on the cross. Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of the Lord, and the beloved disciple, were at one time not afar off, but close to the cross, within hearing. The same close association which drew them together there is seen afterwards. She remains by the cross till all is over, waits till the body is taken down, and wrapped in the linen-cloth and placed in the garden-sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathæa. She remains there in the dusk of the evening, watching what she must have looked upon as the final resting-place of the Prophet and Teacher whom she had honored (Matt. xxvii, 61; Mark xv, 47; Luke xxiii, 55). Not to her had there been given the hope of the resurrection. The disciples to whom the words that spoke of it had been addressed had failed to understand them, and were not likely to have reported them to her. The Sabbath that followed brought an enforced rest, but no sooner is the sunset over than she, with Salome and Mary, the mother of James, "bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint" the body, the interment of which on the night of the crucifixion they regarded as hasty and provisional (Mark xvi, 1).

The next morning, accordingly, in the earliest dawn (Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2), they came with Mary, the mother of James, to the sepulchre, and successively saw the "vision of angels" (Matt. xxviii, 5; Mark xvi, 5). A careful comparison of the relative time of the several appearances of Christ on his resurrection makes it evident that the term "first," applied by Mark (xvi, 9) to the appearance to Mary, must not be taken so strictly as to exclude the prior appearance to the other females who had accompanied her to the sepulchre (see *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1850, p. 337 sq.). See APPEARANCES OF CHRIST. To her, however, after the first moment of joy, it had seemed to be but a vision. She went with her cry of sorrow to Peter and *John* (let us remember that *Salome* had been with her), "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him" (John xx, 1, 2). But she returns there. She follows Peter and John, and remains when they go back. The one thought that fills her mind is still that the body is not there. She has been robbed of that task of reverential love on which she had set her heart. The words of the angels can call out no other answer than that—"They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him" (John xx, 13). This intense brooding over one fixed thought was, we may venture to say, to one who had suffered as she had suffered, full of special danger, and called for a special discipline. The spirit must be raised out of its blank despair, or else the "seven devils" might come in once again, and the last state be worse than the first. The utter stupor of grief is shown in her want of power to recognise at first either the voice or the form of the Lord to whom she had ministered (John xx, 14, 15). At last her own name uttered by that voice, as she had heard it uttered, it may be, in the hour of her deepest misery, recalls her to consciousness; and then follows the cry of recognition, with the strongest word of reverence which a woman of Israel could use, "Rabboni," and the rush forwards to cling to his feet. That, how-

ever, is not the discipline she needs. Her love had been too dependent on the visible presence of her Master. She had the same lesson to learn as the other disciples. Though they had "known Christ after the flesh," they were "henceforth to know him so no more." She was to hear that truth in its highest and sharpest form. "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." For a time, till the earthly affection had been raised to a heavenly one, she was to hold back. When he had finished his work and had ascended to the Father, there should be no barrier then to the fullest communion that the most devoted love could crave. Those who sought, might draw near and touch him then. He would be one with them, and they one with him. This is the last authentic record of the Magdalene. On her character, see the *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1866.

II. *Proposed Identifications with other Females mentioned in the N. T.*—1. The questions which meet us connect themselves with the narratives in the four Gospels of women who came with precious ointment to anoint the feet or the head of Jesus. Each Gospel contains an account of one such anointing, and men have asked, in endeavoring to construct a harmony, "Do they tell us of four distinct acts, or of three, or of two, or of one only? On any supposition but the last, are the distinct acts performed by the same or by different persons, and if by different persons, then by how many? Further, have we any grounds for identifying Mary Magdalene with the woman or with any one of the women whose acts are thus brought before us?" This opens a wide range of possible combinations, but the limits of the inquiry may, without much difficulty, be narrowed. Although the opinion seems to have been at one time maintained (Origen, *Tract. in Matt.* xxxv), few would now hold that Matt. xxvi and Mark xiv are reports of two distinct events. Few, except critics bent like Schleiermacher and Strauss on getting up a case against the historical veracity of the evangelists, could persuade themselves that the narrative of Luke vii, differing as it does in well-nigh every circumstance, is but a misplaced and embellished version of the incident which the first two Gospels connect with the last week of our Lord's ministry. The supposition that there were three anointings has found favor with Origen (*l. c.*) and Lightfoot (*Harm. Evang.* ad loc., and *Hor. Heb.* in Matt. xxvi); but while, on the one hand, it removed some harmonistic difficulties, there is, on the other, something improbable, to the verge of being inconceivable, in the repetition within three days of the same scene, at the same place, with precisely the same murmur and the same reproof. We are left to the conclusion adopted by the great majority of interpreters, that the Gospels record two anointings, one in some city unnamed (Capernaum and Nain have been suggested), during our Lord's Galilæan ministry (Luke vii), the other at Bethany, before the last entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxvi; Mark xiv; John xii).

We come, then, to the question whether in these two narratives we meet with one woman or with two. The one passage adduced for the former conclusion is John xi, 2. It has been urged (Maldonatus, *in Matt.* xxvi, and *Joan.* xi, 2; *Acta Sanctorum*, July 22) that the words which we find there ("It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment . . . whose brother Lazarus was sick") could not possibly refer by anticipation to the history which was about to follow in ch. xii, and must therefore presuppose some fact known through the other Gospels to the Church at large, and that fact, it is inferred, is found in the history of Luke vii. Against this it has been said, on the other side, that the assumption thus made is entirely an arbitrary one, and that there is not the slightest trace of the life of Mary of Bethany ever having been one of open and flagrant impurity. There is, therefore, but slender evidence for the assumption that the two anointings were the acts of one and the same woman, and that woman the sister of Lazarus. That she may have been in the later scene is probable, but certainly not in the earlier. See No. 3, below.

There is, if possible, still less reason for the identification of Mary Magdalene with the chief actor in either history. When her name appears in Luke viii, 3, there is not one word to connect it with the history that immediately precedes. Though possible, it is at least unlikely that such a one as the "sinner" would at once have been received as the chosen companion of Joanna and Salome, and have gone from town to town with them and the disciples. Lastly, the description that *is* given—"Out of whom went seven devils"—points, as has been stated, to a form of suffering all but absolutely incompatible with the life implied in ἁμαρτωλός, and to a very different work of healing from that of the divine words of pardon—"Thy sins be forgiven thee." To say, as has been said, that the "seven devils" are the "many sins" (Greg. Mag. *Hom. in Evang.* 25 and 53), is to identify two things which are separated in the whole tenor of the N. T. by the clearest line of demarcation. The argument that because Mary Magdalene is mentioned so soon afterwards, she must be the same as the woman of Luke vii (Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, July 22), is simply puerile. It would be just as reasonable to identify "the sinner" with Susanna. Never, perhaps, has a figment so utterly baseless obtained so wide an acceptance as that which we connect with the name of the "penitent Magdalene." It is to be regretted that the chapter-heading of the A. V. of Luke vii should seem to give a quasi-authoritative sanction to a tradition so utterly uncertain, and that it should have been perpetuated in connection with a great work of mercy.

2. The belief that Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalene are identical is yet more startling. Not one single circumstance, except that of love and reverence for their Master, is common. The epithet Magdalene, whatever may be its meaning, seems chosen for the express purpose of distinguishing her from all other Marys. No one evangelist gives the slightest hint of identity. Luke mentions Martha and her sister Mary in x, 38, 39, as though neither had been named before. John, who gives the fullest account of both, keeps their distinct individuality most prominent. The only *simulacrum* of an argument on behalf of the identity is that, if we do not admit it, we have no record of the sister of Lazarus having been a witness of the resurrection.

III. *Traditions.*—1. *On the above Identification.*—This lack of evidence in the N. T. itself is not compensated by any such weight of authority as would indicate a really trustworthy tradition. Two of the earliest writers who allude to the histories of the anointing—Clement of Alexandria (*Pædag.* ii, 8) and Tertullian (*De Pudic.* chap. 8)—say nothing that would imply that they accepted it. The language of Irenæus (iii, 4) is against it. Origen (*l. c.*) discusses the question fully, and rejects it. He is followed by the whole succession of the expositors of the Eastern Church: Theophilus of Antioch, Macarius, Chrysostom, Theophylact. The traditions of that Church, when they wandered into the regions of conjecture, took another direction, and suggested the identity of Mary Magdalene with the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman of Mark vii, 26 (Nicephorus, *H. E.* i, 33). In the Western Church, however, the other belief began to spread. At first it is mentioned hesitatingly, as by Ambrose (*De Virg. Vel.*, and *in Luc.* lib. vi), and Jerome (*in Matt.* xxvi, 2; *contr. Jovin.* c. 16). Augustine at one time inclines to it (*De Consens. Evang.* c. 69), at another speaks very doubtingly (*Tract. in Joann.* 49). At the close of the first great period of Church history, Gregory the Great takes up both notions, embodies them in his Homilies (*in Ev.* 25, 53), and stamps them with his authority. The reverence felt for him, and the constant use of his works as a text-book of theology during the whole mediæval period, secured for the hypothesis a currency which it never would have gained on its own merits. The ser-

vices of the Feast of St. Mary Magdalene were constructed on the assumption of its truth (*Brev. Rom. in Jul.* 22). Hymns, and paintings, and sculptures fixed it deep in the minds of the Western nations, France and England being foremost in their reverence for the saint whose history appealed to their sympathies. (See below.) In particular, that passage in Luke has been adopted as the lesson of the day for her festival (Meyer on Luke vii, 37), and her name has passed into all the languages of Western Christendom as expressive of a female penitent. Deyling (*Obss. Sacr.* iii, 261) gives a history both of the progress of the identification and of those controversies, especially in the Gallic Church, which resulted in the distinction being again drawn between them; and a testimony to the success with which this was done will be found in Daniel (*Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, ii, 129), who tells us that in the missals of various churches, the words "Peccatricem absolvisti" were substituted for those which unquestionably belong to that noble hymn, the *Dies Iræ*, in its original condition, "Qui Mariam absolvisti." Well-nigh all ecclesiastical writers, after the time of Gregory the Great (Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas are exceptions), take it for granted. When it was first questioned by Fevre d'Etaples (Faber Stapulensis) in the early Biblical criticism of the 16th century, the new opinion was formally condemned by the Sorbonne (*Acta Sanctorum*, l. c.), and denounced by bishop Fisher of Rochester. The Prayer-book of 1549 follows in the wake of the Breviary; but in that of 1552, either on account of the uncertainty or for other reasons, the feast disappears. The Book of Homilies gives a doubtful testimony. In one passage the "sinful woman" is mentioned without any notice of her being the same as the Magdalene (*Sermon on Repentance*, part ii); in another it depends upon a comma whether the two are distinguished or identified (*ibid.* part ii). The translators under James I, as has been stated, adopted the received tradition. Since that period there has been a gradually accumulating *consensus* against it. Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Casaubon, among older critics, Bengel, Lampe, Greswell, Alford, Wordsworth, Stier, Meyer, Ellicott, Olshausen, among later, agree in rejecting it. Romanist writers even (Tillemont, Dupin, Estius) have borne their protest against it in whole or in part; and books that represent the present teaching of the Gallican Church reject entirely the identification of the two Marys as an unhappy mistake (Migne, *Dict. de le Bible*). The mediæval tradition has, however, found defenders in Baronius, the writers of the *Acta Sanctorum*, Maldonatus, bishop Andrewes, Lightfoot, Isaac Williams, and Dr. Pusey.

2. It remains to give the substance of the legend formed out of these combinations. At some time before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, a great sorrow fell upon the household of Bethany. The younger of the two sisters fell from her purity and sank into the depths of shame. Her life was that of one possessed by the "seven devils" of uncleanness. From the city to which she then went, or from her harlot-like adornments, she was known by the new name of Magdalene. Then she hears of the Deliverer, and repents, and loves, and is forgiven. Then she is received at once into the fellowship of the holy women and ministers to the Lord, and is received back again by her sister and dwells with her, and shows that she has chosen the good part. The death of Lazarus and his return to life are new motives to her gratitude and love; and she shows them, as she had shown them before, anointing no longer the feet only, but the head also of her Lord. She watches by the cross, and is present at the sepulchre, and witnesses the resurrection. Then (the legend goes on, when the work of fantastic combination is completed), after some years of waiting, she goes with Lazarus, and Martha, and Maximin (one of the seventy) to Marseilles. Comp. LAZARUS. They land there; and she, leaving Martha to more active work, retires to a cave in the neighborhood of Arles, and there leads a life of penitence for thirty years. When she dies a church is built in her honor, and miracles are wrought at her tomb. Clovis the Frank is healed by her intercession, and his new faith is strengthened; and the chivalry of France does homage to her name as to that of the greater Mary.

Such was the full-grown form of the Western story. In the East there was a different tradition. Nicephorus (*H. E.* ii, 10) states that she went to Rome to accuse Pilate for his unrighteous judgment; Modestus, patriarch of Constantinople (*Hom. in Marias*), that she came to Ephesus with the Virgin and St. John, and died and was buried there. The emperor Leo the Philosopher (cir. 890) brought her body from that city to Constantinople (*Acta Sanctorum*, l. c.), and deposited it in the church of St. Lazarus. The day of her festival, in both the Eastern and Western Church, is July 22.

The name appears to have been conspicuous enough, either among the living members of the Church at Jerusalem or in their written records, to attract the notice of their Jewish opponents. The Talmudists record a tradition, confused enough, that *Stada* or *Satda*, whom they represent as the mother of the Prophet of Nazareth, was known by this name as a "plaiter or twiner of hair;" that she was the wife of Paphus ben-Jehudah, a contemporary of Gamaliel, Joshua, and Akiba; and that she grieved and angered him by her wantonness (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi; *Harm. Evang.* on Luke viii, 3). It seems, however, from the fuller report given by Eisenmenger, that there were two women to whom the Talmudists gave this name, and the wife of Paphus is not the one whom they identified with the Mary Magdalene of the Gospels (*Entdeckt. Judenth.* i, 277). There is a pretended history of her said to have been written in Hebrew by Marada, servant of Martha, but there is no doubt that it is a forgery (Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*).

There is, lastly, the strange supposition (rising out of an attempt to evade some of the harmonistic difficulties of the resurrection history) that there were two women both known by this name, and both among those who went early to the sepulchre (Lampe, *Comm. in Joann;* Ambrose, *Comm. in Luc.* x, 24).

3. MARY, THE SISTER OF LAZARUS. For much of the information connected with this name, comp. LAZARUS and MARY MAGDALENE. The facts strictly personal to her are but few. She and her sister Martha appear in Luke x, 40 as receiving Christ in their house. The contrasted temperaments of the two sisters have already been in part discussed. See MARTHA. Mary sat listening eagerly for every word that fell from the divine Teacher. She had chosen the good part, the life that had found its unity, the "one thing needful," in rising from the earthly to the heavenly, no longer distracted by the "many things" of earth. The same character shows itself in the history of John xi. Her grief is deeper, but less active. She sits still in the house. She will not go to meet the friends who come on the formal visit of consolation. But when her sister tells her secretly, "The Master is come and calleth for thee," she rises quickly and goes forth at once (John xi, 20, 28). Those who have watched the depth of her grief have but one explanation for the sudden change: "She goeth to the grave to weep there!" Her first thought, when she sees the Teacher in whose power and love she had trusted, is one of complaint. "She fell down at his feet, saying, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." Up to this point her relation to the divine Friend had been one of reverence, receiving rather than giving, blessed in the consciousness of his favor. But the great joy and love which her brother's return to life called up in her, poured themselves out in larger measure than had been seen before. The treasured alabaster-box of ointment was brought forth at the final feast of Bethany (John xii, 3). A.D. 29. Matthew and Mark keep back her name. See ANOINTING.

Of her after-history we know nothing. The ecclesi-

astical traditions about her are based on the unfounded hypothesis of her identity with Mary Magdalene.

4. Mary, the (Wife) of Clopas (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, A. V. "of Cleophas"), described by John as standing by the cross of Jesus in company with his mother and Mary Magdalene (John xix. 25). The same group of women is described by Matthew as consisting of Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother] of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children" (Matt. xxvii, 56); and by Mark, as "Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother] of James the Little and of Joses, and Salome" (Mark xv, 40). From a comparison of these passages, it appears that "Mary of Clopas," and "Mary of James the Little and of Joses," are the same person, and that she was the sister of Mary the Virgin. The arguments, preponderating on the affirmative side, for this Mary being (according to the A. V. translation) the *wife* of Clopas or Alphæus, and the *mother* of James the Little, Joses, Jude, Simon, and their sisters, have been given under the heading James.

To solve the difficulties of this verse the following supposition has been suggested: (1) That the two clauses "his mother's sister" and "Mary of Clopas" are not in apposition, and that John meant to designate four persons as present, namely, the mother of Jesus; her sister, to whom he does not assign any name; Mary of Clopas; and Mary Magdalene (Lange). It has been further suggested that this sister's name was Salome, wife of Zebedee (Wieseler). This is avoiding, not solving a difficulty. John could not have expressed himself as he does had he meant more than three persons. It has been suggested (2) that the word ἀδελφή is not here to be taken in its strict sense, but rather in the laxer acceptation, which it clearly does bear in other places. Mary, wife of Clopas, it has been said, was not the sister, but the cousin of Mary the Virgin (see Wordsworth, *Gr. Test.*, Preface to the Epistle of St. James). There is nothing in this suggestion which is objectionable, or which can be disproved. But it is hardly consistent with the terms of close relationship assigned to the connected members of the holy family. See Brethren of our Lord. By many, therefore, it has been contended (3) that the two Marys were literally sisters-german. "That it is far from impossible for two sisters to have the same name may be seen by any one who will cast his eye over Betham's Genealogical Tables. To name no others, his eye will at once light on a pair of Antonias and a pair of Octavias, the daughters of the same father, and in one case of different mothers, in the other of the same mother. If it be objected that these are merely gentilic names, another table will give two Cleopatras. It is quite possible, too, that the same cause which operates at present in Spain may have been at work formerly in Judæa. Miriam, the sister of Moses, may have been the holy woman after whom Jewish mothers called their daughters, just as Spanish mothers not unfrequently give the name of Mary to their children, male and female alike, in honor of Mary the Virgin. (Maria, Maria-Pia, and Maria-Immacolata, are the first names of three of the sisters of the late king of the Two Sicilies.) This is on the hypothesis that the two names are identical, but, on a close examination of the Greek text, we find that it is possible that this was not the case. Mary the Virgin is Μαριάμ; her sister is Μαρία. It is more than possible that these names are the Greek representatives of two forms which the antique מִרְיָם had then taken; and as in pronunciation the emphasis would have been thrown on the last syllable in Μαριάμ, while the final letter in Μαρία would have been almost unheard, there would, upon this hypothesis, have been a greater difference in the sisters' names than there is between Mary and Maria among ourselves. The ordinary explanation that Μαριάμ is the Hebraic form, and Μαρία the Greek form, and that the difference is in the use of the evangelists, not in the name itself, seems scarcely adequate: for why should the evangelists invariably employ the Hebraic form when writing of Mary the Virgin, and the Greek form when writing about all the other Marys in the Gospel history? It is true that this distinction is not constantly observed in the readings of the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi, and a few other MSS.; but there is sufficient agreement in the majority of the codices to determine the usage. That it is possible for a name to develop into several kindred forms, and for these forms to be considered sufficiently distinct appellations for two or more brothers or sisters, is evidenced by our daily experience." "We find that the high-priest Onias III had a brother also named Onias, who eventually succeeded him in his office under the adopted name of Menelaus. We have the authority of the earliest traditions for the opinion that our Lord's mother had at least one sister called Mary. Indeed, it is an old opinion that Anna, the mother of the Virgin Mary, had three daughters of that name by different husbands; and Dr. Routh, in his *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, gives us from Papias, the scholar of John (*ex Cod. MS. Bibl. Bodl.* 2397), the following enumeration of four Marys of the N. T.: 1. Maria, Mater Domini; 2. Maria, Cleophæ sive Alphæi uxor, quæ fuit mater Jacobi Episcopi et Apostoli, et Simonis, et Thadæi, et cujusdam Joseph; 3. Maria Salome, uxor Zebedæi, mater Johannis evangelistæ et Jacobi; 4. Maria Magdalene. It is further stated, in this fragment of Papias, that both Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Salome, were aunts of our Lord, and consequently sisters of the Virgin Mary" (Kitto). Finally, most interpreters, regarding all the above positions as untenable, or, at least, improbable, suppose (4) that the two Marys were *sisters-in-law* by virtue of having married brothers, i. e. Joseph and Alphæus or Clopas, and afterwards, perhaps by a Levirate marriage, having become the wives of the same husband, namely, Joseph the survivor. See Alphæus.

The only knowledge we have of this Mary, besides the above facts of her sons, and of her presence at the crucifixion, is that she was that "other Mary" who, with Mary Magdalene, attended the body of Christ to the sepulchre when taken down from the cross (Matt. xxvii, 61; Mark xv, 47; Luke xxiii, 55). She was also among those who went on the morning of the first day of the week to the sepulchre to anoint the body, and who became the first witnesses of the resurrection (Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 1; Luke xxiv, 1). A.D. 29.

5. Mary, the mother of John, surnamed Mark (Μαρία ἡ μήτηρ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, Acts xii, 12). A.D. 44. The woman known by this description must have been among the earliest disciples. We learn from Col. iv. 10 that she was sister to Barnabas, and it would appear from Acts iv, 37; xii, 12, that, while the brother gave up his land and brought the proceeds of the sale into the common treasury of the Church, the sister gave up her house to be used as one of its chief places of meeting. The fact that Peter went to that house on his release from prison indicates that there was some special intimacy (Acts xii, 12) between them, and this is confirmed by the language which he uses towards Mark as being his "son" (1 Pet. v, 13). She, it may be added, must have been, like Barnabas, of the tribe of Levi, and may have been connected, as he was, with Cyprus (Acts iv, 36). It has been surmised that filial anxiety about her welfare during the persecutions and the famine which harassed the Church at Jerusalem, was the chief cause of Mark's withdrawal from the missionary labors of Paul and Barnabas. The tradition of a later age represented the place of meeting for the disciples, and therefore probably the house of Mary, as having stood on the upper slope of Zion, and affirmed that it had been the scene of the wonder of the day of Pentecost, had escaped the general destruction of the city by Titus, and was still used as a church in the 4th century (Epiphan. *De Pond. et Mens*, xiv; Cyril Hierosol. *Catech.* xvi). See Mark.

6. A Christian female at Rome, mentioned by Paul as having formerly treated him with special kindness (Rom. xvi, 6). A.D. 54. As this is the only Hebrew name in the list (Jouatt, ad loc.), and as the reading εἰς ἡμᾶς in the same verse is disputed, it is possible that she was not a native of Rome.

Mary OF AGREDA. See AGREDA, MARIA DE.

Mary OF EGYPT, a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, according to her legend, ran away from her parents when twelve years of age; led a very dissolute life for seventeen years at Alexandria, and then joined a party of pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem, with the intention of living there in the same manner. Arriving in that city, she wished to visit the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but was held back by an unseen power; she then knelt before an image of Mary, and vowed to reform her life. She was now permitted to enter the church, and, after praying to the cross, asked the Virgin to direct her what she should do to be agreeable to God. A supernatural voice told her to go to the other side of Jordan, into the wilderness. Mary obeyed, and lived there forty-seven years, enduring privations of all kinds, until the monk Zosimus discovered her one day, an old, naked, sunburnt woman, covered with white hair. She asked him for his cloak, his prayers, and his blessing; related to him her history, and asked him to come to see her again in a year, and to bring her the communion. As he came at the appointed time, she met him and communed with him. But when he went again to her, as appointed, three years afterwards, he found only a corpse, and her name written beside her on the sand. After he had long tried in vain to dig a grave to bury her, a lion came and helped him. According to the general opinion, she died during the reign of Theodosius the Younger. Her grave became a great shrine, and a number of churches and chapels were placed under her protection. She is most honored in the Greek Church, and is commemorated on the 2d of April. See C. Baronii *Martyrologium Romanum* (Moguntiæ, 1631, p. 209 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 105. (J. N. P.)

Mary, queen OF ENGLAND, daughter of Henry VIII by his first wife, Catharine of Aragon, is commonly called *Bloody Queen Mary*, on account of her cruel persecutions of the Protestants—"a history of horrors exceeded only by the persecutions in the Netherlands by Alva, and of Louis XIV after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes." She was born at Greenwich, on the 18th (Burnet says 19th) of February, 1516. The only living one of several children borne by her mother, she was on this account, according to Burnet, and because her father was then "out of hopes of more children," declared in 1518 princess of Wales, and sent to Ludlow, to hold her court there, divers matches being projected for her, none of which, however, were carried into effect. After the divorce of Catharine, and Henry's marriage of Anne Boleyn, Mary's position waned at court, and finally the title of princess of Wales was transferred to princess Elizabeth, soon after she came into the world. Mary had been brought up from her infancy in a strong attachment to the ancient religion, under the care of her mother, and Margaret, countess of Salisbury, the effect of whose instructions was not impaired by the subsequent lessons of the learned Ludovicus Vives, who, though somewhat inclined to the Reformed opinions, was appointed by Henry to be her Latin tutor. The profligate conduct of her father, and the wrongs inflicted upon her mother, naturally had the effect of making her still more attached to the Roman Catholics. But immediately after the execution of queen Anne in 1536, a reconcilement took place between Henry and his eldest daughter, who was now prevailed upon to make a formal acknowledgment both of Henry's ecclesiastical supremacy—utterly refusing "the bishop of Rome's pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction within this realm heretofore usurped"—and of the nullity of the marriage of her father and mother, which she declared was "by God's law and man's law incestuous and unlawful." (See the "Confession of me, the Lady Mary," as printed by Burnet [*Hist. Ref.*] from the original, "all written with her own hand.") This very year, however, shortly after the marriage of Jane Seymour, a new act of succession was passed, by which she was again, as well as her sister Elizabeth, declared illegitimate, and forever excluded from claiming the inheritance of the crown as the king's lawful heir by lineal descent. But as, by the powers reserved to Henry VIII of nominating his own successor after failure of the issue of queen Jane, or of any other queen whom he might afterwards marry, a possible chance was left to Mary, she continued to yield an outward conformity to all her father's capricious movements, even in the matter of religion, and she so far succeeded in regaining his favor that in the new act of succession, passed in 1544, the inheritance to the crown was expressly secured to her next after her brother Edward and his heirs, and any issue the king might have by his then wife Catharine Parr. Upon the death of Henry VIII and the accession of Edward to the throne of England (1544), Mary's hopes of reigning one day over England were darkened by the persistent efforts of her half-brother to establish the religion of the Reformers. Mary's compliance with the innovations in religion in her father's time, as we have noted above, had been dictated merely by fear or self-interest; no longer restrained, she manifested her fidelity to and affection for the court of Rome when, after Edward's accession, his ministers proceeded to place the whole doctrine, as well as discipline, of the national Church upon a new foundation. She openly refused to go along with them, nor could all their persuasions and threats, aided by those of her brother himself, move her from her ground. (Full details of the various attempts that were made to prevail upon her may be found in Burnet's *History*, p. 417–420, and in king Edward's *Journal*. Mention is made in the latter, under date of April, 1549, of a demand for the hand of the lady Mary by the duke of Brunswick, who was informed by the council that "there was talk for her marriage with the infant of Portugal, which being determined, he should have answer." About the same time it is noted that "whereas the emperor's ambassador desired leave, by letters patent, that my lady Mary might have mass, it was denied him." On the 18th of March of the following year the king writes: "The lady Mary, my sister, came to me at Westminster, where, after salutations, she was called, with my council, into a chamber; where was declared how long I had suffered her mass, in hope of her reconciliation, and how now being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendment, I could not bear it. She answered that her soul was God's, and her faith she would not change, nor dissemble her opinion with contrary doings. It was said, I constrained not her faith, but wished her not as a king to rule, but as a subject to obey; and that her example might breed too much inconvenience.") Had it not been for the interference of Charles V, no doubt Mary would have suffered severe punishment for her persistency in remaining faithful to the pope. The emperor, who had once even asked her hand, and only withdrew his request when Catharine was divorced, made it "the condition of his friendly relations to the English government that Mary be left in the free enjoyment of her religious faith, and the king of England, rather than be subject to war, yielded—but with tears" (Lingard, *Hist. of Engl.* vii, 66 sq.). Yet if Mary secured liberty of conscience, she secured it at the risk of a crown, for Mary's firm adherence to the Roman faith finally induced Edward, under the interested advice of his minister Northumberland, to attempt at the close of his life to exclude her from the succession, and to make over the crown by will to lady Jane Grey, an act which was certainly without any shadow of legal force, and failed to be of any effect. Although lady Jane was actually proclaimed queen upon the death

of Edward, Mary herself claimed the crown, and with scarcely any resistance secured the throne.

Mary's reign opens a new and bloody chapter in the history of England—a period in the ecclesiastical annals when the flame of Romanism, which had been slowly dying, was fanned into new life, and, glaring up wildly, spent its full fury, and quickly died, never to burn anew. Mary, as we have seen, was ever a faithful adherent to the cause of Rome; she had quietly submitted to the innovations under Henry VIII to secure her father's favors, but as she grew older she grew more decided. Indeed, her own legitimacy to the throne was involved in her acknowledgment of the pope. One of the pontiffs had confirmed her mother's marriage, and another had refused to annul it. Impressed by this truth, she had clung closely to the Church of her infancy, even when she seemed in danger of losing the privilege of succession, and she faltered not when lady Jane Grey became the avowed heir of her half-brother. Quite in contrast with this bearing is her conduct after the decease of Edward. Satisfied that the way to the throne could be opened only by Protestant aid, she hesitated not to pledge to the men of Suffolk, whose help she invoked, "that she would be content with her own private exercise of religion, and that she would not force that of others" (Butler, ii, 437; Neale, i, 58). She even repeated a like declaration to the council, and renewed it as late as a month after her accession to the throne. Yet all this time she was preparing the way for a speedy return of England's clergy to the Church of Rome. Even before she had made these promises she had already sent a message to the Pope announcing her accession, and giving in her allegiance to him as a dutiful daughter of the Church (Butler, ii, 437).

Mary made her accession to the throne on July 19. In the course of the month of August, Bonner (q. v.), Gardiner (q. v.), and three other bishops, who had been deposed for nonconformity in the late reign, were restored to their sees, and the mass, contrary to law, began again to be celebrated in many churches. In the following month archbishop Cranmer (q. v.) and bishop Latimer (q. v.), having opposed these popish innovations, were committed to the Tower. Soon after Ridley (q. v.) was committed, and upon the meeting of Parliament, Oct. 5, only three months after the king's death, but two of the Reformed bishops—Taylor of Lincoln and Harley of Hereford—remained in their sees, while Peter Martyr (q. v.), John à Lasko [see LASKO], and other foreign preachers, were advised to quit the country. After the assembling of Parliament further steps were taken. An act was forced through repealing all the acts, nine in number, relating to religion that had been passed in the late reign, and restoring the Church to the same position which it had held at the death of Henry VIII. Most high handed were the games of bishop Gardiner, a man truly unscrupulous and void of moral sense. Seeking only to promote selfish ends, he had in the reign of Henry VIII been the most subservient instrument of the king in securing the divorce from Catharine, and to procure the archbishopric he now played a like unmerciful game against all who stood in his way. The crime he had perpetrated he assured Mary had been committed by Cranmer, and persuaded all that he had ever remained a most faithful servant of the pope. See GARDINER. Some writers will even have it that Mary was at this time inclined to be just to all her subjects, and that she was only led astray by this dastardly but wily ecclesiastic. But, be this as it may, certain it is that Mary acted in the interests of Romanism only, quite unmindful of the obligations she had assumed before the Protestants. In the Convocation, the Book of Common Prayer and Poynet's Catechism were pronounced "abominable and pestiferous books." In the lower house, six divines disputed boldly against transubstantiation for three days; but when, overpowered by numbers, they left the house, four articles were framed which became the test of heresy to all who suffered in this reign. They affirmed (1) communion in one kind; (2) a transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; (3) that worship should be rendered to the host; (4) that Christ is offered up as a sacrifice in the mass (comp. Butler, ii, 440). Rome also promptly responded, and appointed a papal legate to England—cardinal Pole—but, as Gardiner himself was desirous to secure the position (Soames, iv, 77), he urged the queen to request the legate to remain at home, at least until the match proposed between herself and Philip of Spain, the pious Catholic, be further matured. There was great opposition on the part of the people to this proposed union with Spain, and it was not best to trifle with popular opinion. Indeed, as it was, these measures, and other indications given by the court of a determination to be completely reconciled with Rome, were followed by insurrection (commonly known as that of Sir Thomas Wyat, its principal leader), which broke out in the end of January, 1554. It is true this rebellion was in a few days effectually put down, its suppression being signalized by the executions of the unfortunate lady Jane Grey and her husband, the lord Guildford Dudley, of her father, the duke of Suffolk, and, finally, of Wyat himself; but the popular indignation, instead of bringing Mary to her senses, led her further and further away from the people over whom she had forced herself as ruler. She was well aware that the people were daily growing in dissatisfaction because of her decision to lead them back to Rome, and yet, in the face of all this opposition, she contracted a union with the greatest Roman Catholic power, the government of Charles V, by her marriage to Philip II (q. v.), July 25. Though the latter pledged himself to the performance of many concessions to the English, the Spanish match remained exceedingly unpopular.

Mary's success in quelling the rebellion which she had provoked gave her, however, most complete ascendency over the reactionists, and she promptly used her courage and capacity to intrench herself by the aid of Rome. Parliament, which was assembled in November, was completely under her sway, and, inspired by her, obediently passed acts repealing the attainder of cardinal Pole, who had long waited to make his appearance in England as the papal legate, restoring the authority of the pope, repealing all laws made against the see of Rome since Henry VIII, reviving the ancient statutes against heresy, and, in short, re-establishing the whole national system of religious policy as it had existed previous to the first innovations made by her father. By one of the acts of this session of Parliament, also, Philip was authorized to take the title of King of England during the queen's life. These measures became the inaugural ceremonies of a rule of bloodshed and tyranny that closed only with the decease of the principal author and actor—"Bloody Queen Mary" herself.

Not content, however, with having restored the power of the Church of Rome over the Anglican Church, Mary introduced new and severe measures for the suppression of those who had dared to follow her father and half-brother in measures of ecclesiastical reform. Many of the clergy had married. One of her first acts now was the ejection of these clergy. The number of such, according to Burnet, was 12,000 out of 16,000; but this seems exaggerated, and we prefer to follow Butler, who estimates them at a little over 3,000, certainly a large enough number of men so suddenly deprived of their living, and, with thousands dependent upon them, at a moment's warning shut out from home and hearth. To say the least, the measure was most tyrannical; not even the option of dissolving the marriage-bond was given, though they had been married under the sanction of the law of the land. Many of the bishops—sixteen of them—shared a like fate with their subordinates. The question, however, still remained to be settled, *How shall the heretic be treated?* "Cardinal Pole, from his gentler temper and larger wisdom, advised mild measures in order to win them back; but, in case

they could not be won, he would, equally with Gardiner and Bonner, have had them burned. Gardiner was now for measures of repression and vigor. He contended that relaxation in the time of Henry VIII had been the cause of the rapid spread of the heresy. He was disappointed of the see of Canterbury [which Pole had secured, of course], and enraged because his books against the papal supremacy were reprinted and dispersed through the country. The queen was always on the side of the severest measures," and the remainder of the history of the reign of Mary is occupied chiefly with the sanguinary persecutions of the adherents to the Reformed doctrines. Most Protestant writers reckon that about 280 victims perished at the stake from Feb. 4, 1555, on which day John Rogers was burned at Smithfield, to Nov. 10, 1558, when the last "auto-da-fé" of the reign took place by the execution in the same manner of three men and two women at Colchester. Dr. Lingard, the Roman Catholic, admits that after expunging from the Protestant lists "the names of all who were condemned as felons or traitors, or who died peaceably in their beds, or who survived the publication of their martyrdom, or who would for their heterodoxy have been sent to the stake by the Reformed prelates themselves, had they been in possession of the power," and making every other possible allowance, it will still be found "that in the space of four years almost 200 persons perished in the flames for religious opinion." The harrowing narrative, in its details, may be found in part in Burnet, and in full in Fox's *Martyrology*. Among the most distinguished sufferers were Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, Ferrar of St. David's, Latimer of Worcester, Ridley of London, and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Nor were the sufferings confined to the stake. Intolerance also carried grief, horror, and ferocity into all England by the persecution of those who were guilty of heresy, but were not considered fit subjects for the stake. It is said that in the last three years of Mary's reign no less than "30,000 persons were exiled and spoiled of their goods" (Butler, ii, 445), among whom were not less than 800 theologians (comp. Fisher, p. 328).

The question has been raised, Who were most responsible for these persecutions? Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and lord chancellor, was Mary's chief minister till his death in November, 1555, after which the direction of affairs fell mostly into the hands of cardinal Pole, who, after Cranmer's deposition, was made archbishop of Canterbury; but the notorious Bonner, Ridley's successor in the see of London, has the credit of having been the principal instigator of these atrocities, which, it may be remarked, so far from contributing to put down the Reformed doctrines, appear to have had a greater effect in disgusting the nation with the restored Church than all other causes together. Says Soames (iv, 385), "These horrid proceedings filled the whole kingdom with amazement, indignation, and disgust. Unfeeling Romish bigots were disappointed because this atrocious ebullition of their party's intolerance had wholly failed to overawe the spirit of their adversaries. Timid Protestants were encouraged by the noble constancy displayed among their friends. Moderate Romanists were ashamed of their spiritual guides. The mass of men, who live in stupid forgetfulness of God, were aroused from that lethargy of sensuality, covetousness, or vanity in which they dissipate existence, to reflect upon the principles which could support the human mind tranquil, or even exulting, amid such frightful agonies."

At the same time that the attempt was thus made to extinguish the new opinions in religion by persecution at the stake, exile, and other severe measures, the queen gave a further proof of the ardor of her own faith by restoring to the Church the tenths and first-fruits, with all the rectories, glebe-lands, and tithes that had been annexed to the crown in the times of her father and brother. She also re-established several of the old monasteries which her father had dissolved, and endowed them as liberally as her means enabled her. Gladly would she have restored them all to the Church, "but it was feared that violent commotions would ensue if that course were adopted;" and the papal legate, while he "reluctantly assented" to the arrangement as proposed by the Convocation, "that the present titles to monasteries and Church lands should not be disturbed," "admonished those who held those lands of the guilt of sacrilege, and reminded them of the doom of Belshazzar" (!). See MONASTICISM. Froude, whom the Romanists are so eager to prove guilty of unfitness as a historian, has been one of the most lenient commentators on the conduct of Mary of England towards her people. He holds that, "To the time of her accession she had lived a blameless and, in many respects, a noble life; and few men or women have lived less capable of doing knowingly a wrong thing." He adds that her trials and disappointments, "it can hardly be doubted, affected her sanity," and ascribes the guilt chiefly to Gardiner, and measurably to Pole. Unless it be on the point of insanity, we are inclined to hold Mary responsible for the persecutions of her reign, believing, with Ranke, that "whatever is done in the name of a prince, with his will and by his authority, decides his reputation in history." In her domestic life Mary was wretched. Philip, whom she loved with a morbid passion, proved a sour, selfish, and heartless husband; at once a bigot and a brute. No children followed their union; and exasperation and loneliness, working upon a temper naturally obstinate and sullen, without doubt rendered her more compliant to the sanguinary policy of the reactionary bishops. Fortunately for England, her reign was brief. She died—after suffering much and long from dropsy and nervous debility—Nov. 17, 1558. Her successor on the throne was her sister Elizabeth, who not only undid all the work she had accomplished, but finally and successfully established Protestantism as the faith of the nation. See ELIZABETH.

Queen Mary's literary productions, though of but minor interest at present, deserve mention here because of the peculiar bearing they have on her early history. She is said to have been a superior Latin scholar, and was commended by Erasmus. "Scripsit bene Latinas epistolas," says he. Towards the end of her father's reign, at the earnest solicitation of queen Catharine Parr, she undertook to translate Erasmus's *Paraphrase on the Gospel of St. John*, but being cast into sickness, as Udall relates, partly by overmuch study in this work, after she had made some progress therein, she left the rest to be done by Dr. Mallet, her chaplain. This translation is printed in the first volume of *Erasmus's Paraphrase upon the New Testament* (London, 1548, folio). The "Preface" was written by Udall, the famous master of Eton School, and addressed to the queen dowager. After her accession to the throne a proclamation was issued calling in and suppressing this very book, and all others that had any tendency towards furthering the Reformation. An ingenious writer is of opinion that the sickness which came upon her while she was translating St. John was all affected; "for," says he, "she would not so easily have been cast into sickness had she been employed on the legends of St. Teresa or St. Catharine of Sienna." Strype (iii, 468) has preserved three prayers or meditations of hers: the first, *Against the Assaults of Vice;* the second, *A Meditation touching Adversity;* the third, *A Prayer to be read at the Hour of Death.* In Fox's *Acts and Monuments* are printed eight of her letters to king Edward and the lords of the council on her nonconformity, and on the imprisonment of her chaplain, Dr. Mallet. In the *Sylloge epistolarum* are several more of her letters, extremely curious: one on her delicacy in never having written but to three men, one of affection for her sister, one after the death of Anne Boleyn, and one, very remarkable, of Cromwell to her. In Haynes's *State Papers* are two in Spanish, to the emperor Charles V. There is also a French letter, printed by Strype (iii, 318) from the Cotton Library,

in answer to a haughty mandate from Philip, when he had a mind to marry the lady Elizabeth to the duke of Savoy, against the queen's and princess's inclination: it is written in a most abject manner and a wretched style. Bishop Tanner ascribes to her *A History of her own Life and Death*, and *An Account of Martyrs in her Reign*, but this is manifestly an error. See Homel, *Marie la Sanglante* (Paris, 1862, 8vo); Burnet, *Hist. Ref.* p. 458 sq.; Soames, *Hist. Ref.* vol. iv, ch. i-iv; Perry, *Ch. Hist. of Engl.* iii, 26, 96; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* vi, 1 sq.; Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 369 sq.; Short, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* p. 351–358; Froude, *Hist. of Engl.* vol. v, ch. xxviii, and the whole of vol. vi; Strickland, *Queens of Engl.*; Turner, *Hist. of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth* (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Phila. 1872, 8vo), vol. ii, ch. xliii; Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.* (see Index in vol. iv); Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 240; Fisher (George P.), *The Reformation* (N. Y. 1873, 8vo), p. 327 sq.; *Brit. and For. Review*, 1844, p. 388 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Mary Stuart, the famous queen of Scotland, whose name, Froude (*Hist. of Engl.* vii, 369) says, "will never be spoken of in history without sad and profound emotion, however opinions may vary on the special details of her life," the hope of Rome at an hour of sorest travail, was born at Linlithgow Dec. 8, 1542. She was the third child of king James V of Scotland, by his wife Mary of Lorraine, daughter of the duke of Guise, who had previously borne her husband two sons, both of whom died in infancy. A report prevailed that Mary too was not likely to live; but being unswaddled by her nurse at the desire of her anxious mother, in presence of the English ambassador, the latter wrote to his court that she was as goodly a child as he had seen of her age. At the time of her birth her father lay sick in the palace of Falkland, and in the course of a few days after he expired, at the early age of thirty, his death being hastened by distress of mind occasioned by the defeats which his nobles had sustained at Fala and Solway Moss. James was naturally a person of considerable energy and vigor both of mind and body, but previous to his death he fell into a state of listlessness and despondency, and after his decease it was found that he had made no provision for the care of the infant princess or for the administration of the government. After great animosities among the nobility, it was decreed that the earl of Arran, as being by proximity of blood the next heir to the crown in legitimate descent, and the first peer of Scotland, should be made governor of the kingdom, and guardian of the queen, who remained in the mean time with her mother in the royal palace at Linlithgow. But while the difficulty was settling, the Roman Catholics, fearing for the decline of their power if the choice of the nobility should fall upon some one likely to join hands with Henry VIII, urged cardinal Beatoun, the head of their party, to seize the regency. Ambitious for office and power, Beatoun but too willingly listened to the advice of his friends, and, producing a testament which he asserted to be that of the late king, promptly claimed the control of the affairs of Scotland. The fraud was not long undiscovered, but as great suit had been made by king Henry, in behalf of his son Edward, for the hand of the infant queen, and as Arran and his party had been indiscreet enough to accept the offer in spite of the opposition of the people, Beatoun held his own in the country, and finally even persuaded Arran to his views, and the engagement with England was annulled. The result was a war between Scotland and England, which ended most ignominiously for the Highlanders. It is not at all likely that this war would have broken out between England and Scotland had it not been for the encouragement France gave to the Highlanders. Scotland had thus far remained true to the cause of Rome: a scion of the house of Guise (duke Claude) was on the throne, and the Reformation, though progressing in the adjoining country, had not yet been suffered to make much of an impression on the Scots. But the new doctrine had found an entrance at least. Indeed, the regent Arran was himself favorable to the Reformers, and in Parliament, as early as 1542, an act had been passed declaring it lawful for all to read the Scriptures in their native language. It was clear, therefore, that though Romanism had hitherto sustained its supremacy, its power was tottering. At this critical juncture of affairs France came forward and offered assistance to the Romish party. The cause of the Church must be upheld at all hazards. The result was the establishment of two camps. "The friends of the Reformation," says Russell (*Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland* [Lond. 1834, 2 vols. 18mo], i, 181), "supported those counsels which had for their object the union of the British crowns; while the Romanists very naturally clung to that alliance which, aided by the personal influence of the queen-mother, promised to strengthen the foundations of their establishment, already somewhat shaken by the popular tempest." Had Arran been a person of indomitable will and stability of purpose the cause of the Reformers might now have been firmly established, but he was "a weak and fickle man, liable at all times to be wrought upon and biased by those of greater decision and energy of character," and his opponent, the wily cardinal, had obtained the ascendancy, and not only neutralized Arran's opposition, but actually brought him to approve and further the great master-scheme of the cardinal to give the young queen in marriage to the dauphin of France. In consonance with a treaty for this purpose, Mary was sent to France in 1548, to be educated in that country.

Mary Queen of Scots.

[The numerous portraits ascribed to this princess are as various and dissimilar as the circumstances of her life, and have excited almost as much doubt and controversy as the disputed points of her history, agreeing only in representing her as eminently beautiful. The picture which has furnished the plate before us has been preserved with the greatest care from time immemorial in the mansion of Dalmahoy, the principal seat in Scotland of the earl of Morton. On the upper part of it is inscribed, "Mary Queen of Scots: said to have been painted during her confinement in Lochleven Castle;" and the earl who at present possesses it states that, according to a tradition in his lordship's family, it was once the property of George Douglas, the liberator of Mary, and that it passed from him to his eminent relation, James, fourth earl of Morton, with whose posterity it remains to the present day.]

Soon after her arrival at her destination Mary was placed with the French king's own daughters in one of the first convents of the kingdom, where she made rapid progress in the acquisition of the literature and accomplishment of the age. She received instructions in the art of making verses by the famous Ronsard, and Latin was taught her by the great Scottish scholar Buchanan. When only fourteen years old she had attained to such a mastery of the language that she pronounced before Henry II a Latin oration, in which she maintained that it is becoming for women to study literature and master the liberal arts. Introduced at the court of Henry II, which, as Robertson observes, "was one of the politest but most corrupt in Europe," Mary, while yet a child, became the envy of her sex, surpassing the most accomplished in the elegance and fluency of her language, the grace and liveliness of her movements, and the charm of her whole manner and behavior. "Graceful alike in person and intellect," says Froude, "she possessed that peculiar beauty in which the form is lost in the expression, and which every painter, therefore, has represented differently. Rarely, perhaps, has any woman combined so many noticeable qualities as Mary Stuart: with a feminine insight into men and things and human life, she had cultivated herself to that high perfection in which accomplishments were no longer adventitious ornaments, but were wrought into her organic constitution. . . . She had vigor, energy, tenacity of purpose, with perfect and never-failing self-possession, and, as the one indispensable foundation for the effective use of all other qualities, she had indomitable courage" (*Hist. of England*, vol. vii, ch. iv). The dauphin, to whom she was betrothed, was about two years her junior, but, as they had been playmates in early childhood, a mutual affection had sprung up between them, and when, on April 24, 1558, she was to be joined to him in wedlock, she hesitated not to submit to the most absurd stipulations. Not only was she obliged to agree that her intended husband should have the title of king of the Scots, but she was even betrayed into the signature of a secret deed, by which, if she died childless, both her Scottish realm and her right of succession to the English crown, as the granddaughter of Henry VII, were conveyed to France. The foolishness of this secret compact Mary had afterwards sufficient cause to regret more than once.

Scarce were the nuptial solemnities fairly over, when queen Mary of England died (1558). In accordance with the agreement entered into, France promptly put forward her claims to the vacated throne, and, though Elizabeth was made successor, Mary Stuart's rights were insisted upon, and continued to be urged with great pertinacity by her ambitious uncles the princes of Lorraine. "On every occasion on which the dauphin and dauphiness appeared in public, they were ostentatiously greeted as the king and queen of England; the English arms were engraved upon their plate, embroidered on their banners, and painted on their furniture; and Mary's own favorite device at the time was the two crowns of France and Scotland, with the motto 'Aliaque moratur,' meaning that of England." July 10, 1559, Henry died, and the young dauphin ascended the throne of Charlemagne as Francis II. "Surely," thought Mary, "I am soon to realize my highest expectations. Over three kingdoms I shall sway the sceptre. The holy father himself will come from Rome and pronounce his blessing upon me as his most faithful daughter. The lately-deceased queen of England received her name in honor of the blessed Virgin, I shall be pronounced more worthy of it still." Alas for human frailty. Man proposeth, but God disposeth. Mary had reached the summit of her splendor at a moment when she believed herself only ascending the heights. Feeble and sickly, Francis II was scarcely seated on the throne when he was seized by disease, and, fast wasting away, died Dec. 5, 1560. Only a year and a half had the young pair enjoyed their royal honors. Childless, Mary was obliged to yield her place on the throne, and the reins of power were seized by the queen-mother, Catharine of Medicis, as regent for her son, Charles IX. Mary must have been prepared, under almost any circumstances, to quit a court which was now swayed by one whom, during her brief reign, she had taunted with being "a merchant's daughter." But there were other reasons for her departure from France. Her presence was urgently needed in Scotland, which the death of her mother, a few months before, had left without a government, at a moment when it was convulsed by the throes of the Reformation. Her kinsmen of Lorraine had ambitious projects for her marriage; great schemes were based on her nearness of succession to the English crown; and both these, it was thought, might be more successfully followed out when she was seated on her native throne. The queen of England, however, interposed; and, as Mary would not abandon all claim to the English throne, refused to grant her a free passage. Mary, notwithstanding, resolved to go, and at length, after repeated delays, still lingering on the soil where fortune had augured so much, she reached Calais, attended thus far by the cardinals of Guise and Lorraine, while three other uncles, D'Elboeuf, D'Aumale, and the grand prior, had come to see her safely to Edinburgh. August 14 she finally set sail, "and with 'Adieu, belle France,' sentimental verses, and a passionate châtelar sighing at her feet in melodious music, she sailed away over the summer seas," and, safely escaping the English ships-of-war Elizabeth had despatched to intercept her, reached Leith on the 19th. Her arrival on her native shores is thus beautifully described in *Harper's Magazine*, Feb. 1873, p. 348: "August 19, 1561. The thickest mist and most drenching rain men remembered ever to have seen. A fog so thick that the very cannon in the harbor boom with a muffled sound, and the peal of bells from the Edinburgh churches sounds ominously, as if it rang out the funeral knell of the young queen. Such is the day that greets French Mary when she lands on Scottish shores. Better far for her had not this fog hid her squadron from the watchful eyes of her royal cousin. Better that she had fallen then into the hands of queen Elizabeth than to have become her wretched prisoner seven years later, shorn of that good name which is woman's chief protection—always and everywhere her best 'safe-conduct.'"

A great change had taken place in Scotland since Mary had left her country nearly thirteen years ago. The Roman Catholic religion was then supreme; and, under the direction of cardinal Beatoun, the Romish clergy displayed a fierceness of intolerance which seemed to aim at nothing short of the utter extirpation of every seed of dissent and reform. The same causes, however, which gave strength to the ecclesiastics gave strength also, though more slowly, to the great body of the people; and at length, after the repeated losses of Flodden and Fala, and Solway Moss and Pinkie—which, by the fall of nearly the whole lay nobility and leading men of the kingdom, brought all classes within the influence of public events—the energies, physical and mental, of the entire nation were drawn out, and under the guidance of the reformer Knox expended themselves with the fury of awakened indignation upon the whole fabric of the ancient religion. The queen-regent died June 10, 1560. In August following the estates convened, adopted and approved the Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and, abolishing the Roman Catholic religion, forbade at the same time the administering of the mass or attendance upon it—the penalty for the third offence being death. "On the morning of Aug. 25, 1560," says Burton (iv, 89), "the Romish hierarchy was supreme; in the evening of the same day Calvinistic Protestantism was established in its stead." Hardly a year had passed since these changes had been effected. A strange atmosphere this for Mary, who had been taught in France to abhor Protestant opinions. But, fortunately for Mary, she had enjoyed a training which fitted her well for the part she was now to play. Had she not

spent the most susceptible years of her life in the court of France under those worthy custodians of the conscience — Vasquez, Escobar, Mendoza? These Jesuit fathers had not hesitated to defend by their casuistry, and under color of religion, fraud, forgery, falsehood, and murder. Their teachings, before counteracted by the protests of such believers as Pascal and such *heretics* as Luther, had brought forth their fruit in the assassination of William of Orange and of Coligni, and in the wholesale massacre of St. Bartholomew. Surely it could not be expected that Mary would prove herself unworthy of her birth and her costly education. Indeed, as early as 1558 she had shown herself an apt pupil worthy of her Jesuitical masters. Never a blush of secret shame mantled her maiden cheek when she signed the treaty which the Scotch commissioners brought her for the purpose of guarding the independence of the nation, jealous of foreign interference; never a hint from which diplomats could guess that fifteen days before she had signed away the kingdom to the crown of France, annulling beforehand whatever solemn promise to the contrary she might make to her own most beloved and trusting subjects. So young, so fair, and yet so false, was Mary queen of Scots. "The enthusiastic admirers and apologists of Mary maintain that she was sincerely in favor of toleration. They would make her a kind of apostle of religious liberty. It is an unreasonable stretch of charity, however, to suppose that she would not . . . have rejoiced in the restoration, and, had it been feasible, the forcible restoration of the old religion. . . . That she should 'serve the time and still commode herself discreetly and gently with her own subjects,' and 'in effect repose most on them of the Reformed religion,' was the policy which had been sketched for her in France, as we learn from her faithful friend, Sir James Melville" (Fisher, *Reform.* p. 858, 859). But Mary was wise enough to comprehend that the situation was such that any active opposition to the newly-established religion would be futile and disastrous to herself, and she accommodated herself to the circumstances. Yet even this she did only moderately. Her letters to pope Pius IV and to her uncle, the cardinal of Lorraine, in 1563, plainly reveal the secret working of her desire to restore the old religious system to supremacy as soon as practicable. With this purpose in view she refused to grant her assent to the acts of Parliament which established the new religion as the faith of the nation; while she herself failed not to seize every opportunity to prove her attachment to Romanism. The very first Sunday after her arrival Mary commanded a solemn mass to be celebrated in the chapel of the palace; and, as might have been expected, an uproar ensued, the servants of the chapel were insulted and abused, and had not some of the lay nobility of the Protestant party interposed, the riot might have become general. The next Sunday Knox preached a violent sermon against idolatry, and in his discourse he took occasion to say that a single mass was, in his estimation, more to be feared than ten thousand armed men. Upon this, Mary sent for the Reformer, desiring to have an interview with him. The interview took place, as well as one or two subsequent ones from a like cause; but the only result was to make plainer the fact that she was at variance with the newly-established religious power of her country. Her youth, however, her beauty and accomplishments, and her affability, interested many in her favor; she had, moreover, from the first continued the government in the hands of the Protestants. The principal direction of affairs she had left in the hands of her half-brother, the earl of Murray (q. v.), the leader of the Protestant nobles, and she had made William Maitland, of Lethington, another great Protestant leader, one of her most trusted advisers. The government in the hands of worthy leaders, the court sacredly promised to the unimpaired preservation of the Reformed faith and worship, no Protestant felt inclined to ask more; and there were but few to complain when Mary only demanded for herself the same privilege which she accorded to her subjects— "that of worshipping God according to her own creed." "So the nation rested in tolerable peace, trusting in Murray rather than in Mary, and suffering her mass, though always under protest, so long as she suffered herself to be guided by his counsels. But of this kind of compromise the holy Mother Church is always impatient. Although there was no papal legate at the court of Edinburgh, Rome did not lack for envoys—shrewd ones, too. Of these the chief was an Italian, David Rizzio (q. v.). He entered her service as a musician soon after she went to Scotland; was promoted to the office of valet de chambre; became her private secretary; conducted all her private and secret correspondence; became eventually the power behind the throne greater than the throne itself, usurping the very government. Chief we have called him, yet he was not alone. The court of Scotland had her representatives in foreign courts, as befitted her dignity; but her true representatives were unknown to courtly fame—Chesein in France, Yaxley in the Netherlands, Ranlet in the Low Countries. So there was an outer and inner court. My lord James, earl of Murray, was, indeed, the queen's prime minister; but this unknown adventurer from Piedmont—unknown because he succeeded best while he hid his office, as his designs—was virtually her secretary for foreign affairs, and her most confidential adviser. The earl of Murray must be dismissed. No easy task, surely, but one that art can accomplish. Who so fitting to come between sister and brother as a husband? Queen Mary shall be married. It is time she laid off her widow's weeds. And who so fitting a spouse as my lord Darnley—the only one who, when Elizabeth dies, can compete with Mary for the throne of England? So my lord Darnley and Mary queen of Scots are brought together. They meet in Wemyss Castle, by the Firth of Forth. It is a clear case of 'love at first sight.' Royal husbands not a few have been proposed for Mary's hand, but nothing more is heard of them. 'He is the handsomest and best-proportioned long man,' says Mary, 'I have ever seen.' Everything goes as Rizzio and the papal court would have it. The Protestant interest takes fire, for Darnley is a Catholic. It is not less furious in England than in Scotland, for the nation has little hope now that queen Elizabeth will ever take a husband, and in the absence of her heirs the throne of the united kingdom will fall into the hands of this Catholic couple. . . . Queen Elizabeth, who has been playing fast and loose, with fair promises and fickle performance, finds herself no match for the cunning Italian. Her own kingdom is threatened with faction; and rumors of Catholic rebellion, to unseat her and place her rival and cousin on the empty throne, fill the court and the nation with perplexity. She indignantly summons Darnley back again, and gets for answer that 'he has no mind to return.' 'I find myself,' he says, shortly and almost contemptuously, 'very well where I am, and so I purpose to keep me.' My lord Murray sees the end of all this from the beginning. Neither Mary's tears nor Mary's threats, and she uses both with a woman's consummate skill, can wring from him an approval of the marriage. But all his affectionately-earnest protests are powerless to hinder it. Opposition is only fuel to the flame. Marry she will, though all the world opposes. Love, blind as it always is said to be, for the ignoble Darnley, revenge on Elizabeth, whom Mary cordially hates, and who hates her as cordially, and ambition—the ambition to make good her claim to the English throne, which since she was a girl eighteen years old she has never ceased to nourish—all push her on to this destructive marriage. And Mephistopheles is at her side to remove every obstacle and clear the way. It is Rizzio who arranges for the first meeting between Mary and Darnley. It is Rizzio who affects such liking for the young lord that he shares his bed with him. It is Rizzio who promises to secure the pope's dispensation—for Mary and Darnley are cousins. It is Rizzio, who, while negotiations are still pending

and the envoy is yet on his way to the court of Rome, fits up a private room in the palace, where the marriage-ceremony, which the Church pronounces void, is clandestinely performed. For the papal benediction is needed, it appears, not to hallow the marriage-tie, but only to give it respectability before the public. Elizabeth might as well spare her diplomacy, since all is virtually settled. Rizzio has not exceeded his instructions. There are no delays at the court of Rome. Fast as wind and wave can carry him comes back the messenger with the promised dispensation. The marriage, already performed in secret, is repeated in public. It takes place on June 29, 1565. Queen Mary, as though some secret consciousness hung over her of the sorrows on which she is entering, wears at the marriage-altar her mourning dress of black velvet. It is a gloomy ceremony. When the herald proclaims in the streets of Edinburgh that Henry, earl of Ross and Albany, is hereafter king of Scotland, the crowd receive the proclamation in sullen silence. Even the money distributed in profusion among them awakens no enthusiasm. Only one voice cries, 'God save his Grace.' It is the voice of Darnley's father. My lord the earl of Murray has tried dissuasion. It has failed. He has tried wile against wile, has planned to abduct lord Darnley and send him back to the queen of England. But the rough Scotchman is no match in craft for the cunning Italian. This fruitless conspiracy has only incensed the queen against him. His honest portraiture of the poor fool with whom queen Mary is so infatuated has awakened all her womanly indignation. The court is no longer safe. Rumors are rife of plans for his assassination. True or false, they are probable enough to make him avoid Rizzio and Darnley. The queen summons him to court, and offers him a safe-conduct. But Protestants have learned to look with suspicion on safe-conducts proffered by Roman Catholic princes. Murray is conveniently sick, and cannot come. Sentence of outlawry is pronounced against him. All the hate of a hot woman's heart is aroused; 'hatred the more malignant because it was unnatural.' Revenge is sweeter than ambition. 'I would rather lose my crown than not be revenged upon him,' she is heard to say. He calls to arms. The interest of the Protestant religion is his battle-cry. But there are few responses. He despatches messengers to queen Elizabeth for the help she has long since promised. She hesitates, delays, falters. Mary knows no delay. She takes the field in person. Lord Darnley rides at her side. He is clad in gilt armor, she in steel bonnet and corslet, with pistols at her saddle-bow and pistols in her hand. In August the standard of rebellion was raised. In October Murray and his few retainers are flying across the border into England (Burton, ix, 286). Mephistopheles no longer conceals his purpose. Mass is no longer confined to the queen's private chapel. The retainers of Darnley's father go openly to the Catholic service. The General Assembly have passed a resolution that the sovereign is not exempt from the law of the land, and that the Reformed service take the place of the mass in the royal chapel. This is Rizzio's answer to their demand. Negotiations are opened with pope Pius V and Philip of Spain. One promises soldiers, twelve thousand men; the other sends money, twenty thousand crowns. The Catholic powers of Europe have at length settled their political controversies, and joined in a secret league for the extirpation of heresy by fire and sword; a league of which that Alva was the founder whose estimate of Protestantism was summed up in the epigrammatic saying, 'One salmon is worth a multitude of frogs;' a league of which the outcome was the Inquisition in Holland, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France. That Mary was in hearty sympathy with this league is undoubted; that she was actually a party to it is both asserted and denied by men behind the scenes who had every opportunity to know. That a vigorous attempt was to be made to re-establish the Catholic faith and worship is certain. Her most Catholic majesty assures her subjects that in any event the religion of the realm shall not be interfered with. At the same time she writes to Pius V to congratulate him on the victories already gained, and to inspire him with hopes of victories yet to come: 'With the help of God and his holiness,' she says, 'she will yet leap over the wall'" (*Harper's Magazine*, 1873, Feb., p. 352, 353). "To this fatal resolution," says Robertson (*History of Scotland*), "may be imputed all the subsequent calamities of Mary's life." Many of the Protestant lords who had hitherto supported the queen now took fright lest they should suffer the fate of the adherents of the Protestant religion under Mary of England. The bloody deeds of that foul woman were yet fresh in the minds of all. What was there to hinder Mary Stuart from uprooting heresy in her dominions, with her hands stayed by all the other Romish powers of Europe? Moved by such fears, several of the Scotch nobles, whose covetousness had had more to do with their interest in the new religion than their soul's salvation (Fisher, p. 351-353), determined to strike boldly against the throne. Mary, however, was not now the ruler of Scotland. She was only called so. Upon the throne sat the Italian singer. When Mary was married to Darnley she had promised him an equal share in the royal authority, and accordingly the public papers and the public coin were issued in the name of Henry and Mary. But Darnley had not proved the right husband for her, and ere long she manifested her disappointment by placing her name first. Gradually the place lost by the husband is occupied by the Italian adventurer. The public seal is given to Rizzio, and with his own hand he signs and stamps the official papers for the king. There is no access to Mary but through Rizzio: he who would gain the ear of the one must buy the favor of the other. "He had the control," says Froude, "of all the business of the state." The king himself finds the door barred—David admitted, himself shut out. Whispers such as no true woman can afford to suffer circulate freely, and Mary suffers them; ugly stories, aptly illustrated by the saying of a later day, that "King James the Sixth's title to be called the modern Solomon was, doubtless, that he was the son of David, who performed upon the harp." History does not justify these scandals. Neither can it justify the queen who suffered them. David Rizzio was not a man to entertain passion or to inspire it. His power over Mary was not that which love gives. It was that of a Jesuit father over an obedient child. To Mary, Rizzio was the pope, whose benediction he carried with him, whose secret envoy he was. But no husband in such an issue is apt to weigh *pros* and *cons* nicely, least of all such a man as Darnley. "Handsome long man" he may have been, but he carried all his merits in his face and figure. Intriguing nobles easily played the part of Iago to one who was in heart anything but an Othello. A jealous husband and an unscrupulous nobility were not slow to make common cause; and so the death of the queen's favorite was determined, and accordingly Rizzio fell a prey to both Darnley and the nobles, March 9, 1566. The assassins, of course, suffered their merited punishment. High in position and power, they were not given to the hangman, but an ever-watchful Providence meted out to all their merited award. (The charge formerly made by some [e. g. Tytler] that Knox and the Reformed clergy were privy to this scheme to murder Rizzio has been so thoroughly exploded that it is hardly necessary for us even to allude to it here. Those who wish to examine particularly are referred to M'Crie, *Sketches of Scottish Ch. Hist.*, and Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland*, i, 124, 402 sq.) It was an aggravation of the murder of Rizzio that it was committed, if not in the queen's presence, at least within a few yards of her person, only three months before she gave birth (June 19, 1566) to the prince who became king James VI. As that event drew near, the queen's affection for her husband, who had unblushingly declaimed against all part in the conspiracy, seemed to revive; but the change

was only momentary; and before the boy's baptism, in December, her estrangement from the king was greater than ever. Divorce was openly discussed in her presence, and even darker designs were obscurely hinted at among her friends. The king, on his part, spoke of leaving the country; but before his preparations were completed, he fell ill of the small-pox at Glasgow. This was about Jan. 9, 1567. On the 25th Mary went to see him, and, travelling by easy stages, brought him to Edinburgh on the 31st. He was lodged in a small mansion beside the Kirk of the Field, nearly on the spot where the south-east corner of the University now stands. There Mary visited him daily, and slept for two nights in a room below his bedchamber. She passed the evening of Sunday, Feb. 9, by his bedside, talking cheerfully and affectionately with him, although she is said to have dropped one remark which gave him uneasy forebodings —that it was much about that time twelvemonth that Rizzio was murdered. She left him between ten and eleven o'clock to take part in a mask at Holyrood, at the marriage of a favorite valet. The festivities had not long ceased in the palace when, about two hours after midnight, the house in which the king slept was blown up by gunpowder, and in the neighboring garden was found the lifeless body of him to whom Mary, on the assassination of Rizzio, had spoken these ominous words: "I shall never rest till I give you as sorrowful heart as I have at this present."

The chief actor in this tragedy was undoubtedly James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell, a needy, reckless, vainglorious, profligate noble, who, since Murray's revolt, and still more since Rizzio's murder, had enjoyed a large share of the queen's favor. But there were suspicions that the queen herself was not wholly ignorant of the plot, and these suspicions could not but be strengthened by what followed. On the 12th of April, Bothwell was brought to a mock-trial and acquitted; on the 24th, he intercepted the queen on her way from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, and carried her, with scarcely a show of resistance, to Dunbar. On the 7th of May, he was divorced from the young and comely wife whom he had married little more than a twelvemonth before; on the 12th, Mary publicly pardoned his seizure of her person, and created him duke of Orkney; and on the 15th—only three months after her husband's murder—she married the man whom every one regarded as his murderer, married while the stain of her husband's blood was still upon him. "Surely this is carrying quite too far the 'indulgent temper' for which her eulogist (Meline, p. 124) praises her so highly." Impelled by a just and burning indignation, her subjects rose in rebellion, led by nobles of both the Protestant and Romish factions. Surrounded at Borthwick Castle, Bothwell escaped under cover of the night, Mary following him dressed in male attire. They hastily gathered the Royalists about them, but such a cause enlisted few followers. Yet the few were mustered, and, however sparse in number, Mary hesitated not to brave the storm; she even dared to enter the lists against her opponents, but on the field of Carberry (June 15) the army melted away in sight of the enemy, and no alternative was left to her but to abandon Bothwell, and surrender herself to the confederate lords. She was now escorted by the nobles as a prisoner to Edinburgh, where the insults of the rabble and grief at parting with Bothwell threw her into such a frenzy that she refused all nourishment, and, rushing to the window of the room in which she was kept prisoner, called for help, and showed herself to the people half naked, with her hair hanging about her ears. From Edinburgh she was hurried to Loch Leven, where, on the 24th of July, she was prevailed upon to sign an act of abdication in favor of her son, who, five days afterwards, was crowned at Stirling [see JAMES I]; while to her brother Murray was intrusted the government during the minority of her successor on the throne. Barred windows and iron doors proved no confinement to Mary. She soon found ways to communicate with the world, and made even the very prison-keeper her friend and confidant. May 2, 1568, she finally succeeded in making her escape from the island-prison, and once more she made a call to arms, this time to enter the lists life for life. An army gathered, and in a few days she found herself at the head of 6000 men. Elizabeth of England, whose great political maxim was "that the head should not be subject to the foot," would gladly have extended aid to Mary had she not feared the power of the perspicacious and firm leader of the Protestants who had imprisoned Mary—her own half-brother, Murray. On the 12th of May it finally came to a battle between the Royalists and the insurgents at Langside, near Glasgow. Mary was completely routed, and obliged to flee the kingdom. She entered England, and threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth. The queen of England, however, had always had cause to fear the presence of her rival on English ground. Mary had never yet renounced her claim to the crown which Elizabeth wore. Moreover, "Mary Stuart was the centre of the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England and of Elizabeth. Their plots looked to the elevation of Mary to the throne which Elizabeth filled" (Fisher, p. 382). Political ambition and religious fanaticism controlled both parties, and should the stronger yield to the weaker? Mary had come hoping to secure her cousin's sympathy and aid. But that cousin feared for her own life and the security of her throne, and therefore persistently denied the ardent and persevering solicitations of Mary for an interview, on the agreeable pretence that she should first clear herself of the crime imputed to her. A criminal, then, she was made a prisoner, and, after an immense amount of deceptive diplomacy, a commission was appointed, nominally to investigate the charges of Mary against her rebellious lords, really to investigate the charges of the lords against their queen. Before this commission Murray represented the Scottish government. At first he laid the guilt of the murder on Bothwell alone, and defended the insurrection only as one against the infamous, ambitious, and tyrannical earl. But as the trial proceeded he changed his ground. He hesitated, procrastinated, faltered. At length he openly charged his sister with the murder of her husband; and he produced, in confirmation of this charge, the since famous "casket letters." Of their discovery he told this story: The earl of Bothwell—so said lord Murray, and so said the lords he represented—fleeing from Edinburgh, sent back a confidential messenger to the castle to bring thence a silver casket from a certain drawer. James Balfour—that Balfour who drew the deed for Darnley's murder—had received the captaincy of the castle as the price of his crime. He delivered the casket; he at the same time sent the lords a hint of the fact. The messenger was intercepted and the casket seized. This casket, with its contents, was the witness Murray produced before the English commission against the Scottish queen. Its contents were eight letters and twelve sonnets, written in French, apparently in Mary's handwriting. Among the commissioners were more than one of Mary's friends, one of them that duke of Norfolk who subsequently attested the strength of his attachment by the sacrifice of his life: if these letters were a forgery, they were not so declared by them. Of these letters one gave a full account of Mary's interview with Darnley at Glasgow; of his unsuspicious confidence; of her own mournful sense of shame and guilt. Another advised the earl when and where to abduct her, and cautioned him to come with force sufficient to overcome all resistance. All breathed the language of passionate devotion, with here and there a flash of fierce jealousy. They were true to nature, but to a lost, though not a shameless one. Their language was that of a once noble but now ruined woman unveiling her heart's secrets in unsuspecting confidence. If forged, the forger was a consummate master of his art. True or false, they were equally remarkable as contributions to the language of passion. Mary denounced them as forgeries. She de-

manded to see the originals. Elizabeth granted the reasonableness of the demand, but never complied with it. She demanded to face her accusers. Elizabeth half promised that she should do so, but never fulfilled the pledge. The commission broke up without a verdict. Elizabeth had no interest to press for either acquittal or conviction. Murray was glad to return to his regency. Mary alone had any reason to demand the completion of the investigation, but Mary was a prisoner, and her access to the public not the most easy. Though inconclusive, the trial had revealed enough to strengthen the worst suspicions of the Scottish people, and no one thought of finding fault with Elizabeth for retaining Mary a prisoner. For nineteen years Mary Stuart thus passed life. "For nineteen years both captive and captor are made miserable by plots and counterplots; and whether Mary in prison or Mary at large is the more dangerous to the security of Protestant England is a question so hard to decide that Elizabeth never fairly attempts to determine it. At length a plot is uncovered more deadly than any that has preceded. Half a score of assassins band themselves together to attempt Elizabeth's life, and to put Catholic Mary on the vacant throne. The blessing of the pope is pronounced upon the enterprise. The Catholic powers of Europe stand ready to welcome its consummation. Mary gives it her cordial approbation. 'The hour of deliverance,' she writes exultingly, 'is at hand.' But plots breed counterplots. In all the diplomatic service of Europe there is no so ingenious spy as Walsingham, Elizabeth's prime minister. Every letter of Mary's is opened and copied by his agents before sent to its destination. The conspiracy is allowed to ripen. Then, when all is ready for consummation, the leaders are arrested, the plot is brought to the light of day. Mary, with all her faults, never knew fear; no craven heart was hers. The more dangerous was she because so brave. She battles for her life with a heroism well worthy a nobler nature—battles to the last, though there be no hope. She receives the sentence of death with the calmness of true courage, not of despair. With all her treachery, never recreant to her faith—never but once, when her infatuated love of Bothwell swerved her from it for a few short weeks—she clings to her crucifix till the very hour of death. Almost her last words are words of courage to her friends. 'Weep not,' she says; 'I have promised for you.' Her very last are a psalm from her Prayer-book—'In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust.' And then she lays her head upon the block as peacefully as ever she laid it upon her pillow. No 'grizzled, wrinkled old woman,' but in the full bloom of ripened womanhood—forty-five, no more—Mary Stuart pays on the scaffold at Fotheringay [whither she had been removed for trial of conspiracy from Charpley in September, 1586] the penalty of her treachery at Edinburgh, May 8, 1587. The spirit of the stern old Puritans is satisfied, and the prophecy of the Good Book receives a new and pregnant illustration—'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.'" Five months after the execution her body was buried with great pomp at Peterborough, whence, in 1612, it was removed to king Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster, where it still lies in a sumptuous tomb erected by king James VI.

"Whoever has attended but little to the phenomena of human nature has discovered how inadequate is the clearest insight which he can hope to attain into character and disposition. Every one is a perplexity to himself and a perplexity to his neighbors; and men who are born in the same generation, who are exposed to the same influences, trained by the same teachers, and live from childhood to age in constant and familiar intercourse, are often little more than shadows to each other, intelligible in superficial form and outline, but divided inwardly by impalpable and mysterious barriers." Thus Froude opens the fourth volume of his *History of England*, when about to pass in review the affairs of Scotland and Ireland in the 16th century. Yet, when this same writer comes to speak of Mary Stuart, he "writes almost as a public prosecutor of the Scottish queen, and sometimes sacrifices historical accuracy to dramatic effect." The truth is that the character of Mary was long one of the most fiercely-vexed questions of history, and is still in debate; hence the difficulties which beset any attempt to tell correctly the story of her career, or analyze aright her character. The student of history finds no impartial witnesses; few in her own time who are not ready to tell and to believe about her the most barefaced lies which will promote their own party. During her life she was calumniated and eulogized with equal audacity. Since her death the same curiously-contradictory estimates of her character have been vigorously maintained—by those, too, who have not their judgment impaired by the prejudices which environed her. On the one hand, we are assured that she was "the most amiable of women;" "the upright queen, the noble and true woman, the faithful spouse and affectionate mother;" "the poor martyred queen;" "the helpless victim of fraud and force;" an "illustrious victim of state-craft," whose "kindly spirit in prosperity and matchless heroism in misfortune" award her "the most prominent place in the annals of her sex." On the other, we are assured, by men equally competent to judge, that she was "a spoiled beauty;" "the heroine of an adulterous melodrama;" "the victim of a blind, imperious passion;" an "apt scholar" in "the profound dissimulation of that school of which Catharine de' Medici was the chief instructor;" "a bad woman, disguised in the livery of a martyr," having "a proud heart, a crafty wit, and indurate mind against God and his truth;" "a bold, unscrupulous, ambitious woman," with "the panther's nature—graceful, beautiful, malignant, untamable." The great preponderance of authority, however, seems now to be on the side of those who believe in her criminal love for Bothwell and her guilty knowledge of his conspiracy against her husband's life. The question of her guilt as to the murder of her husband does certainly not rest on the authenticity of the "casket letters," however much these may be matter of historical interest. "Evidence which her own day deemed clear," says the writer in *Harper* whom we had occasion to quote before, "history deems uncertain. Circumstances which, isolated, only created a widespread suspicion in her own times, put together by history, form a net-work of evidence clear and conclusive. A wife learns to loathe her husband; utters her passionate hate in terms that are unmistakable; is reconciled to him for a purpose; casts him off when that purpose is accomplished; makes no secret of her desire for a divorce; listens with but cold rebuke to intimations of his assassination; dallies while he languishes upon a sick-bed so long as death is near; hastens to him only when he is convalescent; becomes, in seeming, reconciled to him; by her blandishments allays his terror and arrests his flight, which nothing else could arrest; brings him with her to the house chosen by the assassins for his tomb—a house which has absolutely nothing else to recommend it but its singular adaptation to the deed of cruelty to be wrought there; remains with him till within two hours of his murder; hears with unconcern the story of his tragic end, which thrills all other hearts with horror; makes no effort to bring the perpetrators of the crime to punishment; rewards the suspected with places and pensions, and the chief criminal with her hand in marriage while the blood is still wet on his. That the world should be asked to believe her the innocent victim of a diabolical conspiracy affords a singular illustration of the effrontery of the Church which claims her for a martyr. That half the world should have acquiesced in the claim affords an illustration no less singular of the credulity of mankind when sentiments and sympathies are called on to render the judgment which the reason alone is qualified to render."

The genuineness of the "casket letters" is maintained by the historians Hume, Robertson, Laing, Burton,

Mackintosh, Mignet, Ranke, and Froude. The most acute writer on the other side of the question is Hosack, an Edinburgh barrister, but he "writes in such a vein as would befit him were he indeed earning a lawyer's fee by a lawyer's service." One of the latest writers on the ecclesiastical history of this period, Prof. Fisher (p. 376), of Yale College, thus comments on the question at issue: "No candid critic can deny, whatever may be his final verdict, that the letters contain many internal marks of genuineness which it would be exceedingly difficult for a counterfeiter to invent, and that the scrutiny to which they were subjected in the Scottish Parliament, the Scottish privy council, and the English privy council, was such that, if they were forged, it is hard to account for the failure to detect the imposture. Moreover, the character of Murray, although it may be admitted that he was not the immaculate person that he is sometimes considered to have been, must have been black indeed if these documents, which he brought forward to prove the guilt of his sister, were forged; but Murray is praised not only by his personal adherents and by his party, but by men like Spottiswoode and Melville (Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, ii, 121)." Yet, however writers may differ about her moral conduct, they agree very well as to the variety of her accomplishments. She wrote poems on various occasions, in the Latin, Italian, French, and Scotch languages; "Royal advice to her son," in two books, the consolation of her long imprisonment. A great number of her original letters are preserved in the king of France's library, in the Royal, Cottonian, and Ashmolean libraries. We have in print eleven to the earl of Bothwell, translated from the French by Edward Simmonds, of Christ-church, Oxford, and printed at Westminster in 1726. There are ten more, with her answers to the articles against her, in "Haynes's State-papers;" six more in "Anderson's Collections;" another in the "Appendix" to her life by Dr. Jebb; and some others dispersed among the works of Pius V, Buchanan, Camden, Udall, and Sanderson.

To enumerate all that has been written on Mary would fill a volume. Among the chief works are S. Jebb, *De Vita et Rebus Gestis Mariæ Scotorum Reginæ* (Lond. 1725, 2 vols. fol.); J. Anderson, *Collections relating to the History of Mary, Queen of Scotland* (Lond. 1727–28, 4 vols. 4to); Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, vol. iv; Bishop Keith, *Hist. of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland* (Edinb. 1734, fol.; 1844–50, 3 vols. 8vo); W. Goodall, *Examination of the Letters said to be written by Mary, Queen of Scots, to James, Earl of Bothwell* (Edinb. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo); Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland;* W. Tytler, *Inquiry into the Evidence against Mary, Queen of Scots* (Edinb. 1759, 8vo; Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo); Laing, *Hist. of Scotland;* Chalmers, *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots* (Lond. 1818, 2 vols. 4to; 1822, 3 vols. 8vo); Schütz, *Leben Maria Stuarts* (1839); P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland;* Prince Labanoff, *Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart* (Lond. 1844, 7 vols. 8vo); David Laing, edition of John Knox's *Hist. of the Reformation* (Edinb. 1846–48, 2 vols. 8vo); M. Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Ecosse* (Par. 1851–60, 3 vols. 4to; 1862, 5 vols. 8vo); Miss Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of Scotland* (Edinb. 1850–59, 8 vols. 8vo); M. Mignet, *Histoire de Marie Stuart* (Par. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); A. de Montaiglon, *Latin Themes of Mary Stuart* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Prince Labanoff, *Notice sur la Collection des Portraits de Marie Stuart* (St. Petersb. 1856); M. Cheruel, *Marie Stuart et Catherine de Medicis* (Par. 1858, 8vo); M. Teulet, *Lettres de Marie Stuart* (Par. 1859, 8vo); Joseph Robertson, *Catalogues of the Jewels, Dresses, Furniture, Books, and Paintings of Mary, Queen of Scots* (Edinb. 1863, 4to); Hosack, *Mary, Queen of Scots and her Accusers* (2d ed. Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Meline, *Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest English Historian* (N. Y. 1872, 8vo), a polemic against Froude, assails the English historian very bitterly, and shows him to be inaccurate in some minor details; but Meline's own "intense partisanship unfits him for the office of a critic, and he entirely fails in his narrative." (J. H. W.)

Masaccio, called Maso da San Giovanni, one of the earliest and the most celebrated of the Italian painters of the second or middle age of modern painting, the unquestioned founder of the Florentine school, was born at San Giovanni, in Val d'Arno, in the year 1401. He was a disciple of Masolino da Panicale, to whom he proved as much superior as his master was to all his contemporaries. He had great readiness of invention, with unusual truth and elegance of design. He made nature his constant study; and he gave in his works examples of that beauty which arises from a judicious and pleasing choice of attitudes, accompanied with spirit, boldness, and relief. He was the first who studied to give more dignity to his draperies, by designing them with greater breadth and fulness, and omitting the multitude of small folds. He was also the first who endeavored to adapt the color of his draperies to the tints of his carnations, so that they might harmonize with each other. Masaccio was remarkably well skilled in perspective, which he was taught by Brunelleschi. His works procured him great reputation, but excited the envy of his competitors. He is supposed to have been poisoned, and died about 1443. Fuseli says of him: "Masaccio was a genius, and the head of an epoch in the art. He may be considered as the precursor of Raphael, who imitated his principles, and sometimes transcribed his figures." His most perfect works are the frescoes of St. Pietro del Carmine at Florence, "where vigor of conception, truth and vivacity of expression, correctness of design, and breadth of manner are supported by a most surprising harmony of color;" and the picture of *Christ curing the Dæmoniacs*. The "Arundel Society" has lately published these frescoes in a series of superior chromo-lithographs. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Mrs. Jameson, *Memoirs of Early Italian Painters*.

Masăda (Μασάδα), a very strong fortress not far south of Engedi (Josephus, *War; Ant.* i, 12, 1), on the west of the Dead Sea (Pliny, v, 17), in a volcanic region (Strabo, xvi, p. 764), minutely described by Josephus in various places, especially in the account of its final tragedy (*War*, vii, 8). It was built by Jonathan Maccabæus on an almost inaccessible rock, and was probably one of his "strongholds in Judæa" (1 Macc. xii, 35), as it had possibly been in earlier times a refuge of David (1 Sam. xxiii, 14, 29; comp. 2 Sam. v, 17). It was much enlarged and strengthened by Herod the Great, who placed Mariamne here for safety when he was driven from Jerusalem by Antigonus (Josephus, *War*, i, 13, 7). It resisted, at that time, the attack by the Parthians (*ib.* 15, 3), but was afterwards taken from the Romans through treachery by Judas the Galilæan (*ib.* 17, 2). It was the last stronghold of the Jews in the final struggle with the Romans under Flavius Silva, who took it by assault, the garrison, in their desperation, having immolated themselves (*ut sup.*). The site was conjectured by Dr. Eli Smith to be that of the modern *Sebbeh* (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 24); which has been abundantly confirmed by later travellers, who have attested the prodigious strength of the place, and its exact agreement with the description of Josephus (Traill's *Josephus*, ii, 109 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 62 sq.; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 97 sq.; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 293 sq.).

The description of Josephus, in whose histories Masada plays a conspicuous part, is as follows: A lofty rock of considerable extent, surrounded on all sides by precipitous valleys of frightful depth, afforded difficult access only in two parts—one on the east, towards the Lake Asphaltis, by a zigzag path, scarcely practicable, and extremely dangerous, called "the Serpent," from its sinuosities; the other more easy, towards the west, on which side the isolated rock was more nearly approached by the hills. The summit of the rock was not pointed, but a plain of 7 stadia in circumference, surrounded by a wall of white stone, 12 cubits high and

The Rock of Masada.

8 cubits thick, fortified with 37 towers of 50 cubits in height. The wall was joined within by large buildings connected with the towers, designed for barracks and magazines for the enormous stores and munitions of war which were laid up in this fortress. The remainder of the area, not occupied by buildings, was arable, the soil being richer and more genial than that of the plain below; and a further provision was thus made for the garrison in case of a failure of supplies from without. The rain-water was preserved in large cisterns excavated in the solid rock. A palace, on a grand scale, occupied the north-west ascent, on a lower level than the fortress, but connected with it by covered passages cut in the rock. This was adorned within with porticoes and baths, supported by monolithic columns; the walls and floors were covered with tessellated work. At the distance of 1000 cubits from the fortress, a massive tower guarded the western approach at its narrowest and most difficult point, and thus completed the artificial defences of this most remarkable site, which nature had rendered almost impregnable. In attacking the fortress, the first act of the Roman general was to surround the fortress with a wall, to prevent the escape of the garrison. Having distributed sentries along this line of circumvallation, he pitched his own camp on the west, where the rock was most nearly approached by the mountains, and was therefore more open to assault; for the difficulty of procuring provisions and water for his soldiers did not allow him to attempt a protracted blockade, which the enormous stores of provisions and water still found there by Eleazar would have enabled the garrison better to endure. Behind the tower which guarded the ascent was a prominent rock of considerable size and height, though 300 cubits lower than the wall of the fortress, called the White Cliff. On this a bank of 200 cubits' height was raised, which formed a base for a platform (*βῆμα*) of solid masonry, 50 cubits in width and height, and on this was placed a tower similar in construction to those invented and employed in sieges by Vespasian and Titus, covered with plates of iron, which reached an additional 60 cubits, so as to dominate the wall of the castle, which was quickly cleared of its defenders by the showers of missiles discharged from the scorpions and balistæ. The outer wall soon yielded to the ram, when an inner wall was discovered to have been constructed by the garrison—a framework of timber filled with soil, which became more solid and compact by the concussions of the ram. This, however, was speedily fired. The assault was fixed for the morrow, when the garrison anticipated the swords of the Romans by one of the most cold-blooded and atrocious massacres on record. At the instigation of Eleazar, they first slew every man his wife and children; then, having collected the property into one heap, and destroyed it all by fire, they cast lots for ten men, who should act as executioners of the others while they lay in the embrace of their slaughtered families. One was then selected by lot to slay the other nine survivors; and he at last, having set fire to the palace, with a desperate effort drove his sword completely through his own body, and so perished. The total number, including women and children, was 960. An old woman, with a female relative of Eleazar, and five children, who had contrived to conceal themselves in the reservoirs while the massacre was being perpetrated, survived, and narrated these facts to the astonished Romans when they entered the fortress the following morning, and had ocular demonstration of the frightful tragedy. On the present ruined site the ground-plan of the storehouses and barracks can still be traced in the foundations of the buildings on the summit, and the cisterns, excavated in the natural rock, are of enormous dimensions. One is mentioned as nearly 50 feet deep, 100 long, and 45 broad. The foundations of a round tower, 40 or 50 feet below the northern summit, may have been connected with the palace, and the windows cut in the rock near by, which Mr. Woolcot conjectures to have belonged to some large cistern, now covered up, may possibly have lighted the rock-hewn gallery by which the palace communicated with the fortress. From the summit of the rock every part of the wall of circumvallation could be traced, carried along the low ground, and, wherever it met a precipice, commencing again on the high summit above, thus making the entire circuit of the place. Connected with it, at intervals, were the walls of the Roman camps, opposite the north-west and south-east corners, the former being the spot where Josephus places that of the Roman general. A third may be traced on the level near the shore. The outline of the works, as seen from the heights above, is as complete as if they had been but recently abandoned. The Roman wall is six feet broad, built, like the fortress walls and buildings above, with rough stones laid loosely together, and the interstices filled in with small pieces of stone. The wall is half a mile or more distant from the rock, so as to be without range of the stones discharged by the garrison. No water was to be found in the neighborhood but such as the recent rains had left in the hollows of the rocks, confirming the remark of Josephus that water, as well as food, was brought thither to the Roman army from a distance. Its position is exactly opposite to the peninsula that runs into the Dead Sea from its eastern shore, towards its southern extremity. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.

Mas'aloth (Μαισαλώθ v. r. Μεσσαλώθ), *e*, place

in Arbela, which Bacchides and Alcimus besieged and captured on their way from Gilgal to Judæa (1 Macc. ix, 2). Josephus, in his parallel account, omits the name (*Ant.* xii, 11, 1); but a trace of the name is thought by Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 398) to be found in the "steps" (מַסְּלוֹת, *mesilloth'*) or *terraces* (as in 2 Chron. ix, 11), in connection with the remarkable caverns besieged by Herod near Arbela (Josephus, *War*, i, 16, 4), now Kulat ibn-Maon. See ARBELA.

Masaupasa, a famous fast among the East Indian pagans. The name is derived from *masa*, which, in the Malabarian language, signifies a mouth, and *upada* a fast. It is the most sacred of all their fasts, and begins with the last day of October. Such as keep the fast, having first washed and dressed themselves very clean, repair to the pagoda or temple of the god Vistnum, and the next morning, having changed their clothes, go round the temple 101 times, and the most devoted 1001 times. They repeat the same ceremony every day during the months of November and December. During this time they must eat nothing but milk and eggs, must not look upon a woman, nor think or speak of anything but what relates to the Vistnum. The next year they perform the same devotion, beginning with the first day of December, and continuing till the tenth day of January. The next year they begin with the first day of January and end with the tenth day of February, and so on till the number of twelve years is completed, when they receive pardon for all their sins.—Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* vol. ii, s. v.

Mascaron, JULES, a distinguished French Roman Catholic preacher, was born at Aix in March, 1634. He studied at the college of the Oratorians in his native city, and afterwards at that of Mans, where he was appointed professor of rhetoric in 1656. About the same time he commenced preaching at Saumur, and soon attracted attention. He afterwards preached successively at Marseilles, Aix, and Nantes, and then at Paris, in the churches of the Oratory, of the Louvre, and of St. André des Arts. In 1666 he preached, in presence of Francis de Harlay, archbishop of Rouen, the funeral sermon of the queen dowager, Anne of Austria. This discourse was so much admired that, aided by the influence of De Harlay, Mascaron was admitted at Versailles. Louis XIV was greatly pleased with him, and appointed him court preacher. He was made bishop of Tulle in 1671, but his bulls arrived only two years afterwards. In the mean time Mascaron preached three other funeral sermons: those of the duke of Beaufort, of Henrietta of England, and of chancellor Seguier (the two first are considered his best). He finally went into his diocese, and wrote there, in 1675, the funeral sermon of marshal Turenne, eulogized by La Harpe as a chef-d'œuvre. Made bishop of Agen in 1678, he founded there a theological seminary and a hospital. He only left his diocese once, to preach his last sermon before Louis XIV. He died Nov. 20, 1703. His *Oraisons funèbres* passed through a large number of editions (Paris, 1704, 12mo; reprinted in 1740, 1745, 1785, 1828, etc., and in 1734, together with those of Bossuet and Fléchier). See A. de Bellecombe, *L'Agénois illustré; Dict. of Biog.* s. v. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 125. (J. N. P.)

Masch, ANDREAS GOTTLIEB, D.D., a noted German pulpit orator, was born at Beseritz, in Mecklenburg, Dec. 5, 1724. His father was himself a minister of the Gospel, and instructed Andreas in the preparatory branches of study. In 1743 he went to the University of Rostock; two years later removed to Halle, and there enjoyed the favor and society of the celebrated Baumgarten and Semler. The latter desired that Masch should remain at the university as instructor, but his health failing he decided to return to his father's. In 1752 he was made the assistant preacher, in 1756 pastor of a church at New Strelitz, and only four years after this he was honored with the appointment of "court preacher." He died Oct. 26, 1807. His most important literary remains are embodied in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, which, originally edited by Le Long, he continued upon the same plan (now in 5 vols. 4to)—a work of great labor and merit, which had been discontinued for want of patronage. Le Long had published 2 vols. 8vo (Paris, 1709; republished by Börner, of Leipsic, with additions). Dr. Masch began its continuation in 1773, and completed it in 1790. It gives a full account of the literary history of the Bible, the various editions of the original, and the ancient and modern versions. Dr. Masch also wrote several dissertations of considerable value, particularly a treatise on the Religions of the Heathen and of Christians (*Gedunken von der Geoffenbarten Religion*, Halle, 1750, 8vo), intended as an argument against the naturalists. For a complete list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands d.* 18*ten u.* 19*ten Jahrb.* ii, 422 sq.

Mas'chil (Heb. *maskil'*, מַשְׂכִּיל, *instructing*, Hiph. part. of שָׂכַל, to *be wise;* used as a noun in Psa. xlvii, 7, זַמְּרוּ מַשְׂכִּיל, *sing ye a poem*, Peshito, *sing praise*, but the Sept., Vulg., and Auth. Vers. "sing ye with understanding") occurs in the titles or inscriptions of Psa. xxxii, xlii, xliv, xlv, lii, liii, liv, lv, lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxxviii, lxxxix, cxlii. The origin of the use of this word is uncertain, and it has been variously interpreted. The most probable meaning of maschil is *a poem, song*, which enforces *intelligence, wisdom, piety*, q. d. *didactic;* which is true of every sacred song, not excepting Psa. xlv, where everything is referred to the goodness of God. It occurs elsewhere as an adjective, and is accordingly rendered "*wise*," or some other term equivalent to instruction (1 Sam. xviii, 14, 15; 2 Chron. xxx, 22; Job xxii, 2; Psa. xiv, 2; xli, 1; liii, 2; Prov. x, 5, 19; xiv, 35; xv, 24; xvi, 20; xvii, 2; xix, 14; xxi, 12; Jer. l, 9; Dan. i, 4; xi, 33, 35; xii, 3, 10; Amos v, 13). For other derivations from the Arabic, see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1331. See PSALMS, BOOK OF.

Masclef, FRANÇOIS, a noted Roman Catholic divine and Orientalist, was born at Amiens in the year 1662. He very early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages, and attained in them an extraordinary degree of proficiency. Educated for service in the Church, he became first a curate in the diocese of Amiens, but afterwards obtained the confidence of De Brou, bishop of Amiens, who placed him at the head of the theological seminary of the district, and made him a canon. De Brou died in 1706, and Masclef, whose opinions on the Jansenistic controversy were not in accordance with those of the new prelate Sabbatier, was compelled to resign his place in the theological seminary and retire from public life. From this time he devoted himself to study with such close application as to bring on a disease, of which he died, on Nov. 24, 1728, when only in his prime. Though austere in his habits, he was amiable and pious. Masclef's chief work is the *Grammatica Hebraica, à punctis aliisque inventis Massorethicis libera*, still considered one of the best works of the kind; it embodies an elaborate argument against the use of the vowel-points. The first edition was published in 1716, and speedily called forth a defence of the points from the abbé Guarin, a learned Benedictine monk. In the year 1731 a second edition was published at Paris, containing an answer to Guarin's objections, with the addition of grammars of the Syriac, Chaldee, and Samaritan languages. Other works of Masclef are, *Ecclesiastical Conferences of the Diocese of Amiens:—Catechism of Amiens:*—and in manuscript, *Courses of Philosophy and Divinity;* not printed because it is thought to contain Jansenistic opinions.

Mash (Heb. *id.* מַשׁ, signif. unknown; Sept. Μοσόχ, Vulg, *Mes*), the last named of the four sons of Aram (B.C. post 2513), and a tribe descended from him, who gave their name to a region inhabited by them (Gen. x, 23); probably, therefore, to be sought in Syria or Mesopotamia. In the parallel passage (1 Chron. i, 17) the

name of MESHECH has been erroneously substituted. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 4) understands the *Mesanæi* (Μησαναῖοι), and states that their locality "is now called *Charax of Spasinus*," evidently the same place (Χάραξ Πασινοῦ, Ptol. vi, 3, 2), situated, according to others, at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates (Plin. vi, 26, and 31, ed. Hardouin). Most interpreters, however, following Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 11), understand to be meant the inhabitants of Mount *Masius*, which lies north of Nesibis, and forms part of the chain of Taurus separating Media from Mesopotamia (Strabo, xi, 527; Ptol. v, 18, 2), of which latter the Shemites occupied the southern part (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* ii, 140 sq.). "Knobel (*Volkertafel*, p. 237) seeks to reconcile this view with that of Josephus by the supposition of a migration from the north of Mesopotamia to the south of Babylonia, where the race may have been known in later times under the name of Meshech: the progress of the population in these parts was, however, in an opposite direction, from south to north. Kalisch (*Comm. on Gen.* p. 286) connects the names of Mash and *Mysia:* this is, to say the least, extremely doubtful; both the Mysians themselves and their name (*Mœsia*) were probably of European origin" (Smith). "It is remarkable that among the Asiatic confederates of the Kheta or Sheta, i. e. Hittites, who are enumerated as conquered by Rameses II at Kedesh on the Orontes, is found the prince of *Maso* or *Masa* (Brugsch, *Hist. de l'Egypte*, i, 140, 142)." See ETHNOLOGY.

Ma'shal (1 Chron. vi, 74 [59]). See MISHAL.

Masham, Lady DAMARIS, a lady celebrated for her attainments in divinity, daughter of the celebrated Cudworth, was born at Cambridge, England, in 1658. Her father, perceiving the bent of her genius, took particular care of her education, so that she was early distinguished for piety and uncommon learning. She became the second wife of Sir Francis Masham, of Oates, in Essex; and repaid her father's care of her in the admirable pains she took in the education of her only son. In the study of divinity and philosophy she was greatly assisted by Locke, who lived in her family most of his last years, and who died in her house. She died in 1708. Lady Masham wrote a discourse concerning *the Love of God* (1691, 12mo); and *Occasional Thoughts in reference to a Virtuous or Christian Life* (1700, 12mo); and drew up the account of Mr. Locke published in the great *Historical Dictionary*. See Lord King, *Life of Locke;* Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Masi'as (Μασίας v. r. Μισαίας), one of the "servants of Solomon" whose descendants returned with Zorobbabel from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 34). Nothing corresponding to the name is found in the Heb. text (Ezra v, 55 sq.).

Masius, ANDRÉ, a very learned Orientalist, was born near Brussels in 1516. He was a man of excellent parts, an accomplished lawyer, and counsellor to the duke of Cleves. He died in 1573. Masius translated a variety of articles from the Syriac, which may be found in the Supplement to the *Critica Sacra*, compiled a *Syriac Lexicon* and *Grammar*, and a learned *Commentary on Joshua* and part of *Deuteronomy*. The former contains the readings of the Syriac Hexaplar version. See Hœfer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.



Corbel, West Clandon, Surrey.

Mask, or NOTCH-HEAD, is the technical term in ecclesiastical architecture for a kind of corbel, the shadow of which bears a close resemblance to that of the human face. It is common in some districts in work of the 13th and 14th centuries, and is usually carved under the eaves as a *corbel-table*. A good example occurs in Portsmouth Church, where it is mixed with the tooth-ornament. It is a favorite ornament in Northamptonshire in the cornices of the broad spire, and under the parapet of the chancel; but it is by no means confined to any particular district.—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

Mas'man (Μασμάν v. r. Μαασμάν), a corrupt reading (1 Esdr. viii, 43; compare Σαμαίας, ver. 44) for the SHEMAIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 16).

Mason (גּוֹדֵר, *goder'*, a *wall-builder*, 2 Kings xii, 12; xxii, 6; "repairer," Isa. lviii, 12; חוֹצֵב, *chotseb'*, 1 Chron. xxii, 2; 2 Chron. xxiv, 12; Ezra iii, 7; a "*hewer*" of wood, Isa. x, 15; or a stone-cutter, 2 Kings xii, 13; or of both, 1 Kings v, 15; חָרַשׁ אֶבֶן, *charash' e'ben*, 2 Sam. v, 11, a "*carver* or *worker of stone*," as in 1 Chron. xxii, 15; חָרַשׁ קִיר, *charash' kir*, 1 Chron. xiv, 1, a *wall-workman*), a stone-mason or artificer in stone. From 2 Sam. v, 11, which states that "Hiram, king of Tyre, sent messengers to David, and cedar-trees, and carpenters, and masons, and they built David a house," we may infer that the Hebrews were not so skilful in architecture as the Tyrians, though they had long sojourned in Egypt, where that art attained a high degree of perfection at a very early period. The ruins of immense temples and palaces at the present day fill the traveller in Egypt with wonder and astonishment. The sculptures on the granite, basalt, and hard limestone still remain undefaced. Upon the ancient monuments of Egypt the various processes of the building art are very numerous. Masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, brickmakers, etc., may be seen hard at work, and appear to be depicted with minute fidelity, and some of these seem to explain to us a curious circumstance mentioned by the sacred historian in the account of the erection of Solomon's Temple: "And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house whilst it was in building" (1 Kings vi, 7). This previous squaring and preparation of the stones is frequently delineated; they are accurately measured under the superintendence of a principal architect, the shape marked on the rough block with a dark line, so as to determine the course of the stone-cutter accurately, and a mark or number is fixed to the finished stone so as to point out its place in the building. Masons' and carpenters' tools have frequently been found in the tombs. Most of the blades have been attached by linen bandages and an adhesive composition. On the blades of the larger, and handles of the smaller tools, is generally inscribed a line of hieroglyphics. Some of them are of remote antiquity, bearing the prænomen of Thothmes III. (See Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, ii, 305–315.) The peculiar bevelled edges and immense



Masonry of Haram Wall at Hebron. (From Photograph 122 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

size of the lower courses of the walls of Jerusalem and other cities of Palestine attest the antique art of Solomon's day. Similar advancement in the art of stone-cutting is evident from the ruins discovered by Botta and Layard in Assyria. See HANDICRAFT; SCULPTURE.

Mason, Erskine, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. John M. Mason, was born in New York City April 16, 1805; was educated at Dickinson College (class of 1823); was ordained in October, 1826; installed over the Church at Schenectady in May, 1827; pastor of Bleecker Street Church, New York, from 1830 to 1851; and also professor of ecclesiastical history in Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1836 to 1842. He died May 14, 1851. His memoir, by Rev. Wm. Adams, is prefixed to his sermons on practical subjects, entitled *A Pastor's Legacy* (1853, 8vo). See also Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Mason, Francis (1), B.D., an English divine, was born in the county of Durham in 1566; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, about 1583, where he was chosen probationer fellow; became rector of Oxford, Suffolk, and chaplain to king James I, and archdeacon of Norfolk in 1619. He died in 1621. He published *Sermons* (Lond. 1607, 4to; Oxford, 1634, 4to):—*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (1613, fol.; published in an English dress, entitled *A Vindication of the Church of England, and of the Lawful Ministry thereof*, etc.; greatly enlarged by Rev. John Lindsay, with additions, 1728, fol.; 1778, fol.). This book contains a complete refutation of the Nag's Head story:—*Two Sermons* (1621, 8vo):—*The Lawfulness of the Ordination of Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas* (Oxford, 1641, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Mason, Francis (2), D.D., a Baptist minister, and missionary, was born at York, England, April 2, 1799. He was a shoemaker's apprentice, emigrated to Philadelphia in 1818; settled at Canton, Mo., in 1825; studied at the Theological Seminary, Newton, Mo., in 1827; and in May, 1830, having been ordained, sailed with his wife for Calcutta as a missionary to the Karens. After acquiring the language, he wrote *The Sayings of the Elders*, which was the first printed book in the Karen language. He prepared Pali and Burmese grammars, and acquired many of the Oriental languages. He also published a Karen translation of the Bible. He was medical adviser to this people, having studied medicine, and published a small work on materia medica and pathology in one of the Karen dialects. He also edited for many years the *Morning Star*, a Karen monthly, in both the Sgan and Pwo dialects, and was member of a number of literary and scientific bodies. He died at Rangoon, Burmah, March 3, 1874. His English writings are, *Report of the Twvay Mission Society*:—*Life of Kothabyn, the Karen Apostle*:—*Memoir of Mrs. Helen M. Mason* (1847): *Memoir of San Quala* (1850):—and *Burmah, its People and Natural Productions* (1852; enlarged edition, 1861).

Mason, John (1), an English dissenting divine, was born in Essex in 1705 or 1706; became pastor of a congregation at Dorking, Surrey, in 1730, and at Chestnut, Hertfordshire, in 1746. He died in 1763. Mr. Mason published, besides a number of *Sermons*, various theological treatises and other works. The best known are *Self-Knowledge* (1754; new edition and life of the author by John Mason Good, 1811, 12mo; new edition by Tegg, 1847, 32mo; with Melmoth's *Importance of a Christian Life*, published by Scott, 1855, 24mo); this work was very popular for a long time, and was translated into several languages:—*The Lord's Day Evening Entertainments*, 52 practical discourses (1751–52, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1754, 4 vols. 8vo):—*The Student and Pastor* (1755, 8vo; new edition by Joshua Toulmin, D.D., 1807, 12mo):—*Fifteen Discourses* (1758, 8vo):—*Christian Morals* (1761, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Mason, John (2), D.D., a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, father of the celebrated John M. Mason, was born near Mid-Calder, in Linlithgowshire, Scotland, in 1734. The great ecclesiastical agitation within the Church of Scotland occurred in his early days, and, favoring the *Anti-Burgher* party, he identified himself with this branch of the "Secession Church," pursued his theological studies at Abernethy, and later became an assistant professor of logic and moral philosophy at the theological school. In 1761 he was ordained for the office of the ministry, and sent to this country as pastor of the then Cedar Street Church, New York. Believing that the causes which divided the Presbyterians of Scotland did not exist here, he labored, from the moment of his arrival in the States, for the union of all Presbyterians, and, though his course displeased his brethren at home, and the synod suspended him, he pushed his project, and on June 13, 1782, a general union of the Reformed Presbyterians was held as "the Associate Reformed Church." Dr. Mason had the honor to be the first moderator of this body. Untiring in his services to the cause of the Church of Christ, and his own branch of it, he died April 19, 1792. "His death, like his life, was an honorable testimony to his Redeemer's power and grace." The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by New Jersey College, of which he was a trustee from 1779 to 1785. Dr. Mason "was a man of sound and vigorous mind, of extensive learning, and fervent piety. As a preacher, he was uncommonly judicious and instructive, and his ministrations were largely attended. As a pastor, he was specially faithful and diligent. To great learning there were united in him meekness, prudence, diligence, knowledge of the world, and an affectionate superintendence of the interests, temporal and spiritual, of his flock" (Dr. John B. Dales, in *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 4 sq.).

Mason, John Mitchell, D.D., a distinguished Presbyterian divine and noted American pulpit orator, was born in the city of New York March 19, 1770. He was educated at Columbia College, class of 1789, and having decided to devote his life to the service of the Church, went abroad, and studied theology at the University of Edinburgh. While at the "Northern Athens" young Mason became noted for piety and an exemplary life. In 1792 he was unexpectedly recalled by the sudden decease of his father, and, after his return to New York, was established in the ministry over the same Church which his father had served so long. The Associate Reformed Church, to which he belonged at this time, had been wont to celebrate the Lord's Supper but once or twice annually. Mason believed in more frequent communion, and both by his pen and his tongue went forward to advocate reform in this respect. A pamphlet, consisting of "Letters on Communion," which he published, brought him prominently before the religious world, and thereafter John Mitchell Mason was not an uncommon name in the assembly of American Christians. He also served his day and generation in many other ways. The Associate Reformed Church had always depended upon foreign institutions for the education of her ministry. Mason advocated the establishment of a school of the prophets on American soil, and thus became instrumental in founding the institution known as the "Union Theological Seminary." He was appointed its first professor at the opening in 1804. In 1806 he projected the "Christian's Magazine," the pages of which are filled with a controversy he had with bishop Hobart on the claims of the episcopacy. In 1810 he resigned his pastoral charge, for the purpose of forming a new congregation. The intimate relations he now established with the Presbyterians were objected to by many of his own denomination, and in 1811 a charge was brought against him, but the synod had sense enough to refuse all censure. Mason, however, improved the opportunity to push his favorite object, the *Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholic Principles* (published in 1816). In this year (1811) he was also

honored with the provostship of Columbia College, and, though already employed as preacher and professor, accepted the position, "and by his talents and energy raised that institution to a higher character than it had ever before possessed." In 1816 failing health admonished him of the magnitude of the work he had undertaken, and he resigned his connection with the college, and went to Europe. On his return in 1817 he again devoted himself to Gospel labors, but in 1821 exchanged the pulpit for the rostrum, as president of Dickinson College, Pa. In 1822 he transferred his ecclesiastical relation to the Presbyterian Church. In 1824 he resigned his position at college, and returned to New York to recuperate his health, but he was never again permitted to assume any official connection. He died Dec. 26, 1829. Besides the literary enterprises already mentioned, Dr. Mason wrote a number of essays, reviews, orations, and sermons, published at different times. They were collected by his son, the Rev. Ebenezer Mason, and published in 4 vols. 8vo, in 1832 (new ed., with many additions, 1849). A memoir, with some of his correspondence, was published by his son-in-law, J. Van Vechten, D.D., in 1856, 2 vols. 8vo. The mind of Dr. Mason was of the most robust order, his theology Calvinistic, and his style of eloquence powerful and irresistible as a torrent. When Robert Hall first heard him deliver before the London Missionary Society, in 1802, his celebrated discourse on "Messiah's Throne," he is said to have exclaimed, "I can never preach again!" (Fisk's *Pulpit Eloquence*, 1857, p. 486, q. v.). "Taken altogether, no American preacher has combined more impressive qualities. His aspect was on a scale of grandeur corresponding to the majesty of mind within. Tall, robust, straight, with a head modelled after neither Grecian nor Roman standard, yet symmetrical, combining the dignity of the one and the grace of the other; with an eye that shot fire, especially when under the excitement of earnest preaching, yet tender and tearful when the pathetic cord was touched; with a forehead broad and high, running up each side, and slightly parted in the middle by a graceful pendant of hair; a mouth and chin expressive of firmness and decision. . . . Dr. Mason stood before you the prince of pulpit orators" (*N. Y. Observer*, Nov. 1860). See also *Bost. Christ. Disciple*, iii, 475; Dr. Spring, *Power of the Pulpit;* Duyckinck, *Cyclop. Amer. Lit.* (see Index in vol. i); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, 1237; *Princet. Review*, 1856, p. 318. (J. H. W.)

Mason, Lowell, *doctor of music*, a celebrated American composer of music, was born at Medfield, Mass., Jan. 8, 1792. When but a child he exhibited extraordinary love and capacity for music, and began to teach early in life. In 1812 he removed to Savannah, Ga., and there compiled his first book of *Psalmody*, the celebrated Händel and Haydn collection, the success of which eliciting much persuasion of his musical friends in Massachusetts to settle in his native state, he removed to Boston in 1827, devoted himself to the musical instruction of children and the introduction of vocal music into the public schools of New England; caused the Boston Academy of Music to be established, and also "Teachers' Institutes" for the training of teachers and leaders of choirs. He visited Europe in 1837, and acquainted himself with all the improvements in the musical teaching on the Continent. In 1855 the University of New York conferred on him the degree of doctor of music, the first ever conferred by an American college. In the later years of his life he gave much attention to congregational singing in churches, and did much to advance the interests of Church music in general. He died at his residence, Orange, N. J., Aug. 11, 1872. His publications of interest to us are *Juvenile Psalmist, Juvenile Lyre*, etc. (Boston, 1829, '30, '34, '35, '36, '37, '39, '40, '45, '46; New York, 1856; Phila. 1843; Lond. 1838):—several sacred and Church music-books: —*The Boston Händel and Haydn Collection of Church Music* (1822):—*The Choir, or Union Collection* (1833, etc.); etc. Dr. Mason was the author and compiler of more musical works than any other American, and contributed much towards making the Americans a nation of "singing men and singing women." See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Mason, William, an English divine of some note, son of the vicar of St. Trinity Hall, was born in 1725; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and made fellow of Pembroke College in 1747. In 1754 he took holy orders, became rector of Aston, Yorkshire, chaplain to the king, and was for thirty-two years precentor and canon residentiary of York. He died in 1797. His published works, both secular and religious, are chiefly in poetry, among which are *Essays, Historical and Critical, on English Church Music* (1795, 12mo). He also published *Memoirs of Thomas Gray* (1775, 4to). Mason was regarded by his contemporaries as a poet of more than ordinary genius, but the lack of classical culture prevented his rise. There is a tablet to his memory in Poet's Corner, in Westminster Abbey. His style is, to a great extent, that of an imitator of Gray; and, not being so perfect an artist in language as his master, he has been proportionally less successful. In addition to his poetical reputation, he possessed considerable skill in painting and music, and on the latter subject entertained opinions not at all consonant with those of musicians in general. He wished to reduce Church music to the most dry and mechanical style possible, excluding all such expression as should depend on the powers and taste of the organist (Mason's *Compendium of the History of Church Music*). See *Memoir of Mason* in Johnson and Chalmer's *English Poets* (1840, 21 vols. 8vo); Chalmer's *Biog. Dict.* s. v.; *Blackwood's Mag.* xxx. 482; xxvi, 553; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Māsorah, Masóreth, or **Massoreth** (מָסֹרָה, מָסֹרֶת, מַסֹּרֶת), the technical term given to a grammatico-critical commentary on the O. Test., the design of which is to indicate the correct reading of the text with respect to words, vowels, accents, etc., so as to preserve it from all corruption, putting an end to the exercise of unbounded individual fancy. In the Hebrew *Masorah* denotes *tradition*, from מסר, which is used in Chaldaic in the sense of *to give over, to commit* (corresponding to the Hebrew נתן, מגר, חסגיר; comp. *Targ.* on 1 Sam. xvii, 46; xxiv, 11; 1 Kings xx, 13; Exod. xxi, 3; Amos vi, 8); and hence, by the rabbinical writers, in the sense of *to deliver*, with reference to the oral communication of doctrine, opinion, or fact. The derivation, from אסר, *to bind, to fix within strict limits*, seems to have been an afterthought, suggested by the sentiment that the Masorah is a hedge to the Torah. The Masorah, however, is not confined to what is communicated by *oral* tradition; in the state in which it has come down to us it embraces all that has been delivered traditionally, whether orally or in writing. Its correlate is קבלה (*Kabbaluh*), *reception;* and as the latter denotes whatever has been *received* traditionally, the former embraces whatever has been *delivered* traditionally; though in usage Kabbalah is generally restricted to matters of theologic and mystic import [see CABALA], while Masorah has reference rather to matters affecting the condition of the text of Scripture. It takes account not only of various readings, but also contains notes of a grammatical and lexicographical character. It descends to the most minute particulars, and is a monument of prolonged industry, fidelity, and earnest devotion to the cause of sacred learning.

I. *Origin of the Masorah.*—The Masorah is the work of certain Jewish critics, who from their work have received the title of בעלי המסורת (*Baali Hammasoreth*), *masters of the Masorah*, or, as they are generally designated, *Masoretes.* Who they were, and when or

where their work was accomplished, are points involved in some uncertainty. According to Jewish tradition, the work began with Moses; from him it was committed to the wise men till Ezra and the great Synagogue, and was then transferred to the learned men at Tiberias, by whom it was transmitted to writing and called the Masorah (El. Levita, *Masoreth Hammasoreth*, Pref. p. 2). Some even claim Ezra as the author of the written collection (Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, c. 11, p. 102; Leusden, *Philol. Heb. Diss.* 25, sec. 4; Pfeiffer, *De Masora*, cap. ii, in *Opp.* p. 891, etc.); but the arguments which have been adduced in support of this opinion are not sufficient to sustain it. Aben-Ezra says expressly, "So was the usage of the wise men of Tiberias, for from them were the men the authors of the Masoreth, and from them have we received the whole punctuation" (*Zachuth*, cited by Buxtorf, *Tib.* c. 3, p. 9); and even Buxtorf himself unconsciously gives in to the opinion he opposes by the title he has put on his work. That various readings had been noted before this, even in pre-Talmudic times, is not to be doubted. In the Talmud itself we have not only directions given for the correct writing of the Biblical books, but references to varieties of reading as then existing (*Hierosol.*, tr. *Taanith*, f. 68, c. 1; comp. Kennicott, *Diss. Gen.* sec. 34; De Wette, *Einleit. ins A. T.* sec. 89; Hävernick, *Introduct.* p. 280); especial mention is made of the *Ittur Sopherim* (עטור ספרים, *Ablatio Scribarum;* tract *Nedarim*, f. 37, c. 2), of the *Keri ve-lo Kethib*, the *Kethib ve-lo Keri*, and the *Keri ve-kethib* (*Nedarim*, l. c.; tract *Sota*, v, 5; *Joma*, f. 21, c. 2), and of the *puncta extraordinaria*, which, however, are not properly of critical import, but rather point to allegorical explanations of the passage (tr. *Nasir*, f. 23, c. 1; comp. Jerome, *Quæst. in Gen.* xviii, 35); and already the middle consonant, the middle word, and the middle verse of the Pentateuch are noted as in the Masorah. In the tract Sopherim, written between the Talmud and the Masorah, there are also notes of the same kind, though not exactly agreeing with those in the Masorah. But those variants had not before been formally collected and reduced to order in writing. This was the work of the Jewish scholars who, from the 6th century after Christ, flourished in Palestine, and had their principal seat at Tiberias (Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 309).

II. *Contents of the Masorah.*—These are partly palæographic, partly critical, partly exegetical, partly grammatical. They embrace notes concerning—

1. *The Consonants of the Hebrew Text.*—Concerning these, the Masoretes note about thirty letters which are *larger* than the others, about thirty that are *less*, four which are *suspended* or placed above the line of the others in the same word, and nine which are *inverted* or written upside down; to these peculiarities reference is made also in the Talmud, and the use of them as merely marking the middle of a book or section indicated (tr. *Kiddushin*, f. 30, c. 1; Hävernick, l. c., p. 282). The Masoretes also note a case in which the final ם is found in the heart of a word (למרבה, Isa. ix, 6); one in which the initial מ is found at the end (חמי, Neh. ii, 13); and one in which the initial נ occurs at the end (מנ, Job xviii, 1)—irregularities for which no reason can be assigned (comp. Leusden, *Phil. Heb.* Diss. x). They have noted how often each letter occurs; and they signalize the middle of each book, the middle letter of the Pentateuch (the ו in גחוך, Lev. xi, 42), the middle letter of the Psalter (the ע in מיער, Psa. lxxx, 14), the number of times each of the five letters which have final forms occurs in its final and in its initial form.

2. *The Vowel-points and Accents in the Hebrew Text.*—Here the Masoretes note the peculiarities or anomalies in the use of the vowel-points, of the dagesh and mappik, and of the accents in the text—a fact to which Buxtorf appeals with considerable force, as proving that the authors of the Masorah, as we have it, were not the *inventors* of the diacritical marks by which vowels and accents are indicated in the Hebrew text; for, had they been so, they would not have confined themselves to laboriously noting anomalies into which they themselves had fallen, but would at once have removed them. See Vowel-points.

3. *Words.*—With regard to these, the Masoretes note (1) the cases of *Scriptio plena* (מלאים) and *defectiva* (חסרים); (2) the number of times in which certain words occur at the beginning of a verse (as, e. g., קום, which they say is nine times the first word of a verse), or the end of a verse (as הארץ, which they say occurs thrice as the final word of a verse); (3) words of which the meaning is ambiguous, and to which they affix the proper meaning in the place where they occur; (4) words which have over them the *puncta extraordinaria;* and (5) words which present anomalies in writing or grammar, and which some have thought should be altered, or peculiarities which need to be explained (סבירין).

4. *Verses.*—The Masoretes number the verses in each book of the O. Test., as well as in each of the larger sections of the Pentateuch, and they note the middle verse of each book of the O. T.; they also note the number of verses in which certain expressions occur, the first and last letters of each verse, and in many cases the number of letters of which it is composed; and, in fine, they have marked twenty-five or twenty-eight places where there is a pause in the middle of a verse, or where a hiatus is supposed to be found in the meaning (as, e. g., in Gen. iv, 8, where, after the words ויאמר קין אל־הבל אחיו, there is in rabbinical editions of the O. Test. a space left vacant [פסקא, *piska*] to indicate that something is probably omitted).

5. *Tikkun Sopherim* (תקון סופרים, *ordinatio*, sive *correctio Scribarum*).—On the word כבודם (Psa. cvi, 20) the Masorah has this note: *the word* כבודם *is one of eighteen words in Scripture which are an ordination of the Scribes.* These eighteen words are also enumerated in a note at the beginning of Numbers. The passages where they occur are presented in the following table:

	Tikkun Sopherim.	*Erroneous Reading.*
Gen. xviii, 22,	. . . . לפני יהוה . . . . . אברהם	לפני אברהם יהוה . . . . .
Numb. xi, 15,	ברעתי	ברעתם
Numb. xii, 12,	אמו בשרו	אמרנו בשרנו
1 Sam. iii, 13,	לחם	לי
2 Sam. xvi, 12,	בעיני	בעניו
1 Kings xii, 16, / 2 Chron. x, 16,	לאחליו	לאלהיו
Ezek. viii, 17,	אל אפם	אל אפי
Hab. i, 12.	לא נמות	לא תמות
Mal. i, 13,	אותו	אותי
Zech. ii, 8,	עינו	עיני
Jer. ii, 11,	כבודו	כבודי
Hos. iv, 7,	כבודם	כבודי
Psa. cvi, 20,	כבודם	כבודי
Job vii, 20,	אלי	אליך
Job xxxii, 3,	את איוב	את דוד
Lam. iii, 20,	עלי	עליך

Charges have been rashly advanced against these Sopherim of having corrupted the sacred text (Galatin, *De Arcanis Cathol. Ver.* lib. i, c. 8), but for this there is no foundation (see ben-Chajim's *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible*, translated by Ginsburg, p. 21). Eichhorn concludes from "the character of the readings" that "this recension took note only of certain errors which had crept into the text through transcribers, and which

were corrected by collation of MSS." (*Einleit. ins. A. T.* sec. 116). Bleek, however, thinks that this is affirmed without evidence, and that in some cases the rejected reading is probably the original one, as, e. g., in Gen. xviii, 22, and Hab. i, 12 (*Einleit. ins A. T.* p. 803).

6. *Ittur Sopherim* (עטור סופרים, *ablatio Scribarum*).—The Masoretes have noted four instances in which the letter ו has been erroneously prefixed to אחר —viz. Gen. xviii, 5; xxiv, 55; Numb. xii, 14; and Psa. lxviii, 26; they note also that it has been erroneously prefixed to the word משפטיך in Psa. xxxvi, 7. Of these passages, the only one in which the injunction of the Sopherim to remove the ו has been neglected is Numb. xii, 14—a neglect at which Buxtorf expresses surprise (*Lex. Talmud*, s. v. עטר).

7. *Keri and Kethib.*—But not all the dicta of the Masoretes are of equal sterling value; they are not only sometimes utterly superfluous, but downright erroneous. Of its "countings" we may adduce that it enumerates in the Pentateuch 18 greater and 43 smaller portions, 1534 verses, 63,467 words, 70,100 letters, etc.—a calculation which is, however, to a certain degree at variance with the Talmud. See the article KERI AND KETHIB in this work.

III. *Form of the Masorah.*—The language of the *Masorah* is Chaldee; and, besides the difficulty of this idiom, the obscure abbreviations, contractions, symbolical signs, etc., with which the work abounds, render its study exceedingly difficult. In all probability it was composed out of *notes* that had been made from time to time on separate leaves, or in books, as occasion demanded. Afterwards they were appended as marginal notes to the text, sometimes on the upper and lower margin, sometimes in a more brief form on the space between the text and the Chaldee version, where, from scarcity of room, many abbreviations and symbols were resorted to, and considerable omissions were made. Hence arose a distinction between the מסורה גדולה, the *Masora Magna*, and the מ"ק, the *M. Parva*—the former of which comprehends the entire body of critical remark on the margins, the latter the more curt and condensed notes inserted in the intermediate space. The latter has frequently been represented as an abbreviated compend of the former; but this is not strictly correct, for the lesser Masorah contains many things not found in the greater. At an early period the scribes introduced the practice of adorning their annotations with all manner of figures, and symbols, and caligraphic ingenuities; and from this, as well as from causes connected with their method of selection and arrangement, the whole came into such a state of confusion that it was rendered almost useless. In this state it remained until the publication of Bomberg's *Rabbinical Bible* (Venetia, 1526: the second Bomberg *Biblia Rabbin.*, not the first, as is sometimes stated), for which the learned R. Jacob ben-Chajim, with immense labor, prepared and arranged the Masorah. See JACOB BEN-CHAJIM. To facilitate the use of the Greater Masorah, he placed at the end of his work what has been called the *Masora maxima* or *finalis*, and which forms a sort of Masoretic Concordance in alphabetic order.

IV. *Value of the Masorah.*—While there is much in the Masorah that can be regarded in no other light than as laborious trifling, it is far from deserving the scorn which has sometimes been poured upon it. There can be no doubt that it preserves to us much valuable traditional information concerning the constitution and the meaning of the sacred text. It is the source whence materials for a critical revision of the O.-Test. text can now alone be derived. It is a pity that it is now impossible to discriminate the older from the more recent of its contents. We would earnestly reiterate the wish of Eichhorn, that some one would undertake the "bitter task" of making complete critical excerpts from the Masorah.

V. *Literature.*—*Elias Levita*, מסורת המסורת (Ven. 1538; German transl. by Semler, Halle, 1770; English transl. by Ginsburg, Lond. 1867); Buxtorf, *Tiberias, sive Comment. Masoreth. triplex histor. didact. crit.* (Basle, 1620, 4to); Cappell, *Crit. Sac.* lib. iii; Olaus Celsius, *De Masora Disput.*; Leusden, *Philol. Heb.*, Diss. xxii–xxv; Walton, *Prolegg. in Polyglott*, No. viii; Carpzov, *Crit. Sacr.* p. 283; Wähner, *Antiq. Hebr.* sec. 1, c. 36; Abr. Geiger, *Zur Gesch. der Masorah* (in the 3d vol. of his *Jüd. Zeitschr. für Wissensch. u. Leben*); Frensdorff, *Das Buch "Ochlach W'ochlach"* (Massora) (Hamburg, 1864, 8vo); Hupfeld, *Ueber eine bisher unbekannt gebliebene Handschrift der Masorah* (in *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* xxi, 201 sq.); Eichhorn, *Einleit. ins A. T.* vol. i, sec. 140–158; De Wette, *Einleit.* sec. 90–92; Hävernick, *Introd. to the O. T.* p. 279 sq.; Bleek, *Einleit. ins A. T.* p. 803 sq.; Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible by J. ben-Chajim*, transl. in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for July, 1863. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Mas'pha, the name of two places mentioned in the Apocrypha.

1. (Μασσηφάθ v. r. Μασσηφά.) A place opposite to (κατέναντι) Jerusalem, at which Judas Maccabæus and his followers assembled themselves to bewail the desolation of the city and the sanctuary, and to inflame their resentment before the battle of Emmaus, by the sight not only of the distant city, which was probably visible from the eminence, but also of the book of the law mutilated and profaned, and of other objects of peculiar preciousness and sanctity (1 Macc. iii, 46). As the passage contains an allusion to similar acts of devotion "aforetime in Israel," there is no doubt that it is identical with MIZPEH (q. v.) of Benjamin, the ancient sanctuary at which Samuel had convened the people on an occasion of equal emergency (1 Sam. vii, 5). In fact, Maspha, or, more accurately, Massêpha, is merely the form in which the Sept. uniformly renders the Hebrew name Mizpeh, the modern *Nebi-Samwil*, a high range in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 143).

2. (Μασφά.) One of the cities which were taken from the Ammonites by Judas Maccabæus in his campaign on the east of Jordan (1 Macc. v, 35). It is uncertain whether the ancient city of Mizpeh of Gilead (Judg. xi, 29, etc.) or Mizpeh of Moab (1 Sam. xxii, 3) is meant. The Syriac has the curious variation of *Olim*, "salt," and one Greek MS. has εἰς Ἅλεμα, another εἰς Σάλεμα, another εἰς Λέμα: but this seems to be a mere arbitrary correction from ver. 26 by some one who thought that the place mentioned in both verses should be the same. Michaelis, however, would combine both readings, and make the place *Mizpeh-Elim*. Perhaps Josephus also reads מֶלַח, "salt," as he reads Μάλλη (*Ant.* xii, 8, 3), which Grimm thinks has arisen from transposition of letters (*Handb. z. a. Apokr.* ad loc.).

Mas'rekah (Heb. *Masrekah'*, מַשְׂרֵקָה, *vineyard*; Sept. Μασεκκά, Μασεκκά), a place apparently in Idumæa, the native place of Samlah, one of the Edomitish kings (Gen. xxxvi, 36; 1 Chron. i, 47). "The student will observe that while some of these kings are mentioned with the addition, 'and the name of his town was,' others are introduced as 'coming from' some other place. Kalisch (ad loc.) remarks that the former seems to comprise native Idumæans, the latter foreigners. Eusebius and Jerome, however (*Onomast.* s. v. Masraca), locate Masrekah in Gebalene, a province embracing the northern part of Edom" (Kitto). "Interpreted as Hebrew, the name refers to vineyards—as if from *Sarak*, a root with which we are familiar in the 'vine of Sorek,' that is, the choice vine; and, led by this, Knobel (*Genesis*, p. 257) proposes to place Masrekah in the district of the Idumæan mountains north of Petra, and along the Haj route, where Burckhardt found 'extensive vineyards,' and 'great quantities of dried grapes,' made by the tribe of the Refaya for the supply of Gaza

and for the Mecca pilgrims (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 418). But this is mere conjecture, as no name at all corresponding with Masrekah has been yet discovered in that locality" (Smith). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 215), there is still a town, eight miles south of Petra, called *En-Masrak*, which he thinks may be the locality. He probably refers to the place marked *Ain Mafrak* on Palmer's Map, and *Ain el-Usdaka* on Kiepert's.

Mass (Latin *Missa*) is the technical term by which the Church of Rome designates the Eucharistic service which in that Church, as well as in the Greek and other Oriental churches, is held to be the sacrifice of the new law—a real though unbloody offering, in which Christ is the victim, in substance the same with the sacrifice of the cross. It is instituted, Romanists further teach, in commemoration of that sacrifice, and as a means of applying its merits through all ages for the sanctification of men.

Origin and Meaning of the Word.—"The first names given to the administration of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," says Walcott (s. v.), "were the Breaking of Bread (Acts xx, 6, 7), the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. ii, 20), or Communion (1 Cor. x, 18). It was also called, by way of eminence, the mystery, the sacrament, the oblation or prosphora, the sacrifice, Dominicum (the Lord's), agenda (the action), synais and collecta (the assembly), the solemnities, the service, the supplication, the mystical or divine Eucharist or eulogy (the thanksgiving), the office, the spectacle, the consecration, the unbloody sacrifice, the supper, the table, the latria (worship), the universal canon; and, by the Greeks, also the hierurgia (sacred action), and the good by excellence, metalepsis (the communion), in the Apostolical Canons. These terms served either to explain to the faithful the meaning of the service, or, in times of persecution, to conceal its real nature from the profane and persecutors. In Acts xiii, 2, it is spoken of as the liturgy."

The term *Mass* is ancient, having been used by Clement I, Alexander, Telesphorus, Soter, and Felix (cir. 100–275). In a letter of St. Ambrose to his sister Marcellina (of the 4th century), we have this passage: "Ego mansi in munere, missam facere cœpi, dum offers, raptum cognovi" (*Ep.* xxxiii). Its origin and use, however, have given much trouble. There are at present three principal derivations of the word: (1.) From the Anglo-Saxon *mæse*, a *feast*, in which sense the word is of more ancient date than the Eucharist. It seems probable that the ancient word is embodied in such names as Christ*mas*, Michael*mas*, Martin*mas;* but it is very doubtful whether the suffix, as thus used, has any reference at all to the holy Eucharist, and it is much more probable that the coincidence of the Anglo-Saxon word for *feast*, with mass and missa, the *holy Eucharist*, is purely accidental. (2.) From the Hebrew מִשָּׂה, *missah'*, which signifies an *oblation*, as in Deut. xvi, 10. This derivation would tend to show an association between the original idea of the Eucharist and the oblations of the Jewish ritual; but it is extremely improbable that the Jewish word should have found its way into every language of Europe, and yet be entirely absent from the liturgical vocabulary of the Oriental churches. (3.) From the "*Ite, missa est*" of the ancient liturgies of the West, which was equivalent to the Ἐν εἰρήνῃ Χριστοῦ πορευθῶμεν, "Let us depart in peace," of the Greek liturgies. But the words "Ite, missa est," have two senses given to them by ancient writers; thus, in Micrologus, it is said, "In festivis diebus 'Ite, missa est' dicitur, quia tunc generalis conventus celebrari solet, qui per hujusmodi denuntiationem licentiam discendi accipere solet" (*Microlog.* xlvi). St. Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, explains the phrase as meaning that the sacrifice of the Eucharist has been sent up to God by the administration of angels (Thomas Aquinas, iii, qu. 83, art. iv). Both these meanings are combined in a very ancient exposition of the mass, printed by Hittorpius: "Tunc demum a diacona dicitur, Ite, missa est, id est, Ite cum pace in domus vestras, quia transmissa est pro vobis oratio ad dominum; et per angelos, qui nuncii dicunter, allata est in divinæ conspectum majestatis" (*Expos. Miss. ex vetust. cod. in Hittorp.* p. 587).

The proper technical sense of the word undoubtedly is the one in which it is employed by the early Church —that of "offering" or "oblation," which, as we have seen above, are ancient names for the Lord's Supper. In such a sense the English Church used the word, and it thus occurs in the first vernacular liturgy of the Church of England (A.D. 1549): "The Supper of the Lord, and the holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." Indeed it was only abandoned by the Anglican clergy when it was found that Romanists attached to the word *mass* a perverted sense. It was first dropped in the revised Prayer-book of 1552. In Germany the Reformers hesitated not to protest against the accusation that they opposed *mass*. Thus, e. g., the Augsburg Confession "protests against any notion that it abolishes mass" (comp. Schott, *Augsburgische Confession*, p. 137, 141). The doctrine of the mass, as interpreted by Roman Catholics, presupposes the Eucharist, and involves the notion of a sacrifice. On the latter point hinges the controversy between Romanists and Protestants: the question being whether it is a positive sacrifice, renewed at every celebration, or only a solemn feast on a sacrifice once offered by Jesus Christ; whether Christ in body and blood is absolutely and corporally, or only spiritually and really present in the elements. See Real Presence; Transubstantiation.

By primitive use, the communion of the faithful appears always, unless in exceptional cases, to have formed part of the Eucharistic service; but afterwards it came to pass that the officiating priest only communicated, whence arose, especially in the Western Church, the practice of "private masses," which has been in later times a ground of complaint with dissentients from Rome—even those who in other respects approach closely to the Roman doctrine. In the ancient writers a distinction is made between the "mass of the catechumens" and the "mass of the faithful;" the former including all the preparatory prayers, the latter all that directly regards the consecration of the elements and the communion, at which the "discipline of the secret" forbade the presence of the catechumens. With the cessation of this discipline the distinction of names has ceased, but the distinction of parts is still preserved, the mass of the catechumens comprising all the first part of the mass as far as the "preface."

The mass is now in general denominated according to the solemnity of the accompanying ceremonial—a "low mass," a "chanted mass," or a "high mass." In the first, a single priest simply *reads* the service, attended by one or more acolytes or clerks. The second form differs only in this, that the service is *chanted* instead of being *read* by the priest. In the high mass the service is chanted in part by the priest, in part by the deacon and subdeacon, by whom, as well as by several ministers of inferior rank, the priest is assisted. In all these, however, the service, as regards the form of prayer, is the same. It consists of (1) an introductory prayer composed of the 41st Psalm, together with the "general confession;" (2) the introit, which is followed by the thrice-repeated petition, "Lord, have mercy," "Christ, have mercy," and the hymn "Glory to God on high;" (3) the collect, or public and joint prayers of priest and people, followed by a lesson either from the Epistles or some book of the Old Testament, and by the Gradual (q. v.); (4) the Gospel, which is commonly followed by the Nicene Creed; (5) the Offertory (q. v.), after the reading of which comes the preparatory offering of the bread and wine, and the washing of the priest's hands in token of purity of heart, and the "secret," a prayer read in a low voice by the priest; (6) the preface, concluding with the trisagion, or "thrice holy," at which point, by the primitive use, the catechumens and penitents retired from the church; (7)

the "canon," which is always the same, and which contains all the prayers connected with the consecration, the elevation, the breaking, and the communion of the host and of the chalice, as also the commemorations both of the living and of the dead; (8) the "communion," which is a short scriptural prayer, usually appropriate to the particular festival; (9) the "post-communion," which, like the collect, was a joint prayer of priest and people, and is read or sung aloud; (10) the dismissal with the benediction; and, finally, the first chapter of John's Gospel. A great part of the above prayers are fixed, and form what is called the "ordo" or "ordinary" of the mass. The rest, which is called the "proper of the mass," differs for different occasions, many masses having nothing peculiar but the name: such are the masses of the saints—that of St. Mary of the Snow, celebrated on the 5th of August; that of St. Margaret, patroness of lying-in women; that at the feast of St. John the Baptist, at which are said three masses; that of the Innocents, at which the *Gloria in Excelsis* and *Hallelujah* are omitted, and, it being a day of mourning, the altar is of a violet color. As to ordinary masses, some are for the dead, and, as is supposed, contribute to release the soul from purgatory. At these masses the altar is put in mourning, and the only decorations are a cross in the middle of six yellow wax lights; the dress of the celebrant, and the very Mass-book, are black; many parts of the office are omitted, and the people are dismissed without the benediction. If the mass be said for a person distinguished by his rank or virtues, it is followed with a funeral oration: they erect a *chapelle ardente*, that is, a representation of the deceased, with branches and tapers of yellow wax, either in the middle of the church or near the deceased's tomb, where the priest pronounces a solemn absolution of the deceased. There are likewise private masses said for stolen or strayed goods or cattle, for health, for travellers, etc., which go under the name of *votive masses*. There is still a further distinction of masses, denominated from the countries in which they were used: thus the Gothic mass, or *missa Mosarubum*, is that used among the Goths when they were masters of Spain, and is still kept up at Toledo and Salamanca; the Ambrosian mass is that composed by St. Ambrose, and used only at Milan, of which city he was bishop; the Gallic mass, used by the ancient Gauls; and the Roman mass, used by almost all the churches in the Romish communion. The mass of the presanctified (*missa præsanctificatorum*) is a mass peculiar not only to the Roman, but also to the Greek Church. In the latter there is no consecration of the elements; but, after singing some hymns, the bread and wine, which were consecrated on the preceding day, are partaken of. This mass is performed in the Greek Church not only on Good Friday, but on every day during all Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the Annunciation. The priest counts upon his fingers the days of the ensuing week on which it is to be celebrated, and cuts off as many pieces of bread at the altar as he is to say masses, and, after having consecrated them, steeps them in wine and puts them in a box, out of which, upon every occasion, he takes some of it with a spoon, and, putting it on a dish, sets it on the altar.

Ceremony.—The following office of the mass is extracted from the *Garden of the Soul*, prepared by the late bishop Challoner, and may be accepted, therefore, as the authorized rite of the English Roman Catholics: "At the beginning of the mass, the priest at the foot of the altar makes the sign of the cross, 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; amen,' and then recites with the clerk the 42d Psalm—'*Judica me, Deus*,' etc. Then the priest, bowing down, says the *Confiteor*, by way of a general confession to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to all the faithful there present, of his sins and unworthiness, and to beg their prayers to God for him. And the clerk, in the name of the people, prays for the priest, that God would have mercy on him, and forgive him his sins, and bring him to everlasting life. Then, in the name of all there present, the clerk makes the like general confession to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to the priest, and begs his prayers. And the priest prays to God to show mercy to all his people, and to grant them pardon, absolution, and remission of all their sins. Which is done to the end that both priest and people may put themselves in a penitential spirit, in order to assist worthily at this divine sacrifice. After the Confiteor the priest goes up to the altar, saying, 'Take away from us, we beseech thee, O Lord, our iniquities, that we may be worthy to enter with pure minds into the holy of holies, through Christ our Lord; amen,' and kisses the altar as a figure of Christ, and the seat of the sacred mysteries. When the priest is come up to the altar, he goes to the book, and there reads what is called the *introit* or entrance of the mass, which is different every day, and is generally an anthem taken out of the Scripture, with the first verse of one of the Psalms, and the Glory be to the Father, etc., to glorify the blessed Trinity. The priest returns to the middle of the altar, and says alternately with the clerk the *Kyrie eleison*, or Lord have mercy on us, which is said three times to God the Father; three times *Christe eleison*, or Christ have mercy on us, to God the Son; and three times again *Kyrie eleison*, to God the Holy Ghost. After the *Kyrie eleison*, the priest recites the '*Gloria in Excelsis*,' or Glory be to God on high, etc., being an excellent hymn and prayer to God, the beginning of which was sung by the angels at the birth of Christ. But this, being a hymn of joy, is omitted in the masses of *requiem* for the dead, and in the masses of the Sundays and ferias of the penitential times of Advent and Lent, etc. At the end of the Gloria in Excelsis the priest kisses the altar, and, turning about to the people, says, 'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Answer: 'Et cum spiritu tuo' (And with thy spirit). The priest returns to the book, and says, 'Oremus' (Let us pray), and then reads the collect or collects of the day, concluding them with the usual termination, 'Per Dominum nostrum,' etc. (Through our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.), with which the Church commonly concludes all her prayers. The collects being ended, the priest lays his hands upon the book and reads the epistle or lesson of the day, at the end of which the clerk answers, 'Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God)—viz., for the heavenly doctrine there delivered. Then follow some verses or sentences of Scripture, called the *gradual*, which are every day different. After this the book is removed to the other side of the altar, in order to the reading of the Gospel for the day; which removal of the book represents the passing from the preaching of the old law, figured by the lesson or epistle, to the Gospel of Jesus Christ published by the preachers of the new law. The priest, before he reads the Gospel, stands awhile bowing down before the middle of the altar, begging of God in secret to cleanse his heart and his lips, that he may be worthy to declare those heavenly words. At the beginning of the Gospel the priest greets the people with the usual salutation—'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you), and then tells out of which of the evangelists the Gospel is taken, saying, 'Sequentia S. Evangelii secundum,' etc. (What follows is of the holy Gospel, etc.). At these words both priest and people make the sign of the cross: 1st, upon their foreheads, to signify that they are not ashamed of the cross of Christ and his doctrine; 2d, upon their mouths, to signify they will ever profess it in words; 3d, upon their breasts, to signify that they will always keep it in their hearts. The clerk answers, 'Gloria tibi, Domine' (Glory be to thee, O Lord). At the Gospel the people stand up, to declare by that posture their readiness to go and do whatsoever they shall be commanded by the Saviour in his Gospel. At the end of the Gospel the clerk answers, 'Laus tibi, Christe' (Praise be to thee, O Christ), and the priest kisses the book in reverence to those sacred words he has been reading out of it. Then

upon all Sundays, and many other festival days, standing in the middle of the altar, he recites the Nicene Creed, kneeling down at the words 'He was made man,' in reverence to the great mystery of our Lord's incarnation. Then the priest turns about to the people and says, 'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Having read in the book a verse or sentence of the Scripture, which is called the *offertory*, and is every day different, he uncovers the chalice, and, taking in his hand the paten, or little plate, offers up the bread to God; then, going to the corner of the altar, he takes the wine and pours it into the chalice, and mingles with it a small quantity of water, in remembrance of the blood and water that issued out of our Saviour's side; after which he returns to the middle of the altar and offers up the chalice. Then, bowing down, he begs that this sacrifice, which he desires to offer with a contrite and humble heart, may find acceptance with God; and, blessing the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, he invokes the author of all sanctity to sanctify this offering. At the end of the offertory, the priest goes to the corner of the altar and washes the tips of his fingers, to denote the cleanness and purity of soul with which we ought to approach to these divine mysteries, saying, 'Lavabo,' etc. (I will wash my hands among the innocent, and I will encompass thy altar, O Lord, etc.), as in the latter part of the 26th Psalm. Then returning to the middle of the altar, and there bowing down, he begs of the blessed Trinity to receive this oblation in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for an honorable commemoration of the blessed Virgin and of all the saints, that they may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate upon earth. Then the priest, kissing the altar, turns to the people and says, 'Orate, fratres,' etc. (Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be made acceptable to God the Father Almighty). Then the priest says in a low voice the prayers called *secreta*, which correspond to the collects of the day, and are different every day. The priest concludes the secreta by saying aloud, 'Per omnia sæcula sæculorum' (World without end). Answer: Amen. Priest: 'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Answer: 'Et cum spiritu tuo' (And with thy spirit). Priest: 'Sursum corda' (Lift up your hearts). Answer: 'Habemus ad Dominum' (We have them lifted up to the Lord). Priest: 'Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro' (Let us give thanks to the Lord our God). Answer: 'Dignum et justum est' (It is meet and just). Then the priest recites the *preface* (so called because it serves as an introduction to the canon of the mass). After the preface follows the *canon* of the mass, or the most sacred and solemn part of this divine service, which is read with a low voice, as well to express the silence of Christ in his passion, and his hiding at that time his glory and his divinity, as to signify the vast importance of that common cause of all mankind, which the priest is then representing, as it were, in secret to the ear of God, and the reverence and awe with which both priest and people ought to assist at these tremendous mysteries. The canon begins by invoking the Father of mercies, through Jesus Christ his Son, to accept this sacrifice for the holy Catholic Church, for the pope, for the bishop, for the king, and for all the professors of the orthodox and apostolic faith throughout the whole world. Then follows the *memento*, or commemoration of the living, for whom in particular the priest intends to offer up that mass, or who have been particularly recommended to his prayers, etc. To which is subjoined a remembrance of all there present, followed by a solemn commemoration of the blessed Virgin, of the apostles, martyrs, and all the saints—to honor their memory by naming them in the sacred mysteries, to communicate with them, and to beg of God the help of their intercession, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Then the priest spreads his hands, according to the ancient ceremony of sacrifices, over the bread and wine which are to be consecrated into the body and blood of Christ, and begs that God would accept of this oblation which he makes in the name of the whole Church, and that he would grant us peace in this life and eternal salvation in the next. After which he solemnly blesses the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, and invokes the Almighty that they may be made to us the body and blood of his most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. And so he proceeds to the consecration, first of the bread into the body of our Lord, and then of the wine into his blood; which consecration is made by Christ's own words, pronounced in his name and person by the priest, and is the most essential part of this sacrifice, because thereby the body and blood of Christ are really exhibited and presented to God, and Christ is mystically immolated. Immediately after the consecration follows the elevation, first of the host, then of the chalice, in remembrance of Christ's elevation upon the cross. At the elevation of the chalice the priest recites those words of Christ, 'As often as you do these things, you shall do them for a commemoration of me.' Then he goes on, making a solemn commemoration of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and begging of God to accept this sacrifice, as he was pleased to accept the oblation of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek; and to command that it may, by his holy angel, be presented upon the altar above, in presence of his divine Majesty, for the benefit of all those that shall partake of these mysteries here below. Then the priest proceeds to the memento, or commemoration of the dead, saying, 'Remember also, O Lord, thy servants N. and N., who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and repose in the sleep of peace;' praying for all the faithful departed in general, and in particular for those for whom he desires to offer this sacrifice. After this memento or commemoration of the dead, the priest, raising his voice a little, and striking his breast, says, 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus,' etc. (And to us sinners, etc.), humbly craving mercy and pardon for his sins, and to be admitted to some part and society with the apostles and martyrs through Jesus Christ. Then kneeling down, and taking the sacred host in his hands, he makes the sign of the cross with it over the chalice, saying, 'Through him, and with him, and in him, is to thee, O God, the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory;' which last words he pronounces, elevating a little the host and chalice from the altar, and then kneels down, saying, with a loud voice, 'Per omnia sæcula sæculorum" (Forever and ever). Answer, *Amen*. After which he recites aloud the *Pater Noster*, or Lord's Prayer, the clerk answering at the end, 'Sed libera nos a malo' (But deliver us from evil). After this the priest breaks the host over the chalice, in remembrance of Christ's body being broken for us upon the cross; and he puts a small particle of the host into the chalice, praying that the peace of the Lord may be always with us. Then kneeling down, and rising up again, he says, '*Agnus Dei*,' etc. (Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us). He repeats this thrice; but at the third time, instead of 'Have mercy on us,' he says, 'Grant us peace.' After the *Agnus Dei*, the priest says three short prayers, by way of preparation for receiving the blessed sacrament; then kneeling down, and rising again, he takes up the host, and, striking his breast, he says thrice, 'Domine, non sum dignus,' etc. (Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof; speak only the word, and my soul shall be healed). After which he makes the sign of the cross upon himself with the host, saying, 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to life everlasting. Amen.' He so receives it. Then, after a short pause in mental prayer, he proceeds to the receiving of the chalice, using the like words, 'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to life everlasting. Amen.' Then follows the communion of the people, if any are to receive. After the communion, the priest takes the lotions, or ablutions, of wine and water in the chalice, in order to consummate whatever may remain of the con-

secrated species. Then covering the chalice, he goes to the book and reads a versicle of holy Scripture, called the communion; after which he turns about to the people with the usual salutation, *Dominus vobiscum*, and, returning to the book, reads the collects or prayers called the post-communion. After which he again greets the people with *Dominus vobiscum*, and gives them leave to depart with *Ite, missa est;* the clerk answering, 'Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God). Then the priest, bowing down before the altar, makes a short prayer to the blessed Trinity; and then, turning about to the people, gives his blessing to them all, in the name of the blessed Trinity; and so concludes the mass, by reading the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John, which the people hear standing, till these words, 'Et verbum caro factum est' (And the Word was made flesh); when both priest and people kneel down, in reverence to the mystery of Christ's incarnation. At the end the clerk answers, 'Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God). And so the priest returns from the altar to the sacristy, and unvests himself, reciting in the meantime the Benedicite, or the canticle of the three children, inviting all creatures in heaven and earth to praise and bless the Lord. As the mass represents the passion of Christ, and the priest there officiates in his person, so the vestments in which he officiates represent those with which Christ was ignominiously clothed at the time of his passion. Thus the amice represents the rag or clout with which the Jews muffled our Saviour's face, when at every blow they bid him prophesy who it was that struck him (Luke xxii, 64). The alb represents the white garment with which he was vested by Herod; the girdle, maniple, and stole represent the cords and bands with which he was bound in the different stages of his passion. The chasuble, or outward vestment, represents the purple garment with which he was clothed as a mock king; upon the back of which there is a cross, to represent that which Christ bore on his sacred shoulders; lastly, the priest's tonsure or crown, is to represent the crown of thorns which our Saviour wore. Moreover, as in the old law, the priests, that were wont to officiate in sacred functions, had, by the appointment of God, vestments assigned for that purpose, as well for the greater decency and solemnity of the divine worship, as to signify and represent the virtues which God required of his ministers, so it was proper that in the Church of the New Testament Christ's ministers should in their sacred functions be distinguished in like manner from the laity by their sacred vestments, which might also represent the virtues which God requires in them: thus the amice, which is first put upon the head, represents divine hope, which the apostle calls the helmet of salvation; the alb, innocence of life; the girdle, with which the loins are begirt, purity and chastity; the maniple, which is put on the left arm, patient suffering of the labors of this mortal life; the stole, the sweet yoke of Christ, to be borne in this life, in order to a happy immortality; in fine, the chasuble, which is uppermost, and covers all the rest, represents the virtue of charity. In these vestments the Church makes use of five colors, viz. the *white* on the feasts of our Lord, of the blessed Virgin, of the angels, and of the saints that were not martyrs; the *red* on the feasts of Pentecost, of the invention and exaltation of the cross, and of the apostles and martyrs; the *violet*, which is the penitential color, in the penitential times of Advent and Lent, and upon vigils and ember days; the *green* on most of the other Sundays and ferias throughout the year; and the *black* on Good Friday, and in the masses for the dead. We make a reverence to the altar upon which mass is said, because it is the seat of these divine mysteries, and a figure of Christ, who is not only our priest and sacrifice, but our altar too, inasmuch as we offer our prayers and sacrifices through him. Upon the altar we always have a crucifix, that, as the mass is said in remembrance of Christ's passion and death, both priest and people may have before their eyes, during this sacrifice, the image that puts them in mind of his passion and death. And there are always lighted candles upon the altar during mass, as well to honor the victory and triumph of our Great King (which is there celebrated) by these lights, which are tokens of our joy and of his glory, as to denote the light of faith, with which we are to approach to him.

"The priest who is to celebrate mass must previously confess all his mortal sins, in order that he may feel morally sure that he is in a state of grace, since for the recovery of that state by such as have once fallen from it, confession, or contrition, if confession cannot be obtained, is absolutely necessary. Confession is unattainable when there is no confessor, or when there is none but an excommunicated person, or one whose powers have expired, or whose powers do not extend to absolution from the particular sins of which the penitent is guilty, or one who is justly suspected of having betrayed the secrets of confession, or who requires an interpreter, or when it is impossible to go to confession without manifest inconvenience from distance, badness of the roads, inclemency of the season, or the murmurs of the congregation impatient for mass. Even if any of these reasons can be pleaded, no unconfessed priest ought to celebrate mass unless he be compelled by menaces of death, or through fear that a sick person may die without receiving the *viaticum*, or to avoid scandal when a congregation is waiting, or to finish a mass in which another priest has been accidentally interrupted. If a priest, during the celebration of mass, should recollect that he is in a state of mortal sin, excommunicated or suspended, or that the place in which he is celebrating it is interdicted, he must quit the altar, unless he has already consecrated the host; and even if he has done so, or any fear of scandal induces him to proceed (as it is morally impossible but that some such fear must arise), he must perform an act of contrition, and make a firm resolution to confess, if in his power, on the very same day. No priest, without committing venial or perhaps mortal sin, can celebrate mass before he has recited matins and lauds, unless from the necessity of administering the *viaticum* to the dying, or of exhorting such a one during the night, from pressure of confessions on a holiday, or to quiet murmurs among the congregation. It is a mortal sin for a priest intending to say mass to taste food, drink, or medicine after the preceding midnight. Even an involuntary transgression of such rules is a mortal sin; so that a priest offends in that degree if he celebrates mass after having been forced to eat or drink the smallest morsel or drop while the hour of midnight is striking, or a single moment afterwards. The exceptions are—1. To save the profanation of the host; thus, if a heretic is about to profane the host, and there be no one else by who can otherwise prevent it, a priest, although not fasting, may swallow it without sin. 2. When a priest has so far proceeded in mass that he cannot stop, as when water has been accidentally put into the chalice instead of wine, and he does not perceive it till he has swallowed it, or when he recollects after consecration that he is not fasting. 3. When, after having performed the *lavabo*, he perceives any scattered fragments of hosts, provided he be still at the altar, these he may eat. 4. To prevent scandal, such as a suspicion that he had committed a crime the night before. 5. To administer the *viaticum*. 6. To finish a mass commenced by another priest, and accidentally interrupted. 7. When he is dispensed. It is *very probably* a mortal sin, by authorities, to celebrate mass before dawn. So also mass must not be celebrated after noon, and never, unless for the dying, on Good Friday. It is a mortal sin to celebrate mass without the necessary vestments and ornaments, or with unconsecrated vestments, etc., unless in cases of the uttermost necessity. These vestments lose their consecration if any portion has been torn off and sewed on again, not if they are repaired before absolute disjunction, even if it be by a downright patch. No worn-out consecrated vestment should be applied to any other purpose; but it

should be burned, and the ashes thrown in some place in which they will not be trampled on. But, on the other hand, with a very wise distinction, the precious metals which have served profane uses may be applied to sacred purposes, after having been passed through the fire, which changes their very nature by fusion. No dispensation has ever yet been granted by any pope to qualify the rigid precept enjoining the necessity of an altar for mass; and this must have been consecrated by a bishop, not by a simple priest, unless through dispensation from the holy father himself. Three napkins are strictly necessary; two may suffice if such be the common usage of the country—one in very urgent cases; and even that, provided it be whole and clean, may be unconsecrated; but a lighted taper must not on any account be dispensed with, even to secure the receipt of the *viaticum* by a dying man. Mass must stop if the taper be extinguished and another cannot be obtained. On that account a lamp should be kept burning day and night before every altar on which the host is deposited; and those to whom the care of this lamp appertains commit a mortal sin if they neglect it for one whole day. In no case must a woman be allowed to assist a priest at the altar. Certain prevalent superstitions during the celebration of mass are forbidden—such as picking up from the ground, during the *sanctus* of the mass on Palm Sunday, the boxwood consecrated on that day, infusing it for three quarters of an hour, neither more nor less, in spring water, and drinking the water as a cure for the colic; keeping the mouth open during the *sanctus* in the mass for the dead, as a charm against mad dogs; writing the *sanctus* on a piece of virgin parchment, and wearing it as an amulet; saying mass for twenty Fridays running as a security against dying without confession, contrition, full satisfaction, and communion, and in order to obtain admission into heaven thirty days after decease; ordering a mass of the Holy Ghost to be said in certain churches by way of divination. If a fly or a spider fall into the cup before consecration, a fresh cup should be provided; if after consecration, it should be swallowed, if that can be done without repugnance or danger, otherwise it should be removed, washed with wine, burned after mass, and its ashes thrown into the sacristy. There are some nice precautions to be observed in case of the accidental fall of a host among the clothes of a female communicant; if the wafer fall on a napkin, it suffices that the napkin be washed by a subdeacon; but if it be stained by no more than a single drop of wine, the office must be performed by a priest.

In the celebration of mass the priest wears peculiar vestments, five in number—two of linen, called "amice" and "alb;" and three of silk or precious stuffs, called "maniple," "stole," and "chasuble," the alb being girt with a cincture of flaxen or silken cord. The color of these vestments varies with the occasion, five colors being employed on different occasions—white, red, green, purple or violet, and black; and they are often richly embroidered with silk or thread of the precious metals, and occasionally with precious stones. The priest is required to celebrate the mass fasting, and, unless by special dispensation, is only permitted to offer it once in the day, except on Christmas day, when three masses may be celebrated.

In the Greek and Oriental churches, the Eucharistic service, called in Greek *Theia Leitourgia* (The Divine Liturgy), differs in the order of its parts, in the wording of most of its prayers, and in its accompanying ceremonial, from the mass of the Latin Church [see LITURGY]; but the only differences which have any importance as bearing upon doctrine, are their use of leavened bread instead of unleavened; their more frequent celebration of the "Mass of the Presanctified," to which reference has already been made; the Latin use of private masses, in which the priest alone communicates; and, in general, the much more frequent celebration of the mass in the Latin Church. The sacred vestments, too, of the Greek and Eastern rites differ notably from those of the Latin; and in some of the former—as, for example, the Armenian—a veil is drawn before the altar during that part of the service in which the consecration takes place, which is only withdrawn at the time of the communion. The service sometimes used on shipboard, and improperly called *Missa Sicca* (Dry Mass), consists simply of the reading of the prayers of the mass, but without any consecration of the elements. It was resorted to with a view to avoiding the danger of spilling the sacred elements, owing to the unsteady motion of the ship. It is sometimes also called *Missa Nautica* (Ship Mass). (For detailed information on the practices of the Russo-Greek Church, see John Glen King, *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia* [London, 1772, 4to]. For the Eastern Church generally, see Neale, *Eastern Church: Introduction.*)

Frequency of the Mass.—"At first," says Walcott (p. 366), "celebration occurred only on Sundays (1 Cor. xvi, 1); and in the time of Justin Martyr, after the 2d century, the Western Christians communicated on Sundays, and Wednesdays, and Fridays. In the 4th century the Greek Church added Saturday; now it maintains daily celebration. St. Augustine says that the practice differed in various countries; in some celebration was daily, in others on Saturdays and Sundays, but in some on Sunday only; the daily celebration was practiced in Africa, Spain, and at Constantinople; in the 6th century it was general. St. Ambrose mentions three celebrations in the week, St. Francis one daily mass at Rome. After the 5th century priests were allowed on certain days, called Polyliturgic, to celebrate twice. Pope Deusdedit first enjoined a second mass in a day; Alexander I permitted a priest to celebrate only once a day; Leo IV forbade private masses, but still there were several festivals besides Christmas when the priest said mass three times in a day; Leo III sometimes celebrated seven or eight times in twelve hours, and it was not until the close of the 11th century that Alexander III directed that the same priest should say no more than one mass on the same day, Christmas excepted. The Council of Seligenstadt forbade a priest to exceed saying more than three masses in a day. From the 6th century these repeated masses said by some priest may be dated, when private masses were not in common use, and were permitted (as St. Leo says) in order to satisfy the need of crowds of communicants, and he calls it a form of tradition from the fathers. At length, when the pressure no longer existed in the 8th century, there were four masses at Christmas, two on the Circumcision, and three on SS. Peter and Paul's day, and on Maundy-Thursday. In France every priest was allowed to say two masses a day in Holy Week. Three masses were said on St. John Baptist's day: one in the eve, in commemoration of his being the Lord's messenger; a second on his feast, in memorial of the baptism in the Jordan; and the third because he was a Nazarite from his birth. In 1222, in England, mass might be said by a priest twice on the same day, at Christmas, Easter, and in the offices of the dead. The three Christmas masses were in honor of Christ, as the only-begotten of the Father, his spiritual birth in Christians, and his nativity of a woman. A restriction by the Council of Autun (613) was in force until the 10th century, against celebration by a priest at the same altar twice in one day, or where pontifical mass had been said. Priests who celebrated more than once collected all the ablutions of their fingers in one chalice, and the contents being emptied into a cup, were drank at the last mass by a deacon, clerk, or layman in a state of grace or innocent. The day when no mass was offered, except that of the Mass of the Presanctified, was called a liturgic. The Holy Communion was celebrated at first at night, or, as Pliny says, before daybreak, and Tertullian calls the meeting the Night Convocation, or that before light. But in time the Church prescribed the mass to be said in tierce of festivals, but always after tierce in England in 1322; on common days at sexts; in Lent and on fasts at nones,

or 3 P.M. In the Middle Ages the nightly celebrations were permitted on Christmas eve, on Easter eve, on St. John Baptist's, principally in France, and Saturdays in Ember weeks, when ordinations were held; and Easter and Pentecost on the hallowing of the candle. In 1483 archbishop Bourchier, from regard to his infirmity, received permission to celebrate in the afternoon. Belith says each day had its mass, commencing on Sunday; those of Holy Trinity, Charity, Wisdom, the Holy Ghost, Angels, Holy Cross, and St. Mary, and that at Rome. In the province of Ravenna the mass of Easter eve was not said until after midnight. He adds that the Greek Church excommunicated all who failed to partake of the Eucharist for three Sundays. See INVITATORY.

Literature.—The most noted writers on this subject are Bona, Gerbert, Gavanti, Binterim, Augusti. Besides these, see Bochart, *Traité de sacrifice de la Messe;* Derodon, *Le Tombeau de la Messe;* Du Moulin, *Pratique des cérémonies de la Messe;* Fechtius, *De orig. et superstitione Missarum;* Jaeger, *Suppositio missæ sacrificio;* Killian, *Tract. de sacrificio missatico* (Roman Cath.); Kösling, *Lithurg. Vorks. ii. d. heil. Messe* (2d ed.); Michaelis, *Frohnleichnahm u. Messopfer;* Gräser. *Die röm.-Kathol. Lit.* (Halle, 1829); Hirscher, *Missæ genuina notio* (Tüb. 1821); Mornay, *De doctrine de l'Eucharistie quand et par quels degrés la messe s'est introduite à sa place;* Bauer, *Prüfung der Gründe;* Baur, *Gegensatz des Katholicismus u. Protestantismus* (Tüb. 1836, 2d edit.); Baier, *Symbolik der röm.-Kathol. Kirche* (Leipsic, 1854); Anderson, *The Mass* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); Maguire, *One Hundred Defects of the Mass;* Meager, *Popish Mass celebrated by Heathen Priests;* Whitby, *Absurdity and Idolatry of the Mass; Bible and Missal*, ch. iv; Bossuet's *Variations*, vol. i; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv, s. v. Messe); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.; Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.;* Willet, *Synop. Pap.* (ed. Cumming, Lond. 1852); Forbes, *Considerations*, ii, 562; *English Rev.* x, 344; *Retrospective Rev.* xii, 70; *Westm. Rev.* 1866 (July), p. 95; *Christian Ch. Rev.* 1866 (April), p. 15 sq.; *Evangel. Qu. Rev.* 1869 (Jan.), p. 86; *Christian Remembrancer*, 1866 (Jan.), p. 63; *New Englander*, 1869, p. 525; Haag, *Les Dogmes Chrétiennes* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index, vol. ii); Cramp, *Text-Book of Popery;* Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. and Doctr. Theol.* s. v.; Eadie, *Ecclesiast. Dict.* s. v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. Messe.

Mass Penny, a conventional name for the offering made by a chief mourner at a funeral.

Mass Priests, mercenaries hired at a certain sum, who undertook an immoderate number of annals or trentals, and were unable to say them, and sold them to be offered by others. This abuse was forbidden in 1236 by archbishop Edmund's Constitutions (2). In 960 the mass priest was the secular, and the minister priest the conventual, and this is the earliest meaning of the term.

Mas'sa (Heb. *Massa'*, מַשָּׂא, a *lifting* up, as often; Sept. Μασσῆ), one of the sons of Ishmael (B.C. post 2061), who became the progenitor of an Arabian clan (Gen. xxv, 14; 1 Chron. i, 30). The tribe is usually, and not improbably, compared with the *Musani* (Μασανοί, Ptol. v, 19, 2), inhabiting the Arabian desert towards Babylonia, doubtless the same as the *Masæi*, a nomad tribe of Mesopotamia (Pliny, *H. N.* vi, 30). This would confirm Forster's theory that the twelve sons of Ishmael peopled the whole of the Arabian peninsula (*Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 284). As Dumah is named in connection with Seir (Isa. xxi, 11), there is some foundation for the opinion that Massa was a kingdom of considerable size, possibly reigned over by king Lemuel (Prov. xxx, 1, הַמַּשָּׂא, "the prophecy"). See LEMUEL. Hitzig arbitrarily locates Dumah in wady el-Kora, about fifty miles south-east of Akabah, and then places Massa between it and Mount Seir (Zeller's *Jahrbuch*, 1844, p. 288). See DUMAH.

Massa Candĭda, the name given to 300 Christians who, during the persecution of Valerian, and in the time of bishop Cyprian, were put to death by being burned in a lime-kiln. The name *Massa*, says Augustine, was given them "ob numeri multitudinem," and that of *candida* "ob causæ fulgorem." Baronius remarks: "Dicti sunt hi *Massa candida*, eo quod in fornace calcaria martyrium consumarint." Vincentius Bellovacensis, on the other hand, designates the Massa candida as "locus apud Carthaginem, in quo sub Imperatoribus gentilibus et in Christianos sævientibus fovea erat calce plena, in quam Christiani gentilium Diis sacrificare renuentes præcipitabantur." Augustine also uses the expression, "Uticensis Massa candida," which Baronius explains: "Uticæ præcipue agebatur horum solemnitas, atque ea de causa S. Augustinus Massam candidam Uticensem dictam esse refert." Aurelius Prudentius Clemens refers to the Massa candida in his hymn on St. Cyprian (*Lib. Persistephanon*, Hymn xiii) in the following glowing description:

> "Fama refert foveam campi in medio patere jussam,
> Calce vaporifera Summos prope margines refertam
> Saxa recocta vomunt ignem niveusque pulvis ardet,
> Urere tacta potens; et mortifer ex odore flatus.
> Appositam memorant aram, fovea stetisse summa,
> Lege sub hac salis aut micam, jecur aut suis litarent
> Christicolæ, aut mediæ sponte irruerent in ima fossæ.
> Prosiluere alacres cursu rapido simul trecenti.
> Gurgite pulvereo mersos liquor aridus voravit,
> Præcipitemque globum fundo tenus implicavit imo.
> Corpora candor habet, candor vehit ad superna mentes.
> Candida Massa dehinc dici meruit per omne sæclum."

The festival is commemorated Aug. 24.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 142.

Massagĕtæ, an ancient nomadic people, who inhabited the broad steppes on the north-east of the Caspian Sea, to the northward of the river Araxes or Jaxartes. Herodotus says that they had a community of wives; that they sacrificed and devoured their aged people; that they worshipped the sun, and offered horses to him; that they lived on the milk and flesh of their herds, and on fish; and fought on horseback and on foot with lance, bow, and double-edged axe. Cyrus is said to have lost his life in fighting against them, B.C. 530. Niebuhr and Böckh are of opinion that they belonged to the Mongolian, but Humboldt and others, to the Indo-Germanic or Aryan family.

Mas'sah (Heb. *Massah'*, מַסָּה, *trial*, as often; Sept. πειρασμός, πεῖρα; Vulg. *tentatio*), a name given to the spot in Rephidim where the Israelites provoked Jehovah by murmuring for want of water; otherwise called MERIBAH (Exod. xvii, 7; Deut. vi, 16; ix, 22; xxviii, 8). The name also occurs (in the Heb.), with mention of the circumstances which occasioned it, in Psa. xcv, 8, 9, and its Greek equivalent in Heb. iii, 8.

Massalians (from מְצַלִּין) or **Messalians**, also called *Enthusiasts*, were a sect which sprung up about the year A.D. 360, in the reign of the emperor Constantius. They were mainly roaming mendicant monks, and flourished in Mesopotamia and Syria. They maintained that men have two souls, a celestial and a diabolical; and that the latter is driven out by prayer. They consequently conceived the Christian life as an unintermitted prayer, despised the moral law and the sacraments, and claimed to enjoy perfection. The Gospel history they declared a mere allegory. But they concealed their pantheistic mysticism and antinomianism under external conformity to the Catholic Church. From those words of our Lord, "Labor not for the meat that perisheth," it is said that they concluded they ought not to do any work to get their bread. We may suppose, says Dr. Jortin, that this sect did not last long; that these sluggards were soon starved out of the world; or, rather, that cold and hunger sharpened their wits, and taught them to be better interpreters of Scripture. Towards the close of the 4th century the Church discovered the real tendency of the Massalians, and they were sorely persecuted; but, notwithstanding all oppo-

sition, they perpetuated themselves to the 7th century, and reappeared in the *Euchites* and *Bogomiles* (q. v.) of the Middle Ages. See Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 240–247; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 199.

Massarius, a chamberlain of the *massa communis*, which was the common fund of a cathedral.

Masseketh. See Talmud.

Massi'as (Μασσίας v. r. Ἀσσείας), given (1 Esdr. ix, 22) in place of the Maasseiah (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 22).

Massie, James William, D.D., LL.D., a minister of the English Independents, for some time engaged in the missionary field, was born in Ireland in 1799. He was educated for the ministry by Dr. Bogue, and went out as a missionary to India. After laboring there a few years he returned to Great Britain, was pastor for a time at Perth, Scotland, and subsequently at Dublin, Ireland, and Salford, England, from which latter place he removed to London, to act as secretary of the Home Missionary Society. Deeply interested in all the public movements of the day, he took a prominent part in the anti-slavery movement, and was an active member of the Union and Emancipation societies formed during the late war in the United States. He visited this country several times, and was twice delegated from the Independents to our Congregationalists and Presbyterians. He died at Kingston, Ireland, May 8, 1869. Dr. Massie was the author of several works, among which were *Continental India* (1839, 2 vols. 8vo; 1840, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Recollections, illustrating the Religion, etc., of the Hindûs* (2 vols.):—*The Nonconformists' Plea for Freedom of Education* (1847):—*The Evangelical Alliance, its Origin and Development* (1847):—*Liberty of Conscience illustrated*, etc. (1847):—*Social Improvement among the Working Classes affecting the entire Body Politic* (1849):—*Slavery the Crime and Curse of America* (1852):—*The Contrast—War and Christianity: Martial Evils and their Remedy* (1855):—*Christ a Learner* (1858):—*Revivals in Ireland: Facts, Documents, and Correspondence* (1859–60):—*Revival Work* (1860):—*The American Crisis in Relation to the Anti-slavery Cause* (1862):—*America, the Origin of her present Conflict; her Prospect for the Slave, and her Claim for Anti-slavery Sympathy, illustrated by Incidents of Travel during a Tour in the Summer of* 1863 *throughout the United States* (1864); etc.

Massieu, Guillaume, a learned French writer, was born April 13, 1665, at Caen, where he finished his classical studies. At sixteen he began a course of philosophy at the college of the Jesuits. As he proved himself an apt pupil, the Jesuits desired to attach him to their order, and sent him to Rennes to teach rhetoric, designing him ultimately for the professorship of theology; but his studies were not congenial to his tastes, and, his love for belles-lettres far exceeding that for theology, he forsook the society after he had actually joined it, and returned to the world. His remarkable gifts soon gained him friends, and he found work as an instructor. While at Paris he made the acquaintance of the abbot De Tourreil, whom he aided in translating the works of Demosthenes; through his influence also he became a pensioner of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1705, and in the same year was elected professor royal of the Greek language in the College of France, where he distinguished himself during the twelve years that he held the position by his profound knowledge and a pure and delicate taste. In 1714 the French Academy was opened to him. His oration delivered on this occasion is printed in the collections of the academy. Having translated Pindar, he naturally defended the writers of antiquity against the attacks of Perrault and of Lamothe. The *Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions* (vol. i, ii, and iii) contain a great number of dissertations from the abbé Massieu. They are still read with pleasure, although they are more distinguished for delicacy of finish than for profound erudition; the principal are, *Les Grâces, Les Hespérides, Les Boucliers votifs, Les Serments chez les Anciens*, and a *Parallèle entre Homère et Platon*. His most valuable work is *L'Histoire de la Poésie Françoise, à partir du onzième siècle*. Massieu was one of the many distinguished literary men who are obliged all through life to maintain an incessant struggle with poverty. In his old age he suffered many bodily grievances, and two cataracts deprived him of his sight. He rendered valuable service to Biblical literature by his edition of the *New Testament* in Greek (printed at Paris, 1715, in 2 vols. 12mo). He died Sept. 26, 1722, at Paris.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Massilians, a school of theologians in Southern Gaul, who, about the year 425, with John Cassian of Marseilles (*Massilia*), a pupil of Chrysostom, at their head, asserted the necessity of the co-operation of divine grace and the human will, maintained that God works differently in different men, and rejected the doctrine of predestination as a vain speculation of mischievous tendency. They were called at first Massilians; afterwards, by scholastic writers, Semi-Pelagians; although, far from taking that name themselves, they rejected all connection with Pelagianism. Cassian recognised the universal corruption of human nature as a consequence of the first transgression, and recognised grace as well as justification in the sense of St. Augustine, whom he opposed on the question of election. See Riddle, *Eccl. Chron.*; Eden, *Theol. Dict.*; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, ii. 261, 627–630; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 859 sq.; Wiggers, *Gesch. des Semi-Pelagianismus*, ii, 7 sq.; Guericke, *Ch. Hist.* i, 391 sq.; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, ii, 375; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* vol. i. See Semi-Pelagians and Cassianus.

Massillon, Jean Baptiste, prominent among the most eloquent divines of the French Roman Catholic Church, was born at Hières, in Provence, June 24, 1663. His father was a notary in moderate circumstances, and at first intended his son for the same profession, but subsequently allowed him to receive the instructions of the Fathers of the Oratory, and when eighteen years of age the young man joined that order. Soon after, forsaking the world altogether, he entered an abbey under the rule of La Trappe. Here, however, his talents attracted the attention of the bishop, afterwards cardinal de Noailles, who induced him to re-enter the Oratory, in which he soon achieved great eminence. Yet his success was more the fruit of labor than of spontaneous genius, and his last efforts are much superior to his first. In 1696 he went to Paris as principal of the Seminary of St. Magloire, the renowned school of the Oratory. Here, in the midst of the prevailing laxity of morals, he commenced his career as a pulpit orator, the delivery of his "Ecclesiastical conferences" to ecclesiastical students affording him an opportunity of developing his talent. He admired the austere eloquence of Bourdaloue, but chose for himself a different style, characterized by profound pathos, and an insight into the most secret motives of the human heart. He was shortly noted as the preacher of repentance and penitence; and it was declared by able contemporaries of his sermons that "they reach the heart, and produce their due effects with much more certainty than all the logic of Bourdaloue." He delivered the customary Lent sermons at Montpellier in 1698, and the following year at Paris. The latter were warmly applauded, and induced the king to invite Massillon to preach the "Advent" at court. On this occasion king Louis XIV paid him the highest compliments. He said, "I have heard many talented preachers in my chapel before, and was much pleased with them; but every time I hear you, I feel much displeased with myself." He again preached the Lent sermons before the court during the years 1701 to 1704, but afterwards he received no calls to appear before them until the death of the king: so fearless and plain-spoken a preacher would have been ill suited to

the gallant and profligate court of "the great king." At the death of Louis XIV, Massillon was requested to preach his funeral sermon; in other words, to pronounce a eulogy of this prince. This was an arduous task for the uncourtierlike preacher; yet he undertook it, and in his discourse lauded the fame and piety of the king, yet deplored the evils suffered by the nation in consequence of the wars and the looseness of morals. Invited now to preach the Lent sermons before the young king, Louis XV, then but eight years of age, he took advantage of the occasion to censure the manners of the court; and morality, rather than the passion of Christ, formed the subject of his sermons. These are ten in number, and being short, to accommodate them to the youth of his royal hearer, are known under the name of *Le petite carême*. In 1717 Massillon became bishop of Clermont, and in 1719 member of the French Academy. Two years after he preached at St. Denis the funeral sermon of the duchess Elizabeth Charlotte of Orleans, daughter of the elector of Palatinate, and mother of the regent. This is considered one of the best of his six *Oraisons Funèbres*. Thereafter he remained quietly in his diocese, diligently fulfilling his pastoral duties until his death. Less ambitious than Bossuet, he did not wish to remain connected with the court, or in any way to take part in temporal affairs. His life was a model of Christian virtue and gentleness; he never disputed against any but infidels, and the Roman Catholics will not forgive him for having, in his eulogy of Louis XIV, after praising this monarch for his efforts to destroy heresy, alluded to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve and pronounced it *a bloody wrong*, to be ever condemned in the name of religion as well as of humanity. Preaching from the fulness of his heart, he did not consider the rank of those he addressed, but spoke to them with nobleness of purpose in all simplicity and fervor. He carefully instructed the clergy of his diocese by holding numerous conferences and by synodal discourses. He died Sept. 18, 1742. D'Alembert pronounced his eulogy before the French Academy.

The fame of this celebrated man stands perhaps higher than that of any preacher who has preceded or followed him, by the number, variety, and excellence of his productions, and their eloquent and harmonious style. Grace, dignity, and force, and an inexhaustible fecundity of resources, particularly characterize his works. His *Avent et Carême*, consisting of six volumes, may be justly considered as so many "chef-d'œuvres." His mode of delivery contributed not a little to his success. "We seem to behold him still in imagination," said they who had been fortunate enough to attend his discourses, "with that simple air, that modest carriage, those eyes so humbly directed downwards, that unstudied gesture, that touching tone of voice, that look of a man fully impressed with the truths which he enforced, conveying the most brilliant instruction to the mind, and the most pathetic movements to the heart." The famous actor, Baron, after hearing him, told him to continue as he had begun. "You," said he, "have a manner of your own; leave the rules to others." At another time he said to an actor who was with him, "My friend, this is the true orator; we are mere players." Voltaire is said to have kept a volume of Massillon's sermons constantly on his desk, as a model of eloquence. He thought him "the preacher who best understood the world—whose eloquence savored of the courtier, the academician, the wit, and the philosopher." Massillon's works, consisting mainly of sermons, have been collected and published under the title *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1776, 15 vols. 12mo). In English we have, *Sermons on the Duties of the Great*, translated from the French; preached before Louis XV during his minority; by William Dodd, LL.D. (Lond. 1776, 2d ed. sm. 8vo):—*Sermons*, selected and translated by William Dickson (Lond. 1826, 8vo):—*Charges, with two Essays*, translated by Theophilus St. John [the Rev. S. Clapham] (Lond. 1805, 8vo):—*Sermons on Death, Psa. lxxxix*, 47, translated (T. Wimbolt, *Sermons*):—*Ecclesiastical Conferences, Synodical Discourses, and Episcopal Mandates*, etc., translated by C. H. Boylan, of Maynooth College (1825, 2 vols. 8vo). See La Harpe, *Cours de Littérat.*; Maury, *Éloquence de la Chaire*; F. Theremin, *Demosthenes und Massillon* (1845); D'Alembert, *Éloge de Massillon*; Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries de Lundi*; Talbert, *Éloge de Massillon* (1773); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; *Christian Remembrancer*, 1854 (Jan.), p. 104; *Presb. Rev.* 1868 (April), p. 295. (J. H. W.)

Masson, John, a minister of the Reformed Church, who was a native of France, whence he emigrated to England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He then settled in Holland, and assisted in a critical journal entitled *Histoire Critique de la Republique de Lettres* from 1712 to 1721. He also wrote lives of Horace, Ovid, and Pliny the Younger, in Latin; and *Histoire de Pierre Huyle et de ses Ouvrages* (12mo). He died in England about 1760.

Masson, Philip, a relative of the preceding, who assisted in the same journal, and was also the author of a critical dissertation designed to show the utility of the Chinese language in explaining various passages of the Old Testament.

Masson, Samuel, brother of John, was pastor of the English Church at Dort, and conductor of the above journal.

Massorah. See MASORAH.

Massuet, RÉNÉ, a French Benedictine monk of the Congregation of St. Maur, was born at St. Ouen, in Normandy, in 1665. He studied philosophy and theology in different Benedictine convents; was made licentiatus juris at Caen; and came to the abbey of St. Germain des Près, at Paris, in 1703. Here he commenced his scientific labors, which secured him a distinguished place in that learned congregation. After the death of Ruinart, Massuet was intrusted with the continuation of the annals of the order, and he furnished the fifth volume. The principal work from his pen is an edition of the works of Irenæus, published under the title *Sancti Irenæi, episcopi Lugdunensis, contra Hæreses Libri v* (Paris, 1710, fol.); considered as having been the best edition of this Church father that had appeared up to Massuet's time. He prefaced the works of Irenæus by three dissertations, which give good proof of the editor's penetration and judgment. In the first dissertation the person, character, and condition of Irenæus are considered, setting forth particularly the writings and heretics he encountered; in the second, the life, actions, martyrdom, and writings of this saint are treated of; and in the third his sentiments and doctrines are reviewed. Massuet took an active part in the Jansenistic controversies. Having undertaken to defend the edition of the works of St. Augustine against the attacks of the Jesuit Langlois, he wrote *Lettre d'un Ecclesiastique au R. P. E. L. sur celle qu'il a écrite aux R. P. Bénédictins de la Cong. de Saint-Maur* (Osnabruck, 1699). He is also the author of a *Lettre à M. l'évêque de Bayeux, sur son mandement du 5 Mai* 1707 (La Haye, 1708, 12mo); and a book entitled *Augustinus Græcus*, in which he defends the opinions of his order on grace and free agency, but which was never published. He died at Paris, Jan. 11, 1716. See *Hist. Littér. de la Cong. de St. Maur*, p. 375; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 217; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 145.

Mast is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. words. חֹבֶל (*chibbel'*, so called from the *ropes* and stays with which it is fastened), occurs only in Prov. xxiii, 34, "Thou (that tarriest long at the wine) shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of the mast" (Sept. ὥσπερ κυβερνήτης ἐν πολλῷ κλύδωνι, Vulg. *quasi sopitus gubernator amisso clano*), doubtless correctly as referring to an intoxicated sailor falling asleep at the mast-head in a storm at sea. תֹּרֶן (*to'ren*, prob. i. q. אֹרֶן, a *pine*-tree),

the *mast* of a ship (Isa. xxiii, 23; Ezek. xxvii, 5; Sept. *ἱστός*, Vulg. *malus*); also a *signal-pole* set up on mountains for an ensign (Isa. xxx, 17; Sept. *ἱστός*, Vulg. *malus*, Auth. Vers. "beacon"). Ancient vessels had often two or three masts (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Malus). See SHIP.

Master is the rendering in the A.V. of the following Heb. and Greek words: אָדוֹן, *adon'*, *κύριος*, properly *lord*, as usually rendered; בַּעַל, *ba'al*, an *owner*, hence master in the prevalent sense, *δεσπότης*; also רַב, *rab*, great or chief, usually in combination; שַׂר, *sar*, prince or captain, *ἐπιστάτης*; finally *διδάσκαλος*, *teacher*. On "masters of assemblies" (Eccl. xii, 11), see ASSEMBLY. For master of the feast, see ARCHITRICLINUS.

MASTER, in a *Christian* point of view, is a person who has servants under him; a ruler or instructor. The duties of masters relate, 1. *To the civil concerns of the family.* They are to arrange the several businesses required of servants; to give particular instructions for what is to be done, and how it is to be done; to take care that no more is required of servants than they are equal to; to be gentle in their deportment towards them; to reprove them when they do wrong, to commend them when they do right; to make them an adequate recompense for their services, as to protection, maintenance, wages, and character. 2. *As to the morals of servants.* Masters must look well to their servants' characters before they hire them; instruct them in the principles and confirm them in the habits of virtue; watch over their morals, and set them good examples. 3. *As to their religious interests.* They should instruct them in the knowledge of divine things (Gen. xiv, 14; xviii, 19); pray with them and for them (Josh. xxiv, 15); allow them time and leisure for religious services, etc. (Eph. vi, 9). See Stennett, *On Domestic Duties*, ser. 8; Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, i, 233, 235; Beattie's *Elements of Moral Science*, i, 150, 153; Doddridge's *Lectures*, ii, 266.

Masters OF THE CHURCH, a name given (1) to the learned clergy who sat as advisers of the bishops in synods; (2) also to the residentiaries in a minster, as master of the lady chapel, being its keeper; master of the choristers, master of the common hall, calefactory, or parlor; master of converts, the superintendent of lay-brothers; the master of the novices, always an elderly monk; master of the song-school, master of the shrine, masters of the order or custodes, the great officers of the monastery.

Mastiaux, CASPAR ANTON VON, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Bonn, Germany, March 3, 1766. He became a canon at Augsburg in 1786, and was ordained to the priesthood, and appointed preacher at the cathedral of Augsburg, three years later. After filling several subordinate positions, he was made privy-councillor to the king of Bavaria in 1806. He received the degree of master of philosophy in 1784, doctor of laws in 1786, doctor of divinity in 1790, and was admitted as an honorary member to several academies and learned societies. His published works embrace *De veterum Ripuariorum statu civili et ecclesiastico commentatio historica* (Bonn, 1784):—*A Historical and Geographical Description of the Archbishopric of Cologne*:—*On the negative Character of Religious Principle among the Modern French*:—*A Sketch of Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan and Cardinal in the Romish Church*:—*The Passion-week, according to the Ritual of the Roman Church*:—*An Essay on Chorals and Hymns for the Church*:—*Several Collections of Hymns, and of Ancient and Modern Tunes*:—*A number of Sermons, and of miscellaneous Speeches in German and Latin.* He served for a time as editor of Felder's *Literaturzeitung*, for teachers of the Roman Catholic faith, and was noted for his pointed and satirical style. The year of his death, which occurred at Munich, is not exactly known; it is supposed to have been 1828. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 921.

Mastic (*σχῖνος*, Vulg. *lentiscus*, A. Vers. "mastick-tree") occurs but once, and that in the Apocrypha (Susan. v, 54), where there is a happy play upon the word. "Under what tree sawest thou them? . . . under a mastic-tree (*ὑπὸ σχῖνον*). And Daniel said . . . the angel of God hath received the sentence of God to cut thee in two (*σχίσει σε μέσον*)." This is unfortunately lost in our version; but it is preserved by the Vulgate, "sub schino . . . scindet te;" and by Luther, "Linde . . . finden." A similar play occurs in ver. 58, 59, between *πρῖνον* and *πρίσαι σε*. For the bearing of these and similar characteristics on the date and origin of the book, see SUSANNA.

There is no doubt that the Greek word is correctly rendered, as is evident from the description of it by Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* ix, i, § 2, 4, § 7, etc.), Pliny (*N. H.* iii, 36; xxiv, 28), Dioscorides (i, 90), and other writers. Herodotus (iv, 177) compares the fruit of the lotus (the *Rhamnus lotus*, Linn., not the Egyptian *Nelumbium speciosum*) in size with the mastic berry, and Babrius (3, 5) says its leaves are browsed by goats. The fragrant resin known in the arts as "mastic," and which is obtained by incisions made in the trunk in the month of August, is the produce of this tree, whose scientific name is *Pistacia lentiscus*. It is used with us to strengthen the teeth and gums, and was so applied by the ancients, by whom it was much prized on this account, and for its many supposed medicinal virtues. Lucian (*Lexiph.* 12) uses the term *σχινοτρώκτης* of one who chews mastic wood in order to whiten his teeth. Martial (*Ep.* xiv, 22) recommends a mastic toothpick (*dentiscalpium*). Pliny (xxiv, 7) speaks of the leaves of this tree being rubbed on the teeth for toothache. Dioscorides (i, 90) says the resin is often mixed with other materials and used as tooth-powder, and that, if chewed, it imparts a sweet odor to the breath. It is from this use as chewing-gum that we have the derivation of *mastic*, from *μαστίχη*, the gum of the *σχῖνος*, and *μάσταξ*, *μαστιχάω*, *μασάομαι*, "to chew," "to masticate." Both Pliny and Dioscorides state that the best mastic comes from Chios, and to this day the Arabs prefer that which is imported from that island (comp. Niebuhr, *Beschr. von Arab.* p. 144; Galen, *De fac. Simpl.* 7, p. 69). Tournefort (*Voyages*, ii, 58–61, transl. 1741) has given a full and very interesting account of the Lentisks or Mastic plants of Scio (Chios): he says that "the towns of the island are distinguished into three classes, those *del Campo*, those of *Apanomeria*, and those where they plant *Lentisk-trees*, whence the mastic in tears is produced." Tournefort enumerates several lentisk-tree villages. Of the trees he says, "These trees are very wide

Mastic (*Pistacia Lentiscus*).

spread and circular, ten or twelve feet tall, consisting of several branchy stalks which in time grow crooked. The biggest trunks are a foot diameter, covered with a bark, grayish, rugged, chapt . . . the leaves are disposed in three or four couples on each side, about an inch long, narrow at the beginning, pointed at their extremity, half an inch broad at the middle. From the junctures of the leaves grow flowers in bunches like grapes; the fruit, too, grows like bunches of grapes, in each berry whereof is contained a white kernel. These trees blow in May; the fruit does not ripen but in autumn and winter." This writer gives the following description of the mode in which the mastic gum is procured. "They begin to make incisions in these trees in Scio the first of August, cutting the bark crossways with huge knives, without touching the younger branches; next day the nutritious juice distils in small tears, which by little and little form the mastic grains; they harden on the ground, and are carefully swept up from under the trees. The height of the crop is about the middle of August, if it be dry, serene weather, but if it be rainy the tears are all lost. Likewise towards the end of September the same incisions furnish mastic, but in lesser quantities." Besides the uses to which reference has been made above, the people of Scio put grains of this resin in perfumes, and in their bread before it goes to the oven. Mastic is one of the most important products of the East, being extensively used in the preparation of spirits, as juniper berries are with us, as a sweetmeat, as a masticatory for preserving the gums and teeth, as an antispasmodic in medicine, and as an ingredient in varnishes. The hardened mastic, in the form of roundish straw-colored tears, is much chewed by Turkish women. It consists of resin, with a minute portion of volatile oil. The Greek writers occasionally use the word σχῖνος for an entirely different plant, viz. the Squill (*Scilla maritima*) (see Aristoph. *Plut.* 715; Sprengel, *Flor. Hippoc.* 41; Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* v, 6, § 10). The *Pistacia lentiscus* is common on the shores of the Mediterranean. According to Strand (*Flor. Palæst.* No. 559), it has been observed at Joppa, both by Rauwolf and Pococke. The mastic-tree belongs to the natural order *Anacardiaceæ*. — Smith, s. v. See Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 362; Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1230; Belon, *Observ.* ii, 81.

Masúdi, Abu'l Hasan (*Ali ben-Husein ben-Ali*), one of the most celebrated Arabian savants, an early writer in the department of comparative religion, from the Mussulman stand-point, was born, according to his own statement, at Bagdad in the 3d century of the Hegira, or the 9th of the Christian æra, and was the descendant of an illustrious family, who were among the early and devout followers of the Prophet of Mecca. Masudi was gifted with great talents, which he applied at an early age to learned pursuits. He gathered an immense stock of knowledge in all branches of science; and his learning was not mere book learning, but he improved it in his long travels through all parts of the East, Turkey, Eastern Russia, and Spain. In A.H. 303 he visited India, Ceylon, and the coast of China, where the Arabs had founded numerous small colonies; thence he went to Madagascar and Southern Arabia; thence through Persia to the Caspian; he also visited the Khazors in Southern Russia. In A.H. 314 he was in Palestine; from 332 to 334 in Syria and Egypt; and he says in 345, when he wrote his last book, the second edition of his *Golden Meadows*, he was in Egypt, and had been a long time absent from his native country, Irak. He says he travelled so far to the west (Morocco and Spain) that he forgot the east, and so far east that he forgot the west. Masudi died probably at Kahirah (Cairo), A.H. 345 (A.D. 956); and, since he visited India as early as A.H. 303, it is evident that those who say he died young are mistaken.

No Arabian writer is quoted so often, and spoken of with so much universal admiration. The variety of subjects on which he wrote astonishes even the learned, and the philosopher is surprised to see this Arab of the Middle Age resolving questions which remained problems to Europeans for many centuries after him. Masudi knew not only the history of the Eastern nations, but also ancient history, and that of the Europeans of his time. He had thoroughly studied the different religions of mankind—Mohammedanism, Christianity, the doctrines of Zoroaster and Confucius, and the idolatry of barbarous nations. No Arabian writer can boast, like him, of learning at once profound and almost universal. Unfortunately, however, Masudi wanted method in arranging the prodigious number of facts which a rare memory never failed to supply him with while he was writing. He illustrates the history of the geography of the West with analogies or contrasts taken from China or Arabia; he avails himself of his knowledge of Christianity to elucidate the creeds of the different Mohammedan sects; and, while he informs the reader of the mysteries of the extreme North, he will all at once forget his subject, and transfer him into the Desert of Sahara. For a list of his works, which are mostly extant only in MS., see the *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Mātăli, in Hindû mythology, is the charioteer of Indra. See Williams, *Translation of Sakûntala*, Act VI.

Mater Dolorōsa, or *Lady of Sorrow*, is the technical term given to such portraits of the Virgin Mary as represent her alone, weeping or holding the crown of thorns. "She appears alone," says Mrs. Jameson (*Legends of the Madonna*, p. 36), "a seated or standing figure, often the head or half-length only, the hands clasped, the head bowed in sorrow, tears streaming from the heavy eyes, and the whole expression intensely mournful. The features are properly those of a woman in

Representation of the *Mater Dolorosa*. (After Murillo.)

middle age; but in later times the sentiment of beauty predominated over that of the mother's agony, and I have seen the sublime Mater Dolorosa transformed into a merely beautiful and youthful maiden, with such an air of sentimental grief as might be felt for the loss of a sparrow." It is common also to represent the Virgin with a sword in her bosom, and even with seven swords, in allusion to the seven sorrows (Luke ii, 35)—a version of the allegorical prophecy which the Romanists have found quite profitable for the interests of the hierarchy. There are few Roman Catholic churches without this representation of Mary. See Stabat Mater.

Mater Speciōsa, or *Lady of Joy*, the counterpart of the hymn of "*Mater Dolorosa*." See Stabat Mater.

Materialism may be defined as that system of philosophy which considers matter as the fundamental principle of all things, and consequently denies absolutely the independence and autonomy of the spirit. It

is sometimes considered as synonymous with *Naturalism*, yet this is erroneous, for there is a difference between the notions of nature and matter. It is also called by some *Sensualism*, which is more correct, yet only expresses one of the characteristics of the theory of materialism. In a more extended sense, the expression materialism is made to signify the whole of the practical results which, consciously or unconsciously, flow from such philosophy, and whose final object, although sometimes restrained by considerations of prudence or expediency, is sensual enjoyment in its fullest sense.

Materialism, strictly viewed, is the doctrine that all spirit, so called, is material in its substance, and is subject to the laws which govern the composition of material particles and the activity of material forces. Strictly construed, it is a psychological doctrine or theory; but, as it implies certain philosophical assumptions or principles, it makes a place for itself in the domain of speculative philosophy. Its assumptions and conclusions are also fundamental to theology. If its positions are tenable, theology is impossible. If the human soul is but another name for an aggregation of material particles, it cannot exist when these particles are sundered. Although it is conceivable that these particles may be so minute as not necessarily to be disturbed by the dissolution of the larger particles which constitute the body, yet this is too improbable to relieve the materialistic theory from the charge of being inconsistent with the possibility of a future life. The moral relations of the soul must be entirely inconsistent with its subjection to the laws which govern matter and its activities, and these moral relations give to theology — certainly to Christian theology—all its interest. If the assumptions of materialism are correct, there can be no intelligent and personal Creator. Creation itself is inconceivable, and therefore impossible.

A significant fact, which strikes one at first on the study of the history of materialism, is that it never appears as a power among the masses in the early stages of civilization. On the contrary, we find that in all nations a more or less perfect spiritual contemplation of nature forms the first step towards religious consciousness. This fact is a sufficient answer in itself to the assertion that materialism is the original and true form of human consciousness. On the other hand, we find materialism spreading among the masses in the nations which have attained the culminating point of their civilization. It becomes, then, the premonitory sign of their downfall, being already an evidence of their moral and spiritual decay.

The materialistic theory was in some sense sanctioned by those earlier Greek philosophers who referred the origin of all things—the spirit of man included—to some attenuated form of matter, as water, air, or fire. From these rude speculations philosophy emerged by successive efforts, till in the Socratic school the soul of man was held to be distinct in its essence from matter, to be superior to matter, and indestructible by the dissolution of the body. The Socratic school also emphasized the doctrine that mind has infused order into the universe. The Platonic philosophy enforced these doctrines with glowing appeals to the nobler sentiments, and embellished them with a great variety of mythological representations. Aristotle, more cautious and exact in his statements, asserted for the higher forms of intellectual activity an essence distinct from matter. The philosophers of the Epicurean school were avowed materialists. They taught explicitly and earnestly the doctrine that what is called the soul is composed of atoms, and must necessarily be dissipated at death. The universe itself likewise consists of atoms, and all its phenomena are the results of fortuitous combinations of atoms. Sensation, intelligence, and desire are the effects of the action and reaction of the atoms within and the atoms without the body. These doctrines are elaborately set forth by the celebrated Lucretius (B.C. 95–44) in his poem *De rerum natura*. The Atomic Materialism of Epicurus, and the Imaginative and Rational Spiritualism of Plato and Aristotle, separated the Greek philosophers into two leading divisions, with various unimportant subordinate sections. Among the Jews, the Sadducees denied that there was either angel or spirit, or existence after death; but there is no evidence that they supported these doctrines by any philosophical materialistic theories. The Christian philosophy was necessarily antimaterialistic. With the revival of learning and of the ancient philosophies, the Epicurean materialism found many adherents, against whose influence the pronounced spiritualism of Descartes furnished a positive and most efficient check. Hobbes was the opponent of Descartes, and all his conceptions of the soul and of the laws of its activity are materialistic, reducing all spiritual phenomena to bodily motions. Spinoza made spiritual beings to be modes of the universal substance which is God —every spiritual operation being the necessary counterpart of some materialistic phenomenon. But the rise of the mechanical or new philosophy of nature, to which Descartes incidentally contributed, and which Sir Isaac Newton so triumphantly established, had no little influence in developing the materialism of modern philosophy. The speculations of Locke indirectly furthered this tendency; although, with Descartes, he asserted the authority of consciousness for the reality of spiritual phenomena. But still he contended, as against Descartes, that no man has the right to affirm that God could not endow matter with the capacity to think. The free-thinking Deists of England, who called themselves the disciples of Locke, were in many cases materialists, and advanced their speculations against the possibility of a separate existence of the soul in connection with their attacks upon the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. There were few advocates of philosophical materialism among the English writers of the 18th century. David Hartley (1704–1757) made many phenomena of the soul to depend on vibrations of the brain, but expressly denied the inference that the soul is material in its substance. Joseph Priestley (1733–1804) was led, in the course of his speculations, to assert that the soul is nothing but the organized body, and that this doctrine is essential to the rational acceptance of the Christian system (*Disquisitions relating to Matter and Spirit*, London, 1777, 2 vols. 8vo). In France the influence of the spiritualistic doctrines of Descartes was gradually displaced in the schools by the system of Condillac, which found its logical termination in the extreme materialism of La Mettrie (1709–1751), *L'Homme machine; Histoire naturelle de l'âme*, and of baron Holbach (1723–1789), *Système de la Nature*, in which all spiritual essence and activity are resolved into matter and motion. Here the Encyclopædists Diderot (q. v.) and D'Alembert (q. v.) deserve special mention; nor should the noted Helvetius (q. v.) be forgotten.

In more recent times, materialism has been both metaphysical and physiological. Metaphysical materialism has resulted in some cases by logical deduction, or, rather, a logical tendency, from the idealistic assumption that matter and spirit are identical. The argument which seeks to make matter and spirit one, lends plausibility to the conclusion that it is indifferent whether matter should be resolved into spirit, or spirit resolved into matter. The extreme idealism of some of the German schools has prepared the way for the materialism with which they would seem to have had the least possible sympathy. The real pantheism of Spinoza and the logical pantheism of Hegel have furnished axioms and a method, which have been applied in the service of materialism. It is in physiology, however, that modern materialism has found its most efficient ally. Physiology has renewed the previously-exploded doctrine of vibrations, which again has found confirmation in that view of the correlation of forces which resolves every agency of nature into some mode of motion. If heat, and light, and electricity are but modes of motion, why not nervous activity? and if nervous activity, why

not vital energy? and if vital energy, why not spiritual judgments and emotions? This argument has been urged with great earnestness and pertinacity by certain physiologists both of the German and English schools. Conspicuous among them are Carl Vogt, *Physiologische Briefe für Gebildete; Köhler-Glaube und Wissenschaft*, 1855; J. Moleschott, *Physiologie des Stoffwechsels*; *Der Kreislauf des Lebens*, etc.; Louis Büchner, *Kraft und Stoff* (1855); *Natur u. Geist*, etc.; Häckel, *Naturlich-Schöpfungsgeschichte; Ueber die Entstchung und den Staumbau des Menschengeschlechts*, etc. T. H. Huxley, *On the Physical Bases of Life*, edit. 1868 (compare J. H. Sterling, *As regards Protoplasm*, etc., edit. 1869–72), and H. Maudsley, *Physiology and Pathology of the Human Mind* (Lond. and N. Y. 1867), approximate to the same opinions among the English. Alexander Bain (*The Senses and the Intellect*, Lond. 1855, 1864); *The Emotions and the Will*, 2d ed. 1865; *Mental and Moral Science*, Lond. 1867) sympathizes with these tendencies, treating the soul in the main as though it were but a capacity in the nervous system for special functions which obey physiological laws. The doctrine of evolution by natural selection in the struggle for existence, which has been derived by the celebrated Darwin from a limited cycle of physiological facts, and extended by him to explain the production of all complex forms of being, inorganic and organic, is materialistic in its assumptions and its conclusions, even if neither of these are recognised or confessed by its advocates. The metaphysical doctrine of development by successive processes of differentiation and integration, which has been hardened into an axiom by Herbert Spencer, and applied to the explanation of all forms of being, and even of the primal truths of metaphysical science itself, can lead to no other than a materialistic psychology. The doctrine of unconscious cerebration, which is taught more or less explicitly by Dr. W. B. Carpenter and other eminent physiologists, though not necessarily involving the materialistic hypothesis, is yet materialistic in its tendencies and associations. The positive school of Comte teaches directly that the brain is the only substance of the soul, and that what are usually called spiritual activities are simply biological phenomena. J. S. Mill, though not avowedly a materialist, follows Hume in reducing matter and mind to idealistic formulæ, which, as conceived by him, are not distinguishable from physiological phenomena or products.

According to the materialistic philosophy, as developed by whatever writer, but especially in its once popular form of Epicureanism, the perception of our senses is the only source of all human knowledge. The remembrance of many previous perceptions of the same nature gives rise to general views, and the comparison of these to judgments. Ethics are thus but the doctrine of happiness, and its highest maxim: Seek joy, avoid pain! Yet Epicurus sought to give a certain moral tendency to this fundamental axiom of his system, by declaring every pleasure objectionable which is followed by a greater unpleasantness, and every pain is desirable which is followed by a greater pleasure; according to which principle freedom from care and insensibility to bodily pain become the highest aim of man. See Lutterbeck, *Neutestamentliche Lehrbegriffe* (Mainz, 1852), i, 38–58; H. Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philosophie*; Fries, *Gesch. d. Philosophie*, vol. i. See EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY. In Boston a paper entitled *The Investigator* is now published in the interests of materialism. The German-Americans are also quite active in this work. They have two papers—the *Pionier* (Boston) and the *Neue Zeit* (New York). The editor of the former, Karl Heinzen, is frequently before the public all over the country to press the interests of his abominable work. Recently Dr. G. C. Hiebeling published a pamphlet entitled *Naturwissenschaft gegen Philosophie* (New York, Schmidt, 1871, 12mo) to controvert Hurtmann's *Philosophy of the Unknown*.

The defects of the materialistic hypothesis are manifold. It considers only the similarities, and overlooks the differences of two classes of actual phenomena. Through its overweening desire of unity, it becomes one-sided and imperfect in all its conceptions and conclusions, and fails to do justice to the peculiarities of spiritual experiences, which are as real as the more obtrusive and palpable phenomena of matter. Moreover, it fails to discern that the intellectual and moral functions not only have a right to be recognised in their full import, but that they have a certain supremacy and authority over all others, inasmuch as the agent which knows must furnish the principles and axioms which all science assumes and on which all science must rest. If the soul is only a function of matter, then to know is one of the functions of matter. It follows that the authority of knowledge itself may be as changeable and uncertain as the changes of form, the varieties of motion, the manifold chemical combinations, or the more or less complex developments of which matter is capable. The materialistic hypothesis not only overlooks and does injustice to the facts which are open to common apprehension, but it is a suicidal theory, which destroys, by its own positions and its method, the very foundations on which any science can stand—even the scientific theory of materialism itself. See SOUL.

Literature.—Lange (Frdr. A.), *Gesch. des Materialismus*, etc. (Iserlohn, 1867, 8vo); Schaller, *Leib. u. Seele* (3d. ed. 1858); Wagner, *Kampf um die Seele* (1857); Frauenstadt, *Der Materialismus;* Fabri (Dr. Friedrich), *Briefe gegen den Materialismus* (Stuttg. 1856; 2d ed. 1864, 8vo; comp. *Bibl. Sac.* 1865, p. 525); Janet, *The Materialism of the Present Day* (a critique of Dr. Büchner, Lond. and N. Y. 1866, 12mo); Lotze, *Medicinische* (Leipsic, 1852); also his *Mikrokosmus* (Leipsic, 1856); Ulrici, *Gott und die Natur* (Leipsic, 1862); also his *Gott und der Mensch* (Leipsic, 1866); Fichte, *Zur Seelenfrage* (Leipsic, 1859); *Seelenfortdauer*, etc. (Leipsic, 1867); *Psychologie* (Leipsic, 1864); Trendelenburg, in the *Denkschriften d. K. Akad.* (1849); also *Hist. Beiträge* (1855); Jahr, *Die wichtigsten Zeitfragen; Die Natur, der Menschengeist und sein Gottesbegriff* (Leipsic, 1869, 8vo); Weiss (Dr. L.), *Anti-Materialismus; Vorträge aus dem Gebiete der Philosophie* (Berlin, 1869, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 222, 475; Pearson, *On Infidelity;* Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought;* Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization;* Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, Lect. v; Porter, *Human Intellect*, p. 18 sq.; Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity*, p. 451; Cudworth, *Intellectual System of the Universe;* Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism;* Hamilton, *Discussions;* Fichte, in the *Zeitschr. f. die Philosophie*, 1860; *Christ. Exam.* 1859 (Nov.); *North Brit. Rev.* 1860 (Nov.); *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 1869, p. 193; 1872, p. 194; *Bibl. Sac.* 1860, p. 201; 1865 (July); *Theol. Eclect.* 1869 (Nov.), p. 55; *Princet. Rev.* 1869 (Oct.), p. 616; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* xxv, 25; *Westminster Rev.* 1864 (July), p. 90; 1870 (Oct.), p. 225; Rosenkranz, in *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1864, vol. iii, art. i; *Journ. Specul. Phil.* vol. i, No. 3, art. vi; *Catholic World*, 1870 (Aug.). See MATTER. (N. P.)

Maternus. See FIRMICUS.

Maternus I, bishop of Cologne. See COLOGNE.

Mather, Alexander, one of Mr. Wesley's most useful preachers, was born at Brechin, North Britain, in Feb. 1733. When a boy he had some instruction at a Latin school, and afterwards ran away with the rebels, and was in the battle of Culloden. On account of this he was treated with great harshness by his father, and deprived of all educational advantages. In 1751 he left home and went to Perth, and in 1752 to London, to earn his living as a mechanic. Here, in 1753, he married. He had been religiously inclined from boyhood, and had long followed his convictions in many moralities and means of grace; finally converted under a sermon of John Wesley's, April 14, 1754, he soon became very useful as a band and class leader and local preacher. In 1757 he began itinerating under Mr. Wesley, and with

great success, though often in peril from mobs stirred up by the Establishment. Sometimes he was beaten nearly to death, and often stoned, but grace triumphed, and so much the more grew the word of God and multiplied. In 1757 he experienced the blessing of "the great salvation," or perfect love, and from that time labored with increased unction and usefulness. He was persecuted by some of his brethren on this account, but Mr. Wesley defended him and held him up. He travelled on nearly all the circuits of England, and, during forty-three years, was present at thirty-nine Conferences. Most of the time he was in prominent relations in the Church, and active in all its interests. He was the principal member of Mr. Wesley's select committee, and his clear, strong sense and judgment were of great weight in all things. "His disinterestedness was shown in the fact that, though ordained by Wesley as a superintendent or bishop, and an advocate of the claim of the people for the sacraments, he made no attempt to secure any defence for his peculiar office, but even opposed the immediate adoption of Coke's episcopal scheme, as proposed at the Litchfield meeting" (Stevens). He died at London, Aug. 22, 1800 (?).—Jackson, *Early Methodist Preachers*, i, 369; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, ii, 142; iii, 27, 40, 155 sq.

Mather, Cotton, a very celebrated American divine of colonial days, the most noted of the Mather family, the grandson of Richard Mather and son of Increase, is one of the trio spoken of in the old doggerel tombstone inscription:

> "Under this stone lies Richard Mather,
> Who had a son greater than his father,
> And eke a grandson greater than either."

Cotton Mather was born at Boston Feb. 12, 1662–63. His early education he received under the eye of his father, and as a lad of twelve he entered at Harvard. At this time he is spoken of as a fine classical scholar. Four years afterwards, when he graduated, Dr. Oakes, the president of the college, addressed him in a Latin speech, lauding in glowing terms his past conduct and attainments, and predicting a glorious future. But it was not in worldly knowledge only that he was so advanced a student. The descendant of a line of ministers, he seemed to be himself, by his aptness in learning and early seriousness, specially marked out for the ministry. When only in his fourteenth year, Cotton Mather's mind had begun to be greatly exercised with religious thoughts. He at this time laid down a system of rigid fasts, which he continued to practice monthly or weekly, and sometimes oftener through the rest of his life, of strict and regular self-examination, and of prolonged times of prayer, to which he afterwards added frequent nightly vigils. It is necessary to mention these things in order to understand some points in his character and conduct in future years. For awhile he was diverted from his purpose of becoming a minister by a growing impediment in his speech, and he began to study medicine. But being shown how by a "dilated deliberation" of speech he might avoid stammering, he returned to his theological studies, and commenced preaching when scarcely eighteen years old. In 1680 he received a unanimous call from his father's congregation, then the largest in Boston, to become assistant pastor, and in January, 1682, was settled as a colleague of his father. His labors in the ministry were characterized by great zeal and earnestness, and he soon came to be considered a prodigy of learning and ability. He was not only a most attentive pastor, but a superior preacher, and withal found time for a large amount of literary labors: he published three hundred and eighty-two distinct works, most of them of course small, consisting, besides his sermons, of devotional works, and other contributions to practical religion. In addition to all these labors he was engaged in the accumulation of material for greater works. Nor did he any more than his father shrink from the political duties which the ministerial office had been supposed to cast upon those who held it. "New England," he wrote, "being a country whose interests are remarkably inwrapped in ecclesiastical circumstances, ministers ought to concern themselves in politics." When, therefore, his father was sent to England to seek relief from the arbitrary proceedings of Charles II and James II, Cotton Mather regarded himself as the natural leader of the citizens, and on their seizing and imprisoning the obnoxious governor, he drew up their declaration justifying that extreme measure.

The freedom of thought in politics, however, made its inroads into the Church also, and fearing a falling away from the purity of the old faith, and fancying that he saw the evil one busy in turning away the hearts of the people, he was led to a life of asceticism, which involved him in religious controversies.

The daughter of one Goodwin, a respectable mechanic of Boston, accused a laundress of having stolen some of the family linen. The mother of the suspected person, an Irish emigrant, expostulated in no very gentle terms against such a charge, and, as was averred, not content with abuse, cast a spell over the accuser. The younger children soon began to suffer similarly, and the poor Irishwoman was denounced as a witch. Cotton Mather, fearing that the excesses of superstition would have a still more derogatory effect on the religious life of the colonists, determined to investigate this case of witchcraft. He took the eldest girl, then about sixteen years old, into his house, and her vagaries soon left on his mind no doubt that she was really under the influence of an evil spirit. The poor Irishwoman was tried, condemned, and executed; and Mather printed a relation of the circumstances, and an account of such influences in other places. The book, which was published with the recommendation of all the ministers of Boston and Charlestown, was entitled *Memorable Providences relating to Witchcraft and Possessions, with Discoveries and Appendix* (Lond. and Bost. 1689, 8vo; 2d edit. 1691, 12mo; Edinb. 1697, 12mo). Both in the colony and in England the book was read by everybody. In the old country it had the honor to be introduced by the eminent divine, Dr. Richard Baxter, who wrote a preface for the work, and argued that it was "sufficient to convince all but the most obdurate Sadducees." The question here arises whether or not Cotton Mather was himself a believer in witchcraft, and whether or not he wrote the book simply to explode the "delusion" which was fast making converts, especially in and about Massachusetts. Even to our day this question has not been satisfactorily solved.

Mr. Bancroft, our great historian, has treated Cotton Mather as guilty of having provoked the excitement known as the "Salem witchcraft delusion." Within the last few years, however, one of our ablest writers, Mr. Poole, formerly librarian of the "Boston Library," has come forward to clear Cotton Mather of any and all insinuations, holding that "the opposite" of what is generally charged against Mr. Mather "is the truth." "His gentler treatment," we are told, "cured and Christianized them [the believers of witchcraft]. He opposed, with his father and the rest of the clergy—with but three exceptions—the course of the judges in deeming every possessed person guilty, the ministry holding that the devil might enter innocent persons, and that the fact of their improper conduct was no ground for adjudging them criminals. He also opposed taking spectral testimony, or the words of a confessed witch. It must be ordinary legal witnesses and testimony that could alone convict. He also offered to take six of the accused persons into his own house, at his own expense, and to make upon them the experiment of prayer and fasting which had been so successful with the Goodwin children of his own congregation." Mr. Poole also proves or makes it quite credible that it was Mather and not Mr. Willard who wrote the most vigorous tract of the times against the Salem movements, and who made the Boston and Salem treatment noted for their difference even at that day. See SALEM; WITCHCRAFT.

There can hardly be any question about the fact that Cotton Mather is, in a measure at least, responsible for the blood that was shed at Salem between 1685 and 1692. But it is folly indeed to question his goodness, as some have done, or even to bring charges against his sincerity because of his fanatical treatment of the deluded Salemites. We need only remember that even the very men who built up the Church of Protestantism in the 16th century were not entirely free from mistakes, and failed in a manner very much like their good Puritan descendant. Sublimely ridiculous, then, appears the judgment pronounced by a writer in a late number of *Zion's Herald* (May 20, 1869): "At twenty-three he was in the midst of this terrific panic of mortal fear and its fatal results; and, even at this boyish age, bore himself with such manly courage, prudence, and coolness that he was the only minister, and even the only person, except his father, who may have been said to have stood solidly on his feet, and who won from his contemporary the praise that 'had his notions been hearkened to and followed, these troubles would never have grown unto that height which they now have.'" The quotation is from Poole's article in the *North American Review* of April, 1869. While we would not forget the merits of our ancestors, but would rather extol them and laud them for their virtues, we cannot afford to be blind to their faults and mistakes. Salem witchcraft persecution certainly must not find an advocate in the nineteenth century, surely not at the expense of the truths of history. But to turn to the brighter side of Mather's life. Says a writer in delineating his character, while acknowledging the failing we have felt constrained to condemn: "It was the great ambition of his whole life to do good. His heart was set upon it; he did not therefore content himself with merely embracing opportunities of doing good that occasionally offered themselves, but he very frequently set apart much time on purpose to devise good; and he seldom came into any company without having this directly in his view. It was constantly one of his first thoughts in the morning, What good may I do this day? And that he might more certainly attend to the various branches of so large and comprehensive a duty, he resolved this general question, What good shall I do? into several particulars, one of which he took into consideration while he was dressing himself every morning, and as soon as he came into his study he set down some brief hints of his meditations upon it. He had ordinarily a distinct question for each morning in the week. His question for the Lord's-day morning constantly was, What shall I do, as pastor of a Church, for the good of the flock under my charge? Upon this he considered what subjects were most suitable and seasonable for him to preach on; what families of his flock were to be visited, and with what particular view; and how he might make his ministry still more acceptable and useful." He died Feb. 13, 1728.

Though many of Cotton Mather's productions are indeed but small volumes, as single *Sermons*, *Essays*, etc., yet there are several among them of a much larger size; as his *Magnalia Christi Americana, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England from its first Planting in* 1620 *to* 1698 (Lond. 1702, folio; Hartford, Conn., 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); his *Christ. Philosopher* (Lond. 1721, 12mo); his *Ratio Disciplinæ Fratrum Nov-Anglorum;* his *Directions to a Candidate for the Ministry*—a book which brought him as many letters of thanks as would fill a volume. Besides all these, the doctor left behind him several books in manuscript; one of which, viz. his *Biblia Americana, or Illustrations of the Sacred Scriptures*, was proposed to be printed in three volumes, folio. The true motive that prompted him to write and publish so great a number of books, appears from the motto that he wrote on the outside of the catalogue which he kept of his own works, viz. John xv, 8, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." Dr. Mather was one of the most peculiar men that America has produced. He doubtless possessed larger learning than any other minister of his time, but his mind was better adapted to acquire than to create. He lacked in strong judgment, in original genius, and in sustained power. He had no ability to generalize, no wide and penetrating vision. The most noted benefaction of his life to the country was introducing vaccination for small-pox, which proved a great blessing. See his *Life*, written by his son (Bost. 1729); also by Enoch Pond and Dr. Jennings; Jones, *Chris. Biog.* s. v.; Sparks, *Amer. Biog.* 1st series, vi, 161 sq.; Sherman, *New England Divines*, p. 76 sq.; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of Amer. Lit.* i, 59; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* vol. ii, s. v.; Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* iii, 71, 76, 95, 98; *North Amer. Rev.* xliii, 519; xlvi, 477; li, 1; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* i, 430; *Christian Examiner*, v, 365. (J. H. W.)

Mather, Eleazer, a Puritan minister of New England, son of Richard, and brother of Increase Mather, was born at Dorchester May 13, 1637; graduated at Harvard in 1656; was ordained pastor of the Church at Northampton in 1661; and there died, July 24, 1699. He was a fine scholar, a sound thinker, and a devoted and evangelical minister. Many souls were converted through his labors, and his early death was much lamented by all the churches.—Sherman, *New England Divines*. p. 107; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 159; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Mather, Increase, D.D., an eminent American divine, was born at Dorchester, Mass., June 21, 1639. His father, Richard Mather (q. v.), had emigrated from England to Massachusetts in 1635. In early childhood Increase exhibited signs of unusual mental endowments; he entered Harvard College at the age of twelve, and graduated with the class of 1656. Shortly after this he was converted, and determined to devote his life to the ministry. In the year following that of his graduation he went to Dublin, where his brother was preaching. There he entered Trinity College, and, after securing the degree of M.A., was chosen a fellow of the college, an honor, however, which he declined. The climate of Ireland being unfavorable to his health, he removed to England, and preached there for a while. At the time of the Restoration he was residing in the island of Guernsey, as chaplain to an English regiment; but when, as a commissioned officer, he was required to sign a paper declaring "that the times then were and would be happy," and he refused to comply, his salary was so greatly reduced that soon after this he returned to his native country, and was called and settled as pastor of the North Church in Boston. In this city he married, in 1662, a daughter of the Rev. John Cotton, and from this marriage sprang Cotton Mather, one of the most celebrated divines of his day. In the controversy as to "who are the legitimate subjects of baptism," he opposed his father, and likewise the decision of the synod of 1662, until caused to change his views by the arguments of Mr. Mitchell, of Cambridge. Largely by his instrumentality the government was induced to call the general synod of 1679 from the whole colony, for the purpose of "correcting the evils that had provoked God to send judgment on New England." The synod had its second session the following year, and Mr. Mather acted as moderator. At this meeting the Confession of Faith was agreed upon, and he prepared a preface to it. On the death of president Oakes of Harvard University, Mather temporarily supplied the place. By the sudden death of the appointee, president Rogers, Mather was, in 1684, again called to the head of the college. This time he accepted, and combined his presidential duties with his pastoral. In 1692 he was presented with a diploma of doctor of divinity, "the first instance in which such a degree was conferred in British America." On the accession of Charles II Massachusetts was thrown into trouble. His majesty required full submission of their charter to his pleasure, on pain, in case of refusal, of having a *quo warranto* issued against it. To this op-

pression Mather was stanch in his opposition, and before an assembly in Boston dissuaded his countrymen from yielding their liberties tamely. As a result of their resistance, judgment was entered against the charter of the Massachusetts colony. About this time Charles died, and James II, being his successor, published his specious declaration for liberty of conscience. This produced temporary relief, and Mather was delegated to convey to his majesty in England the grateful acknowledgment of the churches, and to sue for a further redress of their wrongs. James received him kindly, and promised him more than he ever granted. Mather remained, however, until the close of the revolution of 1688, which deposed James and placed William and Mary on the throne of England. After much diplomacy with the prince of Orange, a new charter was at length procured in lieu of the old one, and Mather himself was allowed the privilege of nominating the governor, lieutenant governor, and board of council. After four years thus spent among the nobility at Whitehall, Dr. Mather returned to Boston with the consciousness of having faithfully discharged his duty and rendered his country an important service. He found the Church in great excitement about witchcraft, which called forth his work entitled *Cases of Conscience concerning Witchcraft*. He retained his natural bodily and mental vigor until past his eightieth birthday. After this he endured great bodily and consequent mental derangements for four years, during all of which time his great burden seemed to be, not his suffering, but the painful sense of his inability to labor. At last, on Aug. 23, 1723, he died peacefully in the arms of his eldest son. His loss was deeply mourned by those for whom he had spent his long and laborious life. According to Sprague, "he was the last of more than twenty-two hundred ministers who had been ejected and silenced on the restoration of Charles II and on the Act of Uniformity." He was an industrious student, and published ninety-two separate works, most of which are now very scarce. A noted writer thus comments upon him in the *North Amer. Rev.* 1840 (July), p. 5: "Increase Mather not only stood most conspicuous among the scholars and divines of New England, as president of Harvard College and pastor of a church in Boston, but by his political influence was supposed at times to have controlled the administration of the government." He was a learned, earnest, and devoted minister, whose piety was deep, warm, and full of love. His sermons were elaborate and powerful, and many souls were converted by his labors. He studied earnestly for sixty years, and was regarded as the most learned American minister of his day.—Sherman, *New England Divines*, p. 57; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Bancroft, *Hist. U. S.* (see Index in vol. iii); Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biogr.* s.v.; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. Amer. Lit.* vol. i.

Mather, Moses, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Lyme, Connecticut, March 6, 1719; graduated at Yale College in 1739, and soon after was licensed to preach by the New London Association. In 1742 he commenced preaching in a Congregational church in Middlesex, now Darien, Connecticut, and in 1744 was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church, and this position he held until his death in 1806. Dr. Mather was a fellow of Yale College from 1777 to 1790. He warmly espoused the cause of the Colonies in the Revolutionary War, and was twice taken by the British and Tories, carried to New York, and confined in the provost prison. He published a *Reply to Dr. Bellamy on the Half-way Covenant:—Infant Baptism Defended* (1759):—*A Sermon*, entitled *Divine Sovereignty displayed by Predestination* (1763); and was the author of a posthumous work, *A Systematic View of Divinity* (1813, 12mo). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 425, s. v.

Mather, Nathaniel, an English minister, a brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire in 1630; graduated at Harvard College, 1647, and spent his ministerial life in England and Holland. He died in 1697. He published *Two Sermons* (Oxon. 1694, 4to; Lond. 1718, 12mo):—*A Discussion on the Lawfulness of a Pastor's Officiating in Another Church:—A Fast Sermon:*—and *Sermons preached at Pinner's Hall and Lime Street* (1701). "In his public discourses there was neither a lavish display nor an inelegant penury of oratorical excellence, while the dignity of his subjects superseded the necessity of rhetorical embellishments."—Calamy, *Continuation of the Nonconformists' Memorial;* Wilson, *Dissenters;* Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Mather, Richard, an Episcopal and later a Puritan minister, was born at Lowtown, Lancashire, Eng., in 1596; was converted when a young man; spent two years at Oxford; entered the ministry in 1618, near Liverpool, and at the end of fifteen years of devoted and successful labor was suspended for nonconformity. He then emigrated to Massachusetts, and became pastor of a congregation at Dorchester. There he died, April 22, 1669. He was a sound and earnest preacher, not captivating, but solid, pious, and very useful. He was an active theologian, and a member of every synod in New England after his arrival. He was studious, a good scholar, and a very able and valuable man. Richard Mather assisted Eliot in the New England version of the Psalms, and furnished the synod of 1648 a model of Church Discipline. He published a discourse on the *Church Covenant* (1639), a treatise on *Justification* (1652), and an elaborate defence of the churches of New England. See Increase Mather, *Life and Death of Robert Mather* (1670, 4to); Drake, *Cyclop. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* vol. ii, s. v.; Roger, *New England Divines;* Sherman, *New England Divines*, p. 26.

Mather, Samuel (1), brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire, England, May 13, 1626; graduated at Harvard College in 1643; was for some time assistant pastor to Rev. Mr. Rogers, in Rowley; and was pastor of the North Church, Boston, in 1649. In 1650 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Magdalen College, Oxford; preached in Scotland and Ireland; went to Dublin in 1655, and became senior fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and minister of the Church of St. Nicholas. Soon after the Restoration he was suspended on a charge of sedition, but afterwards continued to preach to a small congregation privately. He died Oct. 29, 1671. Mr. Mather held the first rank as a preacher. He published *Sermons* and *Tracts:—Old Testament Types Explained and Improved* (Lond. 1673, 4to), rewritten by Caroline Fry, as *Gospel of the Old Testament* (1833, 1851):—*Life of Nathaniel Mather* (1689). See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Mather, Samuel (2), D.D., minister of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, son of Cotton Mather, was born in Boston, Oct. 30, 1706; graduated at Harvard College in 1723, having studied theology probably under the direction of his father; was licensed to preach, and in 1732 became colleague-pastor with the Rev. Mr. Gee, of the Second Church in Boston, and was ordained in the same year. In 1741 a dissatisfaction arose against him in this church, partly from the charge of looseness of doctrine, and also of impropriety of conduct, and he, with the smaller part of his membership, withdrew, and established a separate Church in Hanover Street, on the corner of North Bennet. "The fact," says Robbins, in his *History of the Second Church*, "that so many persons of good character supported Mr. Mather, affords good reason to doubt whether the charges of impropriety were well founded." He sustained his relation as pastor of Hanover Street Church until his death, June 27, 1785. Dr. Mather published *A Sermon on the Death of Cotton Mather* (1728):—*Life of Cotton Mather* (1729):—*An Essay concerning Gratitude* (1732):—*Vita A. H. Franckii, cui adjecta est narratio rerum memorabilium in Ecclesiis*

Evangelicis per Germaniam, etc. (1733):—*An Apology for the Liberties of the Churches in New England* (1738):—and *Sermons on various Subjects* (1738, '39, '40, '51, '53, '60, '62, '66, and '68. Also a *Poem*, in five parts, *The Sacred Minister*, by Aurelius Prudentius Americanus (1773):—*Answer to a Pamphlet* entitled *Salvation for all Men* (1782).—Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, i, 371.

Mathesius, Johann, a German Protestant theologian, was a native of Saxony. He studied at Wittenberg in 1528, and was there for a while Luther's fellow-boarder. He was appointed rector of Joachimsthal in 1532, pastor in 1545, and died in 1564. He had witnessed many abuses resulting from the misconception of the doctrine of salvation by grace: we learn from him that there were parties in the Church who claimed, on the strength of it, that faith alone was necessary, and that works were of no importance whatever, so that it did not matter whether the actions of believers were good or bad. Mathesius strongly opposed such heretical views, and thus became involved in controversies which embittered the end of his life. He is especially known by seventeen sermons on the doctrine, the confession, and the death of Luther (Nuremberg, 1588; in recent times the biographical portions were collected and published under the title, *J. Mathesius, d. Leben d. Dr. Martin Luther, mit einer Vorrede von G. H. v. Schubert*, Stuttgart). He wrote also various other sermons, a tract on justification, a catechism, and several hymns. His biography was published by Balthasar Mathesius in 1705. See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, and Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, ii, 127; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 160; Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 140 sq. (J. N. P.)

Mathētæ (Μαθηταί, *disciples*) is one of the names by which the early followers of our Lord were known among their contemporaries. All the common appellations of the professors of the Christian religion which occur in the N. T. were expressive of certain dispositions and privileges belonging to the sincere professor of the Gospel. See Christians; Disciple.

Mathew, *Father* Theobald, the celebrated apostle of temperance, a Catholic priest, was born in the county of Tipperary, Ireland, Oct. 10, 1790; was educated at the Roman Catholic seminary in Maynooth; was appointed, after his ordination, to a missionary charge at Cork, where he established a charitable association on the model of that of St. Vincent de Paul. About 1838 he became president of a temperance society, and in a few months administered the pledge to 150,000 persons in Cork alone. He afterwards visited different parts of Ireland, the cities of London, Manchester, and Liverpool, and the United States of America, and was everywhere received with enthusiasm. For these eminent services in the cause of religion and morality, queen Victoria bestowed upon father Mathew an annuity of £500. He died Dec. 6, 1856, at Queenstown, Ireland. See Maguire, *Father Mathew, a Biography* (Lond. 1863); Morris, *Memoirs of the Life of Theobald Mathew* (New York, 1841); Henshaw, *Life of Father Mathew* (New York, 1849), s. v.; Harriet Martineau, *Biographical Sketches* (1869); *Fraser's Magazine* for January, 1841; Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Mathews, James M., D.D., a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Salem, N. Y., in 1785; graduated at Union College in 1803; at the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church in 1807; was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Associate Reformed Presbytery in New York in 1807; became assistant professor in the theological seminary of his great preceptor, Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, in 1809, and continued there until 1818. After supplying the South Dutch Church in Garden Street, New York, for one year, he became its pastor in 1812, and retained that relation until 1840. Thereafter he never again took a pastoral charge. He was the principal founder of the University of the City of New York, and was its first chancellor—1831 to 1839. The elegant marble edifice of the university and the adjoining Reformed church on Washington Square are monuments of his architectural taste and liberal projects. Dr. Mathews published, in addition to various occasional pamphlets, a book of *Autobiographical Recollections*, a volume of lectures *On the Relations of Science to Christianity*, and another on *The Bible and Men of Learning* (1855). He was a man of noble presence and courtly manners, scholarly in his tastes and habits, a powerful preacher, and fertile in large plans of Christian usefulness. His last labors were given for many months before his decease to preparations for an evangelical council, held in New York, composed of representatives from most of the American churches, and over which he presided, in October, 1869. He was a zealous advocate of the Evangelical Alliance, and of other forms of Christian union; and it is believed that his latest efforts in this cause exhausted his strength and hastened his end. Dr. Mathews was naturally a leader of men. His learning was extensive, his tact and skill were great, and his zeal was ardent. Associated with prominent men and events for more than threescore years, he bore an active part in nearly all of the great religious and philanthropic movements of our country during this period. He died January, 1870, after a brief illness, in the city of New York, where his life was spent. (W. J. R. T.)

Mathilda, a Roman Catholic saint, and queen of Germany, was born in Westphalia, towards the close of the 9th century. She was the daughter of Theodoric, count of Oldenburg, a descendant of the famed Wittikind, and of a princess of Denmark. She was educated by her grandmother, abbess of the convent of Herword. In 909 she was married to Henry, afterwards king of Germany. On the throne she preserved the piety and simplicity which distinguished her from her youth. A great part of her time was spent in prayer. She gave liberally to the poor, whom she often nursed herself. She had three sons: the emperor Otho the Great; Henry, duke of Bavaria; and Bruno, archbishop of Cologne. One of her daughters, Hedwige, was married to Hugh the Great, duke of France, and became mother of Hugh Capet. After the death of her husband, Otho and Henry of Bavaria quarrelled concerning the crown of Germany. Henry, for whom his mother showed great partiality on this occasion, having subsequently become reconciled with Otho, joined him in despoiling Mathilda of her dowry and of all her possessions, under pretence that she was squandering the money of the state in giving alms to the poor. Her property was, however, subsequently returned to her through the interference of Edith, wife of Otho. The remainder of her life was passed in meditation and works of charity. She founded several convents, and died at Quedlinburg, March 14, 968. See *Acta Sanctorum*, March 14; Baillet, *Vie des Saints;* Mabillon, *Sæcula Ordinis Benedictorum;* Schwarz, *De Mathilda, abbatissa Quedlimburgensi* (Altdorf, 1736, 4to); Breitenbauch, *Leben d. Kaiserin Mathilde* (Reval, 1780, 8vo); Treitschke, *Heinrich I und Mathilde* (Lpz. 1814, 8vo); *Mathilde Gemahlin Heinrichs I* (Augsburg, 1832, 8vo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 161; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxiv, 250. (J. N. P.)

Mathilda, countess of Tuscany, well known in history through her close political connection with pope Gregory VII (q. v.), was a daughter of Boniface, count of Tuscany, and was born in 1046. She is said to have married Godfrey (surnamed *Il Gobbo*, or the "Hunchback"), duke of Lorraine, in 1069, by procuration; but, if so, her husband did not make his appearance in Italy until four years after the wedding ceremony, and the two, if they were ever united, soon afterwards separated. Godfrey went back to his duchy, and became a supporter of the emperor Henry IV, while Mathilda made herself conspicuous by the zeal with which she espoused the cause of Gregory VII. She became his inseparable as-

sociate, was ever ready to assist him in all he undertook, and to share every danger from which she could not protect him. In 1077, when Henry had suddenly made his appearance in Italy, and Gregory was fearing for his safety, she gave the pontiff shelter in her own castle. This intimacy of Mathilda with the pope has given rise to much scandal, though every unprejudiced mind will clear both of the guilt they stand accused of. Both the countess and the vicar were pure in character, if their correspondence may serve as an index of their thoughts. (See on this point Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 113, 86.) In 1079 Mathilda made a gift of all her goods and possessions to the Church. In 1081 she alone stood by the pope, when Henry poured his troops into Italy, burning to avenge his humiliation at Canossa; she supported him with money when he was besieged in Rome; and after his death at Salerno boldly carried on the war against the emperor. She died at the Benedictine monastery of Polirone in 1115. Her death gave rise to new feuds between the emperor and pope Paschal III on account of her gift to the Church, which finally resulted in the former wresting from the latter a portion of Mathilda's possessions, but even what remained constituted nearly the whole of the subsequent "Patrimony of Peter." See PATRIMONIUM PETRI. (J. H. W.)

Mathurins, or BRETHREN OF THE HOLY TRINITY, an order of monks which arose at the end of the 12th century, and got this name from having a church at Paris which claims St. Mathurin for its patron saint. All their churches were dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Sometimes they are called *Brethren of the Redemption of Captives*, because, originating at the period of the Crusades, they gave their labor and a third of their revenue to liberate Christian captives from Mohammedan masters. Their founders were two French recluses in the diocese of Meaux—Jean de Mattia and Felix de Valois. By some they seem to have been called the *Order of Asses*, as they were permitted to use those animals only, and were debarred from riding on horses. A similar order was founded in Spain in 1228, and there called the *Order of St. Mary*. See also TRINITARIANS.

Mathurists. See TRINITARIANS.

Mathu'sala (Luke iii, 37). See METHUSELAH.

Matins, or **Matutīna**, the "*new morning service*," or the first of the morning services, and so called in contradistinction from the "old morning service," which was before day, whereas this was after day began. Cassian says this was first set up in Bethlehem, for till that time the old morning service used to end with the nocturnal psalms, and prayers, and daily vigils; after which they used to betake themselves to rest till the third hour, which was the first hour of diurnal prayer. The name for morning prayer, in more modern Church-language, is matins. Before the Reformation the hours of prayer were seven in number, namely, matins, the first or prime, the third, sixth, and ninth hours, and vespers, and compline. The office of matins in the Church of England is an abridgment of her ancient services for matins, lauds, and prime. Ritualists divide the office of matins, or morning prayers, into three parts: first, the introduction, which extends from the beginning of the office to the end of the Lord's Prayer; secondly, the psalmody and lessons, extending to the end of the Apostles' Creed; thirdly, the prayers and collects, which occupy the remainder of the service. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Neale, *Introd. East. Church*. See also HOURS, CANONICAL.

Ma'tred (Heb. *Matred'*, מַטְרֵד, *propelling;* Sept. Ματραΐθ, Ματράδ), the daughter of Mezahab and mother of Mehetabel, which last was wife of one of the Edomitish kings (Gen. xxxvi, 39; 1 Chron. i, 50). B.C. prob. ante 1619.

Ma'tri (Heb. *Matri'*, מַטְרִי [but with the def. art.], prob. *expectant;* Sept. Ματραί, Vulg. *Metri*), a Benjamite, the head of the ancestry of Kish, the father of Saul (1 Sam. x, 21). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

Matricŭla, a list or register of the church, called in Greek κανών and κατάλογος ἱερατικός; in Latin, *album, matricula, tabula clericorum*. The use of the word matricula to designate *entry* at college or university record of a new student is due to this early adaptation of the word. Because the names of all the clergy and other persons were enrolled in the *matricula*, they were called *canonici*.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See CANONICI; DIPTYCHS.

Matricularii, subordinate servants of the clergy, who were intrusted with the care of the church in which they were accustomed to sleep: they had also offices to perform in public processions.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See SACRISTAN.

Matrimony or **Marriage** AS A SACRAMENT. The Church of Rome regards the act of matrimony not only as a religious contract, but also as a sacrament. We need hardly step aside to explain the meaning of the word *sacrament*, but it may be proper here to say that the Romanists hold seven sacraments as established by the Council of Trent, teaching also that "each sacrament confers grace peculiar to itself, so that it has the special effect of conferring grace subservient to that end." This distinction is called by the divines "sacramental grace." See SACRAMENT. The clergy of the Church of England of High-Church tendency incline to hold a like view on this point, but there is certainly nothing in the XXXIX Articles to warrant any such interpretation of the marriage-contract. The Roman view of marriage is based by the schoolmen on the expression of Paul in writing to the Ephesians (v, 32), τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, or, as it runs in the Vulgate, "Sacramentum hoc magnum est." "Thus viewed, the external part or sign, the 'pars sensibilis,' is the expression of a mutual consent involving, as is necessary in all sacramental ordinances, a real present intention; and the inward part or gift is the grace which unites the hearts, or, according to another view, the grace to resist concupiscence, sometimes entirely, judging by St. Thomas Aquinas's remark that carnal intercourse is not a necessary part of marriage, because there was none in Paradise." The following more general considerations are also urged from Scripture in favor of the sacramental theory: "The union between the husband and wife is spoken of as analogous to the union between Christ and the Church. The husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church; therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything (Eph. v, 23, 24). Now if this figure has any meaning it must be this, that the external sign of alliance between bride and bridegroom signify that there should henceforth exist between them a union as holy, as close, and as indissoluble as that between Christ and the Church, a union which could not be maintained without a special gift from God. That such a gift exists is made evident by Paul, who says, while drawing a comparison between marriage and celibacy, 'Every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that' (1 Cor. vii, 7); and what would the gift be which is alluded to in the case of married persons but the grace which unites their hearts, and enables them to be fitting emblems of Christ and the Church? Again, the presence of our Lord at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (John ii, 1–11) is sometimes referred to as having elevated the ceremony into the dignity of a sacrament" (Blunt, *Dict. of Theol.* s. v.).

Those who regard marriage as a sacrament are not themselves agreed as to what is the essential part of matrimony constituting it a sacrament. The prevailing opinion we take to be that the essential part, as well as the efficient cause, is the consent of the two parties, which must be expressed in words as the "pars sensibilis" of the sacrament, and must imply a real present,

and not a future consent. There are others who would make the words of the priest the essential element whereby the marriage union is created, "Ego vos in matrimonium conjungo," etc.; in the English office, "Those whom God has joined together let no man put asunder," followed by the declaration of complete union, "I pronounce that they be man and wife together, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." If the previous consent had made the two persons man and wife, these words on the priest's lips would seem to be, strictly speaking, superfluous. From primitive times it has been the custom to acquaint the Church beforehand with an intended marriage, which is evident from the passages above quoted. The object was to prevent unlawful marriage; not that the Church claimed any absolute power to grant or refuse leave to marry, but that in case a person was about to marry a Jew, or a heathen, or a heretic, or one within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity, etc., the marriage might be prevented, or at least not obtain the sanction of the Church. The earliest allusion to the necessity of such notice in England is contained in the eleventh canon of the Synod of Westminster (A.D. 1200), which enacts that no marriage shall be contracted without banns thrice published in church (Johnson, *Canons*, ii, 91). See BANN. The existing law of the Church of England is expressed in the sixty-second canon: "No minister, upon pain of suspension 'per triennium ipso facto,' shall celebrate matrimony between any persons without a faculty or license granted by some of the persons in these our constitutions expressed, except the banns of matrimony have been first published three several Sundays or holydays in the time of divine service in the parish churches and chapels where the said parties dwell, according to the book of Common Prayer." The only substitute for banns recognised by the Church of England is an ordinary or special license. The power of granting the former has belonged to English bishops from a very early date, being confirmed to them by 25 Henry VIII, c. 21. The right to grant special licenses, which are free from all restrictions as to time or place, was originally a privilege of the archbishop of Canterbury, as "legatus natus." The ritual of the Church of Rome teaches that "the end of the sacrament of marriage is that man and wife may mutually help and comfort each other, in order that they may spend this life in a holy manner, and thereby gain a blessed immortality; and to contribute to the edification of the Church by the lawful procreation of children, and by the care of procuring them a spiritual regeneration, and an education suitable to it. Every person, before entering into wedlock, is required to beseech God to join him with such a person as he may work out his salvation with, and examine whether or no the person he has fixed his affections on has the fear of God before her eyes; is prudent, discreet, and able to take care of a family."

The Council of Trent, at its twenty-fourth session, held Nov. 11, 1563, legislated upon the subject of matrimony in twelve canons, as follows:

"*Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not confer grace; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm that Christians may have more wives than one, and that this is prohibited by no divine law; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall affirm that only those degrees of consanguinity or affinity which are mentioned in the book of Leviticus can hinder or disannul the marriage-contract; and that the Church has no power to dispense with some of them, or to constitute additional hinderances or reasons for disannulling the contract; let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm that the Church cannot constitute any impediments, with power to disannul matrimony, or that in constituting them she has erred; let him be accursed.

"5. Whoever shall affirm that the marriage-bond may be dissolved by heresy, or mutual dislike, or voluntary absence from the husband or wife; let him be accursed.

"6. Whoever shall affirm that a marriage solemnized but not consummated is not disannulled if one of the parties enters into a religious order; let him be accursed.

"7. Whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in teaching, according to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that the marriage-bond cannot be dissolved by the adultery of one of the parties, and that neither of them, not even the innocent party, who has given no occasion for the adultery, can contract another marriage while the other party lives; and that the husband who puts away his adulterous wife, and marries another, commits adultery, and also the wife who puts away her adulterous husband, and marries another (whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in maintaining these sentiments); let him be accursed.

"8. Whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in decreeing that for various reasons married persons may be separated, as far as regards actual cohabitation, either for a certain or an uncertain time; let him be accursed.

"9. Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders, or regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry who feel that, though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed; for God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able.

"10. Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity, or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married; let him be accursed.

"11. Whoever shall affirm that to prohibit the solemnization of marriage at certain seasons of the year is a tyrannical superstition, borrowed from the superstition of the pagans; or shall condemn the benedictions and other ceremonies used by the Church at those times; let him be accursed.

"12. Whoever shall affirm that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges; let him be accursed."

Marriage as a Sacrament unbiblical.—1. In many most important points respecting marriage, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree; yet, when the Church of Rome advances matrimony to a sacrament instituted by Christ, and endows it with sacramental qualities, there are several points of considerable importance to Christianity in which Protestant and Romanist must disagree. The latter asserts that matrimony as a sacrament was instituted by Christ, and confers grace, and supports this dogma by quoting Ephesians v, 32: "This is a great *μυστήριον*; but I speak in Christ and in the Church," where the Douay translation renders by *sacrament* the word *μυστήριον*, which we Protestants prefer to translate *mystery*. "Or, indeed, if we render the word 'sacrament,' still they have no advantage, inasmuch as the original word *μυστήριον*, 'mystery,' which they read 'sacrament,' is employed on other subjects—as 'mystery of godliness' (1 Tim. iii, 16), 'a mystery, Babylon the great' (Rev. xvii, 5). Papists must know that there is no force in their argument. The text, as found in their version, can only influence the minds of ignorant persons, who know not the Scriptures. The apostle does not say that marriage is a mystery, for he speaks concerning Christ and the Church. It is acknowledged that marriage is instituted of God, and is a sign of a holy thing, yet it is no sacrament; the Sabbath was ordained of God, and signified the rest in Christ (Heb. iv, 8), yet it was no sacrament. All significant and mystic signs are not necessarily sacraments" (Elliott, *Romanism*, p. 428). "Romanists," says the same able polemic whom we have just had occasion to cite, "further quote the following passage to support their doctrine: '*She shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and love*' (1 Tim. ii, 15), inferring that the grace of sanctification is given to the parties married. To this we answer: (1.) We deny that any sacraments give or confer grace; they are only means or instruments of its communication. (2.) It is allowed that God does give to pious married persons grace to live in piety and holiness; but it is unnecessary to constitute marriage into a sacrament for this purpose. (3.) Those who are not married may possess the sanctifying grace of God, which is sufficient to preserve all in a state of inward as well as outward holiness."

2. That marriage is no sacrament of the Gospel, speaking of such an institution in its proper scriptural acceptation, may be proved by the following arguments: (1.) Matrimony was instituted in Paradise long before sin had entered, therefore it cannot be a sacrament of the Gospel; marriage is observed among infidels and wicked persons, who are incapable of receiving worthily the sacraments of the Church. (2.) Papists are inconsistent with themselves in calling marriage a profanation of orders; some with consummate effrontery assert that to live in a state of concubinage is more tolerable for a priest than to marry. Can they really believe marriage to be a sacrament, which they contemn as vile and polluted? Pope Siricius applied the words of St. Paul, "*They that are in the flesh cannot please God*," in favor of the celibacy of the clergy—thus proving that this pope, in common with many other pontiffs, knew but little of scriptural interpretation, seeing the reference is plainly to deep human depravity and wickedness, but not to the marriage state. (3.) In every sacrament there must be an external sensible sign as the matter, and an appropriate order of words as the form; but in matrimony there is neither, therefore it is no sacrament. (4.) Again, none but pious persons can be partakers of the sacraments of the Church; but piety is not a necessary condition of marriage, therefore marriage is not a sacrament. The conditions of confession and absolution, which are sometimes enjoined in the Church of Rome, cannot be pleaded as teaching that piety is required of those who are to be married; for confession and absolution are no proper concomitants of true piety, seeing the greatest part of those who confess and receive absolution are no otherwise religious than as members of the Church of Rome, and membership in that community is rather a presumption against, than in favor of true religion. It does not alter the case to introduce the distinctions which have been made by their theologians, namely, that marriage is often a civil or natural contract, and not a sacrament. This distinction is founded on mere technicalities, and not on any scriptural authority, either direct or inferential.

3. It is necessary, as they acknowledge, that a sacrament should be instituted by Christ; but matrimony was not instituted by him, therefore, according to their own rule, it is no sacrament. It is in vain for them to say that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage, when they are unable to produce the words of institution, or to adduce a single circumstance connected with its institution. It is true, the Council of Trent most positively, in their first canon, affirm that Christ did institute the sacrament of matrimony; but then neither chapter nor verse is given to prove the fact. Indeed, so divided among themselves are they respecting the time in which Christ converted matrimony into a sacrament, that the most discordant opinions exist. Let the Roman Catholic Dens speak on the subject: "Some," says he, "say that it was instituted when Christ was present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, which he is said to honor with his presence and bless it (John ii); according to others, when Christ, revoking matrimony to its primeval unity and indissolubleness, rejecting the bill of divorce, said, 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder' (Matt. xix); but others refer its institution to the time of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension, during which Christ often taught his apostles concerning the kingdom of God, or his Church; others say the time is uncertain." Thus the institution of marriage as a sacrament cannot be discovered by their ablest divines. The Council of Trent is unable to find the place where Christ established it; the Roman Catechism adroitly evades this point, and leaves the matter in the same uncertainty as it found it. We therefore hesitate not to affirm that, although marriage was originally instituted by Almighty God, recognised by Christ, and its duties explained and enforced by the apostles, nevertheless its institution as a sacrament cannot be found in any part of the New Testament. See, besides, Elliott's *Delineation of Romanism*, ch. xvi; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index, vol. ii); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, art. Ehe; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, art. Ehe. See also CELIBACY; DISPENSATION; DIVORCE; MARRIAGE; SACRAMENT.

Matrīnæ. See GODMOTHERS.

Matrix Ecclesia. See ECCLESIA.

Matsya, a Sanscrit word, signifying a *fish*, and forming the name, in Hindû mythology, of the first avatar of Vishnu. On that occasion the preserving deity is said to have assumed the form of a great fish shining like gold, and, according to one account, "extending a million leagues," that he might protect the ark which contained Satyavrata and the seven Rhisis with their wives, all the rest of the human race having been destroyed by the deluge. See Moor, *Hindû Pantheon*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Mat'tan (Heb. *Mattan'*, מַתָּן, a *gift*, as in Gen. xxxiv, 12, etc.), the name of two men in the Old Testament and one in the New. See also MITHNITE.

1. (Sept. Μαθάν, Ματθάν v. r. Μαγθάν and Μαχάν.) The priest of Baal slain before his idolatrous altar during the reformation instituted by Jehoiada (2 Kings xi, 18; 2 Chron. xxiii, 17). B.C. 876. "He probably accompanied Athaliah from Samaria, and would thus be the first priest of the Baal-worship which Jehoram, king of Judah, following in the steps of his father-in-law Ahab, established at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxi, 6, 13). Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 7, 3) calls him Μαάθάν" (Smith).

2. (Sept. Ναθάν v. r. Μαθάν.) The father of the Shephatiah who was one of the nobles that charged Jeremiah with treason (Jer. xxxviii, 1). B.C. ante 589.

3. (Ματθάν, Auth. Vers. "Matthan".) The son of Eleazar and father of Jacob, which last was father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Matt. i, 15). According to tradition he was a priest (which disagrees with his tribal descent), and father of Anna, the mother of the same Mary (Niceph. *Hist. Ev.* ii, 3). B.C. considerably ante 40. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

Mat'tanah (Heb. *Mattanah'*, מַתָּנָה, a *gift*, as in Gen. xxv, 6, etc.; Sept. Μαγθαναίν), the fifty-third station of the Israelites on the south-eastern edge of Palestine, between the well (Beer) in the desert and Nahaliel (Numb. xxi, 18, 19). It was no doubt a Moabitish, or rather Ammonitish city, and is placed by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) in the region of Arnon, twelve miles eastward of Medebah, which Hengstenberg corrects to "southward" (*Bileam*, p. 240), i. e. apparently in the plain of Ard Ramadan, perhaps between the branches of wady Wâleh. Leclerc (ad loc.) suggests that Mattanah may be the same with the mysterious word *Vaheb* (ver. 14; A.V. "what he did"), since the meaning of that word in Arabic is the same as that of Mattanah in Hebrew. This is nearly the same with the explanation of the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, who make it an appellative for the well or Beer just mentioned, as being a *gift* of God (see Kennicott, *Remarks on O. T.* p. 60). See EXODE.

Mattani'ah (Heb. *Mattanyah'*, מַתַּנְיָה, *gift of Jehovah*, also in the prolonged form *Mattanya'hu*, מַתַּנְיָהוּ, 1 Chron. xxv, 4, 16; 2 Chron. xxix, 13; Sept. Ματθανίας or Ματθανία v. r. Μαθάν and Βαρθανίας), the name of several men.

1. A Levite, one of the sons of Heman, appointed by David Temple singers, and head of the ninth class of musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 16). B.C. 1014. He is possibly the same with the father of Jeiel, and ancestor of the Jahaziel who predicted Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites (2 Chron. xx, 14).

2. A Levite of the descendants of Asaph, who assisted in purifying the Temple at the reformation undertaken by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 13). B.C. 726.

3. The original name of ZEDEKIAH (q. v.), the last king of Judah (2 Kings xxiv, 17). In like manner Pha-

rach had changed the name of his brother Eliakim to Jehoiakim on a similar occasion (2 Kings xxiii, 34), when he restored the succession to the elder branch of the royal family (comp. 2 Kings xxiii, 31, 36).

4. An Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezra x, 26). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Zattu, who did the same (Ezra x, 27). B.C. 459.

6. Another Israelite of the "sons" (i. e. inhabitants) of Pahath-Moab, who did likewise (Ezra x, 30). B.C. 459.

7. Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Bani, who acted similarly (Ezra x, 37). B.C. 459.

8. A descendant of Asaph (but named as one of "the priests' sons," i. e. perhaps assistants, for Asaph was only a Levite), and great-grandfather of the Zechariah who assisted in celebrating upon trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 35). B.C. much ante 446. His father's name, Michaiah, and grandfather's, Zaccur, present features of identity with Nos. 9 and 10, but in other respects the notices are different. Some interpreters suspect a corruption of the text, and in that case all discrepancies may be removed.

9. A Levite, son of Micah, of the family of Asaph, resident in the neighborhood of Jerusalem after the exile (1 Chron. ix, 15). B.C. cir. 440. He is evidently the same with the leader of those who offered prayer and praise in the Temple after the captivity (Neh. xi, 17; xii, 8), and also guarded the gates (Neh. xii, 25). He also appears to be the same with the father of Hashabiah and great-grandfather of Uzzi, mentioned as one of the chief Levites in the same connection (Neh. xii, 22), but in that case he must have been a very aged man at the time. See also No. 8.

10. A Levite, father of Zaccur, and grandfather of the Hanan whom Nehemiah set over the distribution of the tithes (Neh. xiii, 13). B.C. considerably ante 410. See also No. 8.

Mat'tatha (Luke iii, 31). See MATTATHAH, 1.

Mat'tathah (Heb. *Mattathah'*, מַתַּתָּה, probably a contraction of *Mattathiah*), the name of a person in the Old Test. and of another in the New.

1. (Ματταθά, Auth. Vers. "Mattatha.") The son of Nathan and grandson of David, among Christ's maternal ancestry (Luke iii, 31). B.C. post 1014.

2. (Sept. Μαθθαθά v. r. Ματθαθά.) An Israelite of the "sons" (i. e. inhabitants) of Hashun, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 33). B.C. 458.

Mat'tathias (Ματταθίας), the Greek form of MATTATHIAH (q. v.), and standing for several persons in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. One who supported Ezra in reading the law (1 Esdr. ix, 43), the MATTITHIAH of Neh. viii, 4.

2. The father of the Maccabæan brothers (1 Macc. ii, 1, 14, 16, 17, 19, 24, 27, 39, 45, 49; xiv, 29). See MACCABEE.

3. The son of Absalom and brother of the Maccabæan Jonathan, the high-priest (1 Macc. xi, 70; xiii, 11). In the battle fought by the latter with the forces of Demetrius on the plain of Nasor (the old Hazor), his two generals Mattathias and Judas alone stood by him when his army was seized with a panic and fled, and with their assistance the fortunes of the day were restored.

4. The son of Simon Maccabæus, who was treacherously murdered, together with his father and brother, in the fortress of Docus, by Ptolemæus, the son of Abubus (1 Macc. xvi, 14). See MACCABEE.

5. One of the three envoys sent by Nicanor to treat with Judas Maccabæus (2 Macc. xiv, 19). See MACCABEE.

6. Son of Amos, in the genealogy of Jesus Christ (Luke iii, 25).

7. Son of Semei, in the same catalogue (Luke iii, 26). For both these last, see MATTITHIAH, 5, 6.

Mattei, MARIUS, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, lately the presiding officer of the College of Cardinals at Rome, and in ecclesiastical dignity ranked next to the pope himself, was born at Pergola, States of the Church, Sept. 6, 1792; was educated at Rome, and entered the priesthood in 1814. In 1832 he received his appointment as cardinal. In December, 1860, he became the bishop of Ostia and legate of Velletri. Among other eminent distinctions, he held the post of "archpriest" to the Church of the Vatican, and was the prefect of the commission for the preservation of St. Peter's Church. He died Oct. 8, 1870. Cardinal Mattei was a great favorite of pope Pius IX, and owed most of his distinctions to his friend "the infallible."

Matteis (or **Mattei**), PAOLO, an Italian painter and engraver, was born near Naples in 1662, and died in 1728. Among his masterpieces are the pictures of the "Saviour and St. Gætano," in the church of St. Paul at Pistoia, and the "Meeting of Erminia and the Shepherds," in the Museum of Vienna. See Lanzi, *History of Painting in Italy*.

Mat'tenai (Heb. *Mattenay'*, מַתְּנַי, prob. contracted for *Mattaniah;* Sept. Μαθθανί, Ματθανί), the name of three men after the exile.

1. An Israelite of the "sons" (citizens) of Hashun, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 33). B.C. 459.

2. Another Israelite of the "sons" (or inhabitants) of Bani, who did the same (Ezra x, 37). B.C. 459.

3. A priest, "son" (descendant or representative) of Joiarib, among those last registered in the Old Test. (Neh. xii, 19). B.C. post 536.

Matter, as opposed to *mind* or *spirit* (q. v.), is that which occupies space, and with which we become acquainted by means of our bodily senses or organs. Everything of which we have any knowledge is either matter or mind, i. e. spirit. Mind is that which knows and thinks. Matter is that which makes itself known to mind by certain properties. "The first form which *matter* assumes is extension, or length, breadth, and thickness; it then becomes *body*. If body were infinite there could be no *figure*, which is body bounded. But body is not physical body, unless it partake of or is constituted of one or more of the elements, fire, air, earth, or water" (Monboddo, *Ancient Metaphys.* b. ii, c. 2). According to Des Cartes the essence of mind is *thought*, and the essence of matter is *extension*. He said, Give me extension and motion, and I shall make the world. Leibnitz said the essence of all being, whether mind or matter, is *force*. Matter is an assemblage of simple forces or monads. His system of physics may be called *dynamical*, in opposition to that of Newton, which may be called *mechanical;* because Leibnitz held that the monads possessed a vital or living energy. We may explain the phenomena of matter by the movements of ether, by gravity and electricity; but the ultimate reason of all movement is a force primitively communicated at creation, a force which is everywhere, but which, while it is present in all bodies, is differently limited; and this force, this virtue or power of action, is inherent in all substances material and spiritual. Created substances received from the creative substance not only the faculty to act, but also to exercise their activity each after its own manner. See Leibnitz, *De Primæ Philosophiæ Emendatione et de Notione Substantiæ*, or *Nouveau Système de la Nature et de la Communication des Substances*, in the *Journal des Savans*, 1695. On the various hypotheses to explain the activity of *matter*, see Stewart (*Outlines*, pt. ii, ch. ii, sect. 1, and *Act. and Mor. Pow.* last edit., vol. ii, note A). See also PERCEPTION.

The properties which have been predicated as essential to *matter* are impenetrability, extension, divisibility, inertia, weight. To the senses it manifests color, sound, smell, taste, heat, and motion; and by observation it is discovered to possess elasticity, electricity, magnetism, etc. Metaphysicians have distinguished the qualities

of *matter* into primary and secondary, and have said that our knowledge of the former, as of impenetrability and extension, is clear and absolute; while our knowledge of the latter, as of sound and smell, is obscure and relative. This distinction taken by Des Cartes, adopted by Locke and also by Reid and Stewart, was rejected by Kant, according to whom, indeed, all our knowledge is relative. Others who do not doubt the objective reality of *matter*, hold that our knowledge of all its qualities is the same in kind. See the distinctions precisely stated and strenuously upheld by Sir William Hamilton (Reid's *Works*, note D), and ingeniously controverted by Mons. Emilie Saisset, in *Dict. des Sciences Philosoph.* art. "Matière." See MATERIALISM.

The metaphysical history of this term, like that of most others, begins with Aristotle; its theological significance may be said to begin with the first two verses of Genesis. Three questions of theological as well as philosophical interest grow out of this subject.

I. Popular language, in spite of Berkeley's own appeal to popular opinion, must be admitted to be framed on the hypothesis that matter *exists in itself*, independently of any mind perceiving it; and theologians have in general been content to accept popular language on the point, so that the language of theologians represents the popular opinion. But as Berkeley's system does not, when understood, contradict any of the ordinary facts of experience, so the language of theologians, like that of other non-Berkeleyans, does not become meaningless in consequence of the system being accepted. For a system invented or advanced from a theological motive, it affects theology singularly little.

It can hardly be denied, that a belief in the *reality* of matter, however reality may be defined, is necessary to orthodox Christianity. The narrative of the Creation becomes meaningless, or at least deceptive, if the things created be no more than "permanent possibilities of sensation," things that *would* be perceived, or rather groups of phenomena that *would* make impressions, *if* there were any minds placed ready to observe them, which there are not; and, to tell the truth, even Berkeley's system confuses or obscures the notion of creation. The existence of a material substance means, according to him, that some mind or minds are affected with certain sensations, from a cause external to themselves. Now in *this* there is nothing to conflict with Christian doctrine; when we say that God created all material substances, we shall mean, on this hypothesis, that he is the sole and ultimate cause of the laws, external to created minds, whereby their consciousness is modified in the various ways which we ascribe to the presence of matter.

So far, then, all is clear. If Berkeley has not yet given any support to the doctrines of religion, he certainly has not assailed them. But when we come to the part of his theory which was to confute atheism, it is more possible to bring him into collision with that Revelation which he undertakes to defend. Matter, it is said, exists in virtue of being perceived by a mind: e. g. "my inkstand exists," means "my mind has a group of sensations, simultaneous or successive, which I describe as seeing and feeling a glass inkstand, hearing it ring when struck or thrown down, etc., or otherwise as being conscious of the presence of a hard, smooth, round, hollow body, of a heavy, grayish, transparent substance." But if I go out of the room, I believe that my inkstand still exists, though no longer perceived by me. What do I mean by this, on the idealistic hypothesis? We have rejected the answer, "You mean that you believe that, if you went into the room again, you would again experience the same sensations." In the first place, I do *mean* more than that, though I am unable to prove that anything more than that is true. And further, as has been said above, unless the inkstand exists when not seen, how is it true that the Creator caused the flint, sand, alkali, copper and zinc ore, etc., of which it is made, to exist ages before they were discovered and used, and sustains the manufactured product of his works in being now?

To these objections the sensationalist has no answer: the Berkeleyan has. "When you say that the inkstand exists in your absence, you mean that when it is not perceived by your mind, it is perceived by some mind or other. Your only notion of existence (except the existence of a mind, a conscious subject) is of existence as the object of consciousness of a mind. If you believe, as you doubtless do, that matter exists absolutely, not only in relation to the finite minds that perceive it, you are bound to admit that there is an infinite mind, which always perceives all matter existent, even what is perceived by no other mind."

Injustice is done to Berkeley by a sensationalist philosopher, if he regards the negative part of his system, the denial of an objective substratum to material phenomena, as separate from this, its positive part. Berkeley was a real idealist, not a mutilated or inconsistent sensationalist; and any one who denies an objective substratum to matter, but does not recognise its absolute existence as an object of consciousness to a necessarily existing mind, is not taking half Berkeley's system and leaving the other half, but framing a new one, suggested, it may be, by Berkeley's, but essentially different from it. His religious philosophy was not an amiable excrescence on his metaphysical, but an essential correlative to it; and therefore his system has no sceptical tendency. Neither does it seem fair to charge it with a tendency to pantheism (Mansel's *Prolegomena Logica*, App. B); for God is distinguished adequately, on the one hand, from the created objects, i. e. groups of ideas, which he perceives; on the other, from the created minds which he causes to perceive the same objects. But it seems doubtful whether the system, sublime as is the picture it gives of the Creator's relation to his universe, does not really, by implication, lower our view of his nature and his dealings with it.

What, on this hypothesis, do we mean when we say that God made the material world? That he caused, and, having begun, continues to cause, created intelligences to receive certain impressions, under certain laws of sequence and coexistence. But more than this. We mean also that God himself, when he created, began to perceive certain ideas as real. Now this is almost shockingly contradictory to the generally-received notion of an eternal present in the divine mind; and it is hard to see that it does not contradict the doctrines of his eternal foreknowledge and immutability. Doubtless God began (on this hypothesis) to be conscious of the world at his own mere will, and not, as we do, from an external cause. But his nature seems lowered, if we confess that by his creating we mean that he caused certain ideas to become present to his mind, which therefore were not present to it before. We have, in fact, a curious converse of pantheism. Pantheism (as the term is commonly used) merges the personal God in union with the universe, a universe consisting of matter, or spirit, or both. Here the personality as well as the spirituality of the Eternal is preserved; but instead of his being so merged in the world as to deify it, the world is so merged in him as to introduce its own finite and mutable qualities into his nature.

Creation is a mystery on any hypothesis. On any hypothesis, God, at some finite time, came into new relations with things that are not God. He assumed new characters (as those of Creator, Preserver, Ruler, Judge) which he had not before; and we must believe this to be without any change in his nature, or even in his purpose. Whether this necessary difficulty is aggravated by the above form of stating it; whether the theory of creation in the divine mind implies more of a change of nature than that of a creation of things external to it, may be a question. It is one that at least deserves to be stated. If it be admitted that idealism is not logically opposed to Christianity on this ground, there remain only two slighter objections to it.

Existence has, on this hypothesis, a twofold aspect. Things material exist, absolutely as being perceived by God, relatively as being caused by God to be perceived by his sensitive creatures. Now if, to avoid the objection above stated, it be said that while creation existed eternally in the purpose of God, so that his works were always known to him, yet it may be said that creation had a beginning in time, when God first made it known to other intelligences than his own. In itself, no doubt, this would be inadequate as an account of creation, however fair a defence it might be against the charge of introducing change into the divine purpose or thought. And it just stops short of making the world eternal, though it comes dangerously near to it. It may be added that the hypothesis of a subjective creation is not invented on behalf of this system. One of the recognised explanations of the double account of the creation in Genesis is that the former or Elohistic narrative describes the order in which God's purpose was made known to the holy angels, the second that in which it was executed.

But the reality (in whatever sense) of the material universe is presupposed, not only in the doctrine of the creation, but in that of the sacraments, insomuch that "matter" is used as a technical term in relation to them, describing one of their essential requisites. Speaking generally, any hypothesis that allows the reality of matter would be sufficient, and therefore the idealistic, since it does make matter, in an intelligible sense, real. The command to use certain material substances, and the promise of certain spiritual effects to follow on their use, is not evacuated if we describe their use as "taking the known means to occasion, to our own mind and others, including the divine, certain states of consciousness." But it seems hard to see how the theory can fail to affect the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. If the presence of a body means the fact that its bodily properties are manifest to all intelligences capable of observing them, then a presence of a body, real but not sensible, becomes self-contradictory. If, however, the point be urged with sufficient boldness, that absolute truth is *not* "truth relative to all intelligences," but truth relative to the Infinite intelligence, then it is of course possible to believe that God regards that as present which man does not recognise as present by the ordinary test of manifesting the properties, in manifesting which bodily presence consists; and this will, by an adherent of the system, be regarded as constituting a real but not sensible presence.

II. Whether matter exists only in virtue of minds to which it bears relation, or whether it exists in itself, the *source of its being* must be determined. For not even, if it be said that matter is a mode of the mind of a spirit, is it yet proved that matter is not self-caused or eternal: it might be a necessary mode of an eternal Spirit's thought, and so coeternal with his being. However, the motives that have led to the belief in the eternity of matter have been, in general, such as would involve a belief in its independence. It is conceding either too much or too little to make matter merely the thought of God, yet a thought which he never was without, and without which he could not have existed. Eternal matter was usually conceived as an antitheistic power, whether active or passive; sometimes so passive as to be no more than an imperfect medium for the divine operation. It is hardly worth while to frame a system in which matter should have a subjective eternity, since such a system has never yet been received. It has already been pointed out, however, that such a system is a conceivable corollary of Berkeley's. But, supposing matter to be something external to the divine mind which (all theists will probably admit) knows or contemplates it, what is the relation between the two? Is one the work of the other, or are they both independent?

Strictly speaking, there are three possible answers to this question, viz. that matter is the product of mind, that mind is the product of matter, and that the two are independent. But the second, in this exact form, has probably never been maintained. Matter, being inactive, cannot be conceived as producing, unless it be first personified. Materialism, however, or regarding mind as a *mode* of matter, is a fair representative of this view. Setting this on one side, we come to the choice between the two other alternatives, that matter is the work of mind, and that it is coeternal with mind—between theism and dualism.

The Jewish and Christian religions are theistic: most other religions of any claim to depth or speculative value are dualistic. Attempts to import dualism into Christianity have been numerous, but it has in every age been so obvious that the hybrid system was inconsistent—for if Christianity was a coherent system, its authoritative documents denounced dualism, and its instinctive consciousness rejected it—that it is unnecessary to reopen a question which is practically closed. All who claim to be, strictly speaking, theists, would now admit the prerogative of creation to belong to God in the fullest sense. It will be enough here to classify the forms of dualism which have either been opposed to the theistic doctrine of Christianity, or which it has been sought to amalgamate with it, as they refer to the subject before us, all of them being separately and fully noticed elsewhere. See DUALISM.

1. The Buddhistic dualism assumes two eternal and impersonal principles, matter and spirit. Finite and (eminently) human nature exists in virtue of the union or collision of the two; they are not only the good and evil, but the positive and negative elements of existence: existence consists in partaking of both, as the Hegelian system makes it consist in the union of being and nothing. The victory of the human spirit is to be free from matter, and one with all pure spirit; but since matter as well as spirit is necessary to existence, this pure being, though not conceived as nothingness, is undistinguishable from it.

2. The Manichæan dualism (to use the name of its most famous and permanently vital form, for a system not confined to the Manichæan sect, or those affiliated to it) assumes two eternal principles, matter and spirit, of which both are more or less distinctly *personified*. The strange and grotesque mythology by which the Manichæans (in the stricter sense) accounted for the intermixture of good and evil in the world, may have been meant to be understood allegorically; but this is hardly likely—the allegory is too vivid to have been less than a myth, in the minds of its hearers, if not of its inventors. Two powers which make war on each other, which devour and assimilate from each others' substance, or create and beget from their own, are strangely personal if regarded as abstractions: indeed, the best reason for thinking them so is that, if the Manichæan cosmogony be taken literally, the eternal Spirit is wonderfully carnal. But because a system is unphilosophical or inconsistent, if understood in the natural way, it does not follow that it ought to be understood otherwise: there being such things as inconsistent systems. It, however, is to be remembered that Manichæanism always maintained an esoteric doctrine, which *may* have allegorized the known gross one.

3. The Platonic dualism (if one may take a title from a single enunciation of it—it does not appear to have been a consistent or permanent conviction with Plato) assumes an eternal personal Spirit, acting on an eternal impersonal matter. Out of this he produces all things that are: not deriving them from his own being, lest he should impoverish himself, yet being in a real sense their author. Matter is conceived as negatively but not positively evil—unable to be made entirely good, even by the entirely good Spirit—and passively but not actively resisting his will.

4. The general character of Gnostic systems was not strictly dualistic. They assumed two eternal principles of spirit and matter, of which the first at least was con-

ceived, more or less distinctly, as personal: but matter was made into finite beings, not by the action of the eternal Spirit, but of a created or generated one; who, though not eternal, held a place so exalted as to be practically a third God; and usurped, more or less, the bad eminence of the eternal matter, since, in opposition to orthodox Christians, it was necessary to distinguish him from the eternal Spirit. See DEMIURGE.

The most ancient form of dualism, the Persian, does not come in for consideration here, as its antithesis is not between spirit and matter, but between light and darkness. Owing to its antiquity, the distinction between personal and impersonal principles is not formulated in it.

III. Has matter ever existed abstracted from those conditions of concrete *form* in which we meet with it? The third and fourth of the forms of dualism just enumerated make their cosmogony depend on the distinction devised by Anaxagoras, and formulated by Aristotle, between matter and form. If matter be conceived as eternal, and yet a creation by a spiritual Being be in some sense admitted, this is necessary. If matter be believed to be itself the work of a Spirit, it is possible, but by no means necessary, still to believe that he first created matter, and then formed it. Such was, perhaps, the general view of the scholastic period in the widest sense of the term: the belief recognised absolute creation by God out of nothing, while it left a meaning for the Aristotelian distinction which was familiar. It seemed to derive direct support from the narrative of the creation in Gen. i, 2. But it is evident that the word "without form," in this passage, is not to be pressed in so strict a philosophical sense: if the meaning of the word were less general, it would still follow from the fact that the "formless" matter is already called (not the universe merely, but) "the earth." It therefore follows that the scriptural or Christian doctrine of creation admits, but does not require, the complication of this intermediate step. It probably is ignored by almost all modern thought on the subject: in the last age of scholasticism, Sir Thomas Browne still continued to assume it, and his critic Digby thought it needless. See CREATION.

Matter, JACQUES, a noted French historian and philosopher, was born in Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 31, 1791. His parents were Germans, and, though living under French rule, remained true to the fatherland. Jacques, however, was taught French from his childhood, as he was expected to take a position under the French government. He was intended for the legal profession, and, after enjoying the best educational advantages of private instructors, was sent to the gymnasium at Strasburg, and then entered as a student at the University of Göttingen, Germany, where he enjoyed the instruction and association of Heeren, the noted historian, and Eichhorn, the celebrated Orientalist. He removed to Paris with a diplomatic career in view, attended the lectures of the Faculty of Letters, and wrote his *Essai historique sur l'école d'Alexandrie* (published in 1820), which, crowned by the academy in 1816, gave him a reputation among those French scholars who were interested in German erudition. By favor of Royer-Collard and Guizot, he received in 1819 a professorship in the College of Strasburg, which he exchanged two years afterwards for the directorship of the gymnasium and the professorship of ecclesiastical history in the Protestant academy of the same city. Applying himself to the study of ecclesiastical history and philosophy, he wrote *Histoire critique du Gnosticisme* (Paris, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1843–44, 3 vols. 8vo), and *Histoire universelle de l'Église Chrétienne* (1829–32, 3 vols.; 2d edit. 1838). In 1828 he was appointed inspector of the Academy of Strasburg, and, in 1831, corresponding member of the Academy of Inscriptions. His treatise *De l'influence des moeurs sur les lois et des lois sur les moeurs* (Paris, 1832) received from the academy the extraordinary prize of 10,000 francs. In 1832 he was appointed by Guizot general inspector of the University of Paris, and removed to that city. Among his later productions are, *Histoire des doctrines morales et politiques des trois derniers siècles* (1836–37, 3 vols.):—*De l'affaiblissement des idées et des études morales* (1841):—*Schelling et la philosophie de la nature* (1842):—*De l'état morale politique et littéraire de l'Allemagne* (1847, 2 vols.):—*Histoire de la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la religion* (1854):—*Philosophie de la religion* (1857, 2 vols):—*Morale, philosophie des moeurs* (1860):—*St. Martin, philos. inconnu* (1862):—*Emmanuel de Swedenborg* (1863):—*Le Mysticisme en France aux temps de Fénelon* (1864). He has also written occasional treatises concerning schools and education, and numerous articles in the *Dictionnaire de la conversation* and other cyclopædias. He died at Strasburg June 23, 1864.

Matthäi, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH VON, a noted German theologian, was born in Thuringia in 1744; was educated at the University of Leipsic, and immediately upon the completion of his studies became rector of the Gymnasium at Moscow. While here he devoted himself to a critical study of the Greek fathers of the Church, and published editions of the writings of Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and others. He was promoted to a professorship in the university about 1776, but in 1785 gladly accepted the position of rector at Meissen—this affording him an opportunity to return to his fatherland. In 1789 he was called to the University of Wittenberg, whence he again returned to Moscow in 1805. He died in Russia Sept. 26, 1811. Matthäi, besides patristic studies, devoted himself largely to exegesis. He edited the commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus on the Gospels, with notes, and Nemesius of Emesa on the Nature of Man. But his most celebrated critical labor is his edition of the Greek Testament, for which he made an extensive collation of manuscripts; though, as he chiefly followed the authority of one class, the Byzantine, his edition is less valuable in itself than as a collection of materials for the further labors of the critical editor. A second edition of this Testament appeared in 1803–7, in 3 vols. 8vo. The work is entitled *Novum Test. Græce et Latine: Textum denuo recensuit, varias Lectiones numquam antea vulgatas collegit, scholia Græca addidit, animadversiones criticas adjecit*, etc. (Rigæ, 1782–88, 12 vols. 8vo). The competent judgment of Michaelis pronounces its great value in few words. He says: "He has made his collection of various readings with great labor and diligence; he found in his MSS. a confirmation of many readings, which I should have hardly expected, because they are found in MSS. of a different kind and of a different country from those which he used; nay, even those of the Western edition, of which he speaks with the utmost contempt, he has corroborated by the evidence of his Moscow MSS. This edition is absolutely necessary for every man who is engaged in the criticism of the Greek Testament." See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands d. 18ten u. 19ten Jarh.* vol. ii, s. v.; Horne, *Introd. to the Crit. Study of the Scriptures;* Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. iii, s. v.

Matthæus, CANTACUZENUS, co-emperor of Constantinople, was the eldest son of the far-more illustrious John V Cantacuzenus (Johannes VI). At twenty-one, four years before he was of age, he was associated by his father in the supreme government as a means of checking the rebellion of John Palæologus. This measure of Cantacuzenus, however, owing to the popularity of Palæologus, failed in its design, and in 1355 the associate emperors, father and son, were compelled to abdicate the throne in favor of their rival. Matthæus now retired with his father to a monastic life in the convents of Mount Athos. He married Irene Palæologina, and became the father of six children. His death, preceding that of his father, occurred towards the end of the 14th century. He was a man of much learning, and the author of various works, mostly Biblical commentaries, several of which are still extant in MS. The one entitled *Commentarii in Cantica Canticorum* has been pub-

lished. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, s. v.

Mat'than (Matt. i, 15). See MATTAN.

Mat'that (Ματθάτ, prob. some form of the name *Matthan*), the name of two men mentioned only in the New Test. as maternal ancestors of Jesus. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

1. The son of Levi and father of Jorim, of the private line between David and Zerubbabel (Luke iii, 29). B.C. post 623.

2. The son of another Levi, and father of the Eli who was the father of the Virgin Mary (Luke iii, 24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

Matthe'las (Μαθήλας v. r. Μαηλάς, Vulg. *Mareas*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. ix, 19) of the MAASEIAH (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x, 8). "The reading of the Sept., which is followed in the A.V., might easily arise from a mistake between the uncial Θ and Σ (C)."

Matthes, KARL, a Lutheran minister in the duchy of Altenburg, in Germany, was born Dec. 26, 1811, at Eisenberg. His early studies were pursued at the lyceum of his native town, and in 1830 he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. After completing his studies in 1833, he spent several years in the capacity of family tutor and as a teacher, and finally, in 1843, became the pastor of Ober-Arnsdorf. In 1864 he was transferred to Bornshain, where he died suddenly July 3, 1865. Matthes possessed in a rare degree the love and esteem of his acquaintances, who applied to him the saying of Luther, "He *lived* what we preach." His ripe culture, theological knowledge, and penetrating judgment find expression in his works, which comprise a *Leben Philip Melancthon's* (of which a second edition appeared in 1846) and a *Vergleichende Symbolik* (published in 1854). In the latter year he assumed the publication of the *Allgemeine kirchliche Chronik*, a brief but comprehensive annual, reviewing important matters in the field of Church and theology.

Mat'thew (Ματθαῖος v. r. Μαθθαῖος), one of the apostles and evangelists. In the following account of him and his Gospel we have endeavored to collect and arrange all that is definitely known on the subject.

I. *His Name.* — According to Gesenius, the names *Matthæus* and *Matthias* are both contractions of *Mattathias* (מַתִּתְיָה, "gift of Jehovah;" Θεόδωρος, Θεόδοτος), a common Jewish name after the exile. See MATTITHIAH. Matthew had also the name of *Levi* (Mark ii, 14; Luke v, 27). In the catalogues—Mark iii, 18; Luke vi, 15—he is coupled with Thomas, which has given rise to the not altogether unfounded conjecture that Matthew was the twin brother of Thomas (תְּאוֹם, a *twin*), whose real name, according to Eusebius, *H. E.* i, 13, was Judas, and that they were both "brethren of our Lord" (Donaldson, *Jashar*, p. 10; comp. Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3). This last supposition would account for Matthew's immediate obedience to the call of Christ, but is hardly consistent with the indefiniteness of the words with which he is introduced—*ἄνθρωπον* Ματθ. λεγόμ. (Matt. ix, 9); *τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευΐν* (Luke v, 27)—or the unbelief of our Lord's brothers (John vii, 5). Heracleon, as quoted by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iv, 11), mentions Levi as well as Matthew among the early teachers who did not suffer martyrdom. Origen also (*Contr. Cels.* i, sec. 62 [48]) speaks of *ὁ Λεβῆς τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ*, together with "Matthew the publican;" but the names Λεβῆς and Λευΐς are by no means identical, and there is a hesitation about his language which shows that even then the tradition was hardly trustworthy. The attempt of Theod. Hase (*Bibl. Brem.* v, 475) to identify Levi with the apostle Lebbæus is an example of misapplied ingenuity which deserves little attention (comp. Wolf. *Cur.* ad Marc. ii, 14). The distinction between Levi and Matthew has, however, been maintained by Grotius (though he acknowledges that the voice of antiquity is against him, "et sane congruunt circumstantiæ"), Michaelis, De Wette, Sieffert, Ewald, etc. But it is in the highest degree improbable that two publicans should have been called by Christ in the same words, at the same place, and with the same attendant circumstances and consequences; and that, while one became an apostle, the other dropped entirely out of memory. Still less can we acquiesce in the hypothesis of Sieffert (*Urspr. d. erst. Kanon. Ev.* p. 59) and Ewald (*Drei Erst. Ev.* p. 344: *Christus*, p. 289, 321) that the name "Matthew" is due to the Greek editor of Matthew's Gospel, who substituted it by an error in the narrative of the call of Levi. On the other hand, their identity was assumed by Eusebius and Jerome, and most ancient writers, and has been accepted by the soundest commentators (Tischendorf, Meyer, Neander, Lardner, Ellicott, etc.). The double name only supplies a difficulty to those who are resolved to find such everywhere in the Gospel narrative. It is analogous to what we find in the case of Simon Peter, John Mark, Paul, Jude, etc., which may all admit of the same explanation, and be regarded as indicating a crisis in the spiritual life of the individual, and his passing into new external relations. He was no longer לֵוִי but מַתַּי, not *Levi* but *Theodore* —one who might well deem both himself and all his future life a veritable "gift of God" (Ellicott, *Hist. Lect.* p. 172; compare Meyer, *Comment.* i, 2; Winer, *R. W. B.* s. v. Matthäus, Name). See Michaelis. *Einleit.* ii, 934; Kraft, *Observ. sacr.* v, 3; Biel, in the *Bibl. Brem.* vi, 1038; Heumann, *Erklär. d. N. T.* i, 538; Frisch, *Diss. de Levi c. Matth. non confundendo* (Leips. 1746); Thiers, *Krit. Comment.* i, 90; Sieffert, *Urspr. d. Kanon. Evang.* p. 54. See NAME.

II. *Scripture Statements respecting him.*—His father's name was Alphæus (Mark ii, 14), probably different from the father of James the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who was a "sister" of the mother of Jesus (John xix, 25). See ALPHÆUS. His call to be an apostle (A.D. 27) is related by all three evangelists in the same words, except that Matthew (ix, 9) gives the usual name, and Mark (ii, 14) and Luke (v, 27) that of Levi. Matthew's special occupation was probably the collection of dues and customs from persons and goods crossing the Lake of Gennesareth. It was while he was actually engaged in his duties, *καθημένον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον*, that he received the call, which he obeyed without delay. Our Lord was then invited by him to a "great feast" (Luke v, 29), to which perhaps, as Neander has suggested (*Life of Christ*, p. 230, Bohn; comp. Blunt, *Undes. Coincid.* p. 257), by way of farewell, his old associates, *ὄχλος τελώνων πολύς*, were summoned. The publicans, properly so called (*publicani*), were persons who farmed the Roman taxes, and they were usually, in later times, Roman knights, and persons of wealth and credit. They employed under them inferior officers, natives of the province where the taxes were collected, called properly *portitores*, to which class Matthew no doubt belonged. These latter were notorious for impudent exactions everywhere (Plautus, *Menæch.* i, 2, 5; Cic. *ad Quint. Fr.* i, 1; Plut. *De Curios.* p. 518 *e*); but to the Jews they were especially odious, for they were the very spot where the Roman chain galled them, the visible proof of the degraded state of their nation. As a rule, none but the lowest would accept such an unpopular office, and thus the class became more worthy of the hatred with which in any case the Jews would have regarded it. The readiness, however, with which Matthew obeyed the call of Jesus seems to show that his heart was still open to religious impressions. We find in Luke vi, 13, that when Jesus, before delivering the Sermon on the Mount, selected twelve disciples, who were to form the circle of his more intimate associates, Matthew was one of them. On a subsequent occasion (Luke v, 29), Matthew gave the parting entertainment to his friends. After this event he is mentioned only in Acts i, 13. A.D. 29.

III. *Traditionary Notices.*—According to a statement

in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Pædagog.* ii, 1), Matthew abstained from animal food. Hence some writers have rather hastily concluded that he belonged to the sect of the Essenes. It is true that the Essenes practiced abstinence in a high degree, but it is not true that they rejected animal food altogether. Admitting the account in Clemens Alexandrinus to be correct, it proves only a certain ascetic strictness, of which there occur vestiges in the habits of other Jews (comp. Josephus, *Life*, 2 and 3). Some interpreters find also in Rom. xiv an allusion to Jews of ascetic principles.

According to another account, which is as old as the first century, and which occurs in the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vi, 15), Matthew, after the death of Jesus, remained about fifteen years in Jerusalem. This agrees with the statement in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 24), that Matthew preached to his own nation before he went to foreign countries. Rufinus (*Hist. Eccles.* x, 9) and Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 19) state that he afterwards went into Ethiopia (Meroë); but Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians (*In Ps.* 45); Isidore, the Macedonians (Isidore Hisp. *De Sanct.* 77); and others the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians of the Euphrates (comp. Florini *Exercit. hist. phil.* p. 23; Credner, *Einl. ins N. T.* I, i, 58). There also he probably preached specially to the Jews. See Abdiæ, *Histor. Apost.* vii, in Fabricii *Cod. apocr.* i, 636; Perionii *Vit. Apost.* p. 114; comp. *Martyrol. Rom.* Sept. 21. According to Heracleon (about A.D. 150) and Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* iv, 9), Matthew was one of those apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr, be it true or false, came in afterwards (Niceph. *H. E.* ii, 41). Tischendorf has published the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew" (*Acta Apocrypha*, Lips. 1841). See Acts, Spurious.

MATTHEW, Gospel of, the first of the four memoirs of our Lord in all the arrangements. See New Testament.

I. *Author.*—There is no ancient book with regard to the authorship of which we have earlier, fuller, and more unanimous testimony. From Papias, almost if not quite contemporary with the apostles, downwards, we have a stream of unimpeachable witnesses to the fact that Matthew was the author of a gospel; while the quotations which abound in the works of the fathers prove that at least as early as Irenæus—if we may not also add Justin, whose "Memorabilia of Christ" we cannot but identify with the "Gospels" he speaks of as in public use—the Gospel received by the Church under his name was the same as that which has reached us. As in the case of the other synoptists, a subsidiary argument of no small weight in favor of the correctness of this assignment may be drawn from the comparative insignificance of Matthew among the twelve. Any one desirous of imposing a spurious gospel on the Church would naturally have assumed one of the principal apostles as its author, instead of one whose name could add but little weight or authority to the composition.

Nevertheless a number of alleged circumstances have led Strauss and others to consider the Gospel of Matthew as an unapostolical composition, originating perhaps at the conclusion of the first century; while some consider it a production of the Aramæan Matthew, augmented by some additions; others call it a historical commentary of a later period, made to illustrate the collection of the sayings of Christ which Matthew had furnished (comp. Sieffert, *Ueber die Aechtheit und den Ursprung des ersten Evangelii*, 1832; Schneckenburger, *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten Evangelii*, 1834; Schott, *Ueber die Authenticität des Ev. Matt.* 1837).

(1st.) The representations of Matthew (it is said) have not that vivid clearness which characterizes the narration of an eye-witness, and which we find, for instance, in the Gospel of John. Even Mark and Luke surpass Matthew in this respect. Compare, for example, Matt. iv, 18 with Luke v, 1 sq.; Matt. viii, 5 sq. with Luke vii, 1 sq. This is most striking in the history of his own call, where we should expect a clearer representation. To this it may be replied that the gift of narrating luminously is a personal qualification of which even an apostle might be destitute, and which is rarely found among the lower orders of people; this argument, therefore, has recently been given up altogether. In the history of his call to be an apostle, Matthew has this advantage over Mark and Luke, that he relates the discourse of Christ (ix, 13) with greater completeness than these evangelists. Luke relates that Matthew prepared a great banquet in his house, while Matthew simply mentions that an entertainment took place, because the apostle could not well write that he himself prepared a great banquet.

(2d.) He omits some facts which every apostle certainly knew. For instance, he mentions only one journey of Christ to the Passover at Jerusalem, namely, the last; and seems to be acquainted only with one sphere of Christ's activity, namely, Galilee. He even relates the instances of Christ's appearing after his resurrection in such a manner that it might be understood as if he showed himself only to the women in Jerusalem, and to his disciples nowhere but in Galilee (Matt. xxvi, 32, and xxviii, 7). But an *argumentum a silentio* must not be urged against the evangelists. The raising of Lazarus is narrated only by John, and the raising of the youth at Nain only by Luke; the appearance of five hundred brethren after the resurrection, which, according to the testimony of Paul (1 Cor. xv, 6), was a fact generally known, is not recorded by any of the evangelists. The apparent restriction of Christ's sphere of activity to Galilee, we find also in Mark and Luke. This peculiarity arose perhaps from the circumstance that the apostles first taught in Jerusalem, where it was unnecessary to relate what had happened there, but where the events which had taken place in Galilee were unknown, and required to be narrated: thus the sphere of narration may have gradually become fixed. At least it is generally granted that hitherto no satisfactory explanation of this fact has been discovered. The expressions in Matt. xxvi, 32, and xxviii, 7, perhaps only indicate that the Lord appeared more frequently and for a longer period in Galilee than elsewhere. In Matt. xxviii, 16, we are told that the disciples in Galilee went up to a mountain, whither Christ had appointed them to come; and, since it is not previously mentioned that any such appointment had been made, the narrative of Matthew himself here leads us to conclude that Christ appeared to his disciples in Jerusalem after his resurrection.

(3d.) He relates unchronologically, and transposes events to times in which they did not happen; for instance, the rejection at Nazareth, mentioned in Luke iv, 14–30, must have happened at the commencement of Christ's public career, but Matthew relates it as late as xiii, 53 sq. But, on the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the evangelists intended to write a chronological biography. On the contrary, we learn from Luke i, 4, and John xx, 31, that their object was of a more practical and apologetic tendency. With the exception of John, the evangelists have grouped their communications more according to subjects than according to chronological succession. This fact is now generally admitted. As to the particular event above referred to, namely, the rejection of Christ at Nazareth, it appears to have occurred twice; Luke (iv, 14–31) giving the earlier, and Matthew (xiii, 53–58) the later instance. See Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels*, § 32, 60, and notes.

(4th.) He embodies in one discourse several sayings of Christ which, according to Luke, were pronounced at different times (comp. Matt. v–vii, and xxiii). But if the evangelist arranges his statements according to subjects, and not chronologically, we must not be surprised that he connects similar sayings of Christ, inserting them in the longer discourses after analogous topics had

been mentioned. These discourses are not, in fact, compiled by the evangelist, but always form the fundamental framework to which sometimes analogous subjects are attached. Moreover, it can be proved that several sayings are more correctly placed by Matthew than by Luke (compare especially Matt. xxiii, 37–39 with Luke xiii, 34, 35).

(5th.) He falls, it is asserted, into positive errors. In ch. i and ii he seems not to know that the real dwelling-place of the parents of Jesus was at Nazareth, and that their abode at Bethlehem was only temporary (compare Matt. ii, 1, 22, 23 with Luke ii, 4, 39). According to Mark xi, 20, 21, the fig-tree withered on the day after it was cursed; but according to Matt. xxi, 19, it withered immediately. According to Matt. xxi, 12, Christ purified the Temple immediately after his entrance into Jerusalem; but according to Mark he on that day went out to Bethany, and purified the Temple on the day following (Mark xi, 11–15). Matthew says (xxi, 7) that Christ rode on a she-ass and on a colt, which is impossible; the other Gospels speak only of a she-ass. But it depends entirely upon the mode of interpretation whether such positive errors as are alleged to exist are really chargeable on the evangelist. The difference, for instance, between the narrative of the birth of Christ, as severally recorded by Matthew and Luke, may easily be solved without questioning the correctness of either, if we suppose that each of them narrates what he knows from his individual sources of information. The history of Christ's childhood given in Luke leads us to conclude that it was derived from the acquaintances of Mary, while the statements in Matthew seem to be derived from the friends of Joseph. As to the transaction recorded in Matt. xxi, 18–22, and Mark xi, 11, 15, 20, 21, it appears that Mark describes what occurred most accurately; and yet there is nothing in Matthew's account really inconsistent with the true order of events.

On the other hand, some of the most beautiful and most important sayings of our Lord, the historical credibility of which no sceptic can attack, have been preserved by Matthew alone (Matt. xi, 28–30; xvi, 16–19; xxviii, 20; compare also xi, 2–21; xii, 3–6, 25–29; xvii, 12, 25, 26; xxvi, 13). Above all, the Sermon on the Mount, although containing some things apparently not coincident in time (for instance, the Lord's prayer), is yet far more complete and systematic than the comparatively meagre report of Luke. It may also be proved that in many particulars the reports of several discourses in Matthew are more exact than in the other evangelists, as may be seen by comparing Matt. xxiii with the various parallel passages in Luke. See, generally, Kern, *Ueber den Ursprung des Evangelii Matthæi* (Tübingen, 1834); Olshausen, *Drei Programme*, 1835; and the two *Lucubrations* of Harles, 1840 and 1843.

II. *Time and Place of its Composition.*—There is little in the Gospel itself to throw any light on the date of its composition. In xxvii, 7, 8; xxviii, 15, we have evidences of a date some years subsequent to the resurrection; but these may well be additions of a later hand, and prove nothing as to the age of the substance of the Gospel. Little trust can be placed in the dates given by some late writers — e. g. Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Eusebius's *Chron.*, eight years after the Ascension; Niceph., Callist., and the *Chron. Pasch.*, A.D. 45. The only early testimony is that of Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 1, p. 174), that it was written "when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church." This would bring it down to about A.D. 63 — probably somewhat earlier, as this is the latest date assigned for Luke's Gospel; and we have the authority of a tradition, accepted by Origen, for the priority of that of Matthew (ἐν παραδόσει μαθών . . . . ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τόν ποτε τελώνην ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστ. Ι. Χρ. Ματθαῖον, Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 25). On the supposition of a Hebrew original, we may presume that that would have been written the first of all the Gospels, or soon after the Ascension—i. e. about A.D. 31; and then the present Greek edition may have been issued not much later, or shortly before Matthew's removal from Judæa, i. e. about A.D. 47. Tillemont maintains A.D. 33; Townson, A.D. 37; Owen and Tomline, A.D. 38; Davidson, *Introd. N. Test.*, inclines to A.D. 41–43; while Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Bertholdt, etc., identifying "Zacharias the son of Barachias" (xxiii, 35) with Zacharias the son of Baruch, whose murder is recorded by Josephus (*War*, iv, 6, 4), place its composition shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, a theory which is rejected by De Wette and Meyer, and may safely be dismissed as untenable.

With regard to the place, there is no difference of opinion. All ancient authorities agree that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Palestine, and this has been as unanimously received by modern critics.

III. *For what Readers was it Written?*—The concurrent testimony of the early Church that Matthew drew up his Gospel for the benefit of the Jewish Christians of Palestine (τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, Orig. ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 25), has been accepted without question, and may be regarded as a settled point. The statement of Eusebius is that, "having previously preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, he committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel (τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον), and so filled up by his writing that which was lacking of his presence to those whom he was departing from" (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 24). The testimony of Jerome, frequently repeated, is to the same effect (*Præf. ad Matt.; De Vir. Ill.; Comm. in Hos. xi*). The passages quoted and referred to above, it is true, have reference to the supposed Aramaic original, and not to the present Greek Gospel. But whatever conclusion may be arrived at on the perplexed question of the origin of the existing Gospel, Mr. Westcott has shown (*Introd. to Gospels*, p. 208) that "there is no sufficient reason to depart from the unhesitating habit of the earliest writers who notice the subject, in practically identifying the revised version with the original text," so that whatever has been stated of the purpose or characteristics of the one may unhesitatingly be regarded as applicable to the other also.

Looking, therefore, to our present Gospel for proofs of its original destination, we find internal evidence tending to confirm the traditional statement. The great object of the evangelist is evidently to prove to his countrymen that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah, the antitype of the figures of the old covenant, and the fulfilment of all prophecy. The opening words of his Gospel declare his purpose. Jesus Christ is set forth as "the son of David" and "the son of Abraham," fulfilling "the promises made to the fathers," and reviving the faded glories of the nation in the heir of David's royal line, Abraham's promised seed (comp. Iren. *Fragm.* xxix; *Hær.* iii, 9, 1; Orig. *in Joann.* iv, 4). In the symmetrical arrangement of the genealogy also—"its divisions," as dean Goodwin has remarked (*Comm. in St. Matt.*, Introd.), "corresponding to the two great crises in their national life, the maximum and minimum points of Hebrew prosperity"—we have an accommodation to Jewish prejudices and Jewish habits of thought, in marked contrast with the continuous order of the universalistic Luke. As we advance, we find that the accomplishment of the promises, the proof that Jesus Christ is he of whom "Moses in the law and the prophets did write," is the object nearest to his heart. Thus he is continually speaking of the necessity of this or that event happening, in order that a particular prophecy might be fulfilled (ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου [or Θεοῦ] διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, i, 22; ii, 15; xxi, 4; xxvi, 56; comp. ii, 17; iii, 3; iv, 14; viii, 17, etc.), while his whole Gospel is full of allusions to those passages and sayings of the O. Test. in which Christ was predicted and foreshadowed. As Da Costa has remarked (*Four Witnesses*, p. 20), he regards the events he narrates as "realized prophecy," and everything is recorded with

this view, that he may lead his countrymen to recognise in Jesus their promised Deliverer and King.

It is in keeping with the destination of his Gospel that we find in Matthew less frequent explanations of Jewish customs, laws, and localities than in the other Gospels. Knowledge of these is presupposed in the readers (Matt. xv, 1, 2 with Mark vii, 1–4: Matt. xxvii, 62 with Mark xv, 42; Luke xxiii, 54; John xix, 14, 31, 42, and other places). Jerusalem is the holy city (see below, *Style and Diction*). Jesus is of the elect line (i, 1; ix, 27; xii, 23; xv, 22; xx, 30; xxi, 9, 15); is to be born of a virgin in David's place, Bethlehem (i, 22; ii, 6); must flee into Egypt and be recalled thence (ii, 15, 19); must have a forerunner, John the Baptist (iii, 3; xi, 10); was to labor in the outcast Galilee that sat in darkness (iv, 14–16); his healing was a promised mark of his office (viii, 17; xii, 17), and so was his mode of teaching by parables (xiii, 14); he entered the holy city as Messiah (xxi, 5–16); was rejected by the people, in fulfilment of a prophecy (xxi, 42), and deserted by his disciples in the same way (xxvi, 31, 56). The Gospel is pervaded by one principle, the fulfilment of the law and of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus. This at once sets it in opposition to the Judaism of the time, for it rebuked the Pharisaic interpretations of the law (v, xxiii), and proclaimed Jesus as the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world through his blood, ideas which were strange to the cramped and limited Judaism of the Christian æra. In the Sermon on the Mount Christ is introduced declaring himself not as the destroyer but the fulfiller of the Mosaic law. When the twelve are sent forth they are forbidden to go "into the way of the Gentiles" (x, 5; comp. xv, 24). In the same passage—the only one in which the Samaritans are mentioned—that abhorred race is put on a level with the heathen, not at once to be gladdened with the Gospel message.

But while we keep this in view, as the evangelist's first object, we must not strain it too narrowly, as if he had no other purpose than to combat the objections and to satisfy the prepossessions of the Jews. No evangelist expresses with greater distinctness the universality of Christ's mission, or does more to break down the narrow notion of a Messiah for Israel who was not one also for the whole world; none delivers stronger warnings against trusting to an Abrahamic descent for acceptance with God. It is in Matthew that we read of the visit of the magi (ii, 1 sq.), symbolizing the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles; it is he that speaks of the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, when "the nations that sat in darkness saw a great light" (iv, 15, 16), and adds to the narrative of the cure of the centurion's servant what is wanting to the universalistic Luke, that "many should come from the East and West," etc. (viii, 11). The narrative of the Syro-Phœnician woman, omitted by Luke, is given by Matthew, in whom alone we also find the command to "make disciples of all nations" (xxviii, 19), and the unrestricted invitation to "*all* that labor and are heavy laden" (xi, 28). Nowhere are we made more conscious of the deep contrast between the spiritual teaching of Christ and the formal teaching of the rulers of the Jewish Church. We see also that others besides Jewish readers were contemplated, from the interpretations and explanations occasionally added, e. g. Immanuel, i, 23; Golgotha, xxvii, 33; Eli, lama sabachthani, ver. 46.

IV. *Original Language.*—While there is absolutely nothing in the Gospel itself to lead us to imagine that it is a translation, and, on the contrary, everything favors the view that in the present Greek text, with its perpetual *verbal* correspondence with the other synoptists, we have the original composition of the author himself; yet the unanimous testimony of all antiquity affirms that Matthew wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew*, i. e. the Aramaic or Syro-Chaldee dialect, which was the vernacular tongue of the then inhabitants of Palestine. The internal evidence, therefore, is at variance with the external, and it is by no means easy to adjust the claims of the two.

1. *External Evidence.*—The unanimity of all ancient authorities as to the Hebrew origin of this Gospel is complete. In the words of the late canon Cureton (*Syriac Recension*, p. lxxxiii), "no fact relating to the history of the Gospels is more fully and satisfactorily established. From the days of the apostles down to the end of the 4th century, every writer who had occasion to refer to this matter has testified the same thing. Papias, Irenæus, Pantænus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, all with one consent affirm this. Such a chain of historical evidence appears to be amply sufficient to establish the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Hebrew dialect of that time, for the benefit of Jews who understood and spoke the language." To look at the evidence more particularly—(1.) The earliest witness is Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the beginning of the 2d century; a hearer of the apostle, or more probably of the presbyter John, and a companion of Polycarp (Irenæus, *Hær.* v, 33, 4). Eusebius describes him (*H. E.* iii, 36) as "a man of the widest general information, and well acquainted with the Scriptures" (*ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ γραφῆς εἰδήμων*); and, though in another place he depreciates his intellectual power (*σφόδρα σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν*, *H. E.* iii, 39), this unfavorable view seems chiefly to have reference to his millennarian views (comp. Irenæus, *Hær.* v, 33, 3), and can hardly invalidate his testimony on a matter of fact. Papias says, it would seem on the authority of John the Presbyter, "Matthew compiled his Gospel (or 'the oracles') in the Hebrew dialect; while each interpreted them according to his ability" (*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο: ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*). In estimating the value of this testimony, two important points have to be considered—the meaning of the term *λόγια*, and whether Papias is speaking of the present or the past. On the latter point there can be little doubt. His use of the aorist, *ἡρμήνευσε*, not *ἑρμηνεύει*, evidently shows that the state of things to which he or his original authority referred had passed away, and that individual translation was no longer necessary. It would seem, therefore, to follow, that "an authorized Greek representative of the Hebrew Matthew" had come into use "in the generation after the apostles" (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 207, note). The signification of *λόγια* has been much controverted. Schleiermacher (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 735) was the first to explain the term of a supposed "collection of discourses" which is held to have been the basis that, by gradual modification and interpolation, was transformed into the existing Gospel (Meyer, *Comm.* i, 13). This view has found wide acceptance, and has been strenuously maintained by Lachmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1835), Meyer, De Wette, Credner, Wieseler, B. Crusius, Ewald, Rénan, etc., but has been controverted by Lücke (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1833), Hug, Ebrard, Bauer, Delitzsch, Hilgenfeld, Thiersch, Alford, Westcott, etc. But *λόγια*, in the N. T., signifies the *whole revelation* made by God, rather than the mere *words* in which that revelation is contained (Acts vii, 38; Rom. iii, 2; Heb. v, 12; 1 Pet. iv, 11); and, as has been convincingly shown by Hug and Ebrard, the patristic use of the word confirms the opinion that, as used by Papias, both in this passage and in the title of his own work (*λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*), it implies a combined record of facts and discourses corresponding to the later use of the word *gospel*. (2.) The next witness is Irenæus, who, as quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* v, 8), says that "Matthew among the Hebrews published also a written Gospel in their own language" (*τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ*). Hug and others have attempted to invalidate this testimony, as a mere repetition of that of Papias, whose disciple, according to Jerome, Irenæus was; but we may safely accept it as independent evidence. (3.) Pantænus, the next witness, cannot be considered as strengthening the case

for the Hebrew original much; though, as far as it goes, his evidence is definite enough. His story, as reported by Eusebius, is that "he is said to have gone to the Indians (probably in the south of Arabia), where it is reported that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded him among some who had there acknowledged Christ, to whom it is said the apostle Bartholomew had preached, and had left with them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters (Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν), and that it was preserved to the time mentioned." Jerome tells the same tale, with the addition that Pantænus brought back this Hebrew Gospel with him (*De Vir. Ill.* 36). No works of Pantænus have been preserved, and we have no means of confirming or refuting the tale, which has somewhat of a mythical air, and is related as a mere story (λέγεται, λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτόν), even by Eusebius. (4.) The testimony of Origen has already been referred to. It is equally definite with those quoted above on the fact that the Gospel was "published for Jewish believers, and composed in Hebrew letters" (ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραικοῖς συντεταγμένον, Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 25). There is no reason for questioning the independence of Origen's evidence, or for tracing it back to Papias. He clearly states what was the belief of the Church at that time, and without a doubt as to its correctness. (For a refutation of the objections brought against it by Masch and Hug, etc., see Marsh's *Michaelis*, iv, 128, 135 sq.) (5.) We have already given the testimony of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 24), to which may be added a passage (*ad Marin. quæst.* ii, p. 941) in which he ascribes the words ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου to the *translator* (παρὰ τοῦ ἑρμηνεύσαντος τὴν γραφήν), adding, "For the evangelist Matthew delivered his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue." This is very important evidence as to the belief of Eusebius, which was clearly that of the Church generally, that the Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew. (6.) Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxix, 9, p. 124) states the same fact without the shadow of a doubt, adding that Matthew was the only evangelist who wrote Ἑβραϊστί καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν. The value of his evidence, however, is impaired by his identification of the Hebrew original with that employed by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, by whom he asserts it was still preserved (ἐτι σώζεται). (7.) The same observation may also be made concerning the testimony of Jerome, whose references to this subject are very frequent, and who is the only one of the fathers that appears to have actually seen the supposed Hebrew archetype (*Præf. ad Matt.*; *De Vir. Ill.* 3 and 36; in *Quat. Ev. ad Dam. præf.*; *Ep. Dam. de Osanna*: *Ep. ad Hedib.* quæst. viii; *Comm. in Hos. xi*). A perusal of these passages shows that there was a book preserved in the library collected by Pamphilus at Cæsarea, which was supposed to be the Hebrew original ("*ipsum Hebraicum*"), and was as such transcribed and translated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, about A.D. 392, from a copy obtained from the Nazarenes at the Syrian city of Berœa. Afterwards, about A.D. 398 (*Comm. in Matt.* xii, 13), he speaks more doubtfully of it, "quod vocatur a plerisque Matt. authenticum." Later on, A.D. 415 (*Contr. Pelag.* iii, 1), he modifies his opinion still further, and describes the book used by the Nazarenes, and preserved in the library at Cæsarea, as "Ev. juxta Hebræos. . . . secundum Apostolos, sive *ut plerique autumant* juxta Matthæum" (comp. *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1851, p. 39; De Wette, *Einl.* p. 100). While, then, we may safely accept Jerome as an additional witness to the belief of the early Church that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew (Aramaic), which he mentions as something universally recognised without a hint of a doubt, we may reasonably question whether the book he translated had any sound claims to be considered the genuine work of Matthew, and whether Jerome himself did not ultimately discover his mistake, though he shrunk from openly confessing it. We may remark, in confirmation of this, that unless the Aramaic book had differed considerably from the Greek Gospel, Jerome would hardly have taken the trouble to translate it: and that while, whenever he refers to Matthew, he cites it according to the present text, he never quotes the Nazarene Gospel as a work of canonical authority, but only in such terms as "quo utuntur Nazareni," "quod lectitant Nazaræi," "quod juxta Heb. Nazar. legere consueverunt," and still more doubtingly, "*qui crediderit evangelio*, quod secundum Hebræos editum nuper transtulimus;" language inconsistent with his having regarded it as canonical Scripture. (8) The statements of later writers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory Nazianzen, etc., merely echo the same testimony, and need not be more particularly referred to.

An impartial survey of the above evidence leads to the conclusion that, in the face of so many independent witnesses, we should be violating the first principles of historical criticism if we refused to accept the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. But whether this original was ever seen by Jerome or Epiphanius is more than questionable.

2. *Internal Evidence.*—What, then, is the origin of our present Gospel? To whom are we to ascribe its existing form and language? What is its authority? These are the questions which now meet us, and to which it must be confessed it is not easy to give a satisfactory answer. We may at the outset lay down as indisputable, in opposition to Cureton (who asserts, *ut sup.*, that "a careful critical examination of the Greek text will afford very strong confirmation of the Hebrew original), that the phenomena of the Gospel as we have it—its language, its coincidences with and divergences from the other synoptists, the quotations from the Old Test. it contains, and the citations made from it by ancient writers, all oppose the notion of the present Greek text being a translation, and support its canonical authority. (1.) An important argument may be drawn from the use made of the existing Gospel by all ancient writers. As Olshausen remarks (Clark's ed., i, xxviii), while all the fathers of the Church assert the Hebrew origin of the Gospel, they without exception make use of the existing Greek text as canonical Scripture, and that without doubt or question, or anything that would lead to the belief that they regarded it as of less authority than the original Hebrew, or possessed it in any other form than that in which we now have it. (2.) Another argument in favor of the authoritative character of our present Gospel arises from its universal diffusion and general acceptance, both in the Church and among her adversaries. Had the Hebrew Gospel been really clothed with the authority of the sole apostolic archetype, and our Greek Gospel been a mere translation, executed, as Jerome asserts, by some unknown individual ("quis postea in Græcum transtulerit non satis certum est," *De Vir. Ill.* 3), would not, as Olshausen remarks, *ut sup.*, objections to it have been urged in some quarter or other, particularly in the country where Matthew himself labored, and for whose inhabitants the Hebrew was written? Would its statements have been accepted without a cavil by the opponents of the Church? No trace of such opposition is, however, to be met with. Not a doubt is ever breathed of its canonical authority. (3.) Again, the text itself bears no marks of a translation. This is especially evident in the mode of dealing with the citations from the Old Test. These are of two kinds: (*a*) those standing in the discourses of our Lord himself, and the interlocutors; and (*b*) those introduced by the evangelist as proofs of our Lord's Messiahship. Now if we assume, as is certainly most probable (though the contrary has been maintained by Hug, the late duke of Manchester, and more recently by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, whose learned and able "Discussions on the Gospels" demand attentive consideration from every Biblical student), that Aramaic, not Greek, was the language ordinarily used by our Lord and his Jewish contemporaries, we should certainly expect that any citations from the Old

Test., made by them in ordinary discourse, would be from the original Hebrew or its Aramaic counterpart, not from the Septuagint version, and would stand as such in the Aramaic record; while it would argue more than the ordinary license of a mere translator to substitute the Sept. renderings, even when at variance with the Hebrew before him. Yet what is the case? While in the class (*b*), due to the evangelist himself, which may be supposed to have had no representative in the current Greek oral tradition which we assume as the basis of the synoptical Gospels, we find original renderings of the Hebrew text; in the class (*a*), on the other hand, where we might, *à priori*, have looked for an even closer correspondence, the citations are usually from the Sept., even where it deviates from the Hebrew. In (*a*) we may reckon iii, 3; iv, 4, 6, 7, 10; xv, 4, 8, 9; xix, 5, 18; xxi, 13, 42; xxii, 39, 44; xxiii, 39; xxiv, 15; xxvi, 31; xxvii, 46. In (*b*), called by Westcott (*Introd.* p. 208, note 1) "*Cyclic* quotations," i, 23; ii, 6, 15, 18; iv, 15, 16; viii, 17; xii, 18 sq.; xiii, 35; xxi, 5; xxvii, 9, 10). In two cases Matthew's citations agree with the synoptic parallels in a deviation from the Sept., all being drawn from the same oral groundwork. Matthew's quotations have been examined by Credner, one of the soundest of modern scholars, who pronounces decidedly for their derivation from the Greek (*Einleit.* p. 94; comp. De Wette, *Einl.* p. 198). We may therefore not unwarrantably find here additional evidence that in the existing Greek text we have the work, not of a mere translator, but of an independent and authoritative writer. (4.) The verbal correspondences between Matthew and the other synoptists in their narratives, and especially in the report of the speeches of our Lord and others, are difficult to account for if we regard it as a translation. As Alford remarks (*Gr. Test.* Proleg. i, 28), "The translator must have been either acquainted with the other two Gospels, in which case it is inconceivable that, in the midst of the present coincidences in many passages, such divergences should have occurred, or unacquainted with them, in which case the identity itself would be altogether inexplicable." Indeed, in the words of Credner (*Einleit.* p. 94, 95), "the Greek original of this Gospel is affirmed by its continual correspondence with those of Mark and Luke, and that not only in generals and important facts, but in particulars and minute details, in the general plan, in entire clauses, and in separate words—a phenomenon which admits of no explanation under the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew." (5.) This inference in favor of an original Greek Gospel is strongly confirmed by the fact that all versions, even the Peshito Syriac, the language in which the Gospel is said to have been originally written, are taken from the present Greek text. It is true that canon Cureton (*Syriac Recens.* p. lxxv sq.) argues with much ability against this, and expends much learning and skill in proof of his hypothesis that the Syriac version of Matthew published by him is more ancient than the Peshito, and may be regarded as, in the main, identical with the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew; which he also considers to have been identical with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, "modified by some additions, interpolations, and perhaps some omissions." His statement (p. xlii) that "there is a marked difference between the recension of Matthew and that of the other Gospels, proving that they are by different hands—the former showing no signs, as the others do, of translation from the Greek"—demands the respect due to so careful a scholar; but he fails entirely to explain the extraordinary fact that, in the very country where Matthew published his Gospel, and within a comparatively short period, a version from the Greek was substituted for the authentic original; nor have his views met with general acceptance among scholars.

3. Having thus stated the arguments in favor of a Hebrew and Greek original respectively, it remains for us to inquire whether there is any way of adjusting the claims of the two. Were there no explanation of this inconsistency between the external assertions and the internal facts, it would be hard to doubt the concurrent testimony of so many old writers, whose belief in it is shown by the tenacity with which they held it in spite of their own experience.

(1.) But it is certain that a Gospel, not the same as our canonical Matthew, sometimes usurped the apostle's name; and some of the witnesses we have quoted appear to have referred to this in one or other of its various forms or names. The Christians in Palestine still held that the Mosaic ritual was binding on them, even after the destruction of Jerusalem. At the close of the first century one party existed who held that the Mosaic law was only binding on Jewish converts; this was the Nazarenes. Another, the Ebionites, held that it was of universal obligation on Christians, and rejected Paul's Epistles as teaching the opposite doctrine. These two sects, who differed also in the most important tenets as to our Lord's person, possessed each a modification of the same Gospel, which no doubt each altered more and more, as their tenets diverged, and which bore various names—the Gospel of the twelve Apostles, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, or the Gospel according to Matthew. Enough is known to decide that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not identical with our Gospel of Matthew; but it had many points of resemblance to the synoptical Gospels, and especially to Matthew. What was its origin it is impossible to say: it may have been a description of the oral teaching of the apostles, corrupted by degrees; it may have come in its early and pure form from the hand of Matthew, or it may have been a version of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, as the evangelist who wrote especially for Hebrews. Now this Gospel, "the Proteus of criticism" (Thiersch), did exist; is it impossible that when the Hebrew Matthew is spoken of, this questionable document, the Gospel of the Hebrews, was really referred to? Observe that all accounts of it are at second hand (with a notable exception); no one quotes it; in cases of doubt about the text, Origen even does not appeal from the Greek to the Hebrew. All that is certain is, that Nazarenes or Ebionites, or both, boasted that they possessed the original Gospel of Matthew. Jerome is the exception, and him we can convict of the very mistake of confounding the two, and almost on his own confession. "At first he thought," says an anonymous writer (*Edinburgh Review*, 1851, July, p. 39), "that it was the authentic Matthew, and translated it into both Greek and Latin from a copy which he obtained at Berœa, in Syria. This appears from his *De Vir. Ill.*, written in the year 392. Six years later, in his Commentary on Matthew, he spoke more doubtfully about it—'Quod vocatur *a plerisque* Matthæi authenticum.' Later still, in his book on the Pelagian heresy, written in the year 415, he modifies his account still further, describing the work as the 'Evangelium juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed *Hebraicis literis* conscriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive *ut plerique autumant* juxta Matthæum, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur Bibliotheca.'" There have pronounced for a Greek original—Erasmus, Calvin, Leclerc, Fabricius, Lightfoot, Wetstein, Paulus, Lardner, Hey, Hales, Hug, Schott, De Wette, Moses Stuart, Fritzsche, Credner, Thiersch, and many others. Great names are ranged also on the other side, as Simon, Mill, Michaelis, Marsh, Eichhorn, Storr, Olshausen, and others. May not the truth be that Papias, knowing of more than one Aramaic Gospel in use among the Judaic sects, may have assumed the existence of a Hebrew original from which these were supposed to be taken, and knowing also the genuine Greek Gospel, may have looked on all these, in the loose, uncritical way which earned for him Eusebius's description, as the various "interpretations" to which he alludes? It is by no means improbable that after several inaccurate and imperfect translations of the Aramæan

original came into circulation, Matthew himself was prompted by this circumstance to publish a Greek translation, or to have his Gospel translated under his own supervision. It is very likely that this Greek translation did not soon come into general circulation, so that it is even possible that Papias may have remained ignorant of its existence. See Stuart, in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* 1838, p. 130–179, 315–356.

(2.) We think that Mr. Westcott—to whom the study of the Gospels owes so much—has pointed out the road to a still better solution. Not that the difficulties which beset this matter can be regarded as cleared up, or the question finally and satisfactorily settled, but a mode of reconciling the inconsistency between testimony and fact has been indicated, which, if pursued, may, we think, lead to a decision. "It has been shown," says Mr. Westcott (*Introd.* p. 208, note), "that the oral Gospel probably existed from the first both in Aramaic and in Greek, and in this way a preparation for a fresh representative of the Hebrew Gospel was at once found. The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospels which were adopted by Matthew already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a version as a substitution; and frequent coincidence with common parts of Mark and Luke, which were derived from the same oral Greek Gospel, was a necessary consequence. Yet it may have happened that, as long as the Hebrew and Greek churches were in close connection, perhaps till the destruction of Jerusalem, no authoritative Greek Gospel of Matthew—i. e. such a version of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to Matthew's version of the Aramaic—was committed to writing. When, however, the separation between the two sections grew more marked, the Greek Gospel was written, not indeed as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current." This theory of the origin of the Greek Gospel, it appears to us, meets the facts of the case, and satisfies its requirements more fully than any other. We have seen above that the language of Papias indicates that, even in his day, the Gospel of Matthew existed substantially in Greek, and its universal diffusion and general authority in the earliest ages of the Church prove that its composition cannot be placed much after the times of the apostles. May it not have been then that the two—the Aramaic and the Greek Gospel—existed for some time in their most important portions as an old tradition side by side—that the Aramaic was the first to be committed to writing, and gained a wide though temporary circulation among the Hebrew Christians of Syria and Palestine? that when, as would soon be the case, the want of a Greek Gospel for the use of the Hellenistic Jews was felt, this also was published in its written form, either by Matthew himself (as is maintained by Thiersch, Olshausen, and Lee), or by those to whom, from constant repetition, the main portions were familiar; perhaps under the apostle's eye, and with the virtual, if not the formal sanction of the Church at Jerusalem? As it supplied a need widely felt by the Gentile Christians, it would at once obtain currency, and as the Gentile Church rapidly extended her borders, while that of the Jewish believers was continually becoming confined within narrower limits, this Greek Gospel would speedily supplant its Hebrew predecessor, and thus furnish a fresh and most striking example of what Mr. Westcott, in his excellent work on *The Bible in the Church* (Introd. p. viii), calls "that doctrine of a divine providence separating (as it were) and preserving special books for the perpetual instruction of the Church, which is the true correlative and complement of every sound and reverend theory of inspiration." No other hypothesis, as Dr. Lee has satisfactorily shown (*Inspir. of H. Sc.* Appendix M), than the Greek Gospel being either actually or substantially the production of Matthew himself, "accounts for the profound silence of ancient writers respecting the translation . . . or for the absence of the least trace of any other Greek translation of the Hebrew original." The hypotheses which assign the translation to Barnabas (Isid. Hispal., *Chron.* p. 272), John (Theophyl., Euthym. Zigab.), Mark (Greswell), Luke and Paul conjointly (Anastas. Sinaita), or James the brother of our Lord (*Syn. Sacr. Scr.* apud Athanas. ii, 202), are mere arbitrary assertions without any foundation in early tradition. The last named is the most ingenious, as we may reasonably suppose that the bishop of Jerusalem would feel solicitude for the spiritual wants of the Hellenistic Christians of that city.

Those who desire to pursue the investigation of this subject will find ample materials for doing so in the *Introductions* of Hug, De Wette, Credner, etc.; Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii, pt. i, where the patristic authorities are fully discussed; and they will be found, for the most part, in Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung*, where will also be found the passages referring to the Gospel of the Hebrews, p. 448; also in most of the commentaries. The following have written monographs on this point: Somntag (Altorf, 1696), Schröder (Viteb. 1699, 1702), Masch (Halle, 1755), Williams (Lond. 1790), Elsner (F. ad V. 1791), Buslaw (Vratisl. 1826), Stuart (*Bibl. Repos.* 1838), Harless (Erlang. 1841, also 1842, the latter tr. in *Bibl. Repos.* 1844), Tregelles (Kitto's *Journ.* 1850, and separately), Alexander (*ibid.* 1850), Roberts (Lond. 1864). More general discussions may be found in Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. v; Reuss's *Gesch. d. Kanon;* Tregelles on *The Original Language of St. Matthew;* Rev. A. Roberts's *Discussions on the Gospels;* the commentaries of Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, Wetstein, Kuinöl, Fritzsche, Lange, etc.; and the works on the Gospels of Norton (*Credibility*), Westcott, Baur, Gieseler (*Entstehung*), Hilgenfeld, etc.; Cureton's *Syriac Recension*, Preface; and Dr. W. Lee on *Inspiration*, Appendix M; Jeremiah Jones's *Vindication of St. Matthew;* Ewald, *Die drei Erst. Ev.;* and *Jahrbuch d. Bibl. Wissensch.* 1848-49.

V. *Characteristics.*—Matthew's is emphatically the Gospel of the Kingdom. The main object of the evangelist is to portray the kingly character of Christ, and to show that in him the ideal of the King reigning in righteousness, the true Heir of David's throne, was fulfilled (comp. Augustine, *De Consens. Ev.* passim). Thus the tone throughout is majestic and kingly. He views things in the grand general aspect, and, indifferent to the details in which Mark loves so much to dwell, he gathers up all in the great result. His narrative proceeds with a majestic simplicity, regardless of time and place, according to another and deeper order, ready to sacrifice mere chronology or locality to the development of this idea. Thus he brings together events separated sometimes by considerable intervals, according to the unity of their nature or purpose, and with a grand but simple power accumulates in groups the discourses, parables, and miracles of our Lord (I. Williams, *Study of Gospels*, p. 28). From the formation and objects of the Gospels, we should expect that their prevailing characteristics would be indicated rather by a general tone and spirit than by minute peculiarities. Not, however, that these latter are wanting. It has already been remarked how the genealogy with which Matthew's Gospel opens sets our Lord forth in his kingly character, as the heir of the throne of David, the representative of the royal line of which he was the true successor and fulfilment. As we advance we find his birth hailed, not by lowly shepherds as in Luke, but by wise men coming to wait on him with royal gifts, inquiring, "Where is he that is born king of the Jews." In the Sermon on the Mount the same majesty and authority appear. We hear the Judge himself delivering his sentence; the King laying down the laws of his kingdom, "I say unto you," and astonishing his hearers with the "authority" with which he speaks. The awful majesty of our Lord's reproofs in his teaching in the Temple, and his denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees, also evidence the authority of a king and lawgiver—"one who knew the mind of God and could reveal it;" which may also be noticed in the lengthened discourses that mark the close

of his ministry, in which "the king" and "the kingdom of heaven" come forward with so much frequency (xxi, 31, 43; xxii, 2 sq.; xxiii, 14; xxiv, 14; xxv, 1, 34, 40). Nor can we overlook the remarkable circumstance that, in the parable of the marriage-feast, so similar in its general circumstances with that in Luke (xiv, 16), instead of "a certain man," it is "a king" making a marriage for his son, and in kingly guise sending forth his armies and binding the unworthy guest. The addition of the doxology also to the Lord's Prayer, with its ascription of "the kingdom, the power, and the glory," is in such true harmony with the same prevailing tone as to lead many to see in this fact alone the strongest argument for its genuineness.

But we must not in this, or in any of the Gospels, direct our attention too exclusively to any one side of our Lord's character. "The King is one and the same in all, and so is the Son of Man and the Priest. . . . He who is the King is also the Sacrifice" (Williams, *ut sup.* p. 32). The Gospel is that of the King, but it is the King "meek" (xxi, 5), "meek and lowly of heart" (xi, 29); the kingdom is that of "the poor in spirit," "the persecuted for righteousness' sake" (ver. 3, 10), into which "the weary and heavy laden" are invited, and which they enter by submitting to the "yoke" of its king. He, it tells us, was to be one of ourselves, "whose brotherhood with man answered all the anticipations the Jewish prophets had formed of their king, and whose power to relieve the woes of humanity could not be separated from his participation in them, who 'himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses'" (viii, 17) (Maurice, *Unity of N. T.* p. 190). As the son of David and the son of Abraham, he was the partaker of the sorrows as well as the glories of the throne—the heir of the curse as well as the blessing. The source of all blessings to mankind, fulfilling the original promise to Abraham, the curse due to man's sin meets and centres in him, and is transformed into a blessing when the cross becomes his kingly throne; and from the lowest point of his degradation he reappears, in his resurrection, as the Lord and King to whom "all power is given in heaven and earth." He fulfils the promise, "In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed;" in the command to "go and make disciples of all nations," he "expands the I AM, which was the ground of the national polity, into the name of 'the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'" (Maurice, *ut sup.* p. 221).

Once more, the kingdom he came to establish was to be a fatherly kingdom. The King he made known was one reigning in God's name, and as his representative. That God was the father of his people, as of him, in and through whom human beings were to be adopted as the children of God. This characteristic of the Gospel is perpetually meeting us. At every turn Matthew represents our Lord bringing out the mind of God and showing it to be the mind of a Father. The fatherly relation is the ground of all his words of counsel, command, warning, comfort. Especially is this the case in the Sermon on the Mount. Every command, as to good works (v, 16, 45, 48), almsgiving (vi, 1, 2), prayer (vi, 6, 8), forgiveness (vi, 14, 15), fasting (vi, 18), trust and faith (vi, 26; vii, 11), is based on the revelation of a Father. The twelve are sent forth in the same name and strength (x, 20, 29). The kingdom Christ came to establish is not so much a kingdom as a family—the *Ecclesia*, a word found only in Matthew (xvi, 18; xviii, 17)—"held together by the law of forgiveness and mutual sacrifice, with their elder Brother in the midst of them, and their will so identified with that which rules heaven and earth, that whatever they shall agree to ask shall be done by their Father." This characteristic of Matthew is remarkably evidenced by a comparative survey of the usage of the evangelists. In Mark we find our Lord speaking of or to God, as his Father, three times, in Luke twelve times, in Matthew twenty-two times; as the Father of his people, in Mark twice, in Luke five times, in Matthew twenty-two times.

Another minor characteristic which deserves remark, is Matthew's use of the plural, where the other evangelists have the singular. Thus, in the temptation, we have "stones" and "loaves" (iv, 3), two dæmoniacs (viii, 28), τούς χόρους (xiv, 19), two blind men (xx, 30; comp. ix, 27), the ass and her colt (xxi, 2), servants (xxi, 34, 36), both thieves blaspheming (xxvii, 44). This is ingeniously accounted for by Da Costa (*Four Witnesses*, p. 322), though this is not universally applicable, on the idea that "his point of view—regarding the events he narrates as fulfilled prophecies—leads him to regard the species rather than the individual; the entire plenitude of the prophecy rather than the isolated fulfilment."

VI. *Relation to Mark and Luke.*—In the article on Mark we have expressed our opinion that, while his Gospel is probably *in essence* the oldest, there is nothing seriously to invalidate the traditional statement that Matthew's was the earliest in composition—the first committed to writing. Neither does a careful review of the text of the Gospel allow us to accept the view put forth by Ewald with his usual dogmatism, and defended with his wonted acuteness, that, as we have it, it is a fusion of four different elements—(1.) An original Greek Gospel of the simplest and briefest form; (2.) An Aramaic "collection of sayings" (τὰ λόγια); (3.) the narrative of Mark; and (4.) "a book of higher history." That our Gospel is no such curious mosaic is evident from the unity of plan and unity of language which pervades the whole, and to an unprejudiced reader Ewald's theory refutes itself.

Comparing Matthew's Gospel with those of Mark and Luke, we find the following passages peculiar to him: chap. i (with the exception of the great central fact), and chap. ii entirely. The genealogy, the suspicions of Joseph, the visit of the magi, the flight into Egypt and return thence, the massacre of the innocents, and the reason of the settlement at Nazareth, are given by Matthew alone. To him we owe the notice that "the Pharisees and Sadducees" came to John's baptism (iii, 7); that John was unwilling to baptize our Lord, and the words in which Jesus satisfied his scruples (ver. 13–15); the Sermon on the Mount in its fullest form (ch. v, vi, vii); the prediction of the call of the Gentiles, appended to the miracle of the centurion's servant (viii, 11, 12); the cure of the two blind men (ix, 27–30); and that memorable passage by which, if by nothing else, Matthew will forever be remembered with thankfulness—which, as perhaps the fullest exposition of the spirit of the Gospel anywhere to be found in Holy Scripture, taught Augustine the difference between the teaching of Christ and that of the best philosophers (xi, 28–30); the solemn passage about "idle words" (xii, 36, 37); four of the parables in ch. xiii, the tares, the hid treasure, the pearl, and the draw-net; several incidents relating to Peter, his walking on the water (xiv, 28–31), the blessing pronounced upon him (xvi, 17–19), the tribute-money (xvii, 24–27); nearly the whole of ch. xviii, with its lessons of humility and forgiveness, and the parable of the unmerciful servant; the lessons on voluntary continence (xix, 10, 12); the promise to the twelve (ver. 28); the parables of the laborers in the vineyard (xx, 1–16), the two sons (xxi, 28–32), the transference of the kingdom to the Gentiles (ver. 43); the parable of the marriage of the king's son (xxii, 1–14); nearly the whole of the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees in ch. xxiii; the parables of the last things in ch. xxv. In the history of the passion the peculiarities are numerous and uniform in character, tending to show how, in the midst of his betrayal, sufferings, and death, our Lord's Messiahship was attested. It is in Matthew alone that we read of the covenant with Judas for "thirty pieces of silver" (xxvi, 15); his inquiry "Is it I?" (xxvi, 25), as well as the restoration of the money in his despair, and its ultimate destination in unconscious fulfilment of prophecy (xxvii, 3–10); the cup "for the remission of sins" (xxvi, 28); the mention of the

"twelve legions of angels" (ver. 52–54); Pilate's wife's dream (xxvii, 19), his washing his hands (ver. 24), and the imprecation "His blood be on us," etc. (verse 25); the opening of the graves (ver. 52, 53), and the watch placed at the sepulchre (ver. 62–66). In the account of the resurrection we find only in Matthew the great earthquake (xxviii, 2), the descent of the angel, his glorious appearance striking terror into the guards (ver. 2–4), their flight, and the falsehood spread by them at the instigation of the priests (ver. 11–15); our Lord's appearance to the women (ver. 9, 10); the adoration and doubt of the apostles (ver. 17); and, finally, the parting commission and promise of his ever-abiding presence (ver. 18–20).

This review of the Gospel will show us that of the matter peculiar to Matthew, the larger part consists of parables and discourses, and that he adds comparatively little to the narrative. Of thirty-three recorded miracles eighteen are given by Matthew, but only two, the cure of the blind men (ix, 27–30) and the tribute money (xvii, 24–27), are peculiar to him. Of twenty-nine parables Matthew records fifteen; ten, as noticed above, being peculiar to him. Reuss, dividing the matter contained in the synoptical Gospels into 100 sections, finds 73 of them in Matthew, 63 in Mark, in Luke, the richest of all, 82. Of these, 49 are common to all three; 9 common to Matthew and Mark; 8 to Matthew and Luke; 3 to Mark and Luke. Only 7 of these are peculiar to Matthew; 2 to Mark; while Luke contains no less than 22.

Matthew's narrative, as a rule, is the least graphic. The great features of the history which bring into prominence our Lord's character as teacher and prophet, the substance of type and prophecy, the Messianic king, are traced with broad outline, without minute or circumstantial details. We are conscious of a want of that picturesque power and vivid painting which delight us in the other Gospels, especially in that of Mark. This deficiency, however, is more than compensated for by the grand simplicity of the narrative, in which everything is secondary to the evangelist's great object. The facts which prove the Messianic dignity of his Lord are all in all with him, the circumstantials almost nothing, while he portrays the earthly form and theocratic glory of the new dispensation, and unfolds the glorious consummation of the "kingdom of heaven."

VII. *Arrangement and Contents.*—Matthew's order, we have already seen, is according to subject-matter rather than chronological sequence, which in the first half is completely disregarded. More attention is paid to order of time in the latter half, where the arrangement agrees with that of Mark. The main body of his Gospel divides itself into groups of discourses collected according to their leading tendency, and separated from each other by groups of anecdotes and miracles. We may distinguish *seven* such collections of discourses—(1.) The Sermon on the Mount, a specimen of our Lord's ordinary didactic instruction (ch. v–vii); divided by a group of works of healing, comprising no less than ten out of eighteen recorded miracles, from (2.) the commission of the twelve (ch. x). The following chapters (xi, xii) give the result of our Lord's own teaching, and, introducing a change of feeling towards him, prepare us for (3.) his first open denunciation of his enemies (xii, 25–45), and pave the way for (4.) the group of parables, including seven out of fifteen recorded by him (ch. xiii). The next four chapters, containing the culminating point of our Lord's history in Peter's confession (xvi, 13–20), and the transfiguration (ch. xvii), with the first glimpses of the cross (xvi, 21; xvii, 12), are bound together by historical sequence. In (5.), comprising ch. xviii, we have a complete treatise in itself, made up of fragments on humility and brotherly love. The counsels of perfection, in xix, 1–xx, 16, are followed by the disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees (xxi, 23–xxii, 46), which supply the ground for (6.) the solemn denunciations of the hypocrisies and sophisms by which they nullified the spirit of the law (ch. xxiii), followed by (7.) the prophecy of the last things (ch. xxiv, xxv).

More particularly its principal divisions are—1. The introduction to the ministry (ch. i–iv). 2. The laying down of the new law for the Church in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. v–vii). 3. Events in historical order, showing Jesus as the worker of miracles (ch. viii, ix). 4. The appointment of apostles to preach the kingdom (ch. x). 5. The doubts and opposition excited by his activity in divers minds—in John's disciples, in sundry cities, in the Pharisees (ch. xi, xii). 6. A series of parables on the nature of the kingdom (ch. xiii). 7. Similar to 5. The effects of his ministry on his countrymen, on Herod, the people of Gennesaret, Scribes and Pharisees, and on multitudes, whom he feeds (xiii, 53–xvi, 12). 8. Revelation to his disciples of his sufferings. His instructions to them thereupon (xvi, 13–xviii, 35). 9. Events of a journey to Jerusalem (ch. xix, xx). 10. Entrance into Jerusalem and resistance to him there, and denunciation of the Pharisees (ch. xxi–xxiii). 11. Last discourses; Jesus as lord and judge of Jerusalem, and also of the world (ch. xxiv, xxv). 12. Passion and resurrection (ch. xxvi–xxviii).

The view that Matthew's Gospel is arranged chronologically was revived by Eichhorn, who has been followed by Marsh, De Wette, and others. But it has been controverted by Hug, Olshausen, Greswell, Ellicott, and others, and is almost universally held to be untenable.

VIII. *Style and Diction.*—The language of Matthew is less characteristic than that of the other evangelists. Of the three synoptical Gospels it is the most decidedly Hebraistic, both in diction and construction, but less so than that of John. Credner and others have remarked the following: (1.) *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, which occurs thirty-two times in Matthew and not once in the other evangelists, who use instead *ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ*, employed also by Matthew (vi, 33; xii, 28; xxi, 31, 43). (2.) *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (*ὁ οὐράνιος*, four times), sixteen times, only twice in Mark, not at all in Luke. (3.) *Υἱὸς Δαβίδ*, to designate Jesus as the Messiah, seven times, three times each in Mark and Luke. (4.) *Ἡ ἁγία πόλις*, and *ὁ ἅγιος τόπος*, for Jerusalem, three times; not in the other evangelists. (5.) *ἡ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*, "the consummation of the age"="the end of the world," is found five times in Matthew, nowhere else in the New Test. except Heb. ix, 26, in the plural, *αἰώνων*. (6.) *ἵνα* (*ὅπως*) *πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν*, eight times, nowhere else in the New Test. John uses *ἵνα πληρ. ὁ λόγ.*, or *ἡ γραφ.*; Mark once (xiv, 49), *ἵνα πληρ. αἱ γραφ.* (7.) *τὸ ῥηθέν* (always used by Matthew when quoting holy Scripture *himself*, in other citations *γέγραπται*, with the other evangelists), twelve times; *ὁ ῥηθείς*, once (iii, 3). He never uses the singular, *γραφή*. Mark once uses *τὸ ῥηθέν* (xiii, 14). (8.) *ἐθνικός*, twice; nowhere else in the New Test. (9.) *ὀμνύειν ἐν*, seven times; not elsewhere, save Rev. x, 6. (10.) *καὶ ἰδού*, in narrative, twenty-three times; in Luke sixteen times; not in Mark. *ἰδού*, after a genitive absolute, nine times. (11.) *προσέρχεσθαι* and *πορεύεσθαι*, continually used to give a pictorial coloring to the narrative (e. g. iv, 3; viii, 5, 19, 25; ix, 14, 20, etc.; ii, 8; ix, 13; xi, 4, etc.). (12.) *λέγων*, absolutely, without the dative of the person (e. g. i, 20; iii, 2, 15, 20; iii, 2, 14, 17; v, 2; vi, 31, etc.). (13.) *Ἱεροσόλυμα* is the name of the holy city with Matthew always, except xxiii, 37. It is the same in Mark, with one (doubtful) exception (xi, 1). Luke uses this form rarely; *Ἱερουσαλήμ* frequently.

Other peculiarities, establishing the unity of authorship, may be noticed: (1.) The use of *τότε*, as the ordinary particle of transition, ninety times; six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke. (2.) *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε*, five times; Luke uses *ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο*, or *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο*. (3.) *ἕως οὗ*, seven times. (4.) *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκ.*, and *ἀπὸ τ. ὥρ. ἐκ.*, scarcely found in Mark or Luke. (5.) *ἀναχωρέω*, "to retire," ten times. (6.) *κατ' ὄναρ*, six times. (7.) *ποιεῖν ὡς, ὥσπερ, καθώς,*

ὡσαύτως; Luke, ποι. ὁμοίως. (8.) τάφος, six times; only Rom. iii, 13 besides in the N. T. (9.) σφόδρα, and other adverbs, after the verb, except οὕτω, always before it. (10.) προσκυνεῖν, with the dative, ten times; twice in Mark, three times in John.

Other words which are found either only or more frequently in Matthew are, μαθητεύειν, σεληνιάζεσθαι, φρόνιμος, οἰκιακός, ὕστερον, ἐκεῖθεν, ἱστάζειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, μεταιρεῖν, συναιρεῖν λόγον, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, μαλακία—κος, etc. (see Credner, *Einleit.* p. 63 sq.; Gersdorf, *Beiträge z. Sprachcharact. d. N. T.*).

IX. *Citations from the Old Testament.*—Few facts are more significant of the original purpose of this Gospel, and the persons for whom it was designed, than the frequency of citations from and references to the O.-Test. Scriptures. While in Luke and Mark, the Gentile Gospels, we have only twenty-four and twenty-three respectively, Matthew supplies no less than fifty-four. The character of the quotations is no less noticeable than the number. In Matthew the Old Test. is cited verbally no less than forty-three times, many of the quotations being peculiar to this evangelist; in Luke we have not more than nineteen direct citations, and only eight quotations (in Mark only two), which are not found elsewhere. The two classes into which these citations are distinguished—those more or less directly from the Sept., and those which give an original rendering of the Hebrew text—have been alluded to above. The citations peculiar to Matthew are marked with an asterisk (*), and those which he quotes as having been fulfilled in our Lord's life with (*a*).

* (*a*) i, 23.....Isa. vii, 14.	xv, 4.....Exod. xxi, 16.
* (*a*) ii, 6.....Mic. v, 2.	8, 9....Isa. xxix, 13.
* (*a*) 15.....Hos. xi, 1.	* xviii, 16...Deut. xix, 15.
* (*a*) 18.....Jer. xxxi, 15.	xix, 4.....Gen. i, 27.
iii, 3.....Isa. xl, 3.	5.....Gen. ii, 24.
iv, 4.....Deut. viii, 3.	7.....Deut. xxiv, 1.
6.....Psa. xci, 11, 12.	xix, 18, 19. Exod. xx, 12-16.
7.....Deut. vi, 16.	* (*a*) xxi, 5.....Zech. ix, 9.
10.....Deut. vi, 13.	9.....Psa. cxviii, 25, 26.
* (*a*) 14–16....Isa. ix, 12.	13.....Isa. lvi, 7; Jer. vii, 11.
* v, 5.....Psa. xxxvii, 11, 29.	* 16.....Psa. viii, 2.
* 21.....Exod. xx, 13.	* 42.....Psa. cxviii, 22.
* 27.....Exod. xx, 14.	xxii, 24...Deut. xxv, 5.
31.....Deut. xxiv, 1.	32...Exod. iii, 6.
* 33.....{Lev. xix, 12; Deut. xxiii, 23.	37...Deut. vi, 5.
* 38.....Exod. xxi, 24.	39...Lev. xix, 18.
43.....Lev. xix, 18.	44...Psa. cx, 1.
viii, 4.....Lev. xiv, 2.	xxiii, 38...Hag. i, 9 (?).
* (*a*) 17.....Isa. liii, 4.	39...Psa. cxviii, 26.
* (*a*) ix, 13.....Hos. vi, 6.	xxiv, 15...Dan. xii, 11; ix, 27.
* x, 35, 36...Mic. vii, 6.	29...Isa. xiii, 10; Joel ii, 10.
xi, 5.....Isa. xxxv, 5; xxix, 18.	xxvi, 31...Zech. xiii, 7.
10.....Mal. iii, 1.	64...Dan. vii, 13.
* (*a*) xii, 7.....Hos. vi, 6.	* (*a*) xxvii, 10..Zech. xi, 13.
* (*a*) 18–21...Isa. xlii, 1–4.	* (*a*) 35....Psa. xxii, 18.
xiii, 14, 15. Isa. vi, 9, 10.	* 43..Psa. xxii, 8.
* (*a*) 35....Psa. lxxviii, 2.	46..Psa. xxii, 1.
xv, 4.....Exod. xx, 12.	

To these may be added (ii, 23), "He shall be called a Nazarene;" and the appeal to the words of the prophets generally (xxvi, 54, 56).

References to the O. Test. which are not direct citations, are as under:

xi, 14.....Mal. iv, 5.	xvii, 11.....Mal. iv, 6.
xii. 3.....1 Sam. xxi, 3–6.	xxi, 44.....Dan. ii, 44.
5.....Numb. xxviii, 9.	xxiii, 35..{Gen. iv, 8; 2 Chron. xxiv, 21.
40.....Jonah i, 17.	
42.....1 Kings x, 1.	

X. *Genuineness.*—Notwithstanding the doubts that have been thrown upon it, the genuineness of Matthew is as satisfactorily established as that of any ancient book whatever. See Davidson's *Introd. to the N. Test.*, vol. i. From the days of Justin we find perpetual quotations corresponding with the existing text of the Gospel, which prove that the book then in circulation, as of canonical authority, was the same as that we now have. Of the various recensions by which we are invited by Marsh, Hilgenfeld, Schleiermacher, Ewald, etc., to believe that the Gospel assumed its present form, there is absolutely no external evidence; while the internal, arising from style and diction, are entirely in favor of the whole having substantially proceeded from one hand. Other supposed internal evidence varies so much, according to the subjective position of critics, and leads them by the same data to such opposite results, as to be little worth.

1. Some critics, admitting the apostolic antiquity of a part of the Gospel, apply to Matthew, as they do to Luke, the gratuitous supposition of a later editor or compiler, who, by augmenting and altering the earlier document, produced our present Gospel. Hilgenfeld (p. 106) endeavors to separate the older from the newer work, and includes much historical matter in the former; since Schleiermacher, several critics, misinterpreting the λόγια of Papias, consider the older document to have been a collection of "discourses" only. We are asked to believe that in the 2d century, for two or more of the Gospels, new works, differing from them both in matter and compass, were substituted for the old, and that about the end of the 2d century our present Gospels were adopted by authority to the exclusion of all others, and that henceforth the copies of the older works entirely disappeared, and have escaped the keenest research ever since. Eichhorn's notion is that "the Church" sanctioned the four canonical books, and by its authority gave them exclusive currency; but there existed at that time no means for convening a council, and if such a body could have met and decided, it would not have been able to force on the churches books discrepant from the older copies to which they had long been accustomed, without discussion, protest, and resistance (see Norton, *Genuineness*, chap. i). That there was no such resistance or protest we have ample evidence. Irenæus knows the four Gospels only (*Hær.* iii, chap. i). Tatian, who died A.D. 170, composed a Gospel harmony, lost to us, under the name of Diatessaron (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 29). Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about 168, wrote a commentary on the Gospels (Jerome, *Ad Algasiam*, and *De Vir. ill.*). Clement of Alexandria (flourished about 189) knew the four Gospels, and distinguished between them and the uncanonical gospel according to the Egyptians. Tertullian (born about 160) knew the four Gospels, and was called on to vindicate the text of one of them against the corruptions of Marcion. See Luke. Origen (born 185) calls the four Gospels the four elements of the Christian faith; and it appears that his copy of Matthew contained the genealogy (*Comm. in Joan.*). Passages from Matthew are quoted by Justin Martyr, by the author of the letter to Diognetus (see in Otto's *Justin Martyr*, vol. ii), by Hegesippus, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement, Tertullian, and Origen. It is not merely from the matter, but the manner of the quotations, from the calm appeal as to a settled authority, from the absence of all hints of doubt, that we regard it as proved that the book we possess had not been the subject of any sudden change. Was there no heretic to throw back with double force against Tertullian the charge of alteration which he brings against Marcion? Was there no orthodox Church or member of a Church to complain that, instead of the Matthew and the Luke that had been taught to them and their fathers, other and different writings were now imposed on them? Neither the one nor the other appears.

The citations of Justin Martyr, very important for this subject, have been thought to indicate a source different from the Gospels which we now possess; and by the word ἀπομνημονεύματα (memoirs), he has been supposed to indicate that lost work. We have not space here to show that the remains referred to are the Gospels which we possess, and not any one book; and that though Justin quotes the Gospels very loosely, so that his words often bear but a slight resemblance to the original, the same is true of his quotations from the

Septuagint. He transposes words, brings separate passages together, attributes the words of one prophet to another, and even quotes the Pentateuch for facts not recorded in it. Many of the quotations from the Septuagint are indeed precise, but these are chiefly in the Dialogue with Trypho, where, reasoning with a Jew on the O. T., he does not trust his memory, but consults the text. This question is disposed of in Norton's *Genuineness*, vol. i, and in Hug's *Einleitung*.

2. The genuineness of the first two chapters has been called in question, but on no sufficient grounds. See Meyer's note, *Comment.* i, 65, who adduces as arguments for their genuineness, that—(1.) they are found in all MSS. and ancient versions, and are quoted by the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries, Irenæus, Clem. Alex., etc., and are referred to by Celsus (Orig. *C. Cels.* i, 38; ii, 32). (2.) The facts they record are perfectly in keeping with a Gospel written for Jewish Christians. (3.) The opening of chap. iii, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμ. ἐκ., refers back, by its construction, to the close of chap. ii; and iv, 13 would be unintelligible without ii, 23. (4.) There is no difference between the diction and constructions and those in the other parts of the Gospel.

The opponents of these two chapters rest chiefly on their alleged absence from the Gospel of the Hebrews in use among the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxx, 13). But Epiphanius describes that book as "incomplete, adulterated, and mutilated;" and as the Ebionites regarded Jesus simply as the human Messiah co-ordinate with Adam and Moses, the absence of the two chapters may readily be accounted for on doctrinal grounds. The same explanation may be given for the alleged absence from the Diatessaron of Tatian of these chapters, and the corresponding parts of Luke containing the genealogy, and all the other passages which show that the Lord was born of the seed of David "according to the flesh" (Theodoret, *Hær.* fab. i, 20). The case must be a weak one which requires us to appeal to acknowledged heretics for the correction of our canon. The supposed discrepancy between the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, which has led even professor Norton to follow Strauss, Paulus, Schleiermacher, etc., in rejecting them, has been abundantly discussed in all recent commentaries, and by Wieseler (*Synopsis*), Neander (*Life of Christ*), Mill (*Pantheism*), Kern (*Ursprung d. Ev. Mat.*), etc., as well as in the various answers to Strauss. It is sufficient here to note the following points in reply: (1.) Such questions are by no means confined to these chapters, but are found in places of which the apostolic origin is admitted. (2.) The treatment of Luke's Gospel by Marcion suggests how the Jewish Christians dropped out of their version an account which they would not accept. (3.) Prof. Norton stands alone, among those who object to the two chapters, in assigning the genealogy to the same author as the rest of the chapters (Hilgenfeld, p. 46, 47). (4.) The difficulties in the harmony are all reconcilable, and the day has passed, it may be hoped, when a passage can be struck out, against all the MSS. and the testimony of early writers, for subjective impressions about its contents.

XI. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of Matthew's Gospel, a few of the most important of which we indicate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* iii, 440 sq., 830 sq.); also *Scholia* (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* xiv); Athanasius, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* i, pt. 2; also iii, 18); Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i, 669); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* v, 1); Faustus Rhegiensis, *Super ev. Matt.* (in Jerome, *Opp.* xi, 77, 204, 365); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* [*Spuria*], vi, 731–980; also ed. Field, Cantab. 1839, 3 vols. 8vo; in English, in *Lib. of Fathers*, Oxf. 1843–51, vols. xi, xv, xxxiv); Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta* (in Mai, *Script. vet.* viii, pt. ii, 142); Paschasius Ratbertus, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* i; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xiv); Chromatius Aquiliensis, *Tractatus* (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* viii, 333); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v, 1); Anselm, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* ed. Picard); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *Super Matthæum* (in *Opp.* ii, 1); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* iii); Druthmar, *Expositio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xv, 86); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* ix); Melancthon, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1523, 8vo; also in *Opp.* iii); Munster, *Annotationes* (Basil. 1537, fol.; also in *Critici Sacri*); Luther, *Adnotationes* [on ch. i–xviii] (Vitemb. 1538, 8vo; also in *Works*, both Lat. and Germ.); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Frcft. 1538; Basil. 1540, 1541, 1544, 1560, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1542, fol.); Titelmann, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1545, 8vo; 1576; Par. 1546; Lugd. 1547, 1556, 1568, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* [includ. Mark and Luke] (Basil. 1548, 1556, 1566, 1578, 1591, 1611, fol.); Bredembrach, *Commentaria* (Colon. 1550, fol.); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 1; in Germ. by Küster, Halle, 1783, 8vo); Chytræus, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1555, 1566, 8vo); Ferus, *Enarrationes* (Mogunt. 1559, fol.; Antw. and Lugd. 1559; Par. and Ven. 1560; Complut. 1562; Par. 1564; Antw. 1570; Rom. 1577; Lugd. 1604, 1610, 8vo); Hersel, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1568, 1572, 8vo); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Lat. by Tymme, Lond. 1570, fol.); Junius, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* ii, 1893); Brentz, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* v); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Tyndale, *Notes* [on i–xxi] (in *Expositions*, p. 227); Gualther, *Homiliæ* (Tigur. 1590–96, 2 vols. fol.); De Avendano, *Commentarius* (Madrid, 1592, 2 vols. fol.); Danæus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1593, 8vo); Kirsten, *Notæ* (Vratisl. 1611, fol.); Pelargus, *Illustrationes* (Frcft. 1612, 1617, 2 vols. 4to); Tostatus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*); Scultetus, *Exercitationes* (Amst. 1624, 4to); Novarinus, *Notæ* (Ven. 1629; Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomar, *Explicatio* (Groning. 1631, 8vo); Œcolampadius, *Enarrationes* (Basil. 1636, 8vo); Possinus and Corderius, *Symbolæ* (Tolos. 1646, 2 vols. fol.); Episcopius, *Notæ* [on i–xxiv] (in *Opp.* II, i, 1); Dickson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1651, 12mo); De Aponte, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1651, 2 vols. fol.); Bertram, *Enucleatio* (Arnst. 1651, 4to); Matthias, *Analysis* (Amst. 1652, fol.); Wandalin, *Paraphrasis* (Slesw. 1654, 4to); De Pise, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1656, fol.); Pareus, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ii); Cocceius, *Notæ* (in *Opp.* xii, 3); Lightfoot, *Exercitations* (in *Works*, xi); Blackwood, *Exposition* [on i–x] (Lond. 1659, 4to); A. Lapide, *In Matth.* (Antw. 1660, fol.); Leighton, *Lectures* [on i–ix] (in *Works*, iii, 1); Winstrup, *Pandectæ* (Lund. Scan. 1660, 1674; Hafn. 1699, 2 vols. fol.); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1663, 1696, 4to); Spanheim, *Vindiciæ* (i, ii, Heidelb. 1663; iii, L. B. 1685, 4to); Meisner, *Exercitationes* (Vitemb. 1664, 4to); Hartsoecker, *Aantekeningen* (Amst. 1668, 4to); Saubert, *Variæ Lectiones*, etc. (Helmst. 1672, 4to); De Veil, *Explicatio* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1678, 8vo); Van Til, *Notes* (in Dutch, Amst. 1683; Dort, 1687, 1695; in German, Cassel, 1700; Frcft. 1705, 4to); Huysing, *Exposition* (in Dutch, Hague, 1684, 4to; in German, Cassel, 1710, fol.); Crell, *Commentarius* [on i–v] (in *Opp.* i, 1); Przipcovius, *Cogitationes* (Eleuth. 1692, fol.); Wegner, *Adnotata* (Regiom. 1699, 1705, 4to); Hideyger, *Labores* [includ. some other books] (Tigur. 1700, 4to); Olearius, *Observationes* (Lips. 1713, 1743, 4to); Pfaff, *Notæ* (Tübing. 1721, 4to); Klemm, *Exercitia* [on i–v] (Tüb. 1725, 4to); Vrimoet, *Observationes* [on i–v] (Fr. ad R. 1728, 8vo); D. Scott, *Notes* (Lond. 1741, 4to); Elsner, *Commentarius* (Zwoll. 1767–9, 2 vols. 4to); Wakefield, *Notes* (Lond. 1782, 4to); Adam, *Exposition* (in *Works*, i); Göz, *Erklärung* (Stuttg. 1785, 8vo); Wizenman, *Jesus nach Matth.* (Basle, 1789, 1864, 8vo); Beausobre, *Commentary* (from the French, Cambr. 1790, 8vo, and often since); Heddäus, *Anmerkungen* (Stuttg. 1792, 2 vols. 8vo); Griesbach, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1798, 8vo); Porteus, *Lectures* (Lond. 1802, and since, 2 vols. 8vo); Schulthess, *Homilien* (Winterth. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Menken, *Betrachtungen* (i, Frckft. 1809; ii, Bann. 1822, 8vo); Lodge, *Lectures* (Lond. 1818, 8vo); Meyer, *Beiträge* (Wien, 1818, 8vo); Gratz, *Commentar* (Tüb. 1821–23, 2 vols. 8vo); Binterim, *Bemerkungen* (i, Mainz, 1823, 8vo); *Fritzsche, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Harte, *Lectures* (Lond. 1831–34, 2 vols. 12mo); Cramer, *Jesus nach Matthäus* (Lpz. 1832, 8vo); Penrose, *Lectures* (Lond. 1832,

12mo); *Watson, *Exposition* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1833 and since; N. Y. 1846 and since, 8vo); Scholten, *Ondersocking* (Leyden, 1836, 8vo); Cotter, *Paraphrase* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1840, 12mo); Cheke, *Notes* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Perceval, *Lectures* (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 12mo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Boothroyd, *Notes* (Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Overton, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); Arnoldi, *Commentar* (Trier, 1856, 8vo); Goodwin, *Commentary* (Cambr. 1857, 8vo); *Morison, *Notes* (Bost. 1858, 1861; Edinb. 1870, 8vo); Shadwell, *Translation* (Lond. 1859, 12mo); *Conant, *Notes*, etc. (Amer. Bible Union, N. Y. 1860, 4to); Conder, *Commentary* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Lutteroth, *Essai* [on i–xiii] (Par. 1860–67, 3 pts. 8vo); *Alexander, *Explanation* [on i–xvi] (N. Y. 1861, 12mo); *Luthardt, *De Compositione Matt.* (Lips. 1861, 8vo); Réville, *Études* (Par. 1862, 8vo); Gratry, *Commentaire* (Par. 1863, 8vo); *Nast, *Commentary* [includ. Mark] (Cincinnati, 1864, 8vo); Thomas, *Observations* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Klofuter, *Commentarius* (Vien. 1866, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, *Untersuchung* (in his *Zeitschr.* 1866, 1867); Kelly, *Lectures* (Lond. 1870, 8vo); Adamson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1871, 8vo). See GOSPELS.

Matthew OF BASSI. See CAPUCHINS.

Matthew OF BLATARES. See BLATARES.

Matthew OF CRACOW (more accurately of Krokow, in Pomerania), a noted German prelate of the Church of Rome, and worthy to be counted foremost among the forerunners of the great Reformation, was a native of Pomerania, and flourished near the opening of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history, except that he was made by the emperor Rupert a professor in the young University of Heidelberg; afterwards became chancellor to Rupert, and through the latter's influence became bishop of Worms in 1405, and that he attended the Council of Pisa in 1409, and died in 1410. But of his labors we know enough to award him great praise as an ardent and faithful worker for reform among the clergy of his Church. Indeed, the corrupt condition of the Romish Church, and especially of the ecclesiastical body, seems to have early engaged his serious attention. In 1384 he delivered a discourse on the improvement of morals, both in priests and people, before an archiepiscopal synod in Prague; and, as he began then, so he continued through life to battle for reform and the eradication of corruption, and the abandonment of simony and other vile practices. Both with his tongue and by his pen he sought to advance the interests of the noble cause he had espoused, and, as his position secured him great influence, his labors were certainly not in vain. For his day and generation he was no doubt another cardinal Julian (q. v.). He desired reform rather than a revolution, and therefore failed to accomplish his mission.

Matthew left behind him a number of MSS., some of which were afterwards printed. Among the most noted of his works is a treatise on the pollutions of the Romish court, which appears to have been written a little previous to the year 1409, about the period when the schism in the papacy seemed to open a door for conscientious minds to cherish doubts, at least privately, yet sufficiently to afford a leaven for the future, respecting the boasted infallibility of the popes, and the degree of implicit faith and obedience due to their appointments and decisions. It may be that the weakness occasioned by this papal schism furnished a reason why the author of so bold an attack on the prevailing corruptions did not encounter the hostility and persecution of the ecclesiastical powers. His favor with the emperor was an additional source of impunity, and probably also his early death after the publication of the work. We have no information of the effect immediately produced by the treatise, but it shows that the harvest of the 16th century was even then in its germ, and it seems like some of the seed towards the harvest, sown for a hundred years, to produce fruit in the times of Luther and Melancthon. See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, vol. i; Hodgson, *Reformers and Martyrs* (Phila. 1867, 12mo), p. 118 sq. (J. H. W.)

Matthew (*Matthæus*) OF PARIS, an English monastic, of great celebrity as a chronicler of England's early history, was born about the end of the 12th century. He took the religious habit in the Benedictine monastery of St. Albans in 1217. Almost the only incident of his life that has been recorded is a journey he made to Norway, by command of the pope, to introduce some reforms into the monastic establishments of that country, which mission he has the credit of having executed with great ability and success. He is said to have stood high in the favor of Henry III, and to have obtained various privileges for the University of Oxford through his influence with that king. His acquirements embraced all the learning and science of his age; besides theology and history; oratory, poetry, painting, architecture, and a practical knowledge of mechanics, are reckoned among his accomplishments by his biographers or panegyrists. His memory is preserved mainly by his history of England, entitled *Historia Major*, really a continuation of a work begun at St. Albans by Roger of Wendover (who died in May, 1236), and which was subsequently entitled *Chronica Major*, or *Chronica Majora Sancti Albani*. Roger's name, however, was obscured by that of our subject, Matthew of Paris, who, though he adopted the plan of Roger's work, really furnished a most valuable chronicle, especially of mediæval history. In the British Museum, and in the libraries of Corpus Christi and Benedict colleges, Cambridge, there are manuscripts of an epitome, by Matthew of Paris himself, of his history, generally referred to by the names of the *Historia Minor*, or the *Chronica*, which, bishop Nicholson says, contains "several particulars of note omitted in the larger history." This smaller work was for a long time ascribed to a *Matthew of Westminster* (q. v.). Of late, however, the question of authorship has been fairly settled by Sir Frederick Madden, who edited and published these chronicles. He pronounced the Westminster Matthew "a phantom who never existed," and observes that even the late Mr. Buckle was so deceived by the general tone of confidence manifested in quoting this writer that he characterizes him as, after Froissart, the most celebrated historian of the 14th century. "The mystery of the 'phantom historian,'" says a writer in the *Westminster Review* (Oct., 1866, p. 238), "has been happily unveiled by Sir Frederick Madden, whose correct anticipation is unexpectedly confirmed by his discovery of the original copy of the work, now in the Chetham Library at Manchester. This manuscript establishes beyond all doubt that the largest portion of the *Flores Historiarum*, attributed to the pseudo Matthew of Westminster, was written at St. Albans, under the eye and by direction of Matthew of Paris, as an abridgment of his greater chronicle; and the text from the close of the year 1241 to about two thirds of 1249 is in his own handwriting. This manuscript, continued after his death by another hand on the same plan, down to the issue of the battle of Evesham in 1265, ceased after that date to be written at St. Albans, and passed eventually into the library of the Monastery of St. Peter, at Westminster. The author of the first continuation, after the manuscript had left St. Albans, was, Sir F. Madden thinks, John Bevere, otherwise named John of London. It was brought down by Bevere to the year 1306. A special class of manuscripts, including the Eton MS. of Matthew of Westminster, implicitly follows Bevere's chronicle; but in the original copy of the *Flores Historiarum*, after it came to Westminster, Bevere's text is generally abridged, although under some years there are additions. The entire work is carried on to the year 1305. 'It was,' says Sir Frederick, 'no doubt from the fact that the latter portion of the *Flores Historiarum* was composed by a Westminster monk, that the entire work

was afterwards attributed to a Matthew of Westminster, for the name of *Matthew* really belonged to Matthew *of Paris*, whilst the affix of Westminster was supplied by conjecture; and this pseudonyme having been recognised by Bale and Joscelin, and adopted by archbishop Parker, the error has been perpetuated to our own time.'" Besides this edition by Madden, entitled *Matthæi Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum, sive ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor, item, ejusdem abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliæ* (published by the authority of the lords commissioners of her majesty's treasury, London, Longmans, 1866 sq.), we have one by archbishop Parker (London, 1571, folio; reprinted at Liguri, Zürich, 1606; London, 1640 [or in some copies 1641], fol., by Dr. William Watts; Par. 1644, fol.; Lond. 1684, fol.). Watts's edition, which is sometimes divided into two volumes, contains, besides various readings and copious indexes, two other works of the author never before printed, namely, his *Duorum Offarum Merciorum Regum* (S. Albani Fundatorum) *Vitæ*, and his *Viginti Trium Abbatum S. Albani Vitæ*, together with what he calls his *Additamenta* to those treatises. "Matthew of Paris writes with considerable spirit and rhetorical display, and uses remarkable freedom of speech; and his work, which is continued to the death of Henry III (1272) by William Rishanger, another monk of the same abbey, has been the chief authority commonly relied upon for the history of that reign. Its spirit, however, is somewhat fiercely and narrowly English; and from the freedom with which he inveighs against what he regards as the usurpations of the papal see, Romanist writers have always expressed strong dissatisfaction especially with his accounts of ecclesiastical affairs. With Protestant critics, on the other hand, Matthew of Paris has been a favorite in proportion to the dislike he has incurred from their opponents. At one time it used to be affirmed by the Roman Catholics that the printed Matthew of Paris was in many things a mere modern fabrication of the Reformers; but Watts, by collating all the manuscript copies he could find, and noting the various readings, proved that there was no foundation for this charge" (*Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.). A translation of the *History* of Matthew of Paris, by Dr. Giles, forms a volume of Bohn's "Antiquarian Library," and the *Flowers of History* of Roger of Wendover forms two volumes of the same series. See Oudin, *Scriptores Eccles.* iii, 204 sq.; also Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 176; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 932; *North British Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 119. See ROGER OF WENDOVER.

Matthew OF WESTMINSTER, an early English chronicler, flourished in the reign of Edward II. Nothing whatever is known of his personal history except that he was a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. He is supposed to have died about 1307 or 1377. His chronicle, written in Latin, is entitled *Flores Historiarum, per Matthæum Westmonasteriensem collecti, præcipue de Rebus Brittannicis, ab Exordio Mundi, usque ad annum* 1307 (Lond. 1567; with additions, Frkf. 1601). Bohn has published an English version (Lond. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo). Another work formerly ascribed to him is now definitely settled to be the production of MATTHEW OF PARIS (q. v.).

Matthew OF YORK (TOBIAS), a noted English prelate, was born in Bristol in 1546. In childhood he manifested unusual talent, and was prepared for Oxford when only thirteen years of age. He took the bachelor's degree in 1563, and three years after the master's, and immediately entered into "holy orders"—a young man much respected for his great learning, eloquence, sweet conversation, friendly disposition, and the sharpness of his wit. In 1566 he was made university orator; in 1570, canon of Christ Church and deacon of Bath; in 1572, prebendary of Sarum and president of St. John's College, Oxford, and one of the queen's chaplains in ordinary. In 1583 he was installed dean of Durham, in 1595 he was created bishop of Durham, and in 1606 archbishop of York. He died at Cawood Castle March 29, 1628. The learning and piety of archbishop Matthew have been warmly eulogized by Camden. It is to be much lamented that his sermons, which are said to have been superior productions, were not preserved to us in print. The only publication of his is entitled *Concia Apologetica contra Capianum* (Oxf. 1581 and 1638, 8vo). In the cathedral church at York there is a MS. from his pen containing *Notes upon all the Ancient Fathers*. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses;* Middleton, *Ev. Biogr.* ii, 478 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Matthews, Alford A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mercer County, Pa., July 11, 1838; went to Wethersfield, Ill., in 1855, and was there converted and joined the Missionary Baptist Church. In the winter of 1862–63 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, after advising with his pastor and members of his own Church. Soon after he received license to preach. In the spring of 1864, the health of the pastor of the Buda Circuit failing, the circuit was vacated, and Matthews was appointed his successor. At the close of the year he was admitted on trial into the Illinois Conference, and returned to the Buda charge. From the Conference of 1866 to that of 1868 he was in charge of the Tiskilwa Station. At the Conference of 1868 he was appointed to Chillicothe, and there he labored most acceptably to the people and most successfully for the cause to which he gave his life. He died quite suddenly at this place, Aug. 1, 1869. "From his boyhood days he was a diligent student; from his espousal of the cause of Christ, a devoted Christian; and from the time he received license to preach, a very zealous and successful minister of the Gospel. While at Buda, his first charge, he sought and found the blessing of perfect love, and lived in the enjoyment of the blessing until the day of his death." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1869, p. 241.

Matthews, Henry, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md. Blessed with pious and good parents, he was early led to Christ, and connected himself with Asbury Church, in Howard County. In 1849 he moved to Baltimore, and joined the Sharp Street Church. In 1852 he was licensed to preach, and in 1857 was ordained a local deacon. In 1864 he joined the Washington Conference, just then organizing, and was appointed to Gunpowder Circuit, where he labored with great zeal for three years; was then appointed to West River Circuit, and in 1870 was stationed at Monocacy; but his health suddenly failed, and he was compelled to relinquish his arduous labors. He died Dec. 31, 1870. "Brother Matthews was a faithful, plodding, deeply conscientious minister. Wherever he went his solidity of character was acknowledged; and the firm faith which he himself reposed in the doctrines he preached, and his prayerful reliance on God, stamped on his efforts unvaried success." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1871, p. 28.

Matthews, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., Feb. 7, 1778. He enjoyed the advantages of a good parental training, graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1807, and studied theology under Rev. Dr. John McMillan. He was licensed in 1809, and in 1810 ordained pastor of Gravel Run and Waterford churches; in 1817 he became an itinerating missionary, and took charge of the Church at Louisiana, Pike Co., Mo., where he continued itinerating, especially among the destitute of that vicinity, until 1825, when he settled at Apple Creek Church, in Cape Girardeau Co., Mo.; in 1827 he took charge of the Church at Kaskaskia, Ill., thence went to Missouri, where he labored till his health failed, and then removed to Georgetown, Ill., where he died, May 12, 1861. Mr. Matthews was characterized by a cheerful and warm-hearted disposition. As a pastor he was faithful and zealous; as a friend, kind and affectionate. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 102.

Matthews, William, a Quaker preacher, was born in Stafford Co., Va., in 1732. His parents died when he was quite young. He entered the ministry at twenty-three years of age, and gave convincing evidence of a heavenly call. Matthews was a man of sound judgment and great Christian piety. He spent several years in ministerial work in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The exact date of his death is not known. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 398.

Matthew's (Sr.) Day, a festal day observed in the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches on Sept. 21, and in the Greek churches on Nov. 16, is mentioned in St. Jerome's *Comes*, and was first generally observed in the 11th century.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.

Matthiä, Johann, a noted Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogothia in 1592, and after enjoying the best educational advantages of his country, entered the ministry. After filling several important positions, he became court preacher and almoner to Gustavus Adolphus. He was next appointed preceptor to Christina, the daughter of that monarch, and was created bishop of Strengnäs in 1643. He died in 1670. Matthiä wrote several moral and theological works, the most important of which are, *Opuscula Theologica* (Strengnäs, 1661, 8vo):—*Sacræ Disquisitiones ad refutandos Epicureos, atheos et fanaticos* (Stockholm, 1669, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Matthi'as (Ματθίας, a contraction of *Matithiah* or *Matthew*, a form frequently met with in Josephus [see below]), one of the constant attendants from the first upon our Lord's ministry, who was chosen by lot, in preference to Joseph Barsabas, into the number of the apostles, to supply the vacancy caused by the treachery and suicide of Judas (Acts i, 23–26). A.D. 29. We may accept as probable the opinion which is shared by Eusebius (*H. E.* lib. i, 12) and Epiphanius (i, 20) that he was one of the seventy disciples. He is said to have preached the Gospel in Æthiopia (Niceph. ii, 40; according to Sophronius, "in altera Æthiopia," i. e. Colchis; comp. Cellar. *Notit.* ii, 309), or Cappadocia according to Cave, and to have at last suffered martyrdom (comp. *Menalog. Græc.* iii, 198). According to another tradition, he preached in Judæa, and was stoned to death by the Jews (see Prionii *Vitæ Apostol.* p. 178; *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. 24; comp. Augusti, *Denkwürdigk.* iii, 241). There was early an apocryphal gospel bearing his name (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 25, 3; Clemens Alex. *Strom.* ii, 163; vii, 318; Grabii *Spicileg. patr.* ii, 1, p. 117; Fabric. *Cod. apocr. N. T.* i, 782 sq.).

"Different opinions have prevailed as to the manner of the election of Matthias. The most natural construction of the words of Scripture seems to be this: After the address of Peter, the whole assembled body of the brethren, amounting in number to about 120 (Acts i, 15), proceeded to nominate two, namely, Joseph, surnamed Barsabas, and Matthias, who answered the requirements of an apostle: the subsequent selection between the two was referred in prayer to him who, knowing the hearts of men, knew which of them was the fitter to be his witness and apostle. The brethren then, under the heavenly guidance which they had invoked, proceeded to give forth their lots, probably by each writing the name of one of the candidates on a tablet, and casting it into the urn. The urn was then shaken, and the name that first came out decided the election. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. Luc.* i, 9) describes another way of casting lots which was used in assigning to the priests their several parts in the service of the Temple. The apostles, it will be remembered, had not yet received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and this solemn mode of casting the lots, in accordance with a practice enjoined in the Levitical law (Lev. xvi, 8), is to be regarded as a way of referring the decision to God (comp. Prov. xvi, 33). Chrysostom remarks that it was never repeated after the descent of the Holy Spirit. The election of Matthias is discussed by bishop Beveridge (*Works*, vol. i, serm. 2)." It would seem, however, that Paul was the divine appointee to fill the vacancy in the college of the apostles. Monographs in Latin on his election have been written by Scharff (Viteb. 1652), Bittelmaier (ib. 1676), and Hammerschmid (Prag. 1760).

MATTHI'AS is likewise the name of one person mentioned in the Apocrypha (Ματταθίας) and of several in Josephus (Ματθίας), especially as Jewish high-priests.

1. Given (1 Esdr. ix, 33) in place of the Heb. Mattathiah (Ezra x, 33).

2. A son of Ananus, made high-priest by Agrippa (soon after the appointment of Petronius as president of Syria), in place of Simon Cantheras, after that honor had been declined by Jonathan as a second term (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 6, 4).

3. Son of Theophilus of Jerusalem, made high-priest by Herod in place of Simon, son of Boethius (*Ant.* xvii, 4, 2); removed again by Herod to make room for Joaza (*ib.* 6, 4, where Josephus relates his temporary disqualification on the day of annual atonement), and again reinstated by Agrippa in place of Jesus, son of Gamaliel (*ib.* xx, 9, 7).

Josephus likewise mentions Matthias, son of Boethius, as "one of the high-priests" betrayed by Simon during the last siege of Jerusalem (*War*, v, 3, 1), but it does not appear whether he was one of the above. See High-priest.

Matthias, a religious impostor whose real name was *Robert Matthews*, was born in Washington County, N. Y., about 1790. He kept a country-store, but failed in 1816, and went to New York City. In 1827 he removed to Albany, where he became much excited by the preaching of Messrs. Kirk and Finney; made himself active in the temperance cause; claimed to have received a revelation, and began street-preaching; failing to convert Albany, he prophesied its destruction, and fled secretly to New York City, where he was tried and acquitted on the charge of poisoning a wealthy disciple in whose family he had lived. His impositions exposed, he soon disappeared from public view. See *Matthias and his Impostures*, by W. L. Stone (New York, 1835); Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary, second son of John Hunyady (q. v.), was born in 1443, and came to the throne in 1458. His accession was hailed with the utmost enthusiasm over the whole country. But the Hungarian crown at this time was no chaplet of roses; two sovereigns, alike formidable, the one, Mohammed II, from his military talents and immense resources, the other, Frederick III, from his intriguing policy, were busily conspiring against the boy-king. To meet these dangers Matthias rapidly carried out his measures of defence, and, scarcely prepared, fell on the Turks, who had ravaged the country as far as Temesvar, inflicted upon them a bloody defeat, pursued them as far as Bosnia, took the stronghold Jaieza, there liberated 10,000 Christian prisoners, and then returned to Weisenberg, to be crowned with the sacred crown of St. Stephen, in 1464. He next suppressed the disorders of Wallachia and Moldavia; but feeling that his plans were counteracted by the intrigues of the emperor Frederick III to gain possession of Hungary, Matthias besought the assistance of pope Pius II, but to no purpose. After a second successful campaign against the Turks, he turned his attention to the encouragement of arts and letters, and adorned his capital with the works of renowned sculptors, in addition to a library of 50,000 volumes. He sent a large staff of literary men to Italy for the purpose of obtaining copies of valuable MSS. (even now the *Collectio Corvina* is celebrated), and adorned his court by the presence of the most eminent men of Italy and Germany. He was himself an author of no mean ability, and possessed a delicate appreciation of the fine arts. At the same time the affairs of government were not neglected. The finances were brought into a flour-

ishing condition, industry and commerce were promoted by wise legislation, and justice was strictly administered to peasant and noble alike. But the promptings of his ambition, and the pressure exercised by the Romish party, cast an indelible blot on Matthias's otherwise spotless escutcheon; he wantonly attacked Podiebrad, his father-in-law, the Hussite king of Bohemia, to wrest from Podiebrad the sceptre which he was holding by the declared will of the people. In this action Matthias was influenced especially by pope Pius II and his successor, Paul II. See HUSSITES, vol. iv, especially p. 424, col. 2. After a bloody contest of seven years' duration between these kings, the greatest generals of the age, the Hungarian power prevailed, and Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia were wrested from Bohemia. A third war with the Turks closed as successfully as the former two. The emperor also was humiliated by Matthias, and expiated his guilt in poverty and disgrace. Matthias was suddenly cut down in the midst of his successes at Vienna, April 5, 1490. See Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 165; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, 370 sq. See LADISLAUS OF POLAND; PIUS II.

Matthias OF KUNWALDE, one of the first ministers of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (q. v.), flourished in the 16th century. He was appointed at the Synod of Lhota, in Bohemia, in 1467. On that occasion nine men, of high repute for piety, were elected by ballot. Then twelve lots were prepared, nine being blank, and three inscribed with the Bohemian word *Jest* (He is). Thereupon a fervent prayer was offered up beseeching God to designate of these nine nominees, either one, or two, or three, as the ministers of the Church; but, if this should not be the time which he had ordained for such a consummation, to cause all the nine to receive blanks. In this event the Brethren would have deferred further action to some future period. Nine lots having been drawn singly from a vase and given to the nominees, it appeared that Matthias of Kunwalde, Thomas of Prelouc, and Elias of Chrenovic, had each received one marked *Jest*. The synod rose to its feet, sang a thanksgiving hymn, composed for the occasion, and accepted these three men as the future ministers of the Church. In the same year, after the episcopacy had been secured, Matthias, although only twenty-five years of age, was consecrated a bishop, and, upon the resignation of bishop Michael, became president of the Church Council. He administered its affairs, according to the extreme views of discipline entertained by Gregory (q. v.), until 1494, when he resigned his presidency and united with the liberal party. In 1500, while on his way to a synod in Moravia, he died at Leipnik, after having, in his last will and testament, which he addressed to the Brethren, exhorted them to avoid schisms, and to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. He was buried at Prerau. (E. de S.)

Matthias I, emperor of Germany, son of Maximilian II and Mary, daughter of Charles V, deserves a place here because of his relation to one of the most eventful periods in the earliest stages of modern history. He was born in 1557. In 1578 he was invited by the Romanists of the Netherlands to assume the government of that country, but he held the position only a short time. He was appointed stadtholder of Austria in 1595, and in 1611 was invited by the Bohemians to become their ruler. On the death of his brother Rudolf, emperor of Germany, in 1612, he succeeded to the throne, and was called upon to sit in judgment between Protestant and Romanist in the ensuing contest between these two factions of his empire. He pursued a vacillating policy, and, while striving to direct, made himself distrusted by both. He concluded a disadvantageous treaty with the Turks, then in possession of Hungary (1615), and soon after caused his cousin Ferdinand to be proclaimed king of Bohemia and Hungary. In the midst of the dissensions which preceded the Thirty Years' War he died, in 1619. See Khevenhuller, *Annales Ferdinandei;* P. Santoric, *Vite di Ridolfo e Mattia Imperatori* (1664); Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, i, 240 sq.; Coxe, *House of Austria*, ii, 95 sq.; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, p. 311 sq. See also THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

Matthias, John B., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Germantown, Pa., Jan. 1, 1767; was converted while residing in New York, after his majority; was there licensed to preach in 1793; preached much and with excellent success as a local deacon until 1811, when he joined the itinerancy. Thereafter he labored very usefully until 1841, when loss of sight obliged him to superannuate. He died in great blessedness at Hempstead, L. I., May 27, 1848. He was educated a German Lutheran, and was by trade a ship-carpenter, but when he felt called to preach he prepared to the best of his ability, and for many years delivered regularly no less than three sermons a week, and many souls were converted under these labors. He was one of the most humble, pious, and loving of Christians, and the fruit of his unostentatious labors was abundant and blessed.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 224. (G. L. T.)

Matthias, John J., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New York Jan. 17, 1796. His childhood and early youth were spent with his parents in Tarrytown. At a suitable age he went to Brooklyn to learn the art of printing, but, brought to a knowledge of converting grace, and persuaded in his own mind that he was called of God to preach the Gospel of Christ, he determined to prepare for the work. He entered the ministry when twenty-one years old, in the New York Conference at Goshen Circuit. In 1818 he was appointed to Pittsfield Circuit; in 1819 to Stow; in 1820 to Leyden; in 1821 and 1822 to Cortlandt; in 1823 to Middlebury, Vt.; in 1824 to St. Albans; in 1825 to Pittsfield; in 1826 to Cortlandt. He was stationed in the city of New York in 1827 and 1828, and in the city of Albany in 1829 and 1830; was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference in 1831, and stationed in the city of Newark, N. J. In 1833, 1834, and 1835 he travelled the East Jersey District; in 1836 he was stationed at the Nazareth Church, in the city of Philadelphia. His health failing, he took a superannuated relation, and continued to hold it until 1841. While sustaining this relation to his Conference, the Pennsylvania and New York Colonization Societies appointed him governor of Bassa Cove, on the West Coast of Africa. He was in Africa about a year, but, subjected to severe suffering by the African fever, he returned to the States. In 1842 he was retransferred to the New York Conference, and stationed at Flushing, L. I.; in 1843 at Rockaway; in 1844 to 1847 was presiding elder of the Long Island District; in 1848 and 1849 was stationed in Williamsburgh; in 1850 and 1851 in the Twenty-seventh Street Church, New York; in 1852 was supernumerary at Hempstead, L. I.; but was given an effective relation in 1853, and stationed at Jamaica. In 1854 he was obliged again to superannuate, but his relation was changed to effective at the ensuing Conference, and in 1851 to 1857 served as chaplain to the Seamen's Friend Retreat on Staten Island. "He was held in high esteem by the managers and officers of that institution. At the bedside of the sick and in his chapel services he was felt to be well adapted to the duties of his office." The tax upon his sympathies and the labors of the position were more than his enfeebled health could sustain, and in 1858 he resigned the chaplaincy, and received a superannuated relation. He retired to a quiet and comfortable residence in Tarrytown, where he resided until the day of his decease, Sept. 25, 1861. "Few ministers have a longer or more worthy record than this. Some of these fields of labor were very arduous, others of them very responsible. In all of them he was faithful and useful. He was a high-minded, intelligent, and honorable man. His tastes were refined, his feelings delicate, his conversation chaste, and his manners dignified but affable. His

Christian reputation is without blemish. He possessed the disciplinary attributes of a minister—"gifts, grace, and usefulness." His preaching was practical and experimental. He sought assiduously and successfully to lead the members of his Church to a higher spiritual state, and a holy, active, religious life. As a pastor he had few superiors. Gentle, affectionate, and sympathetic in his manners, his pastoral visits were highly prized by the people of his care. He fostered the Sabbath-school, and fed the lambs of the flock, a good minister of Jesus Christ" (bishop Janes, in the *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, Jan. 9, 1862). See also Smith, *Memorials of the N. Y. and N. Y. East Conferences*, p. 11.

Matthias's (St.) **Day**, a festival observed on the 24th of February in the Church of Rome, with a provision that in leap-year it should be observed on the 25th. In the Church of England it is usually observed on the 24th of February, even in leap-years. In the Greek Church St. Matthias's day is held on the 9th of August. The date of the introduction of this festival is involved in obscurity. Some suppose it was first established in the 11th century, others in the 8th. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* ii, 76.

Matthieists. See Munster, Anabaptists in.

Matthieson. See Anabaptists.

Mattison, Hiram, D.D., a prominent divine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Norway, Herkimer County, N.Y., Feb. 8, 1811. Three years afterwards his parents, who were natives of New England, removed to Oswego County, and settled near the present city of Oswego. His mother, besides rearing her own twelve children, became the foster-mother of ten others who had not homes for themselves. The first years of his early manhood were devoted to teaching, but his conversion at the age of twenty-three turned his thoughts towards the ministry, which soon after became his life-work. He entered the Black River Conference in 1836, and filled successively several of the most important appointments in that body. In 1842 and 1843 he was stationed at Watertown; in 1844 and 1845 at Rome; in 1846 he became superannuated; the next year supernumerary; the next two years he was superannuated; in 1850 he was made secretary of the Conference, and his relation changed to effective. During this and the following year he served, by appointment of the bishop, as professor in Falley Seminary. In 1852 he was elected secretary of Conference for the third time, and his relation was changed to superannuated. This same year, on account of ill-health and a tendency to pulmonary difficulties, he removed to New York City for the benefit of the sea air, and was pastor of John Street Church (left vacant by the death of Rev. W. K. Stopford), and afterwards of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church in Thirty-fourth Street, which he organized, and under his administration the present church edifice was erected. His preaching was both popular and effective, being distinguished by great clearness of statement, force of argument, aptness of illustration, and earnestness of appeal. His sermon at the camp-meeting held near Morristown, N. J., in 1866, may be very justly pronounced one of the most eloquent and powerful discourses of modern times. Dr. Mattison labored with great zeal to secure action by the General Conference (of which he was a member in 1848, 1852, and 1856) against all slaveholding in the Church, but at length, despairing of success, he formally withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, Nov. 1, 1861. He became the pastor of an Independent Methodist Church, for which a house of worship was built under his supervision in Forty-first Street. This church he continued to serve till 1865, when he returned to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was appointed to the Trinity Methodist Church in Jersey City, having been admitted a member of the Newark (N. J.) Conference, in the fellowship of which he continued till death. The last year of his life was devoted to the service of the American and Foreign Christian Union as its secretary. The fertility of his pen was amazing. Believing strongly in the power of the press for good or evil, he made free and constant use of it to aid the one and oppose the other. His publications embraced a range from the little Sunday-school card to the stately volume, all intended to aid the public movement in favor of temperance, and in opposition to slavery and Romanism. There was too much in the life and character of Dr. Mattison to admit of a summing up in the space allotted to this brief sketch. We need only say that to know him, especially to know him well, was to admire, esteem, and love him as a man, a friend, a scholar, a minister, a hero, a Christian. Bishop Thomson, in his introduction to the writer's memoir of Dr. Mattison's life (see below), thus delineates him: "Before the world he stood as the able preacher, the gifted writer, the stern controversialist, the unsparing antagonist; but he was not without the gentler and more attractive elements of character. He was an amiable, communicative, entertaining companion, a generous friend, and loving husband and father.

'From his rough heart a babe could press
Soft milk of human tenderness.'

On all the storms of his life were rainbows, but only his intimate friends were in position to see them." His first book was *A Scriptural Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, a small volume issued in 1843, and to which *multum in parvo* was peculiarly applicable. In the same year he began his publication of *Tracts for the Times*, which at length grew into a small but piquant monthly, called at first *The Conservative*, and afterwards the *Primitive Christian*. In 1846 he published a work on *Astronomy*, with large astronomical maps—a work of rare merit and popularity. Soon after he issued his *Elementary Astronomy*, and in 1850 edited a new and improved edition of *Burrett's Geography of the Heavens*, for which he is spoken of as "one of the most competent astronomers in the country." In 1853 he published his *High-School Astronomy*, and the same year was associated with Prof. J. B. Woodbury in bringing out a music-book, *The Lute of Zion*, which, becoming widely popular, led in a short time to an enlarged edition under the title of *New Lute of Zion*. The next year his work on *Spirit Rappings* was issued, and had a large circulation. In 1856 his celebrated controversy with Dr. J. H. Perry, on the *Wesleyan Doctrine of Christian Perfection*, was published in successive pamphlets. Three years later he issued another tune-book, *Sacred Melodies*, "designed for use on all occasions of public worship:" and the same year also sent forth his *Impending Crisis*, a stout pamphlet of pungent facts and impassioned appeals on the slavery question. In 1864 his *Minister's Pocket Manual* was published, and within the next two years followed with the two most elaborate theological works of his life, *Immortality of the Soul*, and *Resurrection of the Body*, books of superior and permanent value. During 1866 he published *Select Lessons from the Holy Scriptures*, and his *Defence of American Methodism*, and in the next year a timely treatise on *Popular Amusements*. The year 1868, the last of his life, was perhaps the busiest, and the most prolific of results in the line of authorship. Besides editing and bringing through the press the work on *Perfect Love*, he wrote and published *Mary Ann Smith*, and a surprising number of other works on Romanism, from the tract of a few pages to the heavy pamphlet. He left an unfinished treatise on *Depravity in its Relation to Entire Sanctification*, and the outlines of several other theological works. His contributions to the periodical press were abundant and able. He was the author of several poems of decided merit, and among his issues from the press were various Church and Sunday-school requisites. He composed with remarkable ease and rapidity, and seldom rewrote a sentence or even a word. His busy life suddenly closed at his residence, Jersey City, N. J., in a signally triumphant death, Nov. 24, 1868. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1869, p. 55 sq.; also *Work Here, Rest Hereafter, or the Life*

and Character of Rev. Hiram Mattison, D.D., by Rev. N. Vansant, with an *Introduction* by bishop Thomson (New York, 1870, 8vo). (N. V.)

Mattison, Seth, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Shaftesbury, Vt., Feb. 22, 1788; joined the Methodist Church in 1805; entered the Genesee Conference in 1810; and died Oct. 18, 1845, having preached with eminent usefulness and great holiness the Gospel of Christ for thirty-four years.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 643.

Mattison, Spencer, A.M., a Methodist Episcopal minister and educator, was born at Plainfield, N. Y., Aug. 2, 1808; was converted in 1825; graduated, with first honors, at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1835; joined Troy Conference the same year, but on his second charge his health failed, and he went to Georgia. On recovery he spent five years there as principal of Vineville Academy, and then rejoined the Troy Conference in 1842. In 1846 he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in M'Kendree College, Illinois, where he spent six years, and then resigned and re-entered the regular work of the ministry, but at the close of a year he accepted the principalship of Rock River Seminary, Mount Morris, Ill. His health again failed, and he died Nov. 5, 1853. Professor Mattison was an excellent linguist and instructor, and greatly beloved by his pupils. He was a minister of fine talents and uniform piety, and a most accomplished Christian gentleman.—*Minutes of Conferences*, v, 455. (G. L. T.)

Mattithi'ah (Heb. *Mattithyah'*, מַתִּתְיָה, *gift of Jehovah*, compare Θεόδοτος, *Theodore*; also in the prolonged form *Mattithya'hu*, מַתִּתְיָהוּ, 1 Chron. xv, 18, 21; xxv, 3, 21; Sept. Ματταθίας, but in Ezra x, 43 Μαθθαθίας v. r. Ματθανίας; so also Ματταθίας, 1 Macc. ii, 1; Luke iii, 25, 26) the name of three or four men in the Old Test. and of one or two (Auth. Vers. "Mattathias") in the New. See also MATTATHAH; MATTHEW; MATTHIAS, etc.; and especially MATTATHIAS.

1. One of the sons of the Levite Jeduthun, appointed by David chief of the fourteenth section of the Temple musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 3, 21). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same with one of the Levitical wardens who were assigned to the performance of the sacred anthems on the removal of the sacred ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 18, 21; xvi, 5). B.C. cir. 1043.

2. An Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (Ezra x, 43). B.C. 459. He was possibly identical with No. 4.

3. The eldest son of Shallum, a Levite of the family of Korah, who had charge of the baked offerings of the Temple on the re-establishment after the exile (1 Chron. ix, 31). B.C. cir. 440.

4. One of those (apparently chief Israelites) who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people after the captivity (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. A person named in Luke iii, 26 as the son of Semei, among the maternal ancestors of Jesus; but as no such name appears in the parallel passages of the Old Test., and would here unduly protract the interval limited by other intimations of the generations, it is probably interpolated from No. 6. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16.)

6. The son of Amos and father of Joseph, among the maternal ancestry of Jesus after the close of the O.-Test. genealogy (Luke iii, 25). B.C. post 406.

Mattock, an old English name for an agricultural implement like a pickaxe with a wide point, for grubbing up and digging out roots and stones, is the rendering adopted in the Auth. Vers. for three Hebrew words. מַעֲדֵר (*mader'*, an instrument for *dressing* or pruning a vineyard; occurs only in Isa. vii, 25) denotes a *weeding-hook* or hoe; מַחֲרֵשָׁה (*machareshah'*, 1 Sam. xiii, 20) and מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (*machare'sheth*, "share," 1 Sam. xiii, 20) are the names of two agricultural cutting instruments (for they needed sharpening by a smith), one of which is perhaps an ordinary hoe and the other a *pick-axe* (from חָרַשׁ, to *scrape*; but the plur. of one is מַחֲרֵשׁוֹת, *machareshoth'*, "mattocks," 1 Sam. xiii, 21). See PLOUGH. חֶרֶב (*che'reb*, 2 Chron. xxxiv, 6; elsewhere usually a "sword") signifies any sharp instrument, as a knife, dagger, chisel; and possibly a *spade* in the passage in question (marg. "maul"). The tool used in Arabia for loosening the ground, described by Niebuhr (*Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 137), answers generally to our mattock or grubbing-axe (Loudon, *Encyclop. of Gardening*, p. 617; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 100), i. e. a single-headed pickaxe, the *sarculus simplex*, as opposed to *bicornis*, of Palladius (*De Re Rust.* i, 43). The ancient Egyptian hoe was of wood, and answered for hoe, spade, and mattock. The blade was inserted in or through the handle, and the

Ancient Egyptian Hoes.

two were attached about the centre by a twisted rope. See Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 16, 18, abridgm.; comp. Her. ii, 14. See AGRICULTURE.

Maturin, CHARLES ROBERT, an Irish divine, was born in 1782, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Though popular as a pulpit orator, the income from his living—the curacy of St. Peter's, in the Irish metropolis—was inadequate to his support, and he turned aside to secular literary enterprises. He secured special distinction as a poet and dramatist. He died in 1825. Says a contemporary, "The genius of Maturin was great, but it was not always under the control of a pure taste." He published a collection of his *Sermons*, besides many secular works, several of which were first brought out under the assumed name of Dennis Jasper Murphy.

Matutinal. See MATINS.

Mauburne or **Momboir**, JEAN, an ascetic Belgian author, was born at Brussels about 1460. After having studied grammar and music at the cathedral school of Utrecht, he joined the regular canons of Mont-Saint-Agnès, a famous monastery near Zwoll, and was employed in different positions in the congregation of Windesham. The publication of his first work, *Rosetum Spirituale*, gave Mauburne great renown, and induced Nicholas de Hacqueville, first president of the Parliament of Paris, to invite him to France (1497), to reform the regular canons of the kingdom. Mauburne gladly heeded the call, and restored order to the abbeys of Saint-Séverin, of Cysoing, of Saint-Euvert d'Orleans, and of Saint-Martin de Nevers; but he attached himself more particularly to that of Livri, of which he was

elected prior (Nov., 1500), then regular abbot by the resignation of Nicholas de Hacqueville in his favor (Jan., 1502). The zeal of Mauburne was not confined to his own order; he was interested in that of Benedict, and labored much for the reformation of the congregation of Chézal, which served as a model to the houses of Saint-Vanne and Saint-Maur. Taken ill in consequence of the fatigue caused by his religious labors, he was carried to Paris, and died there about the beginning of the year 1503. He included among his friends Saint-François de Paule, Geoffroi de Boussard, chancellor of Nôtre-Dame of Paris; the bishop Louis Pinel, Pierre de Bruges, and probably Erasmus, who addressed several letters to him. His principal works are, *Rosetum exercituum spiritualium et sacrarum meditationum* (Bâle, 1491, et al.). "This book," says Gence, "is the first where some passages of the *Imitation* have been introduced and given under the name of Kempis:"—*Venatorium investigatorium sanctorum canonici ordinis*, a historical manuscript which appears to be an abridgment of that of Buschius, and in which Mauburne again attributes to Kempis the book *Qui sequitus me* of the *Imitation*. We find in the ancient *Gallia Christiana* (t. vii, col. 281–282) two letters addressed to this priest by Erasmus, and written at Paris. See Swurt, *Athenæ Belgicæ*, p. 447; Mastelyn, *Necrol. Viridis Vallis*, p. 121; Sander, *Biblioth. Belgica; Gallia Christiana*, vii, 836–839; Moréri, *Grand Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Paquot, *Mémoires*, vol. iii. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Mauduit, Michel, a learned French theologian, was born at Vire, Normandy, in 1644. While still young he entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians, where for a long time he studied the classics; then he devoted himself to preaching, and instructing the country people. The study of the Bible occupied the remainder of his life. He possessed a great variety of knowledge, understood Greek well, also Hebrew and Latin, and obtained many prizes in the academical competitions of Rouen and Caen. He died at Paris January 19, 1709. Of Mauduit's works we have *Traité de religion contre les Athées, les Deistes et les nouveaux Pyrrhoniens* (Par. 1677, 12mo); the 2d edition (1698) has been greatly enlarged:—*Mélanges de diverses poésies; divisés en IV livres* (Lyons; the edition of 1723, 12mo, is preferable on account of the additions to it). We find in this a well-written preface on the good use of poetry:—*Dissertation sur le sujet de la goutte, avec le moyen de l'en garantir* (Paris, 1687, 1689, 12mo):—*Analyse des Épitres de Saint Paul et des Épitres canoniques, avec des dissertationes sur les endroits difficiles* (Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 12mo; reprinted in 1702):—*Analyse de l'Évangile selon l'ordre historique de la concorde* (Paris, 1694, 3 vols. 12mo, et al.). This work, to which the author devoted nearly all his life, has had many editions (later editions, Malines, 1821, 7 vols. 12mo; Paris, 1843 44, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Analyse des Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Méditations pour une retraite ecclésiastique de dix jours* (Lyons, 1723, 12mo). Mauduit also left, in MS., *Analyse de l'Apocalypse* and *Traduction complète du Nouveau Testament*. See *Mercure de France*, May, 1709; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biogr. Générale*, s. v.

Mauermann, Franz Laur, a German Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Neuzelle in 1780; entered the priesthood in 1797, and, after filling various positions, was in 1825 made chaplain to the royal house of Saxony, and in 1827 præses of the Roman Catholic Consistory of the kingdom. In 1842 he was made bishop of Rome and confessor of the king of Saxony. Later he became apostolic vicar. He died in October, 1845.—*Regensburger Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Maul or **Mall** is an old name for a hammer or *mallet*, and stands in the Auth. Vers. for the Heb. מְפִצ (*mephits'*, only occurs in Prov. xxv, 18; but kindred is מַפֵּץ, *mappets'*, "battle-axe," Jer. li, 20; both from פּוּץ or נָפַץ, to *break* in pieces), a *war-club*, such as was anciently in common use, and even in the Middle Ages, the memory of which is still preserved in the modern *mace* as a sign of authority. "Probably such was that which is said to have suggested the name of Charles *Martel*. The mace is frequently mentioned in the accounts of the wars of the Europeans with Saracens, Turks, and other Orientals, and several kinds are still in use among the Bedouin Arabs of remoter parts (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bedouins*, i, 55). In their European wars the Turks were notorious for the use they made of the mace (Knollys, *Hist. of the Turks*)" (Smith). Various kinds of mace were used by the ancient Egyptians, either with or without a ball at the end to give weight to the blow, and generally with a guard at the handle. The curved club or throw-stick, the Arabian *lissán* or "tongue," is a very general Oriental weapon.



Ancient Throw-sticks: 1, Egyptian; 2, Assyrian.

Among the Australians, this implement is yet a formidable one, called the *boomerang*. Unmistakable traces of its use occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 365; Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 134–6). See Armor.

Maulbronn, originally a Cistercian convent in the bishopric of Spiers, was founded by bishop Gunther of Spiers, on a tract of land given him by Walther von Lomersheim in 1148, previously infested with robbers. The convent soon became very rich, partly through donations, and partly by the zeal and activity of the monks. It was at first placed under the jurisdiction of the empire, by Frederick I and other emperors, but in the 14th century was placed under that of the Palatinate. In 1504 it was conquered by duke Ulrich of Würtemberg, and when the Reformation commenced, it was appointed by him for the monks of his province who wished to remain Roman Catholics; duke Christopher, in 1557, took this also from them, appointed an evangelical abbot, and established a school in it. It is yet the seat of one of the four minor theological seminaries. The remaining portions of the building, i. e. the church, cloisters, entrance-hall, and refectory, are considered among the finest specimens of German Gothic architecture.

The place has become renowned in the annals of Protestantism by its connection with two important transactions, the *Colloquium Maulbrunnense*, in 1564, and the *Formula Maulbrunnensis*, in 1576.

(1.) The introduction of Calvinism into the Palatinate by duke Frederick III after 1560, and in particular the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, provoked great opposition on the part of the Lutherans. The authorities, and especially duke Christopher of Würtemberg, Wolfgang of Psalzneuburg, and margrave Charles of Baden, vainly endeavored to heal the dissension by means of a colloquy held between the theologians of the Palatinate and Würtemberg at Maulbronn in 1564. The elector of the Palatinate was accompanied by his court preacher, M. Michael Diller, and the theologians Dr. Peter Boquin, Caspar Olevian, Zacharias Ursinus, and Peter Dathenius; also the church counsellor Thomas Erastus, chancellor Dr. Eheim, and notary Wilhelm Xylander, professor of Greek at Heidelberg. The representatives of Würtemberg were Valentin

Vannius, abbot of Maulbronn, Johannes Brenz, provost of Stuttgard, Jacob Andreä, provost and chancellor of the University of Tübingen, Dietrich Schnepf, professor at Tübingen, and the court preacher Balthasar Bidembach; also as notary, Lucas Osiander, then preacher at Stuttgard, and as civil counsellors chancellor John Fessler and vice-chancellor Jerome Gerhard. The colloquy lasted from April 10th to April 15th. Chancellor Eheim, in his opening speech, invited the theologians, since the object of the conference was to heal their dissensions, to avoid all merely human views and arguments, and to confine themselves to the positive testimony of Scripture on the points of controversy. Yet, instead of treating of the doctrine of the Eucharist, which was their chief point of difference, the theologians at once launched into arguments concerning the ubiquity, or, as Andreä termed it, the *majestas nullo loco circumscripta*, of the body of Christ. Thus all possibility of harmony was at once destroyed. During eight sessions this same question was discussed without either party coming any nearer to the views of the other. The theologians of the Palatinate, and in particular Boquin, Olevian, and Ursin, partly denied the importance of the doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ, and partly refuted their opponents by the Scriptures, the articles of faith, and by an *exposé* of the errors into which these principles must lead. Those of Würtemberg tried especially to defend the idea of the ubiquity of Christ's body from misapprehension and misrepresentation, and treated it as a necessary consequence of *unio personalis* and the *communicatio idiomatum;* they rejected the accusation of mixing up the two natures, and accused their opponents of making a mere man of Christ. As the others asked whether, in this view, the body of Christ was considered as omnipresent even in the womb, Andreä, who was spokesman of the Würtemberg party, drew a distinction between the possession and the use of the attribute, and asserted that Christ could not have been omnipresent in the womb, but only became so actually after his ascension—a view which the Heidelberg theologians rejected as contrary to reason and unsupported by Scripture.

At the last two sittings, finally, the question of the Eucharist was discussed, as the princes wished that the two parties should seek to arrive at some understanding concerning this important point, leaving aside all Christological questions. Yet, after a very few speeches, the question of ubiquity was again started, this time by the Reformed theologians, and the discussion receded to its original ground. The colloquy now came to a close. The protocols were compared and signed, and the two parties separated, each holding as firmly to its own views as previous to the meeting, and considering itself as having obtained the advantage. In spite of the promise of secrecy, the Heidelberg theologians boasted of having silenced their opponents, claiming even that duke Christopher himself was now more inclined to their doctrines. The Würtemberg party would not brook this, and Brenz wrote an account of the colloquy, denying the statements of the Heidelbergians, which was at first circulated privately, and was finally printed in the same year under the title *Epitome colloquii Maulbrunnensis inter theologos Heidelbergenses et Wurtembergenses de Cœna Domini et Majestate Christi*, and also a *Wahrhaftiger u. gründlicher Bericht v. d. Gespräch*, etc., *gestellt durch d. Würtembergischen Theologen* (Frankfort, 1564, 4to); in these works he accused his adversaries of having had recourse to sophistry, and, when they found it impossible longer to defend their views, to have caused the colloquy to be brought to a close. Heidelberg answered by the *Epitome colloq. Maulbr. cum responsione Palatinorum ad epit. Wurtemb.* (Heidelberg, 1565, 4to), and published at the same time the protocol of the conference, which was followed up by the opposite party with a new edition of the protocols, "without changes or additions" (Tübing. 1565, 4to). Both parties now accused each other of interpolating the protocols. The theologians of Wittenberg were also drawn into the quarrel, as duke Christopher submitted to them the protocols of Maulbronn and the *De Majestate Christi* of Andreä and Brenz, both of which they severely condemned. The dispute lasted for several years. It was finally set at rest by the wise and Christian efforts of elector Frederick at the Diet of Augsburg in 1566. See Osiander, *Histor. eccl.* cent. xvi, c. 59, p. 791; Struve, *Pfälz. K. Hist.* p. 149 sq.; Hospinian, *Hist. sacr.* t. ii.; Arnold, *Unpart. K. Hist.* cent. xvi, § 17, p. 14; Sattler, *Gesch. d. Herzogth. Würtemberg*, iv, 207 sq.; Planck, *Geschichte d. Prot. Lehrbegr.* vol. v, pt. ii, p. 487 sq.; Heppe, *Gesch. des deutsch. Protest.* ii, 71 sq.; Klunzinger, *D. Religionsgespräch zu M.* (*Zeitschr. f. histor. Theolog.* 1849, i, 166 sq.); *Leben u. ausgewählte Schrift. d. Väter*, etc., *d. reform. Kirche* (Elberfeld, 1857, p. 260).

(2.) Another conference, held twelve years later at Maulbronn, between theologians from Wurtemberg, Baden, and Henneberg, secured a better result. The theologians were L. Osiander, Balthasar, Bidembach, provost of Stuttgard, Abel Scherdinger, court preacher of Henneberg, Peter Strecker, pastor at Suhl, and some others. The object of the conference was to discuss a formula of union drawn up by Osiander and Bidembach. The meeting took place Jan. 19, 1576, and the formula itself, which may be considered as a forerunner of the *Formula Concordiæ*, received the name of *Formula Maulbrunnensis*. In the early part of February it was sent, together with an address by count George Ernest of Henneberg, to the elector August of Saxony, who received also about the same time the so-called Suabian and Saxon formula of duke Julius of Brunswick. The elector submitted them both to Andreä, who declared that, in his opinion, the formula of Maulbronn was the most serviceable for the purpose of uniting the different parties. Yet in the conference held at Torgau, May 28, Andreä consented to use nominally the other formula as a basis, but took good care to include all the principal points of the Maulbronn formula into the so-called Book of Torgau. See Hutter, *Concord. conc.* p. 305 sq.; Osiander, *Hist. Eccl.* cent. xvi, lib. iv, pt. iii, p. 866; Planck, *Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegr.* vi, 428; Heppe, *Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel*, 1858, p. 73 sq.

(3.) In September of the same year (1576), still another meeting was held at Maulbronn, in which Heerbrand, Schnepf, Magirus, Bidembach, L. Osiander, Dietz, Scherdinger, and Strecker took part. Its object was to discuss the Book of Torgau, and it ended in expressing its approbation of it as a whole. See Heppe, *Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel*, p. 120 sq.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 178 sq. (J. N. P.)

Maulmont (or **Malmont**), Jean de, a learned Frenchman, was born in Limousin, in the 16th century, of an ancient noble family, which possessed one of the baronies of Limousin, the chateau of Maumont. Of his personal history but little is known except that he was principal of the College of Saint-Michel, otherwise called Chanac, which had been founded in 1530 by the Pompadour house for the Limousin students. According to La Croix du Maine, "Maulmont was a very learned man, master of many languages, especially the Greek, a great theologian, and a prolific orator." He was an intimate friend of Julius Scaliger. Many of his contemporaries have pretended that he was the true author of the translation of Plutarch which bears the name of Amyot; this assertion has been refuted by La Monnoye in a note on *L'Anti-Baillet* of Ménage. We have of Maulmont's works, *Les Œuvres de Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr* (Paris, 1538, fol.):—*Les Histoires et Chroniques du Monde, tirées tant du gros volume de Jean Zonare, auteur Byzantin, que de plusieurs autres scripteurs Hébreux et Grecs, avec annotations* (Paris, 1563, fol.):—*Les graves et saintes remontrances de l'empereur Ferdinand au pape Pie IV sur le Concile de Trente* (Paris, 1563, 8vo):—*Remontrances Chrétiennes en forme d'épître à la reine d'Angleterre, trad. du Latin*

de Hiérosme Oserias, évesque Portugalois (Paris, 1653, 8vo). The same author has written in Italian a life of René de Birague, chancellor of France, who died in 1583, and the *Gallia Christiana* quotes it as a correct and useful work. See La Croix du Maine et Du Verdier, *Biblioth. Françoises;* Goujet, *Biblioth. Françoises*, vol. xii; *Gallia Christiana*, vi, 571.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Maunday Thursday, also known under the term DIES CŒNÆ DOMINICÆ (q. v.), is the name given to the *Thursday before Easter*. The origin of this name is *Dies maudati—mandate* Thursday; either from the commandment which our Saviour gave to his disciples to commemorate the sacrament of his supper, which he instituted on this day (hence also called *dies panis*, day of bread; and *dies lucis*, day of light); or because on this day our Saviour washed his disciples' feet, and gave them commandment to follow his example. Others derive it from the Saxon *mand*, which means a basket, and subsequently any gift or offering contained in the basket. On this day penitents who had been put out of the Church on Ash-Wednesday were readmitted. There was also a general celebration of the Lord's Supper, with which the ceremony of washing the feet was connected. Candidates for baptism publicly recited the Creed. The origin of this practice is generally referred to the 7th century, but Riddle (*Christian Antiquities*, p. 669) contends that "it appears to have been of much earlier institution." See PEDILAVIUM.

Maunoir, JULIEN, a learned French ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 1, 1606, in the province of Saint-Georges de Reinthembault, diocese of Rennes. At the age of twenty he entered the Order of the Jesuits at Paris, and finished his studies at La Flèche. A professorship in the College of Quimper was offered him, but he preferred to preach, and accordingly entered the ministry. He studied the dialect of Brittany, began to travel over the country, and displayed so much zeal in his preaching that his health became impaired, and he was obliged to resume the career of teaching, which he followed at Tours. After having been ordained at Nevers, he consecrated the remainder of his life, according to a vow that he had made, to the evangelization of Brittany. For forty-two consecutive years Maunoir labored for the accomplishment of his project. Unmoved by the injury and violence with which his devotion was often repaid, accepting or imposing on himself the rudest privations, travelling on foot, with a wallet on his shoulders, and carrying only the clothing and nourishment absolutely indispensable, he visited successively and repeatedly nearly all the parishes in the dioceses of Cornovaille and Léon, the islands of Ouessant, of Molène, of Sizein, etc., without mentioning a great number of localities in the other dioceses of Brittany, and everywhere his preaching was attended with success. He died Jan. 28, 1683, at Plévin, near Guincamp. In accordance with his expressed desire, he was buried like a pauper, but later a statue was erected to him in the church of Plévin. With the triple object in view of understanding thoroughly a language so indispensable to himself, of purifying it from the mixed dialect used by the preachers of the times, and of generalizing the learning of the language, Maunoir aided in the promotion of the colleges of Quimper and of Morlaix, where the language of Brittany was generally used. The same motives actuated him in the composition of the following works, which have been adopted by all the ecclesiastics of the country: *Canticon spirituel hac instructionon profetabl evit quisqui an hent da vont d'ar barados* (Quimper):—*Vita S. Corentini, Aremorici; Cosopeti* (Quimper, 1685, 12mo, et al.); far from being written in Latin, as father Southwell and Le Long have supposed, this life is composed of 766 Breton verses:—*Le Temple consacré à la passion de Jésus-Christ*, in Breton, prose and verse (Quimper, 1679, 1686, 8vo):—*Le sacré Collége de Jésus divisé en cinq classes, où l'on enseigne en langue Armorique les leçons Chrétiennes, avec les trois clefs pour y entrer.* These and other works of this character are curious in a philological point of view as monuments of the changes in the Breton language. A very competent judge, M. de la Villemarqué, has given the following opinion: "Born in the French part of Brittany, father Maunoir was shocked by the rudeness of certain sounds in the Breton language. In order to soften them, he suppressed or modified certain signs necessary for preserving the primitive signification of the words, and for showing their etymology, derivation, and affinities. The expressions thus disfigured, of which he makes use in his works, prevailed in the 18th century, and he left an orthography without fixed principles or method, an orthography *ad libitum*, which has very properly been abandoned, since Le Pelletier has substituted the ancient Breton orthography in his *Dictionnaire*. See Boschet, *Le Parfait Missionnaire, ou la vie du P. Julien Maunoir* (Paris, 1697, 12mo); Lobineau, *Vie des Saints*, etc., *de Bretagne*, v, 23–137; G. Leroux, *Recueil des vertus et des miracles du P. Julien Maunoir* (Quimper, 1716, 12mo); La Villemarqué, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Langue Bretonne*, at the head of his edition of the *Dict. Français-Breton de Le Gonidec* (St. Brieuc, 1847, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Maupas du Tour, HENRI CAUCHON DE, a French prelate, was born in 1600 at the chateau of Cosson, near Rheims. Descended from an ancient family of Champagne, he had for his godfather king Henry IV, and was scarcely sixteen years of age when he was elected abbot of Saint-Denis of Rheims, with a regular benefice. In 1636 he founded there the society of Saint Geneviève. He next became chief vicar of the diocese of Rheims, then first chaplain to the queen, Anne of Austria, and in 1641 was finally elected bishop of Puy, whence he was transferred in 1661 to the see of Evreux. In the following year, being called to Rome to solicit the beatification of François de Sales, he was chosen assistant prelate to the pontifical throne. January 14, 1667, he founded a seminary at Evreux, resigned his bishopric in 1680, and died at Evreux August 12 of the same year. Of his works we have *Vie de Mme. de Chantal* (Paris, 1644, 4to):—*Vie de saint François de Sales* (Paris, 1657, 4to):—*Oraison funèbre de saint Vincent de Paul* (Paris, 1661, 4to):—*Statuts synodaux* (Evreux, 1664, 1665, 8vo). See *Gallia Christiana*, vols. ii and xi; Le Brasseur, *Hist. du Diocèse d'Evreux.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Maupin, MILTON, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Campbell County, Tennessee, Dec. 24, 1829. He was educated at Emory and Henry College, Virginia; was licensed to preach about the year 1849; and was engaged for two or three years teaching school and preaching in the local relation. He went to California in 1852, and in 1853 joined the Pacific Conference, California. In 1856 he returned to Tennessee; in 1859 joined the Holston Conference, and was appointed to Grayson Circuit, in Western Virginia; in 1860 to Newport Circuit; in 1861 to Maynardsville Circuit. In 1862 he was appointed by the Conference a missionary chaplain to a regiment in the Confederate States army; but, as the regiment was disbanded before the close of the year, he returned home, and was without regular work until 1866, when he was appointed to Knox and Maynardsville Circuit. In 1867 he was transferred to Trinity Conference, Texas, and appointed in 1869 to Gainesville Circuit; in 1871 to Decatur Mission, where he finished his life and ministry, April 1, 1871. He was faithful to his calling while his strength lasted. "He left the aroma of a good name, and the assurance that he went *to his rest*."—*Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1871.

Maur (ST.), **Congregation of.** The Benedictines afford the only example of a monastic order which, after declining from an originally high position, and after remaining, so to speak, dead for two centuries, re-

vived and took again a leading place in the Church by its activity and learning.

As early as the latter part of the Middle Ages the Order of Benedictines had lost much of their influence. The convents had become too wealthy, and the monks, instead of devoting themselves to study and religious exercises, were entirely given up to idleness and worldly enjoyments. This state of things continued through the 16th century. In the early part of the 17th a reform took place in the Convent of St. Vannes, near Verdun, under the influence of Didier de la Cour, and it was soon imitated by the formerly renowned convents of Moyenmoutier and Sénones. Clement VIII confirmed the organization of this *Congrégation de S. Vannes*, which produced some distinguished men, among them Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. In 1614 the assembly of the French clergy expressed the wish that all the Benedictine convents throughout the country should connect themselves with St. Vannes; the general chapter of the congregation, however, was afraid of the consequences which might result from such extended power. In 1618, however, Dom Bénard, one of the monks of St. Vannes who had been employed in reforming other convents, obtained from Louis XIII authority to establish a congregation, which when organized took the name of St. Maur, for fear of awakening jealousy if it took that of any particular convent. This congregation was confirmed by Gregory XV in 1621, and by Urban VIII in 1627. The first convent subjected by Bénard to the new regulations was that of the Blancs-Manteaux at Paris. Soon a number of others joined it. In 1652 they counted forty convents; in the beginning of the 18th century their number reached 180, divided into six provinces. The most important of all these establishments was the convent of St. Germain des Près, near Paris. It was the residence of the general of the order, was endowed with episcopal authority, and possessed a library particularly rich in ancient MSS. Its statutes, drawn up to accord with the spirit of the times, the strict morality, intellectual pursuits, and great learning of its members, gained universal respect for the congregation. Amid the looseness of morals which then prevailed among the French clergy, the Congregation of St. Maur belongs to the few exceptions which reflect honor on the Church of Rome. According to the confession of a Romanist writer, they are perhaps the only order in the history of convents of which this can be said. It is also to be remembered that, conscious of serving higher and universal interests, they remained entire strangers to all persecutions both of the Jesuits and the Gallican clergy.

To secure a high degree of scholarship among the Congregation, the first general, Dom Tariffe, carefully prepared a scheme of studies; and as early as the 17th and 18th centuries the congregation counted a large number of distinguished men. Their labors were promptly directed to the gathering of materials for the history of the convents belonging to the congregation, and to that of the saints. These researches soon led them into paleological and diplomatic works. The finished education given to the novices required a large number of new books or improved reprints of old ones, which were prepared by order of the superiors by members of the congregation. Thus arose a large number of very important and valuable works. They treat of a great variety of subjects, but especially of the history of France and of the Church. The most distinguished among the monks were intrusted with the editorship, and the others were employed in gathering the materials, or making up some particular part of it: if one of them died before his task was complete, another took his place, and continued it in the same spirit and with the same learning. No other order ever made the same use of its riches: they bought the rarest MSS. and books, made journeys to visit foreign libraries and to establish relations with foreign savans. Their publications also possessed an outward finish previously unknown in typography. Their religious independence is shown in the fact that they remained in friendly relation with the recluses of Port Royal (q. v.), and suffered persecution for their refusal to endorse the bull *Unigenitus* (q. v.), and they were often and severely attacked by the Jesuits. The order continued in existence until the French Revolution.

The historical works of the Congregation of St. Maur are numerous, and embrace an extensive field. Dom Mabillon may be considered as the founder of diplomacy, of which he established the basis in his *De re diplomatica* (1681, 6 vols. fol.); this was followed by a supplement in 1704, in consequence of the attacks of the Jesuit Germon. As these works related almost exclusively to France, a general work on the same subject was published by Dom Toustain and Dom Tassin, under the title *Nouveau traité de diplomatique* (1750–65, 6 vols. 4to), which is still the most perfect of the kind. To these must be added Montfauçon's *Palæographia Græca* (1708, fol.), which, however, has been surpassed by subsequent publications. Chronology may almost be said to have been created by them. The *Art de vérifier les dates*, commenced by Dantine and finished by Clémencet (1750, 2 vols. 4to), is well known to every student of history. A second edition was published by Clément (1770, fol.), and then a third (1783–92, 3 vols. fol.), each time with numerous additions. The fourth, much enlarged edition, due also to Clément, appeared first in 1818 (37 vols. 8vo), and was often reprinted; there are also an edition in folio and one in quarto. This work has justly been called the most important monument of French learning in the 18th century. Montfauçon's *Antiquité expliquée en figures* (1719, 10 vols. fol.) has now become somewhat antiquated in consequence of the new sources discovered since. In the domain of philology, the congregation took an active part in a yet unsurpassed work, the *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* of Dufresne Ducange (1678), which, if it did not originate with them, was at least increased one half by Dom Dantine and Dom Charpentier (1733–36, 6 vols. fol., with a supplement by Charpentier, 1767, 4 vols. fol.), and acquired its full importance by their labors. This work is not only important for its philological value, but also for the information it contains on the literature, laws, and civil and ecclesiastical customs of the Middle Ages. Charpentier is also the author of the *Alphabetum tyronianum* (1747, fol.). They published the sources of the history of France. Such as had been furnished by Pithon and Duchesne were insufficient, and Colbert and Louvois vainly sought to have the work continued; but D'Aguessau finally succeeded in inducing the Benedictines to apply themselves to the task. It finally came into the hands of Dom Bouquet, who completed the first eight volumes of the *Scriptores rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum;* Dom J. B. Haudiguier and C. Haudiguier accomplished the ixth, xth, and xith; Dom Clément the xiith and xiiith, and Dom Brial, the last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, the xivth and xvth (1738–1818, fol.). The work has since been continued by the *Académie des Inscriptions*, which published the xxist volume in 1855. To this class of works belongs the edition of the writings of Grégoire de Tours, published by Dom Ruinart (1699, fol.). They never gave a complete history of France, but only the beginning of it, and the history of particular parts. Dom Martin wrote *La Religion des Gaulois* (1727, 2 vols. 4to), and Dom de Brezillac *Histoire des Gaules et des Conquêtes des Gaulois* (1752, 2 vols. 4to), both of little importance now. Their histories of particular provinces are more valuable. The most important are *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, by Vaissette and De Vic (1730–45) 5 vols. fol.); *Histoire de Bretagne*, by Veisserie (who subsequently became a Protestant) and Lobineau (1707, 2 vols. fol.). This was afterwards entirely remodelled, although not completed, by Maurice de Beaubois (1742, 3 vols. fol., and 2 vols. 4to); *Histoire de Bourgogne*, by Plancher (1739 sq., 3 vols. fol.); *Histoire de la Ville de Paris*, by Félibien and Lobineau (1725, 5 vols.). Finally, the *Histoire littéraire*

de la France (1733–63, 12 vols. 4to), inaugurated by Dom Rivet and others, and continued by the order till 1814, when it was taken up by the *Académie des Inscriptions*; the xxth volume was published in 1842. It is a very valuable collection of documents, not only for the history of French literature, but also for that of the Middle Ages generally. The researches in the libraries of the convents, also the journeys, principally in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, gave occasion to publish extensive catalogues and descriptions of them. Among these we notice the *Spicilegium veterum aliquot scriptorum* of D'Achery (1653–1677, 13 vols. 4to; new edit. by De la Barre, 1723, 3 vols. fol.); *Vetera Analecta*, by Mabillon (1675–85, 4 vols. 4to); *Collectio nova veterum scriptorum*, by Martène (1700, 4to); *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, by Martène and Durand (1717, 5 vols. fol.); *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Bénédictins*, by the same (1724, 4to); *Diarium Italicum* (1702, 4to), and *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova* (1739, 2 vols. fol.), both by Montfaucon. In Church history, their most important works are their revision of the *Gallia Christiana* of the brothers De Sainte-Marthe (1656, 4 vols. fol.). The new work was commenced by another member of that distinguished family, Dom Denis de Sainte-Marthe. It was intended as an introduction to a contemplated *Orbis Christianus*, for which a large amount of documents were collected, yet this work was never completed. The first volume of the *Gallia Christiana* appeared in 1715. Sainte-Marthe died on the completion of the third volume, in 1725. The order continued the work until the thirteenth volume, which appeared in 1785. It was then interrupted, until of late years Hauréau, the author of the *Histoire de la Philosophie scholastique* (1850, 2 vols.), took it up again, and in 1856 he published his continuation. The *Gallia Christiana* was used as a model for other similar works, such as the *Italia sacra*, the *España sagrada*, the *Illyria sacra*, etc. It also gave rise to numerous histories of special convents by others of the congregation; the greater part of them, however, remain unpublished. The only two which appeared are the *Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Denis* of Félibien (1706, fol.), and the *Histoire de l'Abbaye de S. Germain des Près* of Bouillart (1724, fol.). The collection of the French councils, commenced by Dom de Coniac, and afterwards continued by Dom Labat, was to be appended to the *Gallia Christiana*. The first volume appeared in 1789, at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the congregation was dispersed before the second was complete. The history of martyrs was treated by Dom Ruinart in his *Acta primorum martyrum* (1689, 4to). Of greater interest are the works on the old liturgies and convent customs, some of which are among the earliest works of the congregation. Ménard published the *Sacramentarium* of Gregory the Great (1642, 4to), Mabillon the *Liturgia Gallicana* (1645, 4to), Martène his *Libri V de antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690, 2 vols. 4to), and his *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus* (1700, 4 vols. 4to; 2d edit. 1736, 4 vols. fol.); finally, among the most renowned works in that line, we must mention the *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, commenced by D'Achery, and continued by Mabillon and Ruinart (1668, etc., 9 vols. fol.; the tenth remained unpublished); the *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, the celebrated work of Mabillon, completed by Massuet (1703, etc., 6 vols. fol.). The same congregation wrote also a history of their own order, which formed 3 vols. fol. in MS., but the superiors refused permission for publication. Dom Tassin published, however, an abstract from it, down to 1766. Dom Clémencet wrote a history of Port Royal, of which the first part alone appeared (1755, 10 vols. 12mo); the second part remained in MS., as being too favorable to the Jansenists.

The greatest claim of the Benedictines of St. Maur to the gratitude of theologians lies in their editions of the works of the fathers. They had at first contemplated only publishing the complete works of authors of their own order; but the favor with which their productions were received, as also the requirements of their schools, induced them to publish first the works of the Latin fathers, and afterwards of the Greek also. For this purpose they compared the various texts of the different works existing in France, Italy, England, Holland, Germany, etc. The result was a set of works which for correctness of the text remains unsurpassed, especially for the works of the most important among the fathers. Among these works we must not forget their valuable Latin translations of the Greek fathers, and their *Indices*, so important for all historical students. The first Latin father whose works they published is *St. Augustine*. His views afforded them powerful weapons in the Jansenistic controversy. The edition was commenced by Dom Delfau, and continued by Blampin and Constant (1679–1700, 11 vols. folio); Garet published *Cassiodor* (1679, 2 vols. fol.); Du Frische and Le Nourri, *Ambrosius* (1686–90, 2 vols. fol.); Constant, *Hilarius of Poitiers* (1693, fol.); Martianay, *Jerome* (1693–1706, 5 vols. fol.). The works of *Cyprian*, commenced by Baluze, who was not of St. Maur, were completed by Dom Maran (1726, fol.). In 1645 the Benedictines published the *Epistle of Barnabas* (4to). But it is only towards the close of the 17th century that they seriously applied themselves to this branch of ancient ecclesiastical literature. Montfaucon published the works of *Athanasius* (1698, 3 vols. folio); this was followed by his *Collectio nova patrum* (1706, 2 vols. fol.), containing additions to *Athanasius;* the works of *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, and the *Topography of Cosmas*. Massuet published *Irenæus* (1710, fol.); Montfaucon, *Chrysostom* (1718–38, 13 vols. fol.); Toutée, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (1720, fol.); Garnier, *Basil the Great* (1721–30, 3 vols. folio); Charles de la Rue and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, *Origen* (1733–59, 4 vols. folio); Maran, *Justin* and the other apologetists (1742, fol.). Maran commenced an edition of the works of *Gregory of Nazianzum*, which was continued by Clémencet, but the breaking out of the French Revolution prevented the publication of any but the first volume (1788, folio).

Among the works of writers of their order and others of the Middle Ages which they published, we notice the rule of St. Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia regularum*, published by Ménard (1628, 4to); *Lanfranc*, by D'Achery (1648, fol.), and *Guibert of Nogent*, by the same (1651, fol.); *St. Bernard*, by Mabillon (1667, fol.; 2d ed. 1690, 2 vols. fol.; 3d ed. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); *Anselm of Canterbury*, by Gerberon (1675, fol., 2d ed. 1721); *Gregory the Great*, by Denis de Sainte-Marthe (1705, 4 vols. folio); *Hildebert de Mans*, by Beaugendre (1708, folio). Dom Constant compiled a collection of the letters and decrees of the popes, only the first volume of which appeared (1721, folio). To aid in the use of the *Biblioth. patrum maxima* of Lyon, Le Nourri wrote his *Apparatus* (1703, fol.), which, however, does not extend further than the 4th century; it consists of biographical, historical, and literary notices of the writers whose works are contained in the *Bibliotheca*. Finally, among their most valuable publications are those relating to the ancient translations of the Bible. Such are the *Hexapla* of Origen, by Montfaucon (1713, 2 vols. fol.); the *Biblcth. divina* of Jerome, by Martianay (1693, vol. i of the works of Jerome), and the *Latinæ versiones antiquæ*, by Sabatier, Baillard, and Vincent de la Rue (1743–49, 3 vols. fol.).

Their zeal and their liberal views could not fail to involve them in numerous and bitter controversies; yet even then they generally preserved a tone of great moderation, whilst their greater learning often gave them the advantage over their adversaries. Perhaps the weakest contest they ever engaged in was their defence of the claims of their fellow Benedictine abbot Gersen as the author of the *Imitatio Christi*, against the attacks of the Augustinian canon regulars [see KEMPIS]. They ably defended themselves against the insinuations of De Rancé, founder of *La Trappe*, who accused them of worldliness on account of their studies. Mabillon

was thus provoked to publish his renowned *Traité des études Monastiques* (1691, 4to, and 1692, 2 vols. 12mo; it was translated into Latin and Italian). They also got into difficulties with the Jesuits, who accused them of Jansenism on account of their edition of St. Augustine, and otherwise attacked them in the *Journal* of Trévoux. During this controversy they published very important essays against the bull *Unigenitus*. Gerberon published the *Histoire générale du Jansenisme* (1700, 3 vols. 12mo), and Le Cerf the *Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus en ce qui regarde la Congrégation de St. Maur*. The French Revolution, in forbidding the existence of convents, dispersed also the Benedictines. Several of the works they had then on hand remained uncompleted. The *Académie des Inscriptions* undertook to finish such as related to the history of France. The last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, Dom Brial, died a member of the French Academy in 1833. In later times an attempt was made to revive the order. La Mennais (q. v.) with some of his friends bought the abbey of Solesmes, formerly occupied by the Benedictines of St. Maur. The pope made it the regular abbey of the restored Order of Benedictines Sept. 1, 1837, and Geranger (afterwards called Guéranger), a German professor, formerly a Protestant, was made superior-general of the order. Yet so far, the attempts of the new monks to rival the fame of their predecessors have proved unsuccessful; the ultramontanism which pervades the French clergy is not favorable to profound studies. Its first work gave evidence of the spirit which now animates the institution: *Origines catholiques, origines de l'Église Romaine* (Paris, 1836, 4to; vol. i only has appeared). By his *Institutions liturgiques* (Paris, 1846) Guéranger helped to introduce the use of the Roman liturgy in the French dioceses, in spite of the remonstrances of the Gallican clergy. The most eminent of the new Benedictines is Pitra, yet even his works will prove of more value to the papacy than to science. In an article published in the *Correspondant* of 1852 he attacked the *Regesta pontificum* of Jaffé, and asserted that the making of the pseudo-decretals (q. v.) affords proof that the primacy of the See of Rome was then already recognised by all. Pitra has published a *Histoire de St. Léger et de l'Église de France au 7me siècle* (Paris, 1846):—*Études sur la Collection des Actes des Saints par les Bollandistes* (Paris, 1850), a valuable work. Since 1852 he has been working at a *Spicilegium Solesmense*, of which three volumes have been published (Paris, royal 8vo). They do not continue the important works commenced by the old order, leaving even the series of the fathers unfinished. See Petz, *Biblioth. Benedicto-mauriana* (Vienna, 1716, 8vo); Le Cerf, *Bibliothèque historique*, etc., *des Auteurs de la Cong. de St. Maur* (Hague, 1726, 12mo); Tassin, *Histoire litér. de la Congr. de St. Maur* (Paris, 1726, 4to); Herbst, *Die Verdienste d. Mauriner um d. Wissenschaften* (*Tübinger theol. Quartalschrift*, 1833, part i, ii, iii; 1834, pt. i).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ix, 190 sq.

Maurand (or **Mauran**), Pierre, the first leader of the Albigenses in Southern France, was born at Toulouse, of a noted family, in the early part of the 12th century. From his youth he gave himself entirely to spreading the doctrines of the Albigenses (q. v.) throughout Languedoc. Rich and learned, preaching incessantly, travelling barefooted, sleeping on the ground, living in the midst of danger, he strongly impressed the southern mind, always easily excited, and in a short time made a great number of converts, whom he assembled in two of his mansions, one in the city, the other in the country. Maurand said boldly "that the clergy performed their ecclesiastical duties without learning, without morals, and without capacity; that usury was common, and that in many churches all was venal, the sacraments and the benefices; that the clerks, the priests, the canons, and even the bishops, associated publicly with abandoned women; that if the same vices were remarked in the lords and laity, it was owing to the general ignorance, an excuse which the clergy could not plead." As for his belief, he admitted two grand directing principles, independent and uncreated; good and evil; light and darkness. He did not consider almsgiving a means of salvation; and life should not be an incessant commerce. He did not admit that a priest could, by a few words, transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and persisted in seeing in the mass and sacrifice only a commemoration, a symbol. He rejected all the ceremonial service of the Church as an abuse which should be destroyed. He led, moreover, a most regular and sober life, prayed on his knees seven times a day and seven times each night. He did not acknowledge the remission of sins on the earth, not being able to believe that a mere mortal, a priest "all covered with the leprosy of vice," could absolve that of which he was himself knowingly guilty each day. As for the members of the clergy, he called them not pastors, but ravishing wolves, etc. The court of Rome was not slow in being roused, and the number of heretics multiplied so prodigiously that an appeal was made to the secular arm. After having condemned the sectarians in several synods, the archbishops of Narbonne and Lyons made some arrests, and burned alive those who would not recant. After the action of the Council of Albi in 1176, pope Alexander III himself inaugurated a crusade against the heretics, who were particularly strong in the dominion of Raymond V of Toulouse. The legate and the bishops entered Toulouse in the midst of the insulting clamors of the people. One of the prelates however preached, and attempted to refute the doctrines of the Albigenses; the latter, apparently convinced not so much by his reasoning as by fear of the count of Toulouse, did not dare to be seen or to speak in public. The legate, not contented with this success, caused the Roman Catholics to promise with an oath to denounce and deliver up all the heretics they knew. Pierre Maurand was one of the first reached by this measure. They induced him by caresses and promises to appear before the legate. In the examination to which he was obliged to submit, he declared that the bread was not the body of Christ. The inquisitors asked nothing more; they delivered him to the count of Toulouse, who immediately imprisoned him, ordering that his goods should be forthwith confiscated and his mansions demolished, whilst other punishment was yet to follow. Pierre Maurand, seeing himself on the verge of an ignominious death, promised to abjure his faith. They then brought him out of prison, and on the public square, before the assembled people, he kneeled to the legate and his colleagues; begged their pardon, and promised to submit to their orders. The next day the bishop of Toulouse and the abbot of Saint-Sernin took Maurand from his prison, naked and barefooted, and led him through the city, flogging him from time to time. Arriving at the cathedral, he paid a heavy fine, renewed the abjuration of his faith, and heard the sentence which condemned him to start within forty days for Jerusalem, and remain there three years in the service of the poor; his goods were confiscated, half to the profit of Raymond V, half to the profit of the clergy. He was also obliged to pay a fine of five hundred pounds' weight of silver to the count of Toulouse, to make numerous gifts to religious establishments, to the poor, etc. However, when Maurand returned from Palestine, he recovered the greater part of his estates. See Dom Vaissette, *Histoire de Languedoc*, t. iii, chap. xix; *Dict. des Hérésies*, article Albigeois, in the *Encyclopédie theologique* of the abbé Migne; Benoit, *Hist. des Albigeois*, t. 1; Langlois, *Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois;* Basnage de Beauval, *Hist. de l'Église*, t. ii, chap. xxix.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Maurice, St. See Mauritius.

Maurice (*duke* and afterwards *elector*) of Saxony, one of the most prominent characters in the history of the Reformation in the Church of Germany, a celebrated

general and champion of the Protestant cause, was the eldest son of duke Henry of the Albertine line and nephew of duke George the Bearded, the most bitter opponent of the Reformation. Maurice was born at Freiburg March 21, 1521; he espoused in 1541 Agnes, daughter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse; and later in the same year succeeded his father in the duchy of Saxony and its dependencies. He was hardly well established in his dominions when a dispute arose between him and his cousin, the elector of Saxony, John Frederick, regarding their respective rights over the bishopric of Meissen, which was the common property of the Ernestine and Albertine lines; but by the influence of Luther and of the landgrave Philip a temporary reconciliation was effected. In the war with the Turks he distinguished himself as a soldier, and became the favorite of Charles V. Whether, however, Maurice was at this time the sincere friend of the emperor is a question that has never yet been determined. This much is certain that Maurice was selfish by nature, and sought rather the furtherance of his own interests than the welfare of his associates and those who befriended him. A professed Protestant, he took part in the deliberations at Smalcald (q. v.; see also Holy League), but refused to become a member of the league for fear of displeasing the emperor, with whom he coquetted at that time to secure the protectorate of the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. No sooner had the emperor bestowed upon him this much-coveted favor, and honored him with the title of elector (June 19, 1546), than Maurice deserted the Protestant camp, and played the part of a most devoted adherent of the emperor's cause. In consequence of this unexpected hostility to the Protestants the imperial army gained a decisive victory at Mühlberg in April, 1547, wellnigh proving the death-stroke of the Protestant cause. By this defeat of the Protestants, and the imprisonment of his rival, John Frederick, Maurice, according to a previous understanding with the emperor, became himself the ruler of all Saxony. Thus gratified in all the ambitious desires in which he could expect aid from Charles V, Maurice became quite uneasy in his present relation, and hesitated not to embrace the very first opportunity to seek anew the favor of the leaders he had so basely deserted. It is true as late as 1547 Maurice was still found on the side of the imperialists, for he this year supported the *Interim* (q. v.) of Augsburg; but gradually he lessened the hold of the Romanists upon him, and by 1551 we find him a party to a secret treaty of the Protestants with Henry II of France, at the very time that he was professing to besiege the rebellious city of Magdeburg. As treacherously and unhesitatingly as he had abandoned the cause of the Reformers he now forsook the imperial side. Poor Charles was at Innsbruck, employing himself in building up vast schemes of ambition, little dreaming of the mine which the man whom he most of all confided in was preparing to spring under his feet. When suddenly the word came to him that he must release prince Philip of Hesse, whom he had imprisoned for his opposition to the imperial cause, even before he had time to decide the case, news came to him that Maurice of Saxony was marching against him. Without money, without troops, without allies, Charles was compelled to yield to the demands of the man whom he had himself made powerful. On April 18, by the mediation of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, a treaty was concluded at Linz granting the demands of the Protestants; but as it was not to take effect till May 26, Maurice employed himself in attacking (May 18) the camp of Reitti, in which soldiers were assembling for the emperor, defeated and wholly dispersed the imperialists, and advanced on Innsbruck with the view of taking Charles captive. Had it not been that a mutiny stopped his progress, the emperor would have been rudely handled, as Maurice knew his antagonist, and feared the consequences of his treachery. But Maurice also was feared. His advance on Innsbruck so alarmed the members of the Council of Trent, then in session there, that they fled from the town, and the sittings were thenceforth suspended for some years. Finally came the day of convocation of the electors and princes of the empire at Passau; Maurice directing the cause of the Protestants, and Ferdinand attending to the imperial interests. To the Protestants this meeting must ever be memorable. It was here that a treaty of peace was established which secured to Protestants free exercise of worship; and it was by the Passau treaty that the Romanists of Germany agreed that the imperial chamber, from which Lutherans were not to be excluded, should render justice irrespective of religion; and that the Aulic Council should be composed exclusively of German ministers. These conditions, which in political matters secured "Germany for the Germans," and in religious affairs permanently established the principles of toleration, were embodied in the agreement called the *Peace of Passau* (Aug. 22, 1552). Charles, though he professed reconciliation, never lost an opportunity to wreak his vengeance on the elector. The latter, with his usual subtlety and address, patched up a reconciliation with the emperor, and engaged in the campaign of 1553 against the Turks, who were gradually gaining ground in Hungary. Returning soon, he found that one of his former allies, Albert, margrave of Kulmbach, had refused to accede to the treaty of Passau, and continued the war on his own account, making raids on the ecclesiastical princes of the Rhine and Franconia. Maurice also speedily discovered that behind the margrave stood the emperor, who had secured the services of the margrave because he had found in him a general and an army capable of wreaking his vengeance on the perfidious Saxon prince. But Maurice was equal to the occasion. Putting himself at the head of 20,000 men, he marched to protect his bishopric of Magdeburg against the ecclesiastical spoliator, and, falling in with him at Sievershausen, completely defeated him (July 9, 1553), but fell himself in the conflict, mortally wounded, and died July 11, 1553. "So thoughtful and reticent, so enterprising and energetic, so correct in judgment and unfailing in action, and at the same time wholly devoid of moral sentiment, he is one of the most prominent instances of power without principle which the world's history has ever presented." Kohlrausch has perhaps furnished the most moderate comment on the perjured life of Maurice of Saxony. "The final efforts he so patriotically made for the promotion and establishment of general tranquillity, and his love for peace and order, which he sealed with his own blood, have in a great degree served to throw the mantle of oblivion over his earlier proceedings, and conciliated the critical voice of public opinion" (*Hist. Germany*, p. 296). Robertson appears to be equally anxious to laud the last act of Maurice, and to let it stand forth only as the life-work of this faithless prince. He excuses him on the ground that "his long and intimate union with the emperor had afforded him many opportunities of observing narrowly the dangerous tendency of that monarch's (Charles) schemes. He saw the yoke that was preparing for his country, and was convinced that but a few steps more remained to be taken in order to render Charles as absolute a monarch in Germany as he had become in Spain. At the same time he perceived that Charles was bent on exacting a rigid conformity to the doctrines and rites of the Romish Church, instead of allowing liberty of conscience, the promise of which had allured several Protestant princes to assist him in the war against the confederates of Smalcald. As he himself, notwithstanding all the compliances which he had made from motives of interest, or an excess of confidence in the emperor, was sincerely attached to the Lutheran tenets, he determined not to be a tame spectator of the overthrow of a system which he believed to be founded in truth" (p. 386). Though we would gladly like to concede this point, truth compels us to dissent from the opinion of the noted historian. We doubt very

much whether Maurice of Saxony, in any period of his life, believed either Romanism or Protestantism "to be founded in truth;" we doubt even that he ever believed himself "to be founded in truth." Let us say, rather, that he was possessed of an ambition which knew no bounds, and that, seeking honor for himself, he reaped all the glory of having concerted and completed that unexpected revolution which closed with the treaty of Passau—"that overturned the vast fabric in erecting which Charles had employed so many years, and had exerted the utmost efforts of his power and policy; that annulled all his regulations with regard to religion; defeated all his hopes of rendering the imperial authority absolute and hereditary in his family; and established the Protestant Church, which had hitherto subsisted precariously in Germany, through connivance or by expedients, upon a firm and secure basis" (p. 415; comp. p. 424, 425). It is indeed a singular circumstance that the Reformation should be indebted for its security and full establishment in Germany to the same hand which had brought it to the brink of destruction, and that both events should have been accompanied by the same acts of dissimulation. See J. Camerarius, *Vita Mauritii Electoris Saxoniæ* (1569); Georg Arnold, *Vita Mauritii* (1719); F. A. von Langenn, *Moritz Herzog und Churfürst von Sachsen* (1841, 2 vols.); Schlenkert, *Moritz Churfürst von Sachsen* (1798–1800, 4 vols.); R. von Weber, *Moritz, Graf von Sachsen*, etc. (Lps. 1863); Taillandier, *Maurice du Saxe* (Paris, 1865); Coxe, *House of Austria*, i, 450 sq.; Vehse, *Memoirs Court of Austria*, i, 254; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. iv; Robertson, *Charles V*, book x. See also CHARLES V; INTERIM; REFORMATION.

Maurice, Antoine (1), a French Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Eyguières, in Provence, Sept. 27, 1679. He belonged to a Provençal family which had embraced the Reformed religion in the 16th century, and furnished many pastors to the churches of the south. When the revocation of the Edict of Nantes forced his father to retire to Geneva, he was not permitted to follow him, and remained for some time in the hands of priests, who hoped to educate him to the service of the Church of Rome. Two officers, friends of his family, coming to his aid, he succeeded finally in escaping the vigilance of his guardians and arrived at Vienna; being denounced during a halt, he fled alone, and arrived on foot at Bourg in Bresse (1686). Although it was in the middle of winter, he resumed his route with a faithful servant, and, after having wandered in the mountains of Jura, he succeeded in reaching Basle, from whence he was conducted to Geneva in a pitiable condition. He was then only nine years old. Consecrated to the ministry, he entered it in 1697, at Geneva, where, in 1704, he assumed pastoral duty. Gifted with a happy memory and great talent for the study of languages, he learned the greater part of the Oriental idioms, and perfected himself by speaking them fluently with a rabbi and priest from the Levant whom he had invited to his house. He was also fond of the sciences, and abandoned the system of Des Cartes for that of Newton, of whom he became a zealous partisan. In 1710 he was elected professor of belles-lettres and of history in the Academy of Geneva, later he taught the Oriental languages, and after 1724 theology. He was twice called to the rectorship. In 1713 he was made a member of the Royal Society of the Sciences of Berlin, on the proposition of Leibnitz. Maurice died in Geneva Aug. 20, 1756. Of his works we have an edition of the *Rationarium Temporum* du P. Petan, with notes (Geneva, 1721, 3 vols. 8vo):—twelve *Sermons* (ibid. 1722, 8vo):—twenty different dissertations, among others, *De Conscientia* (1725–1734, 4to):—*De Resurrectione Jesu Christi* (1734–1763):—*Jus examinis* (1740, fol):—*De Suicidio* (1756, 8vo). His scientific and philological works have not been published.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Maurice, Antoine (2), a Swiss theologian, was born at Geneva April 11, 1716. He showed at an early age a decided taste for the physical sciences; at the age of sixteen he maintained before the celebrated professors Caames and Calendrini some theses, *De Actione Solis et Lunæ in aërem et aquam* (Geneva, 1732, 4to), which were then considered very remarkable. He became pastor in 1748, and in 1753 succeeded his father in the theological chair. He died in Geneva July 23, 1795. He has left some dissertations on philosophical and theological points: *De Musica in Sacris* (Geneva, 1771, 4to):—*De Fide veterum Judæorum circa futurum post hanc vitam statum* (ibid. 1780, 8vo):—*De Tolerantia apud Ethnicos* (ibid. 1790, 4to);—and in MS. a *Histoire ecclésiastique*. See Sènebier, *Hist. littér. de Genève;* Mensel, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Maurice, Frederick Denison, a very celebrated English divine of our day, the successor of Dr. Arnold as leader of the "Broad Church" party of the Anglican clergy, was born in 1805, the son of a Unitarian minister of high reputation for intelligence and philanthropic zeal. Young Maurice at an early age entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he formed an intimate friendship with the late Scotch divine John Sterling (q. v.), a friendship which lasted through the whole of Sterling's life, and which was made closer in the end by the marriage of the friends to two sisters. From Trinity College both Maurice and Sterling removed to the smaller corporation of Trinity Hall; and here thus early the former began to exert that singular influence, partly intellectual and partly moral, upon all who came near him, which accompanied him throughout his whole career. His examinations at college were passed with such great distinction that he was recommended for a fellowship notwithstanding his nonconformity, and when he refused, upon the ground that he could not conscientiously subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, he was given a year or two that he might overcome his scruples, take his degree, and enjoy a fellowship. This also he declined, on the ground that, by holding out to himself such a prospect, he would be subjecting his intellectual independence to the risk of a temptation, and bribing his conscience. Accordingly, quitting Cambridge without a degree, he removed to London, where for some time he devoted himself to literature. With his friend Sterling he became connected with the "Athenæum," then just starting, and opened a literary career that lasted for a period of forty-four years, within which "the ink of his pen was seldom dry." Experiencing a change in his religious sentiment, he finally decided to enter the ministry of the Established Church, but, lest his motives should be misinterpreted, he went to Oxford instead of Cambridge, and there about 1828 received ordination. From that very moment his activity in the Church began, and as he commenced so he continued through life. Earnestly devoted to the interests of the Christian religion, he sought to present the truths of the Gospel in a manner that might bring within the pale of the Church the educated and the liberal. He held that the Church ought to grapple intellectually, in its theological aims and expositions, with the most advanced forms of sceptical thought, in such a manner as to evince a liberal sympathy with much that is non-theological in its apparent aspect, in order the more surely to exhibit the supremacy of religion over all, and that the Church, as an institution, ought so to grapple with contemporary forms of social evil as to exhibit Christianity as the true source of every effective social amelioration. In carrying out these ideas he necessarily came into conflict with the views of others, both in and out of the Church; his orthodoxy on various doctrinal points was questioned, and he was severely attacked by those who believed him guilty of injuring the best interests of the Church.

Mr. Maurice was holding a position as preacher, but it is especially as a writer that he exerted his influence and secured a reputation, and, as a proper estimate of

this man is impossible without a glance at his works, we proceed to a hasty consideration of his written productions in the field of theology and philosophy. Omitting numerous separate sermons and occasional tracts, we note his *Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures:—Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries:—Theological Essays:—Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament:—Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament:—The Unity of the New Testament:—Christmas Day and other Sermons:—On the Religions of the World:—On the Prayer-book:—The Church a Family:—On the Lord's Prayer:—On the Sabbath;* and *Law on the Fable of the Bees.* To the "Encyclopædia Britannica" he contributed *History of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy,* in ancient and in mediæval times, which was afterwards collected into book form and republished (2 vols. 8vo). He also published a reply to Mansel's *Bampton Lectures* in 1859. Particularly noteworthy among all these productions are his *Theological Essays* (Lond. 1853, 8vo; N. Y. 1854). A Unitarian by birth and education, Mr. Maurice had imbibed much of the humanitarian principles. In these essays he proposed for himself the task of influencing the general religious thought of England, determined, as a faithful ambassador of his Saviour, to meet the actual wants of the disturbed and reluctantly sceptical age in which he lived. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Maurice had failed to make due allowance for the moderate degree of toleration that was in vogue twenty years ago, when he came forward to act as a religious and theological reformer, and for the ignorance that prevailed among his fellow-men concerning the man who sought to do this work. Now that careful inquiry and investigation have clearly revealed his character, even the most orthodox of all orthodox Christians need not hesitate to speak in terms of highest commendation of the labors and services of Frederick Denison Maurice. But not so in the days of his travail. "It was the specialty of his position," says a writer in the *British Quart. Rev.* (Jan. 1873, p. 30), "that he stood midway, as it were, between the professors of the Christian faith, as commonly received, and the modern sceptical and rationalizing spirit which attracted his sympathies, in so far as it was a spirit of free and earnest inquiry, aiming sincerely at the attainment of the truth. Thus he came to be considered by many as affording a sort of half-way house of shelter to those who did not or could not accept the ordinary orthodoxy, and who were yet too much in earnest about life and destiny to be satisfied with the cheerless negations of atheism or the cold comforts of a provisional scepticism. It was natural that he should meet the fate of those who strive to reconcile contraries. Disowned by orthodoxy—which is no matter for wonder—he was rejected and often also despised by scepticism. By the one party he was charged with unsettling the faith of ingenuous youth, while the others accused him of paltering with words in a double sense, and seeking to reconcile things really irreconcilable." The Lessing of the English Church, he held many views akin with the great German writer. Seeking, like the latter, to spread truth by giving it a fair test, Mr. Maurice often went beyond reasonable limits, and unknowingly endangered the interests of the cause he so unhesitatingly served; his language respecting both the *atonement* and the question of *eternal punishment* was made the text of many attacks, the most noted of which was that by Dr. Candlish of the Scottish Church, in a sermon entitled *Examination of Mr. Maurice's "Theological Essays."*

Starting from the divine centre as the root and source of all, religion is to Mr. Maurice a mode of life conditioned and determined on all sides by dependence upon God—the human personality upon the divine Person. "As a life it is a series of experiences through and in which man is acted upon by God, so as to be filled full out of the Infinite fulness. But how shall there be a communion between God and man? In order to the revealing of God, there must be a revealer. This revealer must be able to manifest forth what is *in* God, who is the Father universal, and to do this by such means that man may thereby know him as his Father. A mediator between God and man is essential to the satisfying and fulfilling of human wants. Only one who was himself God could adequately unfold the Eternal. And he must do this by manifestation of the divine in and through the human, otherwise man could not apprehend the revelation; the light would continue shining in darkness without being comprehended of the latter. . . . The Father has shown us what he is by an actual man like ourselves, who told us that he came forth from the Father, and that he knew him. . . . He could reveal God to men because, having been ever with the Father, he had also been near to all men from their beginning, as the Light lightening every man coming into the world. He was the Root, and because he was the Root, he was also the Head of humanity. He could redeem humanity, and he alone could, because it was his own; because he was in some way already one with it; because in its deepest roots the human personality was bound to him. He did not, therefore, first become a Redeemer when he came to our earth in human form. He could redeem in time, because he had been the Deliverer before his incarnation—because it was his nature to be so." So far so well. There is, however, one great aspect of the work and mission of Christ which Mr. Maurice ignored, that brought the charge of heterodoxy to his door. The necessity of vindicating the authority of a broken law, the obligation from which even God himself could not escape of only pardoning when justice had been satisfied, and which, therefore, magnified and made honorable the law that man had disowned and the authority he had despised, are altogether tossed aside by Mr. Maurice. According to him, it is the sin, and not alone, if at all, the penalty of the sin of the world that Christ takes away. The penalty is and must always be borne by those against whom it is directed, and cannot be endured by any at second hand. Need we wonder that this view of the atonement exposed Mr. Maurice to much obloquy? "He transforms the atonement," says the writer already quoted, "into a mere means of reconciling man to God by a process of education. The subjective influence of the sacrifice of Christ—its effects, that is, upon the souls of men, ethically and spiritually—was alone emphasized by him. And whatever benefits may have been wrought by bringing this aspect of the atonement into prominence, obviously it is not the whole scriptural doctrine of sacrifice, as unfolded in the work in which he seeks to deduce that from the Scriptures." Fundamentally defective in this one great doctrine of Christianity, there are yet others in which his influence was mainly pernicious. "Grateful to him as we are for the power with which he vindicated that great truth on which Christianity rests—the incarnation of our Lord—is it not evident that he was apt to resolve this, and with it the whole work of Christ, into the fulfilment of a merely naturalistic order? . . . He clung to the indefinite, afraid of losing hold of the reality by putting thoughts in the place of things—opinions, theories, and speculations about the real, for true contact with and genuine apprehension (or laying hold and grasping) of it. He would not let go his hold upon reality, which somehow was brought near by being revealed to man; but he was satisfied with the *somehow.*" And yet, while there are some points like those mentioned on which we must differ from the teachings of Mr. Maurice, we must concede that, in face of a rationalism which menaces the foundations of Christianity, Mr. Maurice might well be counted, even by the most orthodox, "a champion of revelation." We do not so much refer to his influence upon those who, accepting his theological teaching in its entirety, may be called his disciples, as to the far more diffused influence exercised by him upon the general religious thought of England. The very corner-

stone of this influence lies in his vivid and unfailing apprehension of the revelation of God in Christ as a present reality, exactly fitted to accomplish all that the world needs.

Mr. Maurice held for many years the professorship of divinity in King's College. The peculiar views advocated in his *Theological Essays* deprived him of this position, and he was thereafter confined to the office of chaplain to Lincoln's Inn. In 1860 the queen, in addition, appointed him incumbent of the district church of Vere Street, Marylebone, and in 1866 he was honored with a call to the chair of moral philosophy at Cambridge. He died at his residence in London, April 1, 1872, the object of universal admiration. "By not a few he was 'worshipped on this side idolatry,' while by a large number of outsiders he was regarded with affectionate veneration. These feelings culminated at his death in a display of feeling such as it is given to few to call forth. The unanimity of the testimony borne to his character and work by the many journals, secular and religious, that chronicled his decease, was an index of the general sentiment. It was felt everywhere that England had lost a veritable hero in the battle for truth, and the Church a bright ornament and exemplar of the practical graces of the Christian life."

It must not be believed that Mr. Maurice's labors were confined to the theological or philosophical arena. It has been truly said by the *Athenæum* that he "lived during his allotted term the lives of many men." He was the originator, or one of the originators, of the Christian socialistic movement, the design of which was to break down the system of competitive labor, and elevate the working classes by teaching them to associate together in little companies, undertaking work in common, and sharing the proceeds. With a view to preparing working-men for such a task, he founded a working-men's college in London, to which in his last years he devoted much of his time and attention. He also took great interest in the cause of female education. Indeed, there are few social questions of any importance to which his sympathies did not extend. See *Fraser's Magazine*, 1854 (April); *Scribner's Monthly*, 1872 (Sept.); *British Quart. Rev.* 1873 (Jan.), art. ii; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* s. v.

Maurice, Henry, D.D., an English divine, flourished near the middle of the 17th century as chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. He published *A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy*, in answer to Baxter's *Church History of Bishops* (Lond. 1682, 8vo):—*Sermons* (1682, 4to; 1744, 4to):—*A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy*, in answer to David Clarkson's *Primitive Episcopacy* (Lond. 1700):—*Doubts concerning Roman Infallibility*. See Gibson's *Preservative*, iv, 271; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, s. v.

Maurice, Thomas, an English divine and scholar, noted particularly for his studies of the antiquities of India, was born about 1755 at Hertford, where his father was then head-master of the Christ's Hospital school. After his father's death the family was impoverished by an unfortunate marriage of the widow, and his education proceeded irregularly till Dr. Parr, on opening his school at Stanmore, was prevailed on to receive him as a pupil, and treated him with great generosity and kindness. Destined for the Church, he entered at nineteen St. John's College, Oxford, whence he removed next year to University College. After taking his degree of B.A., he was ordained by bishop Lowth, and held for some time the curacy of the large parish of Woodford, in Essex, which in 1785 he resigned for a chapel at Epping, in order to obtain greater leisure for study. His turn for historical studies had been fostered at University College by his distinguished tutor Lord Stowell, and he now began to concentrate his attention on the history of India, for treating upon which he made proposals in 1790 in a published letter addressed to the East India directors. The irreligious spirit of the French Revolution, alarming Mr. Maurice's mind, induced him to remodel his first work after it was nearly completed, and to devote a considerable proportion of it to dissertations on the Hindû mythology. In 1791 he came before the public with two volumes of his *Indian Antiquities:* the rest were brought out at intervals, the completion of the work being mainly owing to the liberality of the earl of Harborough; and the seventh and last volume appeared in 1797. This work remains to our day a trustworthy book of reference. Meantime he had undertaken a *History of Hindostan*, the three volumes of which, in quarto, were published in 1795, 1798, 1799, and a second edition appeared in 1821. In 1798 earl Spencer presented him to the vicarage of Wormleighton, in Warwickshire; next year he was appointed assistant librarian in the British Museum; in 1800 bishop Tomline obtained for him the pension that had been held by the poet Cowper; and in 1804 he received from the lord chancellor the vicarage of Cudham, in Kent. His *Modern History of Hindostan*, in two volumes, appeared in 1802 and 1804. Several other volumes on Eastern history and theology, and attempts in verse, succeeded this work; and one of his last undertakings was his *Memoirs, comprehending the History of the Progress of Indian Literature, and Anecdotes of Literary Characters in Britain, during a Period of Thirty Years*. Of this work the three volumes appeared in 1819, 1820, and 1822. He died March 30, 1824. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Mauritius AND THE THEBAIC LEGION. The legend concerning St. Mauritius and his fellow-soldiers originated with Eucherius, bishop of Lyons († about 450), and was first published in A.D. 1662, by the Jesuit Francis Chiffletus, from an old martyrology in the Abbey of St. Claude, in the Jura. A recension of this legend was admitted by Surius into his *Lives of Saints* in 1569, which is drawn from martyrologies of a later date, and was composed by a monk connected with the cloister of St. Maurice, who bore the same name as the bishop, but flourished nearly a century later. Much has been written for and against the authenticity of the legend, but the results of modern criticism seem to indicate that a basis of truth underlies the story. The evidence in its favor reaches to the 4th century, while the adverse proof rests chiefly on the improbability of the events narrated. It relates that during the wars of the emperor Maximian with the Gauls, a legion, known as the Thebaic, was ordered from the East to reinforce his army. It was composed entirely of Christians, and was led by Mauritius. While the emperor rested at Octodurum (now Martigny, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard), the bulk of this legion was stationed at St. Maurice, in the present canton of Wallis, excepting two cohorts, which were sent to Trêves. The army was at this time employed in persecuting Christians, in which service the Thebaic legion was ordered to co-operate. They refused to obey, and the emperor, in a rage, commanded the decimation of the legion. As they remained firm, even after a second decimation, Maximian ordered the massacre of the entire body. Eucherius states that at this period a legion numbered 6600 men, and clearly asserts that the greater portion of this legion perished at St. Maurice, while the martyrology of St. Mauritius adds that officers were sent to Trêves to execute a similar punishment on the two cohorts stationed there. A similar legend occurs in Simeon Metaphrastes, according to which a St. Mauritius with seventy of his soldiers was executed by order of Maximian; but this was probably a Greek adaptation of the Latin story. Grave doubts are cast upon the legend by the great number of fugitives from this massacre which constantly meet us, and by the improbability of the sacrifice of so large a body of troops in time of war. See De Lisle, *Défense de la Vérité du Martyre de la Légion Thébéenne* (1737); the *Acta SS.*,

Surius, and the *Martyrol. Usuardi*, edit. J. B. du Sollier, S. J., Sept. 22, and October 4, 10, 15; also Tillemont, *Mémoires*, tom. iv; Stolberg, ix, 302 sq.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, i, § 16.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 197 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 414 sq.

Maurus, a pupil of Benedict of Nursia, is chiefly known by the account given of him by the monks of the Congregation of St. Maur (q. v.). His history is mainly legendary. He is said to have been the first to introduce the Benedictine rule into France; to have founded its first convent in France at Glanfeuil, in the province of Anjou, and to have died in 584, after having performed a great number of miracles. Such at least are the main points to be gathered from his biography, much mixed up indeed in regard to dates, which appeared in the 9th century. Gregory of Tours makes no mention of him whatever. This, however, appears certain, that France was the field of his labors, for his name was known there before his biography appeared. Yet all the *Maurimonasteria* do not lead us back to him; thus, for instance, that at the foot of the Vosges is named after an abbot of the 8th century. Mabillon and Rainart vainly tried to prove the correctness of the old biography (*Acta Sanctorum ord. S. Bened. sæc.* i, 274 sq.; *Annales ord. S. Bened. sæc.* i, 107 sq., 629 sq.), whilst not only Protestant but also Roman Catholic writers have found ample reason to doubt its genuineness.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 201. (J. N. P.)

Maurus, Rabanus. See Rabanus.

Maury, John Siffrein, a French prelate, and noted also as a pulpit orator, was born June 26, 1746, at Vauréas, in the Venaissin, of poor but respectable parents. He displayed at a very early age great eagerness for learning, and being destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical profession, he was placed at the Seminary of St. Garde, at Avignon, to pursue his theological studies. About 1766 he proceeded to Paris, in the expectation of earning a subsistence by the cultivation of his talents. Though he was without friends in that city, his first publication attracted considerable notice. Encouraged by this early success he took orders, and devoted himself to the study of pulpit eloquence. In 1772 an *Éloge* on Fénelon, which he published, was favorably received by the French Academy, and caused him to be appointed vicar-general of the bishop of Lombez. He however soon returned to Paris, where he became very popular as a preacher. A panegyric of St. Louis, which he delivered before the French Academy, and one of St. Augustine before an assembly of the clergy, met with so much success that king Louis XVI appointed him preacher to the court, and presented him with the living of the abbey Frenade, in the diocese of Saintes. In 1785 he delivered his panegyric on *St. Vincent de Paul*, which is esteemed a masterpiece; shortly after he had the honor to be chosen a member of the Academy in the place of the lyric poet Lefranc de Pompignan, and the following year the valuable benefice of the priory of Lioris was conferred upon him. At the assembly of the States-General in 1789 he was named deputy of the clergy for the bailiwick of Péronne, and soon took a prominent part in the debates. From the first he enlisted himself on the aristocratic side, where his energetic eloquence and peculiar talent at reply rendered him a formidable antagonist to Mirabeau. His impressive and impassioned oratory, though it expressed opinions hostile to the great majority of the assembly, was often listened to with admiration and greeted with applause. His great moral courage and firm adherence to the principles which he had adopted, and which, in spite of the most violent opposition and in the face of the greatest danger, he earnestly advocated, secured for him the respect and esteem of the more enlightened portion of his enemies. November 27, 1790, a decree was passed in the National Assembly, by which every ecclesiastic in the kingdom was required to take an oath to maintain with all his power the new constitution; and, in case of any priest's refusal, it was declared that he should be held to have renounced his benefices. To this constitution the pope had refused his sanction, on account of its hostility to the interests of the Church, and the oath was indignantly refused by the great majority of the clergy. When the day arrived for the taking it by the bishops and clergy of the Assembly, an infuriated mob surrounded the hall, threatening death to all who should refuse. On this occasion also Maury displayed his usual intrepidity, and boldly advocated the independence of his order. "Strike, but hear me," was his exclamation, when the last efforts of his impassioned eloquence in that Assembly were interrupted by the incessant cries of his political antagonists. At the close of the stormy session of the National Assembly, Maury, who could lend no further aid to the prostrate cause of royalty and religion, quitted his native country, and, at the invitation of Pius VI, took up his residence at Rome. He was there received with the highest distinction, and the loss of his benefices in France was more than compensated by his speedy elevation to the highest positions in the gift of the Roman Church. In 1792 he was named archbishop of Nicæa "in partibus infidelium," and afterwards appointed apostolical nuncio to the diet held at Frankfort for the election of the emperor Francis II. This mission accomplished, in 1794 he was elevated to the dignity of a cardinal, and was instituted to the united sees of Monte-Fiascone and Corneto. On the invasion of Italy by the French in 1798, though every effort was made to seize cardinal Maury, he escaped under disguise to Venice, where he assisted at the conclave assembled for the election of Pius VII. In 1799 he returned to Rome upon the conquest of Italy by Suwarrow, and was accredited as ambassador to his exiled king, Louis XVIII, at that time a resident of Mittau. This office he resigned on the reconciliation of the Church of Rome with the government of France under Napoleon (in 1804); thereafter he embraced the cause of the first consul, and was permitted to return to France. This position, which was deemed not to be in unison with the tenor of his former conduct, subjected him in after times to the reproaches and persecutions of the party whom he had served with so much personal hazard. Napoleon gladly received the approaches of so distinguished a member of the Church whose establishment he was restoring in France; an interview took place between them at Genoa, and in May, 1806, Maury reappeared at Paris. The flattering reception he there met with was calculated to attach him to the interests of this chief, who admitted him to his intimacy, and availed himself of his counsels in ecclesiastical matters. He received the pension assigned to the dignity of a French cardinal, and was appointed first almoner of Jerome Bonaparte. In 1807 he was elected a member of the Institute in the place of Target, one of the advocates of the unfortunate Louis XVI. His acceptance in 1810 of the archbishopric of Paris subjected him to the displeasure of Pius VII, between whom and Napoleon there had arisen much disagreement. Cardinal Maury was a warm and sincere admirer of the emperor, and he not only espoused his cause in the disputes with the head of the Church, but took every occasion, which the frequent victories of this chief afforded him, of testifying his gratitude by expressions of admiration in his mandates to the clergy of his diocese. These mandates, written in a style of the most florid eloquence, do not remind us of the impressive and energetic orator of the National Assembly: they were severely criticised by the adherents of the ancient *régime*, and by the witty frequenters of the Parisian saloons, who styled them "archiepiscopal despatches," in allusion to their military tone, and their imitation of the style and manner of Napoleon's bulletins. After the capitulation of Paris on the 30th of March, 1814, Maury was deprived by the Bourbons of the administration of his diocese; and, in their

resentment for his adherence to Napoleon's fortunes, they forgot his former daring and powerful support of their tottering throne. He then returned to Rome, where he was imprisoned during one year by the orders of the pope; he was afterwards allowed to live in retirement on a pension which was given to him in compensation for his resignation of the see of Monte Fiascone. In this retirement, deeply affected by the ingratitude of his former party, and that of the pontiff, to whose elevation he had been instrumental, he died on the 11th of May, 1817. "Notwithstanding his extraordinary eloquence," says the duchess of Abrantes, who knew him intimately, "the abbé Maury had been before the Revolution, what he was in proscription, what he continued under the empire, a man of talent rather than a man of sense, and a curate of the time of the League, rather than an abbé of the reign of Louis XIV." She adds that his figure was in the highest degree disagreeable, but the description she gives of it appears rather a caricature than a portrait. His principal work, *Essais sur l'Eloquence de la Chaire* (3 vols. 8vo), published after his death by his nephew, Louis Siffrein Maury, still maintains its well-merited popularity. His mind was formed to appreciate the eloquence of Massillon, Bossuet, and Bourdaloue, and his criticisms on the other French divines are in general as correct as they are temperate. In his review, however, of English pulpit oratory, he manifests a want of acquaintance with the writings of its most celebrated preachers, such as Jeremy Taylor, Sherlock, and Barrow. He selected Blair as the best model of English eloquence, and the comparison which he draws between him and Massillon is necessarily most unfavorable to Blair. His own panegyric of St. Augustine is esteemed one of the finest pieces of French pulpit eloquence. He is also supposed, conjointly with the abbé de Boismont, to be the author of a work entitled *Lettres sur l'Etat actuel de la Religion et du Clergé en France*. See *Vie du Cardinal Maury* (1827), by Poujoulat; *Le Cardinal Maury, sa Vie et ses Œuvres* (1855); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; *Monthly Review*, vol. lxix (1812), Appendix; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Maüz'zim (מָעֻזִּים Sept. Μαωζείμ v. r. Μαωζεί, Vulg. *Maozim*). The marginal note to the A. V. of Dan. xi, 38, "the God of *forces*," gives, as the equivalent of the last word, "*Mauzzim*, or gods protectors, or munitions." The Geneva version renders the Hebrew as a proper name both in Dan. xi, 38 and 39, where the word occurs again (marg. of A. V. "munitions"). In the Greek version of Theodotion, given above, it is treated as a proper name, as well as in the Vulgate. The Sept., as at present printed, is evidently corrupt in this passage, but ἰσχυρά (ver. 37) appears to represent the word in question. In Jerome's time the reading was different, and he gives "Deum fortissimum" for the Latin translation of it, and "Deum fortitudinum" for that of Aquila. He ridicules the interpretation of Porphyry, who, ignorant of Hebrew, understood by "the god of *Mauzzim*" the statue of Jupiter set up in Modin, the city of Mattathias and his sons, by the generals of Antiochus, who compelled the Jews to sacrifice to it, "the god of Modin." Theodoret retains the reading of Theodotion (Μαζωείμ being evidently for Μαωζείμ), and explains it of Antichrist, "a god strong and powerful." The Peshito-Syriac has "the strong god," and Junius and Tremellius render it "Deum summi roboris," considering the Hebrew plural as intensive, and interpreting it of the God of Israel. There can be little doubt that "Mauzzim" is to be taken in its literal sense of "fortresses," just as in Dan. xi, 19, 39, "the god of fortresses" being then the deity who presided over strongholds. But beyond this it is scarcely possible to connect an appellation so general with any special object of idolatrous worship. Grotius conjectured that Mauzzim was a modification of the name Ἄζιζος, the war-god of the Phœnicians, mentioned in Julian's hymn to the sun (Beyer, *Addit. ad* Seldenii "*De Dea Syria*," p. 275). Calvin suggested that it denoted "money," the strongest of all powers. By others it has been supposed to be Mars, the tutelary deity of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is the subject of allusion. The only authority for this supposition exists in two coins struck at Laodicea, which are believed to have on the obverse the head of Antiochus with a radiated crown, and on the reverse the figure of Mars with a spear. But it is asserted, on the contrary, that all known coins of Antiochus Epiphanes bear his name, and that it is mere conjecture which attributes these to him; and, further, that there is no ancient authority to show that a temple to Mars was built by Antiochus at Laodicea. The opinion of Gesenius is more probable, that "the god of fortresses" was Jupiter Capitolinus, for whom Antiochus built a temple at Antioch (Livy, xli, 20). By others it is referred to Jupiter Olympius, to whom Antiochus dedicated the Temple at Jerusalem (2 Macc. vi, 2). See JUPITER. Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.), comparing Isa. xxxiii, 4, where the reference is to Tyre, "the fortress of the sea," makes מָעֻזּוֹ חַיָּם equivalent to מָעֻזִּים, or even proposes to read for the former מָעֻזּוֹ יָם, the god of the "stronghold of the sea," i. e. Melkart, the Tyrian Hercules. A suggestion made by Mr. Layard (*Nineveh*, ii, 456, note) is worthy of being recorded, as being at least as well founded as any already mentioned. After describing Hera, the Assyrian Venus, as "standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess," he adds in a note, "May she be connected with the 'El Maozem,' the deity presiding over bulwarks and fortresses, the 'god of forces,' of Dan. xi, 38?" Pfeiffer (*Dub. Vex.* cent. iv, loc. 72) will only see in it "the idol of the *mass!*"

Maw (מֵכָה, *kebah'*, *hollow*, only occurs in Deut. xviii, 3), the rough *ventricle* or *echinus* of ruminating animals, which is the second of their four stomachs (Aristotle, *Hist. anim.* ii, 17). So the Vulg., Onkelos, Saadias, and Kimahi interpret; but Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 4), Philo (ii, 235, ed. Mang.), after the Sept. (ἔννυστρον, i. e. ἠννυστρον), understand the fourth stomach, or *omasum*, esteemed a great delicacy (like *tripe*) among the ancients (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 571 ed. Lips.).

Mawmoisine or **Malvoisine**, WILLIAM DE, a Scotch Roman Catholic prelate, supposed to be a native of France, flourished in Scotland about the opening of the 13th century. He was made bishop of St. Andrew's in 1202; established many monasteries in that country, and was active in promoting a crusade to the Holy Land.

Mawson, MATTHIAS, D.D., an English divine of the 18th century, became master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1732; subsequently rector of Hadstock, Essex; bishop of Llandaff in 1738; was translated to Chichester in 1740, and in 1754 to Ely. He died about 1771. Bishop Mawson published only occasional *Sermons* (Lond. 1732, '52, '40, '41, '43, '46, '50). See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Maxcy, JONATHAN, D.D., a Baptist minister and noted American educator, was born in Attleborough, Mass., Sept. 2, 1768; graduated at Brown University in 1787, and immediately became a tutor in that institution. Deciding for the ministry, he was licensed to preach April 1, 1790, and was on Sept. 8, 1791, ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I. He was on the same day also elected both a trustee and professor of divinity in the college, and in July, 1792, became president. His pastoral relations he severed September 8, 1792. In 1802 he accepted the presidency of Union College; and in 1804, the newly-established South Carolina College having chosen him for its first president, he heeded the call, in the hope that a Southern climate would improve his health, which had become much impaired. Over this institution he con-

tinued to preside, with almost unprecedented popularity, until his death, June 4, 1820. Dr. Maxcy was one of the most accomplished pulpit orators and scholars this country has produced. He was well versed in philology, criticism, metaphysics, logic, politics, morals, and philosophy. His character was very amiable and his piety sincere. His death was that of the believer in Jesus, and his memory is widely revered. He published a large number of sermons, addresses, orations, etc., which after his death were gathered in a volume, entitled *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Jonathan Maxcy, D.D., with a Memoir of his Life*, by Romeo Elton, D.D. The most valued of his publications were his sermons on the existence of God, frequently republished. See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 297; *Christian Review*, vol. ix; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Maxentius. See CONSTANTINE.

Maxfield, THOMAS, a noted early Methodist lay-preacher, flourished in the latter part of the 18th century. He was one of Wesley's converts at Bristol, and was appointed to pray and expound the Scriptures, but not to preach, at the Foundery, in London, during Mr. Wesley's absence. Maxfield, however, being a young man of "much fervency of spirit, and mighty in the Scriptures," greatly edified the people, who, assembling in vast crowds, and listening with earnest attention, insensibly led him to deviate from this restriction and begin to preach. Wesley was informed of this irregularity, and hastened to London in alarm to check him, his prejudices for "Church order" being still strong. The mother of Wesley counselled him to hear Maxfield preach before reproving him, adding, "But take care what you do respecting that young man; he is as surely called of God to preach as you are." Wesley heard him, and, his prejudices yielding to the power of truth, he objected no longer. Thus Maxfield became the first of the innumerable itinerant lay-preachers, who have spread the Gospel throughout the world more successfully than any other class of the Christian community. Wesley promoted his welfare in every way, introduced him in London to a social position superior to his birth, by which he was enabled to make an advantageous marriage, and obtained ordination for him in Ireland from the bishop of Londonderry, who favored Wesley in that country. Maxfield was present at the first Methodist Conference, which was held at the Foundery, London, June 25, 1774. Maxfield also attended the third Conference assembled at Bristol, May, 1746. He shared the persecution to which the followers of Wesley were subjected; was at one time seized and imprisoned for the king's service, thrown into a dungeon, and offered to the commander of a ship of war. In 1763, during a revival in London, great excitement was produced by an honest madman, Bell, formerly a life-guardsman, who had become a local preacher, and supposed that he had performed a miraculous cure. Possessing more enthusiasm than judgment, he became fanatical in public meetings, and greatly excited his hearers. He unfortunately obtained much influence over Maxfield—the latter was not naturally an enthusiast—and made him a companion in his fanaticism. Both the Wesleys conversed with Maxfield on the subject, telling him what they disliked in his conduct. In some matters he had been unjustly blamed, in others he promised to change; the evil, however, was not remedied, but seemed rather to increase. Then Mr. Wesley wrote a long letter to Maxfield, plainly telling him of the errors of his preaching and conduct, and of its tendency towards a separation from the Wesleyans. The doctrines advocated by Maxfield and Bell were erroneous, inasmuch as they taught that a person saved from sin need not examine himself, need not pray in private, need *only* believe; that *believing* makes man perfect, and that the pure in heart cannot fall from grace. They said no one thus saved could be taught by any one who was not. They were thus led to consider themselves the only persons really capable of interpreting the Gospel and qualified to teach it, and soon regarded themselves as inspired, mistaking the workings of their own imaginations for the voice of the Spirit, and neglecting knowledge, reason, and wisdom generally. Maxfield finally decided to separate from Mr. Wesley, and accordingly gave up his work at the Foundery, and took with him one hundred and seventy persons who had embraced the Wesleyan cause. He now opened an independent chapel, and preached for twenty years. Towards the close of Maxfield's life, Wesley, in his travels through England, found him sinking under paralysis and the weight of years, prayed with him, invoking God's blessing on his last days, and subsequently preached in his chapel. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism* (Index in vol. iii); Smith, *Hist. of Wesley and his Time;* Tyerman, *Life of Wesley* (see Index in vol. iii).

Maximian. See DIOCLETIAN.

Maximianists, a considerable party among the Donatists who separated from the main body of that sect, and arrogated to themselves the exclusive possession of those qualities of perfection and infallibility to which the whole sect had made pretensions when they separated from the Catholic Church. See DONATISTS.

Maximilian I, one of the most distinguished of the German emperors, the son and successor of Frederick III, the forerunner of Charles V, was born at Neustadt, near Vienna, March 22, 1459. In his nineteenth year he married Maria, the only child and heiress of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, who died in 1482. Maximilian had hoped to enjoy the estates of his father-in-law, but Louis XI of France attempted to seize some of these possessions, and thus involved our German prince in a contest which, when it promised to end favorably for Maximilian, was suddenly turned in favor of Louis XI by the dexterous intrigues of the latter among the Netherlanders. It was not until 1493 that peace was finally established at Senlis. This very year his father the emperor died, and Maximilian succeeded to the government of the vast possessions of the Teutonic realm, so soon to become the theatre of one of the greatest revolutions the world has ever been called upon to witness—the Reformation of the 16th century—an event that was ushered in just as Maximilian himself was fast fading as the shades of evening. In 1494 the newly-crowned emperor married Bianca Sforza, daughter of the duke of Milan, which alliance gave rise to a succession of wars in Italy. Shortly after he joined the League of Cambray, formed between pope Julius II, Ferdinand of Spain, and Louis XII of France, against the Venetians; but that republic having soon after become reconciled to the pope, Maximilian joined the so-called Holy League between England, Spain, Venice, and the pope, in opposition to the French, who were signally defeated by the forces of Henry VIII and the emperor in the "battle of the spurs," near Guinegate (1513). The ascension of Francis I to the throne of France somewhat modified matters in favor of the French. The new king of the Franks captured Milan, and compelled Maximilian to give up Verona to the Venetians for 200,000 ducats. By the treaty of Basle (1499) he had been obliged to acknowledge the independence of Switzerland. Though thus unsuccessful in his wars, he had the fortune to see the hereditary dominions of his house increased during his reign by several peaceful additions; and the marriage of his son Philip with the infanta Juana, and of his daughter Margaret with the infant Juan of Spain, led to the subsequent union of Spain with Austria, while the marriage of two of his grandchildren with the son and daughter of Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Bohemia, brought both these kingdoms to the Austrian monarchy. The closing activity of his reign was displayed against the rising heresy. Luther had just come forward and attacked Tetzel (1517), and, as Leo X was inclined to make light of the opposition of the little

Augustine friar, Maximilian addressed the Roman pontiff, and persuaded him to heed this difficulty as "a question which was dividing Germany." But in the very year in which the discussion at Leipzic came off Maximilian died (1519), and left it for his successor Charles V to further the cause of Protestantism by a blind obedience to the dictates of an incompetent Roman pontiff. Maximilian I was a liberal patron of literature, and learned men were greatly encouraged by him. Indeed he was himself an author, producing several works in prose and verse. See Hegewisch, *Gesch. d. Regierung Maximilians I* (1782; new ed. Leipz. 1818); Haltaus, *Gesch. d. Kaisers Maximilian* (1850); Klüpfel, *Kaiser Maximilian I* (Berl. 1864); Lichnowsky, *Gesch. d. Hauses Habsburg;* Vehse, *Memoirs of Austria*, i, 2-33; Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, i, 278 sq.; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, p. 234 sq.

Maximilian II, emperor of Austria, son of emperor Ferdinand I, and of Anna of Hungary, was born at Vienna Aug. 1, 1527. He was educated in Spain by Charles V; took part in the war of Smalcald (1544-48) against the French; became viceroy of Spain in 1549; on his return to Germany, about 1551, he made the treaty of Passau, and in 1552 became governor of Hungary. In September, 1562, he was crowned king of Bohemia; elected king of Rome at Frankfort in November of the same year; king of Hungary at Presburg in 1563; and finally succeeded his father as emperor of Germany in July, 1564. He made war against the Turks, in Hungary, until 1567, but afterwards reigned in peace. During his youth his preceptor, Wolfgang Stiefel, had made him acquainted with the Protestant tenets, and he showed himself favorable to the Reformation, living on very friendly terms with the Protestant princes (Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation* [N. Y. 1873, 8vo], p. 423). Yet he did not allow their doctrines free scope throughout his empire, as the majority in the states was opposed to it, and the Protestants themselves, divided into Lutherans and Calvinists, were engaged in strife with each other. From the manner in which he sought the friendship and alliance of Romish princes, it must appear that Maximilian II never allowed his private convictions to rule him as a monarch, but that all was made subservient to the interests of the empire. Some will even have it, as Vehse (see below), that he was at one time a convert to the Protestant religion (comp. Baker, *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 211). He, however, granted the Protestants in 1568 liberty to worship God according to their conscience throughout Austria, and commissioned D. Chytræus to draw up a Protestant liturgy for Austria. Although he was opposed to the Jesuits, and subjected them to many restrictions, he yet, by his toleration, permitted them access and great influence in his own family. He died Oct. 12, 1576. See J. F. Miller, *Epistolæ Ferdinandi I et M. II* (Pesth, 1808); Koch, *Quellen z. Gesch. M. II* (Leipz. 1857-61); Ranke, *Historisch-politischer Zeitschr.* (1832, p. 278 sq.); and the same reprinted in *Deutsche Gesch.* (1868), vol. vi; Bernard Raupach, *Evang. Oesterreich*, vol. i and ii; Lebret, *Magazin z. Gebrauch d. Staaten und Kirchengesch.* (Ulm, 1785), vol. ix; Maurenbrecher, in Sybel's *Histor. Zeitschrift*, 1862, p. 351 sq.; E. Reimann, in the same journal, 1866, p. 1 sq.; Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ii, 4 sq.; Vehse, *Memoirs of the House of Austria*, i, 217 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, xi, 29; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 204.

Maximin I, Julius Verus, Roman emperor, was a native of Thrace, and a shepherd in his youth. His fine figure, great height, and strength attracted the notice of the emperor Severus, who enrolled him in his guards. Maximin advanced rapidly, but did not serve under either Macrinus or Heliogabalus. During the reign of Alexander Severus he came to Rome, was made senator and chief of a newly-formed legion, took an active part in the wars against the Persians and Allemans, and soon gained great influence over the soldiers. When Alexander Severus was killed at Mayence, March 19, 235, the troops appointed Maximin his successor, and the senate, frightened, confirmed the election. He remained, however, with the army, and made several expeditions into Germany. His disposition was naturally cruel, and he gave full scope to it when on the throne. Two conspiracies against him which were discovered led to fearful massacres; in the first, it is said, over four thousand persons were executed. He also opposed Christianity, and particularly persecuted the bishops who had been most favored by Alexander. About the same time some earthquakes occurred in the empire, particularly in Cappadocia, and the people became enraged against the Christians, whom they accused of being the cause of all the evils which befell them, and the emperor allowed free scope to all barbarities the people chose to inflict on them. The persecution, indeed, broke out only in some parts of the empire, so that Christians could flee before it; but as the Christians had of late become used to toleration, this sudden visitation of persecution fell severely upon their heads, and caused much suffering (comp. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* vi, 28; Firmilian, in Cypr. *Ep.* 75; Origen, *Comment. in Matt. xxiv*, 9). Finally his soldiers, tired of his tyranny and cruelty, murdered him, together with his son, at Aquileia, March, 238. Maximin was only regretted by the inhabitants of Thrace and Pannonia, who were proud of having an emperor of their own; the other parts of the empire rejoiced over his death. The legendary poesy of the 10th century assigns to the reign of Maximin the fabulous martyrdom of St. Ursula, a British princess, and her company of eleven thousand (according to others, ten thousand) virgins, who, on their return from a pilgrimage to Rome, were murdered by heathens in the neighborhood of Cologne. "This incredible number has probably arisen from the misinterpretation of an inscription, like 'Ursula et Undecimilla' (which occurs in an old missal of the Sorbonne), or 'Ursula et XI M. V., i. e. Martyres Virgines, which, by substituting *millia* for *martyres*, was increased from eleven martyrs to eleven thousand virgins. Some historians place the fact, which seems to form the basis of this legend, in connection with the retreat of the Huns after the battle of Chalons, 451" (Schaff). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* ix, 207; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii, 983; Schaff, *Church Hist.* i, 170; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, i, 115.

Coin of Maximin I.

Maximin II, Daza, Roman emperor, was originally an Illyrian peasant, who served in the Roman armies, and was raised by Galerius, who was his relative, to the rank of military tribune, and lastly, A.D. 303, at the time of the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, to the dignity of Cæsar, receiving for his share the government of Syria and Egypt. After the death of Galerius, in 311, Maximin and Licinius divided his dominions between them, and Maximin obtained the whole of the Asiatic provinces. Both he and Licinius behaved ungratefully towards the family of Galerius, their common benefactor. Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and widow of Galerius, having escaped from Licinius into the dominions of Maximin, the latter offered to marry her, and on her refusal banished her with her mother into the deserts of Syria. He gained unenviable notoriety

by his severity towards his Christian subjects, and made war against the Armenians. A new war having broken out between Licinius and Maximin, the latter advanced as far as Adrianople, but was defeated, fled into Asia, and died of poison at Tarsus in 313.—*English Cyclop.* s. v.

Coin of Maximin II.

Maximus Alexandrinus, called also the *Cynic Philosopher*, was born in the fourth century, in Alexandria, of Christian parents of rank. He united the faith of an orthodox believer with the appearance and conduct of a cynic philosopher, and was greatly respected by the leading theologians of the orthodox party. Athanasius, in a letter written about A.D. 371 (*Epist. ad Maxim. Philosoph.* in *Opp.* i, 917, etc., ed. Benedict.), compliments him on a work written in defence of the orthodox faith. Tillemont and the Benedictine editor of the works of Gregory Nazianzen (*Monitum ad Orat. xxv*), misled by the virulent invectives of that father, attempt to distinguish between this Maximus and the one to whom Athanasius wrote, for the reason that Athanasius could never have approved of so worthless a character. They also distinguish him from the Maximus to whom Basil the Great addressed a letter (*Ep.* 41, Paris, 1839) in terms of great respect, discussing some points of doctrine, and soliciting a visit from him; but they are not successful in either case. The Maximus Scholasticus, however, to whom Basil also wrote (*Ep.* 42), was a different person. In A.D. 374, during the reign of the emperor Valens, in the persecution carried on by Lucius, Arian patriarch of Alexandria, Maximus was barbarously scourged and banished to the Oasis, on account of his zeal for orthodoxy, and the alacrity with which he aided those enduring the same persecutions (Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. xxv*, c. 13, 14). He was released at the end of four years, probably on the death of Valens; and it was soon after this event that he presented to the emperor Gratian at Milan his work *De Fide*, written against the Arians (compare Jerome, *De Viris Illustr.* c. 127). He wrote also against other heretics, but whether in the same work or in another is not certainly known; and he disputed ably against the heathens. He appears to have returned from Milan and visited Constantinople, where Gregory Nazianzen had just been made patriarch, A.D. 379. Gregory received him with the greatest honor, and pronounced an oration (*Orat. xxv*) in his praise, where his warm panegyrics cause the commendations of Athanasius and Basil to seem exceedingly tame. He welcomed him at his table, treated him with much confidence and regard, but was subsequently grievously disappointed in him. Whether in the succeeding events Maximus was himself ambitious or merely the tool of others, does not appear. Profiting by the sickness of Gregory, and supported by some Egyptian ecclesiastics, sent by Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, under whose guidance they professed to act, Maximus was ordained, during the night, patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Gregory, whose election had not been perfectly canonical. This bold proceeding greatly excited the indignation of the people, with whom Gregory was popular. The emperor Theodosius, to whom the usurper applied, showing him no favor, the latter withdrew to Alexandria, from whence he was speedily expelled by his patron Peter (see Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de Vita sua*, vss. 750–1029). The resignation of Gregory did not benefit Maximus. His election was declared null and void by the second general council, and the presbyters whom he had ordained were declared not to be presbyters (*Concil. Constantinop.* can. 3, sec. Dionys. Exiguum; *Capital.* 6, sec. Isidor. Mercat; apud *Concil.* vol. i, col. 809, 810, ed. Hardouin). He attempted again to assert his claims to the patriarchate; but, though the Italian bishops seemed inclined for a time to second his efforts, he met with no permanent success. The invectives of Gregory Nazianzen against Maximus (*Carmina*, sec. *De Vita sua*, l. c.; *In Invidos*, vs. 16, etc.; *In Maximum*) were written after their struggle for the patriarchate, and contrast strongly with his former praises in his twenty-fifth Oration, to which some of Gregory's admirers, to conceal the inconsistency, prefixed the name of Heron or Hero (*In Laudem Heronis;* Jerome, *De Viris Illustr.* l. c.), which it still bears. The work of Maximus, *De Fide*, which is well spoken of by Jerome, is lost. (See Athenas, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, *l. c.;* Sozomen, *H. E.* vii, 9, cum not. Vales; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ix, 443, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 380, i, 276, ed. Oxford, 1740–42; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iii, 520).—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Maximus Confessor, a leading champion of orthodoxy in the Monothelite controversy (q. v.), was born at Constantinople in 580. At an early age he became private secretary to the emperor Heraclius, but, deciding for the ecclesiastic state, he resigned this position, and in 630 entered the monastery of Chrysopolis (Scutari), near Constantinople, and in a short time became its abbot. The dangers which threatened the state at the time induced the emperor to attempt a reconciliation between the parties engaged in the Monophysite controversy (q. v.), by means of a compromise, which declared that Christ had accomplished the work of redemption by *one* manifestation of his will as the God-man, (*μιᾷ Θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ*). The patriarchs Sergius, of Constantinople, and Cyrus, of Alexandria, as heads of the contending parties, agreed in 633 to unite on this formula, and many of the Monophysite faction returned to the Church; but several of the orthodox opposed the compromise strongly, as practically endorsing Monophysite views. With a view to put an end to these troubles, the emperor in 639 published an edict, known as the *Ecthesis* (q. v.), which prohibited all controversies on the question whether in Christ were one or two operations, but which itself plainly inculcated the doctrine of one will. Maximus, who had in the mean time removed to Africa, now entered the lists in defence of the orthodox view, and unequivocally resisted all attempts to undermine the faith of the Church. His course was favored by Gregorius (or Georgius), the prefect of North Africa, who sought an opportunity to renounce his allegiance to the Byzantine court; and under his protection Maximus exerted himself to the utmost to combat the many heresies which were then rife, manifesting a special zeal against the Monophysite Severians in Egypt and Crete, and against the Monothelites. His discussion with Pyrrhus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who had fled to Gregorius on being charged with complicity in the murder of the emperor Constantine, was held in July, A.D. 645, and resulted in the signal triumph of Maximus. The records of this disputation belong to the most interesting writings of the Monothelite controversy. In the following year the bishops of Africa and the neighboring isles, influenced by Maximus, held a number of synods which condemned Monothelitism, and called on Theodore, bishop of Rome, to support their views with his authority. Maximus now went to Rome, accompanied by Pyrrhus, who formally recanted his late opinions, and was recognised by the pope as the rightful patriarch of Constantinople; and thus a coalition in the interests of orthodoxy was formed which promised a complete triumph. But Maximus was the only disinterested party to the agreement. Gregorius fell in a battle with the Saracens in A.D. 647; Pyrrhus hastened to take back his recantation, and to make his peace with the emperor; and the pope, disappointed in the hope of seeing his supremacy recognised in the East as well as in the West,

anathematized him. Maximus was again compelled to confine his labors to controversial writings. He was now recognised at the imperial court as the soul of the opposition; and when he resisted the edict of Constans II, promulgated in A.D. 648, and known as the *Typus* (q. v.), Gregorius, an envoy of the Byzantine court, did not disdain to seek him in his cell, and attempt to shake his firmness. The monk, however, refused to make any concessions, since he regarded that edict as degrading Christ to the level of a being without will or energy, and denied the right of the emperor to interfere in dogmatic questions. On the accession of Martin I, Maximus, more than any others, induced that pope to convene the first synod of the Lateran (in 649); and there can be no doubt that he originated the resolutions there adopted, which condemned Monothelitism and the imperial edict. Thereafter Maximus entered a cloister, and we lose trace of the detailed record of his life. We meet him again when apprehended, under orders from Constantinople, perhaps at the same time as pope Martin I, and brought to trial in 655. The proceedings (of which the records are quite full) show that the aim of the emperor was simply to secure his approval of the τύπος, as a measure in the interests of peace; but the monk remained firm, and declared with tears that the only means of securing peace was the recall of that instrument. Hence the treatment he received became harsher; and when, after his third trial, he still persisted in maintaining his views, a synod convened by the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch advised the emperor to banish him, and he was taken to the castle of Bizya, in Thrace, later to the monastery of St. Theodore, near Rhegium, and finally to Perberis. His exile was protracted more than a year, during which period frequent attempts were made by bishop Theodosius of Cæsarea, and by special agents of the emperor to induce him to recant, but always without success. He was finally condemned to be scourged, and to lose his tongue and his right hand, that he might no longer be able either to speak or write, and afterwards to be incarcerated in the castle of Shemari, in the country of the Lacians, where he died, Aug. 13, 662. His influence, however, continued to be felt. A few years later the emperor Constans II fell a victim to the hatred he had aroused chiefly by his persecution of this faithful champion of the Church, and in A.D. 680 the Church gave her sanction to the doctrines so heroically defended by this monk in the first Trullan council (q. v.).

As a writer Maximus is distinguished by a rare combination of dialectic power with mystical profundity. His mind was receptive rather than creative, and in his works Platonic and Aristotelian thought, Chalcedonian orthodoxy, the theology of the Greek fathers, and the ideas of a Christian mysticism, which includes both the subjective ascetism of the Egyptian monks and the hierarchical tendencies of the Areopagite system, all meet and coalesce. The mysticism of the Pseudo-Dionysius exerted the greatest influence over him, and from it he derived his principal thoughts; and it is chiefly because of his authority that the wide-spread influence of this system upon the theology of the Middle Ages was possible. The influence exerted on Scotus Erigena by the writings of Maximus was especially important. Baur asserts that Erigena merely developed the ideas of Maximus, and commented on them; and other writers have shown in detail that the essential features of the system of Erigena are drawn from Maximus, and mediately through him from the Areopagite. This monk thus becomes important as a connecting link between the ideas of the East and West, between the early fathers and the Middle Ages, and as a forerunner of scholasticism; and in his genius, character, piety, learning, literary and ecclesiastical influence, as well as in his eventful life, he appears one of the most remarkable Christian thinkers and martyrs. His works have been largely transcribed and read, but there is no complete edition. Combefis has published a collection in two volumes, folio (Paris, 1675). Catalogues have recorded the titles of fifty-three, his letters being mentioned as one work. Of these, forty-eight have been printed. They may be classed as exegetical, which treat the Scriptures in allegorical style; commentaries on the Church fathers; dogmatico-polemical; moral and ascetic; epistolary; and miscellaneous. He is commemorated in the Latin Church Aug. 13; by the Greek Church Jan. 21. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xx, 114 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 783 sq.; Kurtz, *Church Hist.* i, 205 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 72 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 366 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, ii, 274 sq.; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, ii, 423 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Maximus THE GREEK, a celebrated personage in Russian Church history, was born at Arta, in Albania, towards the end of the 15th century. After studying at Paris, Florence, and other cities then distinguished as seats of learning, he took the monastic vows at the cloister of Mount Athos. The grand-duke Vassili Ivanovitch, having requested the patriarch of Constantinople to send two persons to arrange and describe a vast number of Greek manuscripts and books that had recently been discovered in some part of the palace, Maximus was selected, and accordingly set out for Moscow. He was directed by Vassili to examine the books, and to select such as were most deserving of publication; but as he was then wholly ignorant of the Slavonic tongue, he had first to prepare a Latin version, which was afterwards rendered by others into Slavonian. It was thus that the translations of a Psalter with a commentary, and Chrysostom's *Homilies on St. John*, were produced. Desirous of returning to his convent, it was only at the instances of the Czar, who wished him to revise the earlier translated books of the Greek Church, that he decided to remain, and he then undertook this task, for which he was now qualified by a successful mastery of the Slavonian. The diligence with which he executed it, resulting in many corrections, tended however only to raise up numerous enemies against him, among the rest Daniel the metropolitan. But what more immediately tended to his disgrace was the firmness with which he opposed Vassili's divorce from his first wife, Salome (on account of barrenness), and his marriage with the princess Helena Glinski (comp. Duncan, *Hist. of Russia*, p. 350). Maximus was condemned by a synod, excommunicated as a heretic, and imprisoned in the Otrotch monastery at Tver in 1525. In this confinement he was for some time treated with great rigor, though the bishop of Tver interceded for him. At length removed to the Monastery of St. Sergius, he died there in 1556. A great number of works by him are extant, chiefly in manuscript, on a variety of subjects—dogmatical, polemical, philosophical, etc., from which considerable information has been derived with regard to the opinions and prejudices of the clergy and people in that age; nor was he at all timid in reproving the abuses and vices of the times. This alone would account for the persecution which he drew down upon himself; but after his death even those who had been among the more violent against him admitted his innocence, nor was it long before his memory came to be regarded as that of a holy man and a martyr.—*English Cyclop.* s. v.; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Maximus OF JERUSALEM (*Hierosolymitanus*), a Greek ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the latter part of the 2d century. Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 47) speaks of Maximus as writing on the questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter, and as having lived under the emperors Commodus (A.D. 180–193) and Severus (A.D. 193–211), but he does not designate what office he held in the Church, or whether he held any; nor does he connect him with any locality. Honorius of Autun (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, 47), extracting from Jerome, mentions the name of Maximinus; and Rufinus,

translating from Eusebius, who has a brief passage relating to the same writer (*H. E.* v, 27), gives the name in the same form; but it is probably incorrect. A Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, lived in the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius, or the early part of that of Commodus, somewhere between A.D. 156 and A.D. 185; another Maximus occupied the same see from A.D. 185, and the successive episcopates of himself and seven successors occupy about eighty years, the duration of each episcopate not being known. The date of this latter Maximus of Jerusalem accords sufficiently with the notice in Jerome respecting the writer; but it is remarkable that though both Eusebius and Jerome mention the bishop (Eusebius, *Chronic.* and Jerome, *Euseb. Chronic. Interpretatio*), they do not either of them identify the writer with him; and it is remarkable that in the list given by Eusebius of the bishops of Jerusalem, in his *Histor. Eccles.* (v, 27), the names of the second Maximus and his successor Antoninus do not appear. It is uncertain, therefore, whether the writer and the bishop are the same, though it is extremely probable they were. The title of the work of Maximus noticed by Jerome and Eusebius (for the two questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter appear to have been comprehended in one treatise) was *De Materia.* Eusebius has given a long extract from it (*Præp. Evang.* vii, 21, 22). A portion of the same extract is inserted, without acknowledgment, in the *Dialogus Adamantii de recta in Deum Fide*, or *Contra Marcionitas*, sect. iv, commonly attributed to Origen, but in reality written long after his time. It is also quoted in the *Philocalia*, c. 24, compiled by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great almost entirely from the works of Origen. In the inscription to the chapter they are said to be from the *Præparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius; and their being contained also in the supposed work of Origen, *De Recta Fide*, is affirmed in a probably interpolated sentence of the concluding paragraph of the chapter (Delarue, *Opera Origenis*, i, 800 sq.). This passage, apparently the only part of Maximus's work which has come down to us, is given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (ii, 146), who identifies the author with the bishop, and gives his reasons for so doing in the *Prolegomena* to the volume, c. 6; see also Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 196, i, 95; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ii, 706, note xiii on Origen.

There was a third bishop of Jerusalem of this name, besides the two previously mentioned, who lived in the reign of Constantine the Great and his sons. He suffered in one of the later persecutions of the heathen emperors, apparently under Maximian Galerius (Philostorgius, *H. E.* iii, 12). His sufferings in the cause of Christianity, and the great excellence of his character, so endeared him to the people of Jerusalem, among whom he officiated as priest, that when he was appointed by Macarius, bishop of that city, to the vacant bishopric of Diospolis, the multitude would not permit his departure, and Macarius was forced to nominate another in his place. According to some accounts, Macarius repented almost immediately of the nomination of Maximus to Diospolis, and readily acquiesced in his remaining in Jerusalem, taking him for his assistant in the duties of the episcopal office (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 20). Upon the death of Macarius (some time between A.D. 331 and 335), Maximus succeeded him, and was present at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335, when Athanasius was condemned. Sozomen records (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 25) that at this council Paphnutius, a bishop of the Thebais or Upper Egypt, and himself a confessor, took Maximus by the hand, and told him to leave the place; "for," said he, "it does not become us, who have lost our eyes and been hamstrung for the sake of religion, to join the council of the wicked." This appeal was in vain, and Maximus was induced, but unfairly, to subscribe to the decree condemning Athanasius. But he soon regretted this step, and, at a synod of sixteen bishops of Palestine, joyfully admitted Athanasius to communion when returning from the Council of Sardica, through Asia, to Alexandria. Sozomen relates (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 20) that Maximus was deposed by the influence of Acacius of Cæsarea and Patrophilus (A.D. 349 or 350), and Cyril (St. Cyrillus of Jerusalem) appointed in his place; but if there is any truth in this statement, the death of Maximus must have very shortly followed his deposition (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 8; Sozomen, *l. c.*, and iii, 6; Theodoret, *l. c.*; Philostorgius, *l. c.*; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. iii, col. 156).—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Maximus Philosophus. Different parties of that name are known in ancient history.

1. A heathen eclectic-Platonic philosopher and conjuror, who was teacher to the emperor Julian, and had great influence over him.

2. Also a heathen, of Madaura, in Africa, is known to us by an interesting letter to Augustine. In consequence of his consciousness of the downfall of heathenism, he seeks to uphold a philosophical but impotent monotheism, which, in the worship of several deities, sees only the adoration of a higher or supreme deity who imparts to them their power; but he reproaches the Christians with wishing to have that God all to themselves, and visiting the graves of the dead (martyrs). Regardless of the new life which Christianity awakened, or of the divine energy testified by its exclusiveness, he finally exclaims, wearily, "Trahit sua quemque voluntas." The answer of Augustine is somewhat haughty and ironical (August. *Opp.* ii, 25 sq., ed. Venet.).

3. Eusebius mentions a Christian philosopher of that name in the 2d century, giving an interesting fragment of a work of his on the question, then much discussed, of the origin of evil (*Præp. Evang.* vii, 21 fin., 22; *Hist. Eccles.* v, 27). He has been by some considered as the author of the *Dialogus c. Marcion.*, formerly and erroneously attributed to Origen; but Gieseler (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830–32, p. 380) successfully opposed this view.

4. Another Maximus, who represented himself both as a philosopher (cynic) and a Christian, and gave much trouble to Gregory of Nazianzum, at Constantinople.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 208.

Maximus, bishop of Turin, was born towards the close of the 4th century, and early in the 5th was elevated to the episcopate. But little is known of his life. His signature is affixed to a document expressing the approval by the bishops of Northern Italy of pope Leo's letter to Flavian on Eutychianism (Leo, *Opp.* ed. Quesnel, p. 291). Among the signatures to the acts of a synod held at Rome in A.D. 465, his name appears immediately below that of pope Hilarius, the successor of Leo, a circumstance that marks him as the oldest bishop of the assembly. His writings, chiefly homilies, are rich in descriptions of the life of the Christians, at a time when paganism, although tottering to its fall, was still powerful among the rural population, and when the empire was trembling before the power of the invading hordes of barbarians. During the irruption of Attila he displayed a lofty faith in God, and succeeded in arousing his people from their despair, which had determined them to forsake their homes and seek safety in flight. The people of Turin obeyed his counsel, and their city was spared. But when the Huns departed from Italy, and the citizens purchased a share of their spoil, including slaves, he did not hesitate to condemn their conduct, and even compared them to wolves following in the track of lions, in order to gorge themselves on their abandoned prey. His homilies often censure the still prevailing idolatry, particularly the cultus Dianæ arvorum numinis, the practice of the priests in inflicting wounds on themselves to do honor to their goddess, etc., and also defended the orthodox doctrines of the Church against Eutychians, Nestorians, Pelagians, and Manichæans. The best edition of his works is that published at Rome in 1784, found in Migne, vol. lvii. See also Schönemann, *Bibl. Hist. Lit.* (Leips. 1794), ii, 607 sq.; *Acta Sanct.* June 25; *Biogra-*

phie, Universelle, vol. xxvii, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 208 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 782 sq.

Maximus OF TYRE, a Neo-Platonic philosopher, surnamed after the place of his abode, flourished in the 2d century as teacher of philosophy and rhetoric, first in Greece and afterwards in Rome, whither he made two journeys, one under the reign of Antoninus, another under that of Commodus. He may be ranked with Phædrus, Quintus Curtius, and others, of whom their contemporaries have scarcely made mention, and therefore of whom very little is known. We have extant of his works forty-one Διαλέξεις, or dissertations, upon various arguments, a MS. copy of which was first brought out of Greece into Italy by Janus Lascaris, and presented to Lawrence de Medicis. From this copy a Latin translation was made, and published by Cosmus Paccius, archbishop of Florence, in 1519; then in Greek by Henry Stephens in 1557; then in Greek and Latin by Daniel Heinsius in 1607; by J. Davis in 1703; by Reiske in 1774, and since, in 4to. These dissertations are entertaining, curious, and instructive, and have gained the author high encomiums among the learned. The following examples will give some idea of the subject of Maximus's dissertations: "On Plato's Opinion respecting the Deity;" "Whether we ought to return Injuries done to us;" "Whether an Active or a Contemplative Life is to be preferred;" "Whether Soldiers or Husbandmen are more useful in a State;" "On the Dæmonium of Socrates;" "Whether Prayers should be addressed to the Deity," etc. The dissertations have been translated into French by Morel (Paris, 1607), by Forney (1764), and by Dounais (1802); into Italian by Petro de Bardi (Venice, 1642); and into German by C. T. Damm (Berlin, 1764). There is, we believe, no English translation of this author. Isaac Casaubon, in the epistle dedicatory of his *Commentaries upon Persius*, calls him "mellitissimus Platonicorum;" and Peter Petit represents him as "auctorem imprimis elegantem in philosophia ac disertum" (*Misc. Observat.* lib. i, c. 20). He has spoken a good deal of himself in his thirty-seventh dissertation, and seemingly in a style of panegyric, for which his editor Davis has accused him of indecency and vanity; but Fabricius (*Bib. Græc.* lib. iv, c. 23) has defended him very well upon this head by observing that Davis did not sufficiently attend to Maximus's purpose in speaking thus of himself; "which was," he says, "not at all with a view of praising himself, but to encourage and promote the practice of those lessons in philosophy which they heard from him with so much applause." Some have confounded Maximus of Tyre with Maximus Ephesius, the preceptor of Julian the Apostate. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Maxwell, *Lady* **Darcy**, an eminently pious Methodist, who by birth and rank belonged to the nobility of Scotland, is noted for her great works of philanthropy. She was the youngest daughter of Thomas Brisbane, County of Ayr, and was born about the year 1742. In her own home she received the rudiments of an education, but subsequently completed it in the city of Edinburgh. At the age of sixteen she resided for a time in London with her uncle and aunt, lord and lady Lothian, to enjoy the advantages of being presented at court. In 1759, soon after her return from London, she married Sir Walter Maxwell. This union seemed to open before her a bewildering vista of future joys and happiness; but only for two short years did she realize her bright anticipations; at the end of that period her husband and child were taken from her, and she was left a widow at nineteen. When tidings of her little one's death, within six weeks after that of her husband, were conveyed to her, without any outburst of grief, or even a murmur, she exclaimed, "I see God requires my whole heart, and he shall have it!" "God brought me to himself by affliction," she frequently said. It was while overwhelmed by these heavy trials that she became acquainted with the Methodists. The early ministry of John Wesley and George Whitefield was generally respected in Scotland. Many of the higher classes approved their labors; ministers of the Establishment, members of the university, and persons of rank and title mingled in their audiences. It is supposed that some of the pious nobility, admirers of Wesley and Whitefield, first induced lady Maxwell to hear them. However that may be, it is certain that on June 16, 1764, Mr. Wesley preached to a large congregation in Edinburgh, and from that time corresponded with her ladyship, his influence aiding greatly in regulating her views, and guiding her determinations through life. From the time of her husband's death she had resided in Edinburgh or the vicinity. Her benevolence here was unusually great. Seeking to relieve misery in every form, there was scarcely a public or private charity for the repose of age or the guidance of youth, the relief of the poor, the care of the sick, or the spread of the Gospel, to which she did not contribute. In 1770 she established a school in Edinburgh for the purpose of affording education and Christian instruction to poor children—this school was always the object of her pious solicitude; its entire management and superintendence remained with herself, and, as the benefits flowing from it became manifest, pecuniary aid was furnished by others. At the time of her death eight hundred children had profited by this praiseworthy charity, and it is still in active operation. The employment of her time each day was exceedingly exemplary; she usually rose at four o'clock, and attended the Wesleyan chapel at five, morning preaching being then cutsomary; after breakfast she discharged the duties of the head of a family in her own house; from eleven to twelve she spent the time in interceding with God for her friends, the Church, and the world; the remaining hours of the day she devoted to reading, writing, exercise, and acts of benevolence. Her evenings, when alone, were occupied with reading, chiefly divinity; and, after an early supper, and committing her family to the care of the great Father who watches over all, and spending some time in praising God for his mercies, she retired to rest. In this manner, for nearly fifty years, she walked with her God. Her outward religious life had its varieties, but they were the varieties of advance; her inner religious life also had its changes, but they were those of the beautiful morning, which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. In person, lady Maxwell was above the medium height, exceedingly straight and well proportioned; her features quite feminine, but strongly intelligent; her eye quick and penetrating, yet sweet and tender. She died July 2, 1810, passing away as peacefully and joyfully as she had lived: the society to which she belonged losing its oldest member, the world one of its best inhabitants, and the Church universal one of its brightest ornaments. See Lancaster, *Life of Lady Maxwell* (N. Y. 1840, 12mo); Coles, *Heroines of Methodism*, p. 76.

Maxwell, Robert, one of the Scottish lords of the regency during the absence of James V in France, deserves a place here for his action in the first Parliament of Mary queen of Scots (1543), where he introduced a bill to allow the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, which was passed in spite of the opposition of the lord chancellor, the bishops, and priests. He died in 1546.

Maxwell, Samuel, an American divine and educator, was born in Berkshire County, Mass., about 1805; was educated at Amherst College (class of 1829); subsequently became principal of the preparatory department of Marietta College, Ohio, and later a professor in the collegiate department of the same institution, and remained there until his death, which occurred January 24, 1867. He was also in the employ of the American Missionary Association in his last years.

Maxwell, William, LL.D., an American educa-

tor, celebrated also in the department of jurisprudence, was born at Norfolk, Va., Feb. 27, 1784; was educated at Yale College, 1802; practiced in his native city, and attained great eminence; assumed the editor's chair in the literary department of the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce* in 1827; resumed the practice of jurisprudence, however, in the following year; was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates in 1830, and of the State Senate from 1831 to 1837, during which time he was made secretary of the Historical Society of Virginia. He next accepted the presidency of the Hampden Sidney College in 1838, which he retained until 1844, and then edited the Virginia *Historical Register* from 1848 to 1853 (6 vols. in 3, 12mo). He died January 9, 1857, at Richmond, Va. He wrote *Memoir of the Rev. John H. Rice, D. D.* (Phila. 1835, 12mo). See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

May, E. H., a Dutch Reformed minister, was born at Lynn, Norfolk, England, Jan. 28, 1795. He received a good preparatory education, and studied for the ministry at Hoxton College, near London; was ordained in 1815 over the Independent Church at Bury, Lancashire, and subsequently preached in Rochford, in the south of England, and Croydon, Surrey. In 1834 he came to America, and in 1835 became a member of the Classis of Washington, and pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Northumberland; in 1836, pastor of the Church in Schuylerville; in 1839, of the Twenty-first Street Church, New York; in 1848 accepted the appointment of secretary to the Pennsylvania Colonization Society; and in 1849 became secretary of the Pennsylvania Seamen's Friend Society, in which connection he served until near his death, August, 1858. Mr. May was an instructive and evangelical preacher, a man of refined taste and correct judgment, and a frank, open-hearted Christian. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 203.

May, James, D.D., an Episcopal divine and theological educator, was born in Chester County, Pa., Oct. 1, 1805. He entered Jefferson College, Pa., in 1822; graduated with distinction; commenced the study of law, but finally entered the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va. He was ordained by bishop White in 1827, and first settled in Wilkesbarre, Pa., where he remained two years. In 1836 he became rector of St. Paul's parish, Philadelphia. While there he was engaged with Dr. Clark, then rector of St. Andrew's Church, Dr. Tyng, then rector of the Church of the Epiphany, and with Dr. Suddards, then and still rector of Grace Church, in the editorial management of the *Episcopal Recorder*. His health failing at this time, he was led to seek restoration in foreign travel. Two years were thus spent abroad. After his return, he accepted the position of professor of pastoral theology and ecclesiastical history in the Alexandria Seminary, his alma mater. The outbreak of the rebellion in 1861 closing the operations of that school, he removed to Philadelphia, and became professor of ecclesiastical history and systematic theology in the divinity school just organized. He remained there until his death, Dec. 18, 1863. But few men have so thoroughly won the affections of those with whom they were associated. Apparently not an impulsive man, he was by no means a person of cold and unimpulsive temper, but full of deep feeling. He has influenced the training of hundreds now in the ministry, who will greatly miss his counsels, and the encouragement his sympathy and personal attainments gave them. He was remarkable for the unvarying symmetry and depth of his Christian character, and seemed like one *inspired* by Gospel principles, rather than controlled by them, so perfectly natural and habitual was his manifestation of them. See *Am. Ch. Rev.* 1864, p. 150.

May, Samuel Joseph, an eminent Unitarian minister and philanthropist, was born in Boston, Mass., in 1797. He graduated at Harvard College in 1817; and, after preaching several years as a Unitarian minister at Brooklyn, Conn., became general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society. Afterwards he assumed a pastorate at South Scituate, Mass.; from 1842 to 1845 was principal of the Lexington Normal school; and finally, in 1845, settled in the Unitarian ministry at Syracuse, New York. There the remainder of his life was passed, and he was identified with every movement for the moral, intellectual, and social improvement of the people, and came to be regarded as the leading spirit in every measure of benevolence. In all matters of education he was very active, and to him, as much as to any man in Syracuse, it is due that its public schools are so successful and maintain so high a character. He resigned the pastorate July 1, 1871. Mr. May devoted his energies especially to the anti-slavery cause for many years. He was one of the first members of the New England Society in 1832, and a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1833 which formed the Anti-slavery Society. He was author of *Recollections of Amer. Anti-slavery* (1869). See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871, p. 495.

Maya (Sanscrit, *Illusion*) is a term applied by the Hindûs, in a philosophical or mystical sense, to that power which caused or created the visible phenomena of the universe. The Hindû, like Berkeley and other European philosophers, assumes that external objects have no absolute existence, but that they are mere impressions on the mind. Maya, in Hindû theology, is, according to some, that mighty goddess the wife or consort of Brahma. See Moor, *Hindû Mythology*, s. v.; Wilson, *Sanscrit Dictionary*, s. v.; Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Mayence, a German town, beautifully situated on a sloping hill on the left bank of the River Rhine, is noted in ecclesiastical annals as the seat of an archiepiscopal see, and as the seat of several important Church councils. See MAYENCE, COUNCILS OF.

Mayence as an Archbishopric and Bishopric.—We have no trustworthy information as to the early history of this archbishopric. Attempts have been made to prove that the Christian Church was established there by St. Crescens, based on the passage in 2 Tim. iv, 10, "Crescens (is departed) to Galatia;" and Jerome and other writers also favor the opinion of Gaul having been Christianized by Crescens. Ado, however, in his *Martyrologium*, written about 860, is the first to refer to the action of Crescens at Vienna. Still we find no documents referring to it until the 10th century, which may, however, be accounted for by the fact that the city was three times destroyed by fire up to that period. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, Crescens, a pupil of the apostle Paul, came to preach there as early as the year 82, became the first bishop of Mayence, and died a martyr in 103. The list of bishops up to the 6th century is all of later origin; according to it, Crescens was succeeded by Aureus, who was murdered by the Vandals when they took the city in 451. Sidonius, about 546, began the restoration of the town and of the church; Sigbert then became bishop about 589, and is said to have received from king Childebert the onyx bearing a likeness of that prince and of his wife, which is still retained among the jewels of Mayence. In 612 Leonisius (Leutgasius) caused war between Theoderick and Theodebert. We then find in the list Ruthelmus (Rudelin), Landwald, Lupoald (Leowald), Rigbert (Richbert, † 712), Gerold, who died at the hands of the Saxons in 743. He was succeeded by his son Gerwilio or Gewilieb, who in 744 marched with Carloman against the Saxons, and defeated them on the shores of the Weser. In 745 he was deposed, Bonifacius appointed in his place, and the bishopric transformed into an archbishopric, with the sanction of pope Zachary, in 748. In 753 or 754 Bonifacius resigned in favor of his pupil Lullus, who, however, did not receive the pallium before 780; he labored diligently for the interest of the archbishopric, founded several churches and convents, and greatly increased the revenues of the Church by the

adoption of the tithing system in 779. He died Oct. 16, 786. His successor was Riculf, who founded the school of the Church of St. Alban at Mayence, and died Aug. 9, 813, the very year in which Constantine called a council at Mayence (see below). Haistulf, † Jan. 28, 827, introduced canonical life in the archbishopric; yet the succeeding archbishops, down to Marculf, were not elected according to canonical rules, but by the king, with the consent of the clergy and people. This was the case with Otgar, 826–47; Rabanus Maurus, 847–56 (who called a council, by order of Louis of Germany, in the year of his accession to the archiepiscopal chair); Charles, son of king Pepin I of Aquitania, and nephew of Louis the German, 856–63, who was also archchancellor of the empire, a dignity which was retained by his successors; Liutbert, who marched against the Bohemians in 872, and against the Sorbians in 874; defeated the Normans, who had ascended the Rhine, in 883, and died Feb. 17, 889. Sunzo (Sunderhold) fell fighting against the Normans in 891. Hatto I played an important part in the history of Germany during the reign of Louis the Infant and Conrad I, and died Jan. 18, 913. His successor, Heriger, died in 927. Hildebert, who successfully disputed against Cologne and Trêves the right to crown the king, and crowned Otto I at Aix-la-Chapelle in 936, died in 937. Friedrich was exiled to Hamburg or Fulda by the emperor Otto I, as a rebel; was recalled in 954, but repeatedly accused of treason, and escaped punishment only by his sudden decease in 954. He was succeeded by Wilhelm, a natural son of Otto, who died in 968. Of Hatto II (968–70), the tradition says that he was devoured by mice. Ruprecht died in 974. Willigis received the pallium from pope Benedict VII, together with the privilege of presiding at all the German councils and of crowning the king. To remind him always of his low origin (his father was said to have been a wagoner), he caused a wheel to be erected on the walls of his palace, and this is said to be the origin of the wheel on the arms of the archbishops of Mayence. In 978 he laid the foundations of the new cathedral (which, however, was burned down on the day of its consecration in 1009), and died in 1011. Next follow Archimbald (Erkenbold), 1011–21; Aribon, 1021–31; Bardo of Oppershofen, 1031–51, who finished the new cathedral, and consecrated it Nov. 10, 1037. He received on this occasion the pallium from pope John XIX, and the right to act as papal legate whenever no other person appeared invested with that authority in his diocese. The succeeding incumbent was Leopold (Luitpold), count of Bogen, 1051–59. Sigfrid I, count of Eppstein, joined a crusade in 1065; in 1069 he tried, but in vain, to procure a divorce between Henry IV and Bertha, and proclaimed—yet without effect—in 1075 the edict of celibacy of Gregory VII. After 1077 he took the part of the anti-kings, and crowned Rudolf of Suabia and Hermann of Luxemburg. He died in 1084. Wezilo (1084–88) was complained of at the Council of Halberstadt, and put under ban for maintaining that those of the secular clergy who lost their estates were no longer subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he subsequently receded from this position. Under Ruthard (1088–99), in 1097, a persecution broke out against the Jews in Mayence, and the archbishop, fearing the anger of the emperor for having taken an active part in it, fled to Thuringia, whence he returned only after a lapse of eight years. Adelbert I, count of Saarbruck (1109–37), was elected by Henry V, yet sided against him in 1112 on the question of investiture; he was imprisoned for his opposition, and only released in 1115, when the people of Mayence rose in arms to secure his liberation. Adelbert showed his gratitude by granting the citizens of Mayence the charter (releasing them from the jurisdiction of the church-wardens and from their taxes), which was inscribed on the door of the cathedral in 1135. In 1120 he fled again before the emperor, after whose death, in 1125, he assembled a diet for the election of a king. This is the first instance of the appearance in the history of Germany of the electors, among whom the archbishop of Mayence held the first place. Adelbert II, brother of the preceding, held the office 1138–41. Marculf, 1141–42, was the first archbishop elected according to canonical rules, with the concurrence of the people. Henry I, 1142–53, was appointed by Conrad III tutor to his son, before his departure for the crusade. He was hated by the clergy for his severity, and they accused him before the pope of squandering the funds of the Church and of immorality. He was deposed in 1153. Under Arnold I, of Seelenhowen (1153–60), the partisans of his predecessors, among them Hermann, count of the Palatinate, invaded the diocese and laid the land waste. Arnold retaliated, and peace was only restored at the emperor's return from Italy in 1155. Arnold having promised the emperor to accompany him in his next journey to Rome, and to employ his influence to settle the difficulty then existing between him and the pope, he sought to levy a tax on the diocese to defray his expenses; but the citizens resisted, and, the emperor refusing to take the part of the citizens, they murdered the archbishop in 1160. The emperor now appointed Conrad I, in spite of the opposition of the chapter; the new archbishop, however, on being requested to recognise the anti-pope, Pascal, fled to Alexander at Rome, and was made archbishop of Salzburg. His place was filled in 1165 by Christian I, count of Buch, chancellor of the emperor Frederic I. He proved true to that prince, and took his part in Italy against the pope; but was arrested there in 1180 by the count of Monte Ferrara, remained a prisoner until 1181, and died in the neighborhood of Rome in 1183. The title of archchancellor of the empire, which the archbishops of Mayence had often received since the 10th century, became permanent now. After the decease of Christian, Conrad I became again archbishop of Mayence. The late prelate had already set up a claim on the estates of the extinct house of Franconia in Thuringia and Hesse; Conrad brought it forward again in 1184, but was opposed by the landgrave Lewis III, and a lengthy strife ensued. In 1197 Conrad took part in a crusade, and died in 1200. Sigfrid II, the elder, count of Eppstein (1200–30), obtained in 1208 the direction of the bishopric of Worms, and in 1228 the right to crown the kings of Bohemia (which was exercised by his followers until 1343). Sigfrid III, of Eppstein, nephew of the preceding (1230–49), finding the finances in very bad condition, levied, with the assent of the chapter, on all benefices a tax amounting to one twentieth of their income. On the other hand, it was enacted that the archbishop could in future contract no liabilities without the consent of the chapter, and that every future archbishop should be strictly held to submit to that rule. In 1232 Sigfrid obtained from the king the abbey of Lorch, and restored the cathedral, which was consecrated in 1239. He favored the deposition of emperor Frederick II, and supported Henry Raspe, and afterwards William of Holland (this is commemorated by three statues to be seen in the cathedral of Mayence, the centre one representing the archbishop, the one on his right Henry Raspe, and the other William of Holland). After the death of Henry Raspe, Sigfrid attempted to annex his possessions to Thuringia, but was opposed by landgrave Henry and Sophia of Brabant, and the dispute lasted seven years. Sigfrid died in 1249, and was succeeded by Christian II, of Bolanden, who resigned in 1251. Gerhard I (1251–59), was imprisoned in 1256 by duke Albrecht of Brunswick, and liberated in 1257 by king Richard of England, whom he afterwards supported as a candidate to the imperial crown. Under him the cathedral canons of Mayence ceased to lead the communistic life. Werner of Eppstein, nephew of Sigfrid III (1259–84), cancelled part of the debts of the archbishopric, and concluded a treaty with the duchess Sophia of Brabant in 1263, by which he obtained Grunberg and Frankenburg; in 1271 he bought Wildenberg, Amorbach, Schneeberg, and Wilbach from Ulrich of Dü-

ren, and in 1278 the castle of Bockelnheim from count Henry of Sponheim; he took an active part in the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg as emperor of Germany. After a vacancy of two years, Henry II was appointed archbishop in 1286; he was disliked by the clergy for his strictness, and died in 1288. Gerhard II, of Eppstein (1289–1305), labored to have his cousin Adolph of Nassau elected emperor, but afterwards aided in his deposition, and in the election of Albrecht of Austria: he used his influence with both emperors for the aggrandizement of his archbishopric. He was also somewhat distinguished as a legislator; his decrees form the *Concordata Gerhardi*. An electoral edict of king Albrecht having assigned him the second rank among the electors, he protested, and obtained an imperial decree, under date of Sept. 23, 1298, placing him and his successors in the first rank; the same decree confirmed them also in the title of archchancellor of Germany. Peter Aichspalter (1306–20) improved greatly the finances of the diocese by his economy, and was a strict promoter of ecclesiastical discipline. Matthias, count of Bucheck and landgrave of Burgundy (1321–28), first sided with emperor Louis of Bavaria, but afterwards with the pope, and enlarged the estates of the archbishopric. After his death, which occurred in 1328, pope John XXII appointed Henry III, count of Burneburg, but the chapter elected archbishop Balduin of Trêves; the latter governed the diocese during the difficulty, and added to it a part of the village of Herzberg, half of Mark Duderstadt, Schurburg, Botzwangen, Esenheim, and Odenheim. On Nov. 12, 1336, Balduin voluntarily surrendered his claim, and Henry was now accepted by the chapter, after promising to take sides with Louis of Bavaria, and to surrender the strong places of the diocese into the hands of the chapter. In 1329 he engaged not to tax the inhabitants of Mayence, or those of the suburbs, without their consent; in 1330 he released them from the ecclesiastical punishments they had incurred for injuring the clergy, and in 1331 absolved them from their promise to repay the Jews sums advanced by them to the city. He obtained jurisdiction over Eichsfeld, Duderstadt, and Giboldhausen; on the other hand, Olmütz and Prague were detached from Mayence, and, in consequence, the archbishops of Mayence lost the right to crown the kings of Hungary. He finally got into difficulties by his fidelity to emperor Lewis, and was deposed by pope Clement VI in 1346, yet continued to exercise his functions until his death in 1353. Gerlach, who had been appointed by the pope in 1346, was now recognised by all as archbishop. The difficulties between him and his predecessor had greatly injured the diocese: the funds had become low, debts had been contracted, the clergy had become much relaxed, and the respect of the people had diminished in consequence; Gerlach, however, added to the diocese the castles of Itter and Allenfelt, Ballenburg, the village of Budensheim, and the half of Geismar. At this time the Golden Bull, in which the high position of the archbishop of Mayence as dean of the electoral college was officially recognised, was given to the public. Gerlach died Feb. 12, 1371. His successor, John I, duke of Luxemburg, died in 1373. Louis, son of margrave Frederick the Earnest, was now appointed by both the pope and the emperor, while the chapter elected Adolph I, of Nassau, bishop of Spires, who took up his residence at Erfurt; the difficulty lasted until 1380; Adolph remained archbishop of Mayence, while Louis was made archbishop of Magdeburg, and retained the regalia until his death. Adolph was long at war with landgrave Hermann of Hesse about some possessions in that province; he founded the University of Erfurt, and died in 1390. His successor, Conrad II, of Weinsberg, persecuted the Waldenses, of whom there were a number in his diocese, and entered into a league with the Palatinate, Bavaria, and Spires against the Flagellants. He died Oct. 19, 1396. John II, count of Nassau, brother of Adolph I (1396–1419), took part in the deposition of emperor Wenzel, and, in consequence of being suspected of having had a share in the murder of the emperor elect, duke Frederick of Brunswick, as he sheltered the murderer, he became involved in a war with Brunswick and Hesse, which lasted until 1401: he added to his diocese Wetterau and Ardeck, besides several villages. Conrad III, count of Stein, was in 1422 appointed vicar of the empire by emperor Sigismund; but, being opposed by Louis of Heidelberg, he resigned that office in 1423: he added to the diocese the city of Steinheim, and enacted strict regulations for the conduct of the clergy. Under him the citizens of Mayence continued to complain of the exemption from taxes enjoyed by the clergy, and he did not succeed in settling the question. He died in 1434. His successor, Dietrich I, of Erbach, was more fortunate, and put an end to the troubles in 1435, with the aid of two commissioners of the Council of Basle. His whole time was taken up in quarrels with the pope and emperor; the Pragmatic Sanction of Mayence, of which he was the author, and in which he recognised the Council of Basle, the suppression of the annates, and the general restoration of canonical election, was rejected, while the Concordat of Aschaffenburg, which held the contrary views, was afterwards adopted. Dietrich died May 6, 1459, and was succeeded by Diether (Dietrich II), count of Isenburg-Budingen; the latter, however, found a rival in count Adolph of Nassau, whom Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, supported by force of arms; Diether was besieged in Heidelberg July 4, 1461, and obliged to flee. In 1462 he was deposed by pope Pius II, for refusing to collect the annates (which the pope had arbitrarily raised from 10,000 to 21,000 florins). Adolph II, count of Nassau, was now made archbishop, and a war commenced between Diether, supported by Bavaria and the Palatinate, and Adolph, upheld by Bavaria and Würtemberg; a treaty was finally concluded, Oct. 25, 1463, Diether renouncing his claims. The city of Mayence, which was stormed by Adolph in 1462, lost all privileges. After the death of Adolph, Sept. 6, 1475, Diether was again appointed archbishop; but now commenced a strife about the city of Mayence: the cathedral chapter claimed it for its own, while the citizens demanded their liberty, and rebelled against the chapter; they were finally defeated, and the city remained subject to the archbishop, who made it his residence; he built the palace of Martinsburg, and founded the University of Mayence, which was opened in 1477; he also restored to the diocese the estates of Algesheim and Olm, and died May 7, 1482. Albert I, duke of Saxony, was son of the elector Ernst (1482–84). His successor, Berthold, count of Henneberg, accompanied emperor Maximilian as archchancellor to court; he took an active part in restoring peace throughout the country, and in the institution of the imperial chamber of justice; he also introduced great improvements in the ecclesiastical and conventual discipline, and laid the grievances of the Germans with regard to ecclesiastical affairs before the court of Rome. He died Dec. 21, 1504. Jacob of Liebenstein (1504–8) added Kostheim and part of Klingenberg to the diocese. Uriel of Genimengen (1508–14) ordered the examination of the clergy, and strictly opposed concubinage among them. Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Magdeburg, was made archbishop of Mayence in 1514; he loved grandeur, wasted the funds of the diocese, and abused the sale of indulgences; he took part in the league against the Protestant princes; being attacked by the landgrave of Hesse, he purchased peace at the expense of 40,000 thalers. In 1529 he originated the Edict of Worms against the Protestants; yet he afterwards sought to restore peace among the different religious parties, and was one of the principal promoters of the peace of Nuremberg. He died Sept. 24, 1545, highly respected both by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, and even by Luther, with whom he had some correspondence. Sebastian of Heusenstam (1545–55) labored to improve the administration of the diocese, and also to restore the influence of Romanism; he

subscribed to the Interim of 1548. During his reign Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg invaded the diocese, and took Mayence; he made the citizens swear allegiance to the king of France, demanded a contribution of 600,000 florins from the archbishop and chapter, and, as they were unable to pay that amount by the time stipulated, he burnt down the archiepiscopal palace and several churches; the archbishop himself fled to Eltfeld, where he died in 1555. His successor, Daniel of Homburg, endeavored to restore the archbishopric to its former splendor; he introduced the Jesuits into Mayence and in Eichsfelde, and surrendered education into their hands; he took part also in the attempts of reconciliation between the Protestants and Romanists, added to his diocese the county of Lahr (Rieneck), the county of Königstein, and the villages of Rennshausen and Zornheim. He died March 22, 1582. He was succeeded by Wolfgang of Dalberg (1582 to April 5, 1601). John Adam, of Bicken (1601 to Jan. 10, 1604), and John Suicard, of Kronenberg, strictly enforced all the old ecclesiastical rules, and persecuted the Protestants. Under Suicard the diocese began to feel the effects of the Thirty Years' War, which was then raging; it suffered especially from the inroads of Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, against whom he called for the assistance of the Spaniards. He died July 6, 1629. Anselm Casimir, of Wambold, was obliged to flee from Mayence when that city was taken by Gustavus Adolphus, Dec. 23, 1631; he retired to Cologne, and the diocese was, until the Treaty of Prague, in 1635, occupied by Swedish and French troops, who greatly impoverished the country—not more, however, than the imperial forces. In 1635 the archbishop returned to Mayence; but the diocese becoming again the theatre of war in 1643, he fled again before the French armies, and in 1647 made a treaty with Turenne. Mayence remained in the possession of the French, and the archbishop went to reside at Frankfort, where he died, Oct. 9, 1647. His successor, John Philip, of Schönborn, prince bishop of Würzburg, resigned soon after his election, for the Swedes, after the expiration of the peace of Westphalia, exerted themselves for the secularization of the diocese, and the archbishopric was only maintained through the intervention of Saxony; it lost, however, by exemption, the districts of Verden and Halberstadt. On the occasion of the coronation of Ferdinand IV at Regensburg, John Philip came in conflict with the archbishop of Cologne over their respective prerogatives. He was also in difficulty with the inhabitants of Mayence, and finally took the city by force in 1664. Philip also quarrelled with Saxony about the town of Erfurt, which was finally added to his diocese in 1665. He then devoted all his attention to internal improvements; he gave regulations to the court of Mayence in 1659; in 1661 he established a theological seminary; and in 1663 was also made bishop of Worms. He died Feb. 12, 1673. His successor was Lothar Frederick, of Metternich-Burchied, coadjutor of John Philip since 1670; in 1674 he got into war with the elector of the Palatinate, about the district of Böckelnheim, but died June 3, 1675. Domian Hartard, of Leyen, died Dec. 6, 1678. Charles Henry, duke of Metternich-Winneburg, was elected in 1679, and died on Sept. 27 of the same year. Anselm Franz, of Ingelheim, surrendered Mayence to the French in 1688, and took up his residence at Erfurt; but the marshal of Uxelles having given up Mayence to the duke of Lorraine, Sept. 8, 1689, the archbishop returned to it. In 1691 he joined a league against France. By a treaty concluded Aug. 24, 1692 with Brunswick, he gave up the district of Eichsfeld, with the exception of Duderstadt, Gieboldshausen, and Landau. He died in 1695. Lothar Franz, of Schönborn, nephew of John Philip, took the part of Austria against Spain in the War of Succession. In 1704 the district of Kronenberg was joined to the diocese by succession. In 1714 the strife between the archbishop and the Palatinate was brought to a close by the former giving up his claim to Böckelnheim, and receiving in exchange New Bamberg. He died Jan. 30, 1729. Francis Louis, count of Neuburg, bishop of Breslau and Worms, and also archbishop of Trêves, died April 19, 1732. Under Philip Charles, of Eltz-Kempenich, Alzenau, together with five villages, was added to the diocese. He died March 21, 1743. John Frederick Charles, count of Ostein, remained neutral in the Austrian War of Succession, and his diocese suffered severely from the French in consequence; in 1745 the grand duke of Tuscany succeeded in driving the French armies out of the country, but during the Seven Years' War the bishopric suffered again on account of its adherence to the queen of Hungary. The archbishop died June 4, 1763: he had added the bishopric of Fulda to Mayence. Emmerich Joseph, baron of Breidbach-Büresheim, was made also bishop of Worms in 1768; in 1769 he joined the two other ecclesiastical electors in trying to emancipate the German episcopacy from the dominion of Rome; by a decree of Dec. 23, 1766, he abolished a number of festivals, and by another of July 30, 1771, he enacted several reforms in the convents; he encouraged industry and agriculture, founded charitable institutions, and established the administration of the diocese on a regular basis; on Jan. 30, 1773, he entered into an agreement with Saxony concerning Trefurt and Mulhouse, by which he surrendered the jurisdiction of Protestant districts to Saxony. He died July 11, 1774. Frederick Charles Joseph, of Eichthal, who became also bishop of Worms, followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, introducing many reforms in the Church; he endowed the University of Mayence with the convents of Karthaus, Altenmunster, and Reichenklaren in 1781, to which, in 1784, he added seventeen prebends, and also directed that theological studies should no longer be pursued in convents, but only in the University of Mayence. The archbishops had heretofore been partisans of Austria, but he sided with Prussia when Frederick the Great opposed the plans of aggrandizement of the former power towards Bavaria; he opposed, also, the encroachments of the papal nuncios. When the French Revolution broke out, Mayence was betrayed into Custine's hands, Oct. 21, 1792; the archbishop fled to Heiligenstadt, then took up his residence at Erfurt, and died at Aschaffenburg July 25, 1802. He was the last archbishop of Mayence. The archbishopric was secularized Feb. 26, 1803. By treaty France received the portion of the diocese on the left shore of the Rhine, and the remainder was divided between Prussia, Hesse, etc., with the exception of the principalities of Aschaffenburg, Regensburg, the county of Wetzlar, and some other small portions which were given to the coadjutor of the late archbishop, Charles Theodore of Dalberg, as archchancellor, metropolitan, and primate of Germany. The see was transferred to the cathedral of Regensburg, and received jurisdiction over the whole of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mayence, Trêves, and Cologne, lying on the right shore of the Rhine, with the exception of the part belonging to Prussia, and also over the whole province of Salzburg, in Bavaria. The archbishopric of Mayence became a simple bishopric, subject to the archbishop of Mechlin, and including only the territory of the old archbishopric on the left shore of the Rhine. The first bishop was Joseph Louis Colmar, appointed Oct. 3, 1802, who governed his diocese exclusively under French inspiration. Mayence was taken by the allies May 17, 1814; Colmar died Dec. 15 of the same year. A vicar-general was then appointed. In 1829 the bishopric of Mayence was, by a papal decree, detached from Mechlin and subjected to Freiburg. Joseph Vitus Burg was appointed bishop Jan. 12, 1830; he divided the diocese into deaneries, and died May 23, 1833. His successor, the former vicar-general, John Jacob Humann, died Aug. 19, 1834. Peter Leopold Kaiser issued complete diocesan statutes in 1837, and died Dec. 30, 1848. Leopold Schmid, professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Giessen, was appointed bishop of Mayence by pope Pius IX, Feb. 22, 1849, but he was not confirmed (see L.

Schmid, *Ueb. d. jüngste Mainzer Bischofswahl*, Giessen, 1850); and William Emanuel von Ketteler was made bishop in his place, March 29, 1850. Since Ketteler's accession, the bishopric of Mayence is noted as the gathering-place of all Jesuit ultramontanists. How this Roman see in Germany will continue its opposition to all order of state rule, now that the Jesuits have been expelled from Germany (1873), remains to be seen. See Theoderich Gresemund, *Catalogus episcoporum et archiepiscoporum Mogunt.* (Schunk's *Beitragen*, vol. ii); J. Latomus, *Gesch. d. Bischöfe v. M.* (in Mencke, *Scriptores rerum Germ.* vol. iii); Servarius, *Res Moguntiacæ* (in Joannis, *Res Mogunt.* Frankf. 1722, vol. i); Severus, *Memoria pontificum Mogunt.* (Mayence, 1765); Würdtwein, *Diœcesis Moguntina in archidiaconatus districta* (Manh. 1769–77, 3 vols.); Schepfer, *Codex eccles. Mogunt. nov.* (Aschaf. 1803); *D. Untergang d. Kurfürst. M.* (Frankf. 1839); Werner, *Der Dom z. M.* (Mayence, 1827, 3 vols.); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 741 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 697 sq.

MAYENCE, COUNCILS AT. Of the numerous councils of the Church of Rome convened here, special notice is due to those of 813, 847–8, 1225, and 1549.

(1.) The first of these, convened June 9, 813, by order of Charlemagne, was composed of thirty bishops and twenty-five abbots; Hildebald, archbishop of Cologne and arch-chaplain, presided. The object of this council was to restore the discipline of the Church. To this end the Gospels, the canons of the Church, and certain of the works of the fathers were read, among others the pastoral of St. Gregory; the abbots and monks also read the letter of St. Benedict. Fifty-six canons were published. 1, 2, and 3 treat of faith, hope, and charity. 4. Orders the administration of holy baptism after the Roman use, and restricts it to Easter and Pentecost, except in cases of necessity. 6. Orders bishops to take care of disinherited orphans. 9. Orders canons to eat in common, and to sleep in the same dormitory. 11. Relates to the life of the monks. 13. To that of nuns. 22. Is directed against vagabond clerks. 23. Gives entire liberty to clerks and monks who have been forced to receive the tonsure. 28. Orders all priests at all times to wear the stole, to mark their sacerdotal character. 32. Defines the difference between the *exomologesis* and *litania;* the former it states to be solely for confession of sin, the latter to implore help and mercy. 33. Orders the observance of the great Litany by all Christians, barefooted, with ashes. 35. Confirms the 19th canon of Gangra on fasting. 36 and 37. Relate to holidays and Sundays. 43. Forbids mass to be said by a priest alone; for how can he say *Dominus vobiscum*, and other like things, when no one is present but himself? 47. Orders godparents to instruct their godchildren. 52. Forbids all interments within the Church except in the case of bishops, abbots, priests, or lay persons distinguished for holiness of life. 54. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree. 55. Forbids parents to stand as sponsors for their own children, and forbids marriages between sponsors and their godchildren, and the parents of their godchildren. 56. Declares that he who has married two sisters, and the woman who has married two brothers, or a father and son, shall be separated, and never be permitted to marry again (*Conc.* vii, 1239).

(2.) The next council convened there about Oct. 1, 847, by order of Louis of Germany, under Rabanus, archbishop of Mayence, assisted by twelve bishops, his suffragans, and several abbots, monks, priests, and others of the clergy, including the chorepiscopi. Thirty-one canons were published. The most important are: 2. Warning bishops to be assiduous in preaching the Word of God. 7. Leaving the disposition of Church property to the bishops, and asserting their power over the laity. 11. Forbidding to endow new oratories with the tithes or other property belonging to churches anciently founded, without the bishop's consent. 13. Relating to the life to be observed by clerks and monks; forbids joking, gaming, unsuitable ornaments, delicate living, excess in eating or drinking, unjust weights or measures, unlawful trades, etc. 14. Ordering all monks holding livings to attend the synods and give an account of themselves. 15. Forbidding the clergy to wear long hair, under pain of anathema. 30. Forbidding marriage within the fourth degree (*Conc.* viii, 39).

(3.) The next important council was held at Mayence in 1225, by cardinal Conrad, legate of Honorius III. It is by some called "a synod of Germany." Fourteen canons were published, which relate to the incontinence of the clergy, and simony. The sixth declares that excommunicated priests who dare to perform any clerical function while under excommunication shall be deposed both from their office and benefices, without hope of being ever restored; shall be treated as infamous, deprived of the power of leaving their property by will, and never again permitted to hold any kind of ecclesiastical benefice (*Conc.* xi, 294).

(4.) Another very large body assembled in council at Mayence in 1549, called together by Sebastian Heusenstein, archbishop of Mayence, with the deputies of the bishops of his province and the principal of his clergy. Forty-seven canons were published concerning the faith, and fifty-seven canons of discipline. Among the first we find an exposition of the mystery of the sacred Trinity, according to the faith of the Church; it is further stated that man was created with righteousness and endued with grace, but that he was possessed of free-will; afterwards the fall of man and his justification are spoken of, and it is declared that this justification proceeds from the grace of God; that it is given before any merit; that this justification is given when man receives the Holy Spirit, with faith, hope, and charity, which gifts it declares to be inherent in him, and not merely imputed, so that man is not only accounted righteous, but is so in reality, yet not through his own merits, but by God's grace and righteousness communicated to him; that the charity which justifies must be accompanied by good works, of which *grace* is the source and principle (canons 7 and 8). The council moreover, in the canons of faith, set forth the doctrine of the sacraments, and decided, against the heretics, that they are not bare ceremonies, but effectual signs of grace, which they are, by divine operation, the means of conveying to those who receive them worthily.

With regard to ceremonies, it is decreed that such ought to be retained as incite the people to meditate upon God; among these are reckoned the sacraments, churches, altars, images, holy vestments, banners, etc. As to images, the council decrees that the people should be taught that they are not set up to be worshipped, and that none ought to be set up in churches which are likely to inspire worldly and carnal thoughts rather than piety. Curates are also enjoined to remove the image of any saint to which the people flocked, as if attributing some sort of divinity to the image itself, or as supposing that God or the saints would perform what they prayed for by means of that particular image, and not otherwise. Afterwards the following matters are treated of: devout pilgrimages, worship of saints, prayer for the dead, and the law of fasting.

Among the fifty-six canons of discipline and morality, we find it ruled (by canon 61) that when the lesser festivals fall on a Sunday, they shall be kept on some day following or preceding; that apostate monks, upon their return to their duty, shall be kindly treated; that nuns shall not leave their convent without the bishop's permission; that preaching shall not be allowed, nor the holy sacraments administered, in chapels attached to private houses; that care shall be taken that all school-masters be sound Catholics, etc. Finally, it is declared that the council received the acts of the holy œcumenical councils, and yielded entire submission to the catholic, apostolic, Roman Church in all things (*Conc.* xiv, 667; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v.).

Mayer, Jacob, an American minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lykens Valley, Dau-

phin Co., Pa., in 1798; was brought up in the Reformed Church, and early instructed in its doctrines. Preparatory to entering the ministry, he was for four years under the special tuition of Rev. Dr. Samuel Helffenstein, of Philadelphia; was licensed to preach in September, 1822, at the synod held in Harrisburg, Pa.; was soon afterwards ordained, and took charge of the churches in Woodstock, Va., and vicinity. After three years of labor he removed to the neighborhood of Shrewsbury, York Co., Pa., and there took charge of quite a number of congregations. In this field he labored eight years; then removed to Mercersburg, Franklin Co., Pa., and became pastor of the Church at that place, in connection with those at Greencastle and Loudon in the same county. In 1836 he was appointed special agent of the theological seminary at Mercersburg; the next eight years of his active life were devoted to the work of procuring funds for the use of that institution and of Marshall College, in Mercersburg, in the founding and establishing of both of which he was deeply interested. While engaged in this work his health failed, and he was obliged to relinquish the pastoral work, and attend to some secular pursuit in order to provide for himself and family a proper temporal support. He lived in this way, during different periods, at Chambersburg, Philadelphia, Columbia, and mainly at Lock Haven; in the last-named place he died, Oct. 29, 1872. "He suffered severely, especially during the last four years of his life, from lingering consumption, in the midst of which he manifested much Christian patience, especially during the closing portion of his earthly career." See *Reformed Church Messenger*, Nov. 6, 1872.

Mayer, Johann, a German theologian, was born Aug. 2, 1697, at Nuremberg; studied at the high-schools of his native place until 1717, when he went to the University of Altdorf to study theology. In 1720 he removed to the University of Halle, and there enjoyed the instruction of the celebrated German savants Wolf and Michaelis. He continued his studies until 1725, when he finally secured the position of catechist, first at an orphan asylum and later at a prison. In 1727 he was made vicar, and in 1728 morning preacher at St. Waldburg. The year following he became pastor at Schwinunbach and Wengen; in 1732 dean of Spitalch, Nuremberg; in 1738 was transferred to the Church of St. Laurence; in 1749 became senior of the chapter. He died Sept. 3, 1760. Mayer's productions are mostly of an ascetic character; at the time of their publication they secured him much popularity, especially his *Epistolische Betrachtungen des Todes* (Nuremb. 1741, 4to). He also published a number of his sermons. For further details of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theologie Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Mayer, Johann C., a Presbyterian minister, a German by birth, was born in Korb, Würtemburg, May 4, 1835. He was educated at Basle, Switzerland, and attended the seminary at St. Christiana. He left his native land and settled in Texas, where he was licensed by the Lutheran Synod of Texas. On coming to New Orleans he organized a German Presbyterian Church, but died before he had been ordained pastor over it, Aug. 24, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 76.

Mayer, Johann Friedrich, a German Lutheran minister, was born at Leipsic in 1650. He studied in the university of his native city, and became successively superintendent of Leissnig in 1673, of Grimma in 1679, professor of theology at Wittemberg in 1684, pastor of St. Joseph of Hamburg in 1686, professor of the gymnasium of that city in 1687, professor at the University of Kiel in 1688, professor and archchancellor at the University of Greifswald, and general superintendent of Pomerania and Rügen, in 1701. He died at Stettin in 1712. Mayer had taken a leading part in all the controversies of the time. Among his voluminous works we notice *Bibliotheca Biblica*, which treats of the most celebrated Jewish, Romish, Lutheran, and Calvinistic expositions of Scripture (best edition, Nostock, 1713):—*Best Method of Studying Holy Scripture:—History of Martin Luther's German Version of the Bible:—An Account of the Moderns who have written against the Holy Scriptures:—An Exposition of the first two Psalms:—Tractatus de Osculo Redum Pontificis Romani:—De Fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsis Pontificiis ambiguâ.* See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 209; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, xi, 35; Hook, *Biog. Dict.* vii, 262. (J. N. P.)

Mayer, John, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the early part of the 17th century. But few memorials have been discovered to furnish any satisfactory account of his personal history. It appears from his prefaces that he labored under infirm health, which unfitted him for public services as a clergyman for many years. In 1634 he became minister of Reydon, in Suffolk. He published *Theological Treatises and Commentaries on the English Catechism* (Lond. 1621, 4to):—*A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments* (rare; 6 vols. fol., and 1 vol. 4to, 1631, '47, '52, '53). See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s. v.

Mayer, Lewis, D.D., a noted American divine of that branch of the Christian Church denominated the *German Reformed*, was born at Lancaster, Pa., March 26, 1783. After having received a liberal education in his native place, he removed to Frederick, Md., where he devoted his attention for some time to a secular calling. He was fond of reading and study. Having become conscious of a call to the holy ministry, he pursued his theological studies with great zeal and success, under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Wagner, of Frederick, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1807, and became pastor of a charge in Shepherdstown, Va., where he labored till 1821. In that year he was called as pastor to York, Pa. In 1825 he resigned his charge, having been called by the Synod of the German Reformed Church to assume the presidency of the theological seminary then established at Carlisle, Pa., and afterwards located at York, Pa. In this position he labored with great zeal till 1835. His health giving way he retired to private life, and lived in York, Pa. He devoted his remaining strength to the preparation of a *History of the German Reformed Church*, only the first volume of which, however, has been published. This volume is chiefly occupied with an account of the Reformation in Switzerland. His labors were brought down to 1770. Dr. Mayer published also a *Treatise on the Sin against the Holy Ghost*, and *Lectures on Scripture Subjects*. While professor of theology he also edited for some years the Magazine and the Messenger of the German Reformed Church. He died Aug. 25, 1849. See biographical sketch by the Rev. E. Heiner, prefaced to Dr. Mayer's *History* (Phila. 1850, 8vo, pp. 477).

Mayer, Philip Frederick, D.D., a distinguished American Lutheran minister, was born April 1, 1781, in the city of New York, where he continued to reside till he reached his majority. His earlier years were spent at the German school attached to the Lutheran Church. His preparation for college was made under the direction of Mr. Campbell. He graduated with the first honors of his class at Columbia College, New York, in 1799, then under the administration of Dr. W. S. Johnson. He spent three years in the prosecution of his theological studies, under the instruction of the Rev. Dr. Kunze, one of the most learned men of his day. He was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1802, and soon after took charge of the Lutheran Church at Lunenburg (now Athens), N. Y. In 1806 he resigned this position, and accepted a call as pastor of St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia. This was the first exclusively English Lutheran congregation formed in this country. To the discharge of his arduous duties Dr. Mayer devoted himself with conscientious fidelity and untiring zeal. He was unwearied in his efforts to promote the good of his

own flock, as well as faithful and constant in his aims to advance the welfare of the whole community. He never withheld his influence from any object which met his deliberate and cordial approval. In 1808 he was associated with bishop White, Dr. Green, Dr. Rush, and others in the formation of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, the first institution of the kind organized in the United States, of which he continued to be an active and efficient manager, and was at the time of his death the presiding officer. He was also the senior member of the board of trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. He was the president of the board of managers of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum and of the Philadelphia Dispensary, and was actively connected with other eleemosynary institutions. Liberal and enlarged in his views, he was at some time identified, either as a patron or director, with every philanthropic enterprise of a catholic spirit in his adopted city. He retained his pastoral connection with the Church till his death, which occurred April 16, 1858. Dr. Mayer was no ordinary man, or he could never have so successfully sustained himself for so long a period among the same people, and enjoyed in so eminent a degree the regard and confidence of the whole community. He was a man of clear intellect and quick perceptions, united with great delicacy of taste and keen discernment. He was a ripe scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the whole range of English literature, and in the department of Biblical Criticism having few superiors. He received his D.D. from Columbia College, New York, and the University of Pennsylvania. (M. L. S.)

Mayhew, Experience, a noted American divine, for years actively engaged in missionary labors among the Indians, was born Jan. 27, 1673. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all most successfully engaged as missionaries to the Indians before him. In March, 1694, about five years after the death of his father, he began to preach to the Indians, taking the oversight of five or six of their assemblies. The Indian language had been familiar to him from infancy, and he was employed by the commissioners of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in New England to make a new version of the *Psalms* and *John*, which work he executed with great accuracy in 1709. He died Nov. 29, 1758, aged eighty-five. He published a sermon entitled *All Mankind by Nature equally under Sin* (1724): —*Indian Converts* (1727), in which he gives an account of the lives of thirty Indian ministers, and about eighty Indian men, women, and youth, worthy of remembrance on account of their piety:—*Letter on the Lord's Supper* (1741):—*Grace Defended* (1744), in which he contends that the offer of salvation made to sinners in the Gospel contains in it a conditional promise of the grace given in regeneration. In this he says he differs from most Calvinists; yet he supports the doctrines of original sin, of eternal decrees, and of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of man. His son Zechariah succeeded him in the missionary field, making five generations thus engaged. The age attained by the Mayhews is remarkable: the first, Thomas, died aged ninety; Experience, eighty-four; John, grandson of the first John, eighty-nine; his brother Jeremiah, eighty-five; Dr. Matthew, eighty-five; Zechariah, seventy-nine. — *Indian Conv.*, Appendix, p. 306, 307; Chauncy's *Remarks on Landaff's Sermon*, p. 23; *Cyclop. Rel. Knowledge*, s. v.

Mayhew, Jonathan, D.D., a celebrated American divine, was born at Martha's Vineyard Oct. 8, 1720. He was a descendant of Thomas Mayhew, the first English settler of that island. In early childhood Jonathan gave indications of great vigor of mind and a strong will. He was fitted for college by his father, who was a very intelligent man. During his college course at Harvard he was distinguished not only as a fine classical scholar, but also for his skill in dialectics and his attainments in ethical science. He graduated with great honor in 1744. Three years later he received a call from West Church, in Boston, and continued in this station for the remainder of his life. On the day first appointed for his ordination only two clergymen of those invited were in attendance, owing, no doubt, to his extreme rationalism; and even these two refused to act, and a council, consisting of fourteen ministers, had to be convoked, June 17, after which the new candidate was duly installed in office. Mr. Mayhew's liberal opinions were so unpopular in Boston that he was for some time excluded from membership of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. In 1750 the degree of doctor of divinity was conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen. His publications excited great attention not only in this country, but also in England. In 1755 he published a volume of sermons on the *Doctrine of Grace*. At the close of one of these sermons there is a note on the doctrine of the Trinity, which was offensive alike to those who did and did not endorse his general views. Subsequently the doctor himself appears to have regretted having written it, and he unsuccessfully endeavored to prevent its being published in the London edition. Dr. Mayhew was at this time scribe of the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers. In 1763 the Rev. East Arthorp published a pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for Propagating the Gospel*, occasioning a violent controversy, in which Dr. Mayhew bore a prominent part. Dr. Mayhew was extensively known throughout Great Britain, and numbered among his correspondents such men as Lardner, Benson, Kippis, Blackburn, and Hollis. He died July 9, 1766. Dr. Mayhew possessed a mind of great acuteness and energy, and in his principles was a determined republican. He had no little influence in producing the American Revolution. Among his best-known publications are the following: *Seven Sermons* (1749, 8vo):—*A Discourse concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-resistance to the Higher Powers* (1750, 8vo). See Mr. Bancroft's notice of this sermon, and his eloquent tribute to Mayhew, in his *Hist. of the United States*, iv, 60–62:—*Thanksgiving Sermon for the Repeal of the Stamp Act* (1766):—*Sermons to Young Men* (1767, 2 vols. 12mo). See *Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew*, by Alden Bradford (1838); Riche, *Bibl. Amer. Nova*, i, 140, 145, 153; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 22 sq.

Mayhew, Thomas, a Trinitarian Congregational minister, son of Thomas Mayhew, the governor of Martha's Vineyard, was born in Southampton, England, about 1621; emigrated with his father to New England in 1631; resided for a few years in Watertown, Mass.; and in 1642 assisted his father in establishing a settlement at Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. Being deeply affected by the intellectual and moral degradation of the Indians, and possessing good natural talents, and a considerable knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, he determined to devote himself to preaching to the natives of the island. He soon acquired their language, commenced his pulpit ministrations in 1646, and labored among them so faithfully that in 1650 he had 100 converts, and in 1662, 282, among whom were eight pawams or priests. In 1657 he sailed for England to obtain aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but the ship in which he had taken passage was lost at sea, and never heard of. Cotton Mather says that "he was so affectionately esteemed by the Indians that many years afterwards he was seldom named without tears." He wrote, in connection with John Eliot, *Tears of Repentance, or a Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians in New England.*—Sprague, *Annals American Pulpit*, i, 131; Drake, *Dict. American Biography*, s. v.

Maymbourg. See MAIMBURG.

Mayne, James S., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ravallagh, near Coleraine, Antrim County, Ireland, in 1825. He received a careful academic educa-

tion in his native country, and in 1853 came to America; graduated at Princeton College with honor in 1857; studied divinity at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1859, and in 1860 commenced his labors at May's Landing, Atlantic City, and Absecon, N. J., where he died, Aug. 30, 1860. Mr. Mayne was a man noted for his consistent and devoted piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 103.

Mayne, Jasper, an English divine and poet, was born in Devonshire in 1604. At the age of nineteen he entered Christ-church College, Oxford, and in 1631 secured the degree of M.A. He took holy orders, became a popular preacher, was presented by his college to two neighboring livings, and continued at the same time his residence in the university. He was made D.D. in 1646. At the time of Cromwell's usurpation, being firmly devoted to the cause of Charles I, he was deprived of his student's place, and soon lost both of his vicarages. His spirit, however, remained unbroken, and in 1652 we hear of his holding a public disputation with a noted Anabaptist preacher. Subsequently he resided, until the Restoration, as chaplain in the family of the earl of Devonshire; in 1660 he was restored again to his living, was made chaplain in ordinary to the king, a canon of Christ Church, and archdeacon of Chichester. He died in Oxford in 1672. Dr. Mayne published in 1662 a translation of a part of Lucian's Dialogues, also several sermons and scattered poems.

Maynooth College. In consequence of the English Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland lost all its rights and possessions. At the Synod of Dublin, in 1560, seventeen bishops out of nineteen endorsed the Act of Uniformity, and, upon the principle that "ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia," the English Reformed Church was declared the only legal Church in Ireland. The Roman Catholics were therefore compelled to worship in private, and to get their priests educated abroad. With the assistance of foreign princes they established, during the years 1582–1688, a number of seminaries in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands (namely, at Salamanca, Alcala, Lisbon, Evora, Dacay, Antwerp, Tournay, Lille, Rome, Prague, Caupranica, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Poitiers, Nantes, Bouley, and Paris). As most of the students were poor and dependent on the aristocracy of Ireland, a great attachment grew up between them and the class by whom they were patronized. But in consequence of the French Revolution intercourse between Ireland and the Continent became more difficult. The Irish colleges of France and Brabant were closed, and the necessity became apparent of establishing a seminary at home. The most opposite political parties agreed in supporting this measure: the aristocracy from fear that the young priests might imbibe democratic ideas abroad, and the democrats from the hope of gaining over to their views the priests, who had heretofore always sided with their patrons. The middle classes especially thought to find in home-bred priests useful auxiliaries to their emancipation. When therefore the Roman Catholic prelates submitted to the lord lieutenant of Ireland their plan of establishing a college, he immediately gave his approval; the Irish Parliament, composed of Protestants, sanctioned it, voted an appropriation of £8000, and readily obtained the approbation of the Parliament of England in 1795. A board of trustees was organized, consisting of four Protestants, the Irish lord chancellor, three chief justices, six Roman Catholic laymen, and ten bishops. Dr. Hussey, who had been eminently active in organizing the whole affair, was elected president of the college. The whole care and management of the college was vested in this board of managers. The four Protestant members were changed every five years (being replaced by election of the other members), and, together with three Roman Catholics, fulfilled the duties of inspectors, yet without the power of interfering with either the doctrines or the discipline of the college. The most liberal among the Roman Catholics wished the college to be established at Dublin, the seat of the University, and where members of the different denominations were already studying harmoniously together. But the Roman Catholic bishops opposed this, as they desired their priests to be educated under stricter discipline. The board of managers therefore chose the village of Maynooth, eleven miles from Dublin, and commenced building a seminary for fifty students on a piece of land purchased from the duke of Leinster. When the Irish Parliament was incorporated with the English, in 1801, an appropriation was made for the College of Maynooth amounting to some £8000 a year for the next twenty years. In 1808 some £13,000 more was voted for the purpose of enlarging the seminary, as it was inadequate to educating the number of priests required. Indeed in that year there were 478 obliged to study abroad, chiefly in France, while there were only 200 to 250 attending at Maynooth. The seminary continued a long time without attracting much attention; even the report of the board of trustees, presented in 1826 to Parliament, did not throw much light on the real character of the institution; in fact, the true state of things was rather covered up than revealed in that document. But when O'Connell's agitation broke out, it became apparent that its principal champions were priests educated in Maynooth College. It was also found that the alumni of Maynooth took an active part in the Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 by unfairly influencing the elections. The seminary, instituted for the purpose of suppressing democratic ideas, seems thus to have become a centre of political as well as religious agitation. But the interior workings of the institution remained hidden from the public gaze until a zealous Protestant minister, M'Ghee, procured the theological text-book of Peter Dens, used at Maynooth, which was published to the extent of three thousand copies in 1804; another edition of the same number appeared in 1832. This work, which breathes to the utmost the Roman Catholic spirit of aggression and persecution, and upholds the most offensive doctrines of that Church, was considered there as the highest authority, and gives a striking contradiction to the statement so often made by interested parties that the Roman Catholicism of the 19th century is animated by an entirely different spirit from that of former times. These revelations provoked much opposition to Romanism, and a growing desire to abrogate the privileges of the Romanists. June 28, 1835, a great meeting was held at Exeter Hall, which was followed by others in various cities of England and Scotland. It was proved that the Romish Church still displayed the same zeal for the destruction of heretics, still claimed to relieve from oaths, retained auricular confession, with all its attendant evils, and all from unequivocal passages in the aforesaid textbook. Numberless pamphlets were published on this occasion; Protestant associations were formed in Ireland to defend evangelical freedom, and chief among these were found the Orangemen. The old hatred between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was thus revived, and trouble with Ireland seemed imminent. On the side of the Romish Church the "liberator of Ireland" gained crowds to his party by his eloquence and his fiery denunciations of the English; his attitude became so threatening that the government was obliged to prosecute him for high-treason. This repressed the rebellion in its very infancy, but at the same time embittered the feelings of the Roman Catholic population. Previous experience for seven centuries had shown that persecution could indeed weaken, and almost destroy, but never conquer Ireland; and this was still more the case with regard to their Church, which the Roman Catholic Irish clung to the more as it was weaker and more oppressed. There remained nothing but to try whether kindness would succeed where harshness had failed. The occasion was favorable, the insurrection was suppressed, and, if the victors met the vanquished as friends, much might be gained. This Irish question

proved almost insolvable to the English government. Cabinet after cabinet were wrecked upon it, without arriving at any result. And this is not to be wondered at, for the civil as well as religious relations in Ireland had for a long time been in so abnormal a state that all attempts at reform seemed either inefficient or dangerous. Every effort to improve the condition of the peasantry was met by the opposition of the landed aristocracy, while every assistance rendered to the weak and oppressed, but *de facto* national Church of Ireland, exasperated the Protestant element of the population. The passage of any bill concerning Ireland was a most complicated piece of politics. But, said an Irish paper, "Protestantism is not as powerful as landed property, and religion must give way before ground-rents." Without attributing such views—as was often done—to the British government, for attempts at conciliation were made from religious motives, it would appear that Sir Robert Peel inclined to this theory when, in 1845, he presented the Maynooth Bill to Parliament. Indeed for the last fifty years Parliament had been voting an annual appropriation of over £8000 for the education of Roman Catholic priests; the preceding year the Charitable Bequest Bill had been passed almost unanimously, and the Roman Catholic prelates had assured Peel that the passage of his new bill would be thankfully received by the Roman Catholics as a pledge of reconciliation. But hardly had the bill been presented to the House of Commons when a storm of opposition arose. The Protestants of the various denominations united to denounce it, and to petition against a bill which would modify the Protestant character of the administration. A large meeting, chiefly of Dissenters, was held at Exeter Hall, March 18, 1845, and a Central Anti-Maynooth Committee organized to oppose the bill, and to overwhelm the Parliament with petitions. On April 3 Peel presented the bill to the House of Commons. He attempted to prove that there were but three ways of acting: to maintain things as they were, to suppress the usual appropriation, or to increase it. The first he declared impracticable, as so insufficient a sum for the purpose could not gain much gratitude for the donors; the second, he said, was still less advisable, as the withdrawal of assistance to which they had been accustomed for fifty years would not fail to exasperate the Irish; but the third he looked upon as a certain remedy. He therefore proposed to raise the yearly appropriation for Maynooth to £26,000, making it a part of the regular budget, and thus transforming the grant into a dotation; he moreover proposed to incorporate the board of trustees, and to vote a special grant of £30,000 for building purposes. Besides, the existing *ex officio* inspectors were to be replaced by five inspectors appointed by the crown, who, however, would leave the control of the doctrines and discipline to the three Roman Catholic inspectors. The opposition was headed by Sir R. Inglis. He attacked the bill on religious ground, as opposed to Protestant principles. He did not mean to withdraw the usual appropriation, but wanted Roman Catholics, like Dissenters, to educate their ministers at their own expense. All those opposed to the Established Church sided with him. The bill received 216 votes against 114 at the first reading. This, however, was but the prelude. At the second reading the struggle commenced in earnest, and lasted through six sittings. They first argued about the new principle, which converted a yearly grant into a dotation, for *this gave to the previously ignored Roman Catholic Church a legal existence and official recognition.* The friends of the bill sought to defend this principle in various ways. Some claimed that it was the *duty* of the Parliament to care for Maynooth, either because, by uniting with itself the Irish Parliament, it had assumed its charges, or as a sort of restitution for the former possessions of which the Church of Rome had been deprived. Yet the assumption of the liabilities of the Irish Parliament did not guarantee the continuance of the grant longer than twenty years more, and, on the other hand, calling £26,000 a restitution, when the yearly income from the confiscated Church property amounted to over £600,000, sounded like bitter mockery. Others preferred to take the broader ground of moral obligation, claiming that it was necessary to aid oppressed and impoverished Ireland. Others again, leaving the past to consider only the future, argued from the political point of view. They hoped that this conciliatory measure, and the better education of the priests, would open a new æra to Ireland. None of these views satisfied Gladstone, who, after criticising them all, finally arrived at the negative principle that the support granted to Maynooth should only be withdrawn at the last extremity, as it would have the worst consequences on the relation existing between England and Ireland. Some even sought to treat it as a mere educational question. Still the majority could not blind themselves to the fact that it really involved the weighty and difficult question of the relation between the English government and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The opponents of the bill had an easier task. They could readily attack it from an abstract religious stand-point. They divided themselves, however, into two great sections, according to the ground they took. The Churchmen and some of the Dissenters did not oppose the continuation of the former support, but its increase; the Dissenters, as a body, opposed this, like all other government support towards churches. Both parties clamored loudly against the abuses of the Church of Rome, its political as well as religious tendencies, and particularly the Jesuitical spirit inculcated at Maynooth. Yet Parliament perceived that something must be done to allay the hostile feelings in Ireland, and the bill passed the second reading with 323 votes against 176. After another protracted and severe struggle, it received at the third reading 317 votes against 189. The discussion of the bill in the House of Lords was a repetition of that in the House of Commons. The most eminent jurists decided in favor of the bill. Brougham established a precedent in bringing forward a previous act in which the principle of dotation was clearly expressed. On the bench of bishops, six voted in favor of the bill; among them the archbishop of Armagh and the bishops of Norwich and St. David. The bill finally went through with 181 votes against 50, and received the royal sanction on June 30, 1845. While the bill was under discussion in Parliament, the opposition outside was very active. A large meeting was held on April 13 at Covent Garden, in which both Churchmen and Dissenters took part. Other meetings were also held in the principal cities. The Dissenters were especially active. Churchmen and Dissenters asserted as the ground of their opposition: 1, that by increasing the grant to the seminary, the papacy would be legally recognised in Ireland; 2, that the practice of employing government funds for the support of religion is wrong in principle; 3, that there were special objections to the bill under consideration, namely, the Jesuitical tendencies of Maynooth, the danger of the influence over the masses of a more thoroughly-educated clergy, the evil of binding the clergy to the support of the government, leading them to oppose the progressive social tendencies of the people; and, finally, the spirit of aggression inherent to the papacy. Some of the Dissenters, however, found this platform too indefinite; they wanted the bill rejected wholly on anti-State-Church principles, and on May 2 formed a special committee at Salter's Hall, distinct from the original Central Anti-Maynooth Committee. On May 20 they held a meeting at Crosby Hall, in which 300 ministers and 400 laymen (principally Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Calvinistic and Arminian Methodists of the new Connection) took part. They urged the Roman Catholics to decline the assistance of the Government to their Church for their own sake and that of their religion. Sir Culling Eardley, president of the Central Committee, spoke in a quite different tone in a letter to O'Con-

nell. He accused the Roman Catholic leader of inconsistency if he accepted the new grant, and threatened to use every means in his power to gain his end. An Anti-Maynooth Committee was also organized at Dublin, and in a meeting held on June 5 an address to the House of Lords was drawn up, which received 3627 signatures, and also a petition to the queen. On the whole there were some 10,000 petitions drawn up against the bill, which received about 1,130,000 signatures. The government, however, remained unmoved, and the excitement gradually subsided. It was thought that now the Roman Catholic party would rest satisfied, and be truly reconciled; yet at one of the very first synods held by them the royal colleges were excommunicated and the national school condemned. The Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland—Cullen, Slatery, and M'Hale—had already attracted considerable attention by their Ultramontane views, but at this last outrage the old opposition spirit kindled again into a flame. Spooner provoked a visitation of Maynooth College by a bill he proposed May 11, 1852. Yet more moderate advice prevailed: it was claimed that the papal aggression in no wise affected Ireland, but rather England, and that the most Ultramontane among the Irish prelates, Cullen, was educated at Rome, not at Maynooth. Spooner finally withdrew his motion. Yet every year, for some time after, the proposition of stopping the appropriation was renewed; and was not dropped until quiet had been fully restored in Ireland, and general harmony re-established.

The agitation of the Irish population in late years, provoked, no doubt, in a great measure in Ireland, as in Poland, by the immaculate emissaries of the pontiff of Rome, has led the government of England to consider the propriety of granting the three millions of Irish Romanists such liberty in worship and education as should make them as fit subjects as the other twenty millions of the northern isles who enjoy the protection of the British crown, and worthy associates of their English-speaking neighbors. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone, whose very earliest work had been "marked by a plain inclination to elevate the Church above the State," and who, in the very maiden-days of his political career, had "exhibited an unfailing tenderness for the whims, the complaints, and the growing claims of his friends the papal prelates," was called to the premiership of Great Britain, to establish, if possible, perfect accord between the English and Irish people. Almost the sole aim of the policy which the new premier inaugurated was the conciliation of the Romanists of Ireland. For this one purpose he has labored uninterruptedly. No sooner had he succeeded Mr. Disraeli than he urged the disestablishment of the Church of England principles as the ecclesiastical principles of ireland. His success in this attempt is now a matter of history. See IRELAND. Flattered by the easy victory gained in his first effort, Mr. Gladstone followed it by a proposal for the establishment of compulsory education and denominational schools. Herein, also, he succeeded, but only measurably. Encouraged by these repeated successes, he has lately come forward with a scheme which only a few days ago (February, 1873) threatened his ruin, and even now holds him in suspense. His new scheme now on foot is a proposition to dismantle Trinity College, long the eyesore of Romanists, and to found an immense educational establishment, called the Irish University, in which Catholics shall study only their own history and philosophy, Protestants a different series, and which shall be endowed with a vast revenue from the spoliation of Trinity and the wrecks of the Established Church. Both Dissenters and Conformists are alarmed at the step Mr. Gladstone seems determined upon. Even Romanists disfavor the proposal, for of the three or four millions of Catholic Irish it is probable that not one third of suitable age can read and write. The greatest opposition, however, has come from Rome, and suddenly the premier of Great Britain finds himself confronted by those whom he had always had reason to look upon as his chief supporters. Well has it lately been said that "the policy of Rome knows neither friendship nor gratitude; to serve 'the Church' it strikes indiscriminately at its friends or foes; and the British statesman has shown himself no match for the Italian priests, who have preyed upon his eminent renown, and would now, perhaps, exult over his fall. They throw him aside as the instrument they can no longer use, and demand that Ireland shall be ruled and educated by Catholics alone. With mediæval mummeries they have dedicated the island to 'the sacred heart of Jesus,' and plainly intend nothing less than the total subjugation of its Protestant population to a priestly despotism." The endowment of Maynooth, and later the establishment of the queen's colleges, and even the open doors of Trinity, cannot and will not pacify Rome. She seeks control of Ireland both in Church and State; and so long as the papacy shall remain tainted by a zest for temporal power, both England and Prussia will find defilement and abasement, aye, not unfrequently rebellion in the ranks of those of her subjects who claim fidelity to the hierarchy. The last days certainly are teaching even the most liberal-minded politicians that the Church of Rome is built upon a foundation which is political as well as ecclesiastical, and that the severe measures, as inaugurated by Bismark, will alone save the Protestant world from ruin and decay.

Mayo, DANIEL, a Presbyterian divine of some note, was born in London or vicinity in 1672. He was educated first at home, then went abroad and studied for some time in Holland under Witsius. On his return to England he preached successively at Tothill Fields, Westminster, at Kingston-upon-Thames, and at Hackney, and finally settled permanently at Silver Street, London, where he died in 1733. Mr. Mayo was a man of considerable talents, great zeal and activity, combined with prudence. Besides publishing many sermons, he wrote, in continuation of Henry's *Exposition*, a *Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Brown, *Cyclop. of Religious Knowledge*, s. v.

Mayotta, one of the Comoro Isles (in the Indian Ocean), since 1843 under the control of the French, is situated in latitude 12° 34′–13° 4′ S., and longitude 44° 59′ 15″–45° 23′ E., covering some twenty-one miles from north to south, with an average breadth of six or seven miles; if, however, the dangerous coral reefs which surround the island be included, the whole occupies a space of thirty miles north and south, and twenty-four miles east and west, and contains a population of about 8000, mostly Romanists. The surface of this isle is very uneven, and is studded with volcanic-looking peaks, some of which exceed 2000 feet in height. Its shores are in some places lined with mangrove swamps, which are uncovered at low water, and are productive of malaria and fever; it is in most parts capable of cultivation, prominently that of sugar, the only article exported. The French themselves live mainly on the island of Gaondzi, inside the chain of reefs on the east side of Mayotta. A governor and colonial officer are residents, and some 100 French soldiers, besides some natives, were stationed there. The Roman Catholic Church alone has a hold here.

Mayow, ROBERT WYNELL, an English divine, was born at Saltash, in the latter half of the 17th century (1777); was educated at Exeter College, Oxford; and, after serving several curacies in succession, removed to Ardwick, near Manchester, but there he died, only three months after removal, in 1817. Mr. Mayow is highly spoken of as a pulpit orator. A noted English writer has compared him with Sterne for his great humor and strong feeling, which the two possessed in common. He published *Plain Preaching, or Sermons for the Poor and for People of all Ranks* (Lond. 1816, 12mo):—*Sermons and Miscellaneous Pieces*, to which is prefixed a *Memoir*

of his Life (1822, 12mo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Mayr, Beda, a Benedictine monk, was born at Dutingen, in Bavaria, in 1742. He entered the cloister at Donauwörth in his twentieth year. Finely cultured, and classed with the best talent of his day, he sought relief from the dulness of convent life by teaching mathematics, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, canon law, and theology. He was charged with being liberal to excess, and was both feared and distrusted by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. His principal work, *Defence of the Natural, Christian, and Catholic Religion, according to the Necessities of our Time*, was published at Augsburg in 1787, and is still mentioned. He died April 28, 1794. A list of his works is given by Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.; see also Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vi, 953. (G. M.)

Mayr, Cölestin, a German theologian, was born April 21, 1679, at Donauwörth. In 1698 he entered the Benedictine Order at Augsburg; later he became a student at the University of Salzburg, where in 1711 he was appointed professor of philosophy. In 1713 he obtained the professorship of polemical theology, and the inspection of the Salzburg schools. About this time he was made doctor of divinity. In 1714 he was appointed ecclesiastical counsellor of the duke of Salzburg, and at the same time became professor of scholastic theology. In 1716 he was appointed vice-rector of the university, in 1719 pro-chancellor, and in 1728 chief rector. In 1731 he retired from academic life, and thereafter held an official relation to the cloister Linzheim, in Neuburg, where he died, March 19, 1753. Mayr enjoyed great prominence as a writer of theology, but his productions have never been collected in book form. They consist mainly of dissertations and contributions to different journals. For a list of his writings, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, s. v.

Maysart. See Meysart.

Mazarin, Jules (properly *Guilio Mazzarino*), cardinal, the celebrated prime-minister of king Louis XIV of France, the successor of cardinal Richelieu, and inaugurator of a reign noted for attainments in arms, language, fine arts, literature, industry, and a superior degree of splendor, was born of a noble Sicilian family July 14, 1602, most probably at Piscina, near the lake of Celano, in Abruzzo Citra, though in the letters of naturalization granted him in France in 1639 it is stated that he was born at Rome. It is certain, however, that he received his education at the Eternal City, and hence, no doubt, the mistake as to his native place. In 1619 Mazarin went to Spain to pursue the study of jurisprudence, probably intending to enter the legal profession, but, returning to Rome in 1622, a little later he entered the military service, and was given a captain's commission in 1625. Soon after this he entered the service of the Church, and was employed as companion of the papal legate to France, and in this mission displayed great political talents. In the difficulties arising out of the contested succession to the duchy of Mantua, in which France supported the pretensions of the count De Nevers, while the emperor of Germany, the king of Spain, and the duke of Savoy supported those of the duke of Guastalla, Mazarin was sent by pope Urban to Turin as the assistant of cardinal Sacchetti. The latter at once perceived his talent, gave him his entire confidence, and in fact devolved upon him the entire management of the negotiation. It was not immediately successful, for in 1629 Louis XIII in person invaded Savoy, took Suza, and forced the duke of Savoy to abandon his alliance with Spain. Finally Sacchetti returned to Rome, leaving Mazarin, with the title of "internuncio," to continue the negotiations. Cardinal Barberini, the pope's nephew, returned in Sacchetti's stead, and Barberini found Mazarin as indispensable as had his predecessor. Mazarin labored unceasingly to restore peace. He visited the contending powers; in 1630 he saw Louis XIII and cardinal Richelieu, who both formed a high opinion of him, and in 1631 he finally succeeded in effecting the treaty of Cherasco, by which peace was restored. Mazarin at this time displayed considerable trickery in favor of France, and by this unfair partiality acquired the hatred of the courts of Spain and Germany, but the thanks of Louis and Richelieu, who recommended "the able negotiator" to the favor of the pope. Shortly after he was to receive at the hands of the French cardinal and prime-minister the reward due for his great services to Louis XIII. In 1634 he was named vice-legate to Avignon, but was sent to Paris as nuncio to intercede with Louis XIII in favor of the duke of Lorraine, whose duchy the king of the French had taken possession of. Mazarin, now unequivocally drawn towards Richelieu, of course failed to accomplish the task assigned him by the holy father. Mazarin returned to Rome in 1636 as the avowed supporter of French interests, and, on the death of Richelieu's celebrated confidant, father Joseph, pope Urban was solicited by Louis XIII and his minister to bestow upon Mazarin the cardinal's hat promised for father Joseph, but, as Urban refused, Mazarin in 1639 quitted Italy for France, and there entered the service of the king as a naturalized Frenchman. In 1640 he was nominated ambassador to Savoy, where, after a short war, he was enabled to restore peace, and in 1641 he was at length raised to the rank of cardinal, through the persistent efforts of his friend the cardinal and prime-minister of France. Mazarin, in France, was a faithful and useful assistant to Richelieu, especially during the famous conspiracy headed by Henri de Cinq-Mars, which ended by his execution in September, 1642. This was Richelieu's last triumph. In the following December he died, recommending on his death-bed that Louis should receive Mazarin as his own successor, and Louis, sufficiently predisposed in Mazarin's favor, gladly acceded to the last wish of his faithful friend and counsellor. In 1643 Louis XIII himself died, and Mazarin's position became one of great difficulty amid the intrigues, jealousies, and strifes of the courtiers surrounding Louis XIV in his minority. By the will of the late king he had been declared the sole adviser of the queen-regent, Anne of Austria, but the latter assumed a decidedly hostile attitude towards the cardinal, and it was some time before he succeeded in acquiring the principal power in the government, as well as the confidence of the queen-regent. He used his power at first with moderation, and courted popularity by gracious and affable manners. He prosecuted the war against Spain which began under his predecessor, and in which Condé and Turenne maintained the honor of the French arms. A dispute which arose between the court and the Parliament of Paris, regarding the registration of edicts of taxation, was fomented by cardinal De Retz into the revolt of the Parisians called "the Day of the Barricades" (Aug. 27, 1648), and was followed by the civil war of the Fronde. The court was forced to retire to St. Germain, and Mazarin was outlawed by Parliament; but, by the truce of Ruel, he still remained minister. The feeling against him, however, became still more inflamed when, at his instigation, the queen-regent caused the princes of Condé and Conti and the duke of Longueville to be arrested in January, 1650. Mazarin went in person at the head of the court troops to the insurgent provinces, and, after the victory at Réthel, showed so much insolence that the nobles and the people of the capital made common cause against him. He found it necessary to secure his safety by flight to the Netherlands. The press teemed with violent publications against Mazarin, known as *Mazarinades* (collected by Moreau in the *Bibliographie des Mazarinades* [Paris, 1850–51, 3 vols. 8vo]; a selection of them was also published by Moreau under the title *Choix des Mazarinades* [ibid. 1854, 2 vols. 8vo]). After the rebellion of the prince of Condé he ventured to return to France; but Paris making his removal a condition of its submission, he retired again from the court, and it was not till

Feb. 3, 1653 that he made a triumphant entry into the capital, where he was received with significant silence. Yet after a time the skill, patience, and perseverance of Mazarin triumphed, and he regained his former popularity and acquired his former power. See here article Louis XIV, p. 526, col. 1. After governing France with great ability, and just as Louis XIV was arriving at an age when he felt the capacity and desire to sway the sceptre himself, Mazarin died, March 9, 1661. In 1690 some letters, written by Mazarin during the negotiation of the peace of the Pyrenees, were published; additional letters were published in 1693, and in 1745 others were added, and the whole arranged under the title of *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin, où l'on voit le secret de négotiation de la Paix des Pyrénées.* "They were written for the information and instruction of the young king, and form useful examples of clearness and precision in diplomatic writings." His person was remarkably handsome, and his manners fascinating, and from an opponent he turned Anne of Austria, the queen-regent during Louis XIV's minority, into his friend, if not secretly affianced companion, as has been asserted with much appearance of truth. "Mazarin," says Mignet (*Mémoires relatifs à la succession d'Espagne*), "had a far-seeing and inventive mind, a character rather supple than feeble. His device was 'Le Temps et moi.'" Under his administration the influence of France among the nations was increased, and in the internal government of the country those principles of despotism were established on which Louis XIV afterwards acted. The administration of justice, however, became very corrupt, and the commerce and finances of the country sank into deep depression. It is admitted that as a financial administrator he was far inferior to Richelieu. Mazarin was very niggardly and very avaricious, and had acquired in various ways, fair and foul, an immense fortune, amounting to 12,000,000 livres, which he offered to the king shortly before he died; afraid, it is thought, that it might be rudely seized from his heirs. Louis declined the restitution, which was perhaps what the wily minister expected. In his will Mazarin made many and large bequests to students and literary enterprises; indeed, he had always proved himself the friend and patron of learning. The College Mazarin was founded at his wish, to receive students from the provinces acquired by the "peace of the Pyrenees," and to this same institution he presented his library, of immense value and size. See the *Memoirs* of Mazarin's contemporaries, Retz, Madame Motteville, La Rochefoucault, Turenne, Grammont, etc.; *Mme. de Longueville*, etc., by Victor Cousin; Aubery, *Histoire du Cardinal Mazarin* (1751); Capefigue, *Richelieu, Mazarin, la Fronde et la règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1835, 8 vols. 8vo); Saint-Aulaire, *Histoire de la Fronde;* Bazin, *Histoire de France sous le Ministère du Cardinal Mazarin* (Paris, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV;* Gualdo-Priorato, *Vita del Cardinal Mazarin* (1662); John Calvert, *Life of Cardinal Mazarin* (1670); Sismondi, *Histoire des Français;* Grammont, *Mémoires;* V. Cousin, *La Jeunesse de Mazarin;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale;* Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; *Fraser's Magazine*, November, 1831, and February, 1832.

Mazdak (or **Mazdek**), a Persian religious enthusiast, flourished towards the close of the 5th century (he is believed to have been born about A.D. 470). He professed to be a prophet, and, securing many followers, declared for a community of property. Gaining in strength among the people, he found favor finally also in the eyes of his ruler, king Kobâd, and the system of communism was adopted, effecting great changes in the social order. The revolution, however, lasted only a short time, and gradually the old order of things was restored.

Mazel, Abraham, a leader of the French Camisards, was born at Saint-Jean-du-Gard some time about the middle of the 17th century. After the insurrection of the Cévennes in 1702 he was imprisoned, but, escaping from his captors, he determined to bring the people to a more determined stand, and while engaged in this work was killed in a skirmish near Uzés in 1710. See Court, *Histoire des Camisards.* See Camisards.

Maziti'as (Μαζιτίας v. r. Ζειτίας), given by erroneous Græcism (1 Esdr. ix, 35) in place of the Hebrew Mattathiah (Ezra x, 43).

Mazolini, Silvestro, an Italian theologian, is usually known by the surname *Prierias* (after the name of his birthplace, Prierio). See Prierias.

Ma'zor (Heb. *Matsor'*, מָצוֹר), a name occurring only in the original, and which the translators of the A. V. ("besieged places," 2 Kings xix, 24; Isa. xxxvii, 25; "fortified cities," Micah vii, 12; "defence," Isa. xix, 6) have confounded with a word of the same form signifying a *fortress* (as in Psa. xxxi, 22; Hab. ii, 1, etc.). Gesenius, however (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 815), regards it as a title of *Egypt*, and apparently Lower Egypt, as, in three out of the four passages where it occurs, it is in the phrase יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר, the *streams* or canals *of Egypt*, i. e. the branches of the Nile (Isa. xix, 6; xxxvii, 25; 2 Kings xix, 24); and that it comes from the Egpytian word *mesduro*, a *kingdom;* perhaps the sing. of the dual form *Mizraim*, מִצְרַיִם, q. d. *double Egypt* (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* i, 6, 2). Others (see Bochart, *Phaleg*, iv, 24), as probably the Hebrews themselves, considered Egypt to be so called as being strongly fortified (see Diod. Sic. i, 31). See Egypt; Fortress.

Maz'zaroth (Heb. *Mazzaroth'*, מַזָּרוֹת, a word found only in the plural, and occurring but once, Job xxxviii, 32, probably by an interchange of liquids for מַזָּלוֹת, "planets," 2 Kings xxiii, 5), an astronomical term, probably meaning the twelve *signs* of the Zodiac (see Hirzel, Delitzsch, and Conant, severally, ad loc.). See Astronomy. "The Peshito-Syriac renders it by *iogalto*, the Wain, or Great Bear; and J. D. Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* No. 1391) is followed by Ewald in applying it to the stars of the northern crown (Ewald adds the southern), deriving the word from נֵזֶר, *nézer*, a crown. Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.) understands by Mazzaroth the planet Jupiter, the same as the star of Amos v. 26. But the interpretation given in the margin of our version is supported by the authority of Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 869). On referring to 2 Kings xxiii, 5, we find the word מַזָּלוֹת, *mazzâlôth* (A.V. the planets), differing only from *mazzarôth* in having the liquid *l* for *r*, and rendered in the margin 'the twelve signs,' as in the Vulgate. The Sept. there also has μαζουρώθ, which points to the same reading in both passages, and is by Suidas explained as the 'Zodiac,' but by Procopius of Gaza as probably 'Lucifer, the morning star,' following the Vulgate of Job xxxviii, 32. In later Jewish writings *mazzâlôth* are the signs of the Zodiac, and the singular, *mazzâl*, is used to denote the single signs as well as the planets, and also the influence which they were believed to exercise upon human destiny (Selden, *De Dis Syr.* Synt. i. c. 1). In consequence of this, Jarchi, and the Hebrew commentators generally, identify *mazzarôth* and *mazzâlôth*, though their interpretations vary. Aben Ezra understands 'stars' generally; but R. Levi ben-Gershon, 'a northern constellation.' Gesenius himself is in favor of regarding *mazzarôth* as the older form, signifying strictly 'premonitions,' and in the concrete sense, 'stars that give warnings or presages,' from the usage of the root נָזַר, *nâzar*, in Arabic. He deciphered, as he believed, the same words on some Cilician coins in the inscription מזרן זן על, which he renders as a prayer, 'may thy pure star (shine) over (us)' (*Mon. Phoen.* p. 279, tab. 36)."

Mazzocchi (or **Mazzoccolo**), Alessio Simmacho, an Italian antiquary and Orientalist, was born at Santa Maria di Capua in 1684, and afterwards flourished

as professor of Greek and Hebrew at Naples. He died in 1771. Mazzocchi was celebrated for his learning far beyond the borders of his native land. His many treatises (written in Latin and Italian) were elaborate and scholarly dissertations upon various subjects. The Paris Academy of Inscriptions recognised his services to the world by making him a member of its body. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Mazzola, Girolamo Bedolo, an Italian painter, pronounced the most distinguished pupil of Parmigiano, was born near Parma in 1503, and died about 1580. He excelled as colorist and in perspective. Among his most valuable productions are those falling within the domain of sacred art. The most worthy of notice are his *Madonna with St. Catharine* and *Miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves*. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Mazzola (or **Mazzuola**), **Girolamo Francesco Maria,** an eminent Italian painter, surnamed Il Parmigiano, *the Parmesan*, was born at Parma in 1503. He visited Rome in 1523, and was employed by Clement VII to execute a number of works in that city. His style, formed on that of Correggio and Raphael, is characterized by exceeding grace and delicacy of form and softness of coloring. It was said by Mazzola's admirers that "the spirit of Raphael had passed into him." Mazzola was the first Italian artist who engraved with aqua fortis. He died in 1540. Among his masterpieces are the *Madonna della Rosa*, in the gallery of Dresden; an *Annunciation*, in the principal church of Viadana; the *Madonna with St. Margaret, St. Jerome*, etc., in the Museum at Bologna; the *Madonna dello Lungo Collo*, at Florence; and the *Vision of St. Jerome*, in the National Gallery, London. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Affo, *Vita di F. Mazzola* (1784); Mrs. Jameson, *Memoirs of Early Italian Painters;* Bellini, *Cenni intorno alla Vita ed alle Opere di F. Mazzola* (1844); Mortara, *Memoria della Vita di F. Mazzuola* (1846).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

McAdam, Thomas, a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, was born April 10, 1777, near Ballymena, Ireland. Being an ardent friend of liberty, the oppressive measures of the British government led him to take an active part in the efforts made to obtain freedom in Ireland; in consequence of which he incurred the suspicion of the officers of the law, and being in danger of losing his life by a summary trial, in 1797 he left his native land for America. He was subsequently engaged in teaching in Philadelphia; was for a considerable time at the head of the mathematical and English school connected with the University of Pennsylvania; was ordained a ruling elder in 1801, and for many years treasurer of the Board of Missions of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. He died Nov. 16, 1844. Mr. McAdam was a man of noble and generous impulses, dignified in manners, intelligent, and truthful. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 176.

McArthur, James P., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Jackson, N. Y., October 22, 1827; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; studied theology, first in the Associate Seminary, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Presbytery of Miami, and connected with the Presbytery of Cambridge when he died, April 15, 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 159.

McAuley, William, an Associate Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in the north of Ireland about 1765. His early education was thorough, as he was intended for some literary profession, and when about fifteen years old he was entered as student at the University of Glasgow, where he gained high distinctions. Both students and professors regarded him as a youth of singular promise. Upon graduation he at once entered upon the study of theology, under the well-known and venerable John Brown of Haddington, the professor of theology to the Associate Burgher Synod of Scotland, and was one of the last class of students taught by that great and good man. William McAuley was licensed to preach in 1789 by the Associate Presbytery of Armagh, and was ordained by that body in 1790, as minister of the Associate congregation of Tulliallan, and there he labored acceptably until 1794, when he emigrated to the United States. Here he was received by the Presbytery of Washington (Synod of New York), and was installed in charge of the united congregations of Kortright, Harpersfield, and Stamford, Delaware County, N. Y. As the country developed, his churches grew in power, and divisions becoming necessary, he was finally confined in his labors to Kortright alone. He held his post for over half a century, and died in the harness March 24, 1851. Mr. McAuley deserves to be remembered as one of the pioneers of American Protestantism. His task was one requiring energy and perseverance, and both these qualities he possessed in an eminent degree. Though frequently left to struggle against poverty and sickness in the care of a large family, he never faltered, and unhesitatingly pressed forward to advance the interests of his Master's cause. Says Dr. John Forsyth (in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ix, 78): "That he was not an ordinary man, all, I think, will admit, who consider the single fact that his 'natural force' as a preacher was considered as 'unabated' by the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who seventy years ago or more settled in a wilderness, which, through their instrumentality, has been made to blossom as the rose. . . . In the central portions of Delaware County there are thousands who, though they never saw him, yet, from what their fathers have told them, will cherish with affectionate veneration the name of William McAuley."

McBride, Matthew, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia April 27, 1830; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1851, and studied in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; was licensed in 1855 by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and became a pastor in Mount Vernon, Iowa, where he remained until 1861, when, compelled by impaired health to resign, he returned to Philadelphia. He next became editor and proprietor of *The Banner of the Covenant*, which he conducted with great acceptance to the Church until his death, May 13, 1863. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

McBride, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Franklin Mills, Ohio, in May, 1825; graduated with honor at Oberlin College, Ohio; subsequently studied theology in the same institution; and in 1853 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McBride was a man of much devotional piety, and labored zealously in building up the Church. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 191.

McBryde, Thomas Livingston, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., Feb. 25, 1817; pursued his literary course in Franklin College, Athens, Ga., graduating in 1837; entered the theological seminary in Columbia, S. C.; and in 1839 was licensed to preach by Harmony Presbytery; was appointed missionary to China in 1839, and sailed for Singapore in March, 1840; in 1843 returned to this country on account of failing health; and afterwards became pastor successively of Providence and Rocky River churches in Abbeville District, S. C., and Hopewell Church, Pendleton, S. C., in which latter place he labored till he died, April 15, 1863. He received the degree of D.D. from Erskine College, S. C. Dr. McBryde was an able minister, a sound divine, and a wise counsellor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 355. (J. L. S.)

McCaine, Alexander, an American divine of note, was born in Tipperary, Ireland, in the year 1768. He was educated in England, and was intended for the ministry of the Church of England; but, emigrating to the United States in 1791, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1797 entered the itinerant ministry, and filled several important pulpits until 1821, when he located. He now became one of the agitators of the movement which so lately has been successfully carried—lay representation. In reply to the adverse decision of the General Conference of 1824, he published the somewhat elaborate *History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy* (1829), a work displaying rare ability. When the Methodist Protestant Church was started, he became one of its zealous promoters, and was regarded as one of the most able and influential ministers of that body. He died June 1, 1856. He was particularly ready with the pen, and distinguished for his rare talents in the pulpit.

McCall, John A., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Athens, Ohio, Feb. 23, 1834; graduated at Franklin College, New Athens, in 1859; studied theology in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Wheeling Presbytery in 1862, and in 1863 was ordained by the Xenia Presbytery, and had just accepted a call to Cedarville, Ohio, when he died, Aug. 25, 1863. Mr. McCall was a man of more than ordinary talents, and remarkable for his sober and studious habits. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 351.

McCall, Joseph Pinckney, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Mississippi; professed religion while young; joined the Methodist Protestant Church, and was soon after licensed to preach. The war breaking out soon after, he went out as a volunteer in the Southern army. After the war he was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and in due course was recommended to the Quarterly Conference and licensed to preach. In 1866 he was received into the Memphis Annual Conference, and was stationed at Wesley Circuit, with Rev. A. R. Wilson as preacher in charge. In 1867 and 1868 he served at Dresden Station. His last appointment was Hickman Station, in Kentucky, where he labored faithfully until his death, April 8, 1870. Mr. McCall was an able and faithful minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly mourned her early loss.—*Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870, s. v.

McCalla, Daniel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Neshaminy, Pa., in 1748; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1766; was licensed to preach July 20, 1772; taught an academy in Philadelphia; was ordained pastor of New Providence and Charleston, Pa., in 1774; acted as chaplain in the Revolutionary War; taught afterwards an academy in Hanover County, Va.; and was finally twenty-one years minister at Wappetaw, S. C. He died April 6, 1809. See Hollinghead, *Sermons and Essays of D. McCalla* (1810, 2 vols.); also Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

McCalla, William Latta, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Nov. 25, 1788. He received his preparatory education under the supervision of his parents; graduated with honors at the Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky.; afterwards studied theology privately; was licensed in 1816, and afterwards ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ky.; in 1823 he went to Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor until 1835, when impaired health prompted him to resign. Subsequently he took charge of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and under his pulpit ministration the Church became large and influential. In 1839 he resigned this charge, and spent some time as an itinerant missionary in Texas; on his return to Philadelphia, he successively filled the Middletown and Ridley charges, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and Union Church, on Thirteenth Street. In 1853 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and after preaching there some time became connected with the Female Seminary at St. Charles, Mo. In 1859 he assumed the pastorate of a Church in Louisiana, where he labored until his death, Oct. 12, 1859. Mr. McCalla possessed excellent pulpit talents; his expository style was rich and absorbing, his preaching close and pungent. He was the author of many published *Sermons* and *Essays*; also *Discussions with Alexander Campbell on Baptism; with Kneeland on Universalism; with Barker on Infidelity;* a small volume on the *Doctorate of Divinity;* and *Travels in Texas.* See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 99.

McCampbell, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., April 9, 1781; graduated at Washington College, Lexington, Va.; subsequently studied theology with Isaac Anderson, D.D., at Maryville, Tenn.; was licensed in 1805, ordained by the Union Presbytery in 1807, and preached successively to the Strawberry Plains, Hopewell, and New Market churches, within the bounds of French Broad Presbytery. He died Sept. 28, 1859. Dr. McCampbell was a faithful minister, a good preacher, and an earnest pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 191.

McCarroll, Thomas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newlin, Pa., August 12, 1800. In 1829 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1835 the New Jersey Conference. He labored as an effective minister for thirty-one years. He was three times appointed presiding elder, and was a member of the General Conference of 1852. A thorough student, an eloquent preacher, a faithful pastor, a gentle ruler, he was greatly beloved and esteemed in all his appointments. He died in East Newark, N. J., May 9, 1860.

McCarron, Michael, D.D., a Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the County of Monaghan, Ireland, in the year 1804. He received his early education in his native place, after the completion of which he entered Maynooth College to pursue his theological studies, and on graduation was ordained to the ministry. Soon after this he came to the United States. He was placed at St. James's Church (now the cathedral), in Brooklyn. Subsequently he was transferred to St. James's Church, New York, but very soon afterwards was appointed pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Sixth Avenue, where he remained several years. About the year 1857 the late archbishop Hughes conferred on him the pastorate of the large congregation of St. Mary's Church, corner of Grand and Ridge Streets, New York, which he retained until his decease, Feb. 23, 1867. At the time when father McCarron arrived in this country, archbishop Hughes had been actively engaged in the work of education, and had succeeded in exciting a deep interest among the Catholics on the subject. Father McCarron, then in the vigor and prime of life, entered upon this work with the greatest zeal, and the results of his efforts in that noble cause were soon apparent, and are felt at the present time. Father McCarron received evidences of the respect and esteem of his associates by his advancement to the archdeaconship of the archdiocese of New York. The date of this appointment is not known to us.

McCartee, Robert, D.D., an American Presbyterian minister, was born in New York City Sept. 30, 1791, and was educated at Columbia College. He chose the legal profession, and was engaged in his studies of jurisprudence when he was impressed with the duty of devoting himself to the sacred ministry. He therefore entered the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at New York, and pursued a theological course of study, and was licensed to preach in 1816. He was immediately called to Philadelphia, where he remained several years; then returned to New York to take charge of the Orange Street Church, which had at that time but thirty members. While he was the pas-

tor of this Church it was removed to Canal Street. When his connection ceased, in 1836, it numbered eight hundred members. In 1836 he accepted a call to the Church at Port Carbon, Pa., and remained there four years. In 1840 he became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Goshen, N. Y.; in 1849 of the Union Church at Newburg, and in 1856 of the Westminster Church in Twenty-second Street (with which the Twenty-fifth Street Church was united), New York City. This was his last pastoral charge. In 1862 his health, which for some time had been enfeebled, failing still more, he resigned his charge. He died at Yonkers, N. Y., March 12, 1865. "All who have known Dr. McCartee will remember him as one possessed of a genial nature, whose warm-hearted friendship was ever finding the most fitting expression in words and acts; as a simple-minded, fervent Christian, whose love for the Saviour and his blessed Gospel was never concealed; and as an able minister of the New Testament, whose fervid eloquence when proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, and in urging them upon the acceptance of perishing men, was seldom equalled. We have often listened with wrapt attention to his solemn appeals, while the tears which were flowing down his cheeks, and his tender words, were answered by the tears of his hearers. But his voice is now silent; his work is done; he has entered into rest" (*The Observer*, N. Y. March, 1865). The degree of D.D. was bestowed on Mr. McCartee by Columbia College in 1831. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 536; Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 132.

McCartney, John B., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa., June 22, 1835; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1855, at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed in 1857, and in 1858 was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Mount Washington and Temperanceville, in the vicinity of Pittsburg, Pa. In 1864 he accepted a call from the Twelfth Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., and was installed its pastor May 2, 1865, where he labored until he died, May 14, 1865. Mr. McCartney was a man of superior abilities, a close student, and an excellent scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 136.

McCartney, William D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbia Co., Pa., in 1806; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa., in 1832; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1835, and installed pastor of West Liberty Church, Pa.; afterwards labored in the Ridge Church, Madison, and Holmesville churches, Ohio, within the bounds of Steubenville and New Lisbon Presbyteries, and died July 27, 1863. Mr. McCartney was gifted with superior intellectual powers, logical and discriminating in his theological views, an excellent scholar, and a successful minister. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 175.

McCaul, Alexander, an eminent Anglican divine, was born about the opening of this century, and was educated at King's College, London, where he afterwards became professor of divinity. He was also prebend of St. Paul's, London, since 1845. He is noted, however, not so much on account of the high positions he filled as an ecclesiastic, as for his missionary labors among the Jews, a task for which his great erudition and uncommon familiarity with the Hebrew language and literature peculiarly fitted him. He died in 1863. Dr. McCaul left, besides *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews* (Lond. 1838, 8vo), *The Old Paths, or a Comparison of Mod. Judaism with the Rel. of Moses and the Prophets* (2d ed. 1868, 12mo); a lot of minor theological works, and a host of sermons; for a list of which see Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1902.

McCaulle, Thomas Harris, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born about the middle of last century; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1774; was ordained minister in the western counties of North Carolina; was several years president of a college at Waynesborough, S. C.; and died in Savannah, Ga., about 1800.

McCay, David, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lewiston, Pa., Feb. 17, 1816; was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1838); studied theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by Huntingdon Presbytery in 1841; and in 1842 was ordained, and installed pastor of the united churches of Bethesda, Concord, and Callensburg, Pa., where he continued to labor for more than twenty years. In 1861 he accepted the chaplaincy of the 103d Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, in which position he labored until his death, June 4, 1862. Mr. McCay possessed an intellect of high order, clear, comprehensive, and eminently practical; his attainments in science and literature were varied and exact: his piety deep, constant, and heartfelt. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 191.

McCheyne, Robert Murray, a celebrated Scotch preacher and evangelist, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, May 21, 1813. At five years of age he was quite proficient in English. When eight years old he entered the high-school, where for six years he maintained high rank in his classes. In November, 1827, he entered Edinburgh University, and during his college course gained prizes in various departments of study. He studied modern languages privately; was proficient in gymnastic exercises, and in music and drawing. This last acquisition was advantageous to him afterwards in sketching scenes in the Holy Land. The death of his eldest brother, David, led to his conversion, or was the beginning of the great change in his life, and brought him to study for the ministry. In 1831 he entered upon his studies in theology and Church history in Divinity Hall, under Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Welsh. In 1835 he removed to the Presbytery of Annan, and was licensed to preach July 1. November 7 he began his labors at Larbert, a parish containing six thousand people, to whom he was a devoted pastor. He was also an intense student of the Bible, reading it in both the Hebrew and the Greek. In 1836 he was called to St. Peter's Church, Dundee, and was ordained there Nov. 24. This charge was large, and his labors were so constant that his health failed, and he was obliged to retire for a season of rest. During this vacation he went, with three other ministers, to Palestine, on a "mission of inquiry to the Jews." His health improved by his travels, and on his return he resumed his work at St. Peter's, where he remained until 1842, when his health again failed. He now undertook a preaching tour, with other ministers, through the north of England, preaching in the open air and in churches of different denominations. Returning from England, he was obliged by failing health to have an assistant in his labors at Dundee. In February, 1843, he went on his last tour as an evangelist; on his return from which he was attacked by a fever, and died March 25, 1843. His death was a loss not to his own congregation or denomination only, but to the whole Christian world. Mr. McCheyne was one of the most beautiful examples of the true Gospel minister. Whether among his own congregation, or in Palestine, or travelling as an evangelist, he was always preaching by his words and holy life. He was pre-eminent as a preacher, as a pastor, and as a Christian, and did a great work not merely by the great number of conversions which took place directly or indirectly through his instrumentality, but by the zealous spirit which he infused into every department of Christian work. He had also fine talents for literary and scholastic pursuits. He wrote a number of pieces showing a taste for poetry, one of which—*Greece, but living Greece no more*—was written at the age of fourteen. His letters from Palestine, his lectures, sermons, and letters, show an ability for composition rarely surpassed; but he consecrated all his talents and powers to the service of Christ, and lived only for the salvation of men. His name will long be

fragrant in the Church as a model preacher of the Gospel. See *Life and Remains of Letters, Lectures, and Poems of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne*, by Rev. Andrew A. Bonar (New York, 1857). (H. A. B.)

McClanahan, Alexander W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near West Union, Adams County, Ohio, Nov. 28, 1821; graduated with honor at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1844; studied theology in the theological seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1847 by the Chilicothe Presbytery; and in 1848 ordained. His first and only charge was at Decatur, Ohio. He died Oct. 29, 1862. Mr. McClanahan was noted for his kindness of heart and spirit of self-sacrifice; he had a massive intellect, capable of broad and comprehensive views, and, when aroused to high mental activity, he wrote and spoke with rare power. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 359.

McClaskey, John, an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Derry County, Ireland, Jan. 2, 1756. His parents, who were members of the Established Church of England, in 1772 emigrated to New Jersey; here John was converted in 1782, and, feeling that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, took the necessary steps to enter the ministry, and in 1786 became a member of Conference as an itinerant; in 1792 was appointed presiding elder on Philadelphia District; in 1793–94, to Baltimore; in 1795, to Philadelphia; in 1796–98, presiding elder on New Jersey District; in 1799–1801, to New York City; in 1802, to Philadelphia; in 1812–13, presiding elder on Chesapeake District, and died at Chestertown, Md., Sept. 2, 1814. Mr. McClaskey was a man of deep and earnest piety; versed in the Scriptures; and thousands of souls were converted through his efforts during a long and useful ministry.—*Conference Minutes*, i, 257; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 125.

McClelland, Alexander, D.D., a noted (Dutch) Reformed minister and educator, was born at Schenectady, N. Y., in 1794; graduated at Union College in 1809; studied theology with Rev. John Anderson, D.D., in Western Pennsylvania, and afterwards with Rev. John M. Mason, D.D.; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery, New York, in 1815; and, when nineteen years only, was elected pastor of Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, as successor of Dr. Milledoler. Here he remained seven years, and established his great reputation as a pulpit orator among the foremost men of his day. In 1822 he became professor of rhetoric, logic, and metaphysics in Dickinson College, Pa.; removed in 1829 to New Brunswick, N. J., as professor of languages in Rutgers College; and in 1832 was elected professor of Oriental literature and Biblical criticism in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He continued, however, to give instruction in rhetoric and belles-lettres in the college for several years. He resigned his place in the theological seminary in 1857; and, after a tour in Europe, returned to New Brunswick, where he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 19, 1864. His published works consist of a few occasional sermons and pamphlets, and a volume on the *Canon and Interpretation of Scripture* (New York, 1860, pp. 329, 12mo). Dr. McClelland was in almost every respect a man *sui generis*. He was original in thought, in style of expression, in oratory, and in the professor's chair. He was humorous and witty, keen and strong, robust in mind, thorough in scholarship, impatient of dulness and idleness, and exacting to the last degree as a teacher. Inspiring his pupils with his own enthusiasm, he taught them to study and to think accurately for themselves. He gave very short lessons in Hebrew and in Greek; but the grammar and dictionary were always in use, and he required critical accuracy in recitations. His written lectures on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, and his oral criticisms on Isaiah and the Psalms; his condensed Hebrew Grammar, and his lectures on the Canon and interpretation of Scripture, were admirable specimens of his skill as an instructor. His rare pulpit eloquence was quite equalled at times by outbursts of his genius and power in the professorial chair. Naturally impulsive and irritable, he was often sarcastic and severe; and these tendencies were aggravated by protracted and distressing disease. Yet his best students overlooked all this in their admiration of his ability as a teacher. In the pulpit he was clear and forcible, brilliant and impassioned, versatile and learned, simple and profound, electric, and frequently eccentric. Among his published sermons are a few of his memorable discourses; but some that were perhaps even more characteristic of his remarkable oratory were left out of the collection. No printed page can reproduce the effects of his mellifluous voice, his significant gestures, and the earnestness of his impassioned power. His peculiarities of temperament and manner interfered considerably with his general usefulness, and his independence of thought sometimes led him into questionable statements of truth; and in 1834 he was arraigned before the General Synod for heresy, on the subject of spiritual renovation; but, having made satisfactory explanations, he retained his professorship and ecclesiastical status. His latter years were spent in retirement among his books, and in the quiet pursuit of favorite studies, until he was disabled by a long and incurable disease; and then, with simple trust in Jesus, entered into rest. Quite detailed sketches of Dr. McClelland's life and works, from the pen of Dr. Chalmers, of New York City, were published in the *Christian Intelligencer* (New York, 1872, Oct., Nov.). (W. J. R. T.)

McClintock, John, D.D., one of the projectors and editors of this *Cyclopædia*, was born in the city of Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1814. His parents were devoted members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in that city. In the year 1832 he entered the freshman class of the University of Pennsylvania, and by strenuous exertions completed the whole collegiate course in the space of three years. Before his graduation, in the year 1835, he had commenced preaching, in the New Jersey Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the year 1836 he accepted a call to the chair of mathematics in Dickinson College, which had been reopened in 1834 under Methodist auspices. In this institution he spent twelve most fruitful years. In the year 1840 he exchanged the mathematical chair for that of the Latin and Greek languages, succeeding his friend, the Rev. Robert Emory. As a teacher Dr. McClintock was most successful. Rapid and brilliant, and at the same time thorough and accurate, he was the beau ideal of a college instructor. In 1846 he commenced, in connection with the writer of this article, a series of Latin and Greek text-books, designed to apply to these languages the method of "imitation and repetition" which had been successfully introduced into the teaching of modern tongues. The series was well received, and its method has since been extensively followed. In the year 1848 Dr. McClintock was elected by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church the editor of its *Quarterly Review*. In this office he spent eight years. His fine taste, his critical acumen, and his interest in all departments of human knowledge, were amply illustrated in his conduct of the *Review*. Under his care it rose rapidly to the highest rank among periodicals of its kind. In 1856 he was, in association with bishop Simpson, appointed a delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of England. He was at various times elected president of several colleges, but he never assumed the active duties of such a position. In 1857 he became pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Church, in the city of New York. He adapted himself readily to the duties of the pastoral office, and speedily became known as one of the most eloquent preachers of the metropolis. A fine presence, a rich voice, and a graceful delivery gave effect to the utterances of a well-stored mind. His

charge of this Church expiring by limitation in 1860, he accepted the appointment of pastor of the American chapel in Paris, then and now under the care of the American and Foreign Christian Union. While holding this position the great American civil war broke out, and Dr. McClintock was not a man to be idle in the time of his country's peril. Appreciating the value to the national cause of the friendly opinion of Europe, he exerted himself to the utmost in diffusing a right knowledge of the merits of the controversy in which the American Union was involved. In these labors he availed himself of the aid of the count De Gasparin and the Rev. Mr. Austin of England. During the entire war his pen was never idle, and from the platform, whenever it was practicable, he made eloquent pleas for the national cause. During the period of his residence abroad, he was also corresponding editor of the *Methodist*, a paper established in 1860 in the city of New York. His letters kept the American public well advised of the fluctuations of European opinion in relation to the war. Upon his return home, in 1864, he was for a second time appointed to the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, but, finding his health unequal to the discharge of the duties of the office, he resigned it at the end of a year. In 1866 he was made chairman of the Central Centenary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which was given the work of organizing the commemoration of the introduction, in 1766, of Methodism into the United States. Mr. Daniel Drew, of New York, having signified his intention of founding, in connection with this centenary commemoration, a Biblical and Theological School, Dr. McClintock was chosen its first president. The school was opened in the year 1867, at Madison, New Jersey, under the most flattering auspices, and has been from the beginning an entire success. Dr. McClintock's health had, prior to his election to the presidency of Drew, shown symptoms of decline. Since 1848 he had been frequently prostrated by attacks of illness. From 1867 to 1870 a great decay of vitality was perceptible, and on March 4 of the latter year the "wheels of life stood still at last."

To the preparation of this *Cyclopædia*, Dr. McClintock had, in company with his co-editor, Dr. Strong, devoted many laborious years. To theology and its kindred studies his attention had through life been chiefly directed. He lived to see three volumes completed, and the fourth in a state of forwardness. In the year 1847 he translated, with Prof. C. E. Blumenthal, Neander's *Life of Christ*, published by Harper and Brothers. In 1851 he prepared an essay on the *Temporal Power of the Pope*, which was at that time a political question of some importance in the United States. The *Theological Institutes*, by Watson, Dr. McClintock supplied with an analysis, which is considered a model work of its kind. He was also a frequent contributor to the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, and an occasional one to several other periodicals. Since his death a volume of his sermons has been collected and published under the title *Living Words* (N. Y. 1871, 12mo). Dr. McClintock's versatility of talent is apparent even from this slight sketch. He was truly a many-sided man. Yet his attainments were solid; an imperfect understanding of any subject he could not tolerate. In facility of acquiring knowledge he was very remarkable. He could track a subject, never losing the clew, through a labyrinth of books, until he came into full possession of it, both as a whole and in its details. The critical faculty was dominant in him. To systematize knowledge, to reduce it to form and completeness, was instinctive with him; yet he had at the same time the fervor which makes the orator. His eloquence was of the highest order; in power to sway an audience he had few if any superiors. He was probably the most complete scholar that his Church has produced in the United States. His style as a writer was remarkable for clearness, precision, directness, and condensation. His personal qualities endeared him to hosts of friends; his death, in the midst of his years, has been deplored as a great loss to the cause of religion and learning in our country. (G. R. C.)

McClung, John Alexander, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Ky., Sept. 25, 1804. His education was received at a private school at Brick Pond, Woodford County, Ky., his instructors being Messrs. Thompson and Daly, from the University of Dublin, Ireland. In 1823 he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, and in 1828 was licensed to preach. Subsequently, his mind becoming unsettled concerning the authenticity of some of the books of the Old Testament and one or two of the Epistles, he gave up preaching and entered upon the study of law. During this stage of his life he wrote *Sketches of Western Adventures*, and otherwise contributed to the press of the day. He was admitted to the bar in 1835, and became a regular practitioner until 1849, when, his religious principles being revived, he was again, in 1851, licensed and ordained, and was called to the First Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.; during his pastorate there he was elected president of Hanover College, Ind. In 1857 he accepted a call to Maysville, Ky., where he labored until the summer of 1859, when he was drowned. Dr. McClung was a man of brilliant intellect and rare eloquence; he was a polished scholar, a generous friend, and an humble Christian. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 100.

McClure, Alexander Wilson, D.D., an American divine, was born in Boston, Mass., May 8, 1808; was educated at Yale and Amherst colleges and Andover Theological Seminary (class of 1830); was settled at Malden, Mass., 1830–41; then at St. Augustine, Fla., 1841–44; editor of the *Christian Observatory* from 1844 to 1847; and pastor again at Malden from 1848 to 1852. Leaving the Congregational body, he accepted a call to the First Reformed Church, Jersey City, N. J., and remained there three years (1852–55), when he became corresponding secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, 1855. His health having been impaired, he was sent in 1856 as chaplain of the union at Rome, Italy. In 1858, broken down by bronchial disease, he retired from public service, and lingered a great sufferer until his death, Sept. 20, 1865. The American Chapel in Paris was erected largely by funds which Dr. McClure secured with great zeal and labor. Dr. McClure's contributions to the periodical press were numerous and popular, including valuable articles for the *Observatory*, the *New Brunswick Review*, and the *Literary and Theological Review*. He also published *The Life-Boat, an Allegory: — Four Lectures on Ultra-Universalism*, "a theological classic, unanswered and unanswerable:"—*A Series of Letters upon the Bible in the Public Schools*, written in controversy with a Romish priest in Jersey City:—*Lives of the Chief Fathers of New England* (2 vols.):—and *The Translators Revived, or Biographical Articles on the History of the Translators of the English Bible* (New York, 1853, 12mo). The title is somewhat unfortunate, but the work is invaluable, the materials being drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fulness. Dr. McClure was a truly learned scholar, a genuine wit, a keen dialectician, and a practical controversialist. Ardent and honest as the sunlight, abounding in good feeling, and simple in manners as a child, he was a man of positive convictions, fearless of consequences in the advocacy of truth and in assailing popular errors. Yet, with all his exuberant mirth and knowledge of the world, Dr. McClure was pre-eminently a devout and humble Christian minister. Chastened by many providential trials, his piety grew more serene, and beautiful, and deep with advancing infirmities and years. His prayers and preaching were solemn, tender, and scriptural. Eternal things were seen and felt by him as eternal realities, and his hearers often were hushed and melted under his reverential appeals. His death was triumphant. See Corwin, *Man-*

ual; Recollections of Dr. N. Adams; Personal Memories. (W. J. R. T.)

McClure, Arthur, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in East Tennessee, Feb. 16, 1801; was converted about 1819; entered the Tennessee Conference in 1822, and died Sept. 26, 1825. He was a young man of much promise, excellent in abilities and graces, and an eloquent and successful minister.—*Conference Minutes*, i, 550.

McClure, David, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 18, 1748, in Newport, R. I.; graduated at Yale College in 1769; was ordained missionary to the Indians near Pittsburg, Pa., May 20, 1772. The mission was broken up by the troubles with England, and McClure became pastor in North Hampton, N. H., Nov. 13, 1776; at East Windsor, Conn., June 11, 1786, and died June 25, 1820. He was chosen trustee of Dartmouth College in 1778, and made D.D. by the same in 1800. Dr. McClure published *Sermons on the Moral Law* (1795, 8vo):—*Memoirs of the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock, D.D.*, in connection with the Rev. Dr. Parish (1810):—and a number of occasional sermons and addresses, and magazine contributions. See Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 7.

McCombs (or **McCoombs**), Lawrence, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent County, in the State of Delaware, on the 11th of March, 1769. Little is known of his early education, but it is to be presumed, from the easy circumstances of his father, who was a man of wealth, and the high character of the schools and academies of the district in which he lived, that he early attained to a good degree of intellectual culture. In 1792 he was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference on probation, and his first appointment was to the Newburg Circuit, in the State of New York; two years later he was appointed to Long Island; in 1795, to New London; in 1796, to Middletown; in 1797 and 1798, to Polland; in 1799, to New London; in 1800, to Philadelphia; in 1801, to Baltimore City; in 1802, to Baltimore City and Fell's Point; in 1804, to the Baltimore Circuit. In 1806 he asked and obtained a location, and selected a residence on the eastern shore of Maryland, near the head of the Chesapeake Bay. In this location he is said to have labored with unabated industry and devotion. In 1815 he re-entered the itinerancy, and took his place in the Philadelphia Conference; in that and in the following year he was appointed to Smyrna; in 1817, to Queen Anne's; and in 1818, to Kent. From 1819 to 1822 he was presiding elder of the Jersey District; in 1823 he was appointed to Essex and Staten Island; in 1824 and 1825, to St. John's Church, Philadelphia; and in 1826, to Wilmington. In 1827 and 1828 he was presiding elder of the East Jersey District; from 1829 to 1832, of the Chesapeake Bay; and in 1833, of the South Philadelphia District. In 1834 he was appointed to St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia; in this year, however, he was constrained, by his rapidly-failing health, to relinquish his active position and become a supernumerary. In 1835 he took his place among the retired and infirm, after having performed an unprecedented amount of labor, and left the impress of his energetic character wherever he went. He closed his useful and eventful life June 11, 1836. An intimate friend, also a minister, the Rev. J. Kennaday, has left this beautiful tribute to his memory: "In his religious character Mr. McCombs blended great zeal and fidelity with a very unusual kindliness of spirit. No hostility could intimidate him in the course of duty, nor could any provocation betray him into petulance or resentment. Meek in spirit, intrepid in purpose, gentle and social in manner, he was greatly respected in the pulpit, and ever welcome to the hospitalities of the numerous circles which he adorned as the man of God. He was strong in faith, much in prayer, and a great reader of the Bible. His intellectual character was developed more in the uniform strength of his faculties than in the marked prominence of any one or more of them. His perceptions were quick and clear, and his judgment sober and impartial. He had a fine imagination, which, being restrained and regulated by his admirable taste, gave beauty and warmth, as the artists say, to all his pictures. In unison with these traits, there were some physical qualities that contributed largely to his power and success. His personal appearance was very imposing. In stature he was full six feet in height, with a finely-developed form; though not corpulent, the breadth of his chest indicated the prodigious strength which enabled him to perform his almost gigantic labors. The general expression of his countenance betokened intelligence, gentleness, and energy, while his full, frank face was illumined by his ever-kindling eye. His voice was full, clear, and of great flexibility, sweeping from the lowest to the highest tone, and modulated in the most delicate manner, in beautiful harmony with his subject. In preaching in the field, which was his favorite arena, I used to think he was quite an approach to Whitefield. Such was his known power at camp-meetings that the announcement that he was to be present on such an occasion would draw a multitude of people from great distances. . . . I have thought that in some respects there was a striking resemblance between him and the late distinguished Dr. John M. Mason, of New York, whom I often heard in my boyhood." See Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 210 sq.; *Conf. Min.* ii, 492.

McConaughy, David, D.D., LL.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Menallen township, York County, Pa., Sept. 29, 1775, and graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1795; studied theology for two years; was licensed in 1797, and preached frequently as a missionary in Philadelphia and New York; accepted a call from the United Christians of Upper Marsh Creek and Conewago in 1800, and remained pastor till 1832. During this connection he visited Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York in behalf of the Gettysburg Church, and as a minister and a teacher rendered important services. At an early period he interested himself much in the cause of temperance by appointing meetings, preaching, and forming a society, of which he himself was president. He removed to Washington in 1832 to the presidency of the college, which he resigned in 1849. He died Jan. 29, 1852. Dr. McConaughy published *A Brief Summary and Outline of Moral Science* (1838):—*Discourses, chiefly Biographical, of Persons eminent in Sacred History* (1850, 8vo):—*Two Tracts on the Doctrine of the Trinity and on Infant Baptism:—Sermons and Addresses.* See Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 199.

McConnell, William L., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Sept. 19, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; and was licensed and ordained by Alleghany Reformed Presbytery in 1857. He accepted a call to Hanover Church, and subsequently to West Newton, Pa., where he labored until failing health compelled him to desist. He died July 18, 1866. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 363.

McCook, Robert J., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkinson County, Ga., Jan. 5, 1817; professed religion and joined the Church when in his fourteenth year, and was impressed with a call to preach the Gospel. Resisting this impression, he lost his religious peace, and finally made shipwreck of his faith. At about twenty-two he again connected himself with the Church, but still shrunk from obeying his call to the ministry until 1853, when he was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Florida Convention in 1854. From that time (except during the year 1866, when he was superannuated), he labored with devoted zeal and encouraging success, filling various important charges with great usefulness until his death at Key West, Nov. 22, 1870. "He was a godly man. 'Holiness to the Lord' was his theme in the pulpit, and was illustrated in his daily life. His

end was peace, and his works do follow him."—*Conference Minutes M. E. Church South*, 1871, s. v.

McCoombs. See McCombs.

McCorkle, Samuel Eusebius, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Harris Ferry, Lancaster County, Pa., Aug. 23, 1746, and graduated at New Jersey College in 1772; was licensed in 1774, and, after laboring for two years in Virginia, accepted a call from the congregation of Thyatira in 1777. About 1785 he opened a classical school named *Zion Parnassus*, which he continued ten or twelve years. He died Jan. 21, 1811. Dr. McCorkle published *Four Discourses on the great First Principles of Deism and Revelation contrasted* (1797):—*Three Discourses on the Terms of Christian Communion*:—*Occasional Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 346.

McCoy, Isaac, a Baptist minister, was born in Fayette County, Pa., June 13, 1784; was licensed to preach in 1805, and began work as a missionary. Oct. 13, 1810, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Maria Creek, in Clark County, Ind., where he remained some eight years, making occasional missionary tours in the surrounding country. In 1818 he was appointed a missionary to the Indians, and in May, 1820, removed to Fort Wayne, where he established a Church; in the fall of the same year he removed to Carey, on the St. Joseph River, and from thence, in 1829, to the Indian country, now Kansas. In 1842 he became the first corresponding secretary and general agent of the American Indian Mission Association, at Louisville, Ky. He died June 21, 1846. He published a *History of Baptist Indian Missions*, embracing remarks on the former, present condition, and future prospects of the aboriginal tribes (1840, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 541.

McCracken, John Steele, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cincinnati, Ohio, April 25, 1804. His opportunities in early life for acquiring knowledge were poor. In 1833 he entered the preparatory department of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and graduated in 1838; studied theology under the care of the First Presbytery of Ohio of the Associate Reformed Church, and subsequently attended the theological seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., and the seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1841, and then went out as a missionary among the newly-formed congregations in Illinois and Iowa; in 1843 he accepted a call from the Church at Kenton, Ohio, where he labored until his health gave way. He died April 1, 1863. Mr. McCracken was an able expounder and a sound theologian; his judgment was eminently just and critical; his disposition charitable and liberal. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 352. (J. L. S.)

McCracken, Samuel W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Jan. 12, 1800; was educated at Miami University (class of 1831); studied theology at Maryville, Tenn., and was elected professor of mathematics in the college at Maryville; was afterwards chosen professor of mathematics in Miami University; was licensed by Ohio First Presbytery in 1835, and in 1836 was ordained; in 1839 accepted a call to Hopewell Church, Ohio, and resigned his professorship in the university; here he continued to labor until his death, Sept. 10, 1859. Mr. McCracken maintained a high reputation for talent; prudent and far-sighted, his counsels were always worthy of consideration; opposed to all expedients, he made experience the basis of action. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, p. 209. (J. L. S.)

McCrary, W. H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Tennessee Jan. 17, 1831; was educated at Bethel College, Tenn.; was licensed in 1849, after teaching school for several years; was ordained in 1854. He died Sept. 14, 1858. Mr. McCrary was a good preacher, a successful teacher, and a fine theologian. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 236.

McCready, Jonathan Sharp, a Presbyterian minister, was born near New Galilee, Pa., April 15, 1828; enjoyed in early life the advantage of religious instruction, discipline, and example; graduated at Franklin College in 1852; studied theology in the Associate Seminary at Canonsburg (class of 1855); was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio in October of the same year; in 1856 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate congregation of Cadiz, and there continued to labor until 1862, when he volunteered in the service of the government. While in the army he continued to preach, and perform every other ministerial duty as occasion offered, until he was killed, Sept. 7, 1864. Mr. McCready was endowed with a clear and penetrating intellect; his education was comprehensive, his style logical and energetic, his manner positive and emphatic. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 265.

McCrie, Thomas, D.D., a noted Scotch divine, celebrated as a writer on ecclesiastical history and polemics, was born at Dunse, in Berwickshire, in November, 1772. "Dr. McCrie's parents," says his biographer, "being connected with that branch of the secession usually termed Anti-Burghers, he was brought up under . . . the primitive strictness of that communion . . . and received that thoroughly religious education, of the importance of which he was ever afterwards so strenuous an advocate, and of the success of which he was himself a striking example." After securing the rudiments of education at the parish school of his native place, he entered, in 1788, the University of Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced his theological studies. In 1795 he was licensed to preach by the Associate Presbytery of Kelso, and he was immediately afterwards chosen pastor of a congregation of the same body in Edinburgh, where he served the following ten years, applying himself with great assiduity to the discharge of his professional duties, and occasionally publishing able pamphlets on some of the gravest and most difficult subjects of theological inquiry. The differences of opinion, and the appearance of *New-Lights* with peculiar doctrines quite unknown to the primitive belief of the "Secession Church," caused McCrie in 1806, with five friends, among them the celebrated Bruce, to separate from the "General Associated Synod," and to form "the Constitutional Associate Presbytery," avowing "strict adherence to the principles of the original secession." (Here compare *Hist. Sketch of the Origin of the Secession Church*, by the Rev. A. Thomson, and the *History of the Rise of the Relief Church*, by the Rev. Gavin Struthers [Edinburgh, 1858, 12mo]). During the controversy which this change provoked he gave himself largely to the study of the Reformers, and came to admire so much his great countryman, John Knox, that he zealously applied himself to the composition of a *Life of John Knox* (Edinb. 1812, 8vo, and often), a masterly work, that combines the highest excellences of which biography is capable, and was by his contemporaries regarded as "a literary phenomenon." "It placed the character of the Scottish Reformer," says Jamieson (*Cyclop. Rel. Biog.* s. v.), "in an entirely new light, and showed him to be so widely different from the rude and illiterate demagogue he had been hitherto represented, that its appearance was hailed with patriotic pride and gratitude. It placed the name of McCrie at once in the foremost ranks of living historians. The highest literary honors were conferred on him" (compare Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland*, ii, 369). He received from the University of Edinburgh the honorary title of D.D., being the first Dissenter to whom that distinction was awarded; and his book, besides passing through several editions in Scotland, was translated into most of the languages of Europe. Encouraged by the success of his first literary effort, Dr. McCrie published, as the fruits of his researches regarding a later period of Scottish ecclesiastical history, the *Biography of Andrew Melville*, a celebrated champion of Presbyterianism in the reign of James VI of Scotland. This work, composed on the same principle of combining the memoirs of an individ-

ual with a narrative of public events (it illustrates the formation of the Kirk of Scotland, and the peculiarities of the Presbyterian establishment), evinces a vast amount of erudition and research. Critics of Anglican tendency have always been inclined to accuse McCrie of great partisan zeal and unfairness to his opponents: thus Mr. Hallam designated his writings as the products of "Presbyterian Hildebrandism." But these censures are unjust and unmerited. His impartiality and candor, and his unaffected desire to investigate the truth, to whatever conclusion it might lead, have been clearly conceded even by liberal opponents, and unmistakably impress themselves on every thoughtful reader. A writer, commenting on a later production from Dr. McCrie, in the *Westminster Review* (Jan. 1857), aptly says: "McCrie belongs to the higher class of writers to whose earnestness, thoroughness, and genuine research we turn for relief from the superficial second-hand showiness of books written from a transient impulse, in order to supply only a transient need." After McCrie's formation of the "Constitutional Associate Presbytery," difficulty arose among his people respecting their Church property. The result finally was the building of a new place of worship in West Nicholson Street, and there he ministered for nearly thirty years. In 1821 he made a tour to the Continent, mainly with a view to study the Continental Reformation, and, after continuing his investigations until 1827, published the *Hist. of the Ref. in Italy*, and in 1829 the *Hist. of the Ref. in Spain*, both of which had the honor of being prominently placed in the list of the Roman Index of forbidden books, and are spoken of "as the very best accounts we possess of the protest made against Romish corruption by the races of the South—a protest not less ardent, but unhappily less persistent than that of the phlegmatic North." At the time of his death, Aug. 5, 1835, the doctor was engaged on a "Life of Calvin," which unfortunately he left uncompleted. All his completed works were published under the title of *Works of the late Thomas McCrie, D.D.*, by his son Thomas, in 4 vols. 8vo (Edinb. 1855–57). They contain, besides the works already mentioned, *Discourses on the Unity of the Church* (1821):—*Memoirs of William Veitch and George Bryson* (1825):—*Lectures on the Book of Esther* (1838):—*Vindications of Christian Faith* and his *Sermons* (1836). See *Life and Times of Thomas McCrie, D.D.*, by his son Thomas (Edinb. 1840, 8vo); *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxxviii, 429; *Gentl. Magazine*, 1835, pt. ii, p. 434; *The Annual Biogr. and Obit.* (Lond. 1836, 8vo), xx, 442; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; Cunningham, *Hist. Studies*, i, 411. (J. H. W.)

McCullough, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland. He received a classical education in the College of Belfast, Ireland; subsequently emigrated to this country, and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1848 he was licensed, and ordained pastor of Mount Grove and Hopewell churches, Ohio, where he remained until 1856, when he went to California. On his return he became connected with the New Lisbon Presbytery, in which connection he remained until his death in 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 76.

McCurdy, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Elbert County, Ga., July 10, 1800; in 1825 he professed religion, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1830 was licensed to preach, and in 1843 was admitted into the Tennessee Annual Conference. From that time till his death he labored faithfully on various circuits and missions. Much of his time was devoted to missionary work among the colored people. In this field he was very successful. For the last several years of his life his health was feeble, and he was on the supernumerary and superannuated lists. He died in Williamson County, Tenn., Aug. 17, 1870. Mr. McCurdy "was a man of sound judgment, good common-sense, and deep and uniform piety. He lived above reproach, and died honored by all who knew him."—*Conference Minutes M. E. Ch. South*, 1870, s. v.

McCutchen, James B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born near Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 26, 1829; professed religion in his fourteenth year, and joined the Methodist Church; was licensed to preach, and joined the Memphis Annual Conference in 1852; was appointed to Camden Circuit in 1853; Mount Pinson in 1854; Tishomingo in 1855; Clinton Circuit in 1857; Paducah Circuit in 1858; Murray Circuit in 1860; and Tishomingo Circuit in 1861. During this year he was elected chaplain of the 7th Kentucky Regiment C. S. A. In this service he continued till the close of the war, when he resumed his place as a travelling preacher, and was appointed in 1866 to Cageville Circuit; in 1868 to Trenton Circuit, and again to Cageville Circuit in 1869. He died Aug. 28, 1870. "Brother McCutchen was a self-made man, having received but a limited education in his youth, but by industry and hard study he had acquired a very good English education, and no mean acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages. His preaching was of a plain, practical character, exhibiting a large acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, and with the standard literature of the Church. He was not of a polemical turn of mind, but when our doctrines were attacked, he always showed himself a fearless champion and a trustworthy debater. But few men in our ranks are better prepared to defend our doctrines than he was, and yet he cherished a noble catholicity of sentiment and feeling that did credit at once to his head and heart. He was not merely acceptable, but popular and useful, making many friends wherever he went."—*Conference Minutes M. E. Church South*, 1870, s. v.

McDearmon, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amelia County, Va., April 1, 1799; was educated in what were known as the *Old Fields Schools* of Virginia; was early made a ruling elder in the Church, and at once identified himself with the cause of temperance. He was licensed by West Hanover Presbytery in 1834, and in 1838 ordained and installed pastor over Hoe Creek and Morris churches, in Campbell County, Va. He died Sept. 15, 1867. Mr. McDearmon was a good and useful man, and an earnest apostle of temperance in his region. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 347.

McDermott, Thomas, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Monmouth County, N. J., in 1791; was educated in the Lawrenceville High School, N. J.; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton (class of 1832), and was licensed and ordained by New Brunswick Presbytery, as pastor of the Church at Stillwater, N. J.; in 1838, removed to Ohio as pastor of Hubbard and Unity churches; in 1844 accepted a call to Clarkson Church; and in 1846 resigned to become pastor of Chippewa Church, where he remained until compelled to resign because of failing health. He died June 6, 1861. Mr. McDermott was a devoted preacher; earnest in his work, and industrious in his efforts. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 109.

McDonald, Andrew, a Scotch minister, was born at Leith in 1757; was educated at the University of Edinburgh; was ordained deacon in 1775; pastor of a congregation at Glasgow in 1777; subsequently removed to London, and devoted himself to the authorship of light literature, and died in the great English metropolis, "a victim to sickness, disappointment, and misfortune," in 1790. A list of his works is given by Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1166.

McDonald, Daniel, D.D., an Episcopal minister in America, was born near Bedford, Westchester County, N. Y., about 1787, and was educated at Middlebury College. Having taught for some time, he was ordained in 1810, and became rector of St. Peter's, Auburn, N. Y. He subsequently took charge of the academy in Fair-

field, Herkimer Co., where he superintended the preparation of candidates for holy orders. In 1821 he was made D.D. by Columbia College; removed to Geneva, and served for many years as missionary in the village of Waterloo. He became professor in the College of Geneva in 1825, and continued so until his death, March 25, 1830. His works are *A Sermon in the Churchman's Magazine*, and *A Series of Articles in the Gospel Messenger, signed P.* See Sprague, *Annals*, v, 525.

McDonald, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brooke County, Va., July 25, 1794; was educated in Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; was licensed and ordained by Athens Presbytery in 1827, and installed pastor of the Church in Burlington, Ohio; subsequently served as missionary in Kentucky; in 1832 labored in Manchester and Huntington churches, Ohio; and from 1836 in the Pleasant Prairie Church, Ill., until his death, Aug. 15, 1866. Mr. McDonald was possessed of rare mental strength and discriminating powers; extensive religious and literary acquirements; sterling piety, and unassuming humility. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 184.

McDonogh, John, an American philanthropist, a merchant of New Orleans, was born at Baltimore in 1778, and in 1800 removed to the Southern city, where, after having by hard labor and strict economy amassed an immense fortune, he delighted to serve the cause of humanity. He founded free schools and asylums for orphans, and also aided greatly the cause of the "American Colonization Society." He established himself a colony in Africa, and sent thither many of his own negroes, after having previously provided them with a thorough education and a trade. He died Oct. 26, 1850. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

McDowell, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, and came to this country in 1737; was licensed in 1739; and afterwards itinerated through portions of Maryland and Virginia, until, in 1741, he was ordained as an evangelist to Virginia, and subsequently to itinerate in New Castle Presbytery; in 1743 took charge of White Clay and Elk River churches; in 1752 was appointed principal of the Synod's school, which he afterwards removed to Elktown, Md., and in 1767 to Newark, Del. He continued to labor as a teacher and preacher until his death, Jan. 12, 1782. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 48. (J. L. S.)

McDowell, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister (O. S.), was born in Bedminster, Somerset County, N. J., Sept. 10, 1780; was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated A.B. in 1801; studied theology with Dr. Woodhull, of Freehold; and was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1804. In December of that year he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Elizabethtown, where he remained until 1833. During his ministry there 1144 persons were added to the Church. In May, 1833, he became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, which, from small beginnings, grew to be a strong Church under his ministry. In 1846 he accepted a call to the new Spring-garden Street Church, where again his talent for organizing and establishing a society was very successfully employed. He remained in this parish till his death, February, 1863. He published a *System of Theology* (2 vols.):—*Bible Class Manual* (2 vols.):—*Bible Questions;* etc. For nearly fifty years he was a trustee of Princeton College, and was a director of the theological seminary from its foundation. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1864, p. 186.

McDowell, William Anderson, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born May 15, 1789, at Lamington, Somerset Co., N. J.; in 1809 graduated at Princeton, where he acted as tutor for several months; completed his theological studies in 1813; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and ordained and installed pastor at Bound Brook. In 1814 he became pastor of the Church of Morristown, N. J.; but after a residence of nine years his health obliged him to resign; in 1823 he was installed by the Charleston Union Presbytery, served for several years, and in 1832 became moderator of the General Assembly, and secretary of the "Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church" (Phila.). He subsequently visited the South; and preached occasionally in New Jersey, where he died, Sept. 17, 1851. See Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 495; Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

McElhany, William G., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntington, Pa.; graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1847; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1850 was licensed by Chartier Presbytery; in 1855 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Hoboken, N. J., which relation existed until his death, May 28, 1860. Mr. McElhany was a sound evangelical preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, p. 209.

McFarland, Asa, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19, 1769, at Worcester, Mass.; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1793; was ordained pastor in Concord, N. H., March 7, 1798, and died there Feb. 18, 1827. He was made trustee of Dartmouth College in 1809, and president of the New Hampshire Missionary Society in 1811. His publications were, *Oration before the Phi Beta Kappa Society in Dartmouth College* (1802):—*An Historical View of Heresies and Vindication of the Primitive Faith* (1808); and several occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 412.

McFarland, James, a Presbyterian divine, was born in March, 1800, at Dumbarton, within the present limits of the city of Glasgow, Scotland. He entered the grammar school in Glasgow when seven years old. He next passed to St. Andrew's College, and afterwards to the divinity school of the Established Church, and was licensed to preach the Gospel at the age of twenty-one. During his college course he served as private tutor to an only son of a branch of the great family of Argyle. At the age of twenty-six he became the assistant and successor of the Rev. Dr. Mushett, at Shettleston, a suburb of Glasgow. Soon after he was called to the largest and most numerous congregation in the whole of Scotland at Aberbrotheck, a seaport and manufacturing town between Montrose and Aberdeen, situate on the German Ocean. In the year 1835 Mr. McFarland came to New York, and a little later went to Delaware County, settled by Scotch people, many of whom were the associates and schoolmates of his boyhood. After a few years he removed to Ulster County, and in 1838 was called to be the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Bloomingdale. During his ministry in that place a beautiful church was erected in the neighboring village of Rosendale, principally through his personal efforts. Unusual accessions were made to the membership, and he continued as pastor of the united congregations until the year 1844, when he was called to a large and flourishing congregation at Canajoharie. In 1848 he became the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of English Neighborhood, where he remained seven years. After a brief visit to Canada, he returned to Ulster County as pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Esopus and St. Remy Chapel. In 1861 he relinquished Esopus and St. Remy, and the next year became minister of a Presbyterian congregation in Galway, Fulton County. From this date until his death his ecclesiastical relations were with the Presbyterian body. In 1866 he left Galway, and became pastor of a congregation at Port Washington, a pleasant summer retreat on the Shrewsbury River, Monmouth County, N. J. He died March 23, 1870. Mr. McFarland was distinguished for his scholarship. He was an excellent linguist. "As a preacher, Mr. McFarland was careful in his preparations, which he delighted in making even to the last. There was the careful use of language, brevity in treatment, and such use and application of the truth as was suited to excite the spirit of devotion, to awaken love and reverence, and to administer satisfying consolation to the penitent and mourner. His positions

in the ministry attest popular qualities, his labors evince practical tact, and his success in gathering men and women into the fold attest the blessing of the Good Shepherd upon his ministrations."

McFarland, James Hunter, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Harrisburg, Pa., March 10, 1809; was converted in 1827, and soon after licensed to preach, and admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1830. His ministerial charges were Trenton Circuit, Essex, Bergen Neck Mission, Plainfield, Westchester, Bustleton, Dover, Elkton, Agency for Dickinson College, Newcastle, Columbia, Eighth Street, Philadelphia, presiding eldership of Reading District, Frankford, Bordentown, and Haverstraw, N. J. In 1852, while a member of the New Jersey Conference, his health failed, and he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference as a supernumerary. In June, 1862, he was appointed chaplain of the United States Hospital in Philadelphia, and in this relation he prosecuted his ministry to the close of his life, March 23, 1863. His last words were addressed to his wife: "Mother, I am dying! Lord Jesus, take me!" McFarland was for more than twenty years a corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Entomological Society. "He was a very faithful and devoted minister of Christ, and did the work of an evangelist successfully. He was warm in his friendship, faithful to the demands of duty, and above everything that looked like a compromise of Christian principle."—*Conference Minutes*, 1863, p. 47.

McFarlane, Jessie, a female preacher of the Society of Friends, was born about the year 1842; commenced preaching at seventeen, at first to girls and women, but later also to men. After eight years of this service, she became the wife of Dr. Brodie, of Edinburgh, and spent the remainder of her life in more private activity for the cause of her Master. She died about 1869. Her preaching was impressive, her life one of uncommon purity and devotion, her death triumphant. She wrote a paper on the scriptural authority for the preaching of women, which is inserted in a memoir of her life, entitled *In Memoriam Jessie McFarlane*, by J. G. (Lond. 1872, 12mo). See *Friends' Review* (Phila.), Oct. 12, 1872.

McFerrin, James, a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington County, Va., March 25, 1784. His ancestors emigrated from Ireland to this country about the year 1740. His father was a Presbyterian, a farmer, a strict observer of the Lord's day, and esteemed for his sobriety, good judgment, and intelligence. Mr. McFerrin's educational advantages were very limited, the years of his minority being passed on his father's farm, where, however, he acquired habits of industry, sobriety, and enterprise. On his twentieth birthday he was married to Jane Campbell Berry; shortly after which event he removed from Virginia to Rutherford County, Tenn. The country was new, the settlements exposed to depredations by the Indians; hardships and dangers were consequently inseparable from such a condition of things. Mr. McFerrin gave great attention to military tactics, in which he became thoroughly skilled, and, on the breaking out of the war with Great Britain in 1812, he was called into service, and, as captain of a company of volunteers, was engaged in a campaign against the Creek Indians under that renowned man, general Jackson. On account of his brave conduct at the battle in which the Indians were defeated, Mr. McFerrin was elected colonel. In his thirty-sixth year his whole course of life was changed, the result of which was that he thenceforth devoted himself to the work of the ministry. In 1823 he became a member of the Tennessee Annual Conference, and was appointed to the Jackson Circuit, in the northern part of Alabama. He had charge of this circuit two years. The two subsequent years (1826 and 1827) he travelled the Limestone Circuit, and at the close of this period removed to the vicinity of Courtland, Ala., where he purchased a farm, and remained for several years. This was in the Franklin Circuit, which he travelled in the years 1828 and 1829. During this period he attended the General Conference held in Pittsburg in 1828. He was also a delegate to the General Conference of 1832, held in Philadelphia. At the close of his labors on the Franklin Circuit he was made presiding elder of the Richland District, which he travelled four years. In the year 1834, having determined to remove to Western Tennessee, he deemed it proper to locate for one year, till he should be settled in his new home. In 1835 he was readmitted into Conference, and appointed to the Wesley Circuit, which he travelled two years. His next appointment was to Randolph and Harmony, for one year; and to the Wesley Circuit for one year (1839), which proved to be the last of his itinerant life. Among his papers is the following record, made in 1839: "Since I joined Conference, Nov. 25, 1823, I have preached 2088 times, baptized 573 adults and 813 infants, and have taken into society 3965 members." Mr. McFerrin died Sept. 4, 1840.

McGaughey, William G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Davidson County, Tenn., Jan. 12, 1812; was converted in 1833; was licensed to exhort at Holly Springs, Miss., about 1843; and shortly after received license to preach, and accomplished much good for the Church in this capacity. He was also for several years agent for the American Bible Society. In 1847 he was ordained deacon by bishop Soule; elder by bishop Andrew in 1852; in 1855 was admitted into Louisiana Conference, and appointed to Swan Lake and Pecan Grove; to Lake Providence in 1858; Carroll Circuit in 1859; Tensas and Elizabeth Chapel in 1861; Tensas Mission in 1863; Wesley, Tensas, and Jordan Chapel in 1864; Tensas District in 1865; Lake Providence District in 1867; Carroll Circuit in 1870; and in 1871 Lake Providence. He died Jan. 26, 1872. Mr. McGaughey was a devoted Christian and an able minister, much esteemed by all who knew him.—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1872, s. v.

McGavin, William, a celebrated Scotch layman and writer, was born in the parish of Auchinleck, Ayrshire, Aug. 12, 1773. His parents were in very moderate circumstances, and young McGavin therefore enjoyed but slender educational advantages. While yet a boy he was apprenticed to a bookseller and printer, but soon made himself a host of friends by the great literary talent he displayed in frequent contributions to the local newspapers. He was intrusted with the care of an elementary school, which he conducted with skill, though he hated the drudgery of teaching. He took an early opportunity to quit the rostrum, and to seek a livelihood in the counting-house. He became the agent of the British Linen Company's banking establishment in Glasgow. Although this business connection gave him great care and responsibility, McGavin's fondness of writing would not allow him to withdraw altogether from literary labors, and, by habits of unwearied industry, he was enabled to command leisure for the publication of many valuable religious tracts. An ardent opponent of Romanism, he attacked it in a series of papers entitled the "Protestant" (1818–21), which Dr. Robert Hall (Review of Birt's *Popery*) pronounced "the fullest delineation of the popish system, and the most powerful confutation of its principles, in a popular style." McGavin also edited John Howie's *Scotch Worthies*, and John Knox's *Hist. of the Reformation*, and frequently preached to the poor and the humble in the suburbs of Glasgow. He died in 1832. See Chambers's and Thomson's *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen* (1865), vol. iii, s. v.; Jamieson, *Dict. of Relig. Biog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

McGee, William C., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paterson, N. J., Aug. 15, 1816, and was educated

at New Jersey College, N. J. (class of 1836), and at the theological seminary, Princeton, N. J. In 1841 he was licensed and ordained pastor of Hardwick and Marksborough churches, where he remained until his death, May 25, 1867. Mr. McGee, as a preacher, was earnest, lucid, and practical; as a pastor, constant and zealous; as a citizen, intelligent and public-spirited. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 127.

McGilvary, Archibald B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in the Isle of Skye, coast of Scotland, towards the close of the last century. He came to this country in 1806, joined the South Carolina Conference in 1832, and died at Greenville, S. C., June 9, 1863. "Brother McGilvary was a modest, cheerful, and agreeable man, a faithful friend, and good citizen. As a minister of Christ, he was holy, laborious, and useful."—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, ii, 449.

McGlashan, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Queenston, Canada, Feb. 23, 1812; pursued his preparatory studies in the academy in Geneva, N. Y.; graduated at Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., and in 1840 at the theological seminary in Auburn, N. Y. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist in 1843, and afterwards commissioned by the American Tract Society as a general agent to the Southern States. While in this employ he built a mariner's church in Mobile, Ala.; subsequently his services were transferred from the tract and colportage efforts to the cause of the Seaman's Friend Society. In 1859 he again removed to the North, and in 1863 commenced work for the cause of the sailor in New York City, where he established a new church, called the Church of the Sea and Land. In 1866 he removed to St. Catharine's, Canada, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9, 1867. Mr. McGlashan was a man of extraordinary Christian zeal, peculiar talents, and marked success. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 128.

McGorrisk, Bernard, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in Ireland in 1818; went to Paris to pursue an academical course, and there also studied theology; emigrated to this country early in 1842; was engaged for several months as professor of French at St. John's College (Fordham, N. Y.); afterwards went as missionary priest to the West, where he labored for nearly eighteen years, building fifteen or sixteen churches. About 1860 he removed to Brooklyn, where he built the present church of St. Vincent de Paul. He died Oct. 29, 1865.—*New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 654.

McGregor, David, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1711, and from 1736 until his death (May 30, 1777) was pastor of Londonderry Church, New Hampshire. He received the degree of A.M. from New Jersey College. He published *Sermons and Theological Treatises* (1741–74). See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

McHenry, Barnabas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in one of the eastern counties of Virginia Dec. 10, 1767; was converted when only fifteen years of age, and shortly after joined the Church. Called to preach the Gospel, he entered the itinerancy in May, 1787, and was appointed to Yadkin Circuit. Thereafter he successively served the cause of his Master in the following appointments: in 1788 at Cumberland Circuit; in 1789 at Danville; in 1790 at Madison; in 1791 at Cumberland; was placed in charge of the district in 1792, and in 1793 of an enlarged number of circuits; in 1794 he was sent to Salt River Circuit; in 1795 was located on account of impaired health; in 1819 was readmitted, and appointed presiding elder of Salt River District, Tennessee Conference, but his health again failed him, and he was finally obliged to retire from active work, and take the place of a superannuate. He died at Mount Pleasant, near Springfield, Ky., June 16, 1833. "Barnabas McHenry," is the testimony of one, "was a man of strong mind and able in argument. He stood upon the walls of our Zion and defended her bulwarks when she was assailed by an enemy." Bishop Bascom says, "Of the early years of his ministry but little is known, except vague yet cherished traditions of the beauty, unction, and eloquence of his preaching, together with the dangers and hardships to which he was exposed as a pioneer missionary in the wilderness of the West from 1788 to 1795. . . . Even a century in a single community produces few such men as Barnabas McHenry and Valentine Cook. They were men by themselves, and their memory would adorn the history of any Church or age." See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 143 sq.; Finley, *Sketches of the M. E. Church South; Minutes of Conferences*, 1834.

McIlvaine (or **MacIlvaine**), Charles Petit, D.D., an eminent divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, New Jersey, June 18, 1799. His father, Joseph McIlvaine, was a leading lawyer and United States senator from New Jersey at the time of his death, in 1826. Charles graduated in 1816 at Princeton; was admitted to deacon's orders July 4, 1820, by bishop White, and, having labored in Christ Church, Georgetown, Md., he received two years later priest's orders from bishop Kemp, of Maryland. In 1825 he became professor of ethics and chaplain in the United States Military Academy at West Point. In 1827 he became rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where he remained until 1832, when he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. While rector at Brooklyn, he also held the professorship of evidences of revealed religion and sacred antiquities in the University of the City of New York. In the episcopacy, Dr. McIlvaine quickly made a name for himself as a man of learning, and of unusual kindliness of disposition, not only in his own Church, but among all Christians, both in this country and in Europe. For the last ten years or more he was looked upon as the representative of the Low Churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In his death (which occurred at Florence, Italy, while on a journey for recreation, March 14, 1873), irenical theology has lost one of its ablest advocates, and the Evangelical Association one of its most active promoters. Bishop McIlvaine was a large contributor to theological literature. His *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity* (9th ed. 1857, 12mo, reprinted in England and Scotland), delivered in New York University in 1831, were published by request of the Council, and have gone through many editions. During the early part of the controversy arising out of the Oxford tracts, appeared his *Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches* (Phila. 1841, 8vo; Lond. 1841, 8vo), which the *Edinburgh Review* recommended as one of the best "confutations of the Oxford school." In 1854 he published a volume of sermons entitled *The Truth and the Life*. He also compiled two volumes of *Select Family and Parish Sermons* (Columbus, Ohio, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo). His other works of a minor character are, *The Sinner's Justification before God* (N. Y. 18mo; Lond. 1851, sq.):—*The Holy Catholic Church* (Phila. 18mo; Lond. 1844, 16mo):—*No Priest, no Altar, no Sacrifice, but Christ* (N. Y. 12mo; Lond. 12mo):—*Valedictory Offering; Five Sermons* (1853, 12mo):—*A Word in Season to Candidates for Confirmation*:—*The Doctrines of the Prot. Epis. Church as to Confirmation*:—*Chief Danger of the Church*:—*The Truth and the Life; a Series of Twenty-two Discourses* (N. Y. 1855, 8vo; Lond. 1855, 8vo; this volume was published at the request of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, together with *A Memoir of the Rev. Chas. Simeon*, both published in New York); and contributed articles to the *N. Y.* (quarterly) *Review*, the *Episcopal* (monthly) *Observer*, the *London* (monthly) *Christian Observer*, the *Protestant Churchman* (New York), the *Episcopal Recorder* (Phila.), and the *Western Episcopalian* (Gambier, Ohio). In 1853 the degree of D.C.L. was conferred on him by the University of Oxford, and in 1858 that of LL.D. by the University of Cambridge. He was distinguished for the soundness and clearness

of his evangelical views, and for the expository character of his preaching. "That for which as a preacher he is most eminent is his power of illustrating Scripture by Scripture; and his mode of doing this shows at once the fulness and the accuracy of his knowledge of Scripture and the transparent simplicity of his conception .... in all his preaching he aims to lay broad and deep the foundations of the Christian character, in strong, clear views of man's sinfulness and need, and Christ's fulness and freeness as a Saviour." See Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century* (N. Y. 1857, 442, q. v.) for a notice of this excellent prelate, and a sermon of his on the resurrection of Christ. See, also, *Western Memorabilia; Knickerbocker*, xxxv, 42; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1911; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s. v. (J. H. W.)

McIver, J. W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Sept. 19, 1835; professed religion in 1858; joined the Memphis Conference in 1861, and filled the Chulahoma and Good Springs circuits. He joined the Confederate army in the late civil war. In 1865 and 1866 he was appointed to the Richland and Cassida circuits; and in 1867 to the Iuka Circuit. He died suddenly, of congestion, while on his way to an appointment, Jan. 17, 1868. "Brother McIvor was a very promising young preacher, much beloved by all the people where he preached, and it is with feelings of deepest sadness that we record his early death." See *Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, iii, 246.

McKay, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 7, 1825; pursued his academic course at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Lisbon, and immediately took temporary charge of the Church at Yellow Creek; but, owing to ill-health and other causes, had to give up his labors. He died Jan. 19, 1863. Mr. McKay possessed an extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and was well versed in theology. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 187.

McKean, James W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lawrence County, Pa., April 30, 1833; was educated at Richmond College and Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. (class of 1859), and at the Western Theological Seminary; in 1862 was licensed and ordained by the Ohio Presbytery, with a view to labor as a domestic missionary in the Lake Superior region; in 1863 was elected principal of the Synodical School at Hopkinton, Iowa, where he continued to labor until May, 1864, when he enlisted in the service of his country. He died while in camp, July 9, 1864. Mr. McKean was an accurate scholar, a good teacher, and a model of Christian piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 137.

McKean, Joseph, D.D., LL.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19, 1776, in Ipswich, Mass.; graduated at Harvard College in 1794; entered the ministry, and was ordained pastor in Milton, Mass., Nov. 1, 1797; resigned Oct. 3, 1804; was elected professor of mathematics in Harvard College in 1806, but declined, and was chosen Boylston professor of rhetoric in 1809. He remained in this position until his health failed. He died at Havana March 17, 1818. He published a *Memoir of the Rev. John Eliot, S.T.D.*, in the *Hist. Coll.*, and several occasional sermons and addresses. See Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 414.

McKearn, Richard, a Baptist minister, was born in Rawdon, Ireland, Aug. 22, 1804, and emigrated with his parents, while yet a youth, to the British possessions this side the Atlantic, and finally settled at Rowdon, N. F. Richard was reared in the Episcopal Church, but in 1820 was converted under the preaching of elder James Munro, a Baptist evangelist, and in 1821 finally joined the Baptists; he began preaching in 1826, and March 10, 1828, became the pastor of a congregation at Rowdon. In May, 1829, he was called upon to assume the pastorate of a Baptist congregation at Windsor also, and he thereafter preached both at Rowdon and Windsor until about 1836, when ill health compelled him to withdraw from the ministry. Deprived of the advantages of academic training, he had prepared for college while in the ministry, and in 1839 matriculated at King's College, and there graduated in due course of time, and took his degree of B.A. In 1842, his health still too feeble to re-enter the ministry, he removed to Dartmouth, and established himself in business. He died Aug. 17, 1860, acknowledged by all who knew him to have been "a conspicuous example of unbending Christian integrity, and earnest, steadfast devotion to the cause of Christ." "As a preacher," says one of his contemporaries and associates, "Mr. McKearn commanded the full attention of his auditory. His manner was earnest and energetic; his subjects practical, and treated with clearness and precision. Their application to the heart and conscience was with great power. His language was free and copious, his voice excellent, and capable of great modulation. As his subject required, he was earnestly winning and persuasive, or denounced with fearful energy the courses of the ungodly." See *The Christian Messenger* (Halifax), Oct. 17, 1860.

McKeen, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister, noted as an educator, was born Oct. 15, 1757, in Londonderry, N. H.; graduated at Dartmouth in 1774; served under general Sullivan in the Revolution; was licensed to preach, and ordained pastor in Beverly in May, 1785. In 1802 he was chosen first president of Bowdoin College, and was inaugurated Sept. 2. He died July 15, 1807. "Dr. McKeen possessed a strong and discriminating mind; his manners were conciliating though dignified, and his spirit mild though firm and decided. He was indefatigable in his exertions to promote the interests of science and religion. He was respectable for his learning and exemplary for his Christian virtues, being pious without ostentation, and adhering to evangelical truth without bigotry or superstition." He published his *Inaugural Address* and a few occasional *Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 216.

McKendree, William, a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in King William County, Va., July 6, 1757. He was the subject of frequent religious impressions in youth, but he failed to find peace. He was an adjutant and commissary in Washington's army for several years, and was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781; in 1787 he was converted, during the great revival that occurred under the labors of the Rev. John Easter; and entered the itinerancy June 17, 1788. In 1796 he was made presiding elder; in 1801 was sent by the bishops to preside over Kentucky District, and to have general superintendence of the Western Conference, then embracing Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Western Virginia, and part of Illinois; and in 1806 was presiding elder on Cumberland District, with the same supervision of the Conference. At the General Conference in Baltimore, May, 1808, McKendree was finally promoted to the highest office in the gift of the Church—the episcopacy. He died March 5, 1835, at his brother's, near Nashville, Tenn., having preached faithfully almost fifty years, been twelve years a presiding elder, and nearly twenty-seven years a bishop in the Church. Bishop McKendree was one of the most eminent of all the preachers and pastors of his age. From the time of his first efforts he was marked as a man of the most vigorous genius, the most genuine modesty, and the most devoted piety. Although not classically educated, his broad and grasping mind went on acquiring and growing until it had digested and could wield at will a vast and varied knowledge. His imagination was grand and fervid, but always healthy; and could give to his knowledge the freshness of romance, or to his judgment the spell of prophecy. His utterance was

copious and forcible, and his voice rich, deep, and flexible. These elements of mind and means, employed by a strong and pathetic heart baptized with the Holy Ghost, made him not only the most truly eloquent bishop that his Church has ever possessed, but one of the best preachers of any Church or age. As a pastor, his administrative abilities were unrivalled. He found the economical methods of the Church crude and indefinite, and imparted to them a systematic vigor; and he was a distinguished promoter of her benevolent institutions. As a man and a Christian he was honored by every class of society. His labors were mighty in laying the deep foundations of evangelical religion in the Mississippi Valley, and his genius and devotion are still a power in the churches, and his memory is blessed. See *Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 402; *Life*, by B. St. J. Fry, in the M. E. S. S. Library; and that by Bp. Paine, of the M. E. Church South (Nashville, 1869, 2 vols. 12mo); Summers, *Biog. Sketches*, p. 43; Wakely, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 93; Bennett (W. B.), *Memorials of Methodism in Virginia* (Richm. 1871, 12mo), p. 260 sq.; McFerrin, *Hist. Meth. in Tennessee*, i, 366; Redford, *Hist. Meth. in Kentucky*, ii, 28. (G. L. T.)

McKennan, James Wilson, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Pa., Sept. 2, 1804; graduated at Washington College, Pa., in 1822, and then studied and practiced law at Millersburg, Ohio; subsequently commenced the study of theology with Dr. John Anderson, of Upper Buffalo Church, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1828, and in 1829 was ordained and installed pastor of the United churches of Lower Buffalo and West Liberty, Pa. In 1835 he accepted a call to Indianapolis, but owing to infirm health he had to resign. He was afterwards engaged in teaching in Wheeling, and at Moundsville, Va., and also as rector in the preparatory department, and adjunct professor of languages in Washington College. He died July 19, 1861. Dr. McKennan's character was truly remarkable in candor, benevolence, and meekness; in simplicity and directness of purpose; in strength of faith and zeal. His sermons were characterized by plainness and directness of style. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 109.

McKinley, John, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1815. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, which institution he entered when not quite fourteen years old, and there he graduated with the first honor of his class in 1833. From his very childhood the ministry had been looked to as the profession of his life, and he therefore, immediately upon the completion of his college course, entered upon the study of theology at the theological seminary of his Church, then under the care of Dr. Samuel B. Wylie. In 1835 Mr. McKinley was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. After filling various minor appointments, he was in 1838 called to the pastorate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Milton, Pa. Here he labored acceptably and successfully until 1841, when failing health compelled him to withdraw from active work. His precautions had been taken too late, for he failed rapidly, and died Oct. 5 of the same year. "All who knew him recognised in his death the extinction of one of the bright lights of the Church." His only publication is a series of articles on *the Slave Trade*, which appeared in a weekly periodical at Milton, Pa. "He was a man of cultivated intellect, of sound and discriminating judgment, of generous sympathies and noble impulses, and fervent piety." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 87 sq.

McKinney, Calvin, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallkill, Orange County, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1819. He received a good academic education, afterwards studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., and was licensed and ordained in 1856. He labored successively at Millport, Mecklenburg, and West Groton, N. Y. He died June 9, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 220.

McKinney, David, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mifflin County, Pa., Oct. 22, 1795. He was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1821); then studied theology at the school of divinity at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia in April, 1824, and ordained and installed at Erie, Pa., in May, 1825. In 1835 he removed to the bounds of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, and took charge of the churches at Sinking Creek and Spring; in 1841 he was transferred to Hollidaysburg, in the same presbytery. In 1852, having severed his pastoral relations, Dr. McKinney removed to Philadelphia, and there established the *Presbyterian Banner*. In 1855 he removed the office of publication to Pittsburg, and there submerged in it the interests of the *Presbyterian Advocate*. He sold the paper in 1864, to become librarian and treasurer for the Board of Colportage of the Synods of Pittsburg and Alleghany, and this position he filled until the time of his decease. Dr. McKinney was a private partner, and at one time in connection with the editorial staff of the *Northwestern Presbyterian Banner*. He died May 28, 1873.

McKinney, Isaac Newton, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Erie, Pa., Oct. 20, 1828; graduated at Jefferson College in 1848, and in 1849 engaged in teaching in Alabama; in 1852 he entered the theological seminary at Princeton, but because of failing health was obliged to relinquish his studies; in 1856 he accepted a license to preach, and in 1857 was ordained and installed pastor of Montour's Church, but soon after accepted an appointment as professor of Latin in his alma mater; in 1862 he was engaged in editing the *Presbyterian Banner*, and then in originating and conducting the *Family Treasure*, and died Nov. 20, 1864. Mr. McKinney was a scholar, well versed in language—embracing Latin, Greek, French, and German. As a preacher, he was ardent, direct, and lucid; as a teacher, he had rare capabilities. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 103.

McKinney, James, a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in Cookstown, Tyrone County, Ireland, in 1759. After due preparation he entered Glasgow College, where he distinguished himself by close application to study and a display of unusual talents. His next step was to study medicine, but, called of God to preach the Gospel, he finally entered upon the study of theology, was licensed in due time, and constituted pastor of a congregation at Kirkhills, Antrim County, about 1780. In 1793 he emigrated to this country, and was immediately employed as missionary. Four years later he became the pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church at Galway and Duanesburg, N. Y., and there he remained until 1804, when he accepted a call to a Church at Chester County, S. C. He went south in May, but lived only a few months; he died Sept. 10, 1804. Dr. McMasters thus comments upon McKinney (in Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 2): "Of the character of Mr. McKinney as a preacher, and of the power of his eloquence, the very large assemblies that everywhere attended his ministry, and the uniform testimony of all well-informed and serious men, of various denominations, leave no room for doubt. . . . One feature of his ministerial character may perhaps be inferred from the plan of a work which he proposed to publish, the introductory portion of which only he lived to complete. The proposal was a discussion of the Rights of God, the Rights of Christ as Mediator, the Rights of the Church, and the Rights of Humanity in general. Taking the part he published as a specimen of the whole, the reader will regret the failure of the purpose. The work would have been worthy of the man—not only sound in matter, but deep in thought and impressive in style." An Irish journal, commenting on the character of James McKinney, says of him: "The character of James Mc-

Kinney never was exceeded in the boldness of its outline and in the distinctness and prominency of its features. His eloquence was in perfect character. His heart, possessed with the love of the truth as it is in Jesus, was ever set upon its recommendation and enforcement; and it was when descanting upon the grand Gospel theme of a crucified Saviour or asserting the Church's rights, or when, with well-sustained pathos, he mourned the wrongs of Zion, that his mind assumed a gigantic attitude, and put forth its wonderful energies. His diction was clear, copious, strong, and full of pertinent and often brilliant figures. He has frequently, in his public discourses, caught a flame from the working of his judgment, imagination, and feelings; and then his conceptions, conveyed in simple, energetic language, or in bright imagery, and in bold and apt allusions, produced an astonishing effect. In America, whose republican institutions he had long loved, the land of enterprise and freedom, was the field which just suited the genius of McKinney; there his powers had full scope for development and exercise."

McKinney, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bellefonte, Pa., Aug. 26, 1797; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1817; studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J., and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1824; was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Fredericksburg, Ohio, in 1829; subsequently became pastor of the Church at Alexandria, Pa., and still later a supply at Oswego, Ill. He died in 1867. Mr. McKinney's life was one of real sacrifice and great usefulness; he was mild, affectionate, trustworthy, and eminently righteous. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 131.

McKinnon, J., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Esquessing, C. W. His early education was commenced in Oneida Institute, in N. Y., in 1837; in 1838 he placed himself under the tuition of Dr. Rae, in Hamilton, C. W. His collegiate studies were pursued in Queen's College, Kingston, C. W., and Knox College, Toronto. In 1844 he was licensed, and became pastor successively of the St. Thomas, Owen Sound, and Beckwith churches. He died Dec. 24, 1865. Mr. McKinnon was a man of sterling integrity and conscientious fidelity; he possessed a competent knowledge of the languages, but excelled in the logical and mathematical faculties. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 478.

McLachlan, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1797; was educated in the Glasgow University, and studied divinity in the theological seminary of the Old Burgher section of the Secession Church; was licensed in 1827, and ordained as a missionary to Southern Africa, under the patronage of the London Missionary Society, but after two years' residence at the Cape of Good Hope he was compelled by ill-health to return. In 1830 he was made chaplain of the Seamen's Chapel in the city of Glasgow; but, becoming dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical connection, he joined the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and in 1834 was sent by the Scottish Synod of the Church to Canada West as their missionary. Subsequently he accepted a call from the congregation at Lisbon, N. Y., where he continued till his death, Nov. 19, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 292.

McLain, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Bloomingsburg, Ohio, April 2, 1824; was educated at the South Salem Academy, Ohio, and studied theology with Dr. Carothers and Rev. H. S. Fullerton, and for a short time at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1852, and ordained in 1853, as pastor of Harmony Church. During the last few years of his life he was connected with the Western Reserve Presbytery, and was a commissioner from that presbytery to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which met at Columbus, Ohio, in 1862. He died June 24, 1862. Mr. McLain was a man of indomitable energy, great zeal, and geniality of spirit. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 193.

McLane, James Woods, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Charlotte, N. C., May 22, 1801; received his preparatory training in Phillips' Academy, Andover, Mass.; graduated with high honor at Yale College in 1828, and in 1834 at Andover Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Andover Congregational Association in 1835; was shortly after ordained pastor of the Madison Street Presbyterian Church in New York, and labored there until 1856, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Williamsburg, L. I. There he labored with untiring zeal until 1863, when he resigned on account of failing health. During his ministry Dr. McLane contributed frequently to the religious press; was for many years director of the American Bible Society, and prepared for this society an improved standard edition of the Bible. He was also for many years recorder of the Union Theological Seminary, and secretary of the Church Erection Fund. He died at Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1864. Dr. McLane was a man of fine talents and scholarship; as a preacher, earnest and practical; as a writer, bold and uncompromising. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 168; Appleton, *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 595.

McLaurin, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1796; graduated at Edinburgh; studied theology in Glasgow; and in 1824 was licensed and ordained by a presbytery of the Church of Scotland. In 1840 he emigrated to the United States, became pastor successively of the Plainfield and Paw Paw churches, within the bounds of Kalamazoo Presbytery, Mich., and subsequently preached at Birmingham and Fentonville, Mich. He died May 11, 1860. Mr. McLaurin was an able and learned minister. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 161.

McLean, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in the Island of North Uist, Scotland, in March, 1827. His early advantages were poor—his boyhood being a constant battle for existence against the strong arm of Romanism. He graduated at the Edinburgh University, and afterwards studied theology; while thus engaged he was associated with the Rev. Mr. Hall in the Glasgow Home Mission work. In 1855 he came to Canada, and in 1856 was ordained pastor of the East Puslinch congregation, where he remained till his death, May 25, 1864. Mr. McLean was an effective minister, and an ardent laborer in the mission work. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 372.

McLean, Charles G., D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, March 17, 1787; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1808, and studied theology under the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, of the Associate Reformed Church; was licensed in 1812, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church near Gettysburg, Pa., during which pastorate he became an Independent. In 1844 he accepted a call from the Reformed Dutch Church at Fort Plains, N. Y., and in 1852 emigrated to the West, and, in connection with his son-in-law, established a female seminary at Indianapolis, Ind. He died July 4, 1860. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 101.

McLeod, Alexander, D.D., a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in the Island of Mull June 12, 1774. His father and grandfather were ministers of the Church of Scotland. In 1792 he came to America and entered Union College, where he graduated in 1798. In 1799 he was licensed by the Reformed Presbytery at Coldenham, and in 1801 was installed pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church. His first publication was *Negro Slavery Unjustifiable* (N. Y. 1802). In 1803 appeared *Messiah governing the Nations;* in 1816, *Ecclesiastical Catechism:—The Gospel Ministry:—Lectures on the Prophecies:—Sermons on the War:—Life and Power of True Godliness.* He was the chief organizer of the American Colonization Soci-

ety in 1816, and wrote its constitution. During his pastoral career he received various calls to other churches, to colleges, and to editorships; but he declined them all, and remained in his charge until his death, Feb. 17, 1833. See Wiley (Sam. B.), *Memoir of A. McLeod, D.D.* (N. Y. 1855, 8vo); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 261; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 9 sq.

McLeod, Cornelius, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born about 1820; joined the Church when but a boy; entered the South Carolina Conference in 1837, and for nearly thirty years labored faithfully and zealously for the cause of the Redeemer. His last appointment was Richland Fork Mission. He died April 9, 1866. "McLeod was a successful laborer, and was much beloved by those for whom he labored. Remarkably amiable, he won without effort the affections of those with whom he was associated; and now, though he has passed away, he lives in the hearts of his people."—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, iii, 17.

McLeod, Norman, D.D., one of the most noted Scotch divines of our day, was born at Campbelltown, Argyleshire, June 3, 1812. He was early destined for the ministry by his father, who was at the time of Norman's birth parish minister of Campbelltown, and Norman was to make the fourth generation of the McLeods in the ministry of the Scotch Kirk. To fit him properly for the responsible position he was to occupy in the near future, his father accepted a parish near Glasgow, and Norman made his preparatory studies for college at Glasgow. His academic education he obtained at Edinburgh, and he then travelled for some time in Germany and the northern countries of Europe. On his return to Scotland he studied theology at Edinburgh, enjoying especially the counsel and instruction of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers. He was licensed to preach in 1838, and "with the Norse tongue in him, and a vigorous Celtic imagination," he soon found a parish ready to receive him, and was ordained pastor of Loudon, in Ayrshire. Here he labored faithfully until 1843, the year so eventful to the Scotch Kirk. See SCOTLAND. Though Norman McLeod had been a pupil of Dr. Chalmers, and greatly esteemed the doctor, he refused to leave the establishment, and even opposed the Free Church movement. In consequence of this decision to remain a Churchman many offers of promotion came to his door, and he finally accepted the parish of Dalkeith, where he resided until 1851, when he was called to the Barony Church of Glasgow, whither he removed, and "substantially began the real work of his life," among a membership of from eleven to twelve hundred adults, who by his guidance not only walked themselves in the path of righteousness, but were the means of promoting Christian holiness and ameliorating the condition of the poor and the forsaken. "Commonly," says his biographer, Dr. Walter C. Smith (in *Good Words*, Aug. 1872, p. 513), "he preached thrice every Sabbath, besides conducting a large class of his own; and his preaching was no mere stringing together of theological commonplaces, but the expression of earnest thought about the highest things, full of practical help and counsel for living men. . . . Neither did he regard his congregation merely as a company of people to be preached to, but rather as a body of men whom he had to lead unto every good work." Aside from his parish work, extended as it was far beyond the labor usually performed by three ministers, he edited for ten years the *Edinburgh Christian Magazine*, a periodical of the old religious type, which, while it existed, did much good to the people who read it, but proved a heavy loss both to publisher and editor. In spite of McLeod's connection with this literary venture, Mr. Strahan, the noted British publisher, hesitated not to court the services of Dr. McLeod when in 1860 the publication of *Good Words* was projected. The manner in which the doctor replied to the invitation is well worthy of the Christian minister of Glasgow (comp. *Contemporary Review*, 1872, July, p. 29 sq.). The success of *Good Words* as a literary venture has been almost unprecedented in the annals of magazine literature. "Wherever the English language is read it has familiarized the people with the great leaders of theological thought; has brought into the cottage specimens of the pencil of the most eminent artists; has diffused sound information on secular truth; and has been the means of introducing to the poor, poets of eminence and writers of wholesome fiction. Its pages, too, were often graced with the kindly productions of the editor's own pen. Many of his works, now published in book form, and of deservedly high popularity, first appeared in *Good Words*." A recognition of his able services came to Dr. McLeod in his later years from a quarter where, as a member of the Church outside the Anglican establishment, he could hardly have expected so much — we refer to his appointment, upon the death of Dr. Robert Lee, to the chaplaincy to the queen of England, a honor which never before fell to the lot of any Scotch minister except William Carstairs. In the midst of these varied labors, while still in fullest sympathy with the great life that stirred around him, and full of hope for its progress, and doing his full share of the task, death came upon him, June 16, 1872, causing a loss deeply felt not only by his own Church, but by all evangelical denominations, by the rich and the poor, the high and the low; for it must be borne in mind that his genial, great, noble nature made its influence felt everywhere; and "he considered no work foreign to him if it could be called his Master's business." "Perhaps no other minister of the Church of Scotland was so generally beloved or exercised so potent an influence for good. His charity was remarkable. He extended the hearty hand of fellowship to men of all sects believing in Jesus Christ and him crucified. In the pulpit his utterances were peculiarly fresh and eloquent; and reproof and instruction, conveyed in a spirit of love, came home with striking effect to men's business and bosoms. He had a holy horror of shams in whatever guise they might be presented;" and we do not wonder that the man who is most competent to speak of him is constrained to say that Dr. Norman McLeod was "the most manly man" he ever knew; "the most genial, the most many-sided, and yet the least angular" (John Strahan, publisher of *Good Words*, in *Contemporary Review*, July, 1872, p. 291 sq.). "Norman McLeod," continues Mr. Strahan, "was no mere paper, and pulpit, and platform good man, putting all his goodness into books, and sermons, and speeches. Where he was best known—known as standing the crucial test of the 'dreary intercourse of daily life'—there he was most respected and beloved. Glasgow had known him for many a year as a most unpretentious and yet most indefatigable worker for his brethren's weal in this life and beyond this life; and money-making Glasgow struck work in the middle of the week to show that it felt it had lost its best citizen." It should not be omitted here that Dr. McLeod strove hard to advance the cause of the Indian Mission scheme of the Church of Scotland by not only obtaining for it the contributions of the Church, but by inducing men of high Christian and educational attainments to undertake the work of preaching the Gospel to the people of India. He himself visited India only a short time before his death to inquire into the success of the Mission and to advance its interests more ably. His last speech before the last Assembly he attended was to revive the mission zeal of the Church. (J. H. W.)

McLeod, Xavier Donald, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in New York about 1821, and was the son of the celebrated Presbyterian divine, Dr. Alexander McLeod. He was educated at Columbia College; studied theology; took orders in the Episcopal Church in 1845; sailed for Europe in 1850, and while abroad embraced Roman Catholicism. After his return to this country he devoted himself to the publication of several works of a secular nature, besides a *Life of Mary Queen of*

Scots (1857). About 1860 he became professor of belles-lettres at Mount St. Mary's College, near Cincinnati; subsequently entered the priesthood, and died in August, 1865.—*New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 648.

McLoughlin, F. T., a Roman Catholic priest, was born in the parish of Aglia, Upper Canada, in 1836; was educated at the College of St. Michael, Toronto; studied for the priesthood in the Seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore, Md.; was ordained priest in Brooklyn for that diocese; died in New York Aug. 3, 1863. "He won, by his attention to the best interests of his people, the sincere admiration of all."—*New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 645.

McLure, Daniel Milton, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flat Rock, S. C., Dec. 1835; pursued his studies at Davidson College, N. C., and subsequently at Oglethorpe University, Ga. (class of 1858); studied divinity in the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C.; and in 1861 was licensed to preach, and supplied a Church in Alabama. In 1864 he was regularly ordained and installed pastor of Williamsburg Church, and died Oct. 25, 1865. Mr. McLure's mind was of more than ordinary strength; independence and clearness characterized his thoughts, deliberation and study formed his opinions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 447.

McMahon, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Dumfries, Prince William County, Va., about 1785; was converted at a camp-meeting held near Oldtown, Md.; was appointed class-leader by Peter Cartwright, and afterwards licensed to exhort by the Rev. James Quinn, and soon after to preach, and was received into the travelling connection in 1811. His first appointment was Silver Creek, in the territory of Indiana; in 1812 he was sent to Kentucky, where he remained four years, and travelled the Lexington, Shelby, Jefferson, and Fleming circuits. Under this four years' ministry thousands were awakened and converted. In 1816 he was transferred to the Mississippi Conference to take charge of a district. He started on his journey with bishop Roberts, but was taken sick at Nashville, and there transferred by bishop McKendree to the Tennessee Conference, and was appointed to Nashville Circuit. After that time he became one of the leading minds of the Tennessee and Memphis Conferences. His health having failed, he located, and removed from North Alabama to De Soto County, Miss., in December, 1835; was readmitted into the travelling connection at the second session of the Memphis Conference, held in the fall of 1841, and was appointed to Holly Springs District, where he remained four years. He continued in the regular work, preaching with a power and success such as but few men ever had, until his health gave way. For several years before his death he sustained either a supernumerary or a superannuated relation. He died about 1867 or 1868. "Few men, during the present century, have exerted a greater influence upon Methodism in the South. For fifty years he held up the cross and preached the doctrines of Christianity in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, leaving holy foot-prints, and winning votaries to Christ. He was in many respects a most remarkable man. No one ever had the reputation that he had in North Alabama and Mississippi."—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870, s. v.; McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, ii, 426; Redford, *Hist. Meth. in Kentucky*, ii, 252.

McMaster, Erasmus D., D.D., a noted Presbyterian divine, was born in Pennsylvania, Feb. 4, 1806; graduated at Union College, N.Y., in 1827; was licensed to preach in 1829; was ordained in 1831, and made pastor at Ballston, N. Y.; was president of the South Hanover College, Indiana, from 1838 to 1845, and of Miami University, Ohio, from 1845 to 1849; was professor of systematic theology in the New Albany Theological Seminary from 1849 to 1866; and was then appointed to the same chair in the theological seminary of the Northwest. He died at Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 10, 1866. Possessed of a vigorous and thoroughly cultured mind and a well-balanced judgment, McMaster succeeded in all he attempted. "His expositions of Scripture and his religious addresses and sermons were exceedingly rich and instructive, and held the attention of all his hearers; while his influence over his students was unbounded." He published several sermons and addresses, and minor theological treatises. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1866, p. 463.

McMaster, Gilbert, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, Feb. 13, 1778; came to this country when yet a child, and was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1803; was ordained August 8, 1808, and was pastor of Duanesburg Church, N. Y., from 1808 to 1840, and of the Church at Princeton, Ind., from 1840 to 1846. He died at New Albany, Ind., March 15, 1854. His works are: *An Essay in Defence of some Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity*:—*An Analysis of the Shorter Catechism* (1815):—*An Apology for the Book of Psalms*:—*The Moral Character of Civil Government considered* (1832):—*Thoughts on Union in the Church of God* (1846). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 368; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 46 sq.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.

McMillan, Edward, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland County, N. C., Sept. 2, 1804; was educated under Rev. Samuel Donnell and Rev. J. R. Bain, Tenn.; was licensed by Shiloh Presbytery in 1827, and ordained in 1828; labored in 1829 in Moulton, Ala.; in 1835, in Bethany, Tenn.; in 1849, in Gallatin, Tenn.; in 1856, in Carlinville, Ill.; and in 1862 became chaplain in the army, in which service he died, Aug. 27, 1864. Mr. McMillan as a preacher was clear and analytical; as a Christian, confiding, prayerful; as a man, naturally kind, noble, and generous. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 220.

McMillan, Gavin, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Feb. 6, 1787, and was brought to Charleston, S. C., in August of the same year. He began his education under Rev. John Kell, and pursued his classical studies under the care successively of John Orr, Rev. Thomas Donnelly, Rev. E. Newton, and Mr. Campbell; in 1817 he graduated with honor at the South Carolina College, S. C.; afterwards studied divinity in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed by the Reformed Philadelphia Presbytery in 1821, and in 1823 was ordained and installed pastor of Beech Woods Church, at Morning Sun, Ohio, where he labored for fifty years. In 1839 and 1861 he was moderator of the Synod. He died Jan. 25, 1867. Mr. McMillan was eminent as a scholar and theologian; clear and instructive as a preacher; wise and trustful as a counsellor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 390.

McMillan, Gavin Riley, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fairfield District, S. C., Dec. 24, 1824; was educated in Miami University, Athens, Ohio; graduated at the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed in 1850, and in 1851 was ordained pastor of the Neshanock and Hermon churches, in Pennsylvania. In 1859 he accepted a call to the First Reformed Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, but owing to failing health resigned in 1860. Subsequently he settled in the West, and became president of the Union Female Seminary at Xenia, Ohio. He died Jan. 9, 1865. Mr. McMillan was a man of good talents—the judgment predominating over the imaginative, the practical over the speculative; truthfulness, simplicity, and humility were the principal traits of his character. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 395.

McMillan, Hugh, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester District, S. C., February, 1794; pursued his collegiate studies at the University of Penn-

sylvania, and graduated with the highest honor; was soon after elected professor of languages in Columbia College; but, determining to consecrate himself to the ministry, he entered the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., and in 1820 was licensed to preach. In 1821 he was ordained and installed pastor of the Rock Creek Brick Church, Chester District, S. C. His reputation as a profound linguist being now well established, at the public solicitation he founded an academy at the Brick Church for the primary education of young men. In 1828 he accepted a call to become pastor of the united congregations of Xenia and Massie's Creek, Ohio, where also, at the earnest request of his people, he established an academy in 1830. In 1850, his congregation, becoming too numerous, divided into two societies, and he removed to Cedarville, where he died, Oct. 9, 1860. Dr. McMillan was a man of deep-toned piety; zealous, faithful, and indefatigable as a minister; profound and learned as a scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 218. (J. L. S.)

McMillan, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington County, Pa., March 10, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1850, then taught some months in Darlington, Pa., and afterwards took charge of the academy in Cross-Creek village, where he labored for three years with great acceptance. Subsequently he studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary in Alleghany City; was licensed in 1856, and in 1857 ordained and installed pastor of the congregations of Warren and Pine Run, Pa., where he labored until his death, Aug. 1, 1864. Mr. McMillan possessed a clear mind, a warm heart, and a most unassuming spirit; his talents were of a high order, cultivated by thorough education; his sermons were of the richest ingredients and finest mould. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 105.

McMullen, James Porter, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., July 21, 1811; graduated at Franklin College, Athens, Georgia, in 1838; studied theology privately, under the direction of his brother, Rev. Dr. McMullen, and in 1841 was licensed and ordained pastor of the united churches of Mt. Zion, Concord, and Carthage, Ala., and afterwards took charge of Pleasant Ridge and Bethsaida churches, in Greene and Pickens counties, Ala. In 1864 he was appointed by the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly of the Church South to labor in the Army of Tennessee, in which service he was killed in battle, May 16, 1864. Mr. McMullen was a man of excellent mind and great force of character. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 348.

McMurray, William, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Salem, N. Y., in 1784; graduated at Union College in 1804; was tutor in same in 1806–7; was licensed to preach by the Associate Reformed Church in 1808; settled at Lansingburg, N. Y., in 1808-11; entered the Reformed Church as pastor at Rhinebeck Flats, N. Y., in 1812–20; then removed to Market Street Reformed Dutch Church, New York, and died in 1835. His character was distinguished for its beautiful balance and harmony of excellent and gentle qualities. His ministry was remarkable for its fervor, diligence, and uniform success. His Church in New York grew from very small and humble beginnings, and chiefly among a poor people in the then suburbs, to a membership of between five and six hundred communicants. Besides frequent contributions to the periodical press, Dr. McMurray published several valuable occasional discourses (1825, 1833). —Sprague, *Annals*, vol. ix; Corwin, *Manual (Dutch) Reformed Church*, s. v. (W. J. R. T.)

McNair, John, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born near Newton, Pa., May 28, 1806. He was reared with an earnest regard to his spiritual welfare, and at an early age made a profession of religion. He was educated at Newton Academy, then at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., graduating in 1828; studied theology at Princeton Seminary, N. J.; was licensed in 1831, and ordained in 1833. He labored for several years as a missionary in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey; but subsequently he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor for eleven years. During the rebellion he entered the army as chaplain, and when the war was over returned and took charge of the Church in Strasburg, Pa. He died Jan. 27, 1867. Dr. McNair was retiring in his manner and deportment, possessing, however, a firmness and integrity of purpose which made itself felt in his expressed opinions. His sermons evinced a high order of talent, being eloquent, yet plain and easily comprehended. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 132.

McNeill, Angus Currie, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Robeson County, N. C., May 4, 1812. He early exhibited an intense fondness for learning, and, though he had to struggle against adverse influences, managed to secure a good primary education; his final preparation for college was received in the Donaldson Academy in Fayetteville, N. C., where he discharged the twofold duties of teacher and pupil until 1835, when he entered the University of North Carolina, where he graduated with the first honor. He studied theology in the Union Seminary at Prince Edward, Va., was licensed in 1845, and ordained and installed pastor of Carthage, Union, and Cypress churches in North Carolina. In 1852 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Centre Ridge Church, Ala., which relation existed until his death, Oct. 14, 1860. Mr. McNeill was an able minister, an eloquent orator, and a fine scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 110.

McNeill, James H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayetteville, N. C., May 23, 1825; entered North Carolina University at Chapel Hill, N. C.; after one year went to Yale College, New Haven, and subsequently graduated at Delaware College, Newark, Del., in 1844; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, for two years, and afterwards graduated at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1848, and in 1849 ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Pittsborough, in Chatham County, N. C.; was made one of the corresponding secretaries of the American Bible Society at New York in 1853; in 1861 was elected associate editor of the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, which position he held until 1862, when he entered the Confederate army. He was killed in battle, March 31, 1865. Mr. McNeill was a man of strong will, and great independence of thought and action; his distinct individuality was indicative of the highest executive ability; his earnestness and vigor made him effective in every sphere. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 356.

McNeish, David, a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1820; came to this country while yet a youth; graduated at Rutgers College in 1841, and at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1844. He consecrated himself to the work of domestic missions, for which he was peculiarly fitted by his constitutional vigor and enthusiasm, by his unusual gifts as a public speaker, and by the depth and activity of his piety. He combined the "ingenium pervidum Scotorum" with a truly American practicality, and with a consuming zeal which dared all difficulties and endured all trials "for Jesus's sake." Few preachers could be more intensely earnest and solemn in dealing with the higher themes of the Gospel, and in appeals to the consciences and the hearts of his hearers. One of his sermons on the last judgment seemed to the writer of this notice as if it were almost inspired. Its realizing power was awful and sublime. But he was equally at home in appealing to the tenderest sensibilities of the soul. Like a master musician, he could sweep all the chords of his mighty harp at will. His devotion to his missionary work in Michigan and Indiana, where all of his ministry was spent, was self-consuming. He

lived for the Church of God until his earthly career closed in 1854. His great thought and last uttered wish was in full accordance with his high theological belief and experience. "Oh, that I may be made perfectly holy!" He was settled successively at Centreville and Constantine, Mich. (1844–49); at South Bend, Ind. (1849–52); and again at Constantine (1852–54). But his influence was powerful in all the Reformed churches of the Western States, among which he was a pioneer and a master builder. (W. J. R. T.)

McNelly, GEORGE, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Feb. 15, 1793, on Drake's Creek, Davidson (now Sumner) County, then territory south of Ohio, now State of Tennessee; was licensed to preach in August, 1814; entered the travelling connection in the autumn of the same year; was ordained deacon in 1816, and elder in 1818, by bishop McKendree. His ministerial life was spent in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. His educational opportunities were limited, but by hard study, pursued in the midst of the abundant labors of a Methodist itinerant, he obtained a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and also of the sciences. He stood quite high, not only as a preacher, but also as a theologian. See McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, ii, 334.

McNulty, JOHN, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Killala, Ireland, in June, 1829; was educated at Belfast, Ireland, and, after reaching the United States, in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., Union Seminary, New York City, and the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J. In 1853 he was licensed, and in 1854 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Richland City, Wis.; in 1856 accepted a call from the Church of Caledonia in De Korra, Wis., where he labored zealously until he died, May 15, 1861. Mr. McNulty was a devoted and zealous worker in the cause of Christ. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 111.

McPheeters, WILLIAM, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta County, Va., Sept. 28, 1778; was educated at Liberty Hall, Lexington, and licensed in 1802. Soon after he preached in various parts of Kentucky, extended his labors to Ohio, and took charge of the Church at Danville, Ky., and of a male school. In 1804 he visited the counties of Greenbriar and Monroe. Subsequently he served at New Lebanon and Windy Cove, and acted as a stated supply in 1805 at Bethel Church. He was ordained in 1806, and took charge of the academy and congregation in Raleigh, N. C., where he remained several years. In 1836 he was principal of a school in Fayetteville, and was afterwards agent of the Board of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly. He died Nov. 7, 1842.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 304.

McPherson, John Erskine, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Iredell County, N. C., Aug. 17, 1806; was educated at the academy at Beattie's Ford, N. C.; spent one year in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and finished his studies privately under the Rev. R. H. Morrison, of Davidson College, N. C.; was licensed in 1838, and for several months labored as a missionary in North Carolina. In 1842 he was ordained, but for ten years more continued to labor in the mission work; in 1852 he was called to Prospect Church, in Rowan County, N. C.; in 1855 removed to Cherokee County, and labored in that missionary region until 1859. He died April 9, 1860. Mr. McPherson was characterized by a patient perseverance and devotion to duty, indicative of the highest grade of spiritual life. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 102.

McPherson, Joseph A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in West Feliciana Parish, La., Dec. 19, 1835; was educated at the Centenary College, Jackson, La. (class of 1853); spent several years in teaching; entered the Mississippi Conference in 1859, and was appointed to Bolivar Circuit; in 1860 he was transferred to Fort Adams Circuit, and died June 18, 1861. He was a faithful and able minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly lamented his early loss.—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Ch. South*, ii, 317.

McQueen, GEORGE, Jr., a Presbyterian missionary, was born in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1826; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1849; studied divinity in the seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed and ordained by the presbytery of Albany in 1852, and soon after sailed for Africa, as a member of the Corisco Mission, where he labored until he died, March 25, 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 76.

McReynolds, ROBERT YOUNG, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Allen County, Kentucky, in 1818; was converted in his sixteenth year; was licensed to preach in his nineteenth year, and joined the Kentucky Conference in 1829. In 1840 he was transferred to the Rock River Conference, and was stationed at Galena; in 1841 was transferred back to the Kentucky Conference, and continued in the regular work until 1845, when he located until 1867. He was next readmitted to the Louisville Conference, and appointed to Portland; in 1868 to Shepherdsville Circuit, and in 1869 to Litchfield Circuit. He died August 23, 1870. Mr. McReynolds was "a benevolent man, a cheerful, happy Christian, very zealous and useful in the ministry."—*Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870, s. v.

McSwain, WILLIAM ADNEY, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Montgomery (now Stanley) County, N. C., Nov. 5, 1814; was converted and joined the Church in 1831; was licensed to preach in 1836, and entered the South Carolina Conference in 1838. He served on the following circuits: Pleasant Grove in 1843; Rutherford in 1844–45; Union in 1846–47, and again in 1854; Neuberry in 1848, and again in 1855–56; Black Swamp in 1849–50. In 1851–52 he was pastor of Trinity Church, Charleston; in 1853 of Spartansburg station; in 1857 tract agent of his Conference; from 1859–62 presiding elder on the Cokesbury District; in 1863–64 pastor of Ninety-six, and in 1865 of Laurens Circuit. He died Jan. 7, 1866. Besides the trustworthiness indicated in his appointments, he served as a delegate to the last two sessions of the Southern General Conference, and was elected to that which was to meet in 1862, and was at the time of his death president of the Sunday-school Society of the South Carolina Conference. "Few men, with similar disadvantages, ever attained that measure of ability, degree of eminence, and width of popularity which constituted that honor which was so cheerfully and universally awarded by the Church and world to this self-made man. Possessed of great versatility of genius, gifted with rare social qualities and conversational powers, and blessed with a singular descriptive faculty, he was well qualified, from his vast fund of general information, to give life, interest, and information to the fireside or social circle. His appearance in the pulpit, his engaging address, flow of language, and tone of voice, and ease and naturalness of manner, his own interest in the subject, with the general persuasiveness of his style, gave to his sermons, which evinced much thought and research, an effectiveness which was only equalled by the great popularity of the preacher himself. He was a favorite divine with all sects of Christians and all classes of people." See *Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, iii, 17.

McVean, DANIEL CREIGHTON, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Caledonia, Livingston County, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1818; graduated at Union College in 1844; pursued his theological studies in the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York at Newburg, and in 1847 was licensed to preach. He travelled for two or three years as a probationer, and in 1850 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Church of Lyndon, where he labored for sixteen years. He died Sept. 7, 1868. Mr. McVean was a faithful pastor,

a useful minister, and an eminently pious man. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 274.

McVickar, JOHN, D.D., an eminent clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at New York in 1787, and was educated at Columbia College (class of 1804), and at Cambridge University, England. He entered the ministry in 1811 as rector at Hyde Park, N. Y., and remained there until 1817, when he was appointed professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres in Columbia College. The duties of this position he discharged until 1857, when ill-health obliged him to retire from active duties. In recognition of his services he was created Emeritus professor. He also acted as chaplain on Governor's Island. He died at Bloomingdale, N. Y., Oct. 29, 1868. Dr. McVickar was the author of several valuable works; among them the following deserve our notice: *Early Years of Bishop Hobart* (1834):—*The Professional Years of Bishop Hobart* (1836):—*A Memoir of the Rev. Edmund D. Griffins*, appended to the "Remains of the Rev. E. D. Griffins" (1831, 2 vols. 8vo). See *Life of the Rev. John McVickar, D.D.*, by W. A. McVickar (N. Y. 1871); *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1868; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1198.

END OF VOL. V.

NOT TO BE TAKEN F

GTU LIBRARY
3 2400 00639 8907